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PREFACE.

In preparing for publication this edition of a Syriac version of the Apocalypse distinct from that which has hitherto been the only one known, I have judged it best to reproduce the text paginatim et lineatim as it stands in the manuscript from which I derive it. I have merely restored a few letters and points which were illegible or doubtful in the original, usually marking such restorations with square brackets, and in every case indicating them in the Notes which I have added after the text. The Ms. has happily reached us in such good preservation, that the instances in which this has been needful are very few. The Syriac text, and following Notes, form Part II of this volume. My aim has been to place any Syriac scholar who may consult it, as nearly as may be in the same position as if he had the Ms. itself before him. This I believe has been substantially effected, so far as is practicable in a typographical reproduction; though here and there, in the placing of points, slight variations have occurred,—probably immaterial, for in this respect the usage of the scribe seems to have been arbitrary. The prefixed autotype Plate gives a perfect representation of two columns of the Ms.; and a comparison of these with the corresponding columns of the printed text will show exactly the degree of faithfulness which has been attained in the latter.

In Part I, I have given a reconstruction of the Greek text on which the translator may be supposed to have worked. From it, a student of
the New Testament who is unacquainted with Syriac, will be able to ascertain the textual evidence of this version less indirectly, and more surely, than through the medium of a rendering into Latin or English. At the points where doubt exists as to the underlying Greek, I have added such footnotes as may enable the reader of it to judge for himself; but, thanks to the fidelity and clearness of the translator's work, such points are not many, and none of them is material. I may safely affirm that on every textual question of interest or importance, this version bears its testimony without ambiguity, and my Greek text conveys that testimony with precision. At p. cxlv will be found an exact statement of the limits within which it may be relied on as a textual authority.

To this text I have prefixed a Dissertation, in which I have fully discussed the Syriac text, and its underlying Greek. I have endeavoured to lead to the conclusion that this Apocalypse is a portion of the original "Philoxenian" New Testament, as translated A.D. 508, for Philoxenus of Mabug, by Polycarpus "the Chorepiscopus." I have endeavoured to show, farther, that the other version of the Apocalypse, first printed by De Dieu in 1627, is a revision of this, and belongs probably to the Syriac New Testament of Thomas of Harkel, of A.D. 616.

Whether I am right or not in these views, I think it will be admitted by competent critics that the version now printed is older than the other, is superior to it in linguistic purity and in textual value, and is therefore more worthy of being printed in future Syriac New Testaments as a supplement to the Peshitto, in company with the text of the four non-Peshitto Catholic Epistles, first edited in 1630 by Pococke. The affinity between that text of the Epistles and this of the Apocalypse is evident; whereas the De Dieu Apocalypse, alike in diction and in method, is Harkleian, harmonizing neither with the Pococke Epistles nor with the Peshitto.
PREFACE.

In the Chapters of the Dissertation which relate to the Greek text, I have judged it most fitting to treat of the authorities—manuscripts or versions—apart from all textual theories, and simply in view of the facts presented by them when independently studied. I have therefore refrained from using the terms "Neutral," "Western," "Alexandrian," "Syrian," and so forth, as designating types of text.

I gladly take this opportunity of acknowledging the great liberality of the Earl of Crawford in giving me permission to borrow from his Library and to retain for many months this unique Ms.

I have also to express my thanks to the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D., Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford, for the information which led me to the discovery of this version, and for much valuable advice and assistance in the course of the present work,—especially for his efficient help in deciphering the defaced colophon: to Mr. J. P. Edmond, Librarian to Lord Crawford, for many verifications of the readings of the Ms.: to Dr. Karl Hörning, late of the Ms. Department of the British Museum, for collation with the original of my transcript of the extract from Ms. Add. 17193, page 35, Part II: to the Rev. H. Jackson Lawlor, B.D., Senior Chaplain of St. Mary's, Edinburgh, and to the Rev. A. Edward Johnston, B.D., Assistant Lecturer in Divinity, Dublin, for careful reading and correction of the proofs of the Syriac text and matter pertaining to it, and for helpful suggestions, some of which are specially acknowledged in the Notes: to Mr. John I. Beare, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, for similar services in the revision of the Greek text and appended Notes: to the Rev. John H. Bernard, D.D., Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity and Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, for useful criticisms and advice on the investigations contained in Chapters III and IV of the Dissertation: and to Mr. John B. Bury, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, for valuable help in the topographical and historical inquiries, of which the results are summed up in Chapter VIII.
PREFACE.

I desire to record, farther, the advice and encouragement which, in the progress of this work, I received from two eminent scholars whose loss, within the last few years, all who are concerned in Semitic studies have to deplore—Dr. William Wright, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, whose judgment guided me in the paleographic questions discussed in Chapter VII of the Dissertation; and the Very Rev. Dr. R. Payne Smith, Dean of Canterbury, to whom I frequently had recourse—and never without a satisfying response from his ready kindness and great learning—in doubtful points of Syriac scholarship. At his request I placed in his hands the sheets containing the Syriac text when first printed (in 1892), and references to them will be found in the latter part of his Thesaurus.

It only remains that I should express my obligations to Mr. Weldrick, of the Dublin University Press, and to his staff, for the care they have bestowed on the printing of the work, especially of the Syriac text.

JOHN GWYNN.

November, 1896.
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THE APOCALYPSE.

PART I.

INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION, AND GREEK TEXT WITH FOOTNOTES.
INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.

THE SYRIAC VERSIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

CHAPTER I.

PREFATORY.

I.—Plan and Contents of the present Work.

The Syriac version of the Apocalypse, which I now introduce to the knowledge of Biblical scholars, forms part of a Ms. of the New Testament in Syriac belonging to the Library of the Earl of Crawford. This Ms. was purchased in London by the late Earl in or about the year 1860, but no record has been preserved of the seller's name, nor is it known how or at what time it was brought to Europe. In a Memoir published by the Royal Irish Academy, in vol. xxx of their Transactions (pp. 347 sqq.), I have already given a full account of it and of its contents, and an investigation into its date and history; and have also discussed the character, and endeavoured to determine the authorship, of the version of the Apocalypse which it contains. In the present Dissertation my principal object is to enter more fully than I have done in that Memoir into the consideration of this version: at its close I propose to give a summary of the results I have arrived at with regard to the Ms. itself. For the present it suffices to say of it that, among Syriac Mss. of non-European origin, it is unique, as being the only one that exhibits the entire New Testament—the Peshitto text supplemented not only by the four minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude), but by the Apocalypse—that it was written in a Jacobite monastery of north-eastern Mesopotamia, and that its age has been variously estimated at from seven to eleven hundred years.
INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.

Immediately after the present Dissertation, forming with it Part I of the present volume, I have given (pp. 1–48) for the convenience of students of the New Testament who do not read Syriac, in lieu of the usual Latin translation, a reconstruction of the Greek text of the Apocalypse which may be presumed to underlie the Syriac, with footnotes appended dealing with the relations of agreement and disagreement that subsist between that text and the other chief authorities. In Part II (pp. 1–29), I have printed the Syriac text complete, reproducing it page for page and line for line, exactly as it stands in the Ms.; followed (pp. 37 sqq.) by a body of Notes, in which I have indicated the chief points of interest in it, and the emendations required by it here and there.

II.—The Syriac Versions of the extra-Peshitto Books of the N. T.

It is generally known that the Apocalypse and the Four Epistles above specified are not acknowledged as part of the Peshitto Canon; and that the Apocalypse is wanting from all, and the Four Epistles from all the earlier, and nearly all the later, Mss. hitherto described of the New Testament in Syriac, as well as from all the earlier printed editions, beginning with the Editio Princeps of Widmanstad (1555). These Books were for the first time edited as part of the Syriac New Testament by Sionita in the Paris Polyglot of 1633, in a form substantially identical with the Syriac texts which had been separately issued—of the Apocalypse, by De Dieu in 1627,* and of the Four Epistles, by Pococke in 1630.* Thence they passed into the Syriac columns of Walton’s Polyglot (1657), and into all subsequent Syriac New Testaments. This text of the Four Epistles (“Pococke’s,” as it is commonly called) is the one exhibited in our Ms.; but of it I do not propose to treat except incidentally, my present business being with the Apocalypse. As regards the commonly printed text of the Apocalypse (known as “De Dieu’s”), there is no room to question that it is the work of an age much later than that of the Peshitto, and is formed on different principles. Its date and authorship are undetermined, but its affinity to the New Testament version of Thomas of Harkel is unmistakable. Of the few Mss. which contain it, however,

* From the Leyden University Ms., Cod. Scalig. 18 (Syr.).
* From the Bodleian Ms., Bod. Or. 119.
PREFATORY.

not one exhibits it as part either of the Harkleian version or of the Peshitto. Yet if not actually the work of Thomas of Harkel, it is wrought so strictly on the lines of the rigid and peculiar method introduced by him, that it cannot be placed earlier—or (probably) much if at all later—than his time; and it may be provisionally assigned to the first half of the seventh century.

It may naturally be—and in point of fact has been*—questioned whether Sionita, and (after him) Walton and subsequent editors, have not judged amiss in thus deviating from the practice of the Mss., and using as a supplement to the Peshitto, a version so widely remote from it in method and diction, as well as in probable age. In reply it may be fairly urged, that the object of these editors being to present a Syriac New Testament in all parts corresponding to the Greek and the Latin, they were justified in adopting the only version of the Apocalypse that was forthcoming, so as to give completeness to their publication even though homogeneity was unattainable.† Nor was there any reason to apprehend that students of the Syriac New Testament might be misled by this arrangement; for even a superficial knowledge of the language would make it impossible for a reader to mistake this supplement for an integral part of the version to which it is appended. Nor again (it may be added with hardly less confidence) could any competent scholar suppose it to come from the same translation as the other portion of extraneous matter above referred to—that which comprises the four non-Peshitto Epistles. These two supplements, though together included in the printed editions, were derived, as above stated, by two different editors, from two independent sources, and are associated in no known Syriac Ms. of the New Testament* of Eastern

---


† In like manner, but with some (though very recent) Ms. authority, Walton includes with the Peshitto Old Testament, 3 Esdras and part of Tobit in a version evidently Hexaplar.

* The Paris Ms., Biblioth. Nat., *Supplement 79 (No. 5 of Zotenbergs Catalogue)*, though it incorporates the supplementary Books with the Peshitto, is no exception to what has been stated above. It was written in Paris, in 1695, sixty-two years after the printing of the Paris Polyglot.

These Books are found together in one Ms. of Oriental origin only—the Dublin Ms., B. 5. 16 (Trinity Coll.). But this Ms. (see *Transactions, Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxvii, pp. 271, 283), is a transcript made in 1625 by a monk of the Lebanon for Archbishop Usher; and it is not a Syriac New Testament, but a supplement to the Syriac New Testament. The combination of its contents (Apocalypse, *Pericope de Adultera*, Four Epistles) is but the reflex of Usher's desire to
origin. They have nothing in common save the negative fact that they do not belong to the Peshitto. The Syriac of the Apocalypse of the printed editions is unsparingly graecized, and its method is severely (even servilely) literal. The Syriac of the Four Epistles is idiomatic, and its method combines faithfulness with freedom. In both respects—diction and method—the former portion (as has been above said) bears the artificial character of the Harkleian; while the latter follows the lines of the Peshitto and makes a near approach to the excellence of that admirable version. Critics of experience and acuteness may perhaps detect shortcomings on the part of the translator of these Epistles, and may fix on points in which he falls short of the Peshitto standard: but the ordinary Syriac student is conscious of no marked change of style when he passes in reading from 1 Peter to 2 Peter, from 1 John to 2 and 3 John. In the Ms. from which Pococke’s *Editio Princeps* of the Four Epistles was printed, they stand, not as in most earlier copies postponed to the Three Epistles of the Peshitto, but in their usual Greek order. I suspect that if the first editor of the Syriac New Testament in 1555 had had in his hands this or a similar Ms., these Epistles would have been unhesitatingly included by him, and accepted by Biblical scholars without question, as an integral part of the Peshitto. Or if questioned, they would have been questioned on grounds of external evidence—for, from the time of Cosmas Indicopleustes* (sixth century), it has been known that the Peshitto Canon lacks these Epistles—not of internal discrepancy of style and language, or of inferiority of execution.

procure the Syriac text of the portions of the New Testament that were wanting from Widmanstäd’s edition; and it gives no sure ground for presuming that the scribe found them in one and the same Ms.

* In his *Topographia Christiana*, lib. vii, p. 292 D.
CHAPTER II.

THE PRESENT VERSION.

I.—Its Character and Merits.

What has been said, in the previous Chapter, of the resemblance to the Peshitto borne by the “Pococke” Epistles, may be affirmed, with at least equal confidence, of the Apocalypse in the version which I now publish. Lord Crawford’s Ms., whence I derive it, was (see pp. cx, cxi, infr.) in the possession of an Eastern—probably Jacobite—Patriarch in 1534. The Ms. on which Widmanstäd’s Editio Princeps of the Syriac New Testament was mainly based, was sent from Marde, in Mesopotamia, in or before 1549, by the then Jacobite Patriarch, through the hands of Moses, one of his priests, who became Widmanstäd’s helper in preparing that edition.* This Ms. is not now forthcoming, but is known to have contained the whole Peshitto New Testament, and no more.† Had that Patriarch, instead of this copy, possessed, like the Patriarch of fifteen years earlier, and sent to Europe, the Crawford Ms., or one of equivalent contents, it may safely be presumed that Widmanstäd would have, on its authority, given to the world, without doubt and in all good faith, a Syriac New Testament complete in all parts and commensurate with the Greek canon as commonly received. Thus the Editio Princeps would have exhibited, with the Peshitto and distinguished from it by no external indications, not only the Four Epistles, but the Apocalypse, in a version

* For the history of Widmanstäd’s edition, see the prefaced Dedicatio ad Div. Ferdinandum Imperat. Design. (a * * *, fo. 3 v, et sqq.); and for the date of the mission of Moses see the Syriac Note appended to the Gospels (fo. 131 v), which states that he was sent to Pope Paul [III.], who died, November, 1549;—See also Wright’s Catalogue of Syriac Ms. in British Museum, pp. 215, 216, for evidence that he reached Rome before Pope Paul’s death.
† See the prefatory Note to the Catholic Epistles (Widmanstäd’s edition), BB. fo. 1, v; and the appended Epistle to Gieger (KK. fo. 3, v).
so closely akin in style and language to the Books of the Peshitto proper, that even an accomplished Semitic scholar might readily fail to discover in the supplementary matter the traces of a later hand. Widmanstad seems to have been unaware that the Canon of the Peshitto fell short of the completeness of the Greek, and to have supposed that the absence of the Apocalypse and Four Epistles from the copy brought by Moses was a mere defect of that Ms.* Better-informed critics would, no doubt, have challenged the Four Epistles on the grounds of external evidence above referred to; but as regards the Apocalypse no such evidence was then forthcoming, and the supplementary character of the version of that Book might readily have escaped detection. For, in point of internal evidence, it might well pass muster. The merits which I have above attributed to the version of the Four Epistles, distinguish—as it seems to me, in a degree even higher—the version of the Apocalypse which the Crawford Ms. associates with it. The Greek of the Apocalypse, above all other New Testament writings, has a Semitic cast, and therefore is capable of idiomatic, while exact, reproduction in a Semitic tongue, such as no effort of a translator could attain in rendering the Epistles in question, or any other part of the New Testament. Compared with the Peshitto proper, it will be found to rival it in vernacular propriety, while giving a closer rendering of the Greek: compared with the Apocalypse of the printed texts, its superiority in purity of idiom, maintained without sacrifice of fidelity to its original, will be apparent.

That the present version deserves the twofold praise I claim for it—of faithfulness at once to the Greek original and to the Syriac idiom—will, I believe, be agreed by all competent critics who examine its text as printed at the close of the second Part of the present volume. It is so exact, that in comparing it with the original, no difficulty will be found in determining what reading of the Greek the translator had before him, except in cases where the deficiencies of the Syriac language—its want of case-endings, its poverty of verbal forms, or the like—make the discrimination between two or more rival readings impossible: while at the same time it is so idiomatic, that no instance will be met with in which he has

* See the references cited in the notes to last page.
sacrificed vernacular propriety for the sake of precise literalness of rendering. His scrupulous fidelity to the substance of the Greek has nowhere betrayed him into the adoption or imitation of Greek constructions, by which the Syriac of the other version of the Apocalypse (in common with the Harkleian) is systematically debased. With him, every word, as well as every phrase, is, with rare exceptions, represented by a purely Syriac equivalent; and the expedient of naturalizing Greek words, adapted or transliterated, is resorted to only in the two extreme cases—of words which have absolutely no Syriac equivalent, such as χρυσόπρασος (xxi. 20)—and of words which, by the usage of good writers, have been admitted into the Syriac vocabulary, such as διαβήματι, στάδιον, στοιχή (xi. 19, xiv. 20, vi. 11); to which are, perhaps, to be added some words of doubtfully Greek origin, such as ἀψυρόσ, κυβιστός (viii. 11, xi. 9) and some names of precious stones in xxi. 19, 20, and elsewhere. But this practice is with him less frequent than even in the Peshitto New Testament.* It is to be added, that he steadfastly avoids the fault of most Syriac translators—the only one justly chargeable as habitual against the Peshitto, of a tendency to amplification and paraphrase. The result is, that it would be difficult for a reader unacquainted with the Greek of the Apocalypse to discover that he had here before him a translation, and not an original document. This is so partly, no doubt, in consequence of the character, already noticed, of the Greek, which being of Semitic rather than Hellenic cast, passes naturally, and without reluctance, into Syriac. But any scholar who compares this with the other Syriac version of the Apocalypse, marked as the latter is by a perpetual graecizing of diction and construction, will soon satisfy himself that the purity and idiomatic propriety which, in this version, are combined with close fidelity of rendering, are largely due to the happy method and skill of the translator, and not by any means altogether to the character of the Book with which he had to deal.

II.—Its general Affinity to the Peshitto.

Although, as I have said, even a practised Syriac scholar might well have been misled into accepting this version as belonging to the Peshitto,

* See below, p. xxx.
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if the Syriac New Testament had first reached him in a Ms. like Lord Crawford’s, in which this is incorporated with the acknowledged Peshitto Books, I do not suggest it even as a possible hypothesis that it may be an integral part of that great version. Its affinity to the Peshitto is far from being so close as that of the other version to the Harkleian: it is such an affinity as bespeaks a translator not identical, or even contemporaneous, with the person (or any of the persons, if there were more than one) to whom we owe the Peshitto; but rather one who had made that version his study, and so imbued himself with its manner and spirit, that, in this his work supplemental to it, he naturally and without effort reproduces in the main its diction and idiom, and in great measure follows its method, though aiming at stricter adherence to his original.

III.—Its special Affinity to the O. T. Peshitto.

Careful scrutiny discloses a further characteristic of this version. Among the Books of the New Testament, the Apocalypse is not only the most Semitic in form, phrase, and spirit, but it is the one in which, though by indirect citation, the language of the Old Testament is most freely appropriated. No reader can fail to observe how it reproduces the imagery and the visions—often almost in the words—of the Hebrew Prophets, especially of Daniel and of Ezekiel. For adequately rendering such a Book into Syriac, therefore, an intimate knowledge of the Peshitto Old Testament would be invaluable—almost indispensable. This qualification our translator proves to have possessed in an eminent degree. His work has some closer affinities, bespeaking a more habitual familiarity, with the Peshitto of the Old Testament than of the New.

This is not the place to discuss the question whether the Old Testament Peshitto is, in whole or part, an earlier work than the New (earlier even, as some Syriac writers claimed, than the Christian era),—or a later work, as J. D. Michaelis and other critics of the last century held;—or whether they were contemporaneous and in fact parts of one great work of one translator, or company or series of translators, which opinion Gregory Barhebraeus, the great scholar of the Jacobite Church of the thirteenth century, was disposed to adopt;—following (as it seems) the still higher authority of Jacob of Edessa, six centuries earlier, and followed by
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(I believe) the majority of Biblical scholars who have studied the matter.\(^*\) For my present purpose it suffices to note the fact, which is beyond question, that, while the diction of the Peshitto Bible as a whole is fairly homogeneous, it is more purely Aramaic in the Old Testament than in the New. Some may see in this a mark of higher antiquity; others (as it seems to me, with better judgment) may regard it rather as a necessary result of the fact that in the Old Testament the basis on which the Peshitto rests is Hebrew, while in the New Testament it is Greek. Hence the task of translation, in case of the Old, was simpler and easier than in that of the New. The former passed readily and without effort into a cognate Semitic tongue: in the latter, the translator (whether we are or are not to suppose one translator to have dealt with both), however steadfast in his adherence to the Syriac idiom, could hardly avoid occasionally introducing Greek words,—such as, in point of fact, are not infrequent in his work.\(^b\) Now in this respect, as I have said, the Crawford Apocalypse follows a stricter usage than that of the Peshitto New Testament; it conforms more nearly to that of the Old, now and then even adopting from the Old a Syriac equivalent for a word (as ἐβαγγέλιον, θρόνος, κυβερνήτης, χαίσαρχος) which, in the New, is (at least sometimes) represented by a transliteration. And, more generally, whenever its vocabulary passes outside the range of the Peshitto New Testament, it proves in most cases to have borrowed from the vocabulary of the Old. In the instances, not of frequent occurrence, where it uses words that are not to be met with at all in the Peshitto, Old or New Testament, it will be found usually to have the authority of one or more good Syriac writers of the best period of the language. The very few words employed in it which are unknown to Syriac literature and lexicography, are correctly formed, and from known roots.

---

\(^*\) See the passages cited from Barhebræus on Ps. x, and from the Preface to his Hororum Mysteriorum, by Walton, Prolegomena, § 13, par. 16;—also by Wiseman, Horae Syriacae, II, § ii, pp. 87, 103. See also the citation from Soade [Jeсуд] in the Praefatio ad Libr. Psalmorum of Sionita (Ad Lectorem, p. 3).

For J. D. Michaelis, see his Introduction to the N.T., vol. II, pt. i, ch. vii. § 2 [March's Translation].

\(^b\) See below, p. xxx.
IV.—Instances illustrative of the foregoing Sections.

I proceed to offer examples in illustration of the above statements; referring for fuller details to the Notes appended to the Syriac text.

i. The following words, so far as I know, are peculiar to this version (S).*

\[\text{αὐτώς} = \text{πονηρός} \text{ (xvi. 2; for the usual ρόνος, but see note in loc.)}; \text{καλλιτω} = \text{μυστικά} \text{ (xviii. 22; from αὐτό; probably a coined word, ingeniously conformed to the sound of the Greek)}; \text{διάκρισις} = \text{δεικν} \text{ (xvi. 8); ἁρματικά} = \text{τετραγώνως} \text{ (xvi. 16). Also καθι} \text{ in καθι} \text{ κεκ} = \text{χαλκολιθικός} \text{ (i. 15).} \]

With these are to be reckoned, as uses or combinations elsewhere unknown of familiar words:

\[\text{καθαρτω} \text{ κόσμος} \text{ (i. 9); κόσμος} = \text{ἀδικωμαί (ii. 11); κακός} = \text{δει (iv. 1, and thenceforward); ἐνδώτης} = \text{εἰσι (v. 6, xvi. 14).} \]

ii. The following lie outside the Peshitto vocabulary, whether of Old or of New Testament, but are otherwise sufficiently authenticated. Those marked *, here and under head iii., occur (some in slightly different forms) in Σ.\(^b\)

\[\text{καθαρτω} = \text{ιερός, εἱρατικός} \text{ (i. 6; see note there); καθαρτω} = \text{χλιαρός} \text{ (iii. 16); καθαρτω} = \text{κολλούρων (iii. 18); καθαρτω} = \text{κυκλόθεν (iv. 8); καθαρτω} = \text{σεισμός} \text{ (vi. 12, where see note; and elsewhere); καθαρτω} = \text{δὴν (vii. 17); καθαρτω, καθαρτω} = \text{ἀψινίθος} \text{ (viii. 11); καθαρτω} = \text{β.β.λαρδίων (x. 2); καθαρτω} = \text{μυκώμαι (x. 3); καθαρτω} = \text{σώρω (xii. 4); καθαρτω} = \text{κεκρυσμενός (xvii. 4); καθαρτω} = \text{μύρο (xviii. 13); καθαρτω} = \text{ναύτης (xviii. 17); καθαρτω} = \text{εὐδομής (xxi. 18); καθαρτω} = \text{β.δ.λυμα (xxi. 27); καθαρτω} = \text{ρυπαρός (xxii. 11). I forbear to enter here the equivalents for χρυσόπαρος, ύακνως, ῥήματος (xxi. 20).} \]

To these may be added the following words used in forms or combinations, or with meanings, unknown to the Peshitto (O.T. and N.T. alike):

\[\text{καθαρτω}, \text{καθαρτω} = \text{σαλπίκω (viii. 6 and after); καθαρτω, καθαρτω} = \text{κατηγορώ, κατήγορος (xii. 10); καθαρτω} \text{ for καθαρτω (xiii. 18); καθαρτω} \text{ (pl. emphat. masc.)} \]

* Henceforth, for brevity's sake, I use (as in my Notes) S to designate this version, and Σ for the version commonly printed.

* Some of the words entered under ii. and iii. occur in the Syro-Hexaplar.
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iii. The following words, forms, and combinations, of words, belong to the vocabulary of the Pesitto Old Testament; but not of the New, though some (but not all) of them might naturally have found a place in it.

* = Found once or twice in Pesitto N. T., but only in O. T. citations.

* = Found in the "Pocolo" Epistles.

* = Written somewhat differently in Pes.
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Also, for κυβερνήται = κυβερνήται (xviii. 17), compare 2 Chron. viii. 18.

This list is, if not exhaustive, at least sufficient to make good what has been above said of our translator’s familiar knowledge and use of the Peshitto Old Testament. Instances are to be found also in which he employs words in senses for which Peshitto authority is not forthcoming until from the New Testament we pass to the Old;—ἐπιστρέψω (i. 12); ἔμω (iii. 15); ζητεῖ (iii. 16); γεγραμμένος (v. 1, xx. 15); σφραγίζω, κατασφραγίζω (iv., xx. 3); κάλλος = πλίνω (vii. 14); μετρῶ (x. 1); μέμημαι (passive, xvi. 19); τίμω (xvii. 4); ἐλέφας (xviii. 12); ἀφαίρομαι = νῦς ἀνθρώπου (i. 13, xiv. 14), as in Peshitto Ezekiel passim; instead of the more adequate ἀφαίρομαι of Peshitto N.T., Σ, Harkleian, and Hexaplar.

Moreover, it appears that certain idioms, apparently Hebraic, which in the Peshitto distinguish the Syriac of the Old Testament from that of the New, have passed into the version S (but not into Σ). Such are, the gerundive use of the infinitive with a prefixed, in rendering λέγων (introductory to a speech, i. 17 et passim) by לְמָסַע (לְמָסַע); and the representation of the adjective ὁμοιομα (as if ὁμοιόμα, or ὁς ὁμοιόμα), by the construct noun ὁμοιόμα (iv. 3), or by ὁμοιόμα (i. 13), or the like, (דומא, דומא, דומא). In like manner, it is observable that S adheres to the usage of the Peshitto Old Testament as against that of the New (if the existing text may be trusted) and of Σ, in its frequent retention of the absolute forms of nouns usually met with only in their emphatic state; also, of the characteristically Semitic mode of expressing the genitive-relation between two nouns by changing the primary noun (as in Hebrew) into the construct state, instead of prefixing a to the secondary noun.

Thus, in place of the emphatic forms used in the Peshitto N. T., and in Σ, it borrows from the Peshitto O.T. the absolute forms—

(i. 16); ἀπὸ (iv. 6); ἐπὶ (vii. 1); ὑπὸ (vii. 9); ἐπὶ (ix. 18); ἐπὶ (xi. 4); ἔχει (xi. 10); ἔχει (xii. 14); ἔχει (xvii. 9); ἔχει (xvii. 12); ἔχει (xviii. 12); ἔχει (xiv. 17).

The same is to be said of the use of the construct form in the expres-
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The frequent *κατοκούντες* ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, passim; a few, even, which are actual citations of it:—as ἀβαλμὸν ἔμμο (v. 11; from Psh. Dan. vii. 10); ἀβαλμὸν ἔμμο (xii. 14; Psh. Dan. vii. 25). Nay, in one or two places, the close following of the Peshitto Old Testament has drawn our translator aside from his usual path of literal exactness:—as vi. 11, where ἔτε (usually = ὁδὸς) is expanded into ἔτε ἐκ (ἐκοι καλροῦ), after Psh. Dan. vii. 12; and xviii. 22, where for αὐληταί (ἀυληταί) he substitutes ἄβαλμον ἔμμο (= γένη μονσικῶν [or αὐλητικῶν]),—a rendering so wide of the mark that it would be unaccountable, were it not an evident reminiscence of Psh. Dan. iii. 5; all the more notable, therefore, as an indication of the model on which his diction was shaped.

To show fully the extent to which the manner and language of the Peshitto Old Testament, as distinguished from the manner and language of the New, have influenced the version of the Apocalypse now before us, it would be necessary to make a more detailed and systematic comparison than present conditions of time and space allow. But any student of the Peshitto, by a single careful reading of certain chapters of Ezekiel (such as i. and x.), or of Daniel (such as vii.), side by side with the parallel passages of the Apocalypse (in chapters i., iv., xiii.), as they appear in this version, may sufficiently satisfy himself that those Books, in their Peshitto form, were familiar to our translator, and are reproduced in the words, the grammatical forms, and the phrases, of his work.

But though the points, such as I have indicated above, are not few, in which the version S follows the precedents of the Old rather than of the New Testament Peshitto, there remains, after allowing for these, a residuum of general and intimate affinity between it and the latter, in degree and extent far exceeding the diversity. The instances of the diversity do not strike one at a single reading, but are detected by

* Found once or twice in Peshitto N. T., but only in O. T. citations.
pains-taking examination; it is a diversity limited,—I may say exceptional: the affinity is habitual; it exists throughout; it is so obvious that no reader could fail to notice it from the first. Or rather, it is so close that (as I have already said) none but a careful reader and experienced Syriac scholar would be likely to discover from internal evidence that this Apocalypse was not part of the Peshitto, if it had chanced to be incorporated with the Peshitto in the copies of the Syriac New Testament which first reached Europe, as it has been in the Crawford Ms.

V.—Contrast between its Diction and that of the Harkleian Version of N.T.

We shall most readily satisfy ourselves how few and unessential are the points wherein the Crawford Apocalypse deviates from the Peshitto New Testament model, if for the Peshitto we substitute the Harkleian (seventh-century) version as the standard of comparison, and note how distinct are the marks which prove our version to belong substantially to the earlier, as distinguished from the later, school of translation. In the Notes appended (in Part II) to the Syriac text, I have gone into considerable detail in noting the instances of variation, whether in words, or in grammatical forms, or in idioms, between it and the other version (Σ) of the Apocalypse, testing each by the two-fold standard above indicated,—of the Peshitto (Old and New Testament) on the one hand,—and of the Harkleian and its cognate Hexaplar on the other. The result of this investigation proves to be, as a matter not of theory but of fact, that on the whole, and with but a few unimportant exceptions, our Apocalypse stands to the Harkleian in a relation of strong contrast, but to the Peshitto at large (putting aside the distinction between Old and New Testament) in a relation of no less strong resemblance: while the other version no less definitely (probably more definitely) parts company with the Peshitto, and sides with the Harkleian. And I venture to anticipate that the reader of those Notes will follow me in the conclusion I have been led to draw, that while the latter version is certainly Harkleianized, and may well be actually Harkleian,—the work of Thomas of Harkel himself, or at least of a disciple of his method,—the version I now present is the work of an able and industrious translator, trained in a different and earlier school;—as a Greek scholar, competent to represent the original with
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faithful accuracy,—as a Syriac scholar, belonging indeed to an age later
than that which produced the Peshitto, but deeply imbued with the spirit
of the Peshitto, and with conscious and successful endeavour reproducing
the idiomatic freedom of its diction.

VI.—General Contrast between this Version (S) and the rival Version (Σ).

The Notes, in which I have indicated the successive instances as they
occur of contrast between these rival versions, S and Σ, will serve to bear
out the comparison which I have above drawn between them; and they will,
at the same time, supply the readiest illustrations of the character and
method of the version S, its habitual conformity to Peshitto usage, and its
exceptional deviations from the same. I proceed to summarize the main
heads under which the points of contrast may be reduced. It will be seen
that their nature may be briefly expressed by the statement, that this
version is idiomatic, following in the lines of the Peshitto, while that is
graecized, identifying itself with the Harkleian. And this is so, alike
as regards their grammar and their vocabulary, and as regards their
general method.

a. As to grammar and grammatical forms*:

(1). In Σ, the simple status absolutus of nouns is almost supplanted by
the status emphaticus which is used indiscriminately: in S, the absolute
forms are of frequent occurrence, especially in representing anarthrous
nouns;—see the examples above given, p. xxiv, to which (over and above
those which occur in Peshitto New Testament) many more may be added
such as מָצַּד, מָנַּת, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד,
מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד.
So too מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, מָהַּד, for מָהַּד, מָהַּד. A few of these, e.g. מָהַּד, seem
to be peculiar to S.

* Skat-Rördam, in the Dissertatio prefixed to his Libri Judicium et Ruth, sec. Ver. Syr.-Hex.,
has given a very complete and valuable account of the grammatical characteristics of the Syro-
Hexaplar version, which may be profitably compared with the above notes on those of Σ.
* A very few instances of the reverse may be found; see, e.g., iii. 1, xiv. 17, xix. 9, and notes.
* Even after a cardinal number, Σ employs stat. emph. against rule; S usually stat. absol.,
except where the Greek has the article.
(2). The place of the lacking definite article is filled in Σ by the personal or demonstrative pronoun (as οὖς, ὄς, ὅς, ἥς, ὅλος): in S by the legitimate use of the status emphaticus.

(3). The use of the status constructus in Σ is limited for the most part to a few fixed expressions, such as ἐκεῖνος, ἐκεῖνος δὲ, ἐκεῖνος δὲν, and its renderings of compounds, such as εἰδολοθυών, εἰδολολάτρης, ἡμών, χιλιαρχος: in S, it is much more extensively used;—see the examples of this given above, p. xxxv; to which are to be added some which are common to S with the Peshitto New Testament.*

(4). Greek adjectives denoting quality or material in Σ are often rendered by adjectival forms, as ἐκεῖς = προϊόν (ii. 28), κατὰ = πύρων (ix. 17): in S, as if they were substantives in the genitive case.

(5). The ordinal numbers are in Σ normally represented by numeral adjectives; in S by the cardinals with a prefixed,—with one exception, four times recurring, for which see note on ii. 11; also p. xxiii, below.

(6). The possessive pronouns are in Σ normally rendered as separate words, formed by attaching pronominal suffixes to the syllable ης: in S, except where special emphasis is required, by the true Semitic mode of attaching the suffixes to the nouns denoting the object possessed.

(7). The prefix κ, when it stands for the relative pronoun, or for the article before a participle, is in Σ generally preceded by a demonstrative: in S, it frequently stands alone.

(8). In such cases, Σ prefers to use ὁς, ὁς, ὅς, ὅλος: S for the most part, ὁς, ὅς, ὅς, ὅλος, which Σ avoids.

(9). The reflexive pronouns (ἐαυτόν and the rest) are in Σ imperfectly represented by ἐς ὅς, ἐς ὅς, and such like combinations: never, as always in S, by με with suitable suffix of person.

(10). The indefinite τις, in εἰ τις, and sometimes in δώς, is in Σ rendered by ἦς: S treats both as equivalent to the simple ὃς, and uses ἦς = τις, only in rendering ἐὰν τις.

(11). οὐδεῖς in Σ appears as ἦς ἤς: S renders it by καὶ (this contraction, καὶ, is avoided in Σ, but frequent in S).

* Three instances occur in S of the anomalous construction in which the governing noun in stat. constr. is followed by a preposition standing before the other noun (xiv. 3 [also Σ], xvii. 8, xviii. 17).
(12). In Σ, δυν usually appears with pronominal suffix: in S it is often used impersonally without suffix; and sometimes (as xvii. 4) we find even δυνδυν impersonal, with δυνδυν uninflected.

(13). Σ prefers to express the substantive verb by δυν, or ροιο, rather than by the characteristically Syriac use of the personal pronouns (enclitic) in this capacity: the latter use is frequent in S.

(14). Where Σ, in expressing the present tense, cannot avoid the use of participle with enclitic pronoun, the latter is written separately (as δυν δυν, i. 11): in S, in case of the second person, the participle and pronoun are contracted into one word (δυνα, שֶּׁבֶת).

(15). The infinitive, expressing purpose or result, is in Σ usually expressed by infinitive with prefix ᾱ; as as ἦτοι βοήθησεν = μέλλει βοήθειν (ii. 10): in S often by future with prefix ᾱ; as ροιο ἦτοι ἔρχομαι (ib).

(16). Ὠσοῦ, Ὠσα, in Σ, are rendered by ἔρχομαι τοι ἔρχομαι: ἔρχομαι ἔρχομαι, ἔρχομαι ἔρχομαι: in S, less exactly, by ἔρχομαι, ἔχομαι, or ἔχο.</p>

(17). For oi λοιποί, τὰ λοιπά, Σ writes ἔρχομαι: S dispenses with the demonstrative pronoun, and sometimes also with the prefix.

(18). For ὧν (with subjunctive following) Σ has ὧν ἔρχομαι: in S, the simple ὧν usually suffices.

(19). For ὧν, in causal sense, Σ always has ὧν ἔρχομαι: S sometimes ἔρχομαι.

(20). For ὧν μῆ, Σ gives the exact rendering ἔρχομαι ἔρχομαι: S often ἔρχομαι.

(21). Σ habitually prefixes ᾱ to the object of a transitive verb: S does so sparingly; and only in cases where it is needed to prevent ambiguity.

(22). In Σ the preposition ὑπ is used after the participle ἔρχομαι (γέμων): never in S.

b.—As to idiom and vocabulary:—

Instances occur where a Greek idiom is retained by Σ in the shape of a literal translation; while S represents it by an equivalent Syriac idiom. Such are:

Ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα (xii. 2);—in Σ, ὑμῖν alle ἔχομαι ἔχομαι: in S, ἔχομαι. Ἡρεῖαν ἔχω (iii. 17; cp. xxi. 23, xxii. 5);—in Σ, ὑμῖν ἔχομαι ἔχομαι: in S, ἔχο (or ἔχει ἔχει). Μακάρως (of felicitation, xiv. 18, &c.); in Σ, ὑμῖν ἔχομαι ἔχομαι: in S, ὑμῖν ἔχει ἔχει (see note on i. 3).

With these are to be associated the transliterations of Greek words above noted (p. xxi) as a Harkleian habit of Σ, avoided in S. The following are so dealt with in Σ (those marked †, also in the Syro-Hexaplar):—
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ἀκρατον (xiv. 10; S, ἀκρατον): ἀπολλων (ix. 11; S, ἀπολλων):
γνωνια (vii. 1; S, γνωσια): ζωη (i. 13; S, ζωη):
kρυσταλλος (iv. 6; S, κρυσταλλος),—but see xxi. 11, where S expresses this word by trans-
literation): λιβανος (xviii. 13; S, λιβανος): ναυτης (xviii. 17; S, ναυτης):
pαθης (i. 13; S, παθης): σφαλμαν (xxi. 20; S, σφαλμαν):
tετραγωνος (xxi. 16; S, τετραγωνος): φωλη (v. 8; S, φωλη):
χοιρινς (vi. 6; S, χοιρινς): χρυσολοβος (xxi. 20; S, χρυσολοβος).
In many of these cases it will be observed that Σ has Hexaplar precedent. For γνωνια, ζωη,
λιβανος, ναυτης, it has also that of the Harkleian; for κρυσταλλος and
φωλη, that of the Old Testament Peshitto. In a few more, it is coun-
terneed by the Peshitto New Testament; as γενος (xxii. 16; S, γενος):
eναγγελος (xiv. 6; S, ναγγελος): θρονος (iv. 4; S, θρονος):
kατηγορος, κατηγορος (xii. 10; S, κατηγορος): κυβερνητης (xviii. 17; S, κυβερνητης):
λαμπας (iv. 5, viii. 10; S, λαμπας, λαμπας): προσωπος (iv. 7; Σ, προσωπος).
In these last instances, however, as well as in some of the former, Σ proceeds by assimilation rather than mere transliteration of the Greek. But
S, as well as Σ, borrows the Greek ἀφνηθος, ἀφνηθων (viii. 11), the Syriac
κακως being from its plural form unsuitable; and likewise κυμαρος (xiv. 2),
νακυθος (xx. 20), κρυσοπρασος (ib.); as well as ἀφρος, δηναρος, διαθηκη,
kυβος, κυβος, κυβος, κυβος, which may be set down as adoptions. Other
seeming examples, such as μυρον (xviii. 13), σεμιδαλς (ib.), are rather Semitic
words reclaimed from the Greek; and possibly some of those instanced above
may have been borrowed from an Oriental, rather than a Greek source.

Passing from these cases of graecism to the more general vocabulary of
Σ, the materials for farther working out the contrast between it and its
rival version will be found to abound. An examination of the examples
(above collected) of words, forms of words, and phrases, borrowed by S
from Old Testament Peshitto usage, will show that for a considerable
number of them, Σ substitutes words, forms, and phrases belonging to
Hexaplar, or other later and less classical Syriac usage. It would be
easy, but it seems superfluous, to compile further lists of instances
illustrative of the general proposition, which I have above laid down, and
now repeat—referring the reader for the detailed proof of it to my Notes
on the Syriac text in Part II—that, on the whole, S closely follows the
usage of the Peshitto Old and New Testament, and Σ, more closely, that
of the Hexaplar and Harkleian. A few instances will suffice for the
present. Such are:—
c.—As to general method:

The contrast between S and Σ, as regards use of words, shows itself in another point—important as illustrating their difference of aim and method. The translator Σ is controlled in his work by a rigid rule of equivalents in translation, and aims therefore habitually, though not with perfect consistency, at rendering each Greek word, with mechanical uniformity, by a fixed and invariable Syriac representative: the translator S, on the contrary, guides himself by his own perception of fitness and adequacy, and freely varies his rendering of a word, as the varying sense of the original seems to him to require. I subjoin a list of such varied renderings in S, adding [Σ] to the renderings of the rival version.

Οπίσω (i. 10, = behind, θέθων [Σ]: xii. 15, xiii. 3, = after, θέθω).—μέλλω (i. 19 et passim, = to be about to, θέθω [Σ]: x. 4, = to be preparing to, θέθω).—φυλακή (ii. 10, xx. 7, = prison, θέθω [θέθω]: xviii. 2, = den, θέθω [Σ]).—διδαχή (ii. 14, = teaching, θάλασσα [Σ]: ii. 15, 24, = doctrine, θάλασσα).—γεγραμμένος (i. 3, xiv. 1, et passim, = written [of the contents of a book], θάλασσα [Σ]: v. 1, = written on [of a roll]; and xx. 15 [of a name] = inscribed, θάλασσα).—θρόνος (iv. 2 et passim, = throne, θάλασσα [Σ]: or θάλασσα): xx. 4 = seat [of judgment], θάλασσα).—πρόσωπον (iv. 7 et passim, = face, θάλασσα: x. 1, = aspect, θάλασσα, [Σ, θάλασσα]).—σφάξω (v. 6, vi. 9 et passim, = to slay, θάλασσα [Σ], θάλασσα: xiii. 3, = to wound, θάλασσα).—τόπος (vi. 14 et passim, = position, abode, θάλασσα [Σ]: xvi. 16, space, region, θάλασσα).—καύμα (vii. 16, = hot wind [= καυματω], θάλασσα: xvi. 9, = heat, θάλασσα [Σ]).—τελώ (x. 7, xx. 7, = to complete, θάλασσα: xi. 7 et passim, = to fulfill, θάλασσα [Σ varies]).—σχήμα (xiii. 6, xxi. 3, = abode, θάλασσα, [connected with θάλασσα = σχήμα]: xv. 5, = the Tabernacle, θάλασσα [Σ]).—μακάριος (xiv. 13 et passim, of felicitation, θάλασσα: xx. 6, predication of felicity, θάλασσα [Σ, θάλασσα]).—λαμπρός (xv. 6 et passim, = shining, θάλασσα: xviii. 14, = sumptuous, θάλασσα; [Σ, θάλασσα]).—ερημοῦμαι (xvii. 16, xviii. 19, to be
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förkoken, ἐπισκόπηται (ἐξαποιεῖται): xviii. 16, to be emptied, ἐκθέτειν). Elsewhere too, S shows finer discrimination of meanings than Σ; as in restricting the combination ἐπισκόπηται to the rendering of τὰς τὰς, while Σ uses it also for εἰς τὰς,—which latter S, with better judgment, represents by εἰς, εἰς Σ. So again, S consistently takes advantage of the doubtful gender of ἀναγνώστημα to distinguish between the visible sky (x. 6, xxii. 1 bis, masculine), and Heaven the divine Abode (passim, masculine): Σ makes it masculine, except x. 6, where it is feminine,—(inconsistently, see note in loc.).

It is not to be denied, however, that our translator not seldom varies capriciously, and without apparent purpose (perhaps with a feeling like that which was expressed by the English translators of 1611, that every available word in the language was alike entitled, without “unequal dealing,” to “have a place in the Bible”)—sometimes even to the detriment of the sense. In a few cases he seems to have intended a distinction, but to have failed to keep it in mind. Thus βίβλος, βιβλίον, usually represented by ἐπισκόπηται, are rendered ἔπισκοπεῖ, only (but not uniformly) where the Book of Life, or of Judgment, is spoken of. So again (see note on v. 1) there is an apparent endeavour to express σφραγίζω, σφραγίζει, by ἐπισκόπηται, where the seal closes; by ἐπισκόπηται, ἐπισκόπηται, where it confirms: but it is not consistently carried out. But it is hard to imagine any reason why in one verse (i. 12) ἐπισκόπεῖσθαι should first be rendered ἐπισκόπηται, and then ἐπισκόπηται; or why λέγω, at the close of each of the Epistles to the Seven Churches, should be ἔλεγο (the usual equivalent of λαλῶ), and everywhere else ἔλεγο; or why σφάλω should be sometimes ἄπειρος and sometimes ἄπειρος; or why ἀδικεῖ (= hither) should be ἀδικεῖ in iv. 1, and ἀδικεῖ where it recurs, xi. 12; or why λαμβάνω should be λαμβάνει in v. 7 and 9, but ἔλεγο in the intervening verse 8; or why the rendering of θέλω should be first ἔλεγο and then the more usual ἔλεγο in xi. 5; or why ἀπηγγεῖλε should be ἀπήγγελε in xvii. 3, but ἔλεγο in the closely similar verse, xxii. 10. Nor can it be said that there is any advantage in rendering φυλή (v. 5, xxii. 12) by ἔλεγο (elsewhere used for ἀδικεῖ), instead of ἔλεγο, as elsewhere; or in the almost alternate use of ἀδικεῖ and ἀδικεῖ to represent σεβασμός. And further, something is lost when the rendering of βάλλω changes in xviii. 21 from ἔλεγο, for the casting of the stone, to ἔλεγο, for the casting down of Babylon; and again when the title ἡ ἄρχή, twice assumed as His own by the Lord (xxi. 6, xxii. 13), is in the first instance translated ἔλεγο; in the
second, ἰαζ. In rendering all the Greek words above cited, except σφραγίς, σφραγίζω, Σ consistently employs a single equivalent.

On the other hand, though Σ in these cases has avoided the needless variations of S in using two different Syriac equivalents for one Greek word, it is sometimes unhappy, when the Syriac has but one equivalent to represent two distinct Greek words, in its attempts to supply the defect;—as in the instance of the clumsy ἀλ ὁσ (lit., beast-of-fang), beast of prey, by which (masculine), after Hexaplar and Harkleian precedent, it renders θηρίον, reserving the simple ἱαμ (feminine) to render ἴων. Σ, like the Peshitto, forbears to put violence upon the language, and is content to represent both words indifferently by ἱαμ. And instances are not wanting where it is S that shows consistency, and Σ caprice. Thus, in both the places (viii. 7, xv. 2), where fire is spoken of as mingled (μεμιγμένον), S renders the participle by ἰαμ: Σ agrees in the former place, but in the latter changes to ἰαμ. So too πόρνος is in S ἰαμ in both instances of its occurrence (xxi. 8, xxi. 15): in Σ, it is ἰαμ in the latter only, ἰαμ in the former.

d.—As to accuracy:—

A few faulty or even mistaken renderings of the translator S may be be noticed here. For ὁφελον (iii. 15), he has ἰαμ ἰαμ, which rather represents ὁυ (as in Peshitto): Σ, with Old Testament Peshitto and Hexaplar authority, gives a better rendering, ἰαμ. For ἀσκημοσύνη (xvi. 15), S has ἰαμ, which would better stand for ἀσκήμονη, pudor, than (as here required) for pudendum: Σ, again from the Old Testament versions, finds a truer equivalent, giving the required shade of meaning, in ἰαμ. A grave and misleading fault in S is, that (following the Old Testament Peshitto, as above noted, p. xxiv) he fails to distinguish between νόον ἄνθρωπον (i. 13, xiv. 14) and the ordinary ἄνθρωπος, but renders both indiscriminately by ἰαμ. Again, the rendering of τῆρε (iii. 3) by ἰαμ (intransitive), “take heed,” instead of ἰαμ (transitive), “keep,” as Σ, almost amounts to a mistranslation. Misunderstanding of the Greek appears also in the renderings (above noted, pp. xxi, xxv) of κρύσταλλος (iv. 6, xxi. 1), and αὐλητῶν (xvii. 22). Where he gives ἰαμ for ἰαμ (xii. 9; but not x. 2), he obviously supposes it to

* But see note on Greek text, in loc.

* See note on Syr. text, in loc.
mean "chief," and not "ancient." And in three of the places where the preposition διά is followed by an accusative, he renders it by εἰς (iv. 11, xii. 11, xiii. 14), as if it were followed by a genitive, instead of (as elsewhere) by διά. None of these errors is shared by Σ. Again, of the two words in the Apocalypse which claim to be Hebrew, ᾱβαδίω (ix. 11), and [ὦρ]μαγεδών (xvi. 16), while he represents the latter correctly by ἡμέρα, he goes wrong when he writes for the former, ἁμαρτία (= bondage), instead of ἀμαρτία (= destruction), or (as Barsalibi in loc. in his Commentary,—see below, p. lxxxiii, note *) ἁμαρτία (= destroying),—confusing the roots ἀμαρτία and ἀμαρτή; a mistake into which Σ likewise falls. But the more serious error which Σ commits in translating κατάθεμα (xxii. 3) by ἄρα, "deciduous," is avoided by S, which gives correctly ἁμαρτία, "curse." S is free also from the still grosser blunder, often noted as the chief blot in Σ, by which the last five syllables of μεσοφθαλμῖν (viii. 13) are torn from the word and perverted (as if οἷγε [ἐν] αἰματι [ἐχόντως]) into αὶμα [ἐχόντως] αἰματι, "which had a tail of blood." Of this I shall have more to say farther on (p. lxxxii).

With these may be noted a few instances where the renderings of S, though not wrong, fall short of his habitual level of exactness. Such are—

For βλέπει (i. 12), ἑλπίζομεν (= γνώσκειμεν): ἵνα μετανοήσῃ (ii. 21), ἑλπίζω (= εἰς μετάνοιαν): ἀπεφεύγει αὐτὸν (vii. 9), ἑλπίζω (= εἰς ἀπεφεύγειν αὐτὸν). Of these, the second and third may perhaps be due to error of transcription; but they are akin one to another, so as rather to suggest a tendency in the translator to use a verbal noun in place of the infinitive (or equivalent future with α) of the verb. E contra, for εἰς βλασφῆμαν (xiii. 6), he writes ἑλπίζομεν (= βλασφημεῖσα). (See further, p. lxxxvi). Such instances are seldom to be found in Σ, a version which tends to overstrictness rather than laxity of rendering.

On the whole, and notwithstanding these blemishes, which are neither numerous nor (for the most part) serious, I am confident that any competent scholar who carefully examines our version will satisfy himself that it is one that does credit to the skill of its author, and to his knowledge and command utriusque lingue. The evidences above adduced will be found amply sufficient for my purpose in collecting them,—namely, to illustrate its character, method, and merits by a detailed comparison between it and its rival version. As regards Σ, our examination shows it to be a work industriously faithful and laboriously exact; but with an
exactness that is pedantic rather than scholarly, and a fidelity that is to
the letter rather than to the spirit. In strong contrast with it, our version
is seen to aim at accuracy in substance rather than in form; its diction, as
regards grammar as well as vocabulary, to be vernacular Syriac of the
best period; its manner, to combine idiomatic freedom with truthful
reproduction of its original.

VII.—Affinity as well as Diversity between the Versions.

But this contrast is only one aspect of the relation between the two
versions, as disclosed by a comparative analysis of both. Side by side
with it will be found a close affinity, of which I now proceed to treat.

a.—In variations of rendering:—

Among the groups above collected of notable words in S, derived
from the Old Testament Peshitto or elsewhere, it will have been observed
that, after setting aside those which belong to S alone, there remains a
large proportion of instances found in Σ as well as S. And this fact,
of the existence to an appreciable though limited extent of peculiarities
of diction common to S and Σ, proves to extend beyond the groups in
question, and to pervade the two versions throughout. My Notes in
Part II, though directed primarily to the points where S and Σ differ,
record incidentally many points where they coincide: and anyone who
reads the two texts together will note very many more which the Notes
pass over without remark. In illustration of the affinity between the
versions thus indicated, I proceed to adduce some instances in which Σ,
deviating from what has been shown to be its habit, varies in its rendering
of a word, and in so varying coincides with a like variation (even where it
is to all appearance an arbitrary one) in S.

Of this class of cases, the most noticeable is that of δεύτερος, usually
rendered by S, χώρα; by Σ, κατά; but where it is an epithet of
θάνατος, in ii. 11 and three other places, κατά by both. Again, both
render βάλλω usually by τοῦ; Σ once only, vi. 13, by κατά, with S.
Both render σκηνή usually by τοῦ: once only, vii. 15, by κατά. Both
render κατννός usually by τοῦ: once only, viii. 4, by κατά. Both

* Coincidences within i. 1–8 are not to be relied on in this argument, that passage (see note
in loc., Part II, p. 37) being apparently borrowed from Σ by the scribe of S.

b.—In grammatical variations:

To this list may be subjoined the following collection of coincidences between S and Σ in variation of grammatical form or construction. Thus, in one place, i. 16, both make κρατῶ feminine: elsewhere (wherever the gender is shown) masculine. In four places only, ii. 13, ix. 6, x. 7, xi. 6, S uses the form ἄμεσον for the plural emphatic of ἄμεσον: Σ agrees in these places, though elsewhere it usually writes τρίτων, a form unknown to S, and rare in Peshitto. In iii. 18, four verbs occur in the subjunctive mood dependent on ἵνα: of these the second only is, in both versions, rendered by an infinitive with prefix ἅ; the rest by futures. Once only in S do we find a cardinal number with pronominal suffix, τρις ἄμεσον, iv. 8: the same form occurs in Σ in the same place (else only vi. 6, where S omits). Once only, x. 6, is ἄμεσον feminine in Σ: as it is likewise there in S (see above, p. xxxii). Once only, xi. 13, both denote a fractional part by writing ἅ ἄμεσον before the cardinal number that expresses the integer (τρις ἄμεσον ἅ ἄμεσον = "one out of ten"): instead of by a substantive formed from the cardinal, as elsewhere (e.g. τρίτος ἄμεσον, "a third"). Once only, xvi. 19, both exhibit the very rare use of ἄμεσον in passive sense.

Of some of these examples I shall have more to say, under another head: for my present purpose they suffice, as evidence of an affinity subsisting between the two versions. For some of the variations above noted reasons may be assigned; others seem merely arbitrary. As regards the former class, it is unlikely that two translators, working (as we have seen) on very different and even opposed principles, should be independently guided by the same reasons for varying: as regards the latter, it is inconceivable that they should independently light on the
same casual changes of rendering. It remains, therefore, that the above coincidences prove some relation of dependence to have existed between them; either, that the author of S had Σ in his hand, or that his work was in the hands of the author of Σ. Which of these two hypotheses agrees best with the whole facts of the case, we shall see presently.

VIII.—Affinity between S and the "Pococke" Epistles.

To what has been said of the relation borne by the diction of S to that of the Peshitto on one hand, and on the other to that of the Harkleian and Harkleianizing Σ, it is important to add a short notice of the affinities traceable between it and that other version of which I have above spoken as being in vocabulary and general manner intermediate between the Peshitto and Harkleian—the "Pococke" text of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles.

One obvious feature of resemblance is the use of the particle ἃμα with personal suffixes (p. xxi (6)). Both employ it where emphasis requires it; both avoid the indiscriminate use of it as an equivalent for the possessive pronoun, or the possessive genitive of the personal pronoun, which is a Harkleian characteristic. Another is the preference for ἀλλά rather than ἀλλο, &c., preceding τ, as = αἰ, αἴ, ἀ (ib. (8)). Again, in the Pococke ἁμαρτία is referred to ἁμαρτίαν (2 Joh. 9, 10), and ἁμαρτάνω to ἁμαρτάνει (2 Pet. i. 19) on the same principles as we have found (p. xxxi) to guide the author of S. They agree also (and with them the Philoxenian Ἑσαίας, see above, p. xxxi) in rendering εἶπεν by ἐκλα (passim in Poc.), instead of its Harkleian and Hexaplar substitute ἐκλα. Another like example is the unusual ἔβαλ, xi. 5, for ἐβλω, instead of ἦλθεν (3 Joh. 13); and a more notable one is ἐμμένω for ἐμμένος, instead of the usual ἐμμένω (2 Pet. i. 4). So, too, ἓμα, which is a favourite word in S, standing in place of the usual ἓμα, for ἓμφαια and ἑκατοπροϊ alike, appears, though in the abstract sense of ἀλώσις, in the Pococke text of 2 Pet. ii. 12. Also the remarkable use in S of ἔτοσι, xiv. 13, = ἐποτρυχογεως (one of the few tokens it shows of an age later than that of the Peshitto), is paralleled by the Pococke rendering of ἐποτρυχος (= θανατος) in 2 Pet. i. 14 by ἐκτελεῖσθαι. A still more striking point of coincidence is the abuse of
the adverb ἀπεξήγησα, xix. 10, which S interpolates without authority, as does the Pococke, 3 Joh. 5.

In all these instances, the Pococke rendering differs from that of the Harkleian version of the same Epistles, and thus emphasizes the fact of the coincidences with S. Further, they serve to make it probable that other instances, in which the Harkleian as well as the Pococke shows like agreement with the diction of S (mostly against the ordinary Harkleian usage), are really cases in which the Harkleian has simply retained the language of the other, which (as I have elsewhere shown and shall presently have occasion to repeat) is certainly its parent version as regards these Epistles. Such instances are:—the employment of the unusual ἐκεῖ (for ὅψε, Apoc. i. 16; for βλέπημα, 2 Pet. ii. 8); of ἀναγεννησία (for ἀ πλανῶν, Apoc. xx. 10; for πλάνος, πλανήτης, 2 Joh. 7, Jude 13); of ἀπεξήγησις (for ἀρχή, Apoc. xxii. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 4, 2 Joh. 5, 6, Jude 4). Compare also ἀραίος (instead of ἀραίοις), for ἄπωγα (Apoc. xviii. 14, Jude 12 [implicitly]); and note that ἀπαύγασθε (βλασφημεία) is followed in both by ἁ, instead of the usual ἱ (Apoc. xiii. 6; 2 Pet. ii. 12, Jude 10).

It is to be added that, of the words above noted as common to the Pococke Epistles with S, none is met with in Σ, except ἐκεῖ, by which Σ (but not Σ) renders ἄπωγας, iv. 3 (bis).

---

* This interpolation in xix. 10, and the attempts to get rid of the ἅρα μὴ in that verse, and again in xxii. 9, may indicate theological bias; and a like cause may possibly account for the twice-repeated omission (perhaps more probably due to homoeoteleuton) of the χρία ἔτη of xx. 3, 5. The rendering of ἀποθέωσις (xiv. 13) above noted, and that of ἡ κυριακή ἡμέρα, i. 10, may be instances of the language of later ecclesiastical usage.
CHAPTER III.

PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE GREEK TEXT OF THE APOCALYPSE.

I now proceed to consider our version in its relation to the original—in other words, to investigate the character of the Greek text on which it is based, which is, no doubt, the most important aspect in which it can be regarded.

I.—The Authorities for the Text.

The materials for the critical determination of the text of the Apocalypse are, indeed, far from deficient in amount or in variety. Early versions are forthcoming—Latin, Ethiopic, Coptic, and (of perhaps questionable antiquity) Armenian; besides early citations, considerable in number and extent, in writers Greek and Latin, Eastern and Western, ranging from Irenæus to Augustine. Five uncial manuscripts are extant (known as Θ, A, C, P, Q*), and about one hundred and eighty cursive—numbers far short (no doubt) of those by which the copies of other parts of the New Testament are reckoned, yet seemingly enough for adequate attestation. But of the cursive, though not a few (perhaps a larger proportion than in case of any other New Testament Book) give important textual evidence, the majority contribute little or nothing towards establishing the best text: and of the uncial, the total available is weaker, in evidential value as well as in number, than elsewhere in the New Testament. Of the five, Q (Cod. Basileensis) is of the eighth century; but its text, as we shall see presently, is hardly to be distinguished from that of the average cursive of late date—inferior to not a few of them. P (Cod. Porphyrianus), though not earlier, but probably later, presents a

* Designated B by Tischendorf; B₄ by Westcott and Hort. I prefer, with Tregelles and Weiss (see p. 11), to avoid the confusion to which this designation tends, and to call it Q, as above.
better text; yet in value falls somewhat short of the earlier three. Of these, however, C (Cod. Ephrem Syri) is very defective, nearly two-fifths of the text of the Apocalypse being lost; while R (Cod. Sinaiticus), though entire, exhibits a text of this Book of quality distinctly below the normal standard of the MS.* A (Cod. Alexandrinus), on the contrary, in this Book rises above its usual level so as largely to make amends for the deficiencies of the other two, and is thus to be accepted as the main authority for the text; taking in some measure the place which, in the greater part of the New Testament, is by consent of most critics accorded to B (Cod. Vaticanus), and going far to compensate for the absence here of that great authority.

Of the versions, I pass over the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Armenian, not in disparagement of their value, but merely because I am unacquainted with the languages in which they are written, and I distrust the second-hand knowledge of them which can be acquired through the medium of a Latin or other translation. Of the three, the Ethiopic Apocalypse is the one of best attested antiquity; on the age of the Coptic a doubt seems to rest. If the Armenian New Testament (ascribed to the fifth century) is rightly believed to be based, in the main, on the Peshitto, it follows

---

* Some facts which have been noted concerning R may, perhaps, serve to account for the inferior character of its text of the Apocalypse.

Tischendorf assures us (Prolegomena to N.T. Sinait., pp. xxii, xxiii; 4th edition of 1863) that no contemporary corrections, made by the diorthote whose hand appears in the emendations of the text of the rest of the New Testament, are to be found in the Apocalypse. In it, therefore, we have, as it seems, the text copied by the scribe from a single exemplar; not revised, as in the preceding Books, by a second person using a second exemplar. Moreover, there is reason to surmise that the single exemplar so used was not part of the same MS. as that from which the scribe derived his text of the previous Books of the New Testament. In the very opening of it, we are met by the singular fact that the heading and some part of the first column (thirty-two lines) are written (ib., p. xx, and note 1) by the person who in the rest of the New Testament acted as diorthote, but who wrote some Books of the Old Testament part of the MS. This may be accounted for by supposing that the New Testament scribe came to a standstill when he had completed the Epistles (on recto of fo. 126), his archetype (or archetypes—for he may have had three; (1st) Gospels, (2nd) Paul, (3rd) Præxpost.) containing no more; that his colleague, the diorthote of the other New Testament Books, having a copy of the Apocalypse, began (on fo. 126 verso) to write it as a supplement to the work of the former which he was engaged in revising;—but that, after writing these thirty-two lines, he transferred his exemplar and the task of transcribing it to the other.
that the Apocalypse is not to be accepted as an integral part of it, but must have been added as a supplement. It will be interesting, therefore, to investigate whether any relation of dependence, or at least of textual affinity, can be traced between the Armenian and either of the Syriac versions of this Book.* Textual affinity may also be looked for between the Coptic and Syriac versions, inasmuch as the Coptic Church, being Monophysite, was in close communion with the Monophysite Syrian Church, from which, as I hope to show, both the Syriac versions proceed.

Under the head of Versions, therefore (apart from the Syriac Σ, of which I have already treated, and to which I shall revert further on), I confine myself to dealing with the Latin.

It is a happy circumstance, and a partial compensation for the comparative paucity of Greek manuscript authority, that the Latin attestation is, for the text of the Apocalypse, stronger and more varied than for any other part of the New Testament, except of course the Gospels. Besides the Vulgate, which gives valuable evidence, there is an almost complete text preserved in the Commentary of Primasius on the Apocalypse (pr), which, by comparison with the extensive citations of the Apocalypse in the writings of Cyprian, is proved to be (in the main) an "African" Old Latin text not later than the third century. Moreover, a large part of a text closely akin to, though not identical with, that of Primasius, has been recovered from a Paris Ms., the Codex Floriacensis, or Fleury palimpsest (h). Another version, quite distinct from these, and complete, has been found in the great Ms. (Vulgate, except as to Apocalypse and Acts) known as "Gigas," of Stockholm (g), which is presumably of the "European" type.

These then are the authorities—the Greek manuscripts, the Latin versions, and the Syriac version Σ, by comparison with which I seek to determine the affinities and estimate the value of the Greek text which underlies the version S.

Even a superficial inspection of the notes attached to the Greek text in Part I, infr., will suffice to prove that the text represented by S

---

* If any such relation exists, it cannot be more than partial in extent; as is proved by the many instances in which the Armenian implies a Greek text different from that of S or of Σ. E.g. the word ἤπειρον (iv. 3), which they render correctly, was read and rendered by the Armenian (and also by the Ethiopian) in the false form ἤπειρες (as by Ν and two mss.).
contains a large element common to it with that which distinctively belongs to the better uncials, combined with an admixture, large, but not so large, of readings attested by less ancient authority. The greater part of the textual criticism of the Apocalypse takes the form (as every student of it knows) of the question, whether to accept, or to reject, the evidence of Ν A C P, or three, or two or even one, of them, against that of Q and the bulk of the cursive. In this conflict of evidence it will be found that our translator—or the editor of the Greek text he used—though too often led aside to follow the many, adhered in the main to the tradition represented by the earlier and presumably more authentic few.

II.—Method adopted, and Objects pursued, in this Chapter.

As a preparation for an inquiry into the character and composition of the text on which our translator worked, it is important that we should enter into a detailed examination of the uncials severally; in order to enable ourselves to measure (1) the value of each of them as a standard, and (2) the affinity subsisting between the text of each and that of S. This examination, though a digression from our immediate subject, is really essential as preliminary to an investigation into the relations of the S-text; and it will moreover be found to possess some independent value as a study of the texts of the extant MSS. of the Apocalypse.

I have, accordingly, judged it necessary (and I believe it will be sufficient), for a satisfactory comparison—(1°) of each MS. severally with the rest, (2°) of S with each of them, and with each combination of them (binary, ternary, or quaternary)—to form a full list of all the places having more or less divided MS. attestation, where the evidence of S is available. This list contains over 850 words or sentences, in all of which one MS. (at least) varies from the rest: it excludes instances where all MSS. agree, as well as instances where S is indecisive (as in case of grammatical or orthographical variation, ambiguity, conflation, or the like).

But of the variants affecting these places, a large proportion are not only trivial in themselves, but are weakly attested—by a single MS. with little or no support. Such variants are plainly worthless as materials for the criticism of the text—the mistakes of a scribe writing carelessly, or following a damaged archetype which he was incompetent to decipher; they are of use only in so far as they serve to mark the character of the MS. in which they occur. For the purpose, therefore, of a comparison
of $S$ with the MSS., it is clearly needless to encumber our inquiry with a multitude of what are not in any proper sense to be counted as variants, but merely as blunders—instances not of divergency in the normal text, but of aberrancy from it. For that purpose, accordingly, I have reduced the list by striking out all such instances—where a MS. stands alone, or supported only by two or three mss. of no special authority, in a reading of no intrinsic interest or value; retaining, however, all readings that have the authority of one MS.—either if (1°) commended by internal probability, or if (2°) confirmed by the approval of weighty critical authority, or by any appreciable support from mss., or by any of the Latin or either of the Syriac texts. In this reduced form I print the list in the Appendix to this Dissertation, below, pp. cxxi, sqq.

III.—Character of the MSS. severally, as regards clerical Accuracy.

Before laying aside, however, the list in its longer or unreduced form, it is worth while to ascertain what is to be learned from it that may be of service in a preliminary study of the individual character, and comparative accuracy, of each of the MSS. It will show us (1°) how many readings each of them stands alone, thus giving a measure of the independence of each; and (2°) what proportion of such readings, for each MS., is negligible or valueless, thereby testing the amount of error affecting each.

The total number of readings recorded in the long list must, of course, be more than double the number of passages entered on that list—there being always two, and often three (or more) readings for each passage; they, in fact, amount to nearly eighteen hundred. Of these, about 790 are readings of single attestation. On examination, these prove to be very unequally distributed, as follows. Much the largest proportion belongs to $N$, over 300. $Q$ comes next, though far behind, with more than 200. $A$ follows, but not closely, with 150 or 160. $P$ shows the comparatively small number of 60 or 70. $C$ stands last with between 40 and 50; but if the MS. were complete (see p. xi), its number would presumably be higher than that of $P$.

Of the five MSS., therefore, $N$ is the one that diverges most independently. The divergency of $Q$ is not much more than two-thirds, that

* In this Chapter, I shall use $S$ henceforth to denote the Greek text that underlies the Crawford Syriac.
of A not much more than half, and that of P not much more than one-fifth, of the divergency of \( \delta \); while that of C is presumably about one-fourth of the same. Again:

Of the singular readings of \( \delta \):
Over 190 prove to be negligible; leaving 115 to be retained.

Of those of A:
Nearly 80 prove to be negligible; leaving 81 to be retained.

Of those of P:
Nearly 20 prove to be negligible; leaving 46 to be retained.

Of those of Q:
About 35 prove to be negligible; leaving 178 to be retained.

Of those of C [probably over 70, if the MS. were complete]:
About 30 [50] prove to be negligible; leaving 17 [36] to be retained.

The total of these noteworthy singular readings is therefore 437. Thus the order of the MSS. in point of actual number of worthless singular readings to be neglected as blunders, is different from their order in point of divergency—except that \( \delta \) still heads the list. A now stands second to it, but very far off; C (probably) third; then Q; and P last. But when the number of these blunders for each MS. is compared with its total number of singular readings (which is the true test of the clerical accuracy of each), the result proves to be as follows:

Of the singular readings found in \( \delta \), nearly two-thirds (\( \cdot 62 \)) are negligible; of those in C, (probably) a slightly smaller proportion; and of those in A, rather less than one-half (\( \cdot 49 \)); while for P the proportion is but \( \cdot 28 \); and for Q (lowest of all) but \( \cdot 17 \).

It follows, therefore, that, as regards clerical accuracy, the two more recent MSS. stand higher—are more carefully executed and freer from errors of transcription—than the three older. More particularly:

\( \delta \) is, of all the five MSS., far the least worthy of regard as representing a defensible form of the text; it is aberrant rather than divergent from the rest, to the point of eccentricity. Not only does the number of its singular readings far exceed that of any of its brethren, but of these the proportion of quite worthless readings, set aside by consent of all critics (including even Tischendorf, notwithstanding his natural bias towards the MS. of his discovery,—see below, p. li), is much greater than
in any other MS. So many of its variants in fact are unquestionably mere
scribe's blunders, as to cast a doubt on some of the 115 which I retain; and
I should hardly feel justified in retaining so many, even of those that
seem possible readings, were it not that in each one of this latter class
$R$ has support, though scanty yet appreciable, from some one or two
cursives of credit, or from a Latin version, or (as we shall find to happen
in not a few notable cases) from $S$. I conclude, therefore, (1) that the
text of the Apocalypse presented by $R$ is one executed by a scribe who,
through haste or incompetence, was careless in his work; and moreover,
(2) that the exemplar which he followed contained a textual element
foreign to the normal uncial text, which element now finds only a rare and
partial support in secondary authorities, mss. and versions.

A also has a text seriously affected by inaccuracy. Yet the number
of its singularities, though large, is little more than half of that which
$R$ shows; and of these the greater part (81) are worthy of consideration—
many of them (see below, p. lli) being accepted as certainly right by the
best critics. Even of the rejected ones, few are absurd or impossible; in
fact, some of those which I exclude from consideration have been more
or less confidently approved by Lachmann (though by him alone)* I
conclude (1) that the scribe of $A$ was superior in carefulness, and still
more in intelligence, to the scribe of $R$; and (2) that he had before him
an exemplar embodying a purer text.

C shows a much smaller amount of divergency than either of the
former. Even allowing for the lost portion of it, we cannot suppose it
probable that the number of singular readings exhibited by its text, when
entire, was half as large as for $A$. But though $C$, thus regarded, appears
in strong contrast with $R$ (which has, probably, not less than four times as
many), in another aspect it comes very close to $R$—as regards the large
proportion of singular readings of the worthless sort, which for $C$ as for $R$
is, as we have seen, little short of two-thirds. This MS., therefore,
presents a text deviating less than that of $R$, or $A$, from the presumable
uncial standard; yet, where it deviates, deviating in such wise, and in so

* It is to be borne in mind that when Lachmann constructed his text (first published in
1831), $A$ was the only MS. fully accessible to him; $R$ and $P$ were as yet undiscovered; $Q$ was
unknown to him, and $C$ but imperfectly known. It was inevitable therefore that, resting as he
did solely on uncial authority, he should follow $A$ too implicitly.
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large a proportion of cases, as to bespeak the hand of a scribe who was less intelligent than industrious, though careful and painstaking, and provided with a good exemplar.

P stands well; both as to the fewness of its singular readings (less than the probable corrected number for C, not nearly half of the number of that for A, and little over one-fifth of that for \( \mathfrak{N} \)), and as to the small proportion of them (much less than one-third) that consists of mere blunders or oversights. But here a new fact (to be considered more fully further on) is noticeable, that of the retained singular readings (46 in all), a large number prove to be singular only relatively to the uncial standard, nearly half being attested by ample cursive evidence; a thing which seldom occurs in case of \( \mathfrak{N} \), and more seldom in case of A, or C,—the singular readings of those MSS. having, for the most part, little support from mss. It thus appears (1\(^{o}\)) that P is a carefully written MS.; and (2\(^{o}\)) that, though later by three or four centuries than \( \mathfrak{N} \), A, or C, it keeps close in the main (but not altogether), to the text represented by their consent. It represents, apparently, an archetype akin to them, but admits (though sparingly) an element akin to the common cursive text.

Q on the contrary stands widely remote in text from all the other MSS. Its singular readings are more in gross number than those of P, or C, or A, though not so many as those of \( \mathfrak{N} \). But the proportion of negligible ones among them is much less than even for P. And it is so much less than for \( \mathfrak{N} \) (for which the proportion has been shown to be exceptionally large), that the residue retained for consideration is much larger for Q than for \( \mathfrak{N} \) (178 against 115), very much larger (therefore) than for any other MS. For Q, as for P, I reserve these singular readings for subsequent examination, stating merely for the present that of the total 178, very few are truly singular, nearly all being supported by many, often a majority, of the mss. Q is thus shown (1\(^{o}\)) to be a MS. more carefully executed even than P; but (2\(^{o}\)) to tend much more strongly into deviation from the normal uncial towards the normal cursive text. To this tendency, which is the characteristic predominant in Q, and not to any want of skill or care on the scribe's part, the wide divergency of this MS. from its brethren is in the main due.

Thus our results are, that—

(i) Of the three greater MSS., C is the most carefully, though not the
most intelligently, written; and comes nearest to giving a true presentation of the normal uncial text. The other two are more extensively affected by inaccuracy, to a degree which, in case of ℗, seriously impairs the authority of the MS. (as regards the Apocalypse), by reason of the nature as well as the number of the errors which disfigure its text. In case of A, the errors are not only fewer but far less grave; and though it is not so free from blemishes as C, yet (and as we shall see further on) it exhibits other characteristics which more than redeem its credit, and add to its readings a value beyond that which attaches to those of the rest.

(ii) To the two later MSS., P and Q, two characteristics belong in common:—(1°) that compared with the elder group, they are little blemished by mere copyists' blunders; (2°) that each, where it stands apart from its fellow-MSS.—but Q much more than P—tends towards the common cursive text. They belong to a later age, when mere errors of transcription had (probably by a tacit and gradual process) been weeded out, and when, moreover, a second form of text, amounting to a distinct recension, originated we know not how, or how early, had asserted its place beside the presumably older text, which in process of time it in great measure superseded. To that older text P, in the main, adheres: the extent to which it was affected by the later text is measured by the number of readings (some 30) where in separating from the MSS. it is supported by many mss., together with more (some 15) where the combination P Q is so supported. Q, on the other hand, in its singular or quasi-singular readings, is (not, like P, exceptionally, but) habitually on the side of the cursive, showing in all only some 35 (barely one-sixth of its total) that can be reckoned even as subsingular.

IV.—Character of the MSS. severally, as regards textual Value.

Dismissing now the long list, with its encumbering detail of readings which attest hardly anything except the shortcomings of the several scribes, I proceed to consider our reduced list, as printed below, pp. cxxv, sqq.

This list, though it still includes many readings of no avail towards the determination of the true text, exhibits (I believe) none that will not serve in this inquiry, as indicating the affinities of the attesting MSS., inter se, or with the mss., or the versions, whose readings I have compared. The passages entered in it, as reduced, are 538 in number, and the MS. variants recorded exceed 1100.
1. **Divergence of each MS. from the rest.**

Our first inquiry must be, What does this list show to be the amount, numerically stated, of *bona fide* textual divergence (as distinguished from mere clerical inaccuracy) of each MS. from the consent of the rest?

For Q it is large—markedly larger than for any of the others; the number of variants in which it stands apart from them being (as above) 178.

Its contemporary (or perhaps junior) P, shows in strong contrast to it in this respect, standing apart in but 46 variants.

For C the amount is less than for any other—but 17. If, however, the MS. were entire, the total would probably amount to 25 or even 30; but, even then, it would be the least divergent of the MSS.

For A the amount is 81; largely in excess of that recorded for its contemporary C, and considerably above the record for P.

Yet higher than A, but still below Q, ranks Ξ in this comparison; the amount recorded for it being 115.

To bring out yet more definitely the character of Q through the contrast between it and P, we may assume that the consent of Ξ Λ C, the three oldest MSS., represents the consent of the uncial, and use it as our standard by which to compare P with Q. This combination, Ξ Λ C, occurs 122 times in our list. The result proves to be that P is with Ξ Λ C 87 times; Q but 26 times; while P is opposed to Ξ Λ C but 34 times*; Q, 96 times.

Or, again, to avoid the uncertainty attaching to the combination Ξ Λ C by reason of the imperfect state of C, we may take as our standard of reference the consent of Ξ and Λ, which will be a fairly true standard, inasmuch as these two MSS., though each of them deviates largely from the normal text, deviate usually in different directions; so that the readings in which they agree form a text nearly free from the divergent element of each. This combination occurs 239 times; and on comparison

---

* Not, as might have been expected, 35 (= 122 – 87); for in one place where Ξ Λ C concur, P defect. So again, P defect in eleven places where Ξ Λ concur, and therefore opposes them not 79 (= 239 – 160) times, but 68 (as next page).
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we find that P agrees with it 160 times; Q but 58: while P opposes it but 68 times; * Q, 181 times.

Thus the isolation of Q among the MSS., already indicated in the earlier stage of our inquiry, becomes more pronounced as we study it farther. For we find (1) the bona fide variants in which it stands alone are half as many again as those recorded for K, eccentric though the text of that MS. is; they are much more than double the number for A; not far from four times the number for P; and probably six times that for C. And (2) it turns out that when we compare Q with P, taking the combination K A C as standard of reference, the deviation of Q is over 78 per cent., while that of P is under 28. Or, if we prefer K A as standard, the deviation of Q is still over 75 per cent.; that of P barely exceeds 28.

2. Tendency of each MS. towards, or away from, the cursive text.

Yet these numerical results, striking as they are, give but an inadequate representation of the character that belongs to Q relatively to its brethren.

In order to appreciate that character, we must recall the fact, above touched on, that, far from being truly singular in the 178 places where it stands apart from the other MSS., it has in most of these places the support of some cursive,—usually of many, sometimes of nearly all, of them. Even if we turn back to our original unreduced list, which shows over 200 places where Q so stands (including the rejected readings), the total number of variants of Q in which it has little or no cursive support is but 40,—less than one-fifth; whereas for P it is 35 out of some 65, more than half—a proportion largely exceeded in case of each of the older uncials. The characteristic fact disclosed by a study of the singular readings of Q is, then, that the position of standing as sole uncial at the head of a train of cursive authorities for a variant—a position not frequently held by P, very rarely by C, A, or K,—is usual, indeed habitual, in case of Q. The quality, as well as the quantity, of these instances, compels us to regard them as a transition on the part of Q (appearing

* See note *, last page.

* The readings where one MS. deviates from its brethren with large cursive confirmation are—for Q, 173 out of a gross total exceeding 200 (see p. xliii); for P, 30 out of between 60 and 70; while for the older MSS. such instances are so rare as to be hardly worth notice or reckoning—for C, 2 out of 40 or 50; for A, 14 out of about 150; for K, but 22 out of over 300.
in P only as a tendency) towards a type of text distinct from that of its elder brethren—the text of the ordinary cursive s. It is hardly an exaggeration to say of the isolation attributable to Q, that it is not merely a distance removing it from the other MSS. in degree, but a difference separating it from them in kind, such that Q (if considered irrespectively of age) is to be classed in text with cursive s, in script alone with uncials. Whatever value attaches to it lies mainly in the fact that it is, by some two hundred years, the earliest manuscript witness to the normal cursive text of the Apocalypse as a whole.

Of P it may be affirmed, in view of the contrast between it and Q, that it presents, in the main, a substantially ancient text, far though the MS. itself fall short of \( \text{\LaTeX} \) C in age. Its late date, no doubt, makes itself felt in the tendency (above noted) of its singular readings towards the cursive type, to which nearly half of them approach. But the total number of such readings is not great, and the tendency so manifested does not appreciably affect the general character of the text; which, considering the late date of the MS., is surprisingly true to the uncial consent.

Of the singular readings of C, there is little to be said. They are fewer than for any other MS.; they show no appreciable leaning towards the cursive text; they present no character of special interest.

Neither of the two remaining MSS. is so free as C, though both are more free than P, from traces which may be due to the influence of the rival text. A, and in a less degree \( \text{\LaTeX} \), deviates now and then in directions whether many cursive s go with it. But of the singular readings of \( \text{\LaTeX} \) on our reduced list, some few are worthy of notice; while those of A are very seldom such as may safely be let pass without consideration. Indeed, the question not seldom arises, whether, in some at least of the cases where \( \text{\LaTeX} \), and (still more) where A, has for its singular readings extensive cursive support, it may not be concluded—not that the sole uncial errs in company with many cursive s; but rather, that some (now and then, most) cursive s have retained a right reading in common with the sole uncial.* It is also noteworthy that now and then \( \text{\LaTeX} \), and A perhaps more frequently, is corroborated in a singular reading by two or three only—sometimes but one—of the exceptional cursive s whose text is found else-

* See *e.g.* v. 11, where \( \text{\LaTeX} \) with most ms. reads \( \text{\LaTeX} \) before \( \text{\LaTeX} \); and again, xx. 6, where A with most ms. omits \( \text{\LaTeX} \) before \( \text{\LaTeX} \)—in each case, without farther uncial authority.
where to tend against the rest, from the cursive to the uncial type, such as the remarkable mss., 36, 38, 79, 87. Moreover, Latin attestation in many instances confirms the singular readings of $\Xi$, $\Lambda$, $C$, and $P$, even where cursive confirmation is scanty: in case of $\Xi$ or $\Lambda$ more frequently than of $C$ or $P$.

3. Value attached to each MS. by critical Editors.

In order to test farther the comparative value of the five MSS., as inferred from the character of the singular readings of each, it is worth while to inquire, Of which of them have the singular readings most frequently commended themselves to the judgment of the best textual critics? To answer this question, I refer to the Greek Testaments of Tischendorf (8th edition), and of Westcott and Hort; and with them to the more recent and very carefully considered text appended to Bernhard Weiss's elaborate textual study of the Apocalypse. The results are as follows:

From $\Xi$ sole, Tischendorf adopts its reading of i. 11 (Zeuxram; also ii. 8); i. 15 (πετυρομένη); ii. 19 (om. σω); v. 11 (ins. ὁς); v. 13 (om. [ά] ἔστε); vi. 13 (βάλλουσα); ix. 11 (ins. ἄ); xiii. 2 (λεοντων); xvi. 6 (αιματα); xviii. 12 (μαργαριτῶν); xxi. 27 (δο ποιῶν); xxii. 8 (βλέπων και ἄκοινων); xxii. 15 (ποιῶν και φιλῶν); xxii. 18 (ἐπτ αὐτῶν δ θεός). Of these, one only (μαργαριτῶν) is accepted by Westcott and Hort (not without doubt), and by Weiss (undoubtedly). Apart from these places, Weiss admits into his text ποιήσει (for ποιήση, xiii. 15) from $\Xi$ alone, with confidence (as in the former case); Westcott and Hort, to their margin only; and with the same or similar uncertainty they give the above readings of v. 11, v. 13, xiii. 2, xxi. 27; and also read with $\Xi$, xi. 4 (ἐνωπίων without art.); xiii. 10

---

* Such instances are:—for $\Xi$, with 36, xix. 17; with 38, xvi. 15:—for $A$, with 36, xvi. 4; with 38, xvi. 12; xxi. 6:—for $P$, with 79, xix. 10. See farther, p. lxiv, infr.; and Appendix, List II, 1 and 2.

* See e.g., for $\Xi$: i. 15; ii. 21; iii. 3:—for $A$, ii. 22; iv. 7; vii. 9:—for $C$, xiii. 17; xviii. 23; for $P$, xviii. 11. So also in some of the places in last note. See farther, p. lxiv.

* For the reasons stated, note to p. xlv, 1 do not refer to Lachmann's edition. Those of Griesbach (1774—1806) and Scholz (1830—36) were likewise formed too early for our purpose.

* Die Johannes-Apokalypse (in Gebhardt and Harnack's Texte u. Untersuchungen, VII. Band, Heft i.), Leipzig, 1891.

* See Weiss, pp. 129, 131.
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(ἀποκτείνει); xiv. 8 (om. ἓγγελος). But they adopt unreservedly, xxii. 21 (τῶν ἄγιων without πάντων).

From A sole, Tischendorf adopts ὡς ἀνθρώπου, iv. 7; omission of ἡμᾶς, v. 9; ἄξίος, v. 12; ἐξωθεν (for ἐξω), xi. 2; repetition of εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, xiii. 10; ἀνθρωπος ἔγνευτο, xvi. 18; αὐτῆς, xvii. 4; μεθύουσαν ἐκ, xvii. 6; ἐπεσεν (bi), xviii. 2; omission of ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, xx. 9; γέγοναν, xxi. 6; πάντων without τῶν ἄγιων, xxii. 21; omission of ἄμην, xxii. 21. In all these places Weiss concurs, except xi. 2 (where he prefers the reading of Q); and he adopts moreover from A the omission of αὐτοῦ, ii. 18; ἢσι without θ, v. 13; omission of the second διά, vi. 9; ἀνατολῶν, vii. 2 and xvi. 12; καὶ for the first μήτε, vii. 3; ἐδοὺ ἄχλον πολίν, vii. 9; καὶ for ὅν, ὅρ.; ἀστραπαί before φωναί, viii. 5; omission of αὐτοῦς, xi. 12; ἰσχυσεν, xii. 8; βασανισθήσονται, xiv. 10; ὑπάγει, xvii. 8; οἱ ἀληθινοί, xix. 9; omission of τά before χίλια, xx. 6; insertion of αὐτῶν Θεός, xxi. 3; ἐγὼ εἰμι, xxi. 6; δυσμῶν before νόσων, xxi. 13; insertion of καὶ after δοῦν, xxi. 16; ἐν for ἐπί, xxi. 16. Westcott and Hort agree with Tischendorf as to xi. 2, and with both Tischendorf and Weiss as to iv. 7, v. 9, xiii. 10, xvii. 4, xvii. 6, xvii. 2, xxi. 6 (γέγοναν), xxi. 21 (om. ἄμην); also (doubtfully) v. 12, xvi. 18, xx. 9. They admit moreover, but with doubt, the readings accepted by Weiss (as above) of ii. 18, vii. 2, vii. 3, viii. 5, xii. 8, xvi. 12, xvii. 8, xix. 9, xx. 6, xxi. 3, xxii. 16. Of the A-readings which the other two editors reject, they adopt τῷ for τῷ, ii. 8, ii. 18; omission of τεσσάρων, ix. 13: and they mark in their text as doubtful, or place on their margin, about a dozen more.

From C sole, but two readings appear to have been received, and that into but one edition (Westcott and Hort's), and with doubt:—omission of final ἄμην (vii. 12), and οὖ (for οὔτε) μετενόησαν (ix. 20). In the margin of the same edition two C-readings also are noticed:—ἐχέρε (ii. 10); omission of ἄρα (ii. 14).

From P sole, no variant has been received into any of these three editions, except (doubtfully) by Westcott and Hort, the omission of ἐπί (xxii. 5): but all three adopt the interpolation after ἀν' ἄριστος (xiv. 24),* and after ὀνείρετο (xviii. 11), for which it is the only uncial authority.

From Q sole, Tischendorf adopts αἱματα, xviii. 24; αὐτῷ, xxi. 6: Weiss, ἐξω, xi. 2; ἐχον, xvii. 3; μαργαρίταις, xviii. 16; Θεὸς ἐπί αὐτῶν, xxi. 18:

* In this place, Ν Α Ρ C stand neutral, and Q alone opposes P.
Westcott and Hort, the last only; but (doubtfully) μου, ii. 7; ἔγω, v. 4; ὑ (before μερ' αὐτοῦ), xix. 20; Χριστοῦ, xxii. 21; and a few other Q-readings. In nearly all these, Q has large cursive support.

It is clear then that A is, from this point of view, pre-eminent among the MSS. Of its 81 singular readings, Westcott and Hort adopt 13, and admit with reserve more than twice as many more. Weiss adopts 31. Even Tischendorf accepts 13,—a larger proportion than of those of his own MS., Ξ (15 of 115). The other two editors, as we have seen, admit hardly any reading on the sole testimony of Ξ, or of C, P, or Q. In eight places, A stands as the sole MS. witness for readings, including some of the highest importance, which all the critical editions above cited concur in accepting; whereas not one place can be found in which any other MS. holds such a position of authority. In three other places there is a like unanimity in its favour, qualified only by notes of doubt in the edition of Westcott and Hort. But one such instance appears where Ξ is the sole witness, and not one for any of the other three. Thus it is from A alone of the five that the text has received independent contributions towards its rectification, appreciable in number and in value.* Of it alone we can affirm that, where it stands as sole witness, it is signally right so often as to indicate the presence in it of an element of peculiar value and of probably primitive authority.

4. Summary of results as to the MSS. severally.

To sum up:—

Of the three older MSS., C, and of the two later ones, P, exhibit on the whole a more fairly normal uncial text than the others do; the deviations of C being due mainly to deficiencies on the part of the scribe; those of P mostly to the influence of a distinct type of text. The remaining three deviate much more largely. Q is a late MS. with a text studiously conformed throughout by a careful hand to that cursive type which in P appears only to a limited extent, and from which A and Ξ, and still more, C, are in the main free. Ξ, over and above its abounding errors of negligence, presents a text, ancient undoubtedly, but far from being

* It is to be borne in mind that I restrict our examination to the variants which are perceptible in S. If I were to include variations in orthography and grammar, the case for A would be still stronger. It exhibits many archaic forms, evidently retained from the primitive text, which the other MSS. have lost.
purely representative of the uncial consent,—debased, rather, by admixture of an alien element of unknown but early origin. A excels the rest in this, that it alone is characterized by singular readings which are to be accepted, not as divergencies from a standard text, but as survivals of the primitive and authentic text whence its brethren have diverged.

NOTE PREFATORY TO CHAPTER IV.

If the missing part of C were recovered, it is presumable that most, if not all, of the numerical details of the following Chapter would be modified.

(1) The readings attested by C alone would be probably increased from 7 to 11 or 12.—(2) Of the 72 attested by X alone, 32 occur where X fails; some of these, therefore, would probably be transferred to the group X C. Similarly; of the 27 of A, of the 18 of P, and of the 40 of Q, many would pass to A C, C P, C Q, respectively.—(3) Of the groups X A (13 instances), X P (11), X Q (21), A P (13), A Q (14), P Q (15), for like reasons as above, many would be transferred to X A C, X C P, X C Q, A C P, A C Q, C P Q.—(4) The groups X A P, X A Q, X P Q, A P Q, number respectively 45, 10, 20, 12. Many transfers would be made from these to X A C P, X A C Q, X C P Q, A C P Q.—(5) An instance of the group X A P Q, in a place where C fails, might be changed into an instance of all MSS. concurring, and would thus pass out of our total list. But in point of fact, no such instance occurs.

Hence it follows:

(1) That the total number of 538 instances would probably be increased by a few singular readings of C; possibly to 542 or 543.—(2) That, as regards head δ, against this small increase in it, due to C, would be set a decrease under each of the other heads; the result being that the instances under head δ would be on the whole diminished in number.—(3) That, as regards head γ, the four binary groups containing C would each receive an increase (corresponding to the decrease affecting X, A, P, Q, severally, under head δ); while the remaining six groups would be diminished. Under this head, then, as under δ, there would probably be a decrease on the whole.—(4) That, as regards head β, the decrease under the six binary groups which exclude C would appear in the form of an increase in the six ternary groups containing C; while each of the remaining four (X A P, X A Q, X P Q, A P Q) would be diminished. But the range of probable diminution is very large in A P Q, and much larger in X A P; and it is therefore doubtful whether, on the whole, the number of ternary groups would be increased or decreased.—(5) That, as regards head α, there would be an increase in the four groups which include C; and against this increase there would be no counter-decrease under X A P Q (see above).

Thus (finally), the total number of cases would be increased, to a possible maximum of nearly 545; the distribution under each head would be altered, with the general result that the number under each of the heads δ, γ, β (doubtful) would be decreased, but under head α largely increased; and the position of C, as the most frequent constituent of the groups, especially the quaternary, and as the most constant representative of the normal uncial text, would be rather strengthened.
CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK TEXT UNDERLYING THE VERSION S.

I now apply myself to test the text that underlies S by comparing it with the text of the MSS., collectively in groups, and severally, by means of the appended collection of readings (list I, Appendix, pp. cxxv, sqq.) on which this investigation is based.

This list enables us to exhibit the facts of the case in a numerical form. It sets forth (as above stated, pp. xlii, xliii) in 538 places where the evidence of S is available, all the noteworthy variants which have more or less divided uncial evidence, none being omitted which even one uncial attests, if corroborated by any appreciable evidence of cursives, or by a Latin or Syriac version, or if approved by sufficient critical authority.

I.—Numerical Expression of Amount of Agreement between S and each MS.

I find that in these 538 places—

S agrees with Q 218 times: so that in nearly three-fifths (320) of the cases before us it is opposed to Q.

S agrees with P 285 times; so that the cases where it is opposed to P are but 253—considerably less than half (·47) of the whole number.*

S agrees with A 290 times; the cases of agreement being very slightly more, and those of disagreement (348, being ·46 of the whole) as slightly less, than are shown by P.

S agrees with N 330 times. Here, therefore, S finds most support, and the cases of disagreement are 208, less than two-fifths of the whole.

S agrees with C (which I take last in order because of the rectification needed by its figures) 198 times. But inasmuch as in 196 of the places in our list C is wanting, and is forthcoming therefore for but 342

* These figures require slight correction, inasmuch as P is wanting in rather more than twenty of the 538 places.
of them, it appears that we are to compare these 198 cases with a total of 342 only; in other words, that if the MS. were entire, the 198 would be increased to something over 310. The proportion of agreement with S, therefore (so far as can be judged from the extant part of C), is considerably higher (about 58 per cent.), and that of disagreement correspondingly lower (about 42 per cent.), for C than for any of the others, except Ν, which it closely approaches.

This result is not, however, to be absolutely relied on, for we cannot be sure that the amount of agreement with S was as great in the lost parts of C as in the extant parts (see above, p. liiv).

The result, then, of the comparison of S with the uncial (setting C aside for the moment because of the uncertainty that attaches to its statistics) is, that S has the maximum of uncial support from Ν, and the minimum from Q: the instances of agreement being over 61 per cent. for Ν, and under 41 for Q, out of the total list of 538 readings; while the percentage for P is nearly 53 and that for Λ a shade higher—nearly 54. [That for C is probably intermediate between that for Ν and that for Λ.] Thus Q is the only MS. for which it is under 50 per cent.

II.—Variation of this Amount according to Group-distribution of the MSS.

This comparison may be pressed farther, and fuller results may be obtained, by examining our list, and classifying the readings it records according as they are severally attested by one, two, three, or four MSS.

The 538 places on the list, when thus classified, fall into four divisions, as follows:—

Class (a).—Where four MSS. agree with S, i.e., where it is supported by quaternary groups; of which places there are, in all, 141.

Of these, the largest proportion, 66 (nearly one-half of the whole number) belong to the group Ν A C P, i.e., the one group which excludes Q; leaving 75 to the groups into which Q enters, of which 18 belong to Ν A C Q, 9 to Ν A P Q, 26 to Ν C P Q, 22 to Α C P Q.

Class (b).—Where three MSS. agree with S, i.e., where the groups are ternary; of which cases there are, in all, 127.

Under this head the figures yield a result similar to (but more marked

* The reader who is not disposed to go into numerical details may omit this section (II.), and pass on to section III., in which he will find the results summed up.
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than) that found under (a), so far as this, that much more than half—
almost three-fifths—belong to groups which exclude Q, as follows.—To
group Ἀ C, 7 belong; to Ἀ P, 45; to Ἀ C P, 5; to Ἀ C P Q, 18; in all, 75:
as against 52 belonging to groups containing Q, viz., 10 to Ἀ A Q; 2 to
Ἀ C Q; 20 to Ἀ P Q; 4 to Ἀ C Q; 12 to Ἀ P Q; 4 to Ἀ C P Q.

Class (γ).—Where two MSS. agree with S, i.e., where they give it their
support in pairs; of which there are, in all, 106.

Here we are met by a different result. Of these pairs, those into which
Q enters are not far from equal in number with those which exclude it, 51
against 55. Of the latter class, the pair Ἀ A numbers 13; Ἀ C, 5; Ἀ P, 11;
Ἀ C, 12; Ἀ P, 13; Ἀ C, 1. Of the former, Ἀ Q, 21; Ἀ Q, 14; Ἀ C Q, 1;
P Q, 15.

Class (δ).—Where but one MS. agrees with S, of which the instances are
164 in all.

Here, as under (γ), Q stands high, the readings which it alone of the
MSS. supports being 40, largely exceeding those supported by A, which
are but 27, or by P and C, which are but 18 and 7 respectively. But a
new fact comes now to light as regards Ἀ, which under this head proves to
stand highest, supporting S in no less than 72 instances.

Reverting now to the totals (as given above, p. lv) of agreements
between S and Ἀ Ἀ C Ἀ P Ἀ Q severally, we find that the figures, when
rearranged in view of the group-distribution, yield for each MS. the
following results:

Of the 218 readings in which S agrees with Q: 75 belong to the
quaternary groups (Ἀ Ἀ C Ἀ Q, 18; Ἀ Ἀ P Ἀ Q, 9; Ἀ C P Ἀ Q, 26; Ἀ C P Ἀ Q, 23):
52 to the ternary (Ἀ Ἀ Q, 10; Ἀ C Q, 2; Ἀ P Q, 20; Ἀ C Q, 4; Ἀ P Q, 12;
Ἀ P Q, 4): 51 to the binary (Ἀ Q, 21; Ἀ Q, 14; Ἀ C Q, 1; P Q, 15). In
40, Q stands apart from the rest.

Of the 285 agreements of S with P: 123 are in the quaternary groups
(Ἀ Ἀ C Ἀ P, 66; Ἀ Ἀ P Ἀ Q, 9; Ἀ C P Ἀ Q, 26; Ἀ C P Ἀ Q, 23); 104 in the ternary
(Ἀ Ἀ P, 45; Ἀ C P, 5; Ἀ P Q, 20; Ἀ C P Q, 18; Ἀ P Q, 12; Ἀ C P Q, 4); 40 in
the binary (Ἀ P, 11; Ἀ P, 13; Ἀ C, 1; P Q, 15). In 18, P stands alone.

Of the 290 agreements of S with A: 115 are in the quaternary groups
(Ἀ Ἀ C Ἀ P, 66; Ἀ Ἀ C Ἀ Q, 18; Ἀ Ἀ P Ἀ Q, 9; Ἀ Ἀ P Q, 22); 96 in the ternary
(Ἀ Ἀ C, 7; Ἀ Ἀ P, 45; Ἀ Ἀ Q, 10; Ἀ C P, 18; Ἀ C Q, 4; Ἀ P Q, 12); 52 in
the binary (Ἀ Ἀ, 13; Ἀ C, 12; Ἀ P, 13; Ἀ Q, 14). In 27, A stands alone.
Of the 330 agreements of $S$ with $N$: 119 are in the quaternary groups ($NACP$, 66; $NACQ$, 18; $NAPQ$, 9; $NPCQ$, 26); 89 in the ternary ($NAC$, 7; $NAP$, 45; $NAPQ$, 10; $NPC$, 5; $NPCQ$, 2; $NPCQ$, 20); 50 in the binary ($NA$, 13; $NC$, 5; $NP$, 11; $NQ$, 21). In 72, $S$ stands alone.

Of the 198 agreements of $S$ with $C$: 132 are in the quaternary groups ($NACP$, 66; $NACQ$, 18; $NPCQ$, 26; $NPCQ$, 22); 40 in the ternary ($NAC$, 7; $NPC$, 5; $NPCQ$, 2; $NPCQ$, 18; $NPCQ$, 4; $NPCQ$, 4); 19 in the binary ($NC$, 5; $AC$, 12; $CP$, 1; $CQ$, 1). In 7, $C$ stands alone.

[The probable corrected totals will be (see above, p. liv)—Agreements, 311: quaternary, 207; ternary, 63; binary, 30; sole, 11.]

If, again, we examine our four classes, $a$, $b$, $c$, $d$, to ascertain how the five MSS. severally stand in each class, we find the following results:

For the above 141 cases where the groups are quaternary (class $a$): $Q$ agrees with $S$ in but 75 cases; $P$ in 123; $A$ in 115; $N$ in 119; $C$ in 132. Thus in this class, $N$ and $A$ are nearly on a par as supporters of $S$; $P$ but a trifle above them; $Q$ is considerably the lowest of all, and $C$ the highest, even in its incomplete state [if it were complete, the figure would presumably exceed 200, as above].

For the above 127 cases where the groups are ternary (class $b$):

$Q$ agrees with $S$ in but 52 cases; $P$ in 104; $A$ in 96; $N$ in 89; $C$ in 40 [corrected, 63]. Thus $N$ and $A$ change places, but keep pretty close together, and $P$ not much above; $Q$ being still distinctly the lowest: but $C$ now falls below $N$, $A$, $P$, the highest place belonging in this class to $P$.

For the above 106 cases where the groups are binary (class $c$):

$Q$ in this class stands among the first, agreeing with $S$ in 51 cases; $P$ in 40; $A$ in 52; $N$ in 50; $C$ in 19 [corrected, 30]. Thus $N$ and $A$ are even closer together than before; but $P$ is now distinctly below them, and $C$ still lower than in class $b$; while $Q$ has passed from the lowest to almost the highest place,—by a shade higher than $N$ and lower than $A$. In this class the figures for the several MSS. are less unequal than in $a$ or $b$, except for $C$, which even as corrected is far behind the rest; but $A$ is slightly first.

For the above 164 cases where the MSS. stand single (class $d$):

$Q$ appears in this class as agreeing with $S$ in 40 cases; $P$ in 18; $A$ in 27; $N$ in 72, far exceeding the rest; $C$ in but 7 [corrected, 11],
far the lowest number. Thus Δ has in this class part company with A, and now heads the list; Q following, though at a long interval; then A; then P; and finally C.

III.—Analysis of the Figures arrived at in II.

We are now in a position to analyze the figures above arrived at, and thus to prepare for interpreting their import as regards the relation borne by the MSS. severally to S.

In the case of Q, the total of its agreement with S, which as we have seen is much less for any one of the other MSS. (218 instances), would be small indeed, if it were not more strongly represented (relatively to the others) in classes γ and δ than it is in classes α and β. In other words, S tends towards Q with greater relative frequency where Q stands alone or as one of a pair of MSS., than where it stands in a ternary or quaternary group.

In the case of P, the results stand in sharp contrast to those arrived at for Q. Not only does the total of its agreement with S (285 instances) largely exceed that of Q, but it shows its highest figures where Q is lowest, in the ternary and quaternary classes, and its lowest where Q is highest, in the class of pairs and in that of single instances,—dropping very abruptly as one passes from the two former classes to the two latter. Thus the support of P to S is relatively much more frequent where P is one of a ternary or quaternary group, than where it stands apart, or paired with one other MS.

The case of A yields results numerically akin to those found for P. The figures are nearly the same as regards the total (290), and are similarly distributed, though not so unevenly, among the four classes, with a drop in passing from α and β to γ and δ, in the same direction as in case of P, but less in amount.

The case of Δ stands by itself, differing in more than one respect from the rest. For it the total of agreement with S (330) is higher, as we have seen, than for Δ, A, P, or Q,—higher probably than even for C; but the distribution of its instances of agreement among the four classes is less unequal than for any other MS. It alone cannot be said to stand low in any one of the four classes; though not first in α, β, or γ, it keeps close to A in all three classes, and rises far above A and all the rest in the
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fourth; its preponderance in that class being so great as to overbalance the higher figures attained by other MSS. in the other classes.

In the case of C, taking the MS. in its imperfect condition as it stands, the actual amount of agreement with S is, as might be expected, less than for any other (198): but if we assume that in the lost parts of it the proportion of agreement was the same as in the extant parts, the corrected total (as above, pp. liv, lv, lvii) will be about 311, little short of the total shown by Θ, and greater than for any of the rest. As the MS. stands, the distribution of the 198 instances, though similar to that in A and P, shows a more rapid diminution in passing from the quaternary class (a) downwards, than in A or even P. And when we rectify the figures for C, this unevenness of distribution will be enhanced; for the probable increase of the total number of instances, from 198 to 311, will, as has been shown, fall presumably in class a mainly. Thus for C, if entire, it would probably be found that its agreements with S, which in class δ are fewer even than for P, would in class a be almost as many as for Θ.

IV.—Interpretation of numerical Results.

These numerical results, thus analyzed, give us an insight into the relation borne by S to the text of the five MSS. severally.

1. S with Q.—The text of this MS. is, as has been shown above, of a type distinct from that in which the other four uncials tend to consent, and coincides largely with what may be styled the cursive text. The facts now established, of the relation between Q and S, are:—That S agrees less frequently with Q than with any of the other four; that with Q alone its agreements are less numerous than its disagreements; that this comparative infrequency of agreement lies chiefly in the classes where Q occurs in combination with two or three of its brethren; but that, where Q stands alone among the MSS., or with but one other of them, S shows a relatively larger tendency to side with Q, and that the number of cases where S thus sides with Q (usually supported by many mss.) against the rest is considerable. It follows, therefore, that, on the whole, the text of S is mainly of the uncial type; that its adhesion to this type is most manifest where the MSS. are most agreed inter se; but that into it there enters an admixture, of secondary but appreciable amount, of a text of the Q-type.

2. S with P.—The text in this case we have found to be of normal
uncial type, with but few individualisms. To it, therefore, as such, S in the main keeps pretty close; closest where the uncial consent approaches most nearly to unanimity. Where P stands alone, S is but seldom with it.

3. S with C.—The text of C is, as we have seen, more purely representative of the average uncial than even P, or any other; and it is, of the five, marked by the least proportion of individualisms. In the class of instances where four MSS. concur, C is the one which supports S more fully than any other MS.; less fully than any other (very rarely indeed) in the class where the MSS. stand singly. Thus the case of C is similar to that of P, but more strongly marked. As a MS. representative of the average uncial text, it supports S more strongly, as an individual MS. less strongly, than any other of the five.

4. S with A.—Numerically, the results in this case are closely akin to those we have found for the two preceding, except that the coincidences of S with the singular readings of A, are less infrequent than with those of C or P. And when we recall the fact (see above, pp. lii, liii), that many of these singular readings of A are of special value, tending, not as in case of Q, downward in the direction of a more recent form of the text, but upward towards a form more archaic than that of the average uncial, and presumably primitive, we are led to inquire whether S has retained any of these important readings. On examination, it proves to exhibit the following:—τῷ for τῆς, ii. 8 and ii. 18; omission of αἰτῶν, ii. 18; ὥς ἀνθρώπου, iv. 7; ἔριος, v. 12; ἀνατολῶν (plural), vii. 2 and xvi. 12; ἔδωρ ἄγαλον ποιῶν, vii. 9; ἔσωθεν, xi. 2; εἰς αἵματοςαίν repeated, xiii. 10; αὐτῆς (for τῆς γῆς), xvii. 4; μεθύονταν Ἐκ, xvii. 6; ὑπάγει, xvii. 8; ἔσσετο repeated, xvi. 2; insertion of οἵ before ἀληθῶν, xix. 9; omission of τά before χῶμα, xx. 6; γέγοναν, xxi. 6;—also (nearly) insertion of αἰτῶν Ὁδός, xxi. 3. S thus goes with A in an appreciable number of its most notable and approved singular readings (see especially note on xxi. 6, p. 49 infra.).

5. S with Ν.—This is, as we have seen, an exceptional MS.; and we have seen that its relations with S are exceptional likewise. It exhibits a text fundamentally at one with the consent of A C P, yet with a large alloy of foreign and inferior metal. And S, as has been shown, agrees with it, on the whole, more extensively than with any other, the excess of agreement lying chiefly in the class of cases where Ν diverges in a direction away from the rest. That is to say, S agrees with Ν, not only in so far as Ν represents the average uncial, but (largely) in the individualisms, often
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eccentric, which characterize Κ. In fact, there are a few instances where the singular readings of Κ would hardly be worth recording, were it not that, though otherwise unsupported, or nearly so, they reappear in S: such as—insertion of εἰκασι, ii. 20; insertion of λυσια, v. 5 [also Latin Vulgate]; ψυχήν (for plural), viii. 9; μυριάδας (for nominative), ix. 16 [also Σ]; ἐν φόβῳ for ἐμφοβοί, xi. 13 (also lat. of Primasius); omission of καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ, xiii. 18; διακοσίων for ἐξακοσίων, xiv. 20 [also ms. 26]; insertion of αὐτῶν, xxi. 12. I omit many examples where the variation is more minute, or where it is supported by one or two mss., or by Σ, or by a Latin version, or by some combination of such. None of the above has been adopted from Κ by any editor: but of the few other singular readings of Κ so adopted, with or without doubt (see p. li), S agrees in Ζμυρναν (for Σμ.,) i. 11, ii. 18; πεπυρμένης, i. 15; insertion of ὡς, v. 11; βάλλουσα, vi. 13; insertion of φ, ix. 11; λεώντων, xiii. 2; ἀποκτείνει, xiii. 10; ποιῆσει, xiii. 15; μαργαριτῶν, xviii. 12; ὁ ποιῶν, xxi. 27; βλέπων καὶ ἄκοινων, xxii. 8; ἐστιν αὐτῶν ὁ Θεός, xxii. 18. In some of these, Κ has considerable support also from mss., Latin versions, or Σ.

To sum up: —

S is in the main a witness to the normal uncial text; but not altogether such. It is a mixed text, into which two main components enter, in unequal proportion: the larger component being a text adhering to the consent of ΚΑ Π (or the majority of them), and the smaller component a text agreeing with Q and the cursive. But in the larger component there is not uniformity in its adhesion to the uncialss severally. In so far as it is simply normal, it keeps closest to C and P, especially the former; but it is now and then abnormal in a direction where Λ, or more frequently Κ, leads it. Thus, where it leaves Κ, A, C, and P for Q, it passes from the uncial to the cursive type; where it leaves Λ, C, P for Κ, it tends to an aberrant form of text, and is so far discredited as sharing in the eccentricity of Κ; where it leaves Κ, C, P for Λ, it often appears to revert to a more authentic and probably primitive tradition, and shares, so far, in the credit that attaches to Λ as the MS. that on the whole preserves most faithfully the archetypal text.
V.—Further Examination of the comparative Relations of S with Greek Texts.

The comparison in value between the attestation of S by Ν and by A may be carried further by examining the Ν Q and A Q groups.

Of the 21 Ν Q readings of S, Weiss accepts but five. Of these, Westcott and Hort admit but two, certainly; the other three (with four more), doubtfully—nine in all. Tischendorf, biased (as before noted) in favour of Ν, accepts eight of these nine with three more—eleven in all. There remain nine, unanimously rejected from all three editions.

But of its A Q readings, but 14 in all (all having ample cursive or Latin support), one only (the second insertion of τὰ ὅντα in xxi. 12), though supported by good mss. and by the Vulgate, is unanimously and without question rejected by our editors. Weiss rejects two more, adopting eleven in all. These two, with a third, Westcott and Hort mark as doubtful, adopting nine with certainty. Tischendorf adopts six in all.

So far, then, as these instances go, the contrast established between the Ν Q and the A Q groups points the same way as the contrast previously shown to exist between the class of cases where Ν, and the class where A, is the sole uncial support of S. On the one hand, the 21 Ν Q readings of S indicate that it goes with Ν in deviating towards the text of Q and the cursive; on the other hand, its rarer A Q readings (14) represent, for the most part, the exceptional retention by S, together with Q and its satellites, of the authentic text, for which A is the main authority.

Again, comparing inter se the binary groups in which S has P for one of its supporters (Ι P, A P, P Q), we find further confirmation of the above results.

The P Q readings of S are 15. Tischendorf adopts five of these, of which two only are received into Westcott and Hort's text; but they admit besides (with doubt) three of those which Tischendorf passes by. Weiss adopts four, agreeing with Tischendorf as to two only; with Westcott and Hort only as to one of those two, and one which they place on their margin. Thus the three editions concur in rejecting six; in absolutely accepting only one. It follows, therefore, that P, even more decidedly than Ν, so far as it sides with Q, is somewhat disparaged as a supporter of the text of S.

The readings of Ν that are confirmed by combination with P meet with more approval from our critics. There are 11 such readings. Of
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these, three are adopted by Weiss (the omission of ἐγὼ, v. 4; βασιλεύσουσιν, v. 10; μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁ, xix. 10), the first and third of which Westcott and Hort also admit, but doubtfully. Four more they admit also doubtfully, absolutely rejecting the remaining five. Tischendorf rejects three of these five, with one other, and adopts seven in all, including Weiss’s three. Thus, there are three of these readings which all agree in rejecting; and there is not one accepted without reserve by all. Some of them have Latin support.

But as regards the readings of S that belong to group AP (13 in all), the critics approach much more nearly towards agreement. Two of them they all reject (ψυχρός before ζευγός in iii. 16; the insertion of καὶ μεμοσημένον after πνεῦματος ἀκαθάρτου in xviii. 2). All the remaining eleven, Weiss accepts; as do Westcott and Hort (with doubt as to three of them): Tischendorf rejects five of them. Thus there remain six unanimously accepted.

The conclusion yielded by the above comparison is, then, that P, as a supporter of S, is strongly accredited so far as it is confirmed by A; but less strongly where it is confirmed by N; and that it is, on the whole, discredited by the more frequent instances where it agrees with Q.

The relation borne by the S-text to that of the uncials, collectively, in groups, or severally, might be discussed farther; but enough has been now said to establish the general conclusions above stated as to the text which our translator had before him, or formed for himself.

It is to be added that, of the cursives 36, 38, 79, 87 above referred to (p. li), with which may be joined 1, 7, 28, 35, 49, 91, 95, 96, 152, some support S in conjunction not only with N or A, but with some other one of the MSS., or with one or more Latin texts, against the remaining MSS., and all or nearly all mss. Sometimes S stands with one or more of these against all other Greek copies, or even against all other authorities, Greek and Latin.* Of this perhaps the most notable instance is its agreement with 152 in the interpolation in ii. 13, for which see note in loc.

* The relations of S with these mss., especially 36, 38, 95, deserve to be examined more fully. And if the text to which the Commentary of Andreas is attached, were available in a trustworthy form, a comparison with it too would be important (see note on Greek text of viii. 12).

I have noticed nine cases where 38 is the sole Greek supporter of S, seven where 95, three where 36; also twenty where 38 and 8 have with them but a few mss. and no MS.; twenty-three
VI.—Relations of $S$ with the Latin Versions severally.

In pursuing this investigation, it is important to examine the support which the $S$-text finds in the Latin versions—Old, and Vulgate.

1. $S$ with Latin and MS. support.—On this part of the subject I have touched more than once in the preceding discussion; and in list I (Appendix, pp. cxxv, sqq.), the Vulgate (both Amiatine and Clementine), and both forms of the Old Latin, appear throughout among the textual witnesses cited. Without going into detail, or classifying the Latin texts into groups, as I have done in examining the evidence of the Greek MSS., it will suffice in the first instance to state summarily that, out of the 538 instances entered in this list, $S$ has the support of the Vulgate in more than 300 (in 317 if we take as standard the Amiatine text, as I shall do throughout; if the Clementine, in 332); of the European Old Latin ($g$) in nearly as many (304); of the African ($pr$) less frequently (in 267).* In nearly 100 of them none of these Latin texts is with $S$.

2. $S$ with Latin support against all MSS.—Again, in the 215 instances of list II (pp. cxli—cxliti) in which $S$ is against all MSS., there are 124 (II, 1 and 3) in which it is supported by one or more of the Latin texts. The Vulgate is with it in about 50 of these (am, 44; cl, 55). But for the Old Latin the facts are noteworthy. In list II, $pr$, which we found to be lowest in list I, stands far ahead of the others, supporting $S$ in 82 instances (two-thirds of the entire number); while $g$ stands much on the same level as the Vulgate, supporting $S$ in but 47. Farther; of these instances, the number in which $pr$ is the only Latin text that agrees with $S$, amounts to 36: while for $g$ it is but 9, for the Vulgate, but 10 or 12. Moreover, of these 36, there are but 10 in which $pr$ has any Greek support (that of a few mss., sometimes of but one); but 6 in which $S$ is with it; and there remain 20 in which the combination $pr$ $S$ stands alone, opposed to the consent of all

where 36 and $S$. Of the uncials, $X$ is found with 38 and $S$, against all else, four times; with 36 and $S$ three times: $A$ with 38 and $S$ once. Both $X$ and $A$ now and then have some other sole ms. with them and $S$.

* It is to be borne in mind that no comparison can properly be made between these figures and those which show the amount of agreement between $S$ and the MSS. severally (above, p. lv). In the 538 cases here used as basis of calculation, no account is taken of the cases where $S$ differs from the Latin texts, with or against the consent of the uncials. Within the range of these 538, we may safely compare MS. with MS., or Latin text with Latin text, but not MS. with Latin, as regards extent of agreement with $S$. 
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other authorities—Greek, Latin, and Syriac: whereas the like combination 
S occurs unsupported but 4 times, and \( \gamma \) S but 3 times. In other 
words, the Vulgate and \( g \), though they agree very largely with S in 
company with one or more of the uncials, very seldom do so when it has 
little or no Greek support: while \( pr \), though it stands markedly below the 
other forms of the Latin in amount of agreement with S in the former 
class of cases, is far above them in the latter class—the class, namely, of 
subsingular readings. It thus appears that \( pr \), standing thus lowest in the 
one class, and highest in the other, tends farther than do \( g \) and the 
Vulgate to deviate from the uncial text, or any uncial-attested form of 
text, into a line of its own; and moreover, that in this line it has, to an 
appreciable extent, S as the companion of its deviations.

The interpretation of the facts thus ascertained seems to be: on the 
one hand, that (1) the coincidences between S and the Vulgate, or the 
European (\( g \)) type of Old Latin, form (for the most part)\(^*\) no reliable 
addition to the results already obtained from our examination of S in its 
affinities with the MSS.; but may be illusory, resulting merely from the 
common relation borne by the Syriac and the Latin to known forms of 
Greek text, represented in one or more of the extant uncials. And, on 
the other hand, that (2) the coincidences between S and the African (\( pr \)) 
type of Old Latin, are real tokens of affinity traceable to a common source 
apt from all known MSS., a very ancient type of text, attested often by 
no extant Greek copy, or at most by one, two, or three cursives, of which 
type, in not a few cases, S and \( pr \) are thus the sole surviving representa-
tives.

3. S with each several combination of MS. with Latin version.—It is worth 
while, however, to revert to list I, in order to ascertain how far each Latin 
text shares with S its inclination towards, or against, this or that form 
of text as presented by the uncials severally.

The figures prove to be as follows, for each MS. so far as it agrees 
with S:—

For \( N \); the combination \( \gamma N \) occurs 202 times, \( g N \), 200; \( pr N \), 175.
For A the figures are: \( \gamma A \), 222; \( g A \), 197; \( pr A \), 176. For P, \( \gamma P \), 208;
\( g P \), 201; \( pr P \), 169. For Q: \( \gamma Q \), 131; \( g Q \), 133; \( pr Q \), 115.

\(^*\) I have said, "for the most part," because in a few instances the unsupported coincidences 
of \( g \) at least with S, seem to betoken a common source distinct from all extant Greek. See 
especially xii. 10, and notes on Greek text there; and xviii. 12 (\( \tau \mu \nu\nu \) \&c).
I proceed to consider the questions which are suggested, and may be answered, by these figures.

We have seen above that Q represents to a great extent a type of text distinct from that of the other MSS., and that S tends to the latter rather than to the former. The question then arises, Do the Latin texts tend towards the Q-type, or (like S) away from it?

Let us compare the cases of Q and A. We have seen (p. lv) that, out of the 538 instances of list I, S is with Q three-fourths as often as with A. If then the tendency of the Latin texts was uniform as between A and Q, in supporting S, the combinations vg Q, g Q, pr Q would be three-fourths of the corresponding combinations vg A, g A, pr A. But the proportion actually found to subsist is much less than three-fourths, about two-thirds; and for vg Q especially, it is under three-fifths the amount for vg A.

A comparison of the cases of B and P with that of Q leads to similar results somewhat less marked in degree.

We infer then that the Latin texts, especially the Amiatine Vulgate, within the range of the agreement of S with the uncials, tend to follow the Q-type to a less extent than the type of the other uncials, especially the type represented by A.

We have seen (p. lxi) that B contains an aberrant element, shared to an appreciable extent by S. Does this B-element appear in the Latin texts?

S, as has been shown, is much more frequently with B than with any other MS. Then, as before, if the tendency of the Latin, in supporting S, were uniform as between B and the other MSS., we should find vg B, g B, pr B, far outnumbering the like combinations for A and P severally, as well as for Q. But the above figures show that vg A largely and vg P slightly outnumber vg B, while g B, pr B, are about on a par with g A, pr A, g P, pr P. It is probable, therefore, that the Latin texts, while sharing with S its general affinity to the normal uncial text, tend, not like S, towards the B-type of that text, but rather towards that of P; or, still more, towards that of A—the tendency towards the A-type being most marked in the Vulgate.

The relation of the Latin texts to B, A, and Q, severally (putting aside P as less important and showing fewer characteristic features), will be more distinctly discerned if we confine our observation to the cases where one of these MSS. is the sole uncial supporter of S. These cases number 72 for
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κ; 40 for Q; 27 for A:—that is, the concurrence of S with the subsingular readings of A is little more in amount than one-third of its concurrence with the subsingular readings of κ, and barely over two-thirds of its concurrence with those of Q. But when we examine how far the Latin, Old or Vulgate, goes with S in this respect, we find—

In the 72 subsingular κ-readings: vg κ, 9 times; g κ, 13 times; pr κ, 12 times.

In the 27 subsingular A-readings; vg A, 14 times; g A, 7 times; pr A, 12 times.

In the 40 subsingular Q-readings; vg Q, 12 times; g Q, 15 times; pr Q, 13 times.

It thus appears from this comparison that none of the Latin texts concurs, as they might all have been expected to do, nearly three times more frequently with κ than with A. On the contrary, the Vulgate tends largely towards A rather than κ; the African Old Latin (pr) equally towards both; while the European Old Latin (g), which alone inclines to κ, does so in a ratio of less than two-fold. As to Q, all the Latin texts agree with it rather more frequently than with κ.

As between κ and A, then, our conclusion is, that, within the range of the readings attested by S, when those which are peculiar to A among MSS. are compared with these peculiar to κ, a much larger proportion of the former than of the latter prove to have Latin support, that of the Amiatine Vulgate most frequently—of the European Old Latin least frequently. The Latin texts therefore, and especially the Vulgate, share more or less in the credit which (as above shown, pp. lix, lxii) pertains to S by reason of its concurrence in some of the most distinctive readings of A. And, on the other hand, the Vulgate and the African Old Latin partake very little—and the European Old Latin in no great degree—in the aberrant element akin to κ which discredits S, and which (we conclude) was derived from some text unrelated to any known form of the Latin.*

A remark of some importance here arises as regards the relation borne by S to the κ-text on one side, and on the other, to that represented by pr. We have seen that, as regards concurrence with S in subsingular

---

* A few interesting and notable examples will be found in list I, and in II, (1 and 3), where the Latin texts (or at least one of them)—usually pr stand with S in company with one MSS. (see p.ii, note b), or with one or two important mss., or with no Greek support. See, e.g., iii. 1; v. 4; xiii. 10; xvii. 8; xviii. 12, 14, 20.
readings, Ν stands first among the MSS., and pr among the Latin texts. Now, of the 72 readings in which Ν is the sole MS. supporter of S, pr concurs in but 12; and of the readings in which pr is the sole Latin supporter of S, 51 in all (15 of list I, 36 of II), Ν concurs in but 9 (all of course belonging to the 15, the 36 being non-uncial readings). And it proves on examination that, of these 12 Ν-readings, but one is found among the 9 pr readings. Thus, there is but one reading, among all the 753 (538 + 215) places of lists I and II (1, 2, 3), in which pr alone of Latin texts, and Ν alone of MSS., concur in supporting S. This reading is a very trivial one—βλέπων καὶ ἄκοινων for ἄκοινων καὶ βλέπων, xxii. 8; but is confirmed by a few cursive.* From these facts it follows that the two elements of aberrancy by which we have found the text of S to be affected, one shared by it with Ν and the other with pr, prove to be distinct, each from the other.

With regard to Q, when we inquire how far the Latin texts support it in the 40 readings where it stands with S sole among MSS., it is to be borne in mind that none of these readings is even subsingular in the full sense, but all are largely confirmed by cursive evidence. Comparing these 40 readings, however, as regards their Latin attestation, with the like 27 readings of A, we find that the former are not in any considerable degree more largely supported than the latter, except as regards the r-text—and that A, in fact, exceeds Q in point of concurrence with the Vulgate text. We may, with some probability infer hence that the Vulgate (in its Amiatine form) admits less, and that the European Old Latin admits more, of the Q-type into its text than is to be found in S.\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{k}}}.

It is hardly necessary to explain that, in thus tracing out the extent of

* Also by the Coptic, and by some texts of Andreas, and by Dionysius Alex. (ap. Euseb. \textit{H E.}, vii. 26).

\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{k}}} It may be presumed that the Vulgate, in the Apocalypse as elsewhere, is the result of Jerome’s revision of a form (perhaps “European”) of the Old Latin. With the African (or Primasian) text it has no special affinity; and a comparison of it with r shows an extent of deviation such as to prove, either, that the Old Latin known to Jerome differed materially from the type (presumably European) presented by r, or, that he must have remodelled it largely into conformity with his Greek MS. or MSS. The result has certainly been that the Vulgate comes closer than either form of Old Latin to the uncial text. The facts and figures given above, as resulting from the comparison between A and Ν, A and Q, lead us to suppose Jerome to have used a text of the Apocalypse akin to A in revising his Old Latin: while r, on the other hand, seems to have been somewhat conformed to the Q-type.\textsuperscript{k}
the textual affinity that subsists between our Syriac and the Latin texts, I am not to be understood as suggesting it as, even in the lowest degree, probable that our translator was acquainted with any Latin version. There are, no doubt, 75 readings, out of the whole 753 which lists I and II (1, 2, 3) exhibit, for which there is no Greek evidence, but Latin—chiefly that of pr—in many cases unconfirmed by other versions than S. But these instances can be satisfactorily accounted for by supposing that the Greek texts which the translator chiefly followed (if he had in his hands more than one), or the chief factor in his Greek text (if he had but one), contained certain elements in common with the Greek text, or texts, underlying the Latin versions.

VII.—Hypotheses to account for the Facts of the S-text.

If then we desire to frame a theory of the formation of the S-text, we shall find that (so far as concerns its relations with the Greek and Latin texts—without taking account of a large amount of aberration, not yet treated of, which is peculiar to S) the facts as above stated will be sufficiently accounted for by either of two hypotheses:

i. We may suppose our translator to have formed the text for himself, taking as basis one main exemplar, the text of which he modified at his discretion, to the extent of about one-third, by the introduction of readings from a second subsidiary exemplar. Or:

ii. He may have followed the text of a single exemplar, which text was a composite one—of two factors, a primary and a secondary, the former predominating in the ratio of nearly two to one.

In either case, the secondary text was of the common cursive type with Q as its uncial representative: the primary, a text of the normal uncial type, in character intermediate between S and A, partaking to some extent in the peculiar aberrancies of the former, and to a less but appreciable extent in the special excellence of the latter; and, like both S and A, exhibiting extensive affinity with the texts represented by Latin evidence, but inclining towards the African Latin in its deviations from all uncial, and even from all Greek, authority.

To go further back—to inquire how the supposed primary source of the S-text came into close relations with texts of Latin attestation, or how it came to share in the divergencies of S, or in the peculiarities of the
African Latin where it departs from the Greek and from the other Latin texts—would, I apprehend, be fruitless, or at least premature, in the absence of fuller material for investigation.

Of the alternative hypotheses above suggested, I incline to the former. The admixture of the secondary element in S is not only, as I have said, unequal in amount to the other, but is uneven in distribution; readings of the Q-type tending to occur in patches, and then not to recur till after a not inconsiderable interval. This fact looks like the work of a translator with two copies in his hands: one used habitually; the other for occasional reference only, and unsystematically,—perhaps capriciously, perhaps to clear up places where the sense presented difficulty. It is even an admissible conjecture that he may have noticed passages quoted from a text of the Q-type in some authoritative Greek divine of the fourth or fifth century (in which period that text had become prevalent), and may have endeavoured to conform his text accordingly* in such passages. The admixture of the secondary element, if due to a scribe, would probably have been more uniform, as being more mechanical.

VIII.—Relation between the S-text and the Σ-text.

I now pass on to consider the text of S in its relation to that which underlies Σ.

1. Their extensive agreement.—Directing our examination, in the first instance, to the first list (of the 538 places where the uncial evidence is divided), we find that S is supported by Σ in about 350 of these—not far from two-thirds.† Now, although this list has been made primarily with a view to S, yet in making it I have throughout compared the Σ-text as well as that of S with the uncials, as regards both differences and agreements; and moreover, it is as regards the uncial evidence a complete list. We may, therefore, safely accept it as an adequate basis for a comparison

---

* Thus, as we learn from Moses of Aghel (Assemann, Bibliauc. Orients., tom. ii, p. 83), it was the observation of discrepancies between the Peshito text and that of the citations of Cyril of Alexandria from LXX and N.T., that led to the revision which bears the name of Philoxenus. See p. xvi, ivfr.

† I take no account here of agreements occurring in i. 1–8, for the reason given above, p. xxxv, note: nor in places where the rendering of Σ is indecisive, or its text uncertain.
between S and Σ, (1) *inter se*, and also (2) as regards the relation which each bears to the uncialis, severally or collectively.

We learn then from list I that S has an extensive textual affinity with Σ, and is nearer to it than to any one of the Greek MSS.; the number of the agreements of S with Σ (the one which comes closest to it) being but 330, with A 290, and with P 285, against the above 350. This extensive, though by no means universal, textual agreement between the two versions, is of itself sufficient to suggest the idea that they are textually akin—that, as has already been shown to be on other grounds probable, one of them is in part founded on the other. This inference is confirmed when we turn to list II, 1, 2, 3, (of the 215 readings which have only cursive or Latin attestation), and observe that even in this region where no uncial confirms S, Σ is with it 52 times. And not only so, but of the readings (nearly 150; see below, p. lxxvi) where S has neither Greek nor Latin support, there are 27 (see list II, 4) where Σ alone stands by it. Of these 27, few are of textual value; the most notable being, the substitution of ἦςατι for αὑματι (viii. 7), of the passive δοθή for δώσω [δωσώ] (xiii. 16), and of the accusative feminine τὰς πεπελεκσιμένας [sc., ψυχάς] for the genitive masculine (xx. 4). Of the instances in list II, 1, 2, 3, a few are remarkable, such as τῷ ἐν for τῷ ἐν (iii. 1), τοῦτῳ inserted (xiii. 4), ἀπέγει for συμαχεῖ (xiii. 10), τίμιον for τιμίον (xviii. 12), ὡς omitted (xix. 1). The rest, though in themselves sometimes uncertain and not seldom trivial—such as the substitution of plural for singular noun, present for past or future verb (or *vice versa*)—are collectively of appreciable weight as evidence of affinity between the texts represented by the two versions.*

2. Their differences.—The relation, then, between S and Σ is on the whole one of unmistakable textual affinity. But it is by no means one of simple affinity. Out of the total range of the passages included in lists I and II (780 in all), they read alike in nearly 430, and differ in more than 350 (about 45 per cent.); or, if we confine ourselves to the main list (I), the coincidences are, as we have seen, under two-thirds; the differences exceed one-third. Judged by either method of testing, the figures compel us to

* The evidence of a Syriac version is apt to be precarious as to the number of a noun, or the tense of a verb, inasmuch as the distinction in the MSS. as written is often made merely by a point or points.
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conclude that the texts, though not independent, are far from being identical. A natural explanation of this mixed relation is to be found in the hypothesis that one of the two translators, having in his hands the work of the other, and using it as his main basis, yet revised its text at his discretion into partial accordance with some other text or texts—presumably of one or more Greek copies;—in other words, that the later of the two translators of the Apocalypse dealt with the version of his predecessor, as Thomas of Harkel is known to have dealt with the Philozenian version.

If this be so, we may restate the above numerical results as follows. Within the range of the 780 instances collected in our two lists, probably fairly representative of the total text of the Apocalypse as affected by variation, the later translator has retained without change, to a large extent amounting to more than one-half, the text followed by the earlier, but has introduced changes also large, though less large, from another source.

3. Comparative extent of agreement of S and Σ severally with each MS.—The questions then naturally follow: What is the character of the text of each? Which of the two is the more archaic? And the answers are to be found by instituting the comparison above proposed, between S and Σ in respect of the affinity borne by each to the uncials severally.

The result then proves to be, that out of the total 538 places of list L, Σ agrees with Q in nearly 300; with P in a number slightly less; with A in a number slightly greater; with Ν in but 270 or under. With C the agreements exceed 200 [probably to be corrected, as before, to a number exceeding 300].

Comparing then these figures with those already ascertained (p. iv, sqq.) for S, we learn that, in their relations to A, C, and P, the two versions do not materially differ inter se. But with regard to Ν and Q the case is very different. Q, which stands markedly below the rest in the scale of agreement with S, is nearly on a par with A [and C], and above P, in the scale of agreement with Σ. On the other hand, Ν, to which S approaches nearest in text, is the one from which Σ is most remote. The exact facts are as follows, as regards Q, Ν, and A.

As regards Q:—

Σ is with Q (singly, or in groups including Q) in 298 instances; against Q (with the other MSS., singly, or in groups excluding Q) in 223;
in the remaining 17 it is ambiguous, or deviates from all the MSS. Thus its agreement with Q is over 55 per cent.; while that of S is but 40.

In nearly every one of the groups which include Q, with few and slight exceptions, the agreements with Σ are more numerous than with S; whereas in those which exclude Q the reverse holds good. In the two most important groups, ΣΑCΡ, ΣΑΡ, especially, this fact is conspicuous, the numbers being for Σ: ΣΑCΡ, 54—against 66 for S; ΣΑΡ, 35—against 45 for S. Thus the affinity between the Σ-text and Q is pretty uniformly distributed among the groups.

In the class of cases which yields the surest test, that of agreement with one MS. against the rest, the result is even more plainly conclusive: Σ is with Q alone 63 times; S with Q alone 40 times.

From these figures then we draw the inference, that, while Σ resembles S in having a mixed text, partly agreeing with the normal uncial, partly with that represented by Q against the rest, the admixture of the Q-element is considerably larger throughout in Σ than in S.

As regards Ν:—

Σ is with Ν (singly or in groups) in 267 instances; against Ν (with the others as before) in 254 (the remaining 17 being set aside as above). Its agreement with Ν is therefore under 50 per cent.; as against 61 for S.

This deficiency for Σ occurs for the most part in the groups into which Ν enters without Q, and appears in hardly any group which contains Q.

Σ is with Ν alone but 21 times; whereas the figure for S is 72.

The inference here is, accordingly, that in most of the places where Σ seems to agree with Ν, its agreement is really with Q, and that the aberrant Ν-element which marks the text of S is absent, or present in very much diminished amount, in Σ.

As regards Α:—

The total number of agreements with Α is (as has been above stated) somewhat greater for Σ than for S (301 for 290). But—

This excess is due entirely to the groups in which Q enters with Α, notably A C P Q (where Σ agrees 44 times; S, 22); A P Q (Σ, 26; S, 12); A Q (Σ, 23; S, 14).

Σ is with Α alone 18 times; S, 27 times.
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The inference then is, that though Λ is with Σ to an extent somewhat greater numerically than with S, the advantage of Σ is but apparent: in the class of readings specially characteristic of Λ, S comes closer to it than Σ.

As regards P and C:—

For P, and (so far as can be judged) for C, the facts are similar to those for Λ, but exist in a markedly less degree. They are not sufficient to supply grounds for distinguishing between S and Σ as regards their textual relation to these two MSS.

4. Probable Method by which one Text was formed from the other.—In the case of Σ then, we are led by the above facts to conclude that the underlying text is one which, if we are to regard Σ as the derivate version and S as the primary, has been altered from that of S so as to bring it nearer to the Q-type of text, and to set it therefore farther from the text attested by the consent of the better group, Ω A C P,—altered, that is, in the direction of deterioration. The author of Σ, therefore, on this hypothesis, had S before him, and modified it extensively into conformity with a Greek copy not much differing from Q.—If on the other hand we accept the converse hypothesis, and regard S as a revised and corrected recension of Σ, we must suppose a basis-text akin to Q, revised and corrected in the authority of a copy such as Ω, Λ, C, or P—probably approaching nearest to Ω, the MS. which shows the closest affinity of text with S, but retaining some important traces of Λ. The process under this theory must be admitted to have been, on the whole, one of textual improvement.

Yet the transformation, under the latter hypothesis, of Σ into S, was not altogether for the better; nor, if the former hypothesis be preferred, was the transformation of S into Σ altogether for the worse. For, as we have seen, Σ does not follow as S does the aberrancies of Ω; nor do I find that it has, like S, a considerable number of hardly defensible readings peculiar, or nearly so, to itself. If then S is a revision of Σ, we must own that along with a large amount of better readings it has admitted a considerable, though smaller, amount of worthless ones; if Σ is a revision of S, it is undeniable that, in parting with much that ought to have been retained, it has rejected not a little that deserved rejection. The total of aberrant element that can be held (on this latter supposition) to have passed from S into Σ, is represented by 73 instances where Σ concurs
with S in readings which are weakly attested (i.e., without MS. evidence, or by $\mathfrak{X}$ only;—of which readings S contains 287* in all)—together with the 27 readings in which $\Sigma$ alone is with S (out of nearly 150 where S has no Greek or Latin support).

IX.—The Divergencies of S from all other Texts.

It remains that I should treat of the singular readings of S.

These form a large—but, I apprehend, by no means important—element in its text. Their total number is not accurately determinable. But it appears that there are over 120 instances of variations probably belonging to the underlying Greek; setting aside many more which seem due to carelessness, conjecture, or caprice on the part of the translator; and some which may be set down as errors of the Syriac scribe—especially such as affect a prefix consisting of a single letter, as for example (what seems to have frequently occurred), the omission or insertion of the copulative $\nu\psi$. All that seem worth noticing are recorded (in loco) in the notes on the subjoined Greek text.

1. The following may be deserving of mention here as examples.

Some are substitutions, of which a few evidently represent ecstatic or other orthographic mis-readings in the Greek: as συντρίβεσ [or -ψει], for συντρίβεται (ii. 27); πέση ἐν' ἄνθρωποιν for παῖση . . . (ix. 5); ἕπι τὰ πρώσωπα for ὅτι τὰ πρώτα (xxi. 4); and perhaps δι' αὐτῆς for διαγηγής (xxi. 21). Others again may, perhaps, be due to laxity of rendering; as εἰς μετάνοιαν for ἵνα μετανοήσῃ (ii. 21); and so again the passive ἤνοιγη ἐφ' αὐτῆς (vi. 5); and (conversely) the active οὐ μή εὑρήσεις for οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ (xvii. 21); ἐπιλάνησας for ἐπιλάνησαν (xviii. 23); δεί αὐτὸν λύσαι for δεῖ αὐτὸν λυθήσαι (xx. 3). Again, we have ὅτι ἐπικράνθησαν τὰ ἱδατα for ἐκ τῶν ἱδατών ὅτι ἐπικράνθησαν (viii. 11); and as a

* These are—(1) Attested only by $\mathfrak{X}$, 72; (2) by a few ms. with or without Latin support, 140; (3) by Latin only, 75. S and $\Sigma$ concur in 21 of (1); in 33 of (2); in 19 of (3). In this reckoning I do not include the Q-readings. They cannot be supposed to have been derived by $\Sigma$ from S; and most of them have strong cursive attestation.

It is noteworthy that as regards $\mathfrak{X}$ (the MS. with which S has the maximum and $\Sigma$ the minimum of agreement), $\Sigma$ rarely agrees with its singular readings except in company with S. A similar observation holds good, though not so extensively, with respect to the 36 (p. 1) singular readings of $\nu\psi$. In 6 of these 36, $\Sigma$ concurs.
parallel instance, ἑστρεφεῖν τὰ ὑδάτα for ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ἑστρεφεῖν αὐτῷ (xi. 6). But the brief οὐ γεγραμμένοι δὲν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὄνομα (xiii. 8) is balanced by the expansion οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, οἱ φοβούμενοι αὐτὸν (xix. 5). Other notable instances are:—τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς ἐσθαμμένας for τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσθαμμένων (vi. 9); ἐπὶ ζωῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τηγάς for ἐπὶ ζωῆς ἀντὶς τηγάς (vi. 17); θαλάσσης for ἀβύσσου (xi. 17; xvi. 8); μετὰ τῶν μεγάλων for καὶ τῶν μεγάλων (xi. 18, and so xix. 5); τὴν σκηνὴν ... τῶν σκηνούντων for τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ [καὶ] τοὺς ... σκηνούντας (xiii. 6); δεσπότας for δεσποτέους (xiii. 16); καὶ αὐτῶν (with altered punctuation) for εἰ μὴ αὐτῶν (xiv. 3); δίκαια καὶ ἅλθωνα τὰ ἔργα for δίκαιαι καὶ ἅλθωναι αἱ ὀδοί (xv. 3); βιβλίον ... τῆς κρίσεως for β. τῆς κρίσεως (xx. 12); μέτρων κάλαμον for μέτρων κάλαμον [κάλαμον] (xxxi. 15); τὰ γεγραμμένα for οἰ γεγραμμένοι (xxxi. 27); βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν for βασιλεύσουσιν (xxii. 5). More deserving of consideration are the substitution of κεχρυσομένα for καὶ κεχρυσομένη, as to relate to the “purple and scarlet,” not to their wearer (twice, xviii. 4, xviii. 16); and of ἐπὶ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ for ἐπὶ τὰ ἰμάτια καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, so that the Name of Him who sat on the white horse is written “on the garments [that were] on his thighs,” not “on His garment and on His thigh.” One reading stands by itself—the unmeaning compromise (between ἡμέλλεις ἀποβάλλεις and ἡμέλλεις ἀποθανεῖς, ἡμέλλεις ἀποθανεῖς (iii. 2). A few others may be more or less plausibly accounted for as due to errors of the Syriac scribe (see notes in loc. on the Syriac text); as ἵδοι αἱ οὐαὶ αἱ δύο ἀπήλθον for ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα ἀπήλθε (xii. 14); ἐγένετο βάλασσα ὡς νεκρός for ἐγένετο αἴμα ὡς νεκρός (xvii. 3); νιοῦ for ἄριου (xii. 14); βλέπων for φιλῶν (xxii. 15). Of the omissions a few are considerable in point of extent. Thus (to pass by some instances which may be accounted for by homeoteleuton in the Syriac) the following sentences, or parts of sentences, are wanting: τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς (before τοῦ ἄρνιου, vi. 16); καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ (before λέγοντες, vii. 11); καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν τῶν ἐπονοῦ ἐν τῇ ὀράσει (beginning of ix. 17); αἳ γὰρ οὐραί αὐτῶν ὤμοια ὀφεσιν, ἑχοῦσα κεφάλας, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀδικοῦσα (end of ix. 19); καὶ ἡ ἐξοναία τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (xii. 10); τὰ γὰρ ἐργά αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετὰ αὐτῶν (xiv. 13); ὁτι ἐξηράνθη ὁ θερισμὸς τῆς γῆς (xiv. 15).b In one

---

a Cp. xx. 4 for a similar reading, in which Σ alone concurs.
b Many minor omissions will be found pointed out in my notes on the Greek text.
instance, where but one word is left out, ὅρα (before μή, which is made to belong to what follows, xix. 10), it seems impossible to doubt that doctrinal bias has been at work; and perhaps the same cause may have excluded ἀχρί τελεσθῇ τὰ χείλα ἔτη from xx. 3. This latter instance, however, may be accounted for by homoeoteleuton in the Greek; as may also those noted above in vi. 16, xiv. 13.

Of insertions, the most remarkable are: τοῦ ἐβδόμου [or τὴν ἐβδόμην, scil. φωνήν], after τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (x. 4); καὶ ὁ δράκων before καὶ τὸ θηρίον (xviii. 11); βλέψεις καὶ αὐτὰ between οὐκέτι and οὐ μή (xvii. 4); καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ after Δαυὶ (xxii. 16). Also on the margin, beside ii. 23, is added, καὶ πανδεόνω ύμας κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ύμῶν. A few others, which might be added under this head, belong rather to the category of double renderings or conflations:

v. 10, βασιλείαν καὶ εἰρεῖς [καὶ βασιλείας].

vi. 2, νικήτης [καὶ νικῶν] καὶ ἓνα νικήσῃ,
(or, νικῶν καὶ ἐνικήσει [καὶ ἓνα νικήσῃ]).

xi. 11, πνεύμα ζῶν . . . εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . καὶ [πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐπέσευ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς].

xviii. 17, ἐπὶ τῶν πλοίων [ἐπὶ τόπων] πλέων.

xix. 19, καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ . . . [καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν].

But it is not certain that any one of these represents a conflate reading in the Greek original of S. All of them may have been introduced into the Syriac by the translator, whether hesitating between two texts, or between two renderings of one and the same text; or possibly by a scribe interpolating S with readings from Σ or from some other quarter. In each case these possibilities have to be considered; and they will be found fully discussed in the notes appended to the Syriac text, and (more briefly) in those at the foot of the Greek text. Here, it will suffice to say that vi. 2 and xi. 11 seem to be examples of double rendering, but that each of them is capable also of being accounted for as produced by a scribe's interpolation from Σ: and that in case of xviii. 17 the conflation may be apparent only (arising from the lack of a proper equivalent in Syriac for πλέω). In the remaining two instances (the first and the last of the above

* But see note on Greek text in loc., and cp. xx. 5, where a like omission is countenanced by many Greek authorities.
five) conflation properly so called indisputably exists; but whether derived by the Syriac translator from his Greek copy, or due to interpolation by him of a variant from a second copy, or by the scribe from Σ or some other version, is open in each case to question.*

2. It will be convenient here to deal with certain apparent singular readings of S, which are really corruptions of the Syriac text due to clerical errors of the scribe; though that subject more properly belongs to Chapter VIII. The following is a sufficiently complete list of the errors of this nature (certain or highly probable), which I find in it:—

καταφόρησις for καταφόρησις (i. 16); ἀληθινὸς for ἀληθινὸς (ii. 13); ἀναιρέσις for ἀναιρέσις (ib., context correspondingly modified, and words omitted); ἀστήρ for ὀστήρ (iii. 17); ἡμέραν for ἡμέρα (vi. 12); Ἰωάννης for Ἰωάννης (ib.); ἔσχος for ἐσχὸς (vi. 14); κομψότης for κομψότης (ix. 2); λεία for λεία (x. 7); τὰ ἄγαθα for τὰ ἄγαθα (xi. 6); ἄρτα for ἄρτα (xi. 19); ἔπαθα for ἔπαθα (xii. 1); ἐγκατάστασις for ἐγκατάστασις (xii. 7, context correspondingly modified); ἔπαθα for ἔπαθα (xii. 10); ἔκκαιρος for ἔκκαιρος (xiii. 2); ἠρμιστοῦ for ἠρμιστοῦ (xiii. 3); ἔκκαιρον for ἔκκαιρον (xiii. 12); ἄρματα for ἄρματα (xiii. 14); ἐκκλήσια for ἐκκλήσια (xv. 1, xxi. 9); ἅσθι for ἅσθι (xv. 11); ἐκκλήσια for ἐκκλήσια (xvii. 12); ἔδρα for ἔδρα (xvii. 14); ἔκκαιρον for ἔκκαιρον (xvii. 16); ἔλεος for ἔλεος (xviii. 8); ἔκκαιρον for ἔκκαιρον (xix. 9); ἔκκαιρον for ἔκκαιρον (ib.); ἐκκλήσια for ἐκκλήσια (xix. 17); ὁ ἵλιον for ὁ ἵλιον (xx. 3); ἔβαλε for ἔβαλε (xx. 6).

See also notes on the Syriac text, xviii. 3, 7, 9; xxi. 11.

Of the above, a few (as i. 16, xii. 1, xvii. 14) may possibly represent Greek variants. Two or three (as vi. 14, xiii. 3) are plausible readings; and might well be judged worthy of adoption if there were any ground for supposing the Apocalypse to have been originally written, or to be based on a document written, in an Aramaic idiom. Especially may this be affirmed of the ἔταν (= ἔταν) of vi. 14, which not only suits the context, but agrees with the ταχῦσσονται (LXX) of Isaiah xxxiv. 4, which this passage follows closely (compare the unusual ἀδύνατος of vi. 13,—in S οὐκέτα, the word by which the Peshitto renders the ὄργα (= falling [fig] of the passage of Isaiah, where LXX merely has ὁ τέλεσα τιττ.εί).
CHAPTER V.

REASONS FOR ACCEPTING $S$ AS THE PRIOR VERSION.

I return now to the question, What is the relation subsisting between our version and the version usually printed?

Above, pp. xxxv–xxxvii, I have shown that, in diction, there is a close and unquestionable affinity between $S$ and $\Sigma$ in point of vocabulary, widely though they differ in method and in idiom. And we have now ascertained farther (pp. lxxi, sqq.) that, in text, there is affinity likewise. Thus by two distinct and independent lines of inquiry, we have been led to the conclusion that the two versions are not unrelated inter se,—that one is based on the other. Which, then, is the original, and which the derivate? Is $\Sigma$ a remodelled form of $S$, with its idiom graecized, its freedom reduced into literal and uniform servility, and its text modified on the authority of a text of the Q-type? Or is $S$ a revision of $\Sigma$, rewritten into idiomatic Syriac, and textually emended by the help of a Greek exemplar not distantly akin to $\aleph$?

The latter seems at first sight an admissible hypothesis. It supposes a reviser working on the basis of $\Sigma$ in much the same way as Symmachus appears to have worked on the basis of the Old Testament version of Aquila, or Jerome on the basis of the Old Latin New Testament.

But I do not believe it possible for any competent scholar who examines the two versions side by side, to hesitate in deciding in favour of the former hypothesis. The literalness of $\Sigma$ is not like that of the Old Latin—the barbarous simplicity of an early and unlearned translator,—it is the studious and pedantic literalness of conscious effort. It is thus, no doubt, like the literalness of Aquila, but of Aquila as the reviser of the work of the LXX, not as the precursor of Symmachus; still more, it is like—rather, it is essentially the same as—the literalness of Thomas of Harkel contrasted with the freedom of the Peshitto.
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In confirmation of this judgment, I offer the following:—

I. Analogy of the "Pococke" and Harkleian Versions of the Four Epistles.

—One part, especially, of the Harkleian version enables us to bring the matter to a definite test. Let anyone first compare a chapter or two of S with the corresponding portion of Σ, and then proceed to compare, in like manner, one of the "Pococke" Epistles with the same in its Harkleian rendering; and he cannot fail to convince himself that the mutual relations, and probably therefore the history, of these two versions of the Epistles are precisely analogous to the mutual relations and history of these two versions of the Apocalypse;—so that if we can solve the questions of relative priority and dependence between the Pococke and the Harkleian, we shall have at the same time obtained a probable solution of the same questions as between S and Σ.

But, as regards the Pococke and the Harkleian, it may fairly be claimed that the solution is clear beyond reasonable doubt. The Harkleian is known to be—in fact, professes to be—a derivate version formed from a prior one by a twofold process, of forcing the diction of the basis-version closer to the Greek idiom, and of revising its text by the help of one or more Greek exemplars. A mere comparison of the two will satisfy any student, that in the Pococke Epistles we have the prior version on which the Harkleian was formed. Analogy, therefore, points to the conclusion that, similarly, we have in S the basis-version of Σ.

This argument rests on the general relation borne by S to Σ, and the parallelism between it and the relation borne by the Pococke to the Harkleian version of the Minor Epistles. I proceed to show, farther, that it is amply confirmed by many particular facts and classes of facts.

* II. Traces of S betrayed by Σ.—Some such facts Σ itself yields, as follows:

a. It has been shown (p. xxxi) that uniformity of rendering is prominent among the characteristics which distinguish Σ from S. It has been shown, too (pp. xxxv, xxxvi), that to this uniformity there are some exceptions; and instances have been given where Σ, in varying its rendering of certain words, follows an identical variation in S. Of such instances no explanation seems possible, except that the version which is habitually uniform is here retaining the language of the version which habitually varies.

b. Again: we have seen (p. xxviii (3)) that, for the most part, Σ avoids the status constructus, which S not infrequently employs. In the few instances where Σ deviates into the use of this form, it coincides (or nearly so) with S. Thus we have in both ἡμένη (ii. 14, 20); ἡμένης (v. 11); and ἡμένης [or ἡμένης] (vi. 15, xix. 18) in Σ, where S has ἡμένης, for κυήραρχοι. Each of the two latter instances contains a further point of deviation on the part of Σ from its own usage into that of S. In the first of them we have the two plurals absolute (see p. xxvii (1)); in the second, the avoidance of the Greco-Syriac ἡμένης which even the Peshitto New Testament sanctions. In v. 11 the coincidence may, no doubt, be due to the Peshitto of Daniel, vii. 10, whence Σ might have derived it directly; but then again it is to be noted that the adoption of the language of the Old Testament Peshitto is habitual in S, not in Σ. On the whole, the inevitable inference from these and like examples seems to be, that the influence, and therefore the priority, of S is manifested in exceptional departures such as these, and those noted in paragraph a, from the usual method and diction of Σ.

c. In rendering the name Ἁβαδδάν (ix. 11) by Ἀβαδάν, the versions show their interdependence by falling alike into the mistake of referring it to the root רָשׁ instead of רְשׁ. But to render such words is the habit of S: to transliterate them of Σ. Thus for Ἀντολ[λ]όν (in same verse) S writes Ἀντολοτος; Σ, Ἀντολοθος; compare also xvi. 16, where for Ἄρμαγενόν, S writes Αρμαγενόν; Σ, Αρμαγενόν. It follows, therefore, that Σ is to be presumed to have derived its misrendering from S.

III. Forecast fulfilled by S.—Again: in S we have the fulfilment of a memorable critical forecast, suggested more than a century ago to the acute mind of J. D. Michaelis by a singular blunder in Σ. He notes that in it the words ἀετὸς πετομένον ἐν μεσογαρματί (viii. 13) are ludicrously mis-rendered, as ἀετὸς πετομένον ἐν μεσογαρματί ἀετὸς = “an eagle flying in the midst which had a tail of blood” (μεσογαρματί being read and rendered against sense and grammar alike, as μέσον ὄφραν ἀματί); and he points out that in the like passage, xiv. 6, this gross error is corrected. Hence he infers “that there were two or more translations, and that one

* Introd. to N. T., vol. ii., pt. i., ch. vii., s. 10 [Marsh’s Translation].

* Only in part, however; μεσογαρματί being here rendered as if ὄφρας, ἀματί. Where the words again recur, xix. 17, they are rightly rendered.
was interpolated from the other; and, if I am not mistaken, the proper translation of μεσοφάρμα may be referred to the more ancient version, and the false one to that of Philoxenus” [i.e. to Σ, which Michaelis supposed to belong to the Philoxenian version]. Now in S the words are correctly rendered in all three places. Seeing then that the discovery of S proves Michaelis to have been right in divining the existence of an earlier Syriac version of the Apocalypse, free from this blunder, it is presumable that he is likewise right in his judgment that the version which translates the words in question correctly throughout is the earlier version.

IV. Traces of S in the Apparatus attached to Σ.—In the few available Mss. of Σ (but three in all),* the remains appear of an apparatus attached to the text, of asterisks and marginal notes, similar to what is found in many Mss. of the Harkelian. In the Harkelian this is admittedly an integral part of the translator’s work, and includes (inter alia) references made by him to the readings of the version on which his was based. If, therefore, it can be shown that some of the marks or notes in the Mss. of Σ refer to the text of S, it follows as a probable inference that S was the basis of Σ. Now we find (a) in the Leyden Mss. (Ξι) some forty asterisks; (b) some Harkelian-like marginal notes in the Dublin Mss. (Ξδ), and one in the Nitrian (Ξα).* These asterisks and notes are, in each Ms., by the same hand as its text. Of the asterisks, as being most important in view of their known Hexaplar use, I treat first.®

a. In much the greater part of the places where the asterisk occurs in Ξι, it can be understood as referring to something inserted in, or omitted from, the text of Σ as compared with that of S. In one or two of these places it cannot be accounted for by comparison with any other known textual authority. One such place is viii. 9, where S and Σ render without Greek authority as if πάντων (S, ἑαυτοῦ; Σ, ἑαυτοῦ) stood before κτισμάτων, an asterisk being set in Σ before the inserted word. Of this no explanation is to be found, except that the translator of Σ, finding in S this

* See Part II, p. 36, for these Mss. There is also in the Bodleian an incorrect copy of part of Σ (Thurston, 13, fo. 78). Part of its text is embodied in the Commentary of Barašib (on Apocalypse, followed by the Harkelian Acts and Epistles) in the Brit. Mus. Mss., Rich. 7185; for which see Hermathena, vol. vii, pp. 409, 410; vol. viii, pp. 145, 146, and Plate.

® The Florentine Mss. (Ξγ), which is missing, is known to have been marked with asterisks. One instance (iv. 2) is recorded by Adler, N. T. Versiones Syr., p. 78; but I do not make use of it in this argument, for the reason stated above, p. xxxv, note.
insertion, adopted it (with a slight change) and marked it as such with *. Thus again, xix. 16, an asterisk stands before ἁ (καὶ ἔπι), for which no reason can be imagined except that it points to the small but highly significant variation of S (and S alone) in omitting ἁ (καὶ), so as materially to change the description contained in this passage, as noted above (p. lxxvii). Since then in these two cases the asterisk can only refer to S, it becomes highly probable that it refers likewise to S in many of the other places in which some slight and obscure Greek authority may be found for the variant noted by it—as for example, v. 5, where for the ἄνοιξεν [or ὅ ἄνοιξεν] of the Greek copies, S, with one ms. (13) only, reads ἄνοιξε (ὡς ἄνοιξε), as does also Σ, but with the pronoun ἀν (ὡς ἀνέρ) prefixed and marked *. It seems likely that the translator of Σ retained the ὡς from S, inserted the pronoun to make the meaning clear, and noted by the * the deviation from the Greek. We conclude, therefore, that the asterisks, which in two cases certainly, and very probably in many more, refer to the S-text, prove the version to which they pertain to be posterior to S.

b. None of the side-notes in Σd (which are but five or six in all, and occur within the first nine chapters) is available for our present inquiry. They throw light on it only in so far as they help to show that probably Σ was originally equipped with a full Harkleian apparatus. But the one note on the margin of Σn is quite to the purpose. It stands over against i. 10, and consists of the letters ᾿Σ Σ (i.e. Σ Σ), which is the rendering in S of τῆς κυριακής, as if τῆς μᾶς σαββατάν, a gloss recorded from no other authority.

V. Like traces in Barsalibi's Commentary on Σ.—Further evidence, tending to show that many more such notes relating to S were formerly to be found attached to Σ, is yielded by the (unedited) Commentary of Barsalibi (see p. lxxiii, note *) on the Apocalypse, which he cites according to Σ. Following it he writes σοληνοι for κρύσταλλος (iv. 6), σολήν for φάλας (v. 8), σωλήν [σωλήν] for χαλκῆδων (xxi. 19), and ἀσημένιος [ασημένιος] (xxi. 20). But he explains the first by σολήν, the second by σωλήν, the third by σωλήν, and the last by ἀσημένιος, —in each case by the rendering of S. Now of these three,

* The obelus † would more properly be used here than the *; but the two signs appear to have been confused, and used indiscriminately by scribes in noting variations of text.
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the second (at least) is a rare word, and (what is specially notable as evidence) the first is a mistranslation, unlikely to have been happened on by two translators independently. Again, though (as above noted) he writes 'Απολλών, as Σ, in the transliterated form Αλας (ix. 11), he gives as one interpretation of it, ἐκζ ("Looser," "Releaser"), which is the rendering of S (after the reading Ἀπολλών). These instances go so far to prove that Barsalibi had some knowledge of S; but their infrequency looks as if he knew it but partially and indirectly, and suggests the probability that his copy of Σ may have been furnished with a series of marginalia which survive in these glosses of his, and in the single gloss attached to Σ n.

VI. Conflations in Σ embodying Renderings of S.—Then, further, in view of these facts, all tending to prove that Σ was originally furnished by its author with marginal variants and other signs indicating its relation to a prior version, which presumably was S, it becomes highly probable that certain examples of conflation exhibited by Σ, in which one member of the conflate reading agrees with the reading of S, are due to the transference of such marginalia into the text, and thus serve to reinforce the evidence showing the dependence of Σ on S. It is true that, on the other side (as shown above, p. lxxviii), S also has its conflate readings, of which two or three may possibly be due to interpolation from Σ. But in case of S there is no ground for surmising that it was issued by its author (as Σ apparently was) with the appendages of side-notes and asterisks of the Harklean fashion; and (as we have seen) every one of the S-conflations may have been (as some of them certainly were) in the underlying Greek; or (if belonging to the Syriac text) may have been introduced by the translator from some source other than Σ, or from Σ by a subsequent transcriber.

Three or four such examples of conflations in Σ, due presumably to the influence of S, may be pointed out.

Διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου ἦσαν (iv. 11). S (see p. xxxiv) misrenders this, ἔσθησέ τινα τὸν θελήματος . . . . S (which nowhere falls into this mistranslation of διὰ) has here ἔσθησε: καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου ήσαν; of which sentence the first member has no authority except the mis-rendering of S, out of which it has no doubt been formed.
INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.

'Ina σκοτισθῇ το τρίτον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ φάνη (viii. 12). Σ renders ἦνειν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς ημέρας; where the ἡμέρα makes the passage unintelligible as well as ungrammatical. But ἡμέρα has its proper place in Σ, which follows a variant καὶ ἐσκοτισθήσαν . . . . . . . οὖν ἔφασε,—in which it is to be noted that καὶ ἐσκοτισθήσαν is a reading peculiar to S, supported only in part by a very few authorities which read καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη. The above Σ-rendering is that of Σ I n, where ἡμέρα appears as a crude interpolation; but Σ d p attempt to shape the sentence into sense and grammar by reading ὥστε ἦνειν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας. Here we detect the actual process of conflation, carried out by the omission of a final ο and the insertion of the prefix η; and we can hardly avoid the conclusion that its first stage was a marginal ἡμέρα (= καὶ ἐσκοτίσθησαν), as alternative for ἡμέρα (= ἦν σκοτισθῇ), inserted by the translator to signify that he found the former in Σ, but substituted the latter in his text on the authority of his Greek exemplar. (See note on Greek text in loc. for ἐσκοτίσθη).

Καὶ τὸ ὄμοιον τῶν ἁρκίδων ὄμων [-a, or ou] ἵππους (ix. 7). Here S renders ἦν ἡμέρα τῆς ἡμέρας . . . ἡμέρας (= καὶ τὸ ὄμοιον . . . ὄμων ὄς ὄμοιον). Thus Σ (adopting the reading ὄμων) renders the adjective twice over,—first (more suo) by ἀρχ. then by καὶ ἀρχ. ἄρχ., which is the rendering of ὄμοιος characteristic of S (see p. xxiv). Here again we detect conflation in Σ, and trace it to S, whence it may easily have been derived by a process like that which Σ betrays in viii. 12.

For ἀρῆλθον (xii. 4) Σ gives ἀρῆλθον (rather = παρῆλθον). S, treating the verb as first person singular, gives ἀρῆλθον. In Σ d we find a conflate reading ἀρῆλθον [sic], of which the former word indicates that a former copy of Σ bore on its margin the reading of S.

Thus the asterisks of Σ l, the side-note extant in Σ n, and the side-notes which probably are represented by the glosses of Barsalibi, and in the above-cited conflate readings of Σ,—all presumably due to the author of Σ,—alike evince his knowledge of S.

VII. Renderings borrowed from S, and imperfectly assimilated, by Σ.—

Finally, to complete the evidence for the priority of S, I have to point out that, in some places, the dependence of Σ on it is betrayed by the inadvertence of the translator in so imperfectly assimilating what he has retained of S, as to leave traces of its origin. Thus—
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In rendering ὃς ὁ ἡλιος φαίνει ἐν τῷ δυνάμει αἵτω (i. 16), S has for φαίνει, the feminine ἡλιαῖος, thus treating ἡλιος (= ἡλιος), which is of common gender, as feminine; and (consistently) for αἵτω, the feminine ἀλη. Σ likewise has the feminine verb; but the following pronoun appears as ἀλη (masculine) in all the copies. Elsewhere in both versions, ἡλιος is masculine. Apparently the author of Σ has altered the pronoun into the more usual masculine, but overlooked the verb.

For εἰ τῆς ἀρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης (iii. 10), S has τῇ τῶν πειρασμοῦ τοῦ μελλοντος,—omitting τῆς ἀρας and changing the participle from feminine to masculine, so as to agree with πειρασμοῦ (the former noun being feminine and the latter masculine in Syriac, as in Greek)—a reading unattested otherwise, but consistent and intelligible. Σ, after the Greek, replaces τῆς ἀρας (ἡλιαῖος), but leaves the participle in the masculine, thus representing a reading εἰ τῆς ἀρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ τοῦ μελλοντος,—also unattested otherwise. The probability is, that this arose from an oversight on the part of the author of Σ, who, when he corrected the S-text by inserting τῇ τῶν before ἡλιαῖος, forgot to conform the gender of τῇ to that of ἡλιαῖος.

For κραιτανά τῶν τέσσαρας ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἦν μὴ πτερ ἀνέμος (vii. 1), Σ writes ἤνωτη ἀνέμος ἀνέμος ἀνέμος ἀνέμος. Now that ἤνωτη (= ἀνέμος), though usually feminine, should thus be masculine at the end of this sentence, as it is also in S, is not without precedent: but that it should be, as here, feminine in the first part and masculine in the second, is so strange as to lead us to ask how it is to be explained. The explanation is found when we turn to S, in which, instead of ἤνωτη ἀνέμος we find ἤνωτη ἀνέμος, a form of expression which leaves the gender indeterminate, so that the following ἤνωτη ἀνέμος involves no incompatibility. Apparently, the author of Σ replaced the ἤνωτη ἀνέμος (properly τῆς τετράδα τῶν ἀνέμων) of S by the more literal ἤνωτη ἀνέμος (feminine), but neglected to change the gender of the following masculine verb ἀνέμος.

Σ renders ἦν ἡ μῆ τῆς δύνασα ἁγοράσει ἢ πωλήσει (xiii. 17), by ἦν ἡ μῆ τῆς δύνασα ἁγοράσει ἢ πωλήσει, without the usual and (almost) indispensable prefix τῶν before ἀνέμος. This is at once accounted for by comparison with S, which writes ἀνέμος ἀνέμος after an

unattested reading ἰνα μὴ τις ἄγοράς ἦ πωλήσαι (verbs in optative, without δῶνησαι). The author of Σ inserts ἐκάθα, after his Greek; but omits to supply the οῖ to connect its dependent verbs.

In xviii. 4, ἰνα μὴ συγκομώσητε . . . . καὶ ἰνα μὴ λάβητε, both versions (as noted above, p. xxxvi), vary the rendering of the recurring ἰνα μὴ (ἐκάθα . . . ἐκάθα). In S, there is a valid reason for this: καὶ is omitted (against all other authorities) from before the second ἰνα, so as to make the second clause subordinate to, instead of co-ordinate with, the first. In Σ, the copulative conjunction is restored; and yet the varied rendering of the second ἰνα μὴ, which has significance only in the absence of that conjunction, is retained,—and retained contrary to the uniformity which is with Σ the normal practice.

Thus, in our comparative survey of S and Σ, considered simply as versions representing substantially the same original,—we are led, (1) by the analogy of the relation borne by the "Pococke" to the Harkelean version of the Four Epistles, and (2) by the tendency of Σ to betray its dependence on S, by occasional lapses from its own artificial, exact, and rigid manner into the variations, the idioms, the errors, and (in general) the peculiarities, of S—to conclude that S is the prior version, and Σ a revision of it.

VIII. Textual Affinities of each Version.—When we revert to our comparative study of the Greek texts underlying each version, we find no lack of independent evidence to confirm this conclusion. For—

It has been shown (pp. lxxiii, sqq.) that, comparing the texts of the two versions, S proves to tend, in general, more decidedly than Σ does, to the more archaic type of text,—to that which I have called the "normal uncial" type (of ΡΑΚΠ), as opposed to the type represented by Q and the bulk of the cursive. And this archaic character of S appears farther, in a special way, in the fact that its special affinities are (pp. lxix, lxii; pp. lxv, lxvi),—(1) among the uncials, with Ρ the oldest Greek MS.; and (2) among the Latin versions, with the Primasian, the earliest known form of the old Latin,—probably the oldest version extant of the Apocalypse.

It has been shown, farther (pp. lxv, lxvi, notes), that Σ is to a great extent free from such singular and subsingular readings as are largely present in S—(of three main classes, (1) 72 readings attested by Ρ alone of MSS.; (2) 36 readings attested by pr alone of Latin texts; (3) nearly
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150 readings which have neither Greek nor Latin attestation,—yet that it shares to a limited but appreciable extent in the aberrancies of S. It concurs in 21 out of the 72 Ν-readings, in 6 out of the 36 pr-readings, and in 27 of the readings in which S is unsupported by Greek or Latin. Thus it appears that three distinct elements, characteristic of S, occur likewise, in a less degree but in a form identical so far as they occur, in Σ.

These elements then—the readings of these three aberrant types in which Σ concurs with S,—are in S normal and characteristic, in Σ exceptional.

Hence the inference is (as before, pp. lxxxi, lxxxii, in the matter of peculiarities of diction), that the version in which such readings exceptionally occur, has borrowed or retained them from the version in which they are habitually present:—in other words, that the text of Σ, as well as its diction, shows signs of dependence on that of S.
CHAPTER VI.

DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF $S$.

I now enter on the questions of the probable date, and authorship, of the version $S$.

I.—Its Date.


As to its date, we have one certain fact to limit our inquiry: it is earlier than the year 874 A.D. For though the Crawford Ms., whence I derive the text I now publish, was probably (see below, pp. cxiii, sqq.) written late in the twelfth century, a considerable extract from the Apocalypse (vii. 1–8), which when examined proves to belong to $S$, is included in a volume of Miscellanies (Brit. Mus., Add. 17193, fo. 146), bearing date A. Gr. 1185 (= A.D. 874).* So far, but no farther, the external and direct evidence carries us.

2. Indirect Evidence of Crawford Ms., Syr. 2.

But the Crawford Ms., when we turn back to it, will be found to contain internal and indirect, but cogent, evidence of the antiquity of the text of the Apocalypse exhibited in it. The very blunders which disfigure the text (see p. lxxix), serious as they are and far from infrequent, cannot be reasonably set down to carelessness or stupidity on the part of the scribe, who seems to have done his work accurately and with intelligence, as is shown by its comparative freedom from such blunders in the rest of

* For this extract see Appendix to Part II, p. 35, where it is printed in full as it stands in Add. 17193. This Ms. is fully described by Wright, Catal., pp. 989, sqq.; who notes that the extract is "not according to the ordinary version" (i.e. $S$).
the New Testament. They are probably to be accounted for by supposing either that the text had passed through many stages of transcription before it reached him, or that the exemplar whence it was derived by him, was one much damaged by time or mischance. The latter supposition agrees well with the fact, elsewhere pointed out, that it appears to have lost its first leaf, so that he has been obliged to supply the first eight verses of chapter i. from a copy of Σ. In farther confirmation of this explanation it is to be noted that these blemishes in the text do not appear with any uniformity of distribution, nor yet are they scattered at random: they tend to occur in groups,—three or four in a page, preceded and followed by many pages free from flaw, in such wise as to suggest that the archetype had suffered from injury or decay in places corresponding to these groups. The other supposition,—of repeated transcription, is also confirmed by the state of the text of our Ms. in the passages where the blunders occur; for in some of them (see, e.g., notes on the Syriac text, ii. 17, xii. 7), particles or points have been inserted with the effect of forcing some meaning on the misreadings, so as to betray the care of a scribe not content to copy merely, but bent on editing his text into intelligibility. It is clear that the text, needing to be so edited, cannot have been recent when it came into his hands. Either supposition, if admitted, would go far to account for the state of our text; and either of them implies the lapse of generations, perhaps centuries, between the translator and the twelfth-century scribe. Neither of them excludes the other, and it may well be that both are true. On the whole it seems probable that two or three (if not more) transcripts stand between our Ms. and the original; and that some one of them was separated from its successor by a long interval.

3. *Inference from Comparison of Texts of vii. 1–8, given in above Mss.*

A comparison of vii. 1–8 in our Ms. with the Nitrian copy of the same, enables us to carry the matter farther back. The two texts vary slightly *inter se.* One point of difference is, that, while our Ms. misplaces the "sealing" of Levi in verse 7, postponing it to that of Issachar, the other Ms. omits it from the text but has it on the margin, supplied in a different

---

* Frequent use cannot be supposed as a probable cause of the damage, for the Apocalypse was not included in any Syriac Lectionary system.

* See the notes on Syr. text, i. 1–8; also Transactions, R.I.A., vol. xxx, p. 414.
script, and apparently by a second hand. The inevitable inference is, that both represent an older copy which passed it over altogether. Of the other differences, some are in matters of grammatical form, as follows. For ḫeṭs (verse 1), ḫoṣ ḫaṭṣ (ib.), ḫaṭ ḫaṭ (ib.), ḫaṭ ḫaṭ (verse 4); of the Crawford text, the Nitrian has—ḫeṭṣ, ḫoṣ ḫaṭṣ, ḫaṭ ḫaṭ, ḫaṭ ḫaṭ;—so that in each case it substitutes a less archaic form for a more archaic. So too, as to orthography, it writes (verses 2, 3) ḫoṣ, ḫoṣ ḫaṭṣ, for ḫaṭṣ, ḫaṭṣ, of our Ms. We are thus led to the important conclusion, that our Ms., though probably three centuries later in date than the Nitrian book of Extracts, represents an earlier form of the text;—in other words, is derived, immediately or mediatelv (and if mediatelv, then through a line of accurate transmission), from an ultimate exemplar older than the Nitrian,—so much older as to belong to an earlier stage of the language than that which prevailed in the age to which the Nitrian Ms. belongs,—the latter half (namely) of the ninth century.


We should, therefore, be obliged to ascribe a considerable antiquity to this version, even if we had no grounds to rely on save those that are yielded by the Crawford Ms. whence we derive it, and by the older Nitrian Ms. which preserves a fragment of it. And in this ascription we are confirmed by the internal evidence of the version itself. For, as has been shown in detail in Chapters II and III, on the one hand its diction is that of the earlier stage of Syriac literary use in translations from the Greek, before the Syriac language had been debased by the alloy of græcism; and, on the other hand, its text appears to have had as its propellant element a Greek basis conformed in the main to the earlier type represented by the agreement of the ancient uncial s A C, with P following—which type is known to have passed more and more out of currency among Biblical students as generation followed generation. In the eighth century, or even in the seventh, a text of such type would be unlikely to be adopted by a translator; and a translator of that age would hardly rival, in his language and style, the purity and ease of the Peshitto. Thus we have here two lines of argument, each confirming the other, both tending alike to the common conclusion that, for a version of such quality, based on a text of such character, an earlier date must be assumed than the eighth or seventh century.
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5. Inference from probable Date of Σ.

A more definite approach to its date may be made by means of its relation to the other version (Σ), of which, as has been shown, it must be regarded as the predecessor. The date and authorship of Σ, indeed, are not known with certainty. But we are assured that the missing Florence Ms. (Σf, stated to be written by one Jacob of Hesron, A.D. 1582) had a colophon describing Σ as the work of Thomas of Harkel.* This description is confirmed by the fact that while Barsalibi, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, Acts, and Epistles, makes Σ his basis (see pp. lxxxiii, note *, lxxxiv) in the Apocalypse, which he places first, he comments on the following Books in the Harkelian; thus as it seems treating Σ as part of that version. And the internal evidence amply bears out what these authorities thus affirm or imply. Apart from all external testimony, we find the method and diction of Σ to be beyond dispute Harkelian; so that it may without impropriety be designated the Harkelian Apocalypse, in this sense that, whoever be the translator, the translation is Harkelian in its manner and language—the production, if not of Thomas himself, then of a disciple and continuator, belonging to his age, trained in his school, a rigorous adherent of his system. Now the date of Thomas is accurately recorded; he did his work A.D. 616. If then we may assume that the Σ-version of the Apocalypse was part of the Syriac New Testament as revised by him, or at least a supplement appended to it not long after his time, it follows that the S-version, being prior to it, cannot be reasonably assigned to a period later than the sixth century.

No later period, as has been shown above, would suit the facts of the character of the version, whether viewed on the Syriac side, in its grammatical and literary aspect,—or on the Greek side, as a witness to the text of its original. And this concurrence of evidence, internal with external, textual with linguistic, seems sufficient to warrant us in accepting the conclusion to which we are led by the facts and inferences above stated.

* Those statements as to the Florence Ms. are made by Lelong (Bibloth. Sacra, tom. i, p. 191 [Boerner's edition, 1709]), on the authority of a Catalogue communicated by Montfaucon. It is to be hoped that this Ms. may be recovered and the above account verified. It was missing when Bernstein sought for it at Florence in or before 1854 (Bernstein, De Harkl. Transl., p. 8).
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II.—Its Author.

It remains to examine whether we can with any probability trace its origin and conjecture its author.

1. *Not Jacob of Edessa.*

One negative conclusion we may, in the first instance, lay down with confidence, and thus narrow the field of inquiry. Putting aside for the moment the reasons above given for assigning it to a date earlier than the seventh century, we may unhesitatingly affirm that neither our version nor the rival one can be the work of Jacob of Edessa, whom, as a Biblical scholar and translator, high in repute in the Jacobite Church, one might naturally suggest as the probable author of one or other. His manner is known to us, from his version of the Septuagintal *Esaías*, extant in a Nitrian Ms. (Add. 14441) in the British Museum; and it is unmistakably distinct alike from the manner of S and from that of Σ. His date, moreover (seeing that his activity covered the second half of the seventh century and passed into the eighth, ending in his death, A.D. 708), would oblige us to assign Σ to a period so improbably late as the eighth century, if we supposed him, in the latter years of the seventh to have produced S. But we have, farther, direct evidence to the same effect in a Syriac rendering of Apoc. xvii. 3–6 (contained in a Syriac *Catena* on Genesis, compiled by the monk Severus, appended to the Commentary of Ephraim on that Book), ascribed (apparently with good reason) by the editor of the Roman edition of Ephraim, to Jacob of Edessa,—as follows:

Here, after making all allowance for looseness of citation (such as is shown in the transference of *Esaías* from verse 4 to verse 3),

* Printed by Ceriani, in *Monumenta S. et P.*, tom. v, fasc. i, pp. 7 et seq.
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we find on comparison with the corresponding passage in S and Σ, that we have a version materially different from both, alike in diction and in text.*

2. Presumably identical with Translator of "Pococke" Epistles.

But in endeavouring to reach a positive conclusion which may be accepted as at least provisional, it is necessary to proceed gradually. As a first step in our inquiry, it is to be observed that the combination in which S comes before us, and its accompaniments, are at least suggestive of its probable authorship. It has reached us as an integral part of a New Testament in Syriac,—Peshitto, supplemented by the addition of the Books which lie outside of the Peshitto Canon. It may fairly be presumed that when the scribe and his fellow-workers or directors arranged the contents of the volume, the supplementary matter which they incorporated in it with the Peshitto, was borrowed by them all of it from one and the same source: that is, that this version of the Apocalypse comes from the same hand as the version of the Four Minor Epistles.

3. This Presumption confirmed by Internal Evidence.

For so far, this is a mere presumption, arising out of the external fact that the S-version of the Apocalypse and the Pococke version of the Four Epistles are associated in the same Ms., in the same supplementary relation to the Peshitto New Testament. But when we follow up the clue thus put in to our hands, and examine the two versions side by side, the presumption be comes materially strengthened. I have already noticed (pp. xvii, xviii) the internal resemblance that subsists between them. In method and in diction alike, they are similar works: they belong to the same stage of the language, they occupy the same midway position as regards their literary character—more exact in rendering than the Peshitto, more free than the Harkleian. They are, to all appearance, products not only of the same age, but of the same school,—it may well be, of the same hand. This general similarity, moreover, between the two versions, includes (as pointed out above, pp. xxxvii, xxxviii) some special points of coincidence in diction, which raise to a high degree the probability of their common authorship.

* Thus, e.g., S and Σ read τοπρέπον in verse 5, with all Greek authorities; whereas in Jacob's rendering, as in the Latin, a reading τοπρεπέω is followed.
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If then we assume on these grounds that this version of the Apocalypse is by the same hand as the version of the Four Epistles with which it is associated in the Crawford Ms., and to which it bears a close affinity alike in general character and in particular details, we arrive at a determined date, and a known name. For it is certain, as I have shown, that these Epistles are part of the version made A.D. 508, by Polycarpus, "the Chorepiscopus," under the direction of the famous Philoxenus of Mabug, after whose name it is styled the "Philoxenian" version,—to be distinguished as the "Philoxenian proper" or "unrevised Philoxenian" from the Harkleian, which (though too commonly confounded with it) was really the result of a revision of it in which its text and its diction were largely modified, more than a century later, by Thomas of Harkel. That Polycarpus included the Apocalypse in his work, may be assumed in the absence of evidence to the contrary. We are told by Moses of Aghel, that he translated "the New Testament" (no Book or Books being excepted); and inasmuch as his translation of the Four Epistles proves that "the New Testament" is not to be here taken as limited to the Books of the Peshitto Canon, there is no reason to suppose that he did not—but every probability that he did—translate the Apocalypse likewise.

4. Also by analogous Case of Σ and Harkleian.

A second, and quite independent, line of probable inference leads to the same result. The version Σ, as we have seen, is either a part of the Harkleian New Testament (which, for the like reason as has been above assigned in the case of the Philoxenian, may be presumed to have included the Apocalypse), or a supplement to it, wrought in sedulous imitation of its method. It is probable therefore that, like the rest of the Harkleian, Σ was constructed on the basis of a prior version forming part of the New Testament as translated by Polycarpus. It is therefore also probable, and in the same degree, that S, which is unmistakably the basis of Σ, is to be identified as the Apocalypse of which Polycarpus was the translator.

It is to be observed, that each of these chains of probability holds good apart from the other. The former depends on the affinity between S and the "Pococks" Epistles; the latter on the relation of S, as basis-version,

---

* See ref. note ; p. lxxxi.
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to Σ. If either of our two distinct lines of argument be accepted as valid—if we admit it as probable, either that the S-Apocalypse is from the same hand as the Pococke Four Epistles,—or that the Σ-Apocalypse is a part (supplemental at least if not integral) of the Harkleian New Testament,—on either assumption (and the probability of each rests on a sufficient basis of its own), it follows as an almost inevitable inference, that our Apocalypse is the work of Polycarpus, and belongs to his version of the whole New Testament into Syriac, the Philoxenian proper of A.D. 508.

5. Also by Affinity between S and Philoxenian Esaiahs.

Of this inference, confirmation is forthcoming from yet another quarter. Moses of Aghel (ut supr.) states that "David" was translated for Philoxenus from the Greek by Polycarpus, along with the New Testament; and a note appended to the great Ambrosian Ms. of the Syro-Hexaplar version (Esaï. ix. 6), informs us that the Philoxenian version extended to Esaïas also. This version of the Psalms is not recorded as extant, but that of Esaïas (after the LXX) survives in some large fragments, identifiable as Philoxenian beyond all reasonable doubt, preserved in the Ms., Add. 17106 of the Nitrian Collection in the British Museum, which has been printed by Dr. Ceriani in his Monumenta Sacra et Profana* (cited by me as "Phx.," see Pt. II, p. 36). The internal evidence of these fragments shows that the version to which they belong was in style and language closely akin to S; and also that, though based on the LXX, it bespeaks an author to whom the Peshitto Isaiah was familiar,—a note of identity with the author of S, of whom, as we have seen, familiarity with the Peshitto diction, especially that of the Old Testament, is a marked characteristic, preparing us to find in him an Old Testament translator. It is a noteworthy fact, moreover, and one that serves to reinforce the preceding arguments, that this Philoxenian Esaïas bears to the Syro-Hexaplar Esaïas of Paul of Tella a relation closely parallel with the relation borne by the Pococke version to the Harkleian of the Four Epistles, or by S to Σ.

---

* Tom. v, fasc. i, pp. 9, sqq.—On the authorship of these fragments, see Ceriani, p. 5; and Dict. of Christian Biogr., vol. iv, s.v. POLYCARPUS (5), pp. 430–433. See also Wright, Catal., p. 28, for his account of the Ms., which he assigns to the seventh century.

b See the points of affinity between S and Phx., recorded passim in my Notes to Part II.
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On all those grounds we are, I venture to think, entitled to claim this Polycarpus as the author of the version of the Apocalypse herewith printed,—at least until some more probable theory shall have been advanced.

6. Objections answered.

(1.) To authorship suggested for S:

Against this theory of the authorship, one argument (and I know of no other) may be urged. Barsalibi, the great teacher of the Monophysite Church of the twelfth century, in commenting on the Apocalypse, follows (as we have seen, pp. lxxxiii, note*, lxxxiv) the version Σ; and though a few tokens appear of his knowledge of S, they are doubtful, and, even if certain, could be accounted for by the very probable supposition that he derived them from marginal notes attached to his copy of Σ. Is it likely (it may be asked) that so learned a scholar as Barsalibi should be ignorant or negligent of a version of this Book bearing a name so great and so revered in his Church as that of Philoxenus? This objection (it is to be observed) is raised—not with regard to the existence of S in the time of Barsalibi (for of that we have found Ms. evidence dating three centuries before him,—see p. xc), but with regard to the view that it belongs to the Philoxenian New Testament. And as so raised, it admits of a complete answer. Barsalibi, in the same work in which he comments on the Apocalypse according to the Σ-text, not only comments on the Four Epistles according to the Harkleian text, but states* expressly that he knows of no other. If, then, we are to conclude that S cannot be Philoxenian because Barsalibi ignores it, we must extend the same conclusion to the Pococke text of the Four Epistles, which he likewise ignores. But that text is demonstrably Philoxenian, notwithstanding Barsalibi’s negative witness to the contrary. His negative witness, therefore, against the claim advanced for S, that it too is Philoxenian, may be safely set aside.

(2.) To authorship suggested for Σ:

So again, the theory which makes the Σ-Apocalypse part of the Harkleian New Testament is open to an objection,—a serious one, though

---

* Ap. Pococke, Pref. ad Lectorem, prefixed to his edition (1630) of these Epistles.
of negative character. This Book is absent not merely from the New College Ms. (No. 333) of the Harklean (which supplied the text of White’s edition, but is defective at the end, and therefore inconclusive as a witness), but from the Cambridge Ms. (Add. 1700), the only known unmutilated copy professing to be complete.\(^a\) In this matter, Barsalibi is a witness on our side; for (as noted above, pp. lxxxiii, note \(^b\), xciii) he seems, in the Commentary above referred to, to have known it as associated with the Harklean version of the Four Epistles,—probably deriving it from a Ms. of the Harklean, in which the Apocalypse stood, as in \(S\), before the Acts, the Epistles following after.\(^b\) That the Apocalypse is wanting from the Cambridge Ms. may be a fact of no farther significance than is its absence from many Greek cursives;—to be accounted for simply by the prevalent custom of most Churches of excluding the Apocalypse from their lectionary systems.\(^c\)

In estimating the weight of the above considerations, it is to be borne in mind that the argument for accepting \(S\) as Philoxenian, and the argument for accepting \(\Sigma\) as Harklean, are in the main independent each of the other, each resting on sufficient grounds of its own. They may therefore be regarded as mutually confirmatory; and to argue that if \(\Sigma\) be the work of Thomas, \(S\) is probably the work of Polycarpus, or vice versa, is valid reasoning, and not a vicious circle.

\(^a\) Except these two, no known Harklean Ms. exhibits the Acts and Epistles.

\(^b\) Thus the copy used by Barsalibi would be similar in arrangement to the Crawford Ms., only with the supplementary Books derived not from the Philoxenian proper but from the Harklean.

\(^c\) For the adverse opinion of Adler, who denied (\textit{Versiones Syr.}, p. 78) that \(\Sigma\) could be Harklean, and for the grounds on which that opinion is to be rejected, see \textit{Transactions, R.I.A.}, vol. xxvii, p. 304.
CHAPTER VII.

THE APOCALYPSE IN THE SYRIAN CHURCHES.

In the course of the preceding inquiry, it has distinctly appeared that the Apocalypse was not only unread in public, but had no great currency even among students of Scripture, within the Jacobite communion,—the body which, though lying under the reproach of heresy, unquestionably represents the national Syrian Church, and is honourably distinguished by its zeal for Biblical literature. To the divines of the rival Nestorian Church, and to its Biblical scribes, the Apocalypse, and with it the Four Epistles, appear to have been absolutely unknown.

It seems worth while to put together the facts, so far as I have been able to ascertain them, which indicate the extent of knowledge of this Book, existing among Christians who studied the Scriptures in Syriac, traceable back from the latest point at which that knowledge may reasonably be presumed to have been acquired in or from the East, and independently of printed editions of the Syriac New Testament.

I.—The Apocalypse known to certain Members of Syrian Churches.

1. Of the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries.—In the seventeenth century the Apocalypse, in the version Σ, is known to have been in the hands of three persons belonging to Syrian Churches;—of a priest of Amid (Diarbekr) 'Abdul Aḥad, who transcribed it with the rest of the Scriptures in Paris, A.D. 1695;* of Gabriel Sionita, who edited it from a Ms. or Mss., no longer forthcoming, for the Paris Polyglot, 1633; and of Joseph, a monk of Kenobin, in the Lebanon, who transcribed it for Archbishop Ussher, in 1625b—the two last-named being Maronites, the first no doubt a Jacobite.

---

* This copy is numbered 1 to 5 in Zotenberg's Catalogue, q. v.
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To these, the sixteenth century adds two more—Jacob of Ḥesron (in the Lebanon country), who wrote the Florence copy in 1582, and (as it seems) Caspar, whose name appears in the colophon of the Leyden copy, described as "from the land of the Hindus" (ἡ παραγωγή, not ἡ Παραγωγή, as printed by De Dieu). Thus, of these five, the last was apparently of the Syro-Indian Church of Malabar; three were Maronites; and one only was of the Jacobite Church of Mesopotamia—the other four belonging to communities subject to the See of Rome. All five, however, worked merely as transcribers,—in Europe, or for European scholars; and it was, no doubt, under European influences that their transcripts were made: but the fact that they had, or had access to, Mss. whence they transcribed the text, proves that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, copies of the Book in this version were still preserved among Syrian Christians in three regions so remote one from another as Mesopotamia, the Lebanon, and Malabar,—not only in the Jacobite Church whence it sprang, but in two other Churches ecclesiastically and doctrinally distinct from it. As regards the Apocalypse, therefore, Widmanstad was no doubt correctly informed by Moses of Marde, in 1554–5, that the non-Peshitto Books in Syriac were then extant in Mesopotamia.

For so far, the evidence points to Σ as the form in which the Apocalypse was known in the places named; but the version S, too, is proved, by a note entered in the Crawford Ms. (see pp. cx, cxi, infr.), to have been in the hands of two successive owners in the same Mesopotamian region, in 1534,—of one Ṣaliba, and of a Patriarch (probably Jacobite but possibly Nestorian) Simeon of Hatacha, to whom he sold the Ms.

2. Of the twelfth, eleventh, and ninth centuries.—For three centuries before that date I am unable to adduce any evidence of knowledge of either version; but when we go back to the twelfth century, both come again into view. Shortly before the year 1200, as I hope to show in the following Chapter, the Crawford Ms., in which the Apocalypse in the version S is, as we have seen, ranked high among the New Testament Books, and ascribed to the Fourth Evangelist, was written in the very heart of the Jacobite Church, in a convent of Ṣalach, in Tur'ābdin. Not many years earlier is to be placed the composition of the Commentary of

---

* See De Dieu's Apocalypse, p. 164.
  
* See ref. in note a, p. xvii, to Widmanstad's Epistle to Gingen.
  
* See below, pp. cx, cxi.
  
* See above, p. lxxxiii, note 4.
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Barsalibi (the leading divine of the Jacobite Church of this century), who died Bishop of Mabug, A.D. 1171,—in which the Apocalypse is ascribed to St. John and expounded after the Σ-version. An earlier Commentary (of unknown authorship and date), contained in the Ms. Add. 17127 (Brit. Mus.), embodying the text I have designated as Ση, written A.D. 1088 in a convent near Alexandria, proves that Syrian monks of the eleventh century, settled among their Monophysite brethren in Egypt,*—the country in which the Harkleian New Testament was produced, A.D. 616, by a Syrian Bishop,—knew the Apocalypse in the Harkleian or Harkleianized Σ-version. This is at once the earliest Syriac Commentary on the Book,⁵ and the earliest evidence of the existence of Σ. For S, we are enabled to bring proof two centuries earlier, in the shape of the fragment of it (Rev. vii. 1–8), included in the collection of extracts, Ms. Add. 17193 (Brit. Mus.), written A.D. 874. This Ms. is no doubt Jacobite, and was in Tur'abdine hands A.D. 1493, but its place of origin is uncertain (the second part of its name, which began with ὶδα, being illegible*).

3. Of the seventh and sixth centuries.—About 200 years before the date of this Ms., Jacob of Edessa, as we have seen, knew and cited the Apocalypse, but in a rendering of his own. It is uncertain, however, whether he translated the whole Book, or merely the passage from Rev. xvii. (see above, p. xciv); and we can only infer from it that he did not know, or did not care to quote, S or Σ. The latter, as I have endeavoured to prove, is to be regarded as a work of Thomas of Harkel or a continuator in the earlier part of his century, the seventh; and the former is to be placed still earlier, as part of the Philoxenian New Testament, in the sixth. I am unable, however, to point to any evidence in the writings of Philoxenus to show that he knew the Apocalypse in any form.⁶

4. Of the fourth century.—In the fourth century, however, we find it distinctly cited, and ascribed to St. John, by the greatest of Syriac divines, Ephraim, in one of his Sermones Exegetici, as follows:—

---

* The Coptic Church was in close communion with the Syrian Jacobite Church, both being Monophysite.

⁵ The Commentary may be considerably earlier than the date of this Ms.; but that it is of Syriac origin, and not a translation from the Greek, is proved by the fact that the author cites, and explains, the verse viii. 13 as mistranslated in Σ, attributing a "tail of blood" to the eagle.

⁶ Wright's Catalogue, pp. 989, 992. See also p. xc, supr.; and p. 35, Pt. II, infr.

⁷ No citation of it is recorded in Dr. Budge's edition (1894) of Philoxenus.
"In his Revelation, John saw a book great and wonderful, which was written by God, and there were on it seven seals. There was none that was able to read it in earth nor in heaven save the Son of God alone who Himself wrote it and sealed it."

Here we have a brief summary of Apoc. v. 1–3, but too loosely worded to admit of comparison with the text of these verses as it stands in S or Σ. Ephraim seems to have written the above from an inexact recollection of the passage, which he may have known only in the Greek. It does not therefore prove that in his time a Syriac version of the Book existed.

But elsewhere he apparently cites a text from Apoc. xxii. 6 (also xxii. 17), with a slight variation (τῶν ζωντῶν for τῶν ξωσμένων), in which it is to be noted that S (with Σ) concurs against all other authorities.

So too in his elder contemporary, Aphrahat, there seems to be a trace of the Apocalypse under a Syriac form akin to the two extant versions, in the remarkable phrase, twice used by him, "καὶ τὸν θείον τῇ δεύτερῃ θανάσι"; "the second death." Yet this reference must be accepted as a doubtful one, in view of the fact that the same phrase occurs more than once in the Targums.

II.—Its Circulation very limited.

On the whole, it seems most probable that this Book, excluded as it was (by ignorance rather than of set purpose) from the Peshitto Canon, remained unknown to Syriac-speaking Christians for perhaps four centuries, except to the comparatively few who had access to, and could read, the Greek original. It may well be that the author of our version was the first to place it within reach of his countrymen in their own tongue. In

---

* Opera Syr., tom. ii, p. 332, Sermo Exegeticus in Ps. cxi. 3. So far as I know, the genuineness of this Sermon has not been disputed.

* Hymn. vii in Fest. Epiph. (Hymni, &c., tom. i, p. 66, ed. Lamy). In his Greek works some references to the Apocalypse are to be found; but I do not cite them, feeling doubtful whether we can accept anything as altogether his which does not survive in Syriac.

* Demonstr. vii. 25, viii. 19 (Paris, 1885). See the editor's Praefatio, p. xliii; see also my note on the Syriac text, ii. 11 (Part II., p. 43).
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the numerous translations of the writings of the Greek Fathers, with which Syriac scholars of the sixth century (and perhaps earlier) sought to compensate for the dearth of original Syriac theology, the points of difference between the Greek and Syriac Scriptures must have been noticed by Syrian readers;—and above all, the absence from the Syriac of whole Books which stood unquestioned in the Greek. In the account of the origin of the Philoxenian version, given (see note *, p. lxxi) by Moses of Aghel, it is plainly suggested that the object of Philoxenus, in issuing that version, was that his people should learn to know the Scriptures in a form assimilated to that in which their Greek-speaking brethren of Alexandria and elsewhere knew them.

Yet it is plain that the Apocalypse never became familiarly known in the Jacobite or any other of the Syrian Churches. It was rarely transcribed, rarely commented on, had little influence on their religious mind, and contributed little if anything to their religious thought or phraseology. The hymns and liturgies, in which alone Syriac religious literature is rich, are with hardly an exception devoid of all such Apocalyptic imagery and language as we meet at every turn in the hymnology of the West,—whether of the medieval Latin Church, or of English Christendom, Anglican and Nonconformist alike.

III.—Value of the Versions S and Σ.

But if, as it seems we must admit, both the Syriac versions of the Apocalypse have failed to commend the Book to Syriac readers, neither of them is therefore to be lightly esteemed: each has a value of its own. The one which has now been for more than two centuries and a-half known to scholars, is interesting in its capacity as a supplement to the Harkleian version, and shares with it the merit of usefulness for critical purposes by reason of the very literalness which is, from a literary point of view, its fault. The other, which I now give to the public, is to be prized as being, together with the Four Epistles published by Pococke, the total of what time has spared to us of the Philoxenian version, once famous but now surviving only in these remnants,—small in bulk, yet constituting the portion of it best worth preserving, inasmuch as in these Books alone the translator worked directly on the Greek before him, without having (as in the other Books) the Peshitto to draw him aside from the faithful rendering of his original. This Apocalypse therefore, and the Four Epistles, come to us as a monument of the learning and industry of
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the Syrian Monophysite Church of the early sixth century. They are valuable alike in their literary aspect, as a successful presentation of the Greek original in a Syriac version of adequate exactness, without sacrifice of idiomatic purity,—and from the point of view of the textual critic, as reproducing the text (or perhaps a combination of two or more texts) that was accessible to a scholar in the Euphratensian province immediately after the close of the fifth century.

In closing this investigation, I may be permitted to quote the concluding sentences of the Memoir I have already referred to*:

"We justly claim [for this Version], as regards its general tone and manner, that it approaches the excellence of the Peshitto; and in point of force, directness, and dignity, that it gives worthy expression to the sublime imagery of the Apocalyptist. It has strength and freedom such as few translations attain; such, in fact, that it would not be difficult to make out a plausible case for accepting it as the Aramaic original, or a close reproduction of an Aramaic original, of the Book. In it, far more fully than in the cramped and artificial diction of its reviser, the Aramaic idiom asserts its power to supply for the burden of the divine visions an utterance more adequate than could be found for them in the Greek which is their actual vehicle. From it, as a comparison of the two versions shows, the latter one has borrowed the touches of simple majesty which ever and again raise it out of its usual level of painstaking and correctness: in it, I may almost venture to say, more perfectly than in the written Greek, we may read 'the things which shall be hereafter', well-nigh in the form in which St. John first apprehended the divine word that came to him, and inwardly shaped into speech the revelation of 'the Lord God, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty.'"

(Apoc. i. 8.)

CHAPTER VIII.

ACCOUNT OF THE CRAWFORD MS. (SYR. 2).

To the preceding study of the version S, I deem it fitting to append a brief account of the Ms. in which it has reached us,* and of my reasons for believing it to have been written in the latter years of the twelfth century.

I.—Description of the Ms.

The Ms. must have consisted, when entire, of twenty-four quinions (240 leaves), with a single sheet (2 leaves) subjoined. It contained the whole New Testament, with the Pauline Epistles placed last. Four leaves have been lost (the first of the first quinion, the first and tenth of the twenty-fourth, and the former of the final pair), and with them the first twelve verses of St. Matthew i, the greater part of the Epistle to Titus, and Hebrews xi. 28 to end, have disappeared. Otherwise the sacred text is complete, except that a few more verses of St. Matthew, and a few of the Acts, have perished owing to the mutilation of two or three leaves. Besides the 238 leaves which remain, eleven have been inserted immediately after the Fourth Gospel, exhibiting a Harmony of the Passion-narratives. Thus the Ms. has now 249 leaves. The last leaf contains the Subscription and Colophon.

That leaf alone is (on both sides) written in single column, the rest in double columns throughout. The last page alone is in a cursive hand: the preceding one, in common with the rest of the Ms. (including the eleven inserted leaves) is in a clear and regular estrangelo, of a well-
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marked but not archaic type. Here and there a word is interlined (prima manu) in cursive. The cursive olaph (1) appears not infrequently, especially when final; also the cursive tau (2), especially before final 1. In the text, the vocalization is sparingly indicated—usually by the simplest method—of points above or below, now and then by Greek vowels attached to unusual words, or to such as would be ambiguous if without vowels. On the whole, the Ms. is in good condition, and hardly any part of its contents is illegible, except in the last leaf, which (especially its latter page) has been so damaged as to be decipherable with difficulty and (in a few places) not with absolute certainty.

II.—Its Contents.

It comprises the New Testament, in the Peshitto version, supplemented by the Apocalypse (as now for the first time printed, Part II., pp. 1–29), and the Four Minor Catholic Epistles (in the version known as "Pococke's text"). Its contents are thus unique in two respects. First, it exhibits the Apocalypse in a version which is (as above shown in detail) quite distinct from the version hitherto included in printed Syriac New Testaments, from the Paris Polyglot down to the latest. And secondly, it is the only Syriac Biblical Ms. (excluding from that title such transcripts made from European libraries, as e.g. the Ms. No. 5 of Zotenberg's Catalogue, Bibliothèque Nationale) that presents to the student a complete New Testament, according to the canon ordinarily received, whether Greek or Latin;—including with the Peshitto not only, as a few other Ms. do, the four non-Peshitto Epistles, but the Apocalypse,—of which Book the few extant Syriac copies exhibit it in the other version, and apart from the Peshitto. The Books are continuously arranged; each Book, after the first, beginning in the same column in which the preceding Book closes, with but a narrow interval of separation. The order is, I believe, unexampled: Gospels, Apocalypse, Acts and seven Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles. It is remarkable that the supplementary Books

---

*a* See the autotype reproduction of two columns of the Ms., in the Plate facing title; also the photographic facsimile at foot of p. cv, *supr.*

*b* In the copies l and a it stands alone; and so also, we are told, in the lost copy f. In d, it is associated only with the "Pococke" Epistles. See p. xv, note †, *supr.*; and Part II, p. 36, *infra*.

thus interpolated into the Peshitto are in no way distinguished by the scribe from the others. The Apocalypse follows St. John's Gospel, and is in turn followed by the Acts (see Plate), as closely as St. John follows St. Luke. And in like manner, the Four Epistles are placed—2 Peter after 1 Peter and before 1 John, which last-named Epistle is succeeded by 2 John, 3 John, and Jude,—as in Greek and Latin Bibles: whereas in the few other Syriac Mss. which exhibit these non-Peshitto Epistles, they are mostly subjoined (as, e.g., in the great Cambridge Syriac Bible, Oo. I, 1, 2) as a sort of appendix to the New Testament. Nor do the notes prefixed or appended to these interpolated Books distinguish them in any way from the rest. On the contrary, the superscription of the Apocalypse assigns it to "St. John the Evangelist," and the subscription to "St. John Apostle and Evangelist," as if to assert its equality in the canon with the Gospel that immediately precedes: and in like manner the subscriptions of 1 Peter and 1 John are "the first Epistle of Peter", "the first Epistle of John", thus connecting them respectively with 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, which follow; whereas in purely Peshitto Mss. they are usually described as "the Epistle of Peter", "the Epistle of John"; and so even in our Ms. in the superscriptions.

Our Ms., however, contains clear indications of the supplementary character of these Books. Its margin bears two distinct series of numbers, both of which are usually found in Syriac New Testament Mss. Of these, one series divides each Book into the or Sections peculiar to Syriac usage, 165 in number: the other into Lessons, for the Sundays and Holydays of the year,—nearly three times as many as the Sections. To each Lesson is prefixed (in the text) a rubric indicating the day to which it is assigned.* These two systems of division, however, relate to the Peshitto text only. The supplementary Books are passed over in the marginal numeration of Sections and of Lessons alike. In the Four Epistles a few lesson-rubrics are inserted; but none in the Apocalypse. The exclusion of all these Books from the division into Sections amounts to a negative intimation that they were not known to the Syrian Church when that division was made. Of the Four Epistles, the same may be said with regard to their exclusion from the Lectionary series; but hardly

* See Plate, second column, for numerals of both series, and a rubric, prefixed to Acts i.
of the Apocalypse, inasmuch as many Churches which know it and accept it as canonical have judged it to be unsuitable for public reading.

But when from the text of our Ms. we turn to the Subscription which occupies the recto of its final leaf, we find a direct and positive statement that none of these Books lay within the scope of the sectional division,—as follows: "The Book of the New Testament; in which there are 165 sections; besides the Revelation and the four Epistles." Of these last, the verses, or ἡμαρα (الحَمْلِي) are numbered, 1373 in all; and the Subscription then goes on to reckon the verses of the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles. The rest of the page records the number of Chapters or ῥίλωι, Eusebian divisions or κανόνες, Parables, Miracles, and Testimonies (Old Testament citations), contained in each Gospel severally. I have printed this Note in full (line for line) in Part II, p. 31, and have added a translation, p. 95.

The Colophon written on the verso of the same leaf gives us the name of the scribe, Stephen, a monk; of the person for whom it was written, Gabriel, also a monk; and of various fellow-monks, relatives, and friends, to some of whom he professes himself indebted for instruction or for assistance, and for whom he asks his readers' prayers. He also names the place where he wrote,—"the monastery of Mar Jacob the recluse of Egypt and Mar Barshabba, beside Sulach, in Tur'abdin, in the dominion of Ḥesna Kipha." I have reproduced this Colophon in Part II, p. 32, and have given a translation of it (pp. 98, 99). Of the persons and places named in it I shall have more to say farther on.

It is unnecessary to describe the contents of the eleven inserted leaves which precede the Apocalypse, farther than to state that the Passion-Narrative contained in them is compiled from the Harkleian Gospels, and is portioned out into lessons for Good Friday. Though written by a hand probably identical, certainly contemporaneous, with that which wrote the New Testament, they form no part of the Ms. proper. It is complete without them; and not only so, but they are intruded into one of the quiniones of which it is composed—the eleventh, between its eighth and ninth leaves. The verso of the eighth leaf breaks off in the last verse of St. John's Gospel, and the rest of that verse (four lines) runs over into the recto of the ninth, where it is followed by three lines of subscription; so that, if these eleven leaves were removed, the Fourth Gospel would appear in unbroken integrity, and the New Testament would be complete and
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continuous. But by a peculiar arrangement, such as I have not met with in any other Ms., Syriac, Greek, or Latin, these seven lines, needed to complete St. John after fo. 8 of quinion 11, are repeated at the head of the first column of the recto of the first intruded leaf, and then followed by the Harmony headed by its superscription, occupying ten leaves and the recto of the eleventh. The result is, that the Four Gospels with this Harmony admit of being separated from the following Books so as to form a volume complete in itself.

The verso of the eleventh of these leaves, originally left blank, now exhibits a record, in a much later and very inelegant cursive hand, of the purchase of the Ms. by "Simeon of Hatacha, Patriarch, named Taibu," in A. Gr. 1845 (A.D. 1534) from a deacon named elib, the price being "one hundred and twenty athmanih (אחתמניא);—probably equal to about £3 15s. sterling."

Of the origin, history, and age of the Ms., our knowledge is limited to the facts stated or implied in the Colophon, and in the memorandum of sale above described, together with such inferences as may be drawn from the contents of the volume, and the handwriting. I have discussed these facts and inferences at length in the Memoir already referred to: here I propose to give a summary of the results arrived at in that discussion, adding a few points which I have noticed since it was published.

III.—Its Place of Origin.

The region of Tur'abdin (now Jebel-Tur), where the Ms. was written, is a hilly district in the north-east part of Mesopotamia, for centuries the headquarters of Jacobite monasticism, and still the chief centre of the dwindling Jacobite Church. The name of the scribe, Stephen, is not elsewhere met with, so far as I have ascertained, but "the monastery of Mar Jacob the recluse of Egypt, near Salach," where he wrote, was a Jacobite house, and Salach, in Tur'abdin, was the seat of a Jacobite Bishop. The first owner of the Ms., Gabriel, the monk for whom it was written, belonged to the town of Beth-nahele, also in Tur'abdin, of which district Hez-n-Kipha (now Hasankef), was

* See Payne Smith, Catal., col. 612, for athmanih.
* See Transactions, R.I.A., vol. xxx, pp. 336-338, for Tur'abdin, Salach, and Beth-nahele; also for Hatacha, which lay some 50 miles outside Tur'abdin.
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the chief stronghold, and for many generations the political capital. Of its contents, the parts supplementary to the Peshitto,—the Four Epistles, and (as I have endeavoured to show) apparently the Apocalypse, are of Jacobite origin; as is also the interpolated Harkleian Passion-Harmony. The modified form of the estrangelo character in which it is written, and the occasional Greek vowels inserted, are Jacobite likewise. Thus we may safely conclude that it is a Ms. in every sense Jacobite.

IV.—Its History.

Between the date, which I now seek to determine, of Gabriel, its first owner, and the date (some thirty or forty years ago), when it was purchased by the late Earl of Crawford, the only fact in its history known to us, is the above-mentioned sale of it in 1534. The seller, however, "Saliba the Deacon" is an unknown person, and the purchaser, "Simeon Taibu [or Taibutho] of Hatacha," cannot be identified with certainty. He is styled "Patriarch," and if we may presume him to have been the head of the Jacobite Church, he was probably the prelate known officially as Ignatius XVI, otherwise 'Abdallah of Ḥesna d'Atta. If so, the Ms. was presumably kept by him at Deir-Zaferan (the convent of Mar Anania) near Marde,—then, as now, the seat of the Patriarchs. But seeing that, at the date specified, the Nestorian Church of the East had at its head a Simeon as "Catholicos," for which title "Patriarch" was commonly used as equivalent,—and had a footing in the chief Jacobite centres, even in Marde,—it may be that by this sale the Ms. passed into Nestorian hands. How, or when, or by whom, it was brought to England, or from whom it was purchased for the Library where it now is stored among so many treasures of Oriental learning, is unknown.

V.—Its Age.

In the Colophon, it will be observed that, though the names of places and persons are fully recorded, no date is given; nor among the persons named is there one whose date is known. The age of the


* The date may have been noted on the lost penultimate leaf of the Ms.

* I.e., p. 360, note †.
Ms. must therefore be inferred from such indications as are yielded by its handwriting and its contents. On the back of the modern English binding, the volume is lettered “Circ. A.D. 1000”; but on what grounds, or by what authority, this date was suggested, does not appear.

a. Arguments for and against an early date.—The experts in palæography to whom it has been submitted have given very various judgments on its age—some dating it as late as the twelfth century, some as early as the ninth, or even the eighth. A perfect idea of the handwriting and present aspect of the Ms. may be obtained from the Plate, which reproduces with absolute fidelity two columns of it as specimens. It will be seen that its estrangelo is not of the purest or earliest type. The dolath and rish are curved, not rectangular; the he, vau, and mim are closed, not open; the semeath is joined with the following letter. In all these respects, and in the occasional insertion (prima manu) of Greek vowels (see facsimile, p. cv), it deviates from the usage of Ms. prior to the seventh century. But the rounded dolath and rish have been relied on by some as tokens of a date not later than A.D. 1000, inasmuch as a reversion to the square archaic forms took place about that time, due (as is supposed) to the revival of estrangelo by John, Bishop of Kartamin in Tur'abdin (consecrated A.D. 988).

I am of opinion, however, that these tokens are unreliable. For—

(1). The revival of the square forms did not supersede the contemporaneous use of the curved forms, as is proved by Ms. which exhibit both. For example, in the Syro-Hexaplar estrangelo Ms. of Genesis, Brit. Mus., Add. 14442, ascribed to the seventh century, the text exhibits the square forms of these letters, but the curved forms prevail in the notes, which are unquestionably contemporaneous with the text.* Again, the Ms. Add. 12139 (Brit. Mus.), dated A. Gr. 1311 (= A.D. 1000), is written in its earlier part in the modified estrangelo of our Ms., and resembles it in the rounded forms in question and in other minor details,—but suddenly, in the middle of a page, changes to the square forms and adheres to them

* These notes are written, according to Coriani, "charactere medio inter estrangholium et maroniticum".—Monumenta S. et P., tom. ii, fasc. ii, p. xviii. The same is true of the notes in other like Mss.; e.g., sometimes of those in the Ambrosian Syro-Hexaplar (eighth century).
for the rest; though the colophon testifies, and the uniformity of the handwriting in all else confirms, that one scribe wrote the whole. All these Mss. are Jacobite.

(2). The extent and permanence of the revival effected by John of Kartamin has been over-estimated. The statement of Barhebræus,* who is our authority in the matter, merely conveys that John restored and carried to perfection the use of the estrangelo among his own monks, so as to enrich his monastery with many volumes, and (no doubt) to organize for Tur'abdin an active and influential school of caligraphy. If his scribes preferred the square forms, the fashion did not last very long, even in his own monastery. In the Bibliothèque Nationale there is a Ms. (Zotenberg, No. 41), written by a monk of Kartamin, A.D. 1194, in which the estrangelo closely resembles that of our Ms., not only in general character, but in every characteristic peculiarity, including the curved dolath and rish, which have been relied on as arguments for an eighth- or ninth-century date.

b. Reasons for assigning Ms. to close of twelfth century.—After a careful comparison of a large number of Mss., especially those of the “Rich” collection in the British Museum, and of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and a full consideration of the evidence yielded by the Crawford Ms. itself, I have come to the conclusion that it belongs to the latter years of the twelfth century. This is the period to which, after inspection of some photographs taken from it, it was assigned by the person who was best qualified to speak with authority in such a matter—the late Dr. William Wright, of Cambridge. Another expert palæographer, Dr. Karl Höning, late of the British Museum, to whom I showed the Ms. without informing him of Dr. Wright’s judgment, at once pronounced the same opinion.

I will briefly state the grounds on which this judgment rests—

Evidence of handwriting.—The handwriting of the Ms., which as I have shown has been assigned to an earlier date only on grounds which are untrustworthy, bears a real and close resemblance to the estrangelo Mss. written about the year 1200—closer than to those of any previous or

following age. Dr. Wright and Dr. Hörning, independently, fixed on one
Ms. of the Nitrian collection as especially like it in general character,—
Add. 12174 (Brit. Mus.), a volume of Lives of Saints, written A.D. 1196 in
the great Jacobite monastery of Melitene, a little north of Tur'abdin.

Farther research, especially among the "Rich" Mss. and those of
the Bibliothèque Nationale, disclosed to me the fact that nearly all the
extant Biblical Mss. written (as this was) in or near Tur'abdin, present,
more completely than those of any other origin, the peculiarities of hand-
writing and usage which characterize our Ms.,—the agreement in this
respect being twofold, for it is observable in the cursive character in which
(as in our Ms.) the colophon is usually written, as well as in the estrangelo
of the body of the book. Moreover, all these Tur'abdinese Mss. of which
the dates are known or probably assignable, prove to have been written
within the period specified: whence it may reasonably be inferred that,
as regards the production of such Mss., the activity of the Tur'abdinese
monks began after the middle of the twelfth century, and did not continue
far into the thirteenth.

I am thus enabled to affirm two propositions:—

(i). That the Biblical Mss. which are most clearly distinguished by the
marks which are characteristic of the Crawford Ms., are Mss. written
within the region, and the period, above indicated,—viz., in Tur'abdin, in
the latter part of the twelfth century.

(ii). Conversely, that a Biblical Ms. marked by such characteristics is
presumably a Ms. of that region and that age.

Mention of Tur'abdin in the Colophon.—The above results (though the
research which led to them was suggested by the local and ecclesiastical
relation between Tur'abdin whence our Ms. comes, and Melitene, the home
of Add. 12174) might have been arrived at even if the colophon which
specifies the birthplace of our Ms. had perished or had never been written.
On the mere evidence of the handwriting, with its accompanying peculiar-
rities, I should have claimed it as belonging to Tur'abdin or some adjacent
Jacobite centre. But when we call to mind the fact stated in the
colophon—that the Ms. was written in a principal Tur'abdinese monastery,

* The detailed particulars as to these Mss. are given at length in my Memoir (in Transactions,
by a Tur'abdinese monk, for another monk also Tur'abdinese;—it follows unquestionably that the twofold heads of evidence, of its characteristics in point of handwriting, and of its Tur'abdinese origin, give twofold force to the presumption raised above, that it belongs to the years just before, or the years just after, A.D. 1200.

The inferences which the colophon yields extend beyond the indication of the place of origin of the Ms. There are, farther, inferences from—

Structure and wording of Colophon; in which respects it closely resembles like notes appended to the other Tur'abdinese Mss. above referred to. Some of these come so near to it in their wording that much help is to be had from them in the difficult task of deciphering the nearly obliterated final page of our Ms.; whereas its fashion and diction differ widely from those of Mss. of earlier or later date, or of other regions. Here then we have the internal evidence of the scribe's language and matter, concurring with the external evidence of his handwriting, in determining the age to which he belongs.

Political situation implied in Colophon; in the mention of "the ρέλεσ (= dominion, or principality) of Ḥesna Kipha." It appears from the Annals of Abu'l'feda (and is confirmed by the Chronicon Ecclesiasticum of Barhebræus) that Ḥesn-Kipha, a strong fortress on the Tigris, became for the first time the capital of a ρέλεσ (i.e., of the dominion of a quasi-independent sovereign prince, ρέλεσ) in the twelfth century, under the Turcoman chief Sokman, son of Ortok (A.D. 1101); by whose line, the Ortokids, it was ruled till 1221-2. Here then the evidence points, as before, to the twelfth century. Another authority supplies facts which serve to determine the date to the latter and not the former part of that century, and at the same time to account for the lack of Tur'abdinese Mss. of earlier date. From the Life of John, Bishop of Marde, based on his own autobiographic memoranda, we learn that when he was consecrated, A.D. 1125, he found that, in his diocese and the adjoining region of Tur'abdin, the monasteries were and had been for two hundred years deserted or even in ruins. This statement is no doubt exaggerated,

---

* Annals, tom. iii, p. 336; iv, pp. 192, 392 (Adler's edition, Copenhagen, 1790).
* The facts above stated as to Kartamin show that, there at least, there was a flourishing monastery little more than a century before John of Marde.
as to the duration or the extent (or both) of the desolation described; but we may safely accept it as evidence that a long period of violence and disorder had preceded the rise of the Ortokid dynasty,—as the authorities above referred to amply attest. And the restoration of monasticism which this John is stated to have effected, in the rebuilding of monasteries and the refurnishing of them with books, which appears to have been the employment of his forty years' episcopate, implies that he lived under a settled government and enjoyed from it some measure of protection. Indeed the narrative of Barhebræus records instances in which, towards the end of the century, the intervention of the Ortokid prince (though a Mohammediand in the affairs of the Jacobite Church was sought and obtained.* Thus the monks of Tur'abdin and the adjoining region (for Amid was added to the Ortokid princes in 1183, and Marde was ruled by another branch of the same house†) were free to follow the impulse towards sacred letters which seems to have been originally given by John of Marde, and which was carried on and enhanced by two more noted persons who came after him,—Barsalibi, who died Metropolitan of Amid, A.D. 1171, and Michael (the Great) his friend and supporter, who died Patriarch, A.D. 1199. Thus the historical indications implied in the word τουραβδιων—of a monastic life in Tur'abdin pursuing its employments in something of security under the rule of a sovereign Prince—lead us, as the palæographical indications have already led us, to assign the Ms. to the latter rather than the earlier years of the twelfth century.

**Personal statements of Colophon as to the scribe, and his uncles.**—Stephen the scribe tells us that he was instructed in writing by his uncles, monks like himself. He is therefore not of the first, but of the second or a later generation, of the calligraphers of the Tur'abdinese school. That school can hardly have been in operation before the middle of the century: and he therefore (especially as three of the five uncles named are described as “deceased”) probably belongs to a time not earlier than its last quarter.

**Farther:** there is something to be said of the names of certain of these uncles; his “paternal uncles, monks: Mas'ud deceased and John and Simeon.” To these men, Stephen tells us, and to two “maternal uncles, monks and priests, deceased,” he owed his training “in the matter of

---


† Abu'lFeda, Annals, tom. iv, 54.

‡ Ib., tom. iii, 350.
doctrines and of writing and so forth." He wrote, therefore, at a time when two of these five persons were still living—the brothers John and Simeon, both monks and (as is implied) scribes. Now in a Paris Ms. above referred to, No. 41 Zotenberg (Biblioth. Nat.)—a copy of the Gospels bearing in its handwriting and all its characteristics the closest possible affinity to our Ms.—there is mention of two brothers, John and Simeon, monks, born at Mido, in Tur'abdin, and trained at Kartamin: one of whom, Simeon, wrote the Ms., and died in November 1194, as is recorded in a note appended by John. If these brothers are the John and Simeon, "paternal uncles" of the scribe of our Ms., it follows that the Ms., having been written in Simeon's lifetime, cannot be later, but probably is not many years earlier, than 1194. The names are too common to permit us to regard the suggested identification as certain: but considering that the geographical area our inquiry deals with is a limited one," and the class of skilled Tur'abdinese calligraphers more limited still, it seems fairly probable that the monk Simeon, who died in 1194, after writing the Paris Ms. No. 41, and who had a brother John also a scribe, was the Simeon who, with his brother John, instructed Stephen in calligraphy, and lived to see him produce the Ms. whose date we are investigating.

Unless, therefore, we are prepared to go back to a date earlier than that of John of Kartamin—earlier than the period of ecclesiastical chaos that prevailed (as we are assured) for two centuries before the time of John of Marde—to go back, that is, to the opening years of the tenth century,—to an age when the type of estrangelo was not nearly so close to that of our Ms. as is the estrangelo of the late twelfth-century group,—an age in which we have no evidence that Tur'abdin possessed any calligraphers,—it seems that there is no date to which any Tur'abdinese Ms. can, with any plausibility, be assigned earlier than the middle of the twelfth century. And in the case of the Crawford Ms., the particulars stated in the

---

* The greatest length of Tur'abdin is about one hundred miles. Marde adjoins its border, and Amid (Diarbekr) is less than one hundred miles from Salach. For the topography of these regions, see Badger's Nestorians (1860), vol. i; Taylor's Travels in Kurdistan, in Journal of Royal Geographical Society, vol. xxxv (1865); Prym and Socin's Der neu-aramäische Dialekt des Tur-Abdin (1881), tom. i (Einleitung); Sachau's Reise in Syrien u. Mesopotamien (1883), also his review of the work of Prym and Socin, in Zeitschrift der Morgenl. Gesellschaft, Bd. xxxv, pp. 237 sqq.
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colophon tend to place it in the fourth rather than in the third quarter of the century.

(6.) Contents and arrangement of the Ms.—An argument, moreover, which seems to preclude the assignment of an earlier date to the Ms., independently of paleographic considerations and of the evidence of the colophon, is to be drawn from the contents of the Ms. and their arrangement. As has been stated, it not only includes the four non-Peshitto Epistles, but reckons them among the Catholic Epistles, on a par with the three of the Peshitto, placing them in their usual Greek order, so that 2 Peter comes next after 1 Peter and before 1 John. Now, of the few other Syriac Biblical Ms. which exhibit these Epistles in combination with the Peshitto (less than a dozen in all), none is older than the eleventh century; only one (Add. 14473, Brit. Mus.) can be confidently counted older than the twelfth, and in that one they are a mere appendix added by a hand possibly of eleventh century to a much older copy of the Peshitto Acts and Three Catholic Epistles; in the remaining two (Cambridge Univ. Libr., Oo. i., 2; and Paris, Biblioth. Nat., Zot. 29) they stand all four together, after the three of the Peshitto. And a like arrangement is found in Ms. even as late as the fifteenth century—as in the Amsterdam Acts and Epistles (No. 184) in which the Four are separated from the Three by the interposition of the Pauline.* The earliest dated Syriac Biblical Ms. which places the Seven in their Greek order is a New Testament dated 1471 (now preserved at Utica, U.S.A.), but the British Museum copy of the Acts and Epistles (Rich. 7162), which follows the same order, is perhaps earlier.† Thus it appears that our Ms., even if we date it, as I venture to do, about 1200, presents much the earliest Syriac example of this arrangement. It is improbable in the highest

---

* This Ms. (see Transactions, R.I.A., vol. xxvii, p. 313), now containing only the Acts and Epistles, appears to have been once a complete New Testament, of which the first 173 leaves are missing. I have elsewhere (ib., vol. xxx, p. 378) shown it to be probable that in the lost leaves the Apocalypse followed the Gospels, as in the Crawford Ms. It may be confidently conjectured farther that, should those leaves be recovered, they would be found (after the analogy of the Crawford Ms.) to exhibit the Apocalypse in the version S, as the extant leaves exhibit the Four Epistles in the "Pococke" version.

† Published in phototyped facsimile by Professor I. H. Hall: Baltimore, 1886.

‡ Rosen and Forshall (Catal., p. 25) assign it to fourteenth century: Wright corrects this to fifteenth (Catal., p. 1203).
ACCOUNT OF THE CRAWFORD MS. (SYR. 2).

degree that a Ms. exhibiting the New Testament Books in such an order should belong to an earlier age. The Seven Epistles are indeed found arranged as of equal authenticity, in a peculiar order (1, 2, 3 John; 1, 2 Peter, James, Jude), in one Syriac Ms. dated as early as A.D. 823 (Add. 14623, Brit. Mus.). But this Ms. is not a Biblical one like the rest, but a mere volume of miscellanies; and does not therefore form a precedent for the order observed in our Ms., which is a complete New Testament, arranged for ecclesiastical use. It is, in fact, surprising that a Ms. of such contents and so arranged, rubricated for Church reading, and with one or two Lessons appointed from non-Peshitto Books, should belong to an age so early as even the end of the twelfth century; for the order in which the Epistles stand would incline us to place it rather in the fourteenth, were it not that the character of the handwriting forbids so late a date.

On the whole, we may with some confidence conclude that the Ms. was written in the latter half, probably in the last quarter, of the twelfth century; yet (we may perhaps add) not later than A.D. 1194.
APPENDIX TO DISSERTATION.
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PRELIMINARY MEMORANDUM TO APPENDIX.

In constructing the following Lists, and the footnotes to the Greek text, I have taken the evidence of the cursive script from the Apparatus Criticus of Tischendorf's Greek Testament (eighth edition), with the corrections made by Dr. C. R. Gregory, Prolegomena, pp. 1298 sqq.; but have also used the editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, and Tregelles, as well as the collections of the late Dr. Scrivener (Codex Augiensis, pp. 530 sqq.; Adversaria Critica Sacra, pp. 143 sqq.), and of the late Rev. W. H. Simcox (Journal of Philology, vol. xxii, pp. 285 sqq.). From the last, I derive the readings of mss. 68 and 152, including the very remarkable one of ii. 13, in which 152 is the sole supporter of S. In case of the alleged variant, γέγονε for γέγονα, xxi. 6, I have judged it necessary to ascertain the readings of mss. 10, 17, 41, 94, 95, with the results that 10 and 17 prove to have been wrongly alleged for the variant; 95 defect; and 41 and 94 remain as its only authorities.*


For the Latin texts I have used the following editions:—Of "Gigas", Belseheim's (Christiania, 1891)*; of "Fleury's Palimpsest", Berger's (Paris, 1889); of Primasius, Haussleiter's (Erlangen, 1891); of

* For these results, I have to express my thanks, as regards ms. 10, to Mr. F. J. H. Jenkinson, M.A., Librarian, Cambridge University; ms. 17, to Monsieur Omont of the Bibliothèque Nationale; ms. 41, to Professor Ignazio Guidi of the Royal University of Rome; and mss. 94, 95, to Mr. F. G. Kenyon, of the British Museum Library.

b I am indebted to the Right Rev. John Wordsworth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, for the use of a copy of this edition, carefully corrected from the Stockholm Ms.
the Vulgate, Tischendorf's *N. T. Amiatinum* (Leipsic, 1850) for the Amiatine, and a Paris edition (1877) for the Clementine. The few readings cited from Cod. Armachanus, I have derived from the Ms. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

For the Syriac (Σ) I have used De Dieu's edition (Leyden, 1627) of Σι; but have verified its readings by reference to the Leyden Ms. (Cod. Scalig., 18 (Syr.)), and to a collation of it for which I am indebted to the Rev. H. Jackson Lawlor: I have also used the texts given in the Paris and London Polyglots of Σp. For Σδ and Σν I have used the actual Mss., B. 5.16 of Trin. Coll., Dublin, and Add. 17127 of Brit. Mus., p. 36.
ABBREVIATIONS, &c.

In the following lists, and in the footnotes to the Greek Text,

pr stands for the text embodied in the Commentary of Primasius,
g for that of the Ms. "Gigas" (Stockholm),
h for that of the Fleury Palimpsest (Paris),
et for the consent of pr, g, h (or of pr and g where h deficiit),
am for the text of Cod. Amiatinus,
cl for the Clementine, as printed,
\sigma \gamma for the consent of am, cl,
arm for the text of Cod. Armachanus,
lat. for the consent of et and \sigma \gamma.

The MSS. are N A C P Q, as in Tregelles, and in Weiss (see pp. xxxix, xl, supr.).
The mss. are numbered as by Tischendorf and Gregory; "mss." stands for the consent of these.

By "nearly all", "most", "many", "some", "few", are to be understood "nearly all mss.",
"most mss.", "many mss.", "some mss.", "few mss.".

\Sigma, \Sigma \delta, \Sigma \eta, \Sigma \eta, \Sigma \rho stand for the commonly known Syriac version, and the various texts
of it, for which see p. 36, Part II. \Sigma \phi signifies that the reading of \Sigma \eta is marked
in the Ms. with * (see above, p. lxxxi).
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1.—The following is a collection of readings of S, which are attested by one or more, but not all, of the MSS.; showing in each case, how the Greek, Latin, and Syriac, evidence is divided.

Readings of S.

i. 3, τοῦτος λόγος, ACP, nearly all mss., lat., Σ:  
4, δ' ἂν, NAACP, 1, 7, 28, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, 99, &c., g, h, εγ, Σ:  
4, om. ἐκεῖνος, NAACP, many, Σ:  
5, ἀδικ[ωρ, or -κα], NAAC, 1, 7, 28, 38, 79, h, pr, Σ:  
5, ins. ὡμός, NCPQ, most, g, h, εγ, Σ:  
6, εἰσείναι, NAACP, most, (lat. ?), Σ:  
6, ἡμᾶς, NCPQ, most, g, ἔρ, cl, Σ; (or ὡμός, Α, 38, few):  
6, τῶν αἰῶνων, Σ:  
7, ἐκεῖνος, 1, 12, 152, Σ:  
8, om. ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, ACPQ, most, h, pr, Σ:  
9, ἐν ισχύοις, NCPQ, 38, g, am:  
9, καὶ διὰ, NCPQ, most, h, Σ:  
9, add Χριστοῦ, Q, most, pr, Σ:  
11, om. ἐνδώ εἰμι . . . ἐκεῖστέ, καὶ, NAACQ, most, lat., Σ:  
11, ζυρίσαν, Σ, am:  
12, om. ἐκεῖνος, NAACP, many, lat., Σ:  
12, ἐλάχιστος, P, 1, 7, &c., many, Σ:  
13, om. ἐκεῖντα, ACP, 1, 28, 38, 152, few, h, pr, am, Σ:  
14, λευκά, NAACP, most, g, εγ:  
15, περισυμφωνία, N, few, lat., Σ; (Σ, -γος):  
18, ὡμός, Q, most, Σ:  
19, om. διὰ, ACPQ, mss., lat., Σ:  
20, ἐκεῖ οὐδέ, NAACPQ, mss., Σ:  
20, & έλθον, P, 1, 79, few:  
ii. 1, τῷ εἴπερ, A Σ:  
2, κόσμον σοιν, NQ, many:  
2, καὶ δεῦ, NAACPQ, mss., lat., Σ:  
2, εἶπα, Q, most, ετ, cl, Σ:  
3, ἐπιστομογῆ ἔχει before ἔβαλεν, NAACQ, most, lat., Σ:  
5, ἐπιστομωτακας, P, 1, 7, 28, 79, some, g, εγ:  
5, om. τοχοῦ, NAAC, g, εγ:  
7, om. ἐκεῖντα, NCPQ, mss., lat., Σ:  
7, om. αὐτοῖς, Σ, 91, 96, few, g, cl:  
7, om. μέση, NAACQ, most, pr, εγ, Σ:  

Counter Readings.

NQ, few mss., sing.  
Q, 36, 87, 95, 97, pref. Θεοῦ.  
P, many, lat., ins.  
PQ, most, g, εγ, λου[σαι].  
Q, 7, 36, &c., ποίησαντι.  
C, h, am, ὡμός.  
ACPQ, mss., lat., Σ, pl.  
P, 28, 79, 97, few, om.; (pr ?)  
ACPQ, most, lat., sing.  
Σ, 1, 28, 35, 36, 79, 87, many, g, εγ, ins.  
Q, most, h, pr, cl, Σ, add. (A, 25, substit.) Χριστοῦ.  
C, many, g, pr, εγ, om.  
ACPQ, 28, 36, 79, few, g, h, εγ, om.  
P, 1, 7, 36, 38, &c., ins.
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Readings of $S$—continued.

| ii. 7, om. μου, Α C P, 1, 28, 36, 79, &c.: |
| 8, τῆς, Α C P Q, ms. (lat.?), Σ: |
| 8, ζωήν, Α, am: |
| 9, om. τὰ ἔργα σου καλὰ, Α C P, few, lat.: |
| 9, βλασφημῶν τῆς, Ν, Σ: |
| 9, ἐκ, Α C Q, most, lat., Σ: |
| 10, μηδὲν, Π, most, lat., Σ: |
| 10, om. δὲ, Α C Q, many, lat.: |
| 10, δὲ διὰβολος before ἓ μᾶν, Α C P Q, most, pr, eg, Σ: |

| 11, ἐκεῖ, Ν, Q, most, eg, Σ: |
| 11, οἱμερᾶς, Q, many, g, eg, Σ: |
| 13, om. τὰ ἔργα σου καλὰ, Α C Q, 38, lat.: |
| 13, καὶ ἐν, Α, C, 91, eg: |
| 13, om. [ἐν] αὐτῷ, Α, C, pr, eg: |
| 13, ἀντιτάσσεται, Α, 97 and some, Σ: |
| 13, πιστῶ, Π, Q, most, lat.: |
| 14, ὅτι, Α C Q, ms., g, cl: |
| 14, ἐδάδαξε, Q, most, Σ: |
| 14, φαγεῖν, Α C Q, 1, 28, 36, 38, 79, 91, &c., lat.: |

| 15, om. σ μου, Α C Q, nearly all, lat., Σ: |
| 16, οὖν, Α C Q, most: |
| 17, νικῶντι, Ν, 92, g, cl: |
| 17, om. φαγεῖν, Α C Q, most, pr, eg: |
| 17, ἐκ, Ν, 36, 91, pr, Σ; (P, 1, 7, 28, 79, 96, &c., ἀντί): |
| 18, τῷ ἐν, Α, pr, Σ: |
| 18, ἔβαλον, Α, 36, 38, lat.: |
| 19, ὑπομονήν σου, Α C Q, nearly all, eg, Σ: |
| 20, πολλῷ, Ν, 36, few, g, (πολλά, few, pr; ὅλγα, 1, cl): |

| 20, γνωσάθηκεν σου, Α, Q, most, pr, Σ: |
| 20, λαυτή, Α C P, most: |
| 20, προφήτην, Α C, most, g, Σ: |
| 21, εἶναί, Ν: |
| 21, θέλει, Α C Q, ms., g, eg, Σ: |
| 22, βάλλει, Α, C, most, pr, am, Σ: |
| 22, αὐτῶν, Α, 1, 36, 79, &c., pr, am, cl: |
| 23, ἐμῶν, Α C P, nearly all, ev, am, Σ: |
| 24, βασιλεία, Α Q, most, Σ: |
| 24, βασιλέα, Ν Q, 1, 14, 91, 92, few, pr, eg: |
| 25, ἐν ἥτοι, Α C Q, most, lat., Σ: |
| 27, συντρίβεται[ε], Α C, 1, 7, 38, few, g: |

| iii. 2, ἐντολέως, Q, many: |
| 2, ἐντολαν, Α C Q, many, lat., Σ: |

Counter Readings.

| Q, most, lat., Σ, ins. |
| Α, τῆς |
| Α C Q, ms., et, cl, Σ, ζωήν. |
| Α Q, most, Σ, ins. |
| Α C Q, ms., om. τῆς, (lat.). |
| P, 1, 28, 36, 79, 91, 96, few, om. |
| Α C Q, 38, few, μηδὲν. |
| Q, many, Σ, ins. |
| Ν, many, g, after. |

| Α P, 46, pr (g om.), ἔχοντε; (C, ἔχει). |
| Α C Q, 1, 7, 28, 87, 91, &c., pr, ἔχειν. |
| Q, nearly all, Σ, ins. |
| Π Q, nearly all, et, Σ, om. |
| Π Q (Π, ἐν τοῖς), ms., g, Σ, ins. |
| Α C Q, most, lat., ἀντιτάσσεται. |
| Α, 14, 92, Σ, add. μου. |
| C, pr, am, Σ, om. |
| Α C Q, 1, 28, 79, few, lat., ἐδάδαξε. |
| Q, many, Σ, pref. καὶ. |

| P, few, ins. |
| Π, many, lat., Σ, om. |
| Α C Q, all else, pr, am, Σ, add. αὐτῶν. |
| P, 1, 7, 14, 28, 79, 91, &c., g, Σ, ins. |
| Α C Q, most, (Q with accus.). |
| Π Q, ms., g, ev, τῆς ἐν; (C om.). |
| Π Q, ms., Σ, add. αὐτῶν. |
| Ν, 49, et, om. σου. |
| Α C Q, nearly all, am, Σ, om. |

| Α C Q, 1, 7, 36, 38, 95, &c., g, ev, om. σου. |
| Α Q, 7, 69, few, Σ, αὐτῆς; (lat.?). |
| Π Q, 7, 36, 87, 96, pr, eg, προφήτην. |
| Α C Q, ms., lat., Σ, om. |
| Α, pr, ἔδηλον. |
| Π Q (Π, καλὰ), 38, few, g, cl, βαλλέ. |
| Α C Q, most, g, some eg, Σ, αὐτῆς. |
| Q, 38, cl, αὐτῶν; (Ν om.). |
| Π Q, 1, 28, 36, 79, &c.; lat., βάθω. |
| Α C P, most, g, Σ, βάλλει. |
| Q, 14, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, few, Σδ (mg), ἀνοίξα. |
| Π Q, most, pr, eg, Σ, συντρίβεται. |
| Α C Q, many, lat., Σ, ἐμέλλων. |
| Q, many, ἐπισπάλλειν. |
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Readings of S—continued.

iii. 3, μημόδευε, Ν, 14, et:
3, καὶ τῷρε, Ν Α Ρ Κ, 1, 7, 38, 87, 91, 96, &c.,
lat., Σ:
3, γρηγορήσῃ, Α Ρ Κ Ρ, μss., g, eg, Σ:
4, ἐκι σύ & ἰρ, Ρ Κ, many, et, am, εἰ, Σ:
5, ὀστῶν, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, lat., Σ:
6, περιβάλλεναι, C, Σ:
7, ἄγος before ἀληθινός, Ρ Κ Ρ Μ, mss., lat., Σ:
7, om. αὐτῆ, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, lat., Σ:
7, om. εἰ & ὁ ἄγος, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, lat., Σ:
7, ἄγος, Α Ρ, 1, 36, few, lat., Σ:
8, αὐτῆ, Α Ρ Κ Ρ, nearly all, Σ:
9, γνῶσιν [γνώσεως], Α Ρ Κ Ρ, nearly all,
g, eg, Σ:
9, τοῦ, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, g, eg, Σ:
12, δύομα μου, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, et, am, εἰ, Σ:
14, καὶ ἥ, Ν:
16, ψυχῆς ὁτὲ καὶ ἡ ἔρωτος, Α Ρ, few, eg, (et om.):
17, οἱ τὰ πλοῖα τοῦ, Α Ρ, 1, 28, 35, 38, 79, 87, 95,
&c., g, eg, (pr om.):
18, πωρ' ἐμοῦ before κρεναίοις, Ν Α Ρ Κ, many, g,
eg, (pr om.), Σ:
18, Ἀλεξάνδρος, Ν Α Ρ Κ, nearly all, lat., Σ:
18, ἐκχύσατο, Ν Α Ρ Κ (P, ἐκχύσας), 7, 28, 36,
few, (lat.?), (Σ):
20, καὶ εἰσελεύσουμαι, Ρ Κ, many, pr:
iv. 1, ὧ φωνῆ, Α Ρ Κ, mss., g, eg, Σ:
2, καὶ εἴδενα, Ρ, 1, 7, &c., εἰ:
3, ἔκαψε, Ρ, nearly all, lat., Σ:
3, καὶ κυνόλαθεν, Α Ρ (Ν om.), many, lat.:
5, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θόρου αὐτοῦ, Ω, most, Σ:
5, αἱ, Ω, most, g, am:
7, ἦς ἀνθρώπου, Α, 11, 13, 36, pr, eg, (g de-
viantes):
8, ἐν ἔκαστον, Ν, 38, Σ (lat.?):
8, αὐτῶν, Ν Α Ρ, many, g, eg, Σ:
9, ἄγος τε, Α Ρ, most, lat., Σ:
9, ἄγος, Ν, 32, 95:
10, ἄγος, Ν, 32:
10, βασιλεῦσι, Α Ρ, many, g, (pr?), (eg?), Σ:
11, δὲ κύριος καί, Ν Α Ρ, most, am, Σ:
11, om. δὲ κύριος, Ν Α Ρ, some, pr, eg:
11, ἰσχοί, Ν Α (Q, 14, 38, ὀχι ἰσχοί), most, g,
eg, (pr?), Σ:

Country Readings.

Α Ρ Κ, nearly all, εἰ, Σ, add ὀχι.
Q, many, om.

Ν, pr, μετανοοῦμεν. 
Α Ρ Κ, 1, 12, 28, some εἰ, om. ἐκεῖ εἰ.
P Κ, many, oṃοιος.
Ν Α Ρ Κ, mss., lat., fut.
Ν Α, after.
Q, many, ins.
Q, many, ins.
Ν Q, most, fut.
Ν, 49, lat., om.
Ν, 14, pr, γνῶση.
Q, many, pr, om.
Q, many, some εἰ, om. μοῦ.
Α Ρ Κ, mss., lat., Σ, om.
Ν Q, most, ζ, ζ. oῦτε ψ.
Ν Ρ, many, Σ, om. ὀτί.
Q, many, after.

P, 7, 36, ἀναγχομοῦν.
Q, most, ἤν ἐκχύσῃ [-ει].

Α Ρ, 1, 7, 28, 36, 38, 79, &c., g, eg, Σ, om. καί.
Ν, pr, prof. ἰδεῖν.
Ν Α Q, most, εἰ, am, Σ, om. καί.
Ν Α, 28, 79, ίπεῖν.
Q, many, Σ, om. καί.
Ν Α Ρ Κ, 1, 36, 38, few, lat., om. αὐτοῦ.
Α Ρ (Ν om.), 1, 36, 94, pr, εἰ, Σ, δ.
P, many, Σ, ὡς ἀνθρώπου; (Ν, ὡς ὅμοιον ἀνθρώπου);
Q, most, ἀνθρώπου.

Α Ρ Κ, most, ἐν καθ' εἰ.
Q, many, pr, om.
Q, many, nomies; (Ν, octises).
Α Ρ Κ, nearly all, lat., Σ, om.
Α Ρ Κ, nearly all, lat., Σ, om.
Ν Q, many, pres.
P, some, εἰ, καίρει.
Q, many, ins.
P, many, εἰκαί.
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Readings of S — continued.

v. 1, ἐξοθεν, P Q, most, lat.:  
2, ἔξωθε, Π A P, 38, few:  
3, om. ἀνω, Π A P, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, 91, &c., lat.:  
4, om. ἐγώ, Π P (A om. vers.), 1, 36, few, g, Σ:  
5, ἐκ, Σ, 14, (lat.?):  
6, ἐστι, Π, most, (lat.?): Σ I:  
7, ἐστιν, Π Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:  
8, ξανθίστων, Π, 1, 36, 49, 79, 87, 91, 96, 97, 98, &c., g, am, (pr, el. —σωμεν):  
9, ἐστιν, Π Q, 36, few, Σ dp, ἐστιν.  
A, 44, om.  
A Q, 7, 14, 28, 35, 38, &c., Σ, pres.  

Counter Readings.

N A, 1, 14, &c., Σ, ἐξοθεν.  
Q, most, lat., Σ, add. ἐστιν.  
Q, many, Σ, ins.  
Q, most, pr, eg, ins.  
A P Q, nearly all, Σ, prefix ἐ.  
A P Q, ms., pr, om, Σ, om.  
N Q, 36, few, Σ dp, ἐστιν.  
A, 44, om.  
A Q, 7, 14, 28, 35, 38, &c., Σ, pres.  

N Q, 28, 35, 38, 79, few, g, Σ, om.  
N Q, 28, 35, 38, few, g, Σ, om.  
most, pr, eg, πάντας; (Q, πάντα καὶ πάντας).  
A P, most, pr, eg, om. καὶ.  
A, 1, 12, λέγοντα.  
A, Σ, om.  
Q, most, ins.  
N A P, 1, 7, 28, 35, 36, 38, 49, 79, &c., lat., Σ, ἐγερον.  
Q, most, am, el, ὅτι.  
P, 1, 28, 79, few, om.  
A C P, many, am, om.  
Q, many, pr, some eg, om.  
N, few, et, cl, ins.  
A P Q, many, πρόπος.  
A, 31, et, om. αὐτῷ.  
A, 7, few, om.  
N A C P, many, lat., Σ, prefix καὶ.  
N Q, many, pr, cl, Σ, ins.  
N A C P, few, pr, ins.  
N A C P, 1, 79, few, Σ, πλ.  
C P Q, most, pr, some eg, Σ, om.  
N Q, most, et, cl, Σ, ins.  

CP, 1, 12, om. αὐτῷ.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings of S — continued.</th>
<th>Counter Readings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi. 8, ἐδὼ ἄνεγ, Q, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td>Ν A C P, 1, 28, 49, 79, &amp;c., &amp; ε. ἀνέγ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, om. τῶν ἄνθρωπων, A C Q, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td>Ν P, 1, 36, 49, 91, 96, few, ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, ἔργαζον, Ν A C Q, most, pr:</td>
<td>A, vt, om. διά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, φονῶ μεγάλη, Ν A C P, 1, 7, &amp;c., lat., Σ:</td>
<td>P, 1, 36, 49, 79, g, eg, Σ, impf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, ἐπὶ χρόνων, C P Q (Κ, ἐπὶ χρ.), ms., cl, Σ:</td>
<td>Q, many, om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, μυρκών, Ν A C P, 1, 28, 36, 38, 79, and few, g, eg. (pr om. vern.), Σ:</td>
<td>A, am, transp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, πληρωθέω, A C, 22, g, eg. (Σ?):</td>
<td>Q, eg, om. kal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποι, Ν A C Q, ms., g, Σ:</td>
<td>Q, many, prefix καί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, καὶ μελλόντες, Ν A C P, many, g, eg, Σ:</td>
<td>Π, many, am, pr, pref. καί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, ἐκεῖ, Ν A C Q, most, g, cl, Σ:</td>
<td>A, 31, g, am, transp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, μέγας ἐγένετο, Ν C P Q, nearly all, pr, cl, Σ:</td>
<td>Α C P, 1, 28, 36, 38, 79, &amp;c., lat., Σ, transp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, μαθαίνει, Ν C Q, 7, 14, 15, 87, 91, 98, &amp;c.:</td>
<td>Π, 1, 33, 49, 87, 91, 96, &amp;c., pr, om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, ἐκεῖ, Ν, 47, eg:</td>
<td>Α C P Q, nearly all, pr, (g om.), Σ, εἰς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, βαθύνουσα, Ν, 35, 87, 90, 97, &amp;c., Σ, (βαθύνουσα, most):</td>
<td>Α C P Q, 14, 36, 49, 92, few, lat., βάθυνοι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, ἡλικιονομός, A C Q (Ν om.), most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td>Α P Q, nearly all, pr, Σ δ, ἀνέγ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 1, Καὶ μετὰ, Ν P Q, ms., Σ:</td>
<td>Α C, lat., om. καί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, ἄαδρα, Ρ, 1, 28, 36, 79, 92, 95, &amp;c., lat., Σ:</td>
<td>Ν A C Q, most, τοῦρο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, ἀναγόμειν, A, 90:</td>
<td>Ν C P Q, nearly all, (lat. ?), Σ, sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, ἔδραφα, Ν C Q, ms., lat., Σ:</td>
<td>Α P, impf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, μᾶτι [μάθ] τῆς, Ν C P Q, most, vt, some eg, Σ:</td>
<td>A, 38, few, am, cl, καί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, νεφελιὰ, Ν, cl, Σ:</td>
<td>Α P Q, ms., vt, am, add. μ; (C, τ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, om. καί ἰδοῦ, A, pr, eg; (C om. ἰδοῦ):</td>
<td>Ν P Q, ms., g, Σ, ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, δὲ, Ν C P Q, ms., lat., Σ:</td>
<td>A, καί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, αὐτόν, Ν A C P, 1, 14, 36, 92, few, Σ:</td>
<td>Q, most, lat., om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, τῷ Θεῷ, Ν C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:</td>
<td>A, 38, genit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, ἐντόμον τοῦ θρόνου, Ν A C P, many, lat.:</td>
<td>Q, many, Σ, add. ἀνέγ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, αἰώνων ἅμων, Ν A P Q, nearly all, g, eg, Σ:</td>
<td>C, 28, pr, om. ἅμων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, μεν, Ν C P Q, nearly all, eg, Σ:</td>
<td>A, 1, vt, om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, αὖθες Ν A P, 1, 49, 79, 91, 96, &amp;c., g, eg, Σ:</td>
<td>Q, most, (pr ?), om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, διακόσων, Ρ, 1, 35, 36, 38, 87, 152, g:</td>
<td>Α P Q, nearly all, g, add. ξρ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, πικάντον, Ν, 36, pr, eg, Σ:</td>
<td>Ν A Q, most, pr, eg, Σ, add. ξρ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Readings of S—continued.

viii. 2, Ἰδόντασαν, Ἡ C P Q, most, lat., Σ dlp:
5, καὶ ἄπερετοι, Π Q, ms., Σ, (lat.?):
6, μεγαμένα, Λ Q, most, g, ey, Σ:
8, om. ἄγγελος, Ν:
8, om. πυρός, Q, many:
9, ὃ ἐν τῇ θεῷ, Λ P Q, nearly all, Σ:
9, τῶν ἐν τῇ θεῷ, Λ P Q, many, g, h, (pr. piskeum), Σ:
9, ψυχῆ, Ν:
9, δικαίων, Q, many, lat.:
11, εἰς ἀφελθον, Ν, 7, 28, 49, 79, few, lat.:
12, μὴ φαγῇ, before τῷ τρώσαν αὐτῷ, Λ P, most, eg, (et?) Σ:
13, ἓν, Α Q, ms., lat., Σ:
13, ἐντι, Ν Α Q, most, lat., Σ:
ix. 2, om. καὶ ἥρωιτο... ἄβουσον, Ν Q, most, am:
4, ὁδεῖ πὴν, Λ Π Q, nearly all, g, ey, Σ:
4, μετάνεϊν αὕτων, Q, most, pr, el, Σ:
6, φιλεῖται, Q, most, lat., Σ:
6, ὁ δάναρασ before ἐν αὐτῶν, Λ P Α P, 1, 28, 36, 38, 79, &c., lat., Σ:
7, ὅμοιος χρυσός, Λ Π Α P, 1, 28, 35, 36, 79, 87, &c., lat., Σ:
10, ἡ εἰσουσία αὐτῶν, Λ Π Α P, 1, 35, 36, 87, &c., g, pr, ey:
11, καὶ ἐκεῖνων, P, 1, &c., lat., Σ:
11, εἰς αὕτων before βασιλέα, Λ Π Α P, 1, 14, 28, 36, 79, 92, &c.:
11, ὅ, ᾿Α, h, pr, ey, Σ:
11, καὶ ἐκ, Λ Π Α P, 1, 36, few, pr, ey:
12, ἐρχεῖται, Α Λ Π, 7, 14, 49, &c., Σ:
12, 13, obai. Meτα τάφρα δ, Ν:
13, τυχερόν, P Q, most, pr, el:
15, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν, Q, many, Σ:
16, δῶο [dōs], Λ Π Α P, 1, 28, 36, 79, &c., g, ey, (pr, δοτῶ), Σ:
16, μετείκάς, Ν, Σ dlp:
18, ἐκ τοῦ κατον, C P, 1 few, g, el, Σ:
18, ἐκ τοῦ θείου, P, 1, 31, 79, &c., g, Σ:
20, οὔτε [οὔτo] μετενόγος, Λ Π Α P Q, many, lat., Σ:

Counter Readings.

A, 35, 87, 93, 95, 96, Σ n, sing.
A, 16, 28, Σ dlp, after β. before φ.

Σ Q, αὕτων.
Ν P, some, some ey, (pr ?), sing.
Δ P Q, ms., lat., Σ, ins.
Λ Α P, many, lat., Σ, ins.
Ν 35, 68, 87, (lat. ?), ins.
Q, many, el, om. τῶν, (απ om. clause).
 Δ P Q, ms., g, ey, (pr ?), Σ, plur.
Λ Α P, 1, 28, 49, 79, 91, 96, &c., Σ, plur.
Λ Π Q, nearly all, Σ, εἰς ἀφελθον.
Q, many, after.

Ν P om.
P, 1, 7, 28, 36, 79, few, ἄγγελον.
Δ P, 1, 7, 28, 36, 38, 49, 79, 87, 91, 96, few, et, el, Σ, ins.
Ν 38, pr, om.
Λ Α P, 1, 28, 79, few, g, am, om. pron.
Δ P (Ν, φυγῇ), 1, 36, 38, few, pres.
Q, most, after.

Q, most, χρυσοῖ.
Σ Q, most, Λ, Σ, εἰσουσίαν ἐκεῖνων.
Λ Α Q, most, om. καί.
Q, many, lat., Σ, after.

A Π Q, ms., g, om.
Q, most, g h, Σ, εν δί.
P Q, most, lat., plur.
A Π, 1, 28, 49, 87, &c., lat., Σ, obai metà τάφρα. Kai δ;
A Π, many, om. εἰς τὴν, (σ om. clause).
Q, most, om.

A Π Q, ms., lat., Σ n, nominat.
Σ Α Q, most, am, om. εκ, (pr om. clause).
Σ Α C Q, most, eg, om. εκ, (pr om. clause).
C, many, οὔ μετε.  

*C hist. viii. 5—ix. 16.
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Readings of S—continued.

ix. 20, ξῦλων, before λίθων, Ν:

21, πορονέα, C R Q, ms., lat., Σ:

x. 1, ἀλλον, Ν A C, 35, 36, 38, 87, few, lat., Σ:

2, βιβλιάριτιον [-ιάριτιον], Α C R Q, 1, &c., Σ:

3, τοῖς . . . φοινίκας, Ν, 7, g, (pr om.):

4, δέ, C R Q, nearly all, eg, Σ:

5, om. τὸν δέκατον, Α, 1, 36, few, eg:

6, om. καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, Ν Α, 38, 49, 98, &c., et:

7, ἐκείνῳθε, Ν A C R Q, most, Σ ἀνά:

8, δούλους ἀντονό, Σ, many, (lat.?), (Σ?):

9, βιβλιάριτιον [-ιάριτιον], Α C R Q, most, Σ:

10, δούλους ἀντονό [-τονό], Α C R Q, 1, 14, 28, 36, 49, 79, 91, 96, &c., pr, (g om.), Σ:

11, διήγα, P, 1, 7, 28, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, &c.,

et, et, Σ:

xi. 1, καὶ εἰσηκεῖν ὁ ἄγγελος, Ο, 14, 35, 36, 49, 79, 91, 96, &c.,

et, et, Σ:

2, τὸν Ἰωάθην, Ν, 1, 35, 87, few:

2, ἐπὶ βαλε Ἰωάθην, Α, 1, 14, 28, 35, 36, 49, 79, 87, 91, 92, 96, Σ:

4, δόῳ λυγιῶν, Ν, (Σ?):

4, oi [al] ἐνεσιν, Α C R Q, most, g, Σ:

5, ἐστοῦτε, Α C R Q, most, Σ:

5, θελεῖ (2), C R Q, nearly all, pr, Σ:

5, αὐποῦ (2) after θ, δεξίῇς, Ν:

6, τὸν ὀφραῖν ἀπὸ λειώνα, Α C R Q, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, &c., lat., Σ:

6, ἐπὶ πάση πληγῇ before διακέις, Α C R Q, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, &c., lat., Σ:

8, τὰ πτώματα, Α C R Q, 1, 35, 36, 38, 49, 79, 87, 91, &c., lat., Σ:

9, φιλῶν καὶ λαῷ, Ν, et, Σ:

9, τὰ πτώματα (1), P, 1, 28, 36, 38, 49, 79, 91, 95, 96, &c., g, (pr om.), Σ:

9, καὶ ἰμοῦσο, Α C R Q, 28, 49, 79, 95, &c., g, (pr om.), Σ:

9, ἀφῆσθε, Ο, most, et, et, Σ:

10, εἰσφάγανθεναί, Ο, most, lat., Σ:

10, πέμποντα, Α C, 1, many, lat., Σ, (Ο, many, διός τον)

Counter Readings.

Α C R Q, ms., lat., Σ, after.

Ν A, πορνηέας.

Ρ Q, most, om.

Q, most, et, βιβλιάν.

Α C R Q, ms., eg, Σ, ac ms.

5, 37, 79, et (quae), δος.

Α C R Q, nearly all, et, Σ, ins.

C P Q, most, eg, Σ, ins.

Q, many, lat. (fut.), Σ, τελεσθή.

ταυτοῦ δοῦλου, Ν A C R Q, most.

Α C, 6, 14, lat., βιβλιάν.

Ν Q, most, eg, βιβλιάν.

Α Q, 36, after .

Ν Α Q, most, am, &c., plural.

Ν Α P, most, lat., om.

Α P Q, most, lat., Σ, τὴν Ιωάθην.

Q, most, (eg?, et om.), ἐβαλε Ἰωάν; (Ν, ἐβ. Ἰωάν, P, ἐβ. Ιωάθην).

Α C R Q, ms., pref. al, (lat.?)

Ν, 7, 14, 35, 87, 82, 95, &c., pr, eg, om. art.

P, 1, 7, 28, 36, 38, 49, 79, 91, 95, &c., et, ἐστώσις.

Ν A, subj. (38, fut.), g, eg.

Α C Ρ Q, many, g, eg, between; (many, pr, Σ, before).

Q, many, before ἤζωσαν.

after θελήσων, Q, most.

Α C Q, most, sing.

Α C R Q, ms., lat., Σ, τραπέζη.

Ν A C Q, most, sing.

Q, many, om. καί.

Ν A C Q, 1, 28, 36, 79, few, am, &c., pres.

Ν A C Q, 1, 28, 36, 79, few, pres.

Ρ, 28, 36, 79, few, some eg, πέμποντα.

* C hist, x. 10 (ἔφαγεν)–xi. 3.
Readings of S—continued.

xi. 11, τρεῖ, Ν Π, 1, 14, 28, 35, 36, 38, 49, 91, 96, 152, &c., lat. ?:

12, ἡκουον, Ν Α Α Π, few, τγ:
12, αὐτοῖς, Ν Α Π Π Π, nearly all, τγ, Σ:
13, καὶ ἐκ τέκνης, Α Α Π Π, 1, many, lat., Σ:
13, ἐκρο, Ν Α Π Π, 1, 36, 95, few, πρ, τγ, Σ:
13, ἐν φόβοι, Ν Π, 14, πρ, (τγ, in timorem):
15, πτο, Α Π Π Π, most, lat., Σ:
16, οἱ ἐνοικοίν, Ν Π Π, most, lat., Σ:
16, κάθηται [-μενού], Α Π Π, most, lat.:
17, δεῖ, Α Π Π, most, lat., Σ:
18, διαφθείρανται, Σ, 7, 35, 45, 87, 91, 96, few, lat., Σ:
19, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, Ν Π Π, most, πρ, τγ, Σ:
19, αὐτοῦ, Α Α Π, 1, 28, 35, 36, 79, 87, 85, &c., Σ:
19, καὶ σειρόμενο, Α Α Π Π, most, lat., Σ:

xii. 2, ἵσθιον καὶ, Ν Π, 95, et, am:
2, κραίζουσα [κραίζει], am, Ν Π Π, some:
2, καὶ ἄδιόναυσα, Α, Σ:
3, μέλαι before πυρ, Α Π, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, 87, 91, 95, 96, &c., τγ:
3, πυρός, Κ, Q, 1, many, Σ:
4, ἐστήκει, Ο, Σ; (14, 92, ἐστη): 4, ἐστε, Ν Π Π, most, έπ:
7, ὁ Μακρός, Ν Π Π Π, mss., lat.:
8, ἱσθοῦνται, Α Π Π Π, 1, 28, 36, 79, many, lat., Σ;
(Q, 14, ἱσθοῦν):
9, ὁ δῆς, Α Π Π Π, nearly all, έγ, τγ, Σ:
12, [σατά]σκυρνούσεν, Α Π Π Π Π, most, Σ:
14, δίο, Ν Π, most, (lat. ?): 14, διός τρέφεται, Κ, most:

17, ἐπὶ τῇ, Ν Π Π Π, mss., lat., Σ:
18, ἐπάθην, Ρ, Π, nearly all:

xiii. 1, ὅνυμα, Ν Π Π, 1, 28, 79, 95, &c., et:
2, λεπτοῖς, Σ, 14, 92, Σ:
3, εἰ τών, Ν Α Π, most, lat., Σ:
4, ἐς [τέ] ἐκεῖς, Ν Α Π Π, 35, 36, 79, 87, 95, &c., πρ, am, Σ:
4, δύναι, Ν Α Π Π, 1, 28, 35, 36, 38, 49, 79, 87, 95, 97, &c., lat., Σ:
5, ἐλασφημίαν, Ρ, Π, most, Σ Χ; (am, genit. sing.):

Counter Readings.

A C Q, many, Σ, pref. art.
Q, most, (pr om.), Σ δε [I om.; η, ἡκουον], ἡκουον.
(A, 28, g, om., (pr om. clause).
Q, many, om. καί.
Q, many, ἵμπρα.
A C P Q, nearly all, g, Σ, ἵμπρα.
(Α, 12, 18, 38, 40, in.
A Q, 1, 7, 14, 92, 95, few, om. οί.
A Q, many, Σ, pref. οί [οί].
(Α, some, lat., pref. καί.
A P Q, most, pres. ptcp.
A C, 14, 35, 38, 87, 92, 95, few, g, h, pref. δ.
Q, most, g, (pr hist), τγ, τού Κυρίου; (Ν, 94, h, τού Θεοῦ).
Q, many, om.
A P Q, nearly all, καί, Σ, om. καί.
Q, some, pr, some τγ, ἵσθεν; (C, some, g, καί, Σ, impf.)
C Q, most, et, Σ, after.
A Π, many, lat., πυρρός.
A P Q, nearly all, ἵστηκε, (lat., statēt).
C, few, πρ, πρ, τγ, Σ, om.
A, Σ, δέ τε Μ.
A, many, ἵστηκεν.

Ν, 1, pr, om. δ.
Ν, few, lat., κατοξιώτες.
A C P, 7, 28, 36, 79, 95, few, Σ, pref. al.
A C P, 1, 28, 36, 79, 94, 95, few, lat., Σ, διόν τρέφεται.

C, pr, om. ἐπί.
Α C, 87, 92, lat., Σ, ἐστήκη.
A Q, most, τγ, Σ, plur.
A C P Q, nearly all, lat., sing.
Q, few, om. εκ.
Q, most, καί, τῇ δεδουκεί.
Q, most, δινάοις.

(Α, some, (ἐλασφημίας), Α, some, (ἐλασφημα), καί, (g τη), (pr om.), Σ δε, plur.
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xiii. 5, ποιήσα, Α C P, 1, 28, 36, 79, 95, few, g, εγ.
Q, many, add. πολεμον; (N, δ' ἔλεει).

7, καὶ ἐδόθη . . . . . . νικήσα αὕτης, Ν Q, most, lat., Σ:
Α C P, 1, 14, 92, few, om.

10, εἰς ἀληθεύων διόν, A, am and some εγ.; (S, with 33, 35, 87, ει., &c., Σ, ins. ἐν [ἐν] ὑγείας:
N C P, many (others vary), semel.

10, ἀποκτείνει, N, 28, 35, 73, 79, 95, g, Σ:
C P Q, nearly all, fut.; (A, ἀποκτείνῃ τινα).

12, θεάντων αὕτω, N A C Q, nearly all, Σ:
P, 14, 92, lat., om. αὕτω.
Q, most, after.

13, ένα before καὶ πάρο, N A C P, 1, 35, 38, 87, &c., lat. (pr om. καί), Σ:
A C Q, most, lat., after.

13, καταβαίνειν, N A C P, 1, 28, 35, 38, 79, 95, &c., εγ. (pr, ptep.), Σ:
Q, most, καταβάτην.

14, διὰ τὰ σημεῖα . . . . . εἰς τῆς γῆς, N A C P, most, lat.:
N A C P, many, εγ., εἰς.
Q, Σ, om.

14, δ, N, 1, many, εγ.:

14, ἐκεῖ, N A C P, 1, many, lat.:

14, [ἀν] τῆς μαχαίρας καὶ ἡγεσί, N A C P, many, lat., Σ:
A C P Q, 28, 35, 79, 87, 92, &c., τὸ, δ', (Σ ?).

15, δοῦναι before πνεύμα, N A P, 1, many, lat., Σ:
Q, most, Σ, impf.

15, om. ἵνα καί . . . . . η εἰσὶ ό τοὺς θηρίους, C, 14, 28, 73, 79, few, Σ:
Q, many, after; (C om. δοῦναι).

15, ἵνα δοῦν, Α P, 7, 36, 95, few, ετ., εἰ, Σ:
N A P Q, most, lat., ἑνεπ, ins.

16, χάραγμα, N A C P, 1, 28, 35, 38, 79, 95, 97, 98, &c., lat., Σ:
A P Q, (C om. clause), most, lat., ποιήσῃ.

17, ἵνα, N C, 28, 79, 96, few, pr, some εγ., Σ:
N Q, 14, 28, 35, 38, 79, 97, 99, 93, 94, 98, &c.,

17, τοῦ ὄντος των, C, pr, some εγ., Σ:
Q, many, Σ, ins.

18, om. [καί] ἐκείνος αὐτοῦ, N:
A, Ἐ, pref. τοῦ.

18, ἐξήκοντα, N A P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
P, some, φωνήν.

xiv. 1, om. ἐρήμος, N A C P, many, lat.:
N A C Q, ms., &c., lat.

1, γεγοραμένων, N C P Q, ms., lat.:
A C P Q, most, g, εγ., pref. καί.

2, ἐπὶ φωνήν, Ν A C Q, many, lat., Σ:
A C P Q, ms., &c., Σ, ins.

3, ἐπὶ φόδην, A C, 1, 28, 36, 79, 95, &c., εγ.:
C, 5, 11, δέκα.
Q, many, Σ, ins.

4, ὅτε εἰσ toward after ἐν τῷ στ. αὕτω, N A C P, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, 91, 95, 96, &c., lat., Σ:
A C, 7, 28, 36, 87, few, pr, (Σ ?), ὅτανεν.
Q, 7, 14, 38, &c., Σ, pref. ὅταν ἦν.

N, 16, 39, pr, ἀνε ἀγάπη.
Q, 7, 14, 35, 38, &c., before.
Readings of S—continued.

xiv. 5, γάρ, Ν Κ Q, nearly all, cl, Σ:
  6, δὲνον, Α C P, 49, 79, 91, 95, &c., lat., Σ:
  6, ἀπ' τού, Ν Κ Α C P, 33, 33:
  6, καθάμενον, Ν Κ Α C P Q, most, lat.:
  7, θεόν, Α C P, 1, 28, 49, 79, 91, 95, 96, &c., pr, am, Σ:
  8, om. ἄγγελος, Ν, 95:
  8, ἔσεσε δίς, Δ Π, 1, 28, 36, 49, 79, 91, 95, &c., lat., Σ:
  8, η, Α C, 35, 38, 90, 95, &c., eg, Σ:
  8, αὐτῆς, Α C P, most, lat., Σ:
  9, αὐτοῖς, Ν Κ Α C P Q, mss., g, eg, Σ:
  10, ἐκ της ποτηρίου, Ν Κ Α C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
  10, βασιλεῦσιν, Ν Κ Α C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
  11, αἰώνας, Ν Κ Q, most, lat., Σ:
  11, αἰώνων, Ν Κ Α C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
  13, ἐκ τοῦ ὄλσων before λέγοντες, Α C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
  13, Κυρίος, Ν Α Q, mss., lat.:
  13, ἀποθητήσαντες ἀπάρτις, Σ, many, am, Σ:
  13, πρὶν before λέγω, Α C P, many, lat., Σ:
  15, [τοῦ] θερισμοί, Α C Π Q, nearly all, lat., Σ:
  18, ἐξήλθεν, Ν Κ Α C P Q, mss., cl, Σ:
  18, ὁ εἰς, Δ Π, g, eg, Σ:
  18, φωνῇ, Ν Α Q, 38, 95, few, g, h, eg (pr om.):
  18, τὸ δράπανον before σον, Σ:
  18, ἴκμασαν αἱ σταθμαῖ, Ν Α C P, 1, 7, 28, 38, 49, 79, &c., g, h, (pr om.), eg, Σ:
  18, αὐτῆς, Ν Κ Α C P, 1, 28, 49, 79, &c., g, h, eg, Σ:
  19, ἐκ της γῆς, Σ, 38, 97:
  19, τὴν μεγάλην, Ν, 1, 7, 28, 33, 79, 87, 91, 94, 95, 97, 98, &c.:
  20, διακοσίων, Ν, 26:

-xv. 2, τοῦ θηρίου before τοῦ ἐλεόνος, Ν Α C P Q, many, lat., Σ:
  2, τοῦ τῆς ἐλεόνος, Α C Π Q, nearly all, Σ:
  3, αἰώνων, Κ C, 18, 95, eg (am, colorum), Σ:
  4, add. στ., Ν, 7, 38, 95, few, cl, Σ:
  4, δοῦνα, Ν Κ Α C P Q, &c., 1, 28, 36, 38, 79, pr, eg, Σ:
  4, πάντα τὰ ἄθνη, Ν Κ Α C P, many, lat., Σ:
  6, om. εἰς, Ν Κ Q, many, lat., Σ:
  6, of χαράτες, Α C, many, Σ:
  6, ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, Ν Κ Α C P, 1, 7, 28, 36, 79, 94, &c., lat., Σ:
  6, om. ὁ ἰσας, Ν Κ Α C P, many, lat.:

Counter Readings.

A C P, 12, et, am, om.
Μ Κ Q, many, om.
Q, most, τοῖς; (38, 97, lat., Σ, τοῖς).
Α, 14, 28, 79, 92, &c., Σ, κατακοινωνεῖα.
Q, most, g, cl, κατακοινωνεῖα.
A C Π Q, nearly all, lat., Σ, om. 3ς
C Q (Μ Κ om. clause), many, semel.

P Q, most, et, om.
Q, some, ταύτης.
A, pr, αὐτῆς.
A, 7, 16, 39, ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου.
A, 8, 14, 36, 92, plur.
C P, 1, 7, 14, 28, 79, 92, sing.
C, 28, 79, sing.
Ν, 38, after.

Α C P Q, Χριστῷ (Σ, Θεός).
Q, many, et, cl, ἀποθητήσαντες ἀπάρτις; (Ν Α C, ?).
Q, many, after; (Μ Κ om.).
Ν, 38, τοῦ θερισμοῦ.
A, et, am, om.
Μ Π Q, mss., h, pr, om. δ.
C P, most, Σ, κραυγῇ.
A C P Q, mss., Σ, after; (lat. ?).
Q, many, sing.
Q, many, Σ, τῆς γῆς.
A C P Q, nearly all, lat., Σ, εἰς την γ.
A C P Q, 14, 38, 49, 90, 92, 96, &c., pr, Σ, τοῦ μέγαν; (g, eg ?).
A C Π Q, nearly all, lat., Σ, ἵδαφ.
Q, many, after.
Μ, 7, 38, few, h, pr, (g, eg ?), om. ἵδαφ.
Α P Q, nearly all, et, ἵδαφ.
A C Π Q, most, et, am, &c., om.
Q, most, g, ἰσας.
Q, 7, 14, &c., χαράτες.
Μ Π Q, many, (lat. ?), om.
Q, many, om.
Q, many, Σ, ins.
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**Readings of S—continued.**

| xv. 6, λίνον [λινον, -οῦς], ΝΡQ, nearly all, et, | Counter Readings. |
| 7, ἐπτὰ φόλας, ACPQ, mss., lat., Σ: | A C, 38, 48, 90, am, &c., λίνον. |
| 8, ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ, Q, many, Σ: | Ν, some eg, om. ἐπτά. |
| xvi. 1, ἐκ τοῦ γαστρού, Α ΣΡ, many, lat., Σ ἀντί: | Α ΣΡ, many, lat., om. ἐκ τοῦ. |
| 1, ἐπτὰ φόλας, Α Σ Ρ, most, g, pr, sg, Σ: | Q, many, Σ, om. |
| 3, δεύτερος ἄγγελος, Q (X om.), nearly all, cl, Σ: | A C P, 18, 35, et, am, om. ἄγγελος. |
| 3, ἕώρα, Ρ Σ Q, nearly all, g, h, (pr om.), eg: | A C, 95, Σ, om. |
| 3, ἐν τῇ βαλάστῳ, Ρ Q, mss., lat.: | Α, 18, 31, ἐν τῷ. |
| 4, εἰς τοῦ, ACPQ, nearly all, lat., Σ: | Α ΣΡ, 49, 79, 91, 95, 96, few, et, some eg, om. prep. |
| 4, εἰς τάς, Q, most, Σ, most eg, τῶι τάς: | Α ΣΡ, nearly all, eg, sing. |
| 4, ἐγένοντο, Α, 36, 95, et, Σ: | Ν, 36, 39, plur. |
| 6, αἱμα, ACPQ, nearly all, lat., Σ: | ACPQ, nearly all, lat., Σ, after. |
| 6, ἄθωσας before ἀθωσι, Ν, 14, 92: | Α ΣΡ, am, &c.; (Σ prep. ἀθωσι, or ἀθωσι). |
| 6, ἄγγελος, Ν, 1, 28, 35, 36, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, | ACPQ, many, g, am, Σ, om. |
| &c., pr, cl: | Ν, many, after. |
| 8, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους before ἐν πυρί, ACPQ, | Q, most, Σ, inst. |
| many, lat., Σ: | Ρ, 38, om. ἐκ. |
| 9, om. οἱ ἄνθρωποι, Ν Α C P, 1, 38, 36, 79, 95, | Α ΣΡ, most, Σ, (lat. ?), sing. |
| &c., lat.: | Ν C, three mss., om. |
| 11, ἐκ τῶν ἑλκῶν, Α Σ Ρ, nearly all, lat., Σ: | Q, many, after. |
| 11, ἐκ τῶν ἑλκῶν, Α Σ Ρ, nearly all, lat., Σ: | Α, 1, 79, 95, few, ἐκτοιχίσθη. |
| 12, ἰδανολῶν, Α, 1, 28, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, &c., | Α, 14, 38, 92, 95, few, g, eg, om. |
| (lat.?): | A Q, nearly all, lat., Σ, plur. |
| 13, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καί, Α Q, nearly | A, 1, 12, 46, om. |
| all, lat., Σ: | Q, many, add. τοῦ ὕπατος; (1, 28, 36, 79, &c., g, om. |
| 13, τρία before ἀκάθαρτα, Α Σ Ρ, 1, 7, 28, 36, | Ν, τοῦ ὕπατος; (1, 28, 36, 79, &c., g, om. |
| 38, 79, 91, 95, 96, &c., pr, eg, (g om.), Σ: | τοῦ ὕπατος). |
| 14, ἐκ τοῦ, A Q, nearly all, lat., Σ: | Q, many, pr, some eg, om. verb. |
| 14, ἐκ τοῦ, A Q, nearly all, lat., Σ: | Α, 38, sing. |
| 14, ἐκεῖνος, Q, most, pr, (Σ?): | Ν, Σ, sing. |
| 15, ξυστήρως, Ν, 38, 47: | Α ΣΡ, few, (?), masc. |
| 15, ξυστήρως, Ν, 38, 47: | Α ΣΡ, few, (lat. ?), (?), masc. |
| 17, ἅπας, Α Σ, 14, 92, 95, few, pr, eg, Σ: | Α Σ Ρ, 1, 7, 36, 38, &c., lat., Σ, inst. |
| 18, σκυσμός ἐγένετο μέγας, Α Σ, 1, 14, 28, 36, | *See note in loc.* |
| 49, 79, 91, 92, 95, 96, &c., g, eg, most, Σ: | *P hist, xvi. 12—xvii. 1.* |
| 18, ἀνθρώπως ἐγένετο, Ν, Σ, nearly all, g, eg, | *C hist, xvi. 13 (ἐς ἐναρξαί)—xviii. 2.* |
| (pr om.), Σ: | *2* |
| 19, αἱ πόλεις ... ἐκπεσαν, A Q, mss., lat.: | |
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Readings of S—continued.

Q, most, et, τῆς γῆς; (N, Σ, αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς γῆς; P om.).

P Q, many, om. ἐκ; (N, 38, dat.).

Q, many, om. καὶ.

A P Q, nearly all, Σ, after.

N P, 1, 14, 36, 49, 79, 92, 96, &c., pr, am, after.

N P Q, nearly all, Σ, infin.

Q, mss., θαυμάζοντα; (lat. ?).

Q, many, pr, eg, τῆν γῆν.

A Q, many, Σ, sing.

Q, many, after.

A P, many, δὲ after αὐτῶν; (N after μείναν).

N Q, many, (Σ ?), obvoc.

A, some eg, oèc.

N P Q, mss., g, λέγει.

Q, 1, 36, 97, &c., om.

A, 79, g, eg, om.

Q, many pref. ἐκ.

Q N, many, semel.

N Q, most, pr, eg, om. καὶ μείνα.

N A Q, most, lat., Σ, ins.

A C, am, om.

C Q, most, pr, sing.

N CP, 38, after.

N A C Q, most, g, eg, (pr deviates), om. αὐτῆς.

N Q, 7, 14, 38, &c., add. αὐτῆς.

N A C Q, most, lat., Σ, om. αὐτῆς.

N A C P, 1, 49, 91, 95, &c., et, pres.

A C Q, most, Σ, with following; (N neutral).

Q, most, μαργαρίζου; (A, -ίσας; C P, -ίσας).

A, eg, λίθου.

Q N, many, genit.

N A C P, 35, 36, 79, 87, &c., g, am, Σ, ins.

Q, some, om.

Q, nearly all, g, cl, Σ, om. σου.

N A C P, 95, pr, am, om. σου.

Q, most, et, εἰρην. 
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Readings of \( \Sigma \)—continued.

|xviii. 15, κλαίωντες, Ν Α C P, many, lat.: Q, many, Ξ, prof. καὶ.
16, καὶ λέγοντες, P, many, pr, εγ.: Ν A C Q, many, g, Ξ, om. καὶ.
16, οὐδὲ διά, Ν A C P F, many, (35, 87, ter), lat., Ξ:
18, κατὰντιόν, Ξ C P Q, nearly all, et, Ξ:
18, om. ταῦτα, Ν A P Q, mas., pr, Ξ:
19, [τῷ] ἔθαλον, Ν A C Q, nearly all, et, Ξ:
19, ἔκραζον, Α C, 35, 85, Ξ:
19, καὶ λέγοντες, P Q, most, g, am, Ξ:
19, οὐδὲ διὰ, Α C P Q, most, (36, 87, ter), lat., Ξ:
20, καὶ ἀπόστολον, Ν A P Q, most, pr, εγ, Ξ:
21, μύλον, P Q, most, g, (pr ?), Ξ δίποτε:
21, om. et ἀστή, Α C P Q, nearly all, lat., Ξ:
22, σάλπτενος (Ν, 35, 87, Ξ, plur.):
22, om. καὶ φωνὴ μύλου... eti, Ξ, 38, 87, 93, 98, few, Ξ:
23, άκοντις, C, it, am, cl, Ξ:
23, φωνῇ σοι, C, et, am:
23, φωνῇ νεόμοιρος, C:
24, αἷμα, Ν A C P, 1, 38, 79, few, lat., (Ξ ?):
25, δάχτυλον καὶ λαμπρόνιον, Α C P Q, (Ν om. ἦ δάχτυλον), few, εγ, (pr om. ἦ δάχτυλον):
26, καὶ φῶς... eti, Ν C P Q, nearly all, et, am, cl, Ξ:
27, καὶ λαμπρόνιον καὶ λαμπρόνιον, 1, 36, few; (λ. καὶ καθ., Q, many, cl, Ξ):
9, τινὶ γάμου, Α Q, most, pr, εγ, Ξ:
9, καὶ λέγει μοι οἴδας, Α P Q, most, lat., Ξ:
10, λόγος, Α P Q, mas., lat.:
11, οἱ διέλθεντες, Α, 4, 48:
11, τοῦ θεοῦ before εἰρεί, Α P Q, most, lat., Ξ:
10, καὶ προσκυνήσαν, P, 1, 38, 79, cl, Ξ:
11, καλοῦμενος, Ν Q, most, et, am, cl, Ξ:
12, ὃς φίλες, Α, 35, 36, 87, 91, 95, &c., lat., Ξ:
12, om. ὁ δυνατά γεγραμένα καὶ, Α P (Ν om. farther), 1, 7, 36, 79, &c., lat.:
14, om. τῶν before εἰρεί ὁδηγοῦ [τοῦ ὁδηγοῦ], Ν Q, 1, 7, 35, 38, 79, 87, 95, &c., g:
14, ἐνδεικνύεις, Ξ, 152:
14, καὶ καθαρῶν, Ξ, few, g, cl:
15, om. διάστομος, Ν A P, 1, 36, 38, 79, &c., g, am.:
16, ἄλλον, Ξ, 36; (Α P, 1, 38, 49, 87, 91, 95, 96, &c., lat., Ξ ὁ:

Counter Readings.

Q, many, Ξ, prof. καὶ.
Ν A C Q, many, g, Ξ, om. καὶ.
Q, many, semel.
Α, 10, εγ, τόπον.
C, g, εγ, ins.
P, few, ετ, impf.
Ν P Q, nearly all, g, (pr ?), impf.
Ν A C, 1, 35, 87, 95, &c., pr, ετ, om. καὶ.
Ν, 36, 95, few, semel.
C, few, g, om. καὶ οἶ.
Α (μυλονος), C (μυλικον), εγ (μολαριη), Ξ P; (Ν, λιθον).
Ν Q, 14, 92, ins.
Α C P Q, mas., lat., σαλπτενων.
Α C P Q, most, lat., ins.
Α, 26, some εγ, om.
Ν P Q, mas. ετ, Ξ, ins. εν.
Ν A P Q, mas., lat., Ξ, om. φωνη.
Q, most, plur.
Q, many, g, Ξ, after.
Ν C P, om. καὶ.
Ν A P, few, ετ, am, om. καὶ.
Ν P, 1, 36, 79, few, g, om.
Ν, 36, 38, 98, few, om. καὶ λέγει μοι.
Ν, Ξ*, add. μοι.
Ν P Q, nearly all, (lat ?), Ξ, om. art.
Ν, 1, 38, 49, 79, 91, after.
Ν A Q, nearly all, lat., Ξ, προσκυνήσαν.
Α P, 1, 7, 39, &c., some εγ, om.
Ν P Q, most, om.
Q, many, Ξ*, ins.
Α P, many, pr, εγ, Ξ, ins.
A P Q, nearly all, lat., Ξ, nominat.
A P Q, most, pr, am, Ξ, om. καὶ.
Q, most, pr, ετ, Ξ*, ins.
Q, many, Ξ, om.

* C hist, xix. 5 (et al μέγ.) add. fn.
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**Readings of S—continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xix. 18</td>
<td>καὶ μικρῶν, ΝΑ P, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>μέρι αὐτῶν δ᾽, Ν P (A, 41, prof. ol), 14, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, few, el, (pr, am?):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 1*</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ χείρι, Ν, 38, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>οὕτω τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄλλην, Ν A, 1, 79, 95, &amp;c., lat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>χώλα, Ν A, 1, 49, 79, 91, 96, &amp;c., (lat.?):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>οὕτω λοιποὶ . . . χώλα ἐπὶ, Ν, 7, 14, 92, &amp;c., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>χώλα, Α, most, (lat.?):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ὅταν τελεσθῇ, Ν A, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>πάντα, Ν, 79:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ἐν ταῖς, Ν, 14, 35, 87, 92, few:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>καὶ συναγαγεῖν, Ν, 73, 79, 152, few, lat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ἀντὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Π Q, many, g, εγ., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>δούλοι, Ν, some, some εγ.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ἐκάνα αὐτοῦ, Ν, 38, Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>μεγάλους, &lt;&lt;μεκρούς, ΝΑ P, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ἔργα αὐτῶν, Ν A P, most, εγ., ετ;?, Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx. 1*</td>
<td>οὐκέτι θεῖον [-ν], Ν A Q, 38, 92, 94, 97, &amp;c., pr [Aug.], Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ἐκ τοῦ ὃδρανοῦ, ἀνθρωποι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ν A Q, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ὃδρανοῦ, Π Q, nearly all, et; Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>λαοῦ, Π Q, most, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>μέρι αὐτῶν [-και] ἄστα, Α Q, many, g, εγ., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>αὐτοῖς [-όν] Θεοῖς, Α, εγ., Σ; (Π, 79, &amp;c., Θεοῖς αὐτῶν):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>om. ἀντ' αὑτῶν, Ν A P, many, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>καθάριον πάντα, Ν A P, 1, 35, 39, 49, 79, 87, 91, 96, &amp;c., lat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ins. μοι, before γράφων, Π P, many el:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>πιτοῦ ἀνθρωποι, Α Q, many, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>γέγονα [-αυτῷ], Α, 38, Iren.; (41, 94, γέγονε; lat., factum est):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ἐγώ, Π P Q, nearly all, Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>δώσω, Ν A P, many, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>αὐτοῖς κληρονομῆσαι, Ν A P, 1, 7, 38, 49, 79, 91, &amp;c., lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ἄστα, Α:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>μοι νῦν, Α P Q, nearly all, lat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>καὶ ἀμεταλλαῖον, Ο Q, most, Σ*:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>τὴν κύριον πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, Ν A P, 1, 35, 38, 79, 87, few, lat., Σ:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counter Readings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q, 14, 36, 38, 92, 98, om. καί.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, most, g, Σ, δ μέρι αὑτῶν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α Q, nearly all, ἐκ τῆς χειρα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α Q, many, Σ, ins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, most, Σ, prof. art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α Q, many, lat., ins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β Q, 14, 38, 92, few, Σ, prof. art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, many, μερα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q, nearly all, lat., Σ, om.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q, most, lat., Σ, prof. τα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α Q, most, Σ, om. καί.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q, 79, few, pr [Aug.], om.; (Ν om. clause).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α P Q, most, et, am, el, Σ add. καί.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α P Q, nearly all, lat., ἐκ αὑτοῦ [-ον, ορ -ων]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, few, after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, 7, 14, 92, &amp;c., pron. sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, 35, 87, 98, &amp;c., g, εγ., sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, 1, 49, 79, 91, 96, &amp;c., after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν Α, 18, εγ., θράνον.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν Α, 1, 79, 92, few, plur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν Π, many, pr [Aug.], ἄστα μερ' αὑτῶν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν Q, 1, 7, 38, 92, &amp;c., et, om.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, many, ins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, many, Σ, after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q, many, et, am, Σ, om.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, many, after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π P Q, nearly all, Σ, γέγονα.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, 38, 39, lat., add. εἰπ`:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, many, add. ἀπό.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, many, δώσω ἀπό.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν Q P, mss., lat., Σ, prof. αὑτὸς.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ, 14, 98, few, Σ, μοι νῦν.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν A P, 1, 49, 79, few, lat., om.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q, 7, 49, &amp;c., after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readings of S—continued.

xxi. 10, ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Λ Α Π, many, lat.: 12, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς πυλώσιν ἄγγελον δώδεκα, Ρ Π Β, MSS., εἰ, ἀμ, εἰ, 12, ἄγιματα αὐτῶν, Ν: 12, γεγογμένα, Ν, εἰ: 12, [τὰ] ἄγιματα τῶν δώδεκα, Α Π, many, ε, εγ, Σ: 13, ἀναστάσει, Α Π, 1, 36, 38, 79, few, Σ: 13, βορᾶ . . . νότου, Ρ Π (Ν, Β . . . β . . . θ), nearly all, εἰ, εἰ, Σ: 15, καὶ τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῆς, Α Π, some, lat. (εγ, om. αὐτῆς), Σ: 16, δοσον, Ρ Π Β, most, εγ: 16, χαλάζου, Α Π, many, lat.: 17, ἰμέροις, Α Π, many, lat., Σ: 18, om. τί, Α Π, εγ, Σ: 19, καὶ οἱ θεμέλιοι, Ν, 1, 7, 35, 49, 79, &c., (ετ;), εἰ, Σ: 19, καὶ οἱ δεύτεροι . . . καὶ οἱ τρίτοι, Ν: 21, δώδεκα μαρτυροῦσα, Ρ Π, MSS., εγ, Σ ἀπ [at defect]: 21, καὶ ἰκανοὶ, Ρ: 21, εἰ τῶν, Ν, A, nearly all, lat., Σ: 23, αὐτῆς ἡ γὰρ, Α Π, many, lat., Σ: 24, φέροντο, Α Π, many, lat., Σ: 24, om. καὶ τῶν τιμῆς, Α Π, many, εἰ: 24, om. τῶν εἰρήνων, Α Π, many, lat.: 26, om. ήπι εἰς ἐπιθέσεις, Α Π, many, lat., Σ: 27, οἱ κοίμων, Ν, 7, 38, 90, 94, 97, 98, &c. (εγ;), Σ: 

xxii. 2, τοὺς καρποὺς, Ν: 5, ἐκ, 1, 7, &c.; (Α Π, 35, few, lat., Σ, ετ): 5, οἱ ἡχοῦσιν χρειάζαν, Α, lat., Σ: 5, φωτοῦ [καὶ] λόγου, Ν Α, 38, 79, few, lat., Σ: 5, ἁλοῦ, Α Π, 1, 35, 38, 49, 79, 91, 96, lat., Σ: 5, αὐτοῦ, Ρ Π, nearly all, εγ, Σ: 6, ἐπε, Α Π, many, pr, εγ, Σ: 6, om. με, Α Π, MSS., lat.: 8, βλέπων before δικοῦ, Ν, 78, 79, 152, few, pr: 8, ξεκυπται καὶ, Ν, A, many, lat. Σ: 11, καὶ δυνατὰς μυρ. ετ, Ν Π, most, lat., Σ: 14, ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, Ρ, nearly all, εγ, &c., Σ: 

* P hist, xxii. 6 (τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτῶν) — ad fin.
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Readings of S—continued.

xxii. 15. φιλῶν [βλέπων] before ποιῶν, A Q, many, Œ, eg, S:

16. ἔρει, Q, most, S:
16. ὁ πρινός, Q, mss., pr, S:
18. ἐκ' αὐτῶν before ὁ Θεός, Χ (A om.), 49, 79, 91, 96, &c.:

18. πληγᾶς, Χ A, most, lat., S:
20. om. ἐμῆν, Χ, et:
21. Χριστοῦ, Q, nearly all, g, eg, S:
21. πάνω τῶν ἄγων, Q, most, S:
21. ἐμῆν, Q, nearly all, om, ei, S:

Counter Readings.

Χ, 35, few, g, after.

A, 38, 79, few, g, eg (pr om.), év.

A, g, eg, pref. καί.

Q, most, lat., S, after.

Q, some, pref. ἐκκαίρα.
A Q, mss., eg, S, ins.

Χ Λ, 26, om., (pr om. vers.).

Χ, g, om. πάνως; (Λ, eg, (el add. ἐμῆν), om. τῶν ἄγων).
A, 79, g, some eg, om.
APPENDIX TO DISSERTATION.

II. The following is a collection of 215 readings of S which have no support from the MSS.; but only from mss., or Latin, with or without Σ: together with 27 supported by Σ alone (242 in all).

1. Readings (49) of S supported by some one or more of the mss., and of the Latin versions, (18 of them also by Σ); against all MSS.:

i. 3, *add. ταύτης, 7, 16, g, *et, Σ.
   11, ἀ, 34, 35, 38, 72, 87, pr.
iii. 2, Θεός without μου, 1, few, pr.
   3, δὲ, 36, pr.
   7, οὐδὲν κλείει, 1, 36, 49, &c., lat., Σ.
iv. 6, *om. ὅς, 1, 94, &c., pr.
   v. 7, *ins. τὸ βιβλίον, 7, 36, et, some *et, Σ.
   13, ἐν τῇ γῇ, 1, few, pr.
vi. 6, *τὸν οἶκον before τὸ Ἰδαιον, 36, pr, *et, Σ.
vii. 1, *om. τῆς γῆς, 38, *et, *.

viii. 2, εἰσόδημον [εἰσόδημον], 38, few, g, Σ.
ix. 2, μεγάλης καυμάκης, 36, 38, few, g.
   8, *om. Ἰερεία, 73, h.
   10, κύπερ ἐν, 1, 7, 28, 35, 36, 38, 79, 87, 90, 92, &c., *et, *.
   10, καὶ ἡ ἔξωθεν, 1, 36, 79, &c., h, pr, *et, *.
   18, τοῦ στόματος, 91, 95, lat.
   x. 8, φωνὴν ἱστώσα, 7, *et, cl.
   xi. 6, βρέχῃ ὑπόκ, 1, few, g.
   6, ἐν [ταῖς] ἡμέρας, 1, pr, Σ.
   10, κρατήσαντα, 38, lat., Σ.
   15, Θεός, 38, pr.
   19, βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ, 14, 28, 36, 38, 73, 79, 87, 97, g, Σ.
   xii. 6, ἐξεύθιον, 38, h, cl, Σ.
   10, ἐν τοῦ οἴκου, 95, g, pr.
   xiii. 10, ἐπάγει, 33 (35, 87, ἐπάγει), *et, cl, Σ.
   xv. 4, *et, 36, 38, 49, 95, 96, few, et, cl, Σ.
   xvi. 4, ἄγγελος, 1, 35, 36, 38, 49, 79, 87, 91, 96, &c., *some *et, Σ.
   5, καὶ [δ] ἄγγελος, 1, 36, 95, few, et, Σ.
   17, *et, 1, 14, 28, 49, 79, 91, 92, 96, &c., lat.
   xvii. 8, ἐν [τῷ] βιβλίῳ, 73, 79, 96, lat.
   8, πάροικοι, 1, 36, 73, 79, 152, few, g, Σ.
   16, ποιήσαντι αὐτήν *τῆς γυμνῆς, 34, pr.
   xviii. 8, *om. ἡ θεός, 38, 96, few, pr.
   xix. 1, *om. ὅς, 1, 7, 38, few, et, Σ.
   1, τῷ Θεῷ, 36, 47, 152, pr, *et, Σ.
   13, καλῶτα, 1, 36, 49, 79, 91, &c., lat.
   xx. 4, τὰς χεῖρας, 94, *et.
   14, ἐστιν before ὁ ἤθανος, 49, 91, 96, few, cl.
   14, *om. ἡ λυμήν τοῦ πυρός, 1, 94, &c., pr [Aug.], cl.
   xxi. 11, καὶ ὁ φωστήρ, 1, 7, &c., pr, cl.
   11, τύμπανοι, 94, g, *et.
   xxii. 5, φωτιζεῖ, 79, &c., g, *om, Σ.
   11, καὶ ὁ ἄκους, 68, pr.
   12, κατὰ τὸ ἔργον, 73, 79, lat.
   17, *ins. καὶ after ἐρχόμενος, 33, 46, *et, Σ.
   21, ἡμῶν, 30, few, lat., Σ.

2. Readings (91) of S supported by one or more of the mss., (15 of them also by Σ); against the MSS., and the Latin versions:

i. 1, *om. ἑστὶν before λεγομένην, 38, 69, 97.
   9, ἐν καταφέροντος *ὑποθέσαντος, 28, 73, 79, Σ.
   10, ὁ διάκολος before βιβλίῳ, 38, 95, Σ.
   13, *pref. καὶ to ὁ μάρτυς, 68, 87.
   17, &c., pr.
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ⅷii. 13, ἵππ. δυτὶ πᾶς μάρτυς [μου] πιστός, 152.
13, παρ' ἴμων, 95.
13, ὁμ. δύον ὁ Σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ, 38.
20, ἄφθασα, 26, 36, 38, 38.
24, ὁμ. δέ, 91.

iii. 2, πεπληρομένα βέβες ἡ ἔργα, 40.
12, ὁμ. μου αφετ' τοῦ θεοῦ, 11, 29, 36.
15, ὁμ. δυτὶ, 28, 36.

iv. 8, σμαραγδὼν, 14, 38.
8, ἀδὰν ἔστο [ωτί], 35, 36, 68, 87.
9, ὁμ. τάσσαμα, 68, 87.

v. 1, ὁμ. ἄλλων, 35, 87.
5, δύοει, 13, 38.
5, ὁμ. ἐπτά, 73.

vi. 5, ἡγοῦτην σφραγίς ἡ τρίτη, 28, 73, 79.
11, ἐκάστην αὐτῶν, 28, 73, 38.

vii. 1, καὶ πραγματέας, 28, 73, 94, 38.

viii. 5, ἐγένετο, 68.
8, ὁμ. ἐγένετο βέβες ὁ, 95.
11, ἄφθασα οὐκ ἀφθάσασθαι, 7, 28, 79.
12, καὶ ἐσκοπήσατο . . . οὐκ ἦσαν, 35, 68, 87.

ix. 1, ἐκ τῆς γῆς, 38, 97, 38.
11, ἄπολλων, 38.

x. 7, 9, 28, 49, 79, 91, 96, 68.

xi. 5, ὀστίς, 38.
5, δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν, 87.
8, ὁμ. καὶ αὕτω δόσου, 1, 7, 14, 35, 36, 35, 87, 92,
12, ἱδεόμενον, 38, 97.

xii. 8, αὐτοῖς, 17, 36.
8, ὁμ. ἐγ. 7, 28, 73, 79, 152, 38.
11, ἀπάθος, 43, 87.

xiii. 2, ὁμ. στόμα (2ο), 38.
12, ποιήσατε ἐνώπισαν, 34, 35, 87.
12, καὶ ποιήσατε, 34, 35, 87.
13, καὶ ποιήσατε, 35, 87.
15, τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θερίου καὶ ποιήσατε, 14, 73, 97, 38.

xiv. 18, ὁμ. λέγον, 14, 92.

xv. 6, ἐκ τοῦ μακαριοῦ πελώτως, 94.
6, ἐκ τῆς αὑτῆς, 28, 73, 79.

xvi. 1, ἐκ τῆς γῆς, 28, 73.
2, ἐκ τῆς γῆς, 1, 28, 49, 79, 91, 96, 95.
3. Readings (75) of S supported by one or more of the Latin versions, (19 of them also by Σ); against all Greek MSS. and mss.:

i. 10, σάλπιγγα λέγουσα, h, pr, Σ. 14, om. λευκῶν, h, pr.
ii. 5, om. οὖν, pr.
7, om. αὐτῷ, g, cl.
8, τῆς ἐκκλησίας Σ[Ζ]μύρνης, lat.
9, πυρωτίαν σου, g, ev.
23, καρδιάν, pr.
iii. 1, τῆς, pr, Σ.
1, καὶ δεῖ, pr.
7, τῆς ἐκκλησίας Φιλαδέλφειας, g, ev.
9, ἐκ τῶν, pr, Σ.
14, τῆς ἐκκλησίας Δαοδεκείας, lat.
19, ὁδός, g, pr.
iv. 1, σάλπιγγα, ev, Σ.
3, λίθου, ev, Σ.
5, om. πυρὸς.
7, om. καὶ βοηθεῖ τὸ ζώον, pr.
9, δὲ έποιεῖ, ev.
v. 4, καὶ λύσει τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτῶν, pr.
9, ἔδοητε, pr.
vi. 8, καὶ εἴδον ἐπιπον χλαμάν, pr.
vii. 9, φαλῆς, pr.
viii. 11, ὡς ἀψιθ., h, pr.
ix. 7, τοῦ ὅρμομα, g, Σ.
17, τοῦ στόματος, lat.
18, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν, ol, Σ.
21, om. οὕτως ἐκ τῶν κλεμάτων αὐτῶν, pr.
x. 11, ἔδοην βοηθεῖ λαοῖς, ol, Σ.
xii. 8, ἱνα προφητεύω, pr.
8, τῶν πλατειῶν, g, ev.
9, μνήματα, pr, ev, Σάφη.
15, ἐβασιλεύετο, am.
19, om. αὐτοῦ after ναῷ, am.
xii. 2, κράζοντα, am.
xiii. 2, κραζόντα, pr, Σ.
xiv. 4, εἰς τοῖς, pr, Σ.
10, εἰς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν, pr.
10, δεῖς εἰ μαχ., pr, ev.
10, εἰ μαχαίρα ἀποκτανθῆται, g.
xv. 6, λαοίς . . . φυλάς, pr.
8, ἵππως, pr, Σ.
20, εἰς σταδίων, pr, ev.
xvi. 6, εἰς καὶ βοηθεῖ λαμπρῶν, ev, cl.
7, om. χρυσάς, pr.
xvii. 3, εἰς . . . θαλάσσα, g, h.
16, σωκάζει, cl.
xviii. 15, εἰς . . . ὑπεράνθε, pr.
18, om. ἐοτίν, pr, arm.
xix. 1, εἰς καὶ βοηθεῖ μετὰ, pr, ev.
3, om. τοῦ θυμοῦ, pr.
4, τῆς πληγῆς, g. for πλετ. r.
12, λίθων τιμίων, pr, Σ.
12, ἐκ ξίλου τιμίων, g.
14, ἡ ἐπιβραχία, pr.
17, ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ev, ol, Σ.
20, εἰς βραχίοναρι, pr, Σ.
23, ταῖς φαρμακείαις, lat.
xx. 1, δῆλων πολλῶν, pr, ev.
2, χειρῶν, pr, ev.
6, δῆλων πολλῶν, pr.
6, om. ἐς Θεός, pr.
8, ἐς αὐτὸ δικαιώματα, g, ev.
20, καὶ θείον, arm.
xxi. 5, εἰς μοι (2d), ol.
8, ἡ ἑτέροι, lat., Σ.
14, om. δώδεκα βοηθεῖ δοστόλοι, am.
18, χρυσίου καθαροῦ, pr, am, Σ.
21, χρυσίου καθαροῦ, pr.
23, εἰς ἑτέροι, lat.
27, om. τῆς ζωῆς, pr.
xxii. 8, εἰς, am, arm.
9, ἔπει, ev, Σ.
17, om. ἐς θέλων, g.
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4. Readings (27) of Σ supported by Σ; against all Greek and Latin texts:

i. 9, συγκαυσώντος ἔμων.
   9, γὰρ ἐν Ἰησοῦ.
   13, μάστοις αὐτοῦ.
   19, ὤ for ἢ.

ii. 12, τὴν ἀξίαν βέβηλε τὴν διάτομον.

iii. 8, ἵνα καὶ βέβηλε ἴδον.

v. 11, μνῆμας ... χιλιάδες.

viii. 7, ἵδαι τοι ἁματι.
   9, πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων.
   13, τῶν σαλπίγγων.

ix. 3, ὁμ. ἱζουσίων.
   16, ἵνα εἰς βέβηλε τὴν ἠμέραν and τὸν μήνα.

x. 9, σοι ... σου.

xiii. 16, δοθῆ.
   16, τῶν χειρῶν ... τῶν ἀξιών.

xiv. 9, χάραγμα αὐτοῦ.

xv. 5, ἵνα σώ.
   6, στήθη αὐτῶν.

xvii. 4, λίθους τιμίους.
   9, τῷ ἤχοι.

xviii. 13, βήδαι καὶ σώματα.
   16, λίθοις τιμίοις.
   19, τῶν στρατευμάτων.

xx. 4, τὰς πεπελεκισμένας.

xxi. 3, αὐτοῖς Θεὸς.

xxii. 2, ἵνα, εἰ τὸ βέβηλε τοῦ ποτάμου.
   5, ὅτι εἰ τῷ αὐτοῦ.
NOTE.

NOTE PREFATORY TO GREEK TEXT.

The following Greek Text of the Apocalypse is offered as a substitute for a Latin or other translation such as is usually subjoined to a version of a Book of Scripture into a language not generally familiar to Biblical students.

In constructing it, I have taken as basis the "Revised" Text of 1881 (in preference to the "Received," which is universally admitted to be exceptionally unsatisfactory in this Book), altering it throughout into conformity with the readings which the version S appears to have followed. In the great majority of the cases where there are variants affecting the sense, including nearly every one of interest or importance, the reading which the translator had before him is determinable with certainty.

But there remain not a few instances in which the evidence of the Syriac is indecisive of the reading of its original. This is so, of course, in most (though not all) cases of variation of orthography; but it occurs, moreover (in consequence of the limitations of the Syriac tongue), in variations affecting—(1) the case of nouns, as between genitive, dative, or accusative, after ἢν—
(2) the tense of verbs, as between aorist and perfect, or between present and aorist participle—
(3) the use of prepositions, as between ἐν and ἐκ, or between insertion and omission of ἐν—
(4) the presence of the article (which however S not seldom is able to express more suavely). In all such instances, I have retained the reading of the "Revised," and have pointed out in a footnote the ambiguity of S.

The text of S, as it has reached us, abounds in superfluous insertions of the copulative conjunction. These I have mostly retained, but it may be that I have overlooked some of them. They seem to be meaningless, due merely to the idiosyncrasy of the translator, or (not improbably) of the scribe.

I have accurately reproduced the interpunction (except in one or two instances, to each of which I have called attention in a footnote)—inasmuch as, though in some places evidently wrong, it seems to have been on the whole carefully and consistently carried out.

In the few instances where the rendering is vague or erroneous, I have not shaped the Greek into conformity with it; but have given the text which the paraphrase or mistranslation was presumably intended to represent, adding an explanatory footnote.

Where error of transcription, admitting of obvious correction, occurs in the Syriac text, I have made the Greek represent the reading as corrected, marking the place with an asterisk (*).

Where error seems to affect the Syriac text—whether on the part of the translator or of the scribe,—such as to leave it doubtful what was the reading of the original, I have rendered the Syriac into Greek, marking the doubtful words with an obelus (†).

For the corrections made, or required, at the places marked with * or †, the reader is referred to the Notes which follow the Syriac text in Part II.
NOTE.

In the Footnotes subjoined to the Greek, I have not attempted to give anything like a complete *apparatus criticus*; but merely to indicate the characteristic features of the text which underlies S. I have accordingly passed over (generally speaking) without remark such of its readings as are attested by uncial evidence, except where the reading is an interesting one and the attestation that of a single uncial. But I have been careful to note every one of its readings which is unconfirmed by each and all of the uncials without exception.

Of this class (of non-uncial readings) many are absolutely peculiar to S. These do not for the most part commend themselves as deserving of consideration; and I have therefore judged it sufficient, without forming a complete list of them, to put together, at p. lxxvi *et sqq.*, *supr.*, such of them as seem to be in any degree noteworthy.

The rest of the non-uncial readings recorded in these notes, are those which have the support of one or more cursives, of one or more Latin texts, or of Ξ,—or of some combination of these authorities. All such readings will be found accurately registered and classified in List II *supr.* (pp. cxli—cxliv). That List is in fact an Index of all readings of the S-text which have other than uncial attestation.

In like manner, List I (pp. cxxv—cxl) will be found to be a complete Index of all S-readings for which there is more or less equally divided uncial evidence.
GREEK TEXT WITH FOOTNOTES.
ADDENDA, CORRIGENDA, AND DELEND

IN PART I.

Page 4, notes, column 2, line 3, after Σ
add (prefixing τϜ)

,, ib. ,, 2, ,, 19, for 48
read 49

,, 5, text, ,, 2, ,, 1, for γυναικα σου read γυναικα σου

,, ib. notes, ,, 1, ,, 28, before ἐκεῖνας add τῆς

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 18, for lust
read third

,, 6, ,, ,, 1, ,, 18, after τϜ, τῆς
add ἦν, ἦν

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 15, after ms.
add and πρ

,, 7, ,, ,, 1, ,, 13, before Σ
add (with τϜ prefixed)

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 20, before Σ
add (with τϜ prefixed)

,, 8, ,, ,, 1, ,, 3, for φυχρός
read φυχρός

,, ib. ,, ,, 1, ,, 17, before with
delete parenthesis

,, 14, ,, ,, 1, ,, 3, after 94
add and Σ

,, 21, ,, ,, 1, ,, 1, before All
add So Σ.

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 16, after So
add Σ, and

,, 26, ,, ,, 1, ,, 1, after ms.
add Σ,

,, ib. ,, ,, 1, ,, 2, for τϜ
read am

,, 27, ,, ,, 2, ,, 15, for MSS.
read ms.

,, 33, ,, ,, 2, ,, 10, after P
delete Q

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 11, after reading.
add P om. sentence

,, 37, ,, ,, 1, ,, 17, 18, before 87
delete 35, 36,

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 15, after So
add Σ,

,, ib. ,, ,, 2, ,, 13, for 48
read 49.

,, 38, ,, ,, 2, ,, 14, after 98.
delete parenthesis

,, 43, ,, ,, 1, ,, 12, after ms.
add and γ and η.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΗΣ

Η ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ

ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΠΙΟΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΝ.

1. Ἀποκάλυψης Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἦν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, δεῖξαι τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ· δεί, γενέσθαι ἐν τάξει· καὶ ἐσύμμαχον ἀποστελέα διὰ τοῦ ἄγγελου αὐτοῦ· τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ.

2. Ἰωάννης, δεῖ ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡσα ἔδει.

3. Μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων· καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας ταύτης· καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα· ὁ γὰρ καρός ἐγώ. 1

4. Ἰωάννης τάς ἐπτὰ ἐκκλησίας ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη· ἀπὸ ὁ ἦν· καὶ ὁ ἦν· καὶ ὁ ἔρχομαιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ πνευμάτων ἃ ἐνόπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς, ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλεῶν τῆς γῆς· ὁ ἀγαπῶν ἡμᾶς καὶ λοῦν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἰματὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἑποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν ἑράν ὁ Θεός καὶ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ· αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν.

1 ἤδοι ἐρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν· καὶ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτῶν πάντες ὀφθαλμοί· καὶ οἴωνες αὐτῶν ἐξεκέντησαν· καὶ κόψουντες ἐντ' αὐτῶν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί τῆς γῆς. ναὶ καὶ ἀμήν.

2 Ἐγώ εἰμί τὸ Λ καὶ τὸ Ὡ, λέγει 5 Κύριος ὁ Θεός ὁ ὄν· καὶ ὁ ἦν· καὶ ὁ ἔρχομαι, ὁ πνευματικός. Ἐγώ ᾧ·
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΥΣ.

1. 9—17.

'Ιωάννης ὁ ἄδελφός ὑμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ θλίμῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ τῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῆς καλουμένης Πάτμου· διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἦκουσα ὅτι ὁμοιοί μου φωνὴ μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγα λέγουσαν.

11 ἀ βλέπεις γράψων εἰς βιβλίον, καὶ πέμψων ταῖς ἐπτά ἐκκλησίαις· εἰς "Εφέσου καὶ εἰς Ζυμὼν καὶ εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ εἰς Θεσσαλίαν καὶ εἰς Σάρδεως καὶ εἰς Φιλαδέλφειαν καὶ εἰς Λαοδίκειαν. Καὶ ἐπιστρέφεις, εἰδὼν ἐπτά λυχνίας καὶ μέσον τῶν λυχνίων ὁμοίων νύφ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐπεδέπνευσαν τοὺς ματοὺς αὐτοῦ ἔως χρυσῶν· ἢ 14 δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχαι αὐτοῦ λευκαὶ ὡς ἐρυθά καὶ ὡς χιόνων καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτοῦ ὡς φλὸς πυρὸς· καὶ ὁ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὁμοίοι χαλκολιθάνων ἐν καμάνι πεπυρωμένων· καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς φωνὴ υδάτων πολλῶν. καὶ 16 ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀστέρα ἐπτα· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὁμοφαία ὡς ἐκ κεραμίου ἐκπορευμένη· καὶ ὡς φιλις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἄρτος φανείν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὅτε ἔδωκα αὐτὸν 17 ἐπεσε ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός· καὶ ἔθηκεν τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ χείρα ἐπὶ ἐμὲ λέγων, μὴ φοβοῦ· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτος.
ΑΠΟΚΛΑΤΨΙΣ.

18 καὶ ὁ ζων καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρός· καὶ ἱδον ζών εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμύνυς καὶ ἔχω τὴν κλίσιν τοῦ βαθαίτον καὶ τοῦ βδούν. γράφων οὖν ἐδέσε καὶ ἐδέσε καὶ μέλεις γίνοντας μετὰ ταύτα τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἐπὶ ἀστέρων οὐς ἐδέσε ἐπί τῆς δεξιᾶς μου καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ λυχνίας. οἱ ἐπὶ ἀστέρων, ἀγγελοὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ἀκλήσιων εἰσὶ· καὶ αἱ λυχνίαι αἱ ἐπὶ αἱ χρυσαὶ ἐδέσε, ἐπὶ ἀκλήσιων εἰσὶ.

II. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν ἀκλήσιω 'Εφέσῳ γράφων, τάδε λέγει ὁ κρατῶν τούς ἐπὶ ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ χείρι αὐτοῦ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν λυχνίων τῶν χρυσῶν οὗτα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ τὸν κόσμον σου καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν σου καὶ ὁ ὃς δύνη βαστάσαι κακοῦς καὶ ἑπέφασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἐναι ἀποτολόκυς εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶ· καὶ ἐδέσε αὐτοὺς ἰσθείς καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις καὶ ἐρέσατας διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου καὶ οὐκ εκκοπήκας. ἀλλὰ ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρόφατον ἀφήκας, μημόνευε τὸ ἑπεπτεκμαῖκα καὶ τὰ πρώτα ἔργα τούτων εἰς ἐν μη, ἐρχομαί σου, καὶ κυνηγοὶ τὴν λυχνιὰν σου, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς. ἀλλὰ τούτο ἐόχεις, ὅτι μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαίτων· δὲ ἐγὼ μισῶ. ὁ ἐχων 7 οὐς, ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ τῷ νικήτῳ δώσαν φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς λωπῆς, ὁ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΗ.

8 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ζμύρης γράφων, τάδε λέγει ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐχαστός, ὅτι ἔγινεν νεκρὸς καὶ ἐφετείρα οἰδά σου τὴν βλάβην καὶ τὴν πτωχείαν σου, ἀλλὰ ἄσωστος εἶ καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν τὴν ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων ἐαυτοῦ Ἰουδαίους ἐν Ιουδαίοι καὶ οὐκ έζων: ἀλλὰ συναγωγῇ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, μηδὲν φοβοῦ ἢ μέλλεις πάσχειν ἵδον μελέτη ὁ διάβολος βάλλειν εἰς υἱὸν εἰς φυλαχήν ἵνα πειρασθῆτη καὶ ἐξετῇ θλίψις ἡμέρας δεκα. γίνωσκε πιστοὶ ἄχρι θανάτου καὶ δῶσιν υἱὸν τῶν στέφανον τοῦ Ἴωνος. ὁ ἐχὼν οὖν, ἀκούσατα τι τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ὁ νικῶν οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου.

11 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ

8. τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ζμύρης] So pr, eccl. Smyrnae, (γγ and ς στ) insert the words); A confirms so far as to give ἤμως (but with τῷ preceding and ἐκκλησίας following). Χ with most other authorities reads τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

*Στὸσθενῆς*) S (see note on Syr. text), as pointed, represents G09, but I treat this as a blunder of the scribe, who understood the sentence absurdly, “who became dead and alive.” Probably the want of inter-punctuation in the parallel passage, i. 18, arose from a like misunderstanding.

9. οἴδας σου] S places σου after τὴν θλίψιν as the Syr. idiom requires. All except γλ and τοις om. σου after τὴν θλίψιν.

τῷ ἰχθὺς] So Χ, else only μ. Most authorities, however, insert ψωμάς before τῷ, with ms. 28, 73, and 79, and Χ; but S alone om. ψωμάς.

†Τοιοῦτοι] Probably a mistake of repetition on the part of the Syriac scribe.

10. ὁ διάβολος καὶ θάνατος] So Χ. The Greek copies place the verb first, except ms. 38, 95.

†Ψωμάς* So Q and most ms., and Χ and most versions: the other Greek copies, and pr., ἡμέρας, γίνεται πιστός ... δῶσιν S alone plural.

11. ὁ ψωμάς] S ins. a prefix = φησι, and so in verse 17.

12. τῷ ἐν ἐκκλησίας Περγάμου] S alone: but pr gives eccl. Primaevi (γγ and ς στ) insert). The Greek copies give τῷ ἐν Περγάμῳ, as does Χ.

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ] All else except Χ place these words after τὴν διστομον.

13. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις] So A C, ms. 91, and τοις, &c.: but B Q, nearly all ms., Χ, and τοις, om. καὶ, and (except pr.), subjoin [καὶ] αἷς (καὶ ἐν ταῖς),—supported in each case by many ms. and versions. The ordinary εὐ διαλέγεται slightly from εἰς.

*Συντείνων] S has ἔφεξε, but a slight emendation (see note on Syr. text) gives its real reading (as in some ms. and A), which is also preserved in Χ [πρ.; but ἐν as δ]. The entire verse looks at first sight like the Syr. text already referred to.

καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις] So ms. 68, 87: all else om. καὶ. ἔνεκτέος μοι πιστός] So ms. 152 only (but without μοι). See Supplementary Note, p. 49 infr.

ως ἐφόροι] So one ms. (96): all else dativ. Note that S om. the rest of the verse with ms. 38.

14. ἐδόθη] So (apparently) both S and Χ, with Q and many ms., &c.; for διάφορα.

φωτις* So ms. A C P: Q, and many ms. prefix καὶ, and so Χ [d e p; l, to, with some ms.].

17. ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις] Dele καὶ: see note on Syr. text.
Σε τού μένα] (i) Note that S om. αὐθή before these words, with W, one ms. (92), and G, but not pr, and most forms of εὐ [not εὖ]: against Ἐ, and all else. (ii) S and Ἐ, with pr, arm, and other versions, inst. the prep. (probably δε, but possibly ἄνευ) against the majority of authorities. But W and ms. 36, 39, have ἰεῖ: P and other ms. δεῖ. (iii) See *ὅδει σεν*] Correction for ἐννυ ἄνθη (= ἔχει αὐθή): see note on Syr. text.

[φῶσον δῦμα καὶν γεγραμμένοι] (i) S has φωλαίνει. For ἰ by an easy mistake of transcription between two very similar Syriac words, the wrong one having been repeated from verse 10. (ii) After φῶσον S om. λειψάνῳ, kai ἦν τῆς φῶσον. But as this result of homoteleuton may as naturally be attributed to the Greek original as to the Syr. text, I do not re-insert the words. (iii) The rendering of ἰεῖ (as it now stands) implies ἰεῖσθαι καὶν γεγραμμένος. But this has no support, and it seems unlikely that the translator found it in his Greek. I regard it as the Syriac scribe's vain attempt to make sense of his mistranslating of the verse, and I restore what I presume to have been the translator's text. See notes on Syr. text, for the matters treated in this and the previous notes.

18. τῷ ἐκείνητι τῷ ἐν Θ.] In reading τῷ, S is supported by Λ, also pr, and Ἐ; but nearly all agree (against S) in reading ἐκείνητι, instead of ἐν ἐκείνητι. Except Λ, which om. τον ἐφθανέων] All else have pl., and most add αὐθήν: but Λ, ms. 36, 38, 152, and lat., om. pron. φῶσον] Or φᾶς.


19. σου] All ins. this pron. in the first and last instances, and most (including Ἐ) after ὥσομενή. In the remaining three, no Greek authority gives it. For the position of the first σου (before τά έργα) see note on ii. 9: also cp. iii. 1, 15.

[πληώτερόν ἐστιν] Rather om. σεν, as all else.

20. τολάδι] So W and a few ms., including 36, and G: a few others, and pr and arm, πολάδι; there is still less support for πλῆγμα of rec. and εὐ [not εὖ]: while all the other MSS., and most other authorities, including Λ, and om. om. altogether.

[ἀδίκος] So Ἐ, with ms. 36 and a few other authorities: all else pres.

[ἑλέον] With ἕν only, against Ἐ and all else.


22. μετανοήσεις] Or -σοῦς: the Syr. fut. (which S and Ἐ give) may stand for either. The Greek copies are divided.

[ἀδίκος] So rec., with A and a few ms. (1, 36, 79, &c.), pr. τῷ εὐ [εὖ, εὔ, &c., and εἰ; but not all], and other versions: the rest αὐθῆς, including Ἐ [except Ἐ] and G. [Tischendorf wrongly adds εὖ].

23. γινόμενοι] Lit., γενόμενοι. Present often stands for future in Syr.

[καθὼς] All else plural except pr.

[S has an addition in marg., = καὶ ταύτης οἷον τα αὐθήν τά εὐγενεία: of which I find no trace anywhere else.)

24. φῶσον] All else, except ms. 31, add τῇ.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗ.

λέγω τούς λοιπούς τοὺς ἐν Θυατείροις· ὅσοι οὐκ ἤχουσι τὴν διδαχὴν ταύτην· οἱ οὖν οἵς ἔγνωσαν τὰ ἑβαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ ὡς λέγουσιν· 25 τοῦ βαλάντι ἐφί ύμας ἀλλο βάρος. ὃ όν ἔχετε κρατήσατε ἄχρις ὃν ἦδον·
26 καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τριάν τὰ ἔργα μου διότι αὐτῷ ἔξωσάν ἐπὶ τῶν ἑβαθῶν· ἦν ποιμανεὶς αὐτοῖς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρῷ, καὶ ως τὰ σκεύη τὰ κεραμικὰ συντρίβεται· οὕτως γὰρ κάγως.
28 εἴληφα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου· καὶ διότι αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστέρα τῶν προϊόντων.
29 ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκούσας τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει· ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ Σάρδεων

γράψων, τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὰ ἐπὶ τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀστέρα· οἶδα σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ ὅτι ὁνομα ἔχεις καὶ ὅτι ζῆς καὶ ὅτι νεκρὸς εἶ. καὶ γίνου γρηγορῶν· καὶ στήριζον τὸν λοιπόν ἡ ἀρμελήλας ἀποθανείν· οὐ γὰρ εὐρηκά σε ὅτι πεπληρωμένα τὰ ἔργα σου ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, μημόνευε πῶς ἦκουσας καὶ εἰληφάς· οἱρεί καὶ μετανάστευσιν.

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ γρηγορηθήσῃς, ἦδον ἐπὶ σε ὡς κλέπτης· καὶ οὐ μὴ γνώςεις ποίαι ὁρᾶς ἢδον ἐπὶ σε. ἀλλὰ ἔχω 4 ὀλίγα ὀνομάτα ἐν Σάρδεων· καὶ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν καὶ περιποιήθησαν ὑπόπτων μου ἐν

25. ὁ ἐκεῖνος. 26. ὁ τριάν. 27. τῶν νοματικῶν. 28. τοῦ Πνεύματος. 29. ὁ ἔχων οὖς.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗΣ.

5 λευκοῖς, καὶ ἀξιώ ἐστιν. ὁ μικρὸς οὖτως περιβάλλεσθαι ἵματίοις λευκοῖς· καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλάφθῃ τὸ ὄνομά αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τῆς ἔνδομα. καὶ ὡμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνόπιον τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ ἐνόπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. ὁ ἔχων οὖς, ἀκούσατε τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

7 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας Φιλαδελφείας γράφων, τάδε λέγει ὁ ἄγιος ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἔχων τὰς κλεῖδες Δαυίδ· ὁ ἄνωθεν καὶ οὔδεις κλείει· καὶ οὔδεις καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίγει· οἶδα τὰ ἐργα σου· καὶ Ἰδοὺ δεδικα ἐνόπιον σου θύραν ἀνεγερμένην, ὥς οὔδεις δύναται κλείσαι αὐτήν· ὅτι μικράν ἔχεις δύναμιν καὶ ἐγκαταστάσεις μου τῶν λόγων καὶ οὐκ ἠμρησάτω τὸ ὄνομά μουν. καὶ ἰδοὺ διδῶ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ, εἰκὼν τῶν λεγόντων ἐαυτοῦς Ἰουδαίους εἰναι καὶ οὖν εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ ἑυφόρουνται· ἵνα λεγώσουσο αὐτοῖς ἦς λέγουσι καὶ προσκυνήσουσον ἐνόπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου· καὶ γνώσομαι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἡγάστησά σε· ὅτι ἐγέρσασα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐνώπιον μου καγώ σε τηρήσως ἐκ τοῦ πιστεύου τοῦ μελλόντος ἑρχεσθαι ἐπί τῆς οἰκουμένης ἄλης, πειράσεις τοὺς κατοικοῦς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ἔρχομαι ταχύ· κράτει ὁ ἔχεις, ἦν μηδεὶς λάβῃ τῶν στέφανων σου.

8 καὶ οὐκ ὄνομα αὐτῶν στόλον· εἰ τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ ἔχων μὴ ἔκζηθη ἐπὶ καὶ ἐγράψατο ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἱεροσολυμίτη· ἢ καταβάσοντα απὸ τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τῆς καὶ τῆς ἱεροσολυμίτη· ἢ καταβάσοντα απὸ τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ καὶ τῶν Καυσίμων· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πνεύμαν. καὶ ὁ ἐχων οὖς, ἀκούσατε τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας Λαο-14 δικείας γράφων, τάδε λέγει ὁ ἅμην,
ἈΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

III. 14—IV. 1.

ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός καὶ ἄλθευνός,
καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ
ὅδα σου τὰ ἔργα σου παντελῶν
οὐκ εἶσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος μου.
ὅτι λέγεις ὅτι πλοῦσιν *εἰμι* καὶ πε-
πλουτηκαίρεις* καὶ οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω,
καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι αὐτὸ τοῦ ταλαντο-
ώρους, καὶ πτωχός καὶ γνωμὸς
συμβουλεὺς σου ἀγοράσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ
χρυσόν πεπτυμένον ἐκ πυρὸς Ἱω
πλουτής, καὶ ἰματία λευκὰ ἑνε
περιβάλλει, καὶ μὴ φανερωθῇ ἡ
ἀισχύνη τῆς γνωμοκράτισσάς σου,
καὶ κολλούριον ἐγχρισαί ἱνα βλέπης.

ἐγὼ οὖν φίλω ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύων
ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. Ἰδοὺ ἐστι
ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρύω
ἐὰν τοὺς ἀκουστεῖ τὴν φωνὴν μου.
καὶ ἀνοίξει τὴν θύραν καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι
καὶ δειπνήσῃς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς
μετ' ἐμοῦ. καὶ ὁ νυκτὸς δόοις αὐτῷ
καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ
μου. ὅπως ἔγω ἐνίκησα καὶ ἔκαθη
μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ
μου. ὡς ἐγὼ ἐνίκησα καὶ ἔκαθη
τῷ Πνεύμα λέγει τάς ἐκκλησίας.

Μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκα, καὶ ἱδοὺ θύρα

19. εἰς] So προὶ, ἐν, γι' ἀρκεῖν [οὐκ ἔστι.

[Ἀλλα] Οἱ ἀρκεῖοι. [Ἡ οἰκία, III. 10—III. 14].

20. εἰς[εἰς] So S alone, (ἐς doubtful); all other authorities read ἀσῆρ, except ἐν, which has ἀσῆρ. Though the Syr. fut. verb might as well represent the Greek subjunctive, the interpolation of S shows that the fut. is meant.

καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι] S alone om. πρὸς αὐτόν after these words. For καὶ, it has the support of Ἐ Q, and many mas., and ἐν against Λ P Q, and others (which rec. follows), also εἰς, and ἐν.

21. ἐξιστ. All else, ἐκαὶ.

IV. 1. ἔμοι] S alone om. ἐξ ἐμοῦ after this word.

[Ἀλλα] οὐ. S and Ἰ only; cp. I. 10: all else, except ἐτει, genitive.

[Ἀλλα] οὐ. S alone (perhaps an error; see note on Syr. text); the rest λέγω, λέγω, or -σα (ἐς doubtful).

λέγω] οὐ λέγων. S uses infin., which is indecisive.

2] All else plural.
2. καὶ ἐκεῖνος. So P and many mss. and versions: the rest, including 3 and lat. (but not o) om. καὶ.

3. λίθου. Here, and with the two following nouns, S and 3 use the prefix which denotes the genitive; but possibly the dative (which all Greek copies have) is meant. The genitive is given by eg, but dative by et. κυκλόθεν. Or κυκλάθε, and in next verse (where however the Syr. differs slightly); also in verse 6; but in verse 8 the Syr. definitely implies κυκλόθεν (with all else).

4. θρόνου. So P Q and many mss. (with εἰκοσι *[kai] τέσσαρες following: η λα. and one or two mss., θρόνου; but also with τέσσαρες.) 3 and 2 are not decisive, but seem to favour nominative.

5. τῶν θρόνων. S only; all else singular.

6. βαλάσσα καὶ ἐκεῖνος καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου. καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου, τέσσαρα ξωά γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν. τὸ ξωά τὸ πρῶτον ὄμοιον λέοντι καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ξωά ὄμοιον μοσχαρί καὶ τὸ τρίτον ξωά ἔχων τὸ πρόσωπον ὥς ἀνθρώπου καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ξωά ὄμοιον ἀτέρτων πετομένη τὸ τέσσαρα ξωά ἐν ἐκαστόν αὐτῶν ἐστός ἔχων ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπάνω, πτέρυγας ἐξ κυκλόθεν καὶ ἐσωθεν γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἔχον: ἕμερας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες: ἄγιος ἄγιος ἄγιος Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὦ ἤμι καὶ

λεγόντες. All else except στ ἔπεσον.

αφ' εἰκοστ. So Q and most mss., and g and eg [μι., &c.]: the rest 4 for αφ', with 3 [l n p: not d'], pr, and some texts of eg.

ἐν πνεύματα S (and perhaps 2) favours the omission here (but not v. 6 infra.) of the article before ἐντα (as Q, and many mss.): A F, &c., insa.

6. Φλάσινα. The MSS. most mss. g and eg, and 3, prefix δι' ma. i with one or two others, and pr, om.: the other versions are divided.

7. τὸ ἕκαστον. All else except pr prefix καὶ. εἰκοστ. Or perhaps καὶ: lit., εἴκοσι. ἐν ἄνθρωπον] So Λ, ms. 386 and a few, and lat. (γ. deviates): the rest mostly om. ἔν (as Q and many), or read ἐν ἄνθρωπον (as 3, with P and some).

8. τὸ τέσσαρα] All else prefix καὶ. A full stop is wanting in the Syr. before these words.

ἐν ἔκαστον] So α, ms. 38, and 3 (f); the rest mostly, ἐν καθ' ἐν. S possibly read ἐκαστον only.

ἐνταϊ] Or ἐνταϊ, as the few ms. (34, 35, 68, 87) read, which ins. the participle.

ἐκαστοι] Lit., καὶ ἐκαστοι. Greek ms. vary: (ἐκαστοι, ἐκαστοι, ἐκαστοι, ἐκαστοι, &c.): but ἐκαστοι is best supported. διὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκαστοι] A strange paraphrase, perhaps from Ex. i. 27 (LXX), for ἐκαστοι, which all else give.

γεμονῳν] Or γεμονω, as rec. with two or more mss.; but most mss., and all MSS., read as text.

λεγοντε] Or λεγομαι.
ΑΠΟΚΛΑΨΙΣ.

iv. 8—v. 6.

9 ὃ ὁν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. καὶ ὅταν δῶσι
tά τέσσαρα ζώα, δόξαν καὶ τιμήν
καὶ εἰκαρστίαν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ
τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ τῷ ζώτῃ εἰς τοὺς
ἀιωνίως τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν. Πεσοῦνται
οἱ έἰκοσι καὶ τέσσαρες προσβετήρει
ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθημένου ἐπί τοῦ
θρόνου, καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν εἰς τοὺς
ἀιωνίως τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν τῷ ζώτῃ καὶ
βαλοῦσι τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν
11 ἐνώπιοι τοῦ θρόνου λέγοντες,
ἀξίους εἰ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν
λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμήν καὶ τὴν
δύναμιν ὅτι σὺ ἐκτισάς τὰ
πάντα· καὶ διὰ τὸ θελημά σοι ἡςαν
καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.

v. Καὶ ἐδοχῇ ἐπὶ τὴν
δεξιὰν τοῦ
καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, βιβλίων,
γεγραμμένον ἐσωθεὶ καὶ ἐξωθεὶ· καὶ
κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγίσων ἐπτά.

ἐν φωβῇ οὐ φωβεῖν ἐστὶν

3. ὁδός (ὁδοῦ) οὐοδοῦ
ἐν τῷ γῇ Ἡ. All else have ἐν τῷ γῇ.
καὶ λύσω τὰ σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, οὐλομένοι. οὐκ
καὶ λύσω τὰ σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, οὐκ
ἐκ τῶν προσβετών οὐκ ἔσται μὴ κλαίει· ἤδυν
ἐνίκησεν δὲ λέαν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδαῖος, ὡς δὲ
Δαβίδ, ἠνοίξει τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λύσαι τὰς
σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν τῶν προσβετών
ἐστιν 

5. ἔσται All else lack. 
ἐκ τῶν τῶν προσβετών, ἀρνίον ἔστηκεν ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, ἔχων
κέρατα ἐπτά καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπτά·
oi ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπτά πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ,
ἈΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

tὰ ἀποστελλόμενα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν
7 γῆν. καὶ ἦλθε καὶ εἰλήφε τὸ βιβλίον
ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ
8 θρόνου. καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβε τὸ βιβλίον, τὰ
τέσσαρα ζώα καὶ οἱ εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρ
σαράς πρεσβυτέρου ἐπέσουν ἐνώπιον τοῦ
ἀρινοῦ ἔχοντες ἐκατόστα αὐτῶν, κεφάλαιον καὶ
φιλὴν χρυσῷ γέν
10 μουσασ τιμιματών, αἱ εἰσὶν αἱ
προσευχαῖς αὐτῶν, φίλινες φίλιν
καὶ λέγοντες: αἵτως εἰ
λαβεῖν τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λῦσαι τὰς
σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐσφάγης καὶ
ήγορασας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἰματί σου
τῷ θεό, ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς καὶ ναοῦ
καὶ ἔθνους καὶ εποίησας αὐτοὺς
tῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς
καὶ βασιλεῖς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἦκουσα
8 ὃς φωνῆν ἀγγέλων πολλῶν κύκλῳ
tοῦ θρόνου· καὶ τῶν ζωῶν καὶ τῶν
πρεσβυτέρων· καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς
αὐτῶν μυριάς μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάς
χιλιάδων· καὶ λέγουσες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ.
9 αἵτως εἰ τὸ ἀρινὸν τὸ ἐσφαγμένον,
λαβεῖν τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλούτον καὶ
σοφίαν καὶ ἴσχυν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ
dόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν. καὶ πάν τις οὐκ
δὲ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ
ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα.

Καὶ ἦκουσα λέγοντας τῷ καθη
μένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῷ ἀρνῷ,
ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα

---

12. καὶ λέγοντας] Or καὶ λέγοντες. All else have λέγοντες or λέγοντας, and om. καί.
13. εἰ τῇ γῇ] So rec., with a few mas., pr, and some versions: against 2, γ and εν, and the other authorities, which have ἐν τῷ γῇ.

---

C 2
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν
14 αἰώνων. Καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα
λέγονται ἄμην, καὶ οἱ προσβύτεροι
VI. ἔπεσαν καὶ προσεκάμψαν. καὶ ἐδοκε
ὅτε ἦν οὖς τὸ ἄριστον μιᾶν ἐκ τῶν
ἐπὶ τὰ σφραγίδων καὶ ἦκουσα ἐνός
ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζωῶν λέγοντος, ὡς
2 φωνὴ βροντῶν, ἔρχου καὶ ἰδε. καὶ
ῆκουσα καὶ ἐδοκεν καὶ ἦν ἰππὸς
λευκὸς· καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ αὐτῶν,
ἐκαὶ τὸ ἀνάθεμα καὶ ἢκούσα αὐτῷ στέ-
φανος καὶ ἐζήλευε ἰκών καὶ ἦν
καὶ ἵππησε· καὶ ἦν νυκτήσει.

3 Καὶ ὅτε ἦν δρόμος τὴς σφραγίδας τὴν
δευτέραν, ἦκουσα τοῦ δευτέρου ζωῶν
λέγοντος ἔρχου. καὶ ἦσθε ἰππὸς
πυρρός· καὶ τῷ καθήμενῷ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν,
ἔδοθεν αὐτῷ λαβέων τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ
tῆς γῆς, ἵνα ἄλληλοι σφάζοντο· καὶ
ἔδοθεν αὐτῷ μάχαιρα μεγάλη. Καὶ
ὅτε ἦν ὁ ἔρχοντας ζῷον τοῦ τρίτου ζώου
λέγοντος ἔρχου. καὶ ἦπερ ἰππὸς μέλας καὶ ὁ
καθήμενος ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἔκαθεν ἐν τῇ
χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἦκουσα 6
φωνὴν ἐκ μέσου τῶν ζωῶν λέγοντος,
χωνής στίτον δεινοῖς καὶ τριῶν
χωνίκες κριθῆς δηναρίως καὶ τὸν
οἶκον καὶ τὸ ἐλαιον μὴ ἀδικήσῃς.
Καὶ ὅτε ἦν δρόμος τὴς σφραγίδας τὴν
7 τετάρτην, ἦκουσα φωνῆς τοῦ
ζώου λέγοντος ἔρχου. καὶ ἦπερ
8 ἰππὸς χλωρών καὶ τοῦ καθήμενον
ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ βάπτατος·
καὶ ὁ ἐξῆς ἀκολουθεῖ αὐτῷ· καὶ
ἔδοθεν αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τὸ τετάρτον
τῆς γῆς· ἀποκείμενοι ἐν ρομφαίῳ
cαὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν βανάτῳ καὶ

14. ξύστω] So Q and many mas.: but W A P and
most authorities (including Z) have ἤστοι.
VI. 1. ἐρυθρά] All else singular.
2. καὶ ἥκουσα] S only: all else om.

Thus, but points to S merely
represents two alternative forms (the former supported
by Z d' p, the latter by Z n) of rendering the participle.
If so, the conflation is due to a Syriac scribe, not to
the Greek original. See note on Syr. text.

4. τῆς] All else prefix ἥλισα.

5. τῆς] So Q and most mas. and versions: but
W A C P, some mas., Z, and lat. and ree, prefix καὶ.

6. φωνή] So Q and many mas., and versions: but
W A C P, some mas., Z, and lat. and ree, prefix καὶ.

7. ἶππων] So Z, and similarly
mas. So Q, and all else, ἰππῶν ἐκ τῆς τρίτης.

8. ἶππων] So Q and many mas., and versions: the other MSS. and mas. have ἶππων αὐτῶν.
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΜΑΤΙΣ.

9 ὑπὸ τῶν θεριῶν τῆς γῆς. Καὶ ὅτε ἦνοιξε τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν πεπραμένην, ἐδόθη ἐπάνω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς ἐσφαγμένας διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ Ἡρόου, ἦν ἐλέων καὶ ἐκεραίαν ἠμέλη τε μεγάλη λέγουσι· ἐως τότε ὁ ἴσωπός ὁ ἄγιος καὶ ἀληθινός, οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικίων ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; καὶ ἐδόθη ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν στολὴ λευκὴ καὶ ἔρρησε ἢν ἀναπαύσωσαι ἐώς καίρους χρόνον μικρὸν· ἐγὼ δὲ πληροθεί μεν καὶ σύνθεσι αὐτῶν καὶ ἀδέλφων αὐτῶν ὁ μελλόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐδόθη ὁ θεριός τῆς σφραγίδας τῆς ἑκατον, καὶ σειμάδια μέγας ἔγενετο· καὶ ὁ ἱλιος μέλας ἐγένετο ὡς ἱσάκκος τρίχων· καὶ ἡ σέληνη δέλθ ἐγένετο αὐτῇ ὡς αἷμα· καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπεσαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὡς συκκύβος τούς ἄλλους αὐτής ἀπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου σειμάτριες. καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπεξερευνήθη, ἐκατόρθωσεν ὁ κόσμος· καὶ τὴν ὅρον καὶ πάσα νήσος ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν ἐκνηθήσαν. καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ μεγαστάνες καὶ οἱ κυρίαρχοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ἱσχυροί· καὶ πᾶσα δύναμις καὶ κυβερνήτες, ἐκρήμνησαν ἅπαντος εἰς τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν ὅρων· καὶ λέγουσιν 16 τοῖς ὅρεσι καὶ ταῖς πέτραις πέσετε ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ἄρτινος· ὅτι ἦθεν 17

---

ἐν τούς θεριῶν] Lit., ἐν τῷ θεριῷ (ἢ, ἀκὲ τοῦ ἀθ.: but (a) ἐν in this sense has no exact equivalent in Syriac, and the stop after θεριῶν seems intended to indicate the change of preposition; (b) the word which stands for θεριῶν is a plural of a plural meaning.


Ἑρόου] S alone; but three ms. have Ἑρόου Χριστοῦ (cp. i. 2, 9, xii. 17, &c.) a few authorities, ἀστός: θ with Q and many ms., τοῦ Ἁριών. The rest om.


11. ἐδόθη ἀστός] So θ, with some little support (ms. 28, 73). The true reading is probably ἀστός, as θ Q C P and many ms.; but Q and many others have ἀστός simply.

ἔρρησε] All else add ἔρρεσα.

ἀναπαύσωνται] Or ἀναπάυσαται.

ἐν καιρῷ] Or perhaps ἐνι, which all else read.

ἐν εἰ] Or ἐν simply.

12. θρόιζει] S, by an error of pointing, represents ἄρνηται.

ἀναπαύσωνται] S has ρώις, a scribe's error between two similar Syriac words. See note on Syr. text.


βάλλουσι] So θ, with θ and some ms. The other MSS., some ms., and lat., followed by rec., read βάλλει: many ms. βάλλουσι.

16. Ἰεροῦ] So θ, with θ and two ms. only. The Syriac preposition in S and θ represents ἐν or ἐκ, rather than ἐν οί which is the reading of the other Greek authorities. See note on verse 8.

ἀνέμου μεγάλου] Rather ἰδ. ἰσακινοῦ, but for this adjective there is no evidence.

14. ἰσακινοῦσα] S has a verb = ἰδέα or ἰδεῖσθαι: but as there is no support, and is apparently due to a mistake of the Syriac scribe (by transposition of two letters—see note on Syr. text), I restore ἰσακωνοῦσα.

ταχὰς ἐρ] Rather perhaps om. εἰς (also unsupported), and read the following words in sing.: see note on Syr. text.

ἀλίσαται] Lit., ἀλίσασθαι (or sing.). All else have singular, and (except perhaps ms. 102) τὸν τὸν ἀλισάσθαι. S alone ins.

ἰσακωνοῦσα] S and θ use here the same verb as for στικάθαι in last verse. Possibly they read ἰσακωνοῦσα here (as ms. 95), and ἰσακωνοῦσα there (as Λ and ms. 12). But this verb = κοίλον II. 5, sqqq.

16. οἱ ἰσακωνοῦσαι] Or possibly οἱ διώκοντες, as rec. reads (with doubtful authority); lit., ὁ διώκοντας.

18. ἰσακωνοῦσαι] S alone om. τοῦ ἐνθυμούτατος ἐν τῷ ἄρτινος καὶ ἦν τῇ ὅργῃ, after this word.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΙΣ.

7. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν· καὶ τίς δύναται σταθήματι;
VII. Καὶ μετὰ τούτο εἶδον, τέσσαρας ἀγέλους ἐστάτας ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας γωνίας τῆς γῆς· καὶ κρατοῦσας τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀνέμους· ἵνα μὴ πνεῦ
ἀνέμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μὴτε ἐπὶ τῆς θάλασσας, μὴτε ἐπὶ τῶν δενδρῶν.
2 καὶ εἶδον ἄλλων ἄγγελου ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίουν, ἔχοντα σφραγῖδα Θεοῦ ἡσύχως· καὶ ἔκραζε φωνὴ μεγάλη τοῖς τέσσαρας ἀγέλους οἷς ἔδοθε αὐτοῖς ἀδίκησε τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν λέγων, μὴ ἀδίκησε τὴν γῆν μὴτε τὴν θάλασσαν μὴτε τὰ δέντρα, ἀχρὶς οὐ σφραγίσωμεν τοὺς δούλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετωπῶν αὐτῶν.
17. αὐτῶν) So 2 [ἐν π.; not δ], with C and one ms. (88), and lat., except pr: all else αὐτῶν.
VII. 1. και kρατοῦσας] So ms. 29, 73, 94: all else om. καί.
ἀνέμους] The Greek copies, except ms. 38, ins. τῆς γῆς after this word, and so ἥ, ἦ: a few versions, including ἰβαη and other texts of αὐτοῦ, nor om. ἦν, on. ἦν om. ἦν.
2. ἀκαθαίρετα] The Syr. text is slightly uncertain (see note on ii), and may be read either as proterite, or present ptp. If the former is adopted (= τὸ κατέβαι) it may imply that the original of S had ἀκαθαίρετα (with ms. 1, and rec.). But S often uses prot. for pres. ptp. (as in the closely parallel passage, xviii. 1, ἐγγύνω καταβαίνοντα is rendered as if it were ἐγγύνη). I therefore retain ἀκαθαίρετα, with nearly all. It is doubtful.
ἀνέμους] So Α and one ms. (90); so too xvi. 12 ἐνθ. with all else, ἐνθ. But the plural in S, being idiomactic, is not conclusive as to the Greek.
3. μήτε (ὅσα) Or μηθε (ὡς).
μὴτε τὰ δέντρα] Lat., καὶ μὴτε (οὐ μηθα).
δὲμί φ] Or ἐχει simply (cp. ἐκ οὖ, vi. 11). The Greek copies vary here and xv. 8; ii. 26 they ins., xvii. 17 they om., ἦ.
17. εὐφραγημένων] or -ευμερ.
θεὸς] Without δύναται following: so a few mas. and versions (not 2).
4. S alone om. ἐσφραγημένων [-κει] after the numerals; but a few mas. om. them and it together.
Ἰσραήλ] Π reads Ἰσραήλιτον: all else ἦν Ἰσραήλ.
5. S (with sesth. alone) om. ἐσφραγημένου [-κεί] here (after the first χαλ.) and ins. only in verse 8; S n and Ν ins. here, but om. from verse 8 (with πρ.): rec. ins. after every tribe (12 times), with a very few mas., y and σ; but all MSS. and most mas., ἦ πρ. [d doubtful], twice only—here and verse 8.
Note that S (as also 2) favours the spelling Νεφθαλι(οί), and, perhaps, also Mανασ(ή), and in verse 7 Ἰσχαϕ (C Q and many mas.); and S transposes Jasharach and Levi. S n om. Levi; see note on Syr. text.
9. καὶ S alone ins. (see note on Syr. text).
ἐχεῖν χαλέων] So Α, with πρ. and other forms of πρ (but not χ), σ, &c. 2, and the Greek generally, have καὶ ἐσθ. ἐχεῖν χαλέων, but C om. ἐσθ. ἐσθ. ἐπὶ ἀναβαίνοντα] Litt., of εἰς ἀναβαίνοντα.
ΑΠΟΚΛΑΣΘΕΙΣ.

ἐστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἅρπου, καὶ περιβεβλημένοι στολάς λευκάς καὶ φοίνικες ἐν ταῖς χερεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κράζοντες φωνὴ μεγάλη καὶ λέγοντες· ἡ σωτηρία τῶν Ἱσραήλ καὶ τὸ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῷ ἅρπῳ. καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀγγέλοι εἰστήκεισαν κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ζώων καὶ ἔπεσον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν.

λέγοντες· ἁμὴρ; ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμή καὶ ἡ δυνάμεις καὶ ἡ λογία τῶν θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἁμὴρ. Ἐπεκρήθη εἰς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγων μοι· οὗτοι οἱ περιβεβλημένοι τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκὰς τίνες εἰς; καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον; καὶ εἰρήκα αὐτῶ· κύριε μου σὺ ὁ δικαίος καὶ εἰπέ μοι· οὗτοι εἰσόν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς βλάψεως τῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτὰς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἅρπου. διὰ τοῦτο εἰσόν ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ λατρεύσαμεν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου δεκάτες ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ· οὗ πε-νάονοις ὦ ἐρήμωσαν· οὐδὲ διψάσαν· οὐδὲ μὴ πάσχετε εἰς αὐτοὺς· οὗ ἡλιος, οὐδὲ πᾶν καῦμα· δει τὸ ἅρπων τὸ ἀκά-μεσον τοῦ θρόνου ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς· καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πνεύματος καὶ ἐξελέιψε τὰν δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. Καὶ ὅταν ἦν τὰς τῆς σφαγῆς VIII. τὴν ἐβδομήν, ἐγένετο συνή ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὡς ἡμιόρων. Καὶ εἶδον τὸν ἄγγελους οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ εἰστήκεισαν καὶ ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς.

---

[στρατιωτικά] So apparently S and Π (with ΠΑ and some mss.). But the Syriac (as also Latin) is inadmissible here; and possibly ἐστῶτες (of Q and most mss.) may be intended by both; or ἐστῶτες of C and mss. 38.

καὶ περιβεβλημένοι Or οὖν. The accusative is read by Α Q C Q and most mss., and γ; the nominative by Π and a few mss.; also by πρ and εγ. The insertion of καί, in which S is supported only by πρ, and other early citations of εγ, seems to indicate that this tptc. is meant to be of same case as the preceding one. But the Greek of this passage is (if the best copies may be trusted) so ungrammatical that one cannot draw any certain conclusions as to the text.

φοίνικας Or -και.

10. κράζοντες ... καὶ λέγοντες Or κράζοντες ... καὶ λέγοντες. But for λέγοντες there seems to be no authority; and λέγοντες with καί prefixed seems to require κράζοντες, though the Greek evidence for it is slight, and for καί (which S om.) slighter.

καὶ τῷ καθ.} Kal is peculiar to S.

11. At end of verse, S alone om. καὶ προσκυνήσαντι τῷ θεῷ.

12. ἡ εὐλογία καὶ] All else place these words before ἡ δόξα.


16. S, with ms. 38, om. ἔνα after both πνεύμασιν and διψασιν, supported in the first case by w, and in the second by P and a few ms. (1, 38, 38, &c.). A Q and most ms. ins. in both places. S agrees with w [στρατιωτικά]; but s with Q), as do also πρ and εγ.; but p with P [στρατιωτικά, vii. 14-17].

οὐδὲ ... ὕπατος] Or οὐδὲ ἤπατος ... ὑπατος καί.

17. ἔνα καὶ ἔνα πνεύμα] S alone: for ἔνα ζωής w. (MSS., most mss., lat. and other versions), or ἔνα ζωῆς w. (some mss.); f doubiful.

ἐξελέιψε] S alone om. δ ἐλέας after this verb.

VIII. 1. έσται Or ἐστι.

2. εἰστήκεισαν] So S and Π, supported by γ, and ms. 38 and a few others (with varying orthography). All else have ἐστήκεισαν (pr and Π, stasies, which is indecisive).
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

3 ἡπτὰ σάλπιγγες. Καὶ ἄλλος ἥλθε καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίουν ἤχων λιβανωτῶν χρυσῶν καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ θυμίαμα πολλὰ ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων, ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου. καὶ ἀνεβῆ ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμίαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ ἐδήλωσε ὁ ἄγγελος τὸ λιβανωτὸν καὶ ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐγένετο βροντή καὶ φωνή καὶ ἀστραπή καὶ σεισμός.

6 Καὶ οἱ ἡπτὰ ἁγίοι τοὺς ἥχους ἑτέρας ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγες, ἢτοί μασαὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἡμᾶς σαλμίσας. Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἐσάλπισε καὶ ἐγένετο χαλάζα καὶ πῦρ μεμυγμένα ἐν ὑδάτι καὶ ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάθηκεν, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν δέντρων κατεκάθηκεν, καὶ πᾶς χάρτης τῆς γῆς κατεκάθηκεν. Καὶ ὁ δευτέρως ἐσάλπισε καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ὅρος μεγά λαὶ καίμενοι ἐπεσεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης αἰματοῦ καὶ ἀπέθανε τὸ τρίτον πάντων τῶν κυνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὸ ἤχον ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διεθάρη. Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἐσάλπισε καὶ ἐπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφειλοῦ ἀστήρ καὶ οὔτε πᾶς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ τὸ νῦμα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὃς Ἀφίλτος καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον.
ἈΠΟΚΑΛΨΙΣ.

 tàν ύδάτων ὡς ἄψυχων· καὶ πολλοὶ
tῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον· ὡς ἐπὶ
12 κράνθησαν τὰ ὕδατα. Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος
ἐσάλπησε, καὶ ἐπίληγ τὸ τρίτον τοῦ
ήλιου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης
καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ
ἐσκοπήσαν τὸ τρίτον αὐτῶν καὶ
η ἡμέρα οὐκ ἔφαινε τὸ τρίτον
13 αὐτῶς· καὶ η νύξ ὦμοιος. Καὶ
Ἦκονα ἕνας ἀετὸς πετομένου ἐν
τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγοντος οὐαί οὐαί οὐαί
tοὺς κατοικοῦντος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς
φως τῶν σαλαίτην τῶν τριῶν
ἀγγέλων τῶν μελλόντων σαλάιειν.

IX. Καὶ ο πέμπτος ἐσάλπησε, καὶ ἐδών
αστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πετομένα
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐδώθη αὐτῷ ἡ κλείς

tῶν φρεάτων τῆς ἄβυσσου. καὶ
ἀνέβη καπνὸς ἐκ τῶν φρεάτων, ὡς
καπνὸς καμίνου μεγάλης καλομένης
καὶ ἐσκοπήσαν θὸ ἡλίος καὶ θ ἄγρ ἐκ
τοῦ καπνοῦ τῶν φρεάτων. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
3 καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ἀκρίδες εἰς τῆς γῆς,
καὶ ἐδώθη αὐτῶς ἐξονυτά ἃ ἔχουσι ἡ περιού,
η ὁσκρίτι τῆς γῆς καὶ ἔρρεθ 4
αὐτῶς ἐνα μὴ ἀδικήσωσι τῶν χόρτων
τῆς γῆς· καὶ τῶν χλωρῶν οὐδὲ
δείδει· εἰ μὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὕτω
οὐκ ἔχουν τῆς φραγίδα τῆς Θεοῦ
ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐδώθη
αὐτῶς ἐνα μὴ ἀποκτένωσιν αὐτούς,
ἀλλὰ βασανισθήσονται μήπες πέντε
cαὶ ο βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς βασα-
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6 θρωτών. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ ὁ μὴ εὑρὼν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ ἂν ἄρτος ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ ὄμωμα τῶν ἀκρίδων ἄνθρωπων ἵππους θητομασμένους εἰς πόλεμον. καὶ ἐπι τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὡς στέφανοι ὁμοίοι χρυσῷ· καὶ τὰ πρόσω- ρα αὐτῶν ὡς πρόσωπα ἄνθρωπων. καὶ ἔχουσιν τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν. καὶ οἱ ὄντες αὐτῶν ὡς λεόντων. καὶ ἔχουσιν ἑώρακας ὡς ἑώρακας σιδήρους. καὶ ἡ φωνὴ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ὡς φωνὴ ἄρματων ἵππων πολλῶν τρε- χόντων εἰς πόλεμον. καὶ ἔχουσιν ὀφρᾶς ὁμοίας σκορπίῳ καὶ κέντρα ὁ ὑπ' τῶν ὀφραῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδυνατεῖ τοὺς ἀν- θρώπους μήνας πέντε. καὶ ἔχουσιν εἰς αὐτῶν βασιλεία τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου. ὁ ὄνομα Ἐβραίωται Ἀβαδδὼν καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολογίων. ἦν οὐαὶ ἦν μιᾷ ἀπῆλθεν, ἵνα ἔρχονται ἐν δύο οἰκίαι. Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ ἐκτὸς ἄγγελος ἐσάλπησε. καὶ ἔκοψαν φωνὴν μίαν, ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων κερατῶν τοῦ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Λέγοντα τῷ ἐκτῷ ἄγγελῳ ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπηγα, λύσων τὸς τέσ-
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΗ.

σαρας ἀγγελούς τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ Εὐφράτῃ. 15 καὶ ἐλθθησάντων οἱ τέσσαρες ἀγγέλοι οἱ ἡμομασμένοι εἰς τὴν ὁραμα χαί εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ εἰς τὸν μήνα καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔως τὸν ἔως, ἢ ἀποκαλύψω τὸ 16 τρίτον τῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἀδελφός τῶν στρατευμάτων τοῦ ἱπποκόου, δύο μυριάδες μυριάδων ἡκουσά τὸν ἄρι 17 ὅμοιον αὐτῶν. καὶ τῶν καθημένων ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἔχοντας βαθρακᾶς πυρίνους καὶ ἀδάκων θεωδήν καὶ αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἱππών αὐτῶν, ὡς κεφαλαὶ λεόντων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν ἐκπορευέται τῷ καὶ θείον καὶ καπνὸς. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πληγῶν τούτων ἀπεκτάνθησάν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θείου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ τοῦ ἐκπορευομένου ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν. ἡ γὰρ ἔχοντα τῶν ἵππων ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων 20 οἱ οὖν ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν ταῖς πληγαῖς ταῦταις, οὐτέ μετενόησαν ἐκ τοῦ ἔργου τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσωσι τὰ δαμάσκην τὰ στέψα τὰ ἄγνωρα καὶ τὰ χαλάκα καὶ τὰ γόνη καὶ τὰ λίθους, ἢ οὔτε βλέπων ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῶν οὔτε ἄκουσε οὔτε περιπατεῖν, καὶ οὐ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν φαρμακῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῆς πορείας αὐτῶν.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΙΣ.

Χ. Καὶ ἐδὼν ἄλλων ἀγγελον κατα-
βαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ περιβε-
βημένον νεφέλην καὶ ἤ ἱερὸς ἐπὶ
τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ πρόσω-
πον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἡλίος, καὶ οἱ πόδες
αὐτοῦ ὡς στύλοι πυρὸς καὶ ἤχον
ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ βιβλαρίδιον ἀνεφορμένον καὶ ἔθηκε τὸν πόδα
αὐτοῦ τῷ δεξίῳ ἐπὶ τῆς θάλάσσης,
τὸν δὲ εὐώνυμον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ
ἐκραζεὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὡς περὶ λέων
μυκᾶν, καὶ ὅτε ἐκραζεὶ ἔθηκε
αὐτῷ ἐπὶ βρονταί ταῖς ἐκτοῖς
φωναῖς. καὶ ὅτε ἔθηκαν αὐτῷ
βρονταί ἐμπληκτεὶς. Καὶ ἦκουσα
φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἀγγέλου
λέγων, σφράγισεν ἀγγέλου
αὐτῷ ἐπὶ βρονταὶ καὶ μὴ αὐτὸ
γράφης.

οἱ ἄγγελοι οὖν ἐδών ἔστωτα ἐπὶ
tῆς θάλασσης καὶ ἔπη τῆς γῆς, ὃς ἦρε
τὴν χειρὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ὀυρανὸν καὶ ὁ
ἀμωμον ἐν τῷ ξανῆ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰώνων
δὲ ἐκτισε τὸν ὀυρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ
τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι χρόνος οὐκ ἔσται
ἐτίς. ἄλλα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ
ἐβδομοῦ ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μέλη
σαλπίζων, καὶ ἔτεκεθεν τὸ μυστή-
ριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, θεὸν εὐγγέλιον τοῖς
δουλοῖς αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφήτας.

Καὶ φωνὴ ἠκουσα ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ
tάλιν λαοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λε-
γονείν ὑπαγε λάβε τῷ βιβλαρί-
διον τὸ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ
ἐστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἔπη τῆς
θαλάσσης καὶ κατάφαγε αὐτὸ καὶ
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πικρανεί σοι τὴν κοιλίαν σου· ἀλλ' ἐν
tῷ στόματι σου ἔσται ὡς μέλι. καὶ
ἐλαβόν τὸ βεβλαρίδιον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς
tοῦ ἄγγελου καὶ κατέφαγον αὐτὰ·
καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ὡς μέλι
γλυκὸ· καὶ ὅτε ἔφαγον αὐτὸ ἐπὶ
κράνθη ἡ κοιλία μου. καὶ λέγει
μοι· δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεύσαι ἐπὶ
ἐθνοῦς καὶ λαοῖς καὶ γλώσσαις καὶ

XI. βασιλεύσει πολλοῖς. καὶ ἐδοθῆ μοι
κάλαμος ὁμοίος ῥάβδῳ καὶ εἰστήκει
d ὁ ἄγγελος λέγων· ἔγειραι καὶ μετα-
tρέσον τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ
θυσιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς προσκυνο-
tὰς ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τῆς
ἐσωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ, ἐκβάλε ἐξωθῆν
καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν μετρήσῃς· δι' ἐδοθῆ
tούς ἐθνοὺς καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν
ἀγίαν πατήσουσι μήνας τεσσαρά-
κοντα καὶ δύο. καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυναὶς
μάρτυρις μου ἵνα προφητεύσωσι,
ἡμέρας χιλιάς καὶ διακοσίων καὶ
ἐξήκουντα περιβεβλημένα σάκκους.
οὔτοι εἰσι δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ δύο
λυχνίαι οἱ ἑνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου
πασῶς τῆς γῆς ἐστῶτες. καὶ εἰ τὰς
θελεῖ ἀδίκησαι αὐτοὺς, πῦρ ἐκπο-
ρεύεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν
καὶ κατεσθίει τοὺς ἔχθρους αὐτῶν·
καὶ ὄστες θελεῖ ἀδίκησαι αὐτούς,
οὔτω δεῖ αὐτοὺς ἀποκτανθῆναι. καὶ ὁ
οὔτοι ἔχουσι τὴν ἐξουσίαν κλείσαι
tὸν οὐρανόν, ἵνα μὴ βρέχῃ ἄρσεν ἐν
ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς προφητείας αὐτῶν·
καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι στρέψει τὰ
ἔδαπτα εἰς αἵματες· καὶ ἀνατάξησι
τὴν γῆν ἐν πάσῃ πληγῇ ὀσάκες
ἐὰν θελήσωσιν. καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσιν

σοι . . . σου] All else read so before, and
om. after, τῇ κοιλίαν.
ἐσται] All else add γλυκόν.
11. λέγει μοι] So P and many mas.; X and et and
eγ [cf. with στρ. ο., &c.], &c.: but the other Greek
[Texta hist. x. 10—xi. 3], and om. read λέγουσι μοι.
δεῖ σε πάλιν] Lit., διότι σε πάλιν χρήσιν: but see note on Syr. text. in 1.
ἐθνοῦς καὶ λαοῖς] So εἰ (not om or αἰνοῦ), and σὺ with εἰτι before λαοῖς: all else place λαοῖς first.
XI. 1. καὶ ἔστηκεν δ ἐγέλαθεν] So X [but with pre-
fixes *], with Q and several mas. : also στρ. The
other Greek copies, and versions (including lat. except
arv), om.
2. τὴν ἐσωθῆν] So εἰ and a few mas. (1, 35, 87,
&c.) : nearly all the other authorities have τὴν ἐθνοῦς.
ἐθνοῦς] So Α, with some mas. (including 1, 35,
87, as in last note): Q and many, ἐθνῶν; P ἐθνοὺς,
and Λ εἰνω.
3. ἵνα προφητεύσωσι] Lit., προφητεύσαι. All
else, except πρ' ἤ, have καὶ for ἤ. See first note on xi. 27.
περιβεβλημένα] Or μένοις.
4. διὸ . . . διὸ] So apparently S, and probably X.
All else prefix al to the former word; and nearly all,
except Θ, to the latter.
οἵ . . . ἄντιστατα] Or αἱ . . . ἄντιστατα.
πάλιν] S alone ins. this word.
5. εἰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐστῶτες. Or possibly (οἵτινες, but for this
latter there is no support: see note on Syr. text.
θελεῖ διαλείψαι αὐτοὺς (οί)] The position of the
pronoun after both verbs (in S, not Ω) is probably due
to the Syr. idiom; but is supported, in the first
instance, by ms. 14 alone; in the second, by Ω alone.
σοι] So ms. 38: the rest of Ω τις.
δεῖ αὐτοῦς] So ms. 87: all else, δεῖ αὐτόν.
6. καὶ θελεῖ] All else om. καὶ.
βρέχῃ] Lit., καταβρέχῃ.
ὁδοί] A few mas., and υ, place this word thus:
καὶ, and most Greek copies, and versions, place it be-
fore the verb; έι om.
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις] So ms. 1: πρ' in diebus: all
other Greek, τὰ δὲ ἡμέρας.
στρέψει τὰ ἔδαπτα] All else, δεῖ τὰς ὑδάτων
στρέψειν αὐτά.
ἀνατάξησιν] The verb used by S = ἀνατάξῃσιν,
but an obvious correction of the Syr. text (see note on
it) restores ἀνατάξῃσιν.
ἀδικαι] So all authorities: lit., ἓφ' έκαστον:
see note on Syr. text.
θελήσωσι] Or sēsou.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗΣ.

7. τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν, τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ποιήσει μετ᾽ αὐτῶν πόλεμον, καὶ νικήσει ἡ αὐτοῖς οἱ αὐτοῖς. καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν πλατειῶν τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης. ητὺς καλείται πνευματικὸς Σόδομα καὶ Λήγγες ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταιρώθηκ. καὶ βλέπουσιν ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ἐθνῶν τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμείν καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀφιέρωσι τεθήκαν εἰς μνήματα. καὶ οἱ κατακομβοί ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς χαρίσσονται ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ δώρα σεμψοῦσιν ἀλλιώς. οὕτων οἱ δύο προφῆται ἐβασάνισαν τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμείν, πνεῦμα ὄνω ῆκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐστήσαν ἐπὶ τῶν πόδας αὐτῶν. καὶ πνεῦμα ᾧ ζωῆς ἐπέση ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ φόβος μέγας ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοῦ θεωροῦντα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠκούσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ λεγοῦσας αὐτοῖς, ἀνάβατε ἐδέ. καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸν ὀυρανὸν ἐν τῇ νεῖλῃ καὶ ἐθεώρουν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἁρμῇ ἐγένετο σεισμὸς μέγας καὶ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἐπέσαν καὶ ἀπεκτάθησαν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ καὶ ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπου χυλίδες ἐπάνω καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν φόβῳ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐδοξασάν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ ὀυρανῷ ἐντούς.

7. τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν, τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ποιήσει μετ᾽ αὐτῶν πόλεμον, καὶ νικήσει ἡ αὐτοῖς οἱ αὐτοῖς. καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν πλατειῶν τῆς πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης. ητὺς καλείται πνευματικὸς Σόδομα καὶ Λήγγες ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταιρώθηκ. καὶ βλέπουσιν ἐκ τῶν φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ἐθνῶν τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμείν καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀφιέρωσι τεθήκαν εἰς μνήματα. καὶ οἱ κατακομβοί ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς χαρίσσονται ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ δώρα σεμψοῦσιν ἀλλιώς. οὕτων οἱ δύο προφῆται ἐβασάνισαν τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμείν, πνεῦμα ὄνω ῆκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐστήσαν ἐπὶ τῶν πόδας αὐτῶν. καὶ πνεῦμα ᾧ ζωῆς ἐπέση ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ φόβος μέγας ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοῦ θεωροῦντα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠκούσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ ὀυρανοῦ λεγοῦσας αὐτοῖς, ἀνάβατε ἐδέ. καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸν ὀυρανὸν ἐν τῇ νεῖλῃ καὶ ἐθεώρουν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἁρμῇ ἐγένετο σεισμὸς μέγας καὶ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἐπέσαν καὶ ἀπεκτάθησαν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ καὶ ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπου χυλίδες ἐπάνω καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐν φόβῳ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐδοξασάν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ ὀυρανῷ ἐντούς.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗ.

14. τὸ ἴδιον αἰ οὐσι ἢ δύο ἀπλῆθαν· καὶ ἴδιον ἢ οὐσι ἢ τρίτη ἐχρητά ταχύ.  
15. Καὶ ὁ ἐβδομα φάνος ἐσάλπησε, καὶ ἐγένοντο φωτά μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγοντες, ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἦμας καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσειν  
16. εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. καὶ οἱ εἰκοσ καὶ τέσσαρες προσβύτεροι οἱ ἐνώπιοι τοῦ θεοῦ κάθηται ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν, ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ  
17. λέγοντες, εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ ὑπό καὶ ὁ ἀν τοις κεφαλὴς τῶν δύναμεν σοι  
18. τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ βασιλεύσειν. καὶ λέγουσιν, ὁ ὄργη σου καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν  

19. ὁ ραμ. All else add τοῦ θεοῦ.  

14. τὸ ἴδιον A all else om. ἴδιον and read ἴδιον τοῦ θεοῦ, with verb in sing.; and (except ms. 7) om. the following καὶ. But see note on Syr. text.  
15. ἐχρητα ταχύ. Litt. ἐχρητα ταχύ: but the change of a point in the Syriac (see note on it) restores the present, which 2 and all else read.  
16. λέγοντες Or -ον.  
κάθηται. There is no other evidence for this καθηται, which I obviate as probably being an insertion made in the Syriac. Cp. xii. 10.  
θεος. So one ms. (28), also ρα το: the rest read,  

κυριου.  
17. ἴδιον] So all Greek, and θεος. Or δυνασι καθηται.  
18. καθηται καὶ δούναι ... διαφθείρασιν. Litt. καὶ δούναι καὶ δοῦσιν ... διαφθείρασιν.  
τοὺς μικροὺς μετὰ τῶν μεγάλων. All else for μετὰ have καὶ (with change of case of following words), and some read both adjectives in accusative. It inclines to τοὺς μικροὺς. Cp. Ps. cxlii. 21 (LXX.).  

diaφθείρασιν. So apparently S and 2, with C and some ms. (7, 87, &c.), and lat.: the rest diaφθείρασιν.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΑΤΨΗΣ.

3. πορφόρος: So C Q and many mas., and Z and some versions: lat., and all the rest, have πορφόρος.
5. εἰσήθη: C alone of Greek copies, and ζ of versions, support the superfluer.: the rest mostly perf.
6. ἁρτήν: Or ἁρτον. (P Q have mas., A C neut.). There is nothing in S to support the selectism.
7. θεαμάσθης: Lit., θεαμάτωται. The Greek have τοῦ θεαμάτος, and so ζ: λ and π, πιγμαρέων; but not amb., and one mas. (35); the rest, εἰς.
8. ἐξίκοντα: So Q and many mas., and Z and some versions: lat., and all the rest, have ἐξίκοντος.
9. ἐξίκοντα: Or ἐξίκονος. The Greek have τοῦ ἐξίκονος, and so ζ: λ and π, πιγμαρέων; but not amb., and one mas. (35); the rest, εἰς.
10. ἐξίκονος: So ma. 96, and λ and π (but not β), also ἐκ τοῦ ὀφρασίου, of all else.
11. ἐξίκονος: Or ἐξίκονος. The Syr. text (see note on it) by dropping a letter, represents ἐξίκονος: πς alone om.
12. ἐξίκονος: All else add καὶ ἐξενίσχυς τοῦ Ἰωάννου αὐτοῦ.
οὐκ ἡγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἀχρι
θανάτου. διὰ τούτου εὐφράινεσθε
οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦσιν
οὐαὶ τῇ γῆ καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ. οἴκο
καταβαίνει ὁ Διὸβολος πρὸς αὐτούς,
ἐχον θυμὸν μέγαν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅλιγον
καιρὸν ἔχει. καὶ ὅτε ἔδει ὁ Δράκων
ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, εἰδώζη τὴν
γυναῖκα ἥτις ἔστυ τὸν ἄρεσιν. καὶ
ἔδειθη τῇ γυναικὶ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ
αἰτιοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου· ἱνα πετήσατε εἰς
τὴν ἐρήμου εἰς τὸν τοῦτον αὐτῆς,
ὅπως τρέφῃτε ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καιροῦς
καὶ ἤμυην καιροῦ, ἀπὸ προσωποῦ
τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄρος ἐκ τοῦ
στόματος αὐτοῦ· ὁπώσει τῆς γυναικὸς
ὔδαρ ὡς ποταμὸν, ἵνα αὐτὴν ποταμὸν
μοφόρηται θυσία. καὶ ἔβουθησεν
ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἤρθεν ἡ γῆ
tὸ στόμα αὐτῆς καὶ κατέστευ τὸν
ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ Δράκων ἐκ
tοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὁργίσθη
ὁ Δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἀπῆλθε
ποιήσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λυπῶν
τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, τῶν θηριών
tὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἔχοντων
τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἕρωον. καὶ ἔστα- ὁ
θηρίον ἀναβαίνον, ἔχον κήρατα δέκα
καὶ κεφαλάς ἑπτά· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν
κεφάτων αὐτοῦ δέκα διαδήματα· καὶ
ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ὅνυμα
βλασφημίας. καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὁ ἔδει
καὶ ὁμοίου παράδειγµα καὶ οἱ πόδες
αὐτοῦ ὡς ἄρκον καὶ τὸ στῶα αὐτοῦ
ὡς *λεόντων* καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ
Δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν
θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξονισαν μεγάλην.
καὶ μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς
ἐσφαγμενὴν εἰς θάνατον καὶ ἡ
πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ἑρατε-
πεύθη καὶ ἑκατοστὴ ὡς ἡ γῆ
ὁπώσω τοῦ θηρίον καὶ ἑπτάνυµον· 10

12. γῇ γῆ... τῇ θαλάσσῃ] Or accusative.
καταβαίνει] So δ [not σ; p f]; for sor.
αὐτοῦ] All else, ἤμας (or ἤμας, ms. 162).
14. ἐδιέθη] All else -ίσα δ, except a corrector of m. διέθη] So apparently S (not ἤ), with P Q and
most mas., for al ἄνδειον.
τῷ τρέφοντα] So S (lit. τρέφοντα), with Q and
many mas. The rest have διέφραται (so rec.),
supported by X and lat. [Tisch. a note on this place is defect
for the reading of Q, see his ApG. N. T. Vaticanei.
καταβάτων] All else prefix καί.
17. ἔχοντας] Lit. ἔχοντας, but this is probably due
to the Syriac idiom; see note on l. 18.
18. ἔσθαρεν] So P Q, and most mas. The rest,
X, and lat. and most versions, ἐσθάρεων.
XIII. 1. τῆς κεφαλῆς] All else plural.
θηρία] So m cf. and a few mas., τι and most
versions: A Q, most mas., τις and X, plural.
2. *λεόντων*] (i) All else, except one mas. (88),
and one or two versions, prefix στῶα. (ii) S reads λεόντωσιν, as does P [p; but dln have λεόντωσιν].
Both are expressed by the same letters in Syriac, and
only distinguished by points (see note on Syr. text).
As there is the support of m and two mas. (14, 92) for
λεόντως, and none for λεόντωσιν, I restore the former.
The authorities in general read λεόντωσιν.
3. *ἐθαμαθεῖα*] S has a verb = ἀναθῆκα (op. Pub.,
Matth. iv. 1). But by changing a single letter into
a similar one we recover ἐθαμαθεῖα. See note on Syr.
text. I prefer this reading (with ἤ and some mas.—
see also C, and g) to ἐθαμαθεῖν (of the rest), as agreeing
with the passive form of the Syr. verb.
διὰ ἡ γῆ] I reads ἡ ἡγγη (v for σ, and τ misplaced).
4. *προσεκύνησα*] S represents προσεκυνήσαν (by
omission of the final letter of the Syr. verb; see
note on Syr. text). But this is an unsupported
and impossible reading.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΗΣ

xiv. 4—12.

ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς, οἵ οὖ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῇ βυβλίῳ τῆς γῆς, τῷ τοῦ ἄρτινο

τῶν ἐσφαγμένον πρὸς καταβολής κόσμου. Εἰ τις ἔχει ὅς, ἀκούσατο. 9

ιἱ ἑς ἑς ἀιχμαλωσίαν ἀπάγει ὡς ἀιχμαλωσίαν ἄποκτείνει, ἐν μαχαῖρᾳ

ἀποκτεῖνεται. Ἀδεὶ ἔστω ἡ πίστις

καὶ ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλα θηρίαν ἀναβαίνον ἐκ τῆς

γῆς, καὶ ἔλεξεν κέρατα δύο· καὶ ὄμοιον ἄρνι: καὶ ἔδιδε ὡς δράκῶν

καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ πρῶτου θηρίου ἱεροὶ ἱεροὶ

*πάσαν* ἦν πίστις ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ποιήσει τὴν γῆν καὶ

τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικούντας. Καὶ προσκυνήσων τῷ θηρίῳ τὸ πρῶτον

οὐ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου

---

σαν τῷ δράκων, ὅτι ἔδωκε τὴν

ἐξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ, καὶ προσεκλήσα

τῷ θηρίῳ τούτῳ; καὶ τὰς δύναται

5 πολεμῆσαι μετ’ αὐτοῦ; καὶ ἔδωκε

αὐτῷ στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ

βλασφημίαν· καὶ ἔδωκε αὐτῷ ἐξουσία

ποίησαι μήνας πεσσαράκουτα καὶ

6 δύο. καὶ ἤνοιξε τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ

εἰς βλασφημίαν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν

βλασφημίασε τὸ ὅρμα καὶ τὴν

σκηνήν τῶν ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχον σκηνώ

7 τῶν. καὶ ἔδωκε αὐτῷ ποίησαι πόλε

μον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι

αὐτούς· καὶ ἔδωκε αὐτῷ ἐξουσία

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλῆν καὶ λαὸν καὶ

3 γλώσσαν καὶ ξένος. καὶ προσκυνή

σον σουν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικούντες

---

8. ἡμῶν] As in Α C P, and a few mas., pr

and ἢ: or τοῖς ἢδεισ, as γ and εἴ: Q and most, τῷ

πέθαινέν.

9. τοῖς] So 3; pr, illae bestiae: all else om.

6. εἰς βλασφημίαν ... βλασφημίασε.] Lith., βλασφημία.

πρὸς τὸν Θεόν] Lith., ἐνάντιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

τῷ δύον] All else add αὐτόν (u. αὐτοῦ).

τὴν σκηνὴν τῶν ... σκηνᾶσθαι] All else ins.

αὐτοῦ ἀπείραντα, and read [καὶ] τῶν ... σκηνᾶσθαι: except τῇ (καὶ ... τοῖς λαβῶν).

8. αἱ ὑπὸ γεγραμμένοι] S alone: but probably the

Syr. text (on which see note) needs emendation, and

and its true reading may be (οἱ ὑγρὰνα τὸ ἐσχήμα

[αὐτῶν], (with μ P Q, γ, εἴ, ἤκ.; the rest sing.).

τῷ δύον] So apparently S, but all else om. τῷ

9. ἡμῶν] So one ms. (33): also δ (but i with ἢ),

δ' ἡμῶν, including lat. of Irenæus (V. xxviii. 2), ἡς, and

9. εἴ, with σ. κ. ἤκ.; but all MSS. and some few

mas. and εἴ, ἢκ., om. Rec., with ms. 1, has εἴδοσι: 35, 87, ἡμῶν. All MSS. (except A) om. also the

second εἰς ἀιχμαλωσίας.

καὶ δέντα ἐν μαχαῖρᾳ.] All else except ἢ: om.

καὶ, and all read ἢς, except πρ and εἴ (pros).

ἀναγεννήσων.] So S and a few mas.: the rest read

mostly ἀναανεγερθεί, and so rec. ἡ agrees with S, and

so does γ (intervene), but not pr or εἴ (occident).

ἐν μαχαῖρῳ ἀναανεγερθείται.] So S (for δε αὐτόν

ἐν μαχαίρῳ), supported by g alone, which has

has gladio interfectiur. The close agreement between

these two versions in this remarkable verse is note-

worthy.

πίστις ... ὅσιομεθ) All else transpoe.

10. καὶ ἔστω [ἡ] S alone: all else ἔστω, omitting

καὶ ἔστω.

12. *πάσαν* S has ἵππον, but the removal of a

point corrects this. See note on Syr. text.

*τάλα* [ποιήσει] (i) S has a fut. verb, with the

prefix which may stand either for ἔστω or ἵππον. If the

former, it is wrongly inserted; if the latter, it seems

doubtful, but ἵππον ἤποιήσει (ὡς ἐστι, as ms. 97, or

ποιήσει) may be the reading indicated. The MSS.

and most mas. and g read νοικία simply; three mas.

(34, 35, 87) ἤποιήσει. (ii) For

ποιήσει, S has a verb = ἐπαλαβότας: but by shifting a

point we recover ἤποιήσει. See note on Syr. text.

καὶ ἤποιήσει.] So the three ms. cited in last

note (i): 3 with Q and most mas., καὶ ἤποιήσει; the


*τάλα* [προσκυνήσωσιν.] Read rather ἵππον for καὶ,

with all else: see note on Syr. text.
13 αὐτοῦ. καὶ ποιῆσει σημεία μεγάλα, ἵνα τὸ ποιῆσαι καταβαίνεις εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν
14 ἀνθρώπων. καὶ ἀποδημήσῃ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἡ ἐκδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνώ-
πιον τοῦ θερίου λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦντι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου ὥστε τὸν ἑξῆς τῆς
15 μαγαίρας καὶ ἐξήσει. καὶ ἐκδόθη αὐτῷ δύναται πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκών τοῦ θηρίου, καὶ ποιῆσαι ἵνα ὁδοὶ ἐν
μη προσκυνήσωσι τῇ εἰκών τοῦ 16 θηρίου, ἀποκτανθῶσι καὶ ποιῆσαι πάντας τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγά-
λους, τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτω-
χούς, τὸν Δεσπόταν καὶ τοὺς δούλους, ὡς δὴ αὐτὸς χάραγμα
ἐπὶ τῶν κειρῶν αὐτῶν τῶν δεξιῶν, ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν, ὥστε μὴ τις ἀγοράσῃ ἢ πωλήσῃ οὕτως, εἰ μὴ
ὁ ἑξῆς τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ ἀνώματος τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τῶν ἀρμιῶν τοῦ ἀνώ-
ματος αὐτοῦ. δεδή ἡ σοφία ἐστίν. 18 καὶ ὁ ἑξῆς τόν, ἁρμισῶσα αὐτὸν ἀρμισῶσα γὰρ
ἀνθρώπους ἐστίν. ἐξακοστῶσι καὶ ἐξη-
κοντα καὶ ἑξῆς. Καὶ εἴδον καὶ ἔδοξον XIV.
τὸ ἀριστὸν ἑστηκός ἐπὶ τὸ ὀρὸς Σιω, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐκατὸν καὶ τεσσαρά-
κοντα καὶ τέσσαρας χιλιάδες ἐκοιμᾷ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ
πατρὸς αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένοι ἐπὶ τῶν
μετώπων αὐτῶν. καὶ ἢνκυσα φωνὴν 2
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων
πολλῶν, καὶ ὡς φωνὴ βροντῆς με-

13. παράσπ. So two (35, 87) of the ms. cited on
verse 12: for τοῖς, of the rest, and ἡ: lat., foedet.
ἐνεπέτρεπτον] Nearly all else ins. εἰπον before τῆς.
ἔστη] So Q and many ms.; also Ξ: all else εἰπον.
14. ἀποδημήσῃ (i) So Q and, and am (sedent; but 4 with other texts of εἰς, sedent; as also pr): all Greek copies, παρατάθησι, and so 5, also arm: (ii) T S has a verb = ἐξακο-
τάθησιν or ἐκκάθισθησι, but by transposing two letters we
recover the true reading. See note on Syr. text.
τὰ σημεῖα] S renders as if these words were in
genitive: but see note on Syr. text, iv. 11.
6] So ο and many ms., but the rest have Ξ.
ι is here indecisive: έτε has γίνε (Ξ 5); but 5 has γίνε (which confirms 5).
15. αὐτοῦ] ΔΞ Ξ Q: or perhaps ἀυτοῦ, as A CP.
παράσπ. τοῖς εἰς ἐκεῖνο τοῦ θερίου] After these words,
S om. (by homoeot.). the words 1 2 καὶ λαλήσῃ ἐκεῖνο τοῦ
θηρίου, as do Ω and a few ms.; also Ξ [7; not 4 p].
παράσπ. So 5, and a few ms., and apparently
1 I, for παράσπ. Of these ms., three (14, 73, 79) om.
the preceding sentence; and thus agrees with 5 and Ξ in
their reading of the entire passage.
16. παράσπ. So 2 [ΔΞ: but Ξ 4] and Ε (foedet; but arm, foedet): g, foedet; pr, foedet. All Greek copies
have woεi, but a corrector of 5 agrees with 5.

Ε 2 27
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΥΣΗ.

XIV. 2—11.

γάλης· ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἡκουσα, ὡς κιθαριστῶν κιθαρίζοντα εἰς ταῖς κιθάραις αὐτῶν καὶ ξύδουσιν ὡς ψυὴν κακῆς ἐσώπων τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ ἐσώπων τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ ἐσώπων τῶν προευτρέων καὶ οἴδας ἡ δύναμις μαθεῖν τῆς φωνῆς. ἦταν οἱ ἐκατόν καὶ τεσσάρικον καὶ τέσσαρες χιλιάδες οἱ ἡγουμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς οὖσιν εἰσίν, οἱ μετὰ γνωριμιῶν οὐκ ἐμολυνθήσαν παραθέναι γὰρ εἰσίν, οὗτοι οἱ ἐκατονθύματες τῷ ἀρνῷ ὅπου οὐκ ἦν ὑπάγαν. οὗτοι ἡγούμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀπαρχὴ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνῷ. ὅτι ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐκ εὑρήθη ἡ σεισμὸς· ἀρμοὶ γὰρ εἰσίν. Καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄλλων ἀγγέλων πετάμενον ἐν μεσομαρνήματι, ἐξοντα ἑνόπλων ἐναγγέλων αἰώνων εὐαγγελίζεσται ἐπὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν έθνων καὶ λαῶν καὶ φυλάς καὶ γλῶσσαν, λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μετ' γάλης, φοβηθῆτε τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ἀρα τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ ποιήσαντι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ βάλασαν καὶ πηγάς ὄδατων. Καὶ ἄλλος δεύτερος ἡκολούθει αὐτῷ λέγων, ἐπεσεν ἐπεσε Βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου τῆς προνειας αὐτῆς πεπόθηκε πάντα τὰ ἐθνη! Καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος τρίτος ἡκολούθησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, εἰ τις προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαμβάνει χάραγμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ μετατόπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς πεταῖ ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ Κυρίου, τοῦ κεκερασμένου ἀκράτου ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῆς ἀργής αὐτοῦ καὶ βασανισθήσεται ἐν πυρὶ καὶ θειῷ, ἐνάπνευσιν ἄγγελον καὶ ἐσώπων τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ ὁ καπνὸς τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῶν.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

11. ἀναβαίνει] The verb seems to be preterite in S (as pointed); but whether pret., fut., or present in Syriac, it apparently represents the present tense, which all Greek copies show. See note on Syr. text.

13. ἐπὶ τὴν πιστίν Ιησοῦ. Καὶ ἡκοῦσα φωνής ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγοῦσα γράφων, μακαρίοι οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθηνήσκοντες ἀνέρτησιν καὶ λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀνασάπῃ.

14. συναι ἐκ τῶν κόσμων αὐτῶν. καὶ ἴδοι νεφέλη λευκή καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθημένων ὄμοιον νῦν ἀνθρώπου ἔχων ἐπὶ τὴς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ στέφανον χρυσὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ δρέπανον ὀξεύων.

15. Καὶ ἄλλος ἀγγελος ἔξηλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, κράζων ἐν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης, πέμψων τὸ δρέπανον σου καὶ θερισοῦν, ὅτι ἠλθεν ἡ ἀρα θερισαι. καὶ ἐβάλεν ἐν οἷον καθημένων ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ θερισθείη ἡ γῆ. Καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἔξηλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔχων καὶ αὐτὸς δρέπανον ὀξεύν.

16. ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἐφώνησε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τῷ ἔχοντι τὸ δρέπανον τὸ ὀξεύν, πέμψων σὺ τὸ δρέπανον σου τὸ ὀξεύnt, καὶ πρύγησον τοὺς βότρυας τῆς ἀμπελοῦ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἠκμασαν αἱ σταφυλαὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐβάλεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐπτύγησε τὴν ἀμπελοῦ τῆς

11. The verb seems to be preterite in S (as pointed); but whether pret., fut., or present in Syriac, it apparently represents the present tense, which all Greek copies show. See note on Syr. text.

13. Lipa Liti, Kopr ημεροκινητος. The verb in S is preterite.

14. All else add, τα γάρ [48] ἐργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεὶ μὲ τα αὐτῶν. I do not restore the omitted words, for the omission is probably not due to the Syriac scribe, but derived from the Greek by the translator,—the homoteleuton which is complete in the Greek (αὐτῶν... αὐτῶν) being lost so in the Syriac, where the pronoun is expressed by a suffix.

16. καὶ ἔκαρα] All else prex ἐκθεο, except ἐκτός only, καθημένος ἐμοι.] Or nominative.

17. καὶ ἀγαθόν] Or καὶ ἀγαθόν simply.

18. ἐκ] So apparently S, and II distinctly, with Α C; also Η (but not λ or ρ), and Ψ. The rest om.

19. ἰδοὺ] Lipa, ἰδοὺ (op. ver8. 16), and so II. θυτάργη] οἱ ἐν φωνῇ Ἰ. ἱπταντι, with C P and most mas. : but Α Q, a few mas., and lat., φωνῆσαν τα τω δρέπανον σου] (i) S with all else except two mas. (14, 92) prefixed ἵμαρτων. (ii) S alone ins. σο. The nearest approach to its reading is that of a ms. (29), which ins. σου before, as well as after, τῷ δρέπανον, it has the support of C and many mas.

20. καὶ ἐφεσα] Lipa, προφανεία, which possibly may have been in the Greek original of S.

21. καὶ τῶν γάρ] So ι, and mas. 88 and 97, only : with the rest ἐκ των γάρ.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΗΣ.  

γῆς καὶ έξαλεν εἰς τὴν λημνὸν τοῦ σο γίματος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν μεγάλην, καὶ ἐπατήθη ἡ λημνὸς ἐξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐξηλθον ἀλμα ἐκ τῆς λημνοῦ, ἀχρι τῶν χαλιμῶν τῶν ἱππῶν, ἐπὶ σταδίων χιλιῶν καὶ διακοσίων

4. οἰνοῖς. Μεγαλε ἐκ τοῦ ἱματίου τὸν Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ παντοκράτορος δῖκαιον καὶ ἀληθῶς τὰ ἔργα σου ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰῶνων. τὸς οὖ μὴ φοβηθῇ σε, Κύριε! καὶ 4 δοξάσει τὸ ὄνομά σου. ὅτι σὺ ἐλ μόνος ὁσιός· ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἐθνη ἴσας καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνωπίων σου. ὅτι ἕδικαιος εἰ. Καὶ 5 μετὰ ταύτα εἰδὼν, καὶ ἤνοιξή ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐξηλθον οἱ ἔπτα 6 ἀγγέλων ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ οἱ ἔχουσιν τὰ ἐπάνω πληγάς, ἐνδεδυμένου λίχων καθὼς καὶ λαμπρόν καὶ περιποιημένον ἐπὶ τὰ στήθη αὐτῶν λίχων χρυσῆν. καὶ εἰ τῶν τεσσαρῶν 7 ζῶων ἐδοκεῖ τοῖς ἔπτα ἀγγέλων, ἐπὶ φιάλας γεμοῦσας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ

1. τῆς μεγάλης] So m (alone of MSS.), with some ms., followed by rec. The rest have τῶν μέγαν, which for expressly attests: and so ἔ. The other lat. are indecisive: 2 gives λαεῖα. μεγαν. 

20. [ὁ] So m and ms. 1, 28, 38, 79; or ἐκεῖνος, as all else.


22. διακοσίων] S has here the support of m and one ms. (26 only): the rest mostly μεγαλών.

23. ἐπάνω] θαλάσσας] L is here. All else ἐπάνω.

3. ἔσχατον] Or ἔσχατα, with m, pr, and σφ. 

4. λέγωντες] Or καὶ λέγοντες.

5. διεισαγαγώς τὰ ἐργα] All else, διεισαγαγώς καὶ ἀληθῶς αὐτῶν. 

6. αὐτοῦ] So m, C, two ms. (18, 96), ἐκ, and ς [εὐσεβείας: but om, εὐσεβείας]: but the other MSS. and ms. and most versions, including ἐκ, read ἑωθίνια: δειλήν of rec. is an error.

4. ὧν ἐκ] Or ὧν ὥς. 

5. φοβήθη σε] So rec., with many ms., ἐκ, and τῇ [ἐκ, with arm, &c.]; also m and 95 (with ἐκ before ἐκ). But the other MSS., mas., and versions om. ex., including ἐκ, and am, &c. 

6. ὅτι] S and X alone insert ὅτι. The addition of ἕτα is apparently indicated in S, and distinctly in ἐκ, and some mes. support it: also εἰ, and ex [ἐκ, with arm, &c.]; but not am. 

7. δέ] S alone (but its text is here open to suspicion: see note on it); for τὰ διεισαγαγώς σου εὐσωμάτων. 

8. ἀγγελαὶ] A stop wrongly follows in the Syr. ἐκ τῶν ἱμάτων. All else place these words after ἐργα, except one ms. (94). 

9. λίχων] So P and most mes., ἐκ, and ς; or ἐκεῖνος, as Q and some mes., or ἐκεῖνος, as ἐκ: (so pr, lines: g, lineament; h, lineamentae; arm, lineamentae [sic]): but A C, a few mes., and am., &c., lίχων. 

10. καὶ λειτυργεῖ] So om. καὶ, with nearly all authorities, except ἐκ and some texts of ἐκ (but not am or arm).


11. χρυσῆν] All else plural. Possibly the pointing of the Syr. text needs correction.

12. φιάλαι] So pr; nearly all else add χρυσῆν.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗ.

καὶ τὰσα ψυχῆ ᾧσα ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῇ βαλάσῃ. Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἀγγέλος ἐξέχεε ἡν ἡμᾶς ἀυτοῦ εἰς τῶν τοπομοὺς καὶ εἰς τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ἱδᾶτων, καὶ ἐγένετο ἀλᾶ. Καὶ ὁ ἡκουσί τοῦ ἀγγελοῦ τῶν ἱδᾶτων λέγοντος, δικαῖος ἐλ ὁ ἄνω καὶ ὁ ἡμ., καὶ ὁ δύσι ὁ τὰῦτα ἔκρωσι· ὅτι τὰ αἷμα προφήτων καὶ ἀγίων ἔξεχαν, καὶ ἀλὰς δέδωκες αὐτοῖς πεῖν ἄξωι εἰς. Καὶ ἡκουσί τοῦ θυσιαστρίῳ λέγοντος, καὶ Κύριος ὁ Θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἐλήλυναι καὶ δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις σου. Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἀγγέλος ἔξεχε τὴν ἡμᾶς ἄυτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱλιοῦ καὶ εὐδή ἄυτο ἀματίσασί τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐν πυρί. καὶ ἐκαυματίσασί οἱ ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἀματίσασί τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν πυρί. καὶ ἐκαυματίσασί τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν πυρί.

1. τῶν ἰδας. The text of S represents, ἀπίστευτον; but the removal of a point restores the text as I give it: lit. 5 ἀπίστευτον: see note on Syr. text.

2. ἀλᾶς] So 12, but with three mass. (13, 28, 46): nearly all else om.

3. ἔκ τοῦ κανοῦ τῆς δημοτής] 3 with Q and many ms. support δे τοῖς, which the rest om.: but S alone om. ἐκ τοῦ κανοῦ τῆς δημοτής.

4. ἤκρωσι] 12, 55, 9, and 21. Rec. has καὶ ἤκρωσι (with a few mass.) followed by comma: and so (apparently) pr. The MSS., εἰς, and most other authorities, read [ἀ] ἤκρωσι, and om. καὶ.

5. προφήτων καὶ ἰδας] All else insert these nouns.

αὐτῶν] Nearly all also place this word before [ἀ]δωκαν: but 4 and mass. 14, 92, εἰς, as S.

8. ἰδας] So 5, and several mass., εἰς, which αὐτῶν, εἰς, and om., &c.) the other Greek copies om., as do 2, εἰς, and om., &c. The other versions are divided.

8 and 9. ἐν πυρί. καὶ ἐκαυματίσασί οἱ ἀνθρώποι] I insert these words, which S om., because they appear to have been accidentally passed over by the scribe by reason of the homoeoteleuton, which in Syriac is complete (see note on Syr. text); whereas in Greek the similarity between τῶν ἀνθρώπων and τῶν ἰδας is not close enough to mislead. (S om. ἐν).
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΕΙ.

10. ἄγγελος[10] So rec., and some mas., pr, εγ [cf. with arm, &c.], and other versions: but all MSS., 3, γ, and om, &c., om. The evidence as to this word is similarly divided, verses 12 and 17 (but in them ρ ια). 11. τὸ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ] So ms. 91: all else, τὸ Θεό. *μετανόησεν[11] S gives ἔγνωσα: but for this there is no support; and the change of a letter into a very similar one in the Syriac (see note on Syr. text) restores the true reading, as I give it. 12. ἀδεὶς ἄνωθεν] (i) All else insert τῶν before ἄνωτε. (ii) All else, except A, ms. 1, 28, 38, 79, and a few others, read ἄνωθεν. Cpr. viii. 2, and note there [P lαs, xvi. 12-xvii. 1]. 13. βάπτασάν[12] Or accus. [O lαs, xvi. 13-xvii. 2]. 14. τὰ πεπέμβασα] S represents article: all else om. ἄνωθεν] Or -σάν. ἐκακομυμένος[13] All else add ἤτοι. αἴρεται[14] So apparently S, and perhaps 3, with Q and many mas. and pr: the rest om. 15. ἐρχέται[15] S here apparently expresses the third person. This reading is supported by μ and two mas. (38, 47), and by pr: but 3 and all else have ἔρχομαι, and so ρ (prime manus?) as alternative. ἀνακομυμένος[16] Or ἀνακόμημαι, as ms. 7, 29: see note on Syr. text, and cp. iii. 18. 16. ἀνακόμημαι[16] So eg [cf. with arm, &c.]: but om, with εί, and all Greek copies, ἀνακόμημαι, except in (ἀνακόμημα, which 3 reads). All but S add ἀνακόμα. 17. Μαγευσάν[17] So many mas. (Q, Μαγεύσσα). S writes μαγεύεις [ε]: cp. 3 Kings ix. 16 [IX]. 18. τοῖς[18] So some mas., and lat.: MSS., 3, &c., εί. τοῖς[18] So here distinguishes the second preposition from the first. Therefore, as ἀδεὶς is undistinguished in the second place, I infer that τοῖς (with μ ά) is intended in the first; and not (as in Q) ἀδεὶς in both. So the lat., de ... a. 19. ἠρεμήσατο καὶ βροωθαί[19] So ms. 12, 16: all else add καὶ φαινεῖ (Q om. &c.), but arrange the nouns variously. S alone adds ἦ at end of verse.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΙΣ.

ἔσεσον καὶ Ἑβαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, δούναι αὐτῇ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ 20 θυμοῦ καὶ τῆς ὁργῆς αὐτοῦ. καὶ πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγε καὶ ὅρη οὐχ εὗρ
21 ῥέθησαν. καὶ ψάλεται μεγάλη ὡς ταλαντικά κατέβη ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἔβλασφήμισαν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς τῆς χαλάζης· ὅτι μεγάλη

ΧVII. ἐστιν ἡ πλῆθυς αὐτῆς σφόδρα. καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπτα ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐγκαύων τάς ἐπτά φιάλας, καὶ ἐδάκτηε μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων· δεῦρο ὅπως μου δεῖξαν τὸ κρίµα τῆς πόρνης τῆς καθολικής ἐπὶ ὑδάτων
2 πολλῶν, μεθ' ἂς ἐπορνευσαν οἱ βασιλείς τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τῆν γῆν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς. καὶ ἀπήνεγκε με εἰς ἔρημην ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ εἴδον γυναῖκα καθή-

metrical ἐπὶ τὴν ὄρθον κόκκινων, γέμων ὀνάματα βλασφημίας· ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἐπτά, κέρατα δὲ δέκα· καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ῥώην περιβεβλημένη πορφυρὰ καὶ κόκκινων κεχρυσωμένη χρυσῶν, καὶ λίθους τιμίους καὶ μαργαρίτας· ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῆς, γέμων ἀκαδημίας, καὶ βδελύγματος πορνείας αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῆς γεγραμμένην. μένου μυστήριον, Ἑβαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν καὶ τῶν βδελύ-

γμάτων τῆς γῆς. καὶ εἶδον τὴν ἐν γυναῖκα μεθύοντας ἐκ τοῦ αἴματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἴματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐθαύμασα βαύμα μέγα ἰδὼν αὐτὴν. καὶ εἴπε· τοι ἀγγέλος διατέθαις· ἐγὼ ἐρω τοῦ μυστήριον τῆς γυναίκος καὶ τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ βαστάζοντος αὐτῆς, τοῦ ἥχου τὸς ἐπτά κεφαλὰς καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα. τὸ 8

---

21. ἐν ταλαντικῇ] Lit., ἐν ταλανταῖς. κατέβη: all Gk has έχουσα: all Gk has καταβαίνειν. 
ΧVII. 1. ἔστων μαν] S alone: all else om. 

πόρνῃ] All else add, τὴν μεγάλην. 3. γέμων . . . ἔχων] So apparently S (I doubt-
fully with Q and many ms.; the rest reading γέμωτα or γέμων . . . ἔχουσα or ἔχων.

κέρατα δὲ] S alone: the rest, καὶ κέρατα.

4. πορφυρὰ] Or πορφύρα. S alone pl.: the rest πορφυρῶν (or -ώρων); rec. πορφύρα. 

κεχρυσωμένα] S alone pl. (agreeing with πορφυρῶν καὶ κοκάκτων); all else -μένα.

καὶ τίμιον καὶ μαργαρίτας] So apparently S must have read as the interjection, and absence of prefixed prep., show. All else read the words in dativo, and all except εἰκ. have λα. τιμίου, in sing.


ἀκαδημίας καὶ βδελύγματος] (i) All else place βδ. first. (ii) All the MSS., and all ms. (with doubtful exceptions), read τὸ ἁθαυματ. τοῖς εἰς βδελύγματος of rec. The latter word being unattested and barely possible, I write ἁθαυματίας. Of the lat., pr has ἁθαυματίας, g, ἁθαυματίας; r, ἁθαυματίας [arm, ἁθαυματίαν]. (iii) For βδελύγματος, nearly all else read βδελύγματος; g, ἁθαυματίας; pr, ἁθαυματίας; and so οἱ, ἀρμ., ἐκ.; but εἰς, ἀβαθμάτω. 

καὶ τῇ] So Λ, ms. 1, 7, 29, 36, 38, 38, 87, &c., and τῇ: P.Q, most ms. and εἰς, τῇ γάρ. ἦ σοί, give a conflate reading.

5. γγγαμένων] All, except ms. 97, preθ δύσμα.

6. μεθύοντας ἐκ τοῦ αἰματος] So Λ and many ms., and Ε and the versions: P.Q. and other ms., οὐκ αἰματησθεν ἐκτὸς καὶ ms. 38 have τῇ αἷμα without a prep.

θαύματος] All else, except καί and ms. 38, place these words after αἰματος.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΙΣ.

θηρίων ἐδείδες ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν μέλλει ἀναβάινειν ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ εἰς ἄπωλειαν ὑπάγει καὶ θαυμασθήσονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπως ὦ γέγραπται τὰ ὄνοματα ἐν τῷ βυβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, βλέποντες τὸ θηρίον ὅτι ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἦταν καὶ ἕκατον πάρεστιν. ὥστε ὁ νοῦς τῷ ἔχοντι σοφίαν. ἀι ἔπτα κεφαλαὶ ἐπὶ ὅρη εἰσὶν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐπτά εἰσιν οἱ πέντε ἐπεσαν καὶ ὁ έστιν ὁ ἄλλος οὐπώ ἥλθε καὶ τότε ἔληθι, ὁ λίγον δεὶ αὐτῶν μείναι. ἔπειτα καὶ ὁ δράκων καὶ τὸ θηρίων ἐπὶ ἐστί καὶ οὐκ ἦταν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑγίεις καὶ ἕκατον ἐπτά εἰσὶ καὶ εἰς ἄπωλειαν ὑπάγει. καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα τὰ ἐδείδες, δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσίν οἴτων βασιλεῖαν οὐπώ ἤλθον ἀλλὰ ἔξονθιαν ὅσο βασιλεῖς μιᾶν ἄραν λαμβάνοντο μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου. αὐτοὶ μιὰν γνώμην ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἔξονθιαν ἔστων, τῷ θηρίῳ διδασκον. αὐτοὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἀρνίου πολεμήσουσι καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον διδάσκει αὐτούς ὅτι κύριος κυρίων ἔστι καὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλέως καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ καὶ ἐπὶ μοι τὰ ὄντα ἐδείδες ἐφ᾽ ἐν ἡ πόρην κάθηται, λαοὶ καὶ ὄχλοι εἰσὶ καὶ θυσία καὶ γλῶσσα. καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα τὰ ἐδείδες τῷ θηρίῳ, αὐτοὶ διδάσκουσιν τὴν πόρην καὶ ἡρμημένην καὶ γνω-

8. μέλλει] Or perhaps μέλλειν. All else prefix καὶ, except ἔστιν.
9. αὐτοί] Rather διάφωνοι: cp. xi. 7, note. ᾿ωργίαν] So A and one ms. (12); all other Greek copies, δρακον, and so X. Of the lat., g has ἔτι, as also εὖ; but pr, and lat. of Irene, have πρᾶττειν. διαφωνοῦσιν] So apparently S (cp. note on xii. 3 sqq.), with A, for -ἀνοίγοιν.
10. ἐπὶ τὸ βυβλίῳ] Three ms., 73, 79, 95, have ἐν τῷ: the rest ἐν (with accus. or gen.)., and so X: lat., om. βλέποντες] Or βλέπουσιν: but the interpolation of S seems to imply the nom. καὶ ἄφθασιν] So ms. 1, 36, 73, 79, 152, and some others, and a corrector of ms., also X, and g; εὖ om.: the MSS. and most ms., καὶ ἄφθασιν. So pr, εὔφασιν est.
11. τῷ ἐξονθα] S and X only: all else, δ ἐξονθα.
12. καὶ δ ἐξονθα] All MSS., and nearly all ms., X and some versions (including lat.) om. καὶ.
13. γιὰ στὸν] So Q, and many ms., and lat.: the rest transpose.
15. τὰ ἄκτα] So S, for δ ἄκτα. But this reading is unsupported, and the Syr. text (see note on it) needs correction.
16. αὐτὸς διδάσκοι] Or more precisely αὐτὸς διδάσκοι. All else subjoin ἐστιν.
17. μιᾷ] So S, unsupported, has ἐν μιᾷ τους, but an obvious correction of but one letter in Syr. text (see note on it), restores the true reading.
18. ἀνατόμοι] So S apparently (δoubtfully), with ms. 1, for αὐτοί.
19. μετὰ] So all else. S has here a verb = βλέπει, or possibly = διδάσκει. The latter might be admitted as a probable variant for μετὰ, due to the Greek original of S; but I prefer (see note on Syr. text) by the change of one Syriac letter to restore μετὰ.
20. ἐνὶ μοι] So A alone of Greek copies, and so X; also lat., δισι: except g, which has σι, = λέγει, as nearly all else.
21. ἐνὶ] So pr. S pr. all else δ.
22. τῷ ἐκναγ] Or ἐκ τοῦ ἐκναγ [τοῦ ἐκναγ], as rec.: but this reading of rec. has no Greek authority, and comes from εὐ [εἰ, ἕπ.] in bestisa; which is ill supported, and arm reading et bestiam, as also εὐ. All Greek copies have καὶ τοῦ ἐκναγ.
23. μετὰ] S has here a verb (see note on Syr. text) = ἐκναγοῦσαι: but an easy emendation of the Syriac text (see note on it), supported by X, restores μετὰ, which all other authorities read.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗ.


XVIII. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ἑδοὺ ἄλλον ἀγγέλον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐξουσία μεγάλην ἤ ἡ γῆ ἀνατίθηται ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἔκραξεν ἐν φωτὶ μεγάλῃ, ἐπεσεν ἐκβαμώνῃ ή μεγάλη" καὶ ἐγένετο κατουρητὶριον δαιμόνια, καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμοιχημένου. ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ 3 οἴου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, πεποίθηκε πάντα τά ζηλεύ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ' αὐτῆς ἐπορεύονταν καὶ οἱ ἐμποροὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τού στρήνου ἀυτῆς ἐπίλοφτησαν. Καὶ ἤκουσα ἄλλην φωνήν ἐκ τοῦ 4 οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν ἐξέβησεν ἐξ αὐτῆς ὁ λαὸς μου, ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσῃ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῆς ἵνα μὴ λάβῃ ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς αὐτῆς. ὅτι ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῇ αἱ ἀμαρτίαι 5 ἀρχον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐμνήμω-


†η σάρκας αὐτῆς φαγοῦσα καὶ αὐτὴν 17 κατακαίσασθαι ἐν πυρὶ ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ποιήσαι τὴν γνῶμην αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιήσαι μιᾶν γνῶμην αὐτῶν, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ τούτῳ, ἄρα τελεσθούνται οἱ λόγοι τοῦ 18 Θεοῦ. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἤν ἔδει, ἢ πόλις ἢ μεγάλη ἡ ἐξοικομακρέλει ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλείᾳ τῆς γῆς.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΗΣ.

νέυσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἄδικήματα αὐτῆς.

6 ἀπὸ δὲ αὐτῆς ὡς καὶ αὐτῇ ἀπέθεκε· καὶ διπλάσατε αὐτῆς διπλὰ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς· ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ὃ ἐκέρασε· κεράσατε αὐτῇ διπλῶν· ὁσα ἐδόξασεν ἐαυτῆς καὶ ἐστηρινάσε· τοσοῦτον βασανίσμων καὶ πένθος· ὅτι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει· ὅτι καθόμαι βασιλεῦσα, καὶ χῆρα οὐκ εἰμί καὶ πένθος οὐ μὴ 8 ἢδο. διὰ τούτο ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἤζουσιν αἱ πληγαὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς. *θάνατος καὶ πένθος, καὶ λιμὸς· καὶ ἐν πυρὶ κατακαυθήσεται· ὅτι Ἰσχυρὸς 9 Κύριος ὁ κρίνων αὐτὴν· καὶ κλαί- σοντες αὐτὴν καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτῆς· ὅτι βασιλεύσει τῆς γῆς, οἱ μετ' αὐ- τῆς πορνεύσαντες καὶ στρηνύ- σαντες, ὅταν βλέπω τὸν καπνὸν τῆς πυρώσεως αὐτῆς· ἀπὸ μακρόθεν οἱ ἔστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ βα- σανισμοῦ αὐτῆς καὶ λέξουσιν, οὐδὲ ὃναὶ ὃναὶ ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη Ἄβαβυλων ἡ πόλις ἡ ἱσχυρὰ· ὅτι ἐν μιᾷ ἁρά ἠθεῖν ἡ κρίσις σοι· καὶ οἱ ἐμποροὶ τῆς γῆς κλάσονται καὶ πενθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτήν· καὶ τὸν γόμον αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ἀγοράζει ὡκετέ· γόμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργυροῦ καὶ λίθων 12 τιμῶν, καὶ μαγρατίτων καὶ βύσσου καὶ πορφύρας, καὶ σμύρνικον καὶ κατόι καὶ τὸν γόμον· 13 πάν ξύλον θύσιν, καὶ τὰς σκευὰς ἔλεθαντων, καὶ τὰς σκευὰς ἐκ ξύλου, τιμῶν καὶ χαλκῶν καὶ σίδηρως, καὶ μάρμαρον καὶ κυνάμομα καὶ θυμά- κατα καὶ μύρων καὶ λίθων, καὶ οἶνον καὶ ξειών καὶ σεμίδιναι, καὶ πρὸβατα καὶ ιπποὺς καὶ ῥέδας, καὶ
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΗ.

14 σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἡ ὁπώρα σου ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἀπήλθεν ἀπὸ σου· καὶ πάντα τὰ λιπαρὰ καὶ τὰ λαμπρὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σου, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὰ βλέψεις. 15 καὶ αὐτὰ οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσον οἱ ἐμποροὶ τούτων οἱ πλουτήσαντες αὖ ἀυτῆς, ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν στήσουσιν διὰ τὸν φῶνον τοῦ βασιλέως 16 αὐτῆς· κλάιοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες καὶ λέγοντες· οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, ἡ περιβεβλημένη βυθισθοῦσα καὶ πορφυροῦσα καὶ κόκκινα χελώνωμενα χρυσόν καὶ λίθους τιμίους καὶ μαργαρίτας· οὐ μὴν ὁρᾷ ἡμιμόθη δο θοσοῦτοι πλουτοῦσι. 17 καὶ τὰς κυβερνήτικς καὶ τὰς ὅπι τῶν πλοίων ἐπὶ τόπον πλέειν, καὶ ναῦται καὶ δοῦλοι ἐν τῇ βαλάσῃ ἐργάζονται, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἐστὶν σαν καὶ ἐκλαυνάν αὐτῶν βλέποντες τὸν 18 κατάν ἔτη της πυρόσως αὐτῆς.

Καὶ λέγοντες, τὰς ὅμοιας τῇ πόλις τῇ μεγάλῃ; καὶ ἐβαλὼν χόρων ἐπὶ τὸ κεφάλας αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκραξαν κλάιοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες καὶ λέγοντες· οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη· ἢ ἐπλούτησαν οἱ ἔρχοντες τὰ πλοία ἐν τῇ βαλάσῃ ἐκ τῆς τυμβοῦτος αὐτῆς· ὅτι μὴ ὁρᾷ ἡμιμόθη. εὖ 20 φραίνεσθε ἐπὶ αὐτῇ ὑπανε καὶ οἱ ἄγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, ὅτι ἐκρούνον οἱ Θεοὶ τὸ κράμα ὑμῶν ἔξι αὐτῆς. καὶ ἰρεν εἰς 21 τῶν ἄγγελων τῶν λαχερῶν λίθων ὡς μῦλον μέγαν, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν

λίθων τιμίων] All else dat. sing., except Σ, which gives dat. plural (which possibly S intends).

21. τὰς τῶν πλοίων ἐπὶ τόπον πλέειν] A reading apparently conflate, and probably so in the Greek original of S. Most ms., A C Q, and Σ, have ὅ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ πλέειν: P, ms. 36, 73, 79, 80c, substitute ἐν τῶν πλοίων πλέειν. Of the lat., χ and η support τόπον [but χi, κ.κ. lacum for locum]: pr renders, super mare navigans (see Suppl. Note, p. 49).

14 ἡ ἐνθυμία] So pr: all else read τῆς ἐνθυμίας.

15 τῆς ψυχῆς σου] Q and most ms., and χ [cf. with Armg., &c.; not σου] and Σ support S in inserting σου here; but only two (35, 87) ins., as S, both here and after ἀδιάφορα.

16 τὰ λαυρα ἀνθρώπων] So two ms. (1, 79), followed by rec.: the rest, τὰ λ. ἀνθρώπων (or ἀνθρώπων). 17 ἐβάλεν· καὶ ἔδεικνυτοι] S alone ins. these words: all else om., and connect διὰτα ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς [ἐβαίνεται, ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς, or ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς]. Possibly S here preserves the true text, and the rest have lost the words by homoeoteleuton. A and ms. 35, 38, 95 place ἄδεικνυτοι after ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς: but C P Q, &c., as above.

14 and 15. ἐβαίνεσθαι κ.τ.λ. In thus removing the stop usually placed (so C P Q, and most ms.); also lat., but χ om. deviates after the verb, and connecting with ἐκ τῆς καταστροφῆς, S is supported by Σ, and a few ms. (35, 36, 87, &c.): Μhill &c., leave the connexion undecided.

16 καὶ λέγοντες] So rec., with P and many ms., χ, and τοι: but the other MSS. and ms., χ, and Σ, om. καὶ: a few mas. om. both words.

17. τοῖς θαλάσσαις] Σ alone: all else καταστροφῆς.

18. λέγοντας] Σ alone: the rest ἑκατον [ἐκα.]

19. ἐκ θαλάσσαις] All else prefix πάνω.

20. θαλάσσαις] Σ, and χ : all else sing.

21. θαλάσσαις] Σ alone: all else conflate. Nearly all else, ἐγγελός ἀγγελός. Σ om. adjective, with A; χ deviates. ἄν μὴν] Σ, and χ and pr?: but Σ has ὅτι μὴν, and Ω ὅτι μὴν, and so χ, molpros. There is a trace
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΨΙΣ.

ηλασαον λέγων' οὕτως ὀρμήματι βληθήσεται Βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη

22 τόλης, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρήσεις εἰς, καὶ

φωνῇ κυθάρας καὶ σάλπιγγος καὶ ἄκουσθήναι καὶ μουσικῶν, οὐ μὴ

23 ἀκούσθη εἰς σοὶ ἐτί καὶ φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ φανῇ σοι ἐτί

καὶ φωνῇ νυμφίων καὶ φωνῇ νύμφης οὐ μὴ ἄκουσθη εἰς

σοὶ ἐτί ὅτι οἱ ἐμπροσφόροι σοι ἤσσουν οἱ μεγιστάνεις τῆς γῆς ὅτι ἐν τοῖς

φαρμακείοις σου ἐπάλαινας πάντα

24 τὰ ἔσην, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἵμα προφθηνὸν καὶ ἄγιων εὐρέθη τῶν ἐσφαγμένων

XIX. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ἤκουσα

φωνὴν μεγάλην ὄχλων πολλῶν ἐν τῷ οὔρανῷ λέγοντων, ἀλληλούα: ἡ

σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις
tῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν ὧτι ἀλληναι καὶ 2

δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις αὐτῶν ὧτι ἕκρωκ

τὴν πόρνην τῆς μεγάλην ἃτις ὤφθηερ

τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ

ἐξεδύσεν τὸ αἷμα τῶν δουλῶν αὐτοῦ

ἐκ χειρῶν αὐτῆς. δεύτερον εἴρηκαν

3 ἀλληλούα, καὶ ὁ κατόπιν αὐτῆς

ἀνέβη ἐν τοῖς αἵμασι τῶν αἰώνων.

καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσερες 4

προσβύνοι καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα,

καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Θεῷ τῷ καθη-

μένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ λέγοντες ἀμήν

ἀλληλούα. Καὶ φωνὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ 5

θρόνου λέγοντα: αἰνεῖτε τῷ Θεῷ

ἡμῶν πάντες οἱ δουλοί αὐτοῦ καὶ

οἱ φοβοῦμενοι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πάν-

τες οἱ μικροὶ μετὰ τῶν μεγάλων. καὶ 6

of the prefix of genitive placed before the noun, but erased, in S (and the prefix is inserted in Ἐφ): also, the word representing ἐσι is written by an afterthought (but prima mesa) on marg. It seems therefore as if S as at first written supported μέλισσα (without ἐσι). εὐρέθη Or εὐρέθη. S alone: else εὐρέθη. Cp. verse 14 super.

22. κοιτάζων] All else, κοιτάζων.

αὐλάνγγεις] This reading is partly supported by ἦ (alone of MSS.) and two mas. (35, 87), which read αὐλάνγγεις, as does X. All else, σαλτίτζων: and all place the word last of the four genitives.

ταῦτα] καὶ μετὰ καὶ μουσικῶν] All else invert these genitives. I obelise the former word, the rendering of S being obscure, possibly representing αὐλανγγέων: see note on Syr. text.

Note that S, with Hippol. (Ἀντικρ., 42), om. (after ἐν) two sentences of this verse; supported, as to the former of the two, by mas. 14, 92; as to the latter, by ἦ and some mas., including 88, 87, &c., and by Ἐφ.

23. φωνῇ] S and Ἐφ incline to this reading (rec.), rather than φωνῇ (rec.).

sciously] So C (alone of Greek copies); and ἐς and ἐπι [ἐς, ἐμ, ἐκ; not ὑπ.]: all else, ὑπὲρ. ἐπέκειν] So C alone; all else om. ἐπέκειν. τὰς φαρμακείους] So lat.: all Greek, singular.

ἈΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΗΣ.

ηκονόσα φωνήν ὡς όχλων πολλῶν, καὶ ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῶν ἵσχυρῶν λεγόν-
tων ἀληθοῦν. "Ὅτι ἔβασινεν
Κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ χάριμων καὶ ἀγαλλιώμεν δόμεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἤλθεν ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου, καὶ ἡ γνώς αὐτοῦ ἤτοιμασεν ἑαυτῆν. 8 καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἱνα περιμᾶληται βύσσινῳ καθαρὸν καὶ λαμπρόν
tὸ γὰρ βύσσωμα τὰ δικαιώματά 9 ἐστι τῶν ἄγων. καὶ ἐπὶν μοι
*γράφων* μακάριοι εἰς εἰς τὸ δείπνον
tοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου εἰσί κεκλη-
μένοι. καὶ εἰπέ μοι ὠδι οἱ λόγοι οἱ ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσί. καὶ ἐπεσον ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ προστέκυνσα αὐτῷ καὶ εἰπέ μοι μη, σύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ καὶ τῶν αδελφῶν σου τῶν ἁγίων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ τῷ Θεῷ προσ-
κύνησον μᾶλλον. ἢ γὰρ μαρτυρία
Ἰησοῦ εἴστι τὸ πνεύμα τῆς προ-
φητείας.

Καὶ ἔδων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἄνεφεν 11 γένον, καὶ ἐδοὺ ἱππὸς λευκὸς καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐν αὐτῶν καλομένος τιτός καὶ ἀληθινός, καὶ ἐν δικαίω-

χόλων πολλῶν] All else singular, except pr.
λέγωσι] Or λέγοσι; or λέγεστε.
αἰσχραία] Observe the full stop set after this word, leaving Ὀν to be connected with verse 7.
Κύριος] (i) All else (except pr) ins. ὁ Θεὸς after, or for, this word, or ὁ Θεὸς δὲ before it. A seemingly later hand has interlined the equivalent of ὁ Θεὸς in S.
(ii) in P Q, most ms. 2, and all lat., add ἦνε, but A and a few om., as S.
7. χαρίμων] So ms. 73, 152 (for χαρίμωρ); the following ἀγαλλιώμεν being treated as pres. ind.
δύομι] (i) Or δύομας (or δύομεν). (ii) All else prefix καί: the omission of its by S is consistent with its treatment of the preceding verbs.
8. καθαρῷ καὶ λαμπρῷ] So rec., with a few ms. (1, 36; also 73, 79, 152, but without καί). The MSS. and the other ms., 2 and most versions, reverse the order; Q and most ms. and εἰς [ἐν, with ἐν, ἐκ], retain καί: but the rest om., as do εἰς and ἐκ, ἐν.
τὰ δικαιώματα ἐστὶν] S favours this position of the verb, which is that of rec., with many ms., and ἐστι [including εἰς]. The MSS., the other ms., 2, and πρ., also ἐστι, place it after τῶν ἀγώνων.
9. εἰςένθι με] S only; but perhaps the Syriac scribe has wrongly inserted the final letter which marks the plural. However the reading is a possible one, the plural verb finding its subject in verses 6–7. All ms. also λέγει (or εἰςένθι) με.
*γράφων*] S has here a word = παλαί (which has no other authority); but by restoring a letter which no doubt has dropped out from before it, we recover γράφων, which all else give, except one or two ms. which om. See note on Syr. text.
οἱ . . . εις] All else εἰς, omitting εἰς.
*τῶν γάμων*] S represents τῆς δικαιοσύνης, which has neither appropriateness nor authority. By changing one of the six letters of the Syriac word (see note on Syr. text), and transposing two others, we recover τῶν γάμων, which is the reading of A Q and most ms., 2 and πρ. and εἰς; but which the rest om.
εἰς] So 2 here, and in next verse: all else, λέγει in both places.
οἱ δυσφυῆς] A with two ms. ins. εἰς, which apparently S intends to represent. All else om.
10. καὶ προσκείνεται] So P and ms. 73, 79: all else, προσκείνεται.
μὴ, σύνδουλός σου εἰς] S alone omits ἐν before μὴ. In the parallel passage, xxii. 9, ἐν is retained, with a colon after it, to separate it from μὴ, which is thus made to qualify εἰς (and so ms. 68). The copula of ἔστι varies as to the interpolation, both here and xxii. 9, with the general result that (except ἔστι which in the present passage is neutral, giving the sentence without any stop at all) all of them in both passages disconnect μὴ from ἐν, and either isolate it, or attach it to what follows. If so attached, it must be understood as = μὴν εἰς, and not in its proper force as = μὴν ἐν. These modifications of interpolation, and the interpolation of μὴν (which S alone ins.) after προσκείνεται, are apparently due to doctrinal prepossession in the minds of translators, or scribes. All other authorities connect μὴν, a few adding παράγοντας.
*γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ*] I neglect the comma which S unmeaningly places after these words.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΤΩΣ.

12 σύνη κρίνει καὶ πολεμεῖ οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόξ πυρός καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ διαδήματα πολλά· ἦχον ὄνομα γεγραμμένον, ὃ
13 οὔτες οἴδει εἰ μὴ αὐτοὶ καὶ περιβεβλημένοι ἵματιν βεβαμμένον ἐν ἀματὶ καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα
14 αὐτοῦ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα τοῦ ὑπαρχοῦ ἱκελούθει ἀυτῷ ἐφ’ ἑπτοῖς λευκοὶ καὶ ἐν ἐνδεδειγμένως βύσσινων λευκῶν καὶ
15 καθαρῶν. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν ἐκπορευέται ῥομφαία δέξα· ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ πατάξως τὰ ἐθνή καὶ ἀυτὸς ποιμανεὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ,

σιδηρῷ καὶ αὐτὸς πατεί τὴν ληρὸν τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. καὶ ἔχει ἐπὶ τὰ ἵματα 16
αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μηνυτεῖς αὐτοῦ, ὄνομα γεγραμμένον βασιλεῖος βασιλέως καὶ κύριος κυρίως. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον 17
ἀγγέλου ἐστῶτα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ καὶ ἐκράζειν ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων τοῖς ὀρέης τοῖς πεπεραμένοις ἐν μεσο-

ραματὶ: ἐστὶν, συνάσχετη εἰς τὸ δείπνον τὸ μέγα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 18

ино ἐκαθήμενος σάρκας βασιλείας καὶ σάρκας χιλιάρχων καὶ σάρκας ἰσχυρῶν καὶ σάρκας ἰστιών, καὶ

τὸν καθημενὸν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ

12. ὡς φλόγες] So A, ms. 35, 36, 87, and others, ζ, and lat., &c., followed by rec.: the rest om. θς.

ὄνομα γεγραμμένον. η] So A P (and α partly) with some ms. and versions, including lat., followed by rec. Some ms. give the words in plural: Q and many others have a conflate reading (ὑδώματα γεγρα-

μένα καὶ ὄνομα γεγραμμένον), 5, which Ξ adopts [but l marks the plural words with ἐ].

οὕς[ι] Lit., etc.

13. περιβεβλημένοι] The verb used by S seems to represent this word, which is read here by A Q and most ms. (followed by rec.) but possibly it may be meant for περιφερειακός (P), or περιφερειακός (Μ), or some other like form; so the lat., and ξ, represent συνεκτεῖνει, not συνεκτεῖνει.

ἐν αὐτῷ] Or ἐν αὐτῷ: and so ἐναπό, verse 17.

καθαρόν] So apparently S, with some ms. (1, 36, 79, &c.), and lat. (which rec. follows: for καθαρόν (or -τέ) of the MSS., and most ms.; ξ, ἐκδίκησι.

14. τῶν ὑπαρχοῦ] So one ms. (36); or τῶν ὑπαρχόν (as 8): ζ with all else, [κά] ἐν τῷ ὑπαρχόν.

τῶν αὐτοῦ] Λεκανίς καὶ ἐνδεδειγμένοι] (I) The inter-

punctuation apparently requires the Greek to be thus read; unless we prefer λεκανίς καὶ ἐνδεδειγμένοι. For ἐνδεδειγμένος, there is the support of Ζ, and ms. 162, and of Ὑμβολος ἐν Ἱωανν. t. t. c. 7. (ii) S alone, or καλεῖος καὶ καθαρὸς) καὶ a few ms., ρ, and some ἐγερεία (or not am, ομ., &c.), support καὶ: all else om.

15. αὐτόν] S alone: all else, αὐτοῦ.

ἀξία] Q and most ms. insert ἵματιν before ἵματιν, and so τρέ, and ρ, [with many copies]: ζ, after it [but l with *]. There is some appearance of erasure in S, after ἤματιν. But m A P, ms. 1, 36, 38, 79, &c., and most versions, including g, and σ, ομ. ομ, &c., om. ἰστιώνως. Gr. i. 16.

ἀυτὸς] Στις, συνάσχετη. So S, doubtfully: all

ἐν παραστώσισι] Lit., ἐν παραστῶσισι (see note on Syr. Text). All else read the verb in sing.; but the plural is consistent with the reading παραστῶσ (ἐνπρ.).

τὸ ὀργῆς] All Greek copies (with minor variations) prefixed τοιοῦτον τοῖς ὀρέης καὶ τοῖς ὀρέης; and so ργ. and most versions. But et. reads εἰς only before ἢ: ξ gives the words which S om., but om. τὸ ὀργῆς.

16. τὸ ἱματινα ἕνα] Ξ and all else, τὸ ἱματινα; and all, except ms. 87, 162, om. αὐτός [which Tisch. wrongly ins. in his note in loc.].

τὸ ὄνομα μηνυτεῖς] All else prefix καὶ [but ζ with *], and read τὸ ὄνομα. The reading of S is worth noting; it represents “the Name” as “written on the vestments [that were] on His thighs.”

17. ἄλλον] So ζ and one ms. (36) and some versions: rec. with A P and many ms. and lat., ἵματι: two ms., &c. ἄλλον. Q, with the other ms., and ζ, om. both.

*πέπεραμένοι] All else, except ms. 95, prefixed καὶ. *πέπεραμένοι] διασκεδαστῆς] S has καὶ συνάσχετη (or ἀγγέλου): but this is unmeaning, and by replacing a dropt letter we recover δεῦ (for καὶ); see note on Syr. Text. Or perhaps καὶ is to be retained, with δεῦ before it; as rec., and some texts of ργ. [etc.; not am, &c.; om. ομ. ἰστιών].
σάρκιας ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων· καὶ μικρῶν καὶ μεγάλων.

19 Καὶ εἶδον τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς βα-

σιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν· συνηγμένα ποιήσα τοὺς πόλε-

μου, μετὰ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποῦ, καὶ μετὰ τῶν στρατευμάτων

τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐπιάσθη τὸ θηρίον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁ πυثός τοῦ

ποίησα τὰ σημεία ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπάνειπε τοὺς λαβόντας τὸ

χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκύνωντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ. τὸ κατέβα

ζαν καὶ ἔβληθαν οἱ δύο εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν

καιμόμενην καὶ θείοιν καὶ οἱ ἡμῖν ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῇ βομβαίαι
tοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποῦ, τῇ ἐξελθοῦσῃ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ ὀρεία ἐχώρησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν. Καὶ εἶδον ἡλ.

λόλον ἀγγέλου καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ ὀφαντοῦ ἐχωντα τὴν κλεῖν τῆς δαβύ-

σουν καὶ ἄλοι ομόλην ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐκάθησεν τὸν δράκοντα ὃ ὁ ἄρχων ὁ ἡτα διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἔτη καὶ ἔβλεπεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν

ἀβύσσουν καὶ ἔκλειον καὶ ἐσφρά-

γιες τόπων αὐτοῦ, ἣν μὴ πλανήσῃ τόν τὰ ἐθνῆ ἔτη. Μετὰ ταύτα ἡ ἐν.

18. ἐλευθέρων] (i) All Greek copies except ms.

1, 162 and most versions (including the lat. and ἡ) in all after this word. (ii) All MSS. and most must. ins. τα 6 after it.

19. καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ] There is no other evidence for these words as here placed, but ἤ and three ms., in the following sentence (καὶ τῶν ἐπιστρατευμάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν), read αὐτόν for αὐτῶν. Apparently, therefore, we have here a conflation, possibly derived from the Greek original of S. Perhaps, however, it belongs to the Syriac, having got in by insertion into the Syriac text of an alternative reading; and the fact that S uses two different renderings for στρατεύματα in the two members of the conflate sentence, the second agreeing nearly with that of Σ (see note on Syr. text), favours this supposition. If so, one or other (probably the former) is to be obelised. τῶν στρατευμάτων] So Σ: all else singular.

20. μετὰ αὐτοῦ] So N, P, ms. 14, 38, 79, ἡκ., ητ. and εὐ: Σ reads μετὰ αὐτοῦ, with Q and most, and ἐτοῖς: So all authorities. τῶν στρατευμάτων] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

21. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

22. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

23. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

24. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

25. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

26. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

27. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

28. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.

29. θινος προσκυνούντας] So all authorities. S gives genitive: no doubt a blander of the scribe. See note on Syr. text.
4 λύσαι αὐτὸν μικρὸν χρόνου, καὶ ἐδοὺν θρόνους καὶ ἕκαθεσαν ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς· καὶ κρύμα ἕδοθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς πεπελεκυσμένας διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἦσον καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἶνως οὖ προστεκότων τὸ θηριόν οὐδὲ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ γάργαλον ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν, ἦ ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν. ἤτοι ἤγησαν καὶ ἠβασιλεύσαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χίλια ἡτη. καὶ ἀνήθη 6 ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη. μακάρος καὶ ἁγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ δευτερος θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν· ἀλλ' ἐστερικὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ χίλια ἡτη. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγελεομέθη χίλια ἡτη, λυθήσεται ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ εξελεομέθη σαβανήσει πάντα τὰ ἐθνὶ ἐν ταῖς τέσσερισεν γονίαις τῆς γῆς τοῦ Γαγ. καὶ Μαγγ. καὶ συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν χόλον διὸ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς ἡ ἁμοίος τῆς βαλάσσης. καὶ ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τῷ 9 πάλαις τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐκκλεσα συνὶ τῇ πόλιι τῆς παρεμβόλης τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῇ πόλις τῇ ἡγαμημέρῃ καὶ κατεβη τῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ὁ διάβολος ὁ πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός καὶ θείον, ὅπου τὸ θηριόν καὶ ὁ ψυχομοσφάτης. καὶ
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

βασανισθήσονται ἥμερας καὶ νυκτὸς
11 εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. Καὶ ἐδὸν θρόνον μέγαν λευκὸν καὶ τῶν
cαθήμενων ἑπάνω αὐτοῦ, οὐ ἀπὸ τοῦ
προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἐφύγεν ἡ γῆ καὶ ὁ
οὐρανός, καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν τοῖς οἴ Showcase αὐτός.
καὶ ἐδὸν τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικροὺς ἑκατέρων ἐνώπιον τοῦ
θρόνου· καὶ βιβλία ἁνατράπησαν καὶ
ἀλλα βιβλία ἁνατράπησαν· δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς
κρίσεως· καὶ ἐκρίθησαν οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκ
tῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ
13 κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐδωκεν ἡ
θάλασσα τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ:
καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ἀδην ἐδωκαν τοὺς
νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐκρίθη
ἐκατόσ των αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.
14 καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ἀδην ἐβλήθησαν
· εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός· οὔτος
15 ἐστὶν ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος· καὶ εἰ
tὸ οὖν εὑρέθη ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς
γεγραμμένος, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην
tοῦ πυρός. Καὶ ἐδὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ΧΧΙ.
καὶ γῆν καὶ αὐτὴν· ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος
οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ πρῶτη γῆ ἄπελθον· καὶ
η ἡθάλασσα οὐκ ἔστων ἐτί.
Καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἀγίαν Ἰερουσαλήμ· η
καὶ καὶ ἐδὸν καταβαίνωσαν ἐκ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἢτοι
καθήμενα ἐν ὑψίφθει κεκοσμημένη τῷ
ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἠκουσα φωνὴς
3 μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγομένης,
ἴδοι· καὶ καὶ θυρίζη τοῦ θεοῦ, μετά τῶν
ἀνθρώπων· καὶ καινοσωσίμεθα μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ
αὐτὸι λαῖς αὐτοῦ ἔσονται· καὶ
αὐτῶς ὁ Θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐσται
αὐτὸι Θεοῦ. καὶ αὐτῶς εξαλείψῃ πᾶν
4 δάκρυς ἐκ τῶν ἄνθρωπον αὐτών καὶ
ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἐν· ὁ οὐτὲ
πένθος ὁ οὐτὲ καταγηγή· οὐδὲ
ventus ἐσται ἐν τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῆς.
καὶ ἀνέθλυθον καὶ ἐστὶ μου ὁ καθή-
14 μενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ ἰδοὺ καὶ πλη-
πάντα. καὶ ἐστὶ μου γράφων· οὕτωι
οἴ ὁ τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐστι] S alone: A Q and many
mas., 3 and lat. (except S [Aug.], S μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστιν:
the rest, ἐστι μετ’ αὐτῶν.
αὐτῶς καὶ ἔσται] S 3 and 3 [7 with 7] alone; but
A ἐστιν Θεὸς, with τῇ [not τῇ]; P, τῇ, and
A, Θεὸς ἐστιν: Q, most mas., τῇ, ἐκ, ἐκ om.
4. αὐτῶς εξαλείψῃ All else om. αὐτῶς: rec., with
A and a few mas., and τῇ [except τῇ], in. ὁ Θεὸς
after the verb: but the other Greek copies, and the
other versions, including τῇ, and τῇ, do not supply
any subject. ἐστι μετ’ αὐτῶν (with Arethas).
5. ἐσται] All Greek texts add ἐστιν.
4 and 5. ἐσται ἐστιν ἐστιν τῷ πρέσεων αὐτῶς. Καὶ ἀνέθλυθον]
S alone: all else, ἐστιν ἐστι [50] τῷ
πρέσεων ἀνέθλυθον [-e]. The reading of S
evidently represents a Greek, not Syriac, variation
6. ἐστι μου [94] 1 All else om. μου. (2) So τῇ
(not τῇ): P has ἐστι μου: all else, ἐστι μου.
ἀνέθλυθον] All Greek except ms. 94, and most lat.,
prefix ἐστι.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΨΙΣ.

6 λόγου πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ εἰσι. καὶ ἐξῆς μοι γέγοναν. ἐγὼ τὸ Α καὶ ἐγὼ τὸ Ω· ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. ἐγὼ τὸ δυσώτως δώσα ἐκ τῆς σπηγῆς τοῦ ὄντος τῆς ζωῆς δωρεάν· καὶ ὁ νῦν αὐτὸς κληρονομεῖται ταῦτα· καὶ ἔσοραί αὐτὸς Θεός· καὶ ἔσται μοι νῖός.

7 Τοὺς δὲ δειλοὺς καὶ ἀπόστοις, καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὺς καὶ ἐξεκλησιονέντας καὶ φονεύοντας, καὶ φαρμακοῦς καὶ πόρνους καὶ εἰδωλολάτρας καὶ πάσα τοῖς ἠσυχείτες τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ λίμῃ τῇ καιμομείᾳ πυρὸς καὶ θείου, ἡ ἐστιν ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος.

8 Καὶ ἠλθὲν εἰς κάτω τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἑχόντων τὰς ἐπτὰ φιάλας τὰς γεμοῦσας τῶν ἑπτά πληγῶν τῶν ἀσχατῶν. Καὶ ἠδόλησε μετ' ἐμοί λέγων· δεῦρο δειχεῖ σοι τὴν νῦφην τὴν γυναίκα τοῦ ἀρνίου. καὶ ἀπήμεγκε 10 με ἐν πνεύματι ὁποῖος μέγα καὶ υψηλόν· καὶ ἐδειξε μοι τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγιὰν ἰερουσαλήμ, καταβαίνονταν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχουν· 11 σαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ὁ φωνῆ ἀντίς ὁμοίος λίθῳ τιμίῳ ὡς ἱάστιδι, κρυπταλλιζόντι· ἔχουσα 12 τείχος μέγα καὶ υψηλόν· ἔχουσα πυλάνας δόεικα· καὶ ἔπει τοῖς πυλὼν ἀγγέλων δόεικα· καὶ ὁμόματα αὐτῶν γεγραμμένα ἢ ἔστι τὰ ὁμόματα τῶν δόεικα φυλῶν 13 ἰσραήλ. ἀπ' ἀναστολῆς πυλῶν τερεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ πυλῶν τερεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ νότον πυλῶν τρεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμάτων πυλῶν τρεῖς.

9 καὶ τὸ τείχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχων ὅμης 14 λίον δόεικα· καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δόεικα ὁμόματα τῶν ἁπατοῦ ποὺ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

15 καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, εἶχε μέτρου κάλαμον χρυσοῦν, ὥσα μετρήσῃ τὴν
16 πόλιν καὶ τὸ τείχος αὐτῆς. καὶ ἡ πόλις τετράγωνος κείται· καὶ τὸ
17 μῆκος αὐτῆς ὄσον τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐμέτρησε τὴν πόλιν τῷ καλάμῳ,
ἐπὶ σταδίων δώδεκα χιλιάδων τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς καὶ
18 τὸ ἱππὸς αὐτῆς ἦν ἐστὶ. καὶ ἐμέτρησε τὸ τείχος αὐτῆς ἓκατον καὶ τεσσαρά-
κοντα πτέρυγια, μέτρῳ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἐφιστόν ἄγγελος. καὶ ἡ ἔνδομητος τοῦ
tείχους αὐτῆς ἱσασις καὶ ἡ πόλις χρυσίου καθαροῦ ὅμοιον ὑδάτω καὶ
19 ταρσῷ. καὶ οἱ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τείχους τῆς πόλεως, λίθοις τιμίωσ εκκοσμημένοι

καὶ ὁ θεμέλιος ὁ πρῶτος ἱσασις. καὶ ὁ δεύτερος σάπφειρος. καὶ ὁ τρίτος
χαρυδίων. καὶ ὁ τέταρτος σμάραγδος. καὶ ὁ πέμπτος σαρδόνυξ. καὶ ὁ έκτος
σάρδειος. καὶ ὁ ἐβδομος χρυσόλιθος. καὶ ὁ ὀγδόος βήρυλλος. καὶ ὁ ἔνατος τοπανδίου. καὶ ὁ δέκατος
χρυσόπρασος. ὁ ἐνδέκατος ύδάκτυλος. ὁ δευτέρας ἀμύθεσις. καὶ οἱ δει-
21 δεκα πυλών †καὶ διδέκα μαργαρίτας. τις ἀνά εἰς καὶ ἐκατος τῶν
πυλών ἤν εἰς ἐνός μαργαρίτων. καὶ ἡ πλατεία †δεῖ ἡ πόλεως χρυσίου
cαθαροῦ· ὁς ἱερὸς †νῦ ἐν αὐτῇ. καὶ 22 καὶ
ναὸν ὕψος εἰδον ἐν αὐτῇ. ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ Θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ αὐτὸς νὰς

18. μέτρου κάλαμον] S alone: the MSS., and most ms., Σ, and Ῥ read μέτρου κάλαμου: a few
mss., μέτρον κάλαμον (so esp. [Σ, with ο%, &c.], manusci latimimim): some ms. and versions,
followed by rec., κάλαμον only (and so ο%, Ῥ, βουλ). amphil est manuscri, which comes near to the
reading of S.

†τὴν πόλιν] Αll else add, καὶ τῶν πυλῶν ἄγγελος, but Σ, and most ms. om. καὶ τὸ τείχος αὐτῆς.

†τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς (ὁ δεκα) †καὶ ἐκατος (ὁ δεκα). Αll else, except (in the
first instance) ms. Σ, om. ἰσασις: and all except (ms. Σ) om. ἰσασις after the second το μέτρον.

†τὸ καλάμῳ] Ορ καὶ τὸ καλάμῳ.

17. τεσσαράκοντα] S alone fails to add τεσσαράκοντα. μέτρον] Αll else μέτρον, except Σ, which writes
the word plural, and places it before τείχος.

18. χρυσιον καθαροῦ] Αll Greek (except ms. 73, 79, which have dat.), χρυσιον καθαροῦ; and so Ῥ, and Σ
[Σ, &c.]: but Σ supports S; so Ῥ, and Σ, [Σ] autograph.

†διαμετα] Ορ διαμετα; Σ is ambiguous as S: all Greek, ἰσασις οἱ διαμετα: of lat., μετα alone διαμετα, the
rest ἰσασις οἱ διαμετα.

19. καὶ ὁ θεμελίων] So w (alone of MSS.) and many
ms. and versions, including Σ and Ῥ [Σ, &c.]: but A Π Q and many ms., and om. ο%, Σ, &c. om. καὶ.

λίθοις τιμίωσ] Αll else, ζωτὶ λίθοι τιμίῳ.
23 αὐτῆς ἐστὶ. καὶ τὸ ἁρμῶν καὶ ἡ πόλις, οὐ χρείαν ἔχει τὸ ἡλίου σοῦ, διὸ τῆς σελήνης ἵνα φαίνωσιν αὐτή. ἥ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν. καὶ ὁ λόχος αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τὸ ἁρμῶν.

καὶ περιπατήσως τὴ ἔθνη διὰ τοὺς φωτός αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς φέρονται τὴν δόξαν εἰς αὐτήν. καὶ οἱ πολίνες τῆς ὁμοίως ἡμέρας νῦν γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ καὶ οἴκωσιν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἑθῶν εἰς αὐτήν καὶ οὐκ ἔσται εἰς πᾶν κοινόν, καὶ ὁ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα, καὶ ἴδες εἰ μὴ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ ἁρμῶν. καὶ ἐδείξει μοι ποταμὸς ὑδάτος ζωῆς, καθαρὸν καὶ λαμπρὸν ὡς κρύσταλλον καὶ ἐκπεραυμένον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁρμῶν. καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πλατεῖων αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐνεύθεν καὶ ἐνεύθειν, ξύλων ζωῆς ποιῶν καρποὺς δώδεκα καὶ κατὰ μήνα ἐκαστὸν ἀποδίδον τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ φύλλα αὐτοῦ εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν ἑθῶν. Καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ. Καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁρμῶν ἐν αὐτή ἔσται καὶ οἱ δούλοι αὐτοῦ λατρεύσωσιν αὐτῷ καὶ δοξολογεῖ καὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν. Καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ καὶ οὐχ ἐξουσία χρείαν φωτός καὶ λήχυν καὶ φωτός ἡλίου ότι Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς.
ΑΠΟΚΛΑΔΥΣ.

φωτίζει αυτούς, καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν
6 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Καὶ
εἶπεν οὐδὲ αὐτὸι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ
ἀληθεῖς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῶν
πνευμάτων τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν,
ἀποστέλλει τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτῶν δεξιά
τοις δούλοις αὐτῶν, ἢ δὲ γενέσθαι
ἐν τάχει.

7 Καὶ ἦδον ἐρχομαὶ ἐν τάχει: μακά-
ριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς
προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτού.

8 Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ
ἀκούων ταῦτα· καὶ ὁ βλέψα ἢ
κύκωσα, ἐπέσα προσκυνήσαι ἐμ-
προσῆνεν τῶν ποιῶν τοῦ ἄγγελου
9 τοῦ δεικνύόντος μοι ταῦτα. καὶ
εἶπεν μοι ὁ ρα: μὴ σύνδουλο σου
εἰμί; καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν
προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν τροπούντων τού-

tους τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου
τοῦτού, τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον. καὶ
εἶπεν μοι· μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους
tῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτού.

'Ο καρός γὰρ έγγὺς ἐστι. καὶ οἱ
ἄδικοι ἄδικησάτως ἐστι· καὶ οἱ
μυπα-
ρός, ῥυπανθήτω ἐστι· καὶ οἱ δίκαιοι
δικαίωσάν μη πιστῶσίν· ἐστι· καὶ οἱ
ἄγιος ἀγιασθήτω ἐστι.

'Ιδοὺ ἐρχομαὶ ταῦτα, καὶ οἱ μισθοὶ
μου μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀποδώσω ἐκάστῳ
κατὰ τὸ ἐργον αὐτοῦ. ἐγὼ τῷ Α καὶ
ἐγὼ τῷ Ω· οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι.
καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος: μακάριοι
οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἑπταλείς αὐτοῦ
ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔδα
tῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῷ πυλών εἰσελθοῦ-
σονται εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

Καὶ οἱ οὖροι καὶ οἱ φονεῖς καὶ

---

11. καὶ ἀδικήσω] So m. 68, and pr: all else om. καὶ.
12. καὶ ἀνοῦσοι] So alone: all else, aor. infinitive,
without καὶ. By changing the particle (a single letter)
preixed to the fut. in the Syr., we can make it =
infinite, as in the other authorities; and this is
perhaps the true reading of S. See note on Syr. text.

13. διὰ τὰ δύο] All else om. έγὼ. For Α and Ω, cp.
i. 8 supr., and note. There, υ reads as S here.


15. καὶ τὰ πέντε . . . φαν] (i) S alone in placing
this and the next two nouns before the remaining
two,—so that its order is, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2. (ii) All else
om. καὶ, and place βιβλίου τοῦτού at the head of the passage.
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ.

οι εἰδωλολάτραι ἐξω· καὶ οἱ κοινοὶ καὶ οἱ φαρμακοί, καὶ τὰς ὁ ἑβλέπων καὶ ποιῶν ὑπεύθους.

16 Ἡ χάρις Ἰησοῦν ἐπεμψα τὸν ἀγγελόν μου μαρτυρήσαι ἐν ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἐπὶ τᾶς ἐκκλησίας. ἐγώ εἰμὶ ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυίδ καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ ἄστρον ὁ προϊόν ὁ λαμπρός.

17 καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν νύκτα λέγωσιν ἐρχοῦν. καὶ ὁ ἄγων εἰπάτω ἐρχοῦν. καὶ ὁ δύναμις ἐρχόμεθα καὶ λαβέται ὁ θεός ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούσνεί τὸν λόγον τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτού, εάν συν ἐπιθῇ ἐπὶ αὐτὰ, ἐπιθέου εἰπεν δεδομένῳ ἕτερον ὁ Θεός, τὰς πλήρεις τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ καὶ εὰν τὸν ἄγων ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, ἀφελεῖ ὁ Θεός τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξοντος τῆς. ἡμέρας καὶ ἐκ τῶν πόλεως τῶν ἁγίων τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. λέγει οἱ μαρτυρῶν ταύτα. καὶ ἐρχοῦμαι ταχύ.

'Ερχοῦν, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ. ἡ χάρις σοι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἁμήν.


καὶ οἱ κοινοὶ | Ι. the full stop and mark placed in S before these words, making them begin a new paragraph, are unmeaning, and I treat them as belonging to the beginning of the verse. (ii) For κοινοὶ (cp. xxii. 27) all else have αὐτοὶ; but possibly S is rendering loosely, and no variant is to be inferred.

†ἐβλέπω | All else φαῖναι. No doubt the Syr. text (see note on it) is wrong: but φαῖναι cannot be recovered from it but by a rather violent emendation.

16. ἐν ἡμῖν | (i) All else om. ἐν. (ii) For the colon after these words, see note on Syr. text. 17. καὶ θεός ἐκκλησίας | Lit., ἐκκλησίας τῶν ἐκκλησίας, and so S. καὶ δ λαὸς αὐτοῦ | Or, καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. S alone ins., unintelligibly.

καὶ δ ἄγω | So a few mas. (7, 35, 49, 70): the rest om. καὶ: 2 substitutes δὲ.

δ προῴζων | δ ἐξεστήθη | Most authorities transpose the adjectives, but a few mas. place them as in S.

17. καὶ λαμπρός | (i) The MSS., and all mas. but two or three, et, and εὐ [σμ. αὐτ.] om. καὶ: but S. and εὑ, ἐκ, ἐκεῖ, ins. (ii) Before the verb, all ins. δ ἡμέρας, except εὐ.

ἔφη | So S; lit., ἔστω: cp. verse 1, and xxii. 6.

16. τῶν λόγων | All else plural.

τί | Lit., ἄν. τί | So with several mas., placing these words before, not (as Q and most mas.) after, ἐπὶ αὐτὸν. So Q alone: all else singular. Probably the scribe has pointed the words as plural through a misapprehension of the meaning. The translator seems to have treated the following words (τῶν γεγραμμένων) as agreeing with τῶν λόγων (cp. xxii. 27), and not (as the present pointing of S suggests) with τῶν πόλεως. See note on Syr. text.

20. μαρτυρῶν | So S alone, but possibly by a clerical error (see note on Syr. text) for ὁ μαρτυρῶν. ταχύ | Nearly all else subjoin ἁμήν, except ψ, and εὐ.

21. ἀνέκριτῳ | So rec., with a few mas., εὖ, lat. and other versions: the rest om.

Χαράζῃ | Here S is better supported; by Q, nearly all mas., 2, and lat. and most versions: against οἱ Λαβά καὶ οἱ άλλοι. (26), which om. πάντω ὁ πόλεως συνεργεῖ | S alone subjoins συνεργεῖ: the three preceding words are the reading of Q, the ms., εὖ, and most other versions. οἱ, with om, reads πάντως only: εὑ [εἰ, with most] adds νοότα (ἐν, ἐνοίκοις): ψ, with ἐγ, reads τῶν ἕλωρον only; pr om. this verse.
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES TO GREEK TEXT.

II. 13.—(ὅτι ἦν μικρόν [μικρόν] ἐντάξει). This reading of ms. 162 is recorded in "Collation of ms. of the Revelation," by the late Rev. W. H. Simcox, published in Journal of Philology, No. 44 (Cambridge, 1894), p. 286 ff. Mr. Simcox assumes that the words are interpolated "ex commentario." But I find no trace of them in the Commentary of Andreas, which is subjoined in 162 to the text, or in that of Arethas. I incline to the supposition that they are the result of conflation; a variant ὅτι ἦν, for ἐντάξει, having been inserted on the margin of a copy, and having thence passed into the text used by our translator.

XVIII. 17.—(ὡς ἐν τῷ τοῖς ἄνευ). Prof. Nestle happily suggests ἄνευ for ἄνευ. This conjecture is supported by πρ., (omnia super mare navigantes).

XXI. 6.—(γέφυρα). In support of the reading γέφυρα (cp. xvi. 17), ms. 10, 17 have been alleged; but erroneously,—both read γέφυρα: and the only known Greek authorities for γέφυρα are ms. 41, 94. The reading γέφυρα (or that of ms. 38), followed as above by S, is also confirmed by the Latin of Irenaeus (V, xxxv, p. 336), facta sunt (for factum est of g, pr., and eg). The γέφυρα of rec. is no doubt a conjecture of Erasmus based on eg; his ms. (1) reads γέφυρα.
THE APOCALYPSE.

PART II.

SYRIAC TEXT, WITH APPENDIX AND NOTES.
CORRIGENDA AND DELENDA IN PART II.

Page 6, col. 8, last line, for ṣeṣaḥé read ṣeṣaḥé.

" 8, " a, line 9, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 9, " 15, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 9, " 1, dele brackets.

" 9, " 1, " brackets.

" 10, " a, line 23, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 14, " 3, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 7, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 10, " ġeṭhē " ġeṭhē.

" 16, " a, line 15, " ṣeṣaḥé " ṣeṣaḥé.

" 12, " ṣeṣaḥé " ṣeṣaḥé.

" 22, " ṣeṣaḥé " ṣeṣaḥé.
NOTES.

Line 1. The first three letters are effaced; and the hole in the vellum (see p. 96, *supr.*) affects the latter part of lines 3–8.

3. [المختصر] I find this word following [المختصر] in a closely similar sentence in the (unedited) Ms., Biblioth. Nat., Suppl. 43 (Zotenberg 35), fo. 214 ṅ. The upper parts of the lost letters here are discernible.

4. [المختصر] This restoration may safely be accepted; as also that of [المختصر] in line 5.

6. [المختصر] If this word is accepted, the blank may probably be filled as in Rich. 7160 (R.-F., p. 24) by the words [المختصر], with ? prefixed to [المختصر] at beginning of next line. But perhaps the broken word is [المختصر]; and if so, [المختصر], are probably to be supplied.

7 and 8. Of the lost ends of these lines, the former may have been [المختصر], or the like; the latter perhaps [المختصر], as in Rich. 7164 (R.-F., p. 28), or [المختصر], as in Add. 17124 (Wright, p. 43).

10. [المختصر] The prefix ?, though not decipherable in Ms., ought no doubt to be supplied here; and probably 0 before [المختصر] in 15.

14. The illegible first word here may have been [المختصر], or [المختصر], as in line 12.

17. [المختصر] The 3 is legible, and the brackets needless. For the places named here, and lines 18, 29, see Transactions, R.I.A., vol. xxx, pp. 356, *sqq*.

18. [المختصر] Here used = dominion, territory. For this sense of the word, see Wright, *Catal.*, pp. 468, 550; Barhebr., *Chr. Eccl.* 1, s. 71, col. 397, &c. (A. and L.); and cp. Psh., 2 Kin. xx. 13, 1 Macc. x. 39.

22. [المختصر] Sic in Ms.; usually written with 0 for ?

25. For [المختصر], perhaps [المختصر] is to be read; and for [المختصر], as Mr. Gwilliam, perhaps more correctly. But [المختصر] is a man’s name in Barhebr., *Chr. Eccl.*, i, s. 80, col. 437.

28–31. The beginning of each of these lines is effaced, but may safely be accepted as restored; also [المختصر] in 32: but the plural sign supplied to the first word of 31 may be doubted.

29. Some letters are here lost, and a name is irrecoverable.
of the holy Church of God, and for the profit [and . . . . . . . .] of the brethren, studious and lovers of the spiritual life; and for the commemoration and good remembrance before God; of them, namely, and of their deceased faithful; this spiritual treasure in the holy Church of God has been with diligence written and arranged by Stephen, the wretched and sinful and feeble, and wretched above all; and feeble above all; and sinful above all; and full of faults and sores and all hateful things of sin. . . . . . . . indeed in name a monk, though unworthy; who belongs to the holy monastery of the excellent in praises, holy and elect and clad in God, Mar Jacob the recluse of Egypt, and Mar Barshabba; which is beside [S]alach-Castra the blessed; which is in Tur-Abdin the blessed country which is in the dominion of Ḥesna Kipha. But I, a brother wretched and vile entreat of every discreet brother who lights upon these confused lines; that he pray in Christian charity for the said sinner, and for my fathers, true believers and my masters and my brethren; and for my own paternal uncles, monks; Mas'ud deceased and John and Simeon; who ministered to me after their ability. And pray ye in faith for my own maternal uncles monks and priests, deceased, Gabriel and Jacob; who also gave diligence for me in the matter of doctrine and of writing and so forth. God makes [them] joyful in His Kingdom. And pray ye also for my own masters, Rabban Cyriacus deceased, and Rabban Sahda; and Rabban Saliba; and Rabban Marnaha\(^a\) otherwise Ḥaya\(^b\); and Rabban Bars[aum]\(^c\). And pray ye for all that have taken part whether in word or in deed; and each according to his prayer, may he be rewarded, with the Amen of those above and of those beneath.

"This [spiritual] treasure was diligently procured, in order that he might meditate in it and profit by it, by Rabban Gabriel, chaste monk and reverend priest, son of [. . . ]sim deceased, who belongs by family to Beth-nahle, blessed town. Pray ye for him, and for his fathers, true believers, and for his [brothers],\(^d\) Denha, deacon deceased; and Sahda, deacon deceased; and Moses, blessed youth. Pray ye for all that have taken part [with me] in it, whether by word or by deed. Amen and Amen."

\(\text{\footnote{Or Barnaha.}}\)
\(\text{\footnote{Or Naḥa.}}\)
\(\text{\footnote{Or brother.}}\)
and probably the system itself of dividing into אנה, is of Syriac origin,—as Dr. Rendel Harris has in the Lecture above cited shown to be (on other grounds) highly probable. No such confusion could occur with the Greek notation, in which, while Π corresponds with א as representing 80, there is Ω to represent 800; without the need, as in Syriac, of the makeshift of denoting the hundred, if above 400, by the letter which stands for the corresponding ten, distinguished by a point placed over it.\footnote*{Thus the unedited T. C. D. Ms. of the Commentary of Barsalibi on the Gospels (B. 2. 9), which is dated (fo. 359 v, ε) A. Gr. 1508 (= A.D. 1197), was supposed by Dudley Loftus (who had no means of ascertaining the author's date) to have been written A.D. 747 (A. Gr. 1058); the point over the second digit (ănă) of the date being overlooked.}

\section*{COLOPHON (p. 32; cursive).}


The following is a translation of it; a few words being defective, —in the earlier part, in consequence of the hole in the vellum above mentioned,—in the latter part, through friction and decay.

"For the glory and honour of the Trinity, holy and equal in essence; of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; which is one eternal Godhead; that which is acknowledged in unity and is conjoined in [several] ty, three worshipful Persons; one eternal Nature; which [is one] true God; and one mysterious and exalted Essence; where[in there is] not that is young or old above his fellow; but they are Thr[ee which is One, and One which is] Three;\footnote{Or, "a Trin[ity, one, of Persons] three."} Father, and Son and Holy Ghost; one God, true [and . . . . . .]. And for the adornment and edification
vol. II (vi), especially pp. 243–6. In the Greek system the numbers are—St. Matthew, 355; St. Mark, 236; St. Luke, 342; St. John, 232. In the Syriac, they are 426, 290, 402, and 271. (See the notes appended to the Gospels in Bod. Or. 361, ap. Payne Smith, Catal., coll. 87–89, in which both reckonings are given). It is evident that our note, giving them as 360, 240, (…), and 232, is merely a variant from the Greek.

This fact, taken with the reckoning of the Greek τίτλος (see last note) makes it probable that this (second) part of the Subscription (lines 6–21) is derived from a Greek source;—the preceding and following parts, with their record of the Syriac ܡܲܥܬܐ and ܫܠܝܚܬܐ, being no doubt of Syriac origin.


12. ܫܠܝܚܬܐ For ܒܬܐ. See note on xiii. 18 supra.


21–25. Comparing these numbers with those given by Rendel Harris Lecture, p. 9) from his Syriac Ms. (Sinaitt), and from the Greek authorities, we find

(1°) that our list varies slightly as regards Mt.; 2520 for 2522;
(2°) that it falls short by 400 in Mk.; 1275 for 1675:
(3°) that it confirms the Syriac reckoning against the Greek, in Luke; 3083 for 3803:
(4°) that it differs widely from both, by excess, in John; 2532 for 1737 (Syr.) or 1938 (Gr.):

(and finally)

that its figures, when added up, give a total, 9410, which disagrees, not only with the totals of the above figures, whether Syriac or Greek, but with the total stated in the first part of this Subscription (lines 3 and 4), 9 • 63, whether we write 8 for the second digit, as in Rich. 7158, or prefer any other figure.

Of the reckonings for Luke, it appears (Rendel Harris ut supra.) that 3083 of the Syriac Ms. is to be preferred to 3803 of the Greek. The mistake must have arisen from confusion between ܪܒܘܕ = 83, and ܪܒܘܕ = 803. Hence it may be safely inferred that this reckoning of the
1882, pp. 11, 12; and compare the similar reckonings given in other Mss., as (e.g.) in Add. 14408, Brit. Mus. (A.D. 700), ap. Wright, Catal. of Syr. Mss. in Br. M., p. 41. In our Mss., they are marked by marginal rubrics throughout the Peshitto text (to which alone they relate).

2. The first letter is legible; but as the number of Sections in Add. 14408 and all other authorities is 165, we may assume that the word is to be completed as above,—not .

The fourth digit here is doubtful; the former three may be relied on.

3. The beginning of this line, and of lines 4 and 5, is lost in consequence of a hole worn in the vellum. I only doubt whether, in supplying this missing word, to write it as I have done, in stat. absol, or in stat. emphat.; for the usage of the writer of the Subscription in this respect varies (see in this line, farther on, and cp. 5, 22, 24).

For this word (= βηματα of some Greek mss.), and for the numbers here stated, see an important investigation by Dr. Rendel Harris, in his Lecture On the Ferrar-Group (1893); and cp. the reckonings given in Rich. 7158 (Brit. Mus.), ap. Rosen-Forshall, Catal., p. 20; also in Oo. I (Cambridge Univ.) ap. Rendel Harris, Lecture, p. 13.

4 and 5. Missing, as explained in last note, and supplied on the authority of Rich. 7158. On the same authority I complete the half-effaced at end of line 4.

5. Rich. 7158 gives 73, not 71. In the other numbers, the reckoning of our Mss., so far as it is forthcoming, agrees with that.

7. These are the “Greater Chapters,” or τίτλοι, marked in many Greek MSS., from Codd. A and C down; and in some Syriac Mss. (but not in the older ones), introduced probably from the Greek through the Harkleian copies,—see Wright, Catal., p. 56. See, for these Chapters, Scrivener's Introduction, pp. 57-59, vol. i, chap. iii (4th edn.); also Payne Smith, Catal. of Syr. Mss. in Bodl., col. 87, note 3. Though here recorded, they are not marked in the body of our Mss., either in text or on margin.

8. The Eusebio-Ammonian paragraphs. It is to be noted that the divisions here meant are the Greek, not the Syriac: see for these Rev. G. H. Gwilliam’s memoir on The Ammonian Sections, in Studia Biblica,
The following is a translation of the whole Subscription. [The italicized parts are in the Ms. written in black; the rest in red.]

"Here ends [the writing of] the Book of the New Testament; in which there are [one] hundred and sixty five sections; besides the Revelation and the four Epistles 137 [3] verses. But the verses of the Gospel are, nine thousand [eight hundred] and sixty 3; and of the Acts four thousand [one hundred] and 49 verses and of the Apostles six thousand four hundred and 71.

"The Gospel of Matthew one of the Twelve, which he spoke in Hebrew in Palestine, wherein there are Chapters sixty eight; but the number of Canons three hundred and sixty; and the Miracles twenty five; and the Testimonies thirty. The Gospel of Mark one of the Seventy which he spake in Latin in the city of Rome; wherein there are Chapters forty eight; and Numbers two hundred and forty; and Miracles twenty two; and Parables six; and Testimonies seventeen. The Gospel of Luke one of the Seventy which he spake in Greek in the city Alexandria. Wherein there are Chapters eighty three, and Miracles twenty two; and Parables twenty seven; and Testimonies sixteen. The Gospel of John which he spake and preached in Greek in the city Ephesus. Wherein there are Chapters twelve; but the Numbers two hundred and thirty two of the Canons; but Miracles eight; and Parables 5; and Testimonies 15. Here ends this annotation.

"Now the Verses of the Gospel of Matthew, are two thousand five hundred and twenty. But Luke, three thousand and eighty three Verses. John, two thousand five hundred and thirty two. Mark, one thousand two hundred and seventy five.

"Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, now and at all times and for ever and ever. Amen and Amen.

"Every one that reads is entreated to pray for the sinner that wrote."

Line 1. Both upper corners of the page are much defaced; but the words restored [in square brackets] at the beginning and end of this line may be accepted as certain.

[詹姆士] Rather perhaps [詹姆士]

[詹姆士] See note on xi. 19 supr.

[詹姆士] For these Sections, peculiar to Syriac Mss., see Dr. Isaac H. Hall in Journal of Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, June-Dec.,
TRANSLATIONS OF SUBSCRIPTION AND COLOPHON appended to the Ms., occupying respectively the recto and the verso of its last leaf; (see pp. 31, 32, supr.); with Notes on the Syriac text of them:—

Subscription (p. 31; estrangelo).

Subscriptions similar to this, or to parts of it, occur frequently in Syriac, as well as in Greek, Mss. of the New Testament; but usually in scattered notes attached to the several Books, not (as here) collected into one. See e.g., Bod. Or. 361, Hunt. 587, of Bodl. (Payne Smith's Catal., coll. 86–91). This Subscription is accordingly more than usually comprehensive, though deficient in completeness and in accuracy. It is made up of three distinct parts.

The first (lines 1–5) gives the number of the Sections (_period) of the New Testament; and then that of the Verses (period), = ἑπίμετρα of its main divisions,—the Gospels, Acts (with Catholic Epistles), and Pauline Epistles; also a separate reckoning for the non-Peshitto Books (showing that this part of the Subscription belongs to our Ms. and is not merely adopted into it). This part relates to Syriac divisions, and is presumably of Syriac origin. It is very similar to a note in Rich. 7158, referred to below, note on ἐπιτιθημί, line 3.

The second (lines 6–21) gives particulars relating to the Gospels severally, with a reckoning of the "Chapters, Canons, Miracles, Parables, and Testimonies" contained in each. But the reckoning is defective, the number of Parables in St. Matthew, and that of Canons in St. Luke, being omitted. It will be shown below (see notes on lines 7 and 8) that this second part is derived from a Greek source, probably through the Harkleian Version. Cp. the subscription of the Medicean Ms. of the Harkleian Gospels (A.D. 757), ap. Adler, N.T. Versiones Syr., p. 53.

The third (lines 21–25) gives a like reckoning of the "Verses" of each Gospel; but the numbers when added together fail to agree with the total for the four Gospels as given in the first part.

---

* Words conjecturally inserted to fill blanks caused by injury to the Ms. are enclosed in [brackets]. Unsupplied blanks are indicated by points [......].
See notes on xvii. 4, xxi. 27. All Greek copies have κώνες (Σ, Κώνες), for which κωνί is seems to be a variant, else unknown. Perhaps however S is here giving merely a loose rendering of κώνες taken as meaning "the unclean."

This is an unmeaning and unauthorized reading; see note on Greek text. For שִׂמַּה, we may perhaps correct שִׁמַּה. So Σ renders, שִׁמַּה.

16. רְשָׁם] Here, and verse 18, S points this verb as pa.; but verse 20 as aph.; and the aph. occurs also i. 2 (the only other instance of the verb in S). In Σ, the Mss. do not point the word here, but in verse 20 l points for aph. (and so p there, but here for pa.); in verse 18, Σ reads רְשָׁם. S seems to use pa. as intransitive, and aph. as transitive. Hence probably the stop, otherwise superfluous, inserted after רְשָׁם, inf.: r.

רְשָׁם] Elsewhere in S this word = φυλή. But we find it also = γένος, Act. iv. 6, xiii. 26, (Psh.); more usually = γενεά. Σ renders by רְשָׁם, as Hkl. usually; Psh. sometimes.

רְשָׁם] This insertion is unmeaning and unsupported. It may have been a marginal alternative for רְשָׁם. [A. E. J.].

19. הֶלְכָּה ... חָכְיָה] So Σ. The verb is not found = ἀφαίρεω in Psh. N.T. or Hkl.; but in O.T., e.g., Exod. v. 8. (Hxp., as also Psh.). So also in the plls., Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32 (Psh.).

רָמַם] Remove the plural points. They have evidently been supplied by the scribe to suit רָמַם הַחֲכָיָה (= τῶν γεγραμμένον) following;—which words really relate to רָמַם preceding. Σ [l; but d p as S, only without pronoun] treats τῶν γεγραμμένον as masc., and renders רָמַם הַחֲכָיָה.

20. רְשָׁם אָמַר] Perhaps we ought to read רְשָׁם אָמַר, as Σ.
regarded in S as equivalent. Σ renders by ἀριθμός (Levit. xix. 10, Psh.), "deciduous," mistaking the meaning.

5. αἰτία. Probably α is to be substituted for α, and the preceding stop to be struck out. See note on Greek text.

Σ, ἀριθμός, which perhaps ought to be read in S.

6. αἰτία. Cp., for this unusual plural form, Hebr. xii. 9, 23, (Psh. and Hkl.). Σ reads αἰτία (sing.).

Here = εν ταχεία, and so perhaps in verse 7; but in 20 = ταχύ. See note on Greek text. Cp. verse 12, and note on ii. 16.

8. Note the three quadruple points (∵) over the name μεμάθατος.

9. βασιλεὺς .... λέγεται See note on xix. 10; and observe the note of interrogation (☼) placed at end.

10. ἐξῆλθεν. The (☼) is misplaced; probably from end of verse 9.

So i. 3: there, = ἐγγύς simply; here, = ἐγγύς ἐστιν. Σ renders as S, i. 3: but here ἐγείρθη [ln; dp om. the prefix].
Psh. and Hkl. mostly as Σ; but both sometimes as S.

11. οὐκ ἔσται ἀποκρύφων ἀληθείας. So S, here only; Σ, here and ii. 11 (where see note); and so Psh. sometimes, e.g., Mt. xx. 13; and Hkl. usually. See also notes on xi. 5 (ἔστης), and xviii. 5 (Ἄρσις).

For the rare root ἀποκρύψις see Thes. S.; not elsewhere in S, nor in Psh., Hxp., or Hkl. Σ gives ἰσχύς and ἰσχυρός, from the less unusual root ἰσχύς, which is regularly employed in Psh., Hkl., and Hxp. in rendering πύρω and its cognates; e.g., James ii. 2 (Psh. and Hkl.), Isai. iv. 4, Zech. iii. 3, 4 [4, 5], (Psh. and Hxp.).

12. ἴησος = καὶ ἀπδότωσι] Probably α ought to be ι. Σ has ἴησος. The Greek verb occurs else in Apoc. only verse 2 supr., where both have ἴησος; and xviii. 6 (βίο), where both have ἴησος. Psh. uses both renderings indiscriminately (see Mt. xviii. 25–34); Hkl. mostly the latter.

13. εἰσαχθείς = ἱ ἰπχή] Not else in S: Σ, εἰσαχθείς, as iii. 14, where see note. The rendering εἰσαχθείς occurs in Psh. and Hkl.; and uniformly in Poc. (and Hkl. of the Four Epp.),—2 Pet. iii. 4, 2 Joh. 5 and 6, Jud. 4.

14. ἵστατο] Probably the prefix α is to be supplied.

15. ἵστατο] Observe that the list of those that "are without" is altered in order; the third, fourth, and fifth, before the first and second. Also the stop (☼), followed by the red point (☼), is unmeaningly placed in the middle of the list. But nothing is omitted.
NOTES.

Σ [p; d l vary] connects this with what precedes omitting the a, but otherwise agreeing with S.

Obelized in Ms.; see note on ii. 5.

Whether this unintelligible reading is a corruption of some word = διανύγης, or a rendering of a misreading [SYS] δι' αὑτῆς, or the like, for διανύγης, it seems impossible to decide. It is remarkable that in verse 11, Σ (by a converse error) seems to have read ός φῶς τῆς αὐγῆς, for καὶ δφωστήρ αὐτῆς (see De Dieu's note ine loc.), rendering αὐτῆς by ἀλήθεια, as here it has ἁλῆθες = διανύγης. For διανύγης we have a parallel in verse 24, έπικεφαλής = διὰ τοῦ φωτοῦ αὐτῆς. But as the words ἁλῆθες stand in our MS. directly underneath (see next note), it may be that the letters ἁλῆθες have got in here by vertical transference from thence, and that διανύγης was originally represented by a lost word of which the initial α alone remains, four or five letters having been displaced by the intruders.

22. * The stop (५) here is wrongly placed. It probably belongs to the unexplained ὁ γ τ of the previous line (see last note).

Note that S not only places a full stop before this word, but by the prefix δ makes it clear that it is to be read with ὁ γ τ of next verse.

23. * See note on iii. 17, and cp. xxii. 5.

27. * Probably repeated by accidental error from verse 25, in place of the δ of next verse.

... = κοῦν ... βδελυγμα] See notes on xvii. 4 (κοῦν, κοῦν), and cp. verse 8 supr., and xxii. 15: Σ has δελυγμα = κ., and δελυγμα = βδ. (See note on Greek text; and cp. xxii. 19.

XXII. 1. * Probably a is to be read for α: also, in next verse, perhaps γ for α before διανύγης; α in both these cases being unauthorized and superfluous. However, δ is not necessary in verse 2 (see note on i. 13).

2. ἀνάθεμα = ἐντεύθεν καὶ ἐντεύθεν] So Hkl., Joh. xix. 18 (the only other instance in N.T. of the Greek phrase); where Psh. (and Hkl. marg.) has ἀνάθεμα. So too Psh. and Hxp. in the plil., Ezek. xlvi. 7. Σ here follows a different reading.

3. * In Psh. N.T., Hkl., and Hxp. this word uniformly ἀνάθεμα, to which κατάθεμα here (not else in N.T.) is rightly
after each of the remaining stones, and after ἐξετάσαι in verse 21, a
new form of point (ı) is introduced,—apparently equivalent to ı.

[1054] So in Psh., e.g., Exod. xxiv. 10; where Hxp. writes
ἐξετάσαι: Σ has ἐκτιθησο; Barsal., ἐκτιθησο, with the explanation,
ἐξετάσαι.

[1055] See ix. 17, and note there. Σ has here ἑλάξεπ, not
elsewhere found;—probably for ἐρήμλα (= ἀλεξάπων), which however
only occurs as a geographical term. Barsal. writes ἐρήμα, and
explains, ἑλάξεπ.

[1056] Σ, ἑλάξεπ; see iv. 3, and note.

20. ἐρήμα ἐρημόν = σαρδώνις. Lit., σαρδών καὶ ὄνυξ. For ἐρημόν
see note on iv. 3. Cp. Ezek. xxviii. 13 (Hxp.), for ἐρημόν (= ὄνυξν,
LXX); and see above, second note on iv. 8. Σ transliterates here.

[1057] For ἑρατεῖτε: see note on xiii. 18.

has ἐραρτεῖτε, Cant. v. 12. Σ again transliterates, ἐραρτεῖτε;
rather ἐραρτεῖτε, as Barsal. writes,—explaining by ἐρατεῖτε ἐρατεῖτε.

[1059] This form of the word is not elsewhere found, but
see note on Greek text. Σ writes ἐραρτεῖτε [d p; l has s for ı]; and

[1060] S here transliterates more successfully than Σ, which writes ἐραρτεῖτε ἐραρτεῖτε [so d l p] probably ı being substituted
(after ı) for ı by an early error of transcription. Barsal. writes
ἐραρτεῖτε ἐραρτεῖτε.

[1061] Hxp. writes ἐραρτεῖτε, Jer. x. 9 (cp. Σ, ix. 17):
Σ here has ἐραρτεῖτε ἐραρτεῖτε [d l p; places the ı after ı]. Barsal. writes
ἐραρτεῖτε ἐραρτεῖτε, and explains ἐραρτεῖτε ἐραρτεῖτε.

[1062] ἐραρτεῖτε. See Ezek. xxviii. 13 (Hxp.
ἐραρτεῖτε); see also Theo. S., s.v., and cp. note on Greek text.

21. ἐραρτεῖτε ἐρατεῖτε. Probably ı ought to be struck out.

[1063] The punctuation of S compels us to conclude that
the Greek represented is ἔς ἀνά ἔς. See note on Greek text; and cp. Mk.
xiv. 19, where for the similar phrase ἔς καθ' ἔς Psh. gives ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς; and
Hkl. ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς; also Rom. xii. 5, ὅ τι καθ' ἔς = ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς (Psh.), ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς
(Hkl.). Again Joh. viii. 9 (Peric. de Ad.), ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς occurs, but whether
= ἔς καθ' ἔς or ἔς ἐκαστος, is uncertain. Σ here has ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς.
See note on xvii. 4.

So Σ here; and both, xxii. 15, where the Greek word recurs. It is not found else in N.T.; see note on ix. 21.

So again xxii. 15 (the only other instance of π. in Apoc.), as both Psh. and Hkl.; and so Σ there, but here καιων.

Note that the point in red (denoted in the printed text by *), which ought to stand before this word, has been wrongly set by the scribe before Σ in next line.

Correct καιων: op. xv. 1.

So again in next verse (bis): Σ, more exactly, instead of the prefix σ, gives σε here, and Σ there.

For καιων, Σ has καιων; better—see note on iv. 5. In Psh. and Hkl. commonly, and always in S and Σ, φως is rendered by καιων.

Correct ἀλας (also in verses 18, 19): see note on iv. 3.

Correct ζ [or καιων] καιων ιχθυς (as iv. 6): καιων is ptep., and would be followed by Ι.

Cp. iv. 6 (καιων), and see note there.

See note on v. 5.

For καιων: probably a clerical error, σ and ιων being in our Ms. very closely alike. But the error may have been in the Greek, νους for [αν]νους. [H. J. L.]

In Psh. O.T. καιων is frequent where LXX renders τετράγωνος: Hxp. transliterates, as Σ does here. See both, Exod. xxvii. 1.

καιων = δοσον] Σ, ι εκεν. See note on xviii. 7.

So (with numeral preceding) Psh. frequently in O.T., e.g., Exod. xxv. 10; also Joh. xxi. 8: in which places Hxp. and Hkl. use emph., as does Σ here.

καιων = η ενδομηνος] Σ, καιωνονος,—a word not elsewhere found. In Psh. καιωνονος does not occur: but in Hxp., 1[3] Esdr. vi. 24, = δόμος, and it is frequent in other writings.

Observe that in this verse the point *, which up to this is used in our Ms. only to mark the important divisions of the text, is placed four times, after the names of the first four stones, also in verse 20, after the eleventh stone; and after this frequently,—often unmeaningly, as in verse 22, and again in xxii. 3, 10, 15, and 20. Also, in verse 20,
from a person. Σ does not make this distinction in either place, nor in iii. 12 (where S om. καταθέτος),—nor does either version, xx. 9.

Σ, ἀνήρ; and so Hkl. always renders ἀνήρ (= husband): Psh. mostly as S. Cp. Gen. xvi. 3 (Psh. and Hxp.).

3. ανήρ] Perhaps ανήρ would be better, as in Σ: see note on Greek text. For ανήρ see second note on xiii. 6.

ανήρ] A letter seems to have been erased after this word. Probably the scribe had first written ανήρ.

ανήρ] Perhaps the prefix ought to be omitted; and the stop placed after, instead of before, this verb.


καταθέτος = κρατεῖτα] Σ, κρατεῖτα, here and in the other place where κ. occurs in Apoc. (xiv. 18), where S has simply καταθέτος (probably reading φωνή). Psh. renders variously,—only once as S (Eph. iv. 31); Hkl. uniformly as Σ.

ἀνίνα] These words take the place of ἰδία τά πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον. S therefore represents a reading of the Greek, ἐν τά πρῶσωπα ἀνίνας. Και ἀπῆλθον. In this reading, the verb is to be taken as first person singular, and to be connected with the next verse,—in which ἰδία is interpolated after ἰδία, to make good the connexion. Σ in its rendering follows the ordinary text, but with ἰδία (= παρῆλθον) for ἰδία (but ἰδία shows a trace of S in its conflate reading, ἰδία).

5. ἰδία] Written ἰδία where it recurs, xxii. 17; ptcp. ἰδία: so Σ [d points the word as ποιῶ, xxii. 17].

ἰδία] An erasure follows in Ms.; probably of the word ἰδία.


7. ἰδία] Perhaps we ought to correct ἰδία.

8. καταθέτος = διαλόγος] This word is not in Psh., O.T. or N.T.; nor in Hxp. or Hkl.; but καταθέτος occurs, 2 Cor. viii. 20, and καταθέτος, Act. xxviii. 9, 33, 1 Joh. iv. 18 (Psh. and, as regards the first two references, Hkl.). Σ has καταθέτος; and so Psh. and Hkl. in the two places where διαλόγος occurs else in N.T., Mt. viii. 26, Mk. iv. 40. The noun used by S, though unrecorded in the Lexx., is a verbal of exactly similar formation.

καταθέτος = ἀμαρτωλός] Σ, more properly, καταθέτος. The adj. used in S is in Psh. and Hkl. = ἄδικος (cp. S and Σ, xviii. 5 and xxii. 11), or (in Psh.) ἀνομος, but it does not occur in Σ.
the omission is shared by Σ and many Greek copies, headed by ἀ.; and moreover in that verse it is almost certainly due to a more complete homoeot. (χῶνα ἔτη repeated). See notes on Greek text.

4. καθῆσθαι = θρόνους] Here only in S: Σ, καθαιρεῖται; see note on iv. 4. Psh. only once renders θρόνος by καθήσεται (Col. i. 16, where Hkl. renders as Σ here), but both use the same word as = καθέδρα, Mt. xxiii. 6, &c., (by implication).

καθηλθοῦν] (i) S and Σ translate as if they had a reading, τὰς πεπεκελμένας, unknown to the Greek copies, and to the other versions. But perhaps we ought to correct both by prefixing κατ' to καθῆσται, especially as there is in the next sentence (in S) a κατ' wrongly inserted,—see next note: cp. however vi. 9, where S (not Σ) similarly has καθήσεται καθηλθοῦντος. (ii) The final letter of the verb is wanting: supply κατ' ; or (if the prefix κατ' be restored) supply κατ' in S [and in Σ, make corresponding changes].

καθηλθοῦν] Read rather καθήλθον, as suggested in last note. The text as it stands represents "the word of God, and of those who have not worshipped the beast," &c., which is unmeaning. But the connexion may be, "the souls . . . of those who have not worshipped," &c.

6. καθήλθον] Probably we are to correct καθήλθον. So Σ, with the Greek.


καθῆλθον] Correct κακοθείματι: also remove stop after κακοθείμων.

κακοθείμων = ὁ πλανῶν αὐτοῦς] Verbal noun κακοθείμων here used = ptcp.; found but twice in Psh., = πλάνος (Mt. xxvii. 63, 2 Cor. vi. 8; likewise Hkl., as also 1 Tim. iv. 1), and once = γόρις (2 Tim. iii. 13; not so Hkl.); occurs thrice in Poc. (and so likewise Hkl.), 2 Joh. 7(bis), = πλάνος; Jud. 13, = πλανητής. Σ renders here, κακοθείμων κακοθείματι.

12. κακοθείματι] See note on iii. 5, and cp. verse 15.

κακοθείματι] Perhaps we ought to read with Σ, κακοθείματι, as all else.

13. κακοθείματι] The prep. here used is rather = παρά than ἐν (of Greek text); but probably the variation is introduced to suit the sense and not as implying a change from ἐν (= κατ', as in previous sentence). For κατ' cp. i. 13, vii. 17, xxi. 2 (where see note), 10.

κατ' ἐκατον] Here only in S: see note on ii. 23.

XXI. 1. ἐκατον (bis)] Female here, but masc. in Σ: see note on x. 6.

2. ἐκατον ... ἐκατον = ἐκ ... ἐκατον] Here, and verse 10, S uses ἐκατον = ἐκ (as distinguished from ἐκ) to express the idea of coming
combining both, nor for placing καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αἰτοῦ as in S. The reading of S, or of its Greek original, is apparently conflate (see note on Greek text). Σ reads 
λαοῦ ἑλθείσας, nearly agreeing with the latter member of the conflation in S, in the noun used as the equivalent of στρατεύματα, of which ἡλθείσας or ἑλθείσας is in Σ the uniform rendering (see note on ix. 16, where S has ἑλθείσας, as here in the former member). Hence arises a suspicion that Σ may have been here interpolated from Σ. Yet it is to be noted, on the other hand, that S again has ἑλθείσας (= τῶν στρατεύματων αἰτοῦ) at the close of the verse, consistently in both clauses using ἑλθείσας, and not (as Σ) ἑλθαμεν.

20. [Perhaps ] Apparently Σ is to be read for τ, as in Σ. This would represent a reading (see note on Greek text) otherwise unattested. Σ has ἓλθεισας και τρῆσαι. Perhaps ἑλθαμεν, = καὶ ἑλθαμεν, is to be read for ἑλθείσας.

21. [Ought to be obelized (see note on ii. 5); but not so in Ms. } Note the repetition of the prefix εἰ. So Σ, καὶ ἑλθείσας. ἐλθείσας ἑλθείσας = πάντα τὰ δρεα] Σ, καὶ ἑλθείσας ἑλθείσας; cp. both versions, verse 17 (where see note): but in the only other place where δρεα occurs in Apoc. (xviii. 2, sing.), S om., while Σ renders δρεα. In Psh. N.T., ἑλθείσας is not used; but in O.T. often; in Hxp. sometimes.

XX. 2. καὶ ἐκράτησεν] So Σ: elsewhere in both versions κράτω is always rendered by κράτη; as mostly in Psh. and Hkl., in both of which κράτη is very rare, though frequent in Hxp. We find however κράτω = κράτω Lk. xxiv. 16 (Hkl.); also also Tit. i. 8 (Psh., by implication). Here, it is used because κράτη is wanted to represent κλεῖον in next verse (in both versions; and so throughout, and in Psh. and Hkl. passim).

3. [After this word (see note on Greek text), S om. to render ἄριστος τελεσθῇ τά χίλια ἑτη, which all else ins. Probably the previous sentence, in the Greek original (or an ancestor) of S, was so arranged as to end (as in rec.) with ἑτη, and thus the omission, whether in the Greek or made by the translator, would be due to the homoeoteleuton ἑτη. It is true that ἑτη is not so placed as to bear out this supposition concerning the position of ἑτη, but there are other instances where S places ἑτη early in a sentence though the Greek has ἑτη at the end (as is usual in Apoc.): see, e.g., xxii. 11 (quater). Yet, on the other hand, the fact that S also om. from verse 5 an entire clause containing the same words, looks as if some doctrinal bias were at work here. But in case of verse 5,
And thus S is doubtfully supported by Σ, either in disjoining the negative from what follows, here, or in its contrary treatment of xxii. 9. See note on Greek text. It is plain that doctrinal prepossession was at work in causing the confusion and inconsistency,—cp. next note.

Σαρκινώς] Inserted no doubt to qualify the prohibition conveyed. The advb. = μᾶλλον, 2 Pet. i. 10 (Poc. and Hkl.). It is remarkable that the same advb. is interpolated, 3 Joh. 5 (Poc.), apparently = μᾶλλον.

11. Σαρκινώς  ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ] Σ, Σαρκινώς, which rendering is given by both versions, xxiii. 11, the only other instance of ἡ in Apoc. Psh. uses both, but prefers the former: Hkl., with rare exceptions, the latter. See note on xv. 3.

12. ἐδείκτης] Here ἐδείκτης = οὐδείς, for ἐν ἑαυτῷ (as Σ).

13. ἐδείκτης] This verb in Psh. occurs only Joh. ii. 8, = ἐδείκτης; but elsewhere seems nearly = βάπτιζω (= to imbue). Perhaps however it is here = ἐδείκτης, ἐβάπτιζον, ἐβάπτιζον. See Thes. Σ.; see also note on Greek text.

14. ἐδείκτης] Observe that by placing a stop before as well as after ἐδείκτης, and prefixing α to the ptcp. following, S seems to make the adjective parallel with the ptcp., and therefore (see note on Greek text) to have read both in dative, or perhaps both in nominative.

15. ἐδείκτης] There seems to be an erasure in Ms. after this word; see note on Greek text.

16. ἐθέλετε] Rather ἐθέλετε; but the masc. suffix may relate to ἐθέλετε. Σαρκινώς = παράξωσι] Σ uses παράξωσι, which is the almost invariable Psh. and Hkl. equivalent of παράσκευος (see note on xi. 6). But we find it represented by Ἑρμος in both, Act. vii. 24, and therefore are not obliged to suppose that S read here ἀποκτητικά or σφάξιον.

17. ἐθέλετε] See note on Greek text, and observe that S inserts no α before ἐθέλετε, and writes the noun as plural: Σ sing.; [to ἐσόμενον, ἐθέλετε] in reference, as it seems, to the insertion of the copulative, and therefore to its absence from ἡ which is the only authority for omitting it].

18. ἐθέλετε] Singular (collective); so in Psh. with rare exceptions. Σ writes the word pl. here, and verse 21 (see note there, for the rendering of S); and so Hkl. habitually.


20. ἐθέλει] Correct ἐθέλει τοῖς ὀρφείοις, as Σ. Cp. Ezek. xxxix. 17 (Psh. and Hxp.).

21. ἐθέλετε] There is Greek authority for both readings, αὐτοῦ and αὐτών, after καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα,—but none for
Mt. ix. 23 (Psh. and Hkl.), the only other instance of ἀληθὴς in N.T. Cp. Ezek. xxvi. 13 (Psh. and Hxp.). For ἁμαρτάνω, cp. 1 Cor. xii. 10 (Psh.).

[μουσικάν = μουσικῶν] A word unknown to the lexicons; probably chosen (or perhaps formed) by our translator for its similarity in sound to μουσικά. For μουσικά, see second note (ii) on viii. 6.

XIX. 5. δεύτερον] S (not Σ) om. ημί after this word.

6. ἐνδυνάμωσα] After this word, [τάκτης (cursive) is interlined, apparently by a later hand, conforming the text to Σ and the Greek copies. See note on Greek text.

7. [τενλάμαζεσ] (i) Note that S gives these verbs in present ptcp. (= pres. indic.); Σ, in future. (ii) For the rendering of ἀγαλλώ (not else in Apoc.) in S, see note on xi. 10; Σ uses ἔμαθεν. In Psh., it is never rendered as by S, but often as by Σ; in Hkl. always so.


9. [μετέτρω] Probably we ought to correct τετράτω.

[μετέτρω] Read μετέτρω instead of (or perhaps after) this word.

[μετέτρω] Correct μετέτρω, as verse 7.

[μετέτρω] Σ, προς,—one of the few cases where S has the stat. emphat. and Σ the stat. absol.: the former treating κακλημένου adjectively, as both render κακλημένοι (xvii. 14) by κακλημένοι. Cp. xxii. 12 (S, κακλημένος; Σ, κακλημένοι).

10. [τέφθαι] Note that δεδεμένος (= ἔδεικτο) is omitted before the negative. As the text stands, Σ ἤ (so pointed) seems = μὴ [τοιχόγησθαι]! Cp. however the parallel passage, xxii. 9, where ἤ προσκεκληθεῖ προσκεκληθέντο appears; but with a stop after it, so that ἤ (with no stop following) is left to be joined with what follows. X retains ἤ here as well as there; but its interpunction is uncertain: the evidence being

(xix. 10) n; ἐνδυνάμωσα: ἀληθὴς ἀληθὴς
l; ἁμαρτάνω: ἀληθὴς ἀληθὴς
 d; ἁμαρτάνω: ἀληθὴς ἀληθὴς
p; ἁμαρτάνω: ἀληθὴς ἀληθὴς

Thus, as to (i) text, Σ is against the omission here of ἄρα: as to (ii) interpunction,

n agrees with S in both places.

l is indecisive here, but at xxii. 9 makes ἤ stand alone.

d (its triple point being equivalent merely to the single point of S) joins ἤ with what follows, here; but in xxii. 9 agrees with l.

p (alone consistent) makes ἤ stand alone in both places, with (...), i.e. (!), after ἄρα, as well as after ἤ.
NOTES.

by Ἡρν., ἀρχιστατηγος = στρατηγος, implied in ἀρχιστατηγος = ἀρχιστατηγος [LXX, = ἀρχιστατηγος των στρατηγων], Josh. v. 14. See Masius, Syr. Psc., s.v. ἐπι; and note that in Thes. S. (s.v.) this reference of Masius is misunderstood, and wrongly applied to v. 6 (μαχηματος).

(i) Apparently a conflation,—see note on Greek text. But ἀρχιστατηγος may be a periphrasis for πας ὁ πλεων: if so, ἐπι των πλοιων ought to be struck out. Σ renders ὁ πλεων ὁ μαχηματος ὁ διδ [so l; d p; ἀρχιστατηγος]. For διδ = πλεων, see Act. xxvii. 2, 6, Psh.; where Hkl. renders by ἐπι. (ii) Note the constr. form followed by prep., as xiv. 3.

[See for this word Thes. S.; it is not in Psh. Σ here αποθεμαι. Psh. has ἀρχιστατηγος where ναρυσε recurs, Act. xxvii. 27, 30: Hkl. renders as Σ; and so Ἡρν., 3 Kin. ix. 27 [= ναυτικος, LXX].]

Note the peculiar form of the verb with suffix.

19. ἤτησ = της τιμιωτης αυτης Elsewhere in S, and uniformly in Σ, and in Psh., Ἡρν., and Hkl., ἤτης = τιμη. For τιμιωτης (not else in N.T.), Σ has ἀρχιστατηγος, a very rare word, not found in Psh., nor (apparently) in Hkl. or Ἡρν.

20. ἀριστην = ὅτι ἐκροινον Σ, less accurately, ἀριστην; but in xiv. 2 both give ἀριστην. [In the latter place, Σ d has ἀριστην, and S at first sight appears to read the same, but the seeming is only a blot.]

21. ἦτης This word is added in marg., but prima manu. There is some trace of erasure before the next word, as if Σ had originally been prefixed.

[Σωτηρ = μυθην] So Σ [d l n; p, ἠτης—see last note]; and so Psh. and Hkl., Mt. xviii. 6, and wherever μ. recurs. See note on Greek text.

ἄρχων . . . ἄρχων = εβαλεν . . . βλησεται.] Σ more consistently uses the former verb in both places: see note on vi. 13.

[ἀριστην = ἀριστην.] So Σ. The Greek word is not else found in N.T.; but ἀριστην in Hkl. where it occurs (Act. xiv. 6, James iii. 4); also in Ἡρν., e.g., Ezek. iii. 14. So too Psh. O.T., there and elsewhere; but not N.T.

[Perhaps we ought to correct ὁντις (as Σ); see note on Greek text.

22. ἄριστον ἰδι δια] This rendering is borrowed from Psh. of Daniel iii. 5, where it exactly reproduces ἄριστον ἰδι of the Chald. = γένος μονοσικων of Theodot. Possibly our translator found αὐλητικων in his Greek copy, or misunderstood αὐλητῶν. Σ renders simply ἄριστον; see for the word,
NOTES.

printed texts is attested only by later copies. See Hermathena, vol. vii, p. 290.

In S and Σ, ἐρασις is used indifferently = βούσσος or βούσσως (reading of Greek uncertain here and verse 16), the prefix being here the sign of the genitive. In Psh. and Hkl. it = βούσσος, Lk. xvi. 19 (the only instance of β. outside Apoc.) But S, and apparently Σ, seem everywhere else to make ἐρασις = βούσσως (adj.), verse 16, and xix. 8 (bis), 14; and therefore probably mean ἐρασις here to represent βούσσος.

Σ, ἑμείς. ἐρασις = θύμιον So Σ [d p; but l writes ἑρασις].

ἐρασις = ἐλεφαντίων] Cp. the use of ἰω in Hebrew. Σ, (= Elfenbein). Ivory is not mentioned elsewhere in N.T.; but in O.T., Psh. mostly expresses it as S; Hxp. as Σ. But Psh. has ἱερός ἐρασις, Ezek. xxvii. 6; and so Hxp., 3 Kin. x. 22 (with * before the second word), and similarly Ezek. xxvii. 15, in which two places ivory is spoken of in its unmanufactured state, as an article of import.

13. ἐρασις] So Σ; cp. Cant. v. 16 (Psh. and Hxp.), Esth. i. 6 (Psh.).

Σ, ἑρασις, as Exod. xxx. 23 (Psh.); Hxp. ἑρασις. ἑρασις] So Σ; and so Hkl., Mt. xxvi. 7; also in Hxp.: not Psh.

λίβανος ἑρασις] So Psh., Mt. ii. 11 (λ. not else as a separate word in N.T.), where Hkl. transliterates λιβανος, as Σ here.

Σ, ἑρασις] So Σ; and so Psh. O.T., passim.

14. ἐρασις = ἐς ὑπώρα σου So Σ, ἑρασις. Ὑπώρα not else in N.T., but φωνωπώρα (Jud. 12) = ἐρασις (Poc., and Hkl. similarly): in Psh. O.T. (not N.T.) ἐρασις occurs; e.g. Deut. xxxiii. 13.

Perhaps Σ is to be prefixed. See note on Greek text.

ἐρασις = τὰ λαμπρά] See note on xv. 6. The word ἑρασις occurs in Psh. only Phil. iv. 8, ἐς φησιν, where Hkl. uses another ptep. of same verb.

Σ, ἑρασις] In S only: see note on Greek text.

16. ἐρασις = ἐς φησιν, as S, xvii. 16 (where see note). For ἐρασις (usually = κεφαλα), cp. 1 Cor. i. 17, Phil. ii. 7 (Psh. and Hkl.).

17. ἐρασις = πᾶς κυβερνήτης] Σ transliterates; as Psh. and Hkl., Act. xxvii. 11 (where alone κ. recurs in N.T.); also Hxp., Ezek. xxvii. 27;—all with variations of spelling. For the rendering of S, cp. Psh., 2 Sam. vi. 3, 2 Chr. viii. 18, ἐρασις ἐς φησιν; Ezek. xxvii. 29, ἐς φησιν (also Hxp.): but a closer parallel is yielded...
NOTES.

6. ἂν... ἀποκρατήσα] See note on Ἀπήκοα, xxii. 12.

Ἕκατος (bis)] (i) Σ, ἕκαστος. Both forms are recognized; see Mt. xxiii. 15 (Psh. as S, Hkl. as Σ). (ii) Note the full stop placed before the second ἕκαστος, which separates it from the preceding verb, and leaves it to be connected with that which follows (verse 7).

7. ἀνάπλησις = ὁσα] Rather ἐφ' ὁσα or ἐφ' ὁσον: Σ, ἀνάπλησις, which is its rendering for ὁσον, xxi. 16; and which usually = ἐφ' ὁσον in Psh. and Hkl.,—also in Poc. as well as Hkl., 2 Pet. i. 13. For the rendering here given by S, cp. Mt. xviii. 18 (Psh.). See note on i. 2.

ἀνάπλησις = ἐπιτρηπίωσε] Cp. ἀνάπλησις [sic], verse 9: Σ has ἀνάπλησις (= ὁπτηριάσασαι) here, and similarly in verse 9; for which cp. ἀνάπλησις = ἄτοι καταπτηριάσωσι, 1 Tim. v. 11 (Psh., similarly Hkl.). In Psh. (not Hkl.) ἀνάπλησις occurs 2 Thess. ii. 4, James ii. 6, 13, iii. 5; but = different verbs.

ἁμαρτάνει = τοσοῦτον] S renders as if τοσοῦτον, and similarly ἁμαρτάνει, verse 16 (the only other instance of τοσοῦτος in Apoc.); and so Σ there, but here ἁμαρτάνει (more accurately). Psh. usually gives the third of these renderings or something equivalent, rarely the second; Hkl. uses both, often combined: the first is not found in either.

8. ἁμαρτάνει] Correct ἁμαρτάνει.

9. ἁμαρτάνει] Correct ἁμαρτάνει (see verse 7 and note). The reading of text would however make sense,—cp. 1 Cor. x. 7 (Psh. and Hkl.), ἁμαρτάνει = παιζειν.

10. ἅμαρτα] ἅμαρτα = ἀπὸ μακρόθεν] So again verse 15; but verse 17, ἅμαρτα. Σ in all these places gives the latter rendering of the phrase (which does not recur in Apoc.); and so Psh. and Hkl.: but in Psh. O.T. the former is to be found, e.g. Sirac. xxi. 7; in Hxp. the latter.

11. ἁμαρτάνει = τῶν γόμων αἵτων] So in next verse: in both; Σ has ἁμαρτάνει; and so Psh. and Hkl., Act. xxi. 3 (the only other instance of γ. in N. T.), reserving ἁμαρτάνει as = φορτίων.

12. ἄναντα... τιμῶν] So S wherever τιμῶν occurs, (except xvii. 4, where see note): Σ uniformly uses ἄναντα, as does Hkl.: Psh. mostly as S, where τ. means precious,—(but as Σ twice, Act. v. 34, Hebr. xiii. 4, where τ. means honoured). So too 2 Pet. i. 4, ἄναντα (Poc., not Hkl), where printed texts wrongly give ἄναντα = τυμάς; but the reading is as above rectified in our Mss., and in two others, Or. 1.17 of Cambridge Univ., and Suppl. 27 of Paris, of high authority: that of the
NOTES.

Possibly ἔρευν (παρτὸς ὀρνόην) is to be read here; as in Σ l: see De Dieu's note in loc. See also note on Greek text.

3. ἐρωτήσατε] This seems to represent πεντώκε (with accus.); lit., κεκέρακε (with dat.),—cp. verse 6.

So Σ [d p; l, ἐρωτήσας, and so where the word recurs, verses 11, 15, 23 [each copy adhering to its spelling; n as l, verse 11,—
deficit in the other places].

ληρός, Σκιάς ληρός. So ἐρωτήσασθαι = ἐρωτήσασθαι] Lit., ἡς μανίας αὐτής. So ἐρωτήσασθαι = ληρός, Lk. xxiv. 11 (Psh.). Σ gives the transliteration ἐρωτήσασθαι; see second note on verse 7 infra., and cp. ἐρωτήσασθαι, 4 Kin. xix. 28 (Hxp.) = στρηνός [LXX], in which place the Hebrew word is יָוָשָׁה. This suggests that ἐρωτήσασθαι is to be corrected ἐρωτήσεται (from ἐρωτήσασθαι, as יָוָשָׁה from יָוָשָׁה) taken in malam partem, "luxury" instead of "tranquillity." This sense is well established for the Hebrew word, but seems unrecorded for the Syriac. See for ἐρωτήσεται, i. 4 and note.

Infra., verses 7, 9 (where see notes), στρηνῶ = ἐρωτήσασθαι (wrongly written ἐρωτήσεται in the latter verse). Hence another conjecture arises, that ἐρωτήσασθαι (= ὕπαγε, Jer. xii. 5, Hxp.; see also heading of Ps. x., Psh.) may have been the rendering of S, which may have passed, by a like shortening, into ἔρωτα (= ἐμπεδείνω, Eph. v. 4, Psh. and Hkl.), and thence into ἔρωτα.

4. ἔρωτα] Σ, ἔρωτα. Except in the expressions ἔρωτα (iv. 8, v. 1), ἔρωτα (xi. 2), αὐτή is not else found in S; but in Psh. and Hkl. occurs with suffixes as here,—e.g. Mt. xxiii. 26. So too Psh. (not Hxp.), Jer. li. 45, which in this sentence S repeats verbatim.

ἔρωτα . . . . . ἔρωτα = ἔρωτα μη . . . ἔρωτα μη] So Σ (with ἔρωτα, as usual, before the former). But S om. α before ἔρωτα, so as to make the latter of the two final clauses dependent on the former; and thus has reason for changing from ἔρωτα to ἔρωτα: while Σ retains α, so as to make the two clauses parallel, and yet varies the rendering of ἔρωτα, exactly as S. Thus in this verse we have clear evidence not only of the connexion of the versions, but of the dependence of Σ on S.

5. ἐκκολλήθησαν] So Σ. The Greek verb (not else in Apoc.), in Psh. and Hkl. is but once (Lk. x. 11) rendered as here.

ἀποκτήσασθαι = ἐκκολλήθησαν] Similarly Σ. ἀποκτήσασθαι does not recur in Apoc.; else in N.T. only Act. xviii. 14, xxiv. 20, in which places Hkl. renders as here; but not Psh., which however often uses ἐκκολλήθη otherwise. Cp. xxi. 8, xxii. 11.
11. ἀναλογία] An interpolation, probably of a gloss, identifying the "beast" of this chapter with the "dragon" of xi. 3.

12. ὀσκεύς = ὀλαβὼν . . . ἱματίσκειν.] See note on v. 8.


14. ὁμοιότατος] So verse 17 (bis), and so Σ in both verses (the only instances of νυ. in Apoc.). In Phg, ῠμοιότατος, though frequent, is never rendered as here; in Hkl. thrice, Act. xx. 3, 1 Cor. i. 10, Phil. 14, (the Greek being written in marg. of the first of these places).

15. ἀνακατατάσσει] Correct ἀνακατατάσσει (= νικήσει), as Σ. The Greek verbs are so similar as to suggest the surmise that the error may have been in the copy whence S is translated. But in S ἀδικεῖσθαι is never rendered by ἀνακατατάσσει (see notes on ii. 11, xi. 5); and it is doubtful whether ἀνακατατάσσει is ever used in pa. Where it occurs in Σ, it is in aph.

16. ἐπιστεύουσα] I propose to correct πιστεύουσα (see note on Greek text, and cp. Σ), retaining the fem. form, though the following verb is masc.

17. ἀποκαταστάση] So Σ [d writes αποκαταστάση, and so p prints ἀποκαταστάση; but De Dieu, ἀποκαταστάσῃ]. See Thes. S., s.v. ἀποκαταστάση. The Greek verb occurs elsewhere in Apoc. only xvi. 18, 19. In the former place (where see note), S renders by νικῇ; in the latter, as here; and so Σ in both. Else in N.T., it is only found Mt. xii. 25, Lk. xi. 17, and in both places is rendered in Phg. and Hkl. by ἀποκαταστάσῃ.

18. ἄργη] Read rather (with Σ) ἄργη, = ἀδικεύειν, as all Greek copies.
NOTES.

plural: not so elsewhere in S (xviii. 12, 16); nor anywhere in Σ. In Psh. N.T. it is usually singular (but see Mk. xv. 17, 20 [Widm.]); in Hkl. always; but pl. sometimes in Psh. O.T. and Hxp., as Dan. v. 7, 29.

\(\text{kēxρυσωμένα} = \text{kēxρυσωμένη}\) (i) Σ, \(\text{kēxρυσωμένα} = \text{kai kēxρυσωμένη}\). See note on Greek text. (ii) Observe that, consistently with its reading, S places a stop (.) after \(\text{kēxρυσωμένα}\), and does not prefix α as Σ does to the following noun. For the verb, cp. Esai. xxx. 22 (Hxp.): not in Psh.

\(\text{τίμιος}\) S nowhere else (see note on xviii. 12) renders τίμιος thus; nor does Σ, or Psh. N.T. or Hkl.: but Psh. O.T. and Hxp., sometimes, as Ezek. xxviii. 13 (cp. Psh. there). Σ, \(\text{τίμιος}\) here, and throughout.

\(\text{καθαρσία}\) More correctly written \(\text{καθαρσία}\) (see next note: Σ gives \(\text{καθαρσία}\)). In this and next note I assume that in the original of S, ἀκαθ. stood before βθ.; see note on Greek text; also on xvi. 13. This word (once in Psh., = ἀκαθαρσία, Rom. i. 24) occurs nowhere else in S. But we find \(\text{καθαρσία}\), xxi. 27 infr. (= κοινός), and xxi. 15 (= κύνον[?]): in Psh. it sometimes = ἀκαθαρσία, sometimes κοινός.

\(\text{βδέλυγμα}\) = \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\) So again in next verse (5); in xxi. 27, where alone βθ. recurs in Apoc., S has \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\). In verse 5, Σ agrees with S; but here, and xxi. 27, it has \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\) (sing. or pl.). Again, xxi. 8, both versions render \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\) (verb only there in Apoc.) by \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\). In N.T. βδέλυγμα occurs elsewhere only Mt. xxiv. 15, Mk. xiii. 14, Lk. xvi. 15, in all which places other renderings are used in Psh., and in Hkl.; also in Hxp., as well as Psh., Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11; but in 1 Macc. i. 54 (Psh.), it = \(\text{βδέλυγμα}\). In Psh. N.T., also Hkl., \(\text{καθαρσία}\), \(\text{καθαρσία}\), are nowhere found: but the former in O.T., 2 Macc. vi. 5 (Psh., = ?); the latter in Hxp., 1 [3] Esdr. viii. 80 [= μολυσμός, LXX].

But \(\text{καθαρσία} = \text{κοινός}\) sometimes in Psh. and often in Hkl.; and \(\text{καθαρσία} = \text{κοινός}\) usually in both.

6. \(\text{καθαρσία}\) This word seems to have undergone correction, prima manu. The syllable \(\text{λ}1\) [sic in Ms.] is in paler ink than the root letters, and so is the final \(\alpha\), which moreover stands out in the margin.

8. \(\text{καθαρσία}\) Cp. xi. 7, and note.

Note the stat. constr. followed by redundant prep., as in xiv. 3, where see note: see also note on iii. 10.

See note on iii. 5.
NOTES.

(To the only other instance of ἄρχ in N.T.); also Hxp., Deut. xxiii. 13 (see Thes. S., s.v.). Σ uses ἀνείκε, a word not found in Psh. N.T., —but in O.T., Exod. xx. 26 (Psh. and Hxp.), where LXX has ἄρχ. Possibly S read αἰρετυνυν (see note on Greek text).


17. [With] Σ, δακταλιο. In our Ms., the final letter alone is legible.


οἰς = ὄς Σ, ης οἰς. The word ὄς is not else found in Apoc.; but in Psh. is rendered as by S, Mk. xiii. 19 (where Hkl. renders nearly as Σ); also Exod. ix. 24 (where cp. Hxp.).

19. [With] So Σ: a rare use of this form in passive sense: rare also of the Greek verb; but for it cp. Act. x. 31, Ezek. xviii. 22, 24, (LXX). In the latter place, Psh. and Hxp. render as here; in the former, Psh. and Hkl. avoid so doing.

21. [With] So Psh. always; not else in Apoc.: Σ, ἃς, as Hkl. and Hxp.

XVII. 1. ἡ προσερεμμενον Σ Cp. xxi. 9, where δεῦρο recurs, = ἰκανόν simply; and so Σ in both places, as in Psh. and Hkl., Joh. xi. 43, &c.: but ἡ προσερεμμενον (Psh., not Hkl.) = δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι, Mt. xix. 21, &c.

3. ἁταγεμένη = ἁταγεμένη μετέρα] Σ, ἁταγεμένη; as both versions, xxi. 10 (the only other instance of the Greek verb in Apoc.); and so both render ἁταγεμένη, xiii. 10 (where see note). In Psh., ἁταγεμένη often occurs, but never ἁταγεμένη, which Psh. and Hkl. render as Σ.

κοκκωνός = κόκκων] So Σ; but in next verse, both (with Psh. and Hkl.) render κ. by κόκκων, as also where it recurs, xviii. 12, 16; moreover, both make κοκκωνόντος = πυρρός, vi. 4. These instances of exact agreement in variation of rendering are clear marks of the affinity between S and Σ. The reason of varying is, no doubt, that κ. seems proper to denote the colour of an animal; κ. that of a garment. But probably κ., as here applied to the beast, signifies that it was covered with scarlet trappings.

4. ἀκοινο γεγονός] Note that S writes ἀκοινο here without suffix, and κοινο uninflected; see Nödeke, § 304. Σ, ἀκοινο γεγονός.

(equal) = πορφυρά] Observe that this word is written as
NOTES.

XVI. 2. ἀνόητος = πωνηρός] So Σ [n; but d l p, ἀνόητος, which the Lexx. support]; not in Psh. Both versions make ἀνόητος = πώνος wherever it occurs (verses 10, 11, xxi. 4), and so Hxp., e.g., Essai. i. 5 (with Psh.). In Psh. N.T. it = νόσος, πάθος, and the like, but not in Hkl. Else in N.T., πώνος occurs only Col. iv. 13, where Psh. and Hkl. follow the variant Ἐναγός.

[With ἀνόητος following; more regularly ἀνόητος.] To be corrected, as it seems, ἀνόητος ἀνόητος, as Σ: but see note on Greek text.

8. ἀνόητος = καυματίσαι] So, i. 15, S has ἀνόητος = πεπωμένος. Καυματίσαι occurs in Apoc. else only in next verse (where S om.,—see next note). Σ in both verses uses forms of the same root ἀνόητος. So also Psh. and Hkl. where the Greek verb occurs in N.T., Mt. xiii. 6, Mk. iv. 6.

9. ἀνόητος] (i) Note that S om. to render ἐν πνεύμα (end of verse 8). καὶ ἐκαυματίσασαν τὴν ἀνθρώπου (= ἔκκαυματίσασαν τὴν ἀνθρώπου, as Σ). This error of homoeot. is no doubt due to the Syr. scribe,—for ἔκκαυματίσασαν and ἐκαυματίσασαν do not differ in termination as do ἀνθρώπους . . . . ἀνθρώπου (see Greek text). (ii) The verbal ἔκκαυμα occurs in S here only; see note on vii. 16.

αἰνεῖν] The middle letter of this word is partly effaced in Ms., but the other letters and the point are clear. See note on verse 11.

10. Note that a point (,) is prefixed to this verse. Probably four points (in red as usual) were to have been placed round it. [The stop represented in printed text by (, is in Ms. always in vermillion, with a fifth point, in black, in its centre.]

11. ἀφαίρεσθαι] Correct ἀφαίρεσθαι, as ix. 20, 21;—see note on ii. 15. The reading of Ms. = ἐπάνω, which is unsupported (see note on Greek text); but as it makes sense, it may have been also in verse 9, supr.

13. ἀκάθαρτα] Σ, ἀκαθάρτα, as also xviii. 2, where S renders as it does here: but for the other place where ἀκ. occurs in Apoc., xvii. 4, see note there. Psh. never renders as S here; Hkl. but twice (Act. x. 28, 1 Cor. vii. 14): Psh. N.T. sometimes as Σ here; Hkl. frequently; Psh. O.T. and Hxp. usually. All also use ἀκαθάρτος, especially Psh.

14. ἀκαθάρτος] For ἀκαθάρτος, which Σ gives [d ηµ; but l ακάθαρτος, wrongly]: see note on v. 6.

15. ἐρχομαι] Σ [l p; not d; n hiat] adds ἐρχομαι, to make it clear that ἐποίηᾳ is expressed,—not ἐρχομαι, which S seems to represent.

ἀκαθάρτος = τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ] So Psh. and Hkl., Rom. i. 27
3. 

Both emphat. in Σ; as also, δικαίος; but the latter pair are absol. in S and Σ, xix. 2.

δικαίος = δικαία] So xix. 2; and so Σ in both places. But in the remaining three places where δικαίος occurs (xvi. 5, 7, xxii. 11) both render by ἴσως,—a signal instance of agreement in arbitrary variation of rendering. See however note on verse 4. The renderings are used indiscriminately in Phsh., and in Hkl. also.

Note that this word occurs twice in this verse;—substituted, in the second instance, for ἴσως; probably by oversight.

αἰώνιον] So Σ = αἰώνιον of MSS. & C, with vg; also with Psh. of pl., Jer. x. 7: against ἔθνος (= ἡμέρα) of MSS. A P Q and most mss., with st; and with Hebr., Hxp., and Theodot. of pl. (LXX om.).

4. ὅτι δικαίος ἐστί = ὅτι δικαίος ἐστι] Or, ὅτι ἔθνος ἐτ. This sentence, which is supported by no other authority, takes the place of ὅτι τὰ δικαίωματα σου ἐφανερώθησαν (as all else have it). We have ἐδακρύσθη = δικαίωμα, xix. 8 (S; not Σ), which is in favour of reading δικαίος in the Greek here: but on the other hand for ἔθνος we have ἐκθέτης (= ἐθνος ὁ Κύριος, LXX), Ps. xxv [xxiv]. 8 (Psh.; so too Hxp.); and in N.T., ἐκθέτης = ἔθνος (both in moral and in physical sense), Act. viii. 21, ix. 11, (Psh. and Hkl.). Again, we find ἔκδηλος = ὅρθος, Hebr. xii. 13 (Psh. and Hkl.). So likewise Prov. xi. 6 (Psh. and Hxp.), ὅρθος, LXX.

Possibly S originally had ἐκθέτης, and (the last four letters having been lost), ἐκθέτης has become ἔκθέτης.

Or it may be that ἔκθέτης belongs properly to the second sentence of the verse, and was originally a marginal variant (for μακαριός ὅσον), wrongly inserted here, displacing δικαίωμα. In support of this conjecture, note that to μακαρία, Σ adds μακαρία [d p prefixing μακαρία], which is equivalent to μακάριος [H. J. L.]. Cp. Deut. xxxii. 4 (Psh.).

6. γένος] The full stop before these words (a scribe's error) ought to be removed, and placed after them.

λαμπρόν] So S always, except xviii. 14, where the word is used in a different sense: Σ uniformly renders λ. by δικαίος, as Hkl. In Psh. N.T., λ. is nowhere directly rendered, and ἱλαρός is used for φωτεινός and the like, = "lighted", or "luminous": ἱλαρός for κράτιστος (Lk. i. 3, &c.), = "illustrious".

7. δέ] Correct ἵνα.
(except i. 3, where see note), as in Psh., where felicitation is conveyed: but ἐκδημάω is used, xx. 6, where μακάριος is merely predicated; which is Psh. usage also (see e.g. Joh. xiii. 17). Σ uniformly makes μακάριος = ἀπόθεσις, as does Hkl.: but Hxp. sometimes as S (cp. Ps. i. 1, ii. 13).

οἰ ἀποθέσις = ΟΙ ἀποθέσις Σ, ἀποθέσις. The verb ἀποθέσις occurs in Psh. only 2 Cor. v. 6, 8 (cp. also 9), = ἐκδημάω,—not in Hkl.: but in lection-rubrics ἀποθέσις, ἀποθέσις, are used as "the departed", "departure",—"the deceased", "deceased", in English. The last-named word occurs once, 2 Pet. i. 14 (Poc., not Hkl.) in this sense, = ἀπόθεσις, which is a point of agreement between S and Poc.


ἡμείας] Σ, ἡμείας [n; d l p ἡμείας, erroneously],—the usual habit of each version being in this instance reversed; and so through verses 14–19. The absol. form is used (Psh. and Hkl.) in the only other place where the word occurs in N.T., Mk. iv. 29; also in the pl., Joel iii. 13, and elsewhere always in Psh. O.T., and Hxp. For the emph., see Thes. S., s.v. (Zech. v. 1 is wrongly cited there).

ἡμείας] Rather ἡμείας. There is here an error (whether in the Greek or the Syriac) of repetition of a word from earlier part of verse. Note the stop (·) [sic in Ms.], at end of verse.

18. ἀκμαίας] A marginal insertion, prima manu.

ημιας = ημιας Σ] Rather = ἡμιας, which perhaps S may have read here: cp. Mt. vi. 28, &c., where αὐξάνω = ημιας (Psh. and Hkl.). Σ has ἀκμαίας. The verb ἀκμαίας does not elsewhere occur in N.T.

20. ἐχθρόνων] Σ, ἐχθρόνων [d p; but l om., and n hiatus] which S and Σ both use = παθέσις, iii. 19.

ἐπιμέλειας] Σ, ἐπιμέλειας; and so S as well as Σ where the word recurs, xxi. 16. The emph. is always used in Psh. N.T. except Act. i. 12; in Hkl. without exception.

XV. 1. ἔφανον = ἔσπανον] So again verse 3 (the only other instance of θ. in Apoc.), and so Σ in both places; also Hkl. sometimes. But in Psh., ἔφανον means "astonished", not "astonishing": yet see Lk. xiii. 17, where it = ἔφανον.

ἔφθασεν] Correct ἔφθασεν: so again, xxi. 9.

2. ἐπιλαμβάνει = ἐπιλαμβάνει Rather = ἐπιλαμβάνει (with genitive), as xx. 3, 11. Perhaps S means to describe the singers as standing over, not on, the sea.
NOTES.

xviii. 17) is noteworthy. Inasmuch as the use of stat. constr. is very rare in Σ, but frequent in S, the presumption is that Σ here borrows from S.

4. ἵνα ἐστὶν ὅπως ἐπόνυμον οὐκ [Σ], Ἰρια ἦ γενέτοις. In Psh., ἵνα occurs, as Rom. xv. 20 (not Hkl.), ὅπως, but not with ἵνα before it;—for which combination see Thes. S., s.v. ἵνα.

5. μεθαυτός = ψευδός. So Σ; and so both in the other places (xxi. 27, xxii. 15) where ψ. occurs; as also Hkl. uniformly. In Psh. N.T., ψ. is only twice thus rendered, 1 Joh. ii. 21, 27.

[Ἐξ] Not else in Apoc. Σ, ἐξ ἐξομολογητέον [ὁ λείπει], ἐξ ἐξομολογητέον [⇑]. Psh. usually as S, but (with Hkl.) as Σ ἐξομολογητέον, Hebr. ix. 14, 1 Pet. i. 19; and so 2 Pet. iii. 14, Jud. 24, (Poc. ; but Hkl. as Σ λείπει). Hkl. elsewhere sometimes as Σ ἐξομολογητέον, sometimes as Σ λείπει.


[Ἄρχοντα] This is the only instance of ἀρχοντα followed by ἒκτοσώκειν: see note on xiii. 17. Probably S read ἐξομολογητέον ἐπάλληλον. ἐπαγγελία = εὐπληθεύσων] Εὐπληθεύσων. Not else in Apoc. Σ has ἐπαγγελία, as Hkl., and Psh. sometimes (as Mk. i. 1); but Psh. usually as S. In the superscription both S and Σ (but see first note on i. 1) transliterate εὐπληθεύσων.

[For this construction cp. Isai. xlii. 11 (Psh.). In the sense of “to inhabit,” ἐπίστευσιν is usually followed by ὑποῖον.]

7. ἐκεῖνος = φοβήθητε] It is remarkable that Σ instead of this literal rendering gives ἐκεῖνος ἐπαγγελία; rather = λατρεύσατε (as mostly in Psh. and nearly always in Hkl.). The use of ἐκεῖνος = λατρεύω is implied in the rendering (S and Σ) of εἰς ἐπάλληλον (xxi. 8); but where the verb occurs (vii. 15, where see note; xxii. 3) both render it by ἐπιστέω.

8. The two points (...) placed at end of this verse seem to be a note of admiration (!). So again xv. 4, after ἐπιστέω. Cp. Σ p, xix. 10, xxii. 9.

10. ἔγραψα = ἐκεῖνος] Σ transliterates, ἔγραψα (not so Hxp.; cp. pl., Ps. lxiv [lxv], 8). The verb ἔγραψα is not found in S: but once in Σ, xv. 2 (see note on viii. 7). In Hkl. ἔγραψα = μίγμα, Joh. xix. 39: it does not occur in Psh. N.T.; but in O.T., Levit. xix. 19.

11. ἀνομία] Perhaps to be read as fut.; so Σ, ἀνομία [ὁ λείπει; but I writes ἀνομία, and Σ is unpunctuated]. See Thes. S., s.v.

[Ἄνώτά] See note on iv. 8: the word occurs in Psh. N.T. only Phil. ii. 28 as if = ἄνωτα: in Hxp. = ἄνωτας.

13. μακάριοι = μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ] So always in S.
16. ϒορωμα] See note on Greek text. Probably we ought to correct
ςορωμα, as xix. 18. See also note on vi. 15, and compare Σ here.
never occurs; in N.T., else only Act. xvii. 29; but neither there nor
elsewhere is ςορωμα used in Psh. N.T. or Hkl.; nor (apparently) in
Psh. O.T. or Hxp.

17. ενη \των σερην] Note that S omits to render δυνητασ, so that
these two futures must be taken to represent δυρασαι and πωλησαι
read not as infinitives but as optatives. Σ supplies the missing verb
(ςορωμα), and retains these futures; but (contrary to its usage elsewhere)
neglects to prefix to them ι, thereby making its translation almost un-
grammatical, and (as it seems) betraying its dependence on S.
ςορωμα = ρωμα] Here ρωμα replaces the usual
ςορωμα. This form of the idiom recurs in S, xiv. 1, 17, xv. 1, 2, 6, xvii. 1,
xx. 1, xxi. 9, 15; and seems to be used where ρωμα means gero,—"to hold"
or (as here) "to wear". See note on xiv. 6; and cp. Mt. xxvi. 7 (Psh.).
Elsewhere, ρωμα = "officium alicujus est" (Thes. S., s.v. ρωμα).

18. \ινε \ινειν] Another variation of idiom; ινε for ινι.
ινειν = ινειν] So again xvii. 9 (the only other instance of ν. in
Apoc.), and so Σ in both places. So in Hkl. and Hxp. also: but in Psh.
N.T. the word is not thus used; it occurs only Mk. iii. 21, where no
Greek noun corresponds.

ινε] For ινε; so xxi. 20. See also p. 31 supr., end of line 12.

XIV. 3. \ινε \ινειν = ουδειας] Note that the latter word is set on
marg,—apparently by an afterthought, but prima manu. Cp. xix. 12,
where ινε without ουδειας stands for ουδειας.

ινειν] For ινειν, as if S read και for ει μη. The meaning
being lost in consequence of this error, an attempt has been made to
restore sense by inserting a full stop before ινειν, and placing a lesser
stop after (instead of before) ινειν (beginning of next verse); the
result being,—"No man could learn the song. And these are the four
and twenty thousand redeemed from the earth, they who have not been
defiled, &c." Possibly the Greek original of S may have exhibited the
passage thus. See note on Greek text.

ινειν] So Σ. The coincidence of the two versions
in this abnormal construction (stat. constr. with ινε following; cp. xvii. 8,
here is better than that of Σ, as reproducing the paronomasia, σκηνήν . . . σκηνοῦται (= τειχῶ),—and similarly in xxi. 3. For τειχῶ = σκηνῶ, see note on vii. 15. In Psh. and Hkl., though not thus used, it is sometimes found = καταλύω (as Lk. ix. 12) or the like.

8. ʿażib] See Nöldeke, Kurzg. Gramm., § 236. Possibly ʿażib has dropped out after this word.

10. ʾaḥʿāqīm = ʾaḥʿāqāmīn] So Σ; and so Psh. and Hxπ. in the pl., Jer. xv. 2. But Psh. and Hkl. both render ʾaḥʿāqām by ʾaḥʿāqām, Eph. iv. 8 (the only other instance of it in N.T.). So too Psh. and Hxπ., Ps. lxviii. 18 [lxvii. 19], and Judges v. 12 (Hxπ.,—cp. also Psh.); = Hebr. בֵּית.

ʾaḥʿāqām = ʿalāʿyēk] So Σ, which has ʾaḥʿāqām also = ʿalāʿyēk in the two places where that verb occurs (xvii. 3, xxi. 10).—S only in the latter (ʿalāʿyēk does not occur else in Apoc.). Both Psh. and Hkl. use it as = each of these verbs, e.g., Mk. xv. 1, 16.

ʾālām ʾām] Correct ʾām ʾālām. The words have been accidentally misplaced in the printing.

11. ʾālām ʾām] Possibly we ought to correct ʾālām ʾām, as Σ. See note on Greek text here; also on next verse.

12. ʾalām] Correct ʾalām. The word as written would relate to ʾaḥʿāqām instead of to ʾaḥʿāqīm.

ʾalām ʾām] Omit the prefixed ʾ, and for ʾ substitute ʾ. The twofold error here arose probably from a marginal ʾ in the exemplar of our Ms., intended as a correction for ʾ, but mistaken by the scribe and inserted by him as a prefix. See note on Greek text.

ʾāḥʿāqām = ʾaḥʿāqām ʾābōw] We should here expect ʾāḥʿāqām, after ʾaḥʿāqām. The masc. suffix relates to the person symbolized as θεριόν.

ʾāḥʿāqām ʾām] Cp. verse 14; and see note on iii. 10.

ʾāḥʿāqīm ʾām] Probably the prefix ought to be ʾ.

ʾāḥʿāqām ʾām] So Σ; but in verse 3 (the only other instance of θεραπεύω in Apoc.) both have ʾāḥʿāqām, a notable coincidence in a purely arbitrary variation of rendering. In Psh. ʾāḥʿāq always renders θεραπεύω, and ʾaḥʿāqīm ʿalāʾyēk ʾaḥʿāqām ʾām. Hkl. once (Joh. v. 10) uses the latter for θεραπεύω, which it usually renders as Psh. Act. v. 16 (Psh. and Hkl.) seems an exception; but Cod. D there reads ʾaḥʿāq, for θεραπεύωντο.

13. ʾalām ʾām] So again, verses 15, 16; but in the after part of this verse, and in verse 12 (biʾa), ʾalām ʾām.

14. ʾalām ʾām] Correct ʾalām ʾām, as Σ. See note on Greek text.
NOTES.

XIII. 1. \[\text{μάτης}\] So (with cardinal number preceding, as here) verse 11, xvii. 7, 12; elsewhere \[\text{μετέρος}\]. This absol. form is rare, but is found Act. x. 11 (Ps.) = \[\text{δραχαί}\]. \[\Sigma n\] here has \[\text{μετέρος}\], \[\Sigma d\] the more usual \[\text{μετέρος}\]; and elsewhere the copies of \[\Sigma\] vary between these two forms. See Thes. S., s.v. The rules of grammarians there cited do not agree, as regards these plurals, with the usage of \[\Sigma\] or of \[\Sigma\].

\[\text{σημεῖον....στήνος}\] (i) This absol. form of pl. is not found in Ps. nor recorded in Thes. S. (ii) The latter word is perhaps to be corrected by writing \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] for \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\].

2. \[\text{δραχαί} = \text{δροκον}\] So \[\Sigma\] [De Dieu by a wrong pointing, \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], makes \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] appear to have read \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]] So also Ps. and Hxsp.

\[\text{λεωντών} = \text{λεωνής}\] Correct \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] for \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], so as to represent \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. See notes on Greek text here and verses 3, 4.

3. \[\text{συρμένω} = \text{συρμαμένης}\] \[\Sigma\] (see note on v. 6) elsewhere renders \[\text{συρμένω} by \overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (as \[\Sigma\] here and always), or \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], but here changes to a rendering proper to its unusual application (so A.V., “wounded”; R.V., “smitten”). In Ps. N.T. (not Hkl.), \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] occurs only Act. xix. 16, = \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. For Ps. O.T. and Hxsp., see Thes. S., s.v.

\[\text{συρμένος} = \text{συρμάθης}\] Correct \[\overset{i}{\text{θο}}\], as \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. The reading of \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (cp. Ps., Mt. iv. 1) yields good sense, and is more natural than the other; but has no support.

\[\text{συρμένη} = \text{συρμήλα}\] \[\Sigma\] has \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] for these words, as if having read \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] for \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] [\[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]; but \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], perhaps conjecturally, reads as \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\].

4. \[\text{συρμένος}\] Correct \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. \[\Sigma d\] makes the same blunder here.

6. \[\text{συρμένος} = \text{συρμένος}\] This verb in the remaining places where it occurs in Apoc. (xvi. 9, 11, 21) is followed by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] in both versions (as here in \[\Sigma\]): in Ps. usually by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], once by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (as here in \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]), Act. xxvi. 11,—never by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. But in Ps. it is followed by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] twice, 2 Pet. ii. 12, Jud. 10, (and so in Hkl.); and by \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] once, Jud. 8, where Hkl. uses \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. Elsewhere, Hkl. varies as to prep. used.

\[\text{συρμένος = ῥήν σκυρνήν}\] So xxi. 3; but xv. 5 \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (for the Tabernacle). In all three places (\[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]. does not else occur in Apoc.) \[\Sigma\] uses the latter rendering, without discriminating; as does Hkl. everywhere. So likewise Ps., in Act. and Hebr.; but in Gospels (Ps. and Hkl.) \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] = \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\], Both Ps. and Hkl. use \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] = \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (Mk. xiv. 14, Lk. xxii. 11), = \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\] (Philem. 22); but not otherwise. So too Ps. and Hxsp., Ezek. xxxvii. 27 (= xxi. 3 in fr.). The rendering of \[\overset{i}{\text{ο}}\]
A scribe's error, followed by an attempt to restore sense. Either the wrong pointing of the second ἄπατος has led him to omit the α, or vice versa.


9. ἄποτος = ὁ ἀρχαῖος[Properly = ἡ ἀρχή, which Ἀ (not Ἄ) thus renders, iii. 14, xxiii. 6, xxvi. 13. The adjective thus mistranslated here occurs in Apoc. else only xx. 2, where both correctly render by ἄπατος, as usually Psh. and Hkl. Here, Ἀ has ἄπατος (as Psh., 2 Cor. v. 17 only), which in Psh. elsewhere, and in Hkl., = παλαιός.

ἀπάτη = τὴν ἀπείρουσίαν[See note on iii. 10.

10. ἄπτος] Read ἄπτω: so Ἀ. See note on Greek text.

11. ἄπατος ἄπατος[This word is unknown to Psh. N.T., but in O.T. it occurs, as Josh. xx. 9. For ἄποτος see (Psh.) 2 Thess. iii. 3; also (Psh. and Hkl.) Act. xxvii. 44, xxviii. 4, and 1 Cor. iii. 15. Elsewhere (vii. 10, xix. 1) in Ἀ, σωφρία = ἀπάτη, as in Ἀ, Psh. N.T., and Hkl., always.

ἀπάτη ἄπατος ἄπατος = ὁ κατηγορος ὁ κατηγορῶν[The Syr. verb never occurs in this sense in Psh. (once, in ἀπετυχώ, Hebr. xii. 2; in ἐθέτε, similarly, 2 Sam. xxiv. 13); but some authors use it = διαβάλλω, &c. (see Thes. S.). The noun has a like meaning, but is not found in Psh. Ἀ gives ἄπατος and ἄπατος, as Hkl. always; Psh. sometimes uses this verb (ἀπετυχώ) and a cognate noun; sometimes ἄπατος (verb and noun).

11. ἄπατος ἀπετυχώ .... ἄποτος[Probably for the former word we ought to read ἄποτος. See note on iv. 11; also note on Greek text here.


13. ἄποτος ἄποτος ἄποτος[Verbatim from Psh., Dan. vii. 25. Ἀ agrees closely with Hxp. of same, using emphat. for absol. forms of Psh.; while retaining the constr. ἀπετυχώ, but not ἄποτος. See vi. 11 supr.

15. ἄποτος = ὁ ἅπατος[So xiii. 3; but ἄποτος, i. 10 (the only other instance of ὁ ἅπατος in Apoc.), as Psh. and Hkl.; and so Ἀ in all three places.

ἐμφατικά ἄπατος = ἐπιμεθεμοφόρητον[Ἀ, ἀπετυχώ ἀπετυχώ, where the inserted ἀπετυχώ is redundant after the constr. ptcp. This looks as if the unusual ἐμφατικά had been borrowed by Ἀ from Ἀ.
NOTES.

18. [אָשְׁבַתָּה] Observe _stat. constr._ here and xix. 5 as Ps. lxi. 5
[lx. 6] (Ps. and Hx.) Mal. iv. 2 (Ps. not Hx.): not so Σ. _Dele_ the
point under אָשְׁבַתָּה.

19. (as in Σ and all else) is to be supplied, to account for אָשְׁבַתָּה
(= _aantroû_) following. But the omission may have been in the Greek.

Σ writes אָשְׁבַתָּה; so Ps. O.T., or אָשְׁבַתָּה. N.T. the latter, but 1 Pet. iii. 20, אָשְׁבַתָּה. Hkl. the last, or as Σ.

Rather as Hkl. writes, and Ps. O.T. sometimes. Σ is doubtful; n writing אָשְׁבַתָּה; d, אָשְׁבַתָּה; l, אָשְׁבַתָּה.
Psh. and Hx. vary; chiefly between the two last. See p. 31 _supr._ line 1,
where our scribe writes אָשְׁבַתָּה.

[XII. 1. אָשְׁבַתָּה = דַּקְנָבָה] Correct אָשְׁבַתָּה. Note that Σ n, by like
error, writes אָשְׁבַתָּה, with יֵשׁ interlined above and below the third letter.

2. אָשְׁבַתָּה = וְיָנַשְׁגֶּרֶתֶר דַּקְנָבָה] Similarly Psh. (O. and N.T.)
throughout: Σ renders literally, as Hkl. always; also Hx. See e.g.
Mt. i. 18; Gen. xvi. 4.

אָשְׁבַתָּה = דַּקְנָבָה. Σ, אָשְׁבַתָּה [d; n is unpointed; l, אָשְׁבַתָּה wrongly]. 'Ωδωνοκ recurs in N.T. only Gal. iv. 19, 27, (Ps. as S, pa.: Hkl. as Σ, _pe._). In O.T., Psh. and Phx. use _pa._ in this sense; Hx. varies.
See Isai. xxiii. 4, xlv. 10, liv. 1 (= Gal. iv. 27).

3. [אָשְׁבַתָּה] _Dele_ point under this word,—a typographical error.

אָשְׁבַתָּה = πύρος] Cp. ix. 17, where this is the rendering of πύρος
(see note there, and note on Greek text here). There, Σ uses an adjective,
but here agrees with S. For πύρος (= אָשְׁבַתָּה in both), see vi. 4.

אָשְׁבַתָּה] So again xiii. 1; but xix. 12 (without numeral), אָשְׁבַתָּה,
which latter Σ uses in all these places [l (and Barsal.) without יֵשׁ]. The
word occurs Isai. lxii. 3 (Psh. and Hx.), διάδημα (LXX), as here; but
neither the Syriac nor the Greek word is found in N.T. except as above.

4. אָשְׁבַתָּה = σύρει] Σ, אָשְׁבַתָּה [d; n p; but l wrongly אָשְׁבַתָּה = καֵלְיָרֶע].
The Greek verb is not else in Apoc.: in Psh. and Hkl. it = אָשְׁבַתָּה. For
אָשְׁבַתָּה in this sense (nowhere in Psh.), see _Thes. S., s.v._

5. אָשְׁבַתָּה = πύρος] So S in the other two places (xii. 14,
xvii. 3) where πύρος occurs: Σ, אָשְׁבַתָּה; and so Hkl.; also Phx.: Psh.
and Hx. use both renderings; but the latter preferably.

7. אָשְׁבַתָּה אָשְׁבַתָּה] Correct, אָשְׁבַתָּה אָשְׁבַתָּה אָשְׁבַתָּה.
Note the pl. absol.; not found in Psh. N.T., and rarely in O.T.

11. ....... χρῆσται] This insertion is practically a repetition of the sentence next but one preceding, an instance of double rendering or interpolation rather than of conflate text. Probably χρῆσται was at first inserted as a marginal variant for ψάχνει (supr. as Σ), and for ἐκλέγει for ἱσχύσῃ in next sentence; and out of these materials the intruded sentence has been constructed by a subsequent scribe or editor. For ψάχνει in S where Σ has χρῆσται, cp. the similar case, xvi. 3. See note on Greek text.

12. ἁγγίζω = ἔδειξε] In the sense of "hither," ἔδειξε occurs in Apoc. else only iv. 1, where both versions have ἠγγίζω, as Σ here. The latter is always used in Hkl.; the former is preferred in Psh.

φθάσων = ἔθεσέρουν] Σ, διπ. The Greek verb occurs in Apoc. only in this verse and the previous one (in which S and Σ alike render by φθάσων). The verb φθάσω is not found else in S, nor in Psh. N.T.; but in O.T., in the same sense as here, Prov. ix. 18, &c.; and so Hxp. In Hxp. it is also found = ἔγραψα, 1 [3] Esdr. vi. 27; and so in Hkl., Lk. xxii. 56, Act. i. 11, where Psh. has ἡμετέρῳ. This suggests that for φθάσω in verse 11 supr., we should read στάτα (so Psh., Mk. xii. 41, where ἐστάτα = θεοῦ), and perhaps ἠγάπησα for ἠγάπησέ, άμα being usual after ἠγάπησέ.

13. ὅμα τὰ μετὰ τέλη] So Σ; a noteworthy coincidence, inasmuch as in neither version does this method of expressing a fractional part recur. In both versions, ἡμετέροι = τὸ τέταρτον, vi. 8, ἡμετέροι = τὸ τρίτον, viii. 7 et passim, thus warranting us in expecting ἡμετέροι here (as Exod. xxxix. 40, &c., Psh. and Hxp.). But Barsal., on viii. 7, reads ἡμετέρῳ τὸ μέρος. Like forms occur in Psh. and Hxp., as Ezek. v. 2.

μαθήτης] Probably ἡμετέροι is to be prefixed to the latter word, and ἡ removed from before the former. See note on Greek text.

14. τὸ ταύτης ἡμετέροι] Rather ἡμετέροι τὰ ταύτης, as ἡμετέροι. Correct ἡμετέροι, with Σ.

15. μάθητης] The former prefix is probably a scribe's error.

16. Read μάθητης, and ἠγάπησα; the points being inaccurately printed.

17. Λήψθαι σε σιν] The τὰ here seems superfluous, and can hardly be supposed to represent a prep. in the Greek, of which there is no evidence. Possibly its use is idiomatic, as ἐκαθησάμην τὸ προσηγορεῖτο. Σ has ὁ for τὰ.
exception) in S, and rarely (never as = δικαίος) in Psh. N.T.; but sometimes in Psh. O.T. and in Hxp. For ἴων = δικαίος, ep. ii. 11 and note there.


[Note: Correct, ἴων (= παράξει). So Σ, ἴων.

The reading of text = ταπεινώσαι (as Phil. ii. 8, Psh. and Hkl.), which would be unmeaning and is unsupported.

[Note: This is the Psh. and Hkl. rendering of ἐφ' ὀσον, Mt. ix. 15, &c.; also Poc. and Hkl., 2 Pet. i. 13: but all authorities read here ὀσάκις ἐάν, which Σ renders exactly, ἴων. Else, ὀσάκις ἐάν occurs in N.T. only 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26, where Psh. and Hkl. render ἵων.

7. τελεσθή = τελέσωσιν] Σ, τελεσθή. S usually renders τελέω thus (= to fulfill); but by ἐπέλα, x. 7, xx. 7, (to complete): Σ (inconsistently), by ἐπέλα, xv. 8, xvii. 17, xx. 7; elsewhere by ἐπέλα. Psh. mostly has ἐπέλα = τελέω: but once (Lk. xii. 50) ἐπέλα (with the meaning of to fulfill): and so Hkl. more frequently.

[Note: The Greek has τῆς δικαίου. Elsewhere S uses κακοὶ (as Σ always); except xvii. 8, where, as here, the ascent of “the beast” (ep. xiii. 1; also Dan. vii. 3) is spoken of.

8. θαύμα = τῶν πλατείων] So S where πλ. recurs (xxi. 21, xxii. 2); as also Psh.: Σ uniformly θαύμα θαύμα; which is also found in Hkl., Act. v. 15; again in margin of same, Lk. x. 10, as explanatory of τοῦλος, the Hkl. rendering there and elsewhere of πλατεία. In Psh., θαύμα also = βύθος, Mt. vi. 2, to which meaning Hkl. restricts it. This accounts for the addition of θαύμα (= “broad”), to distinguish πλατεία.

[Note: The point under this word is not quite accurately placed in the printed text: correct ἐπέλα.

9. The marks (·) under two words in this verse are placed by the scribe to indicate that they are to be transposed.

10. εὐφράνθησονται = εὐφράνθησονται] So again, where εὐφράνθωμαι recurs, xii. 12, xviii. 20. Σ gives εὐφράνθησον here; and in the other two places, ethpe, (or ethpa.) of the same verb. Psh. renders this verb as Σ does (pa. only Lk. xv. 32); Hkl. likewise always, and so Phx. and Hxp., Esai. xlv. 8, xlxi. 13. In Psh. O.T., εὐφράστησεν occurs sometimes, used as here; in Psh. N.T. (not Hkl.), only (= ὡς) Gal. iv. 27 (= Isai. liv. 1, Psh.; not Hxp.); also Phx. (as well as Psh.; not Hxp.), Esai. xlvi. 13 (= ὡς). See infr., xix. 7, where S (not Σ) makes it = ἄγαλλιώ.
to be connected with \(\text{γράμ} \) (above), and if so is \(\text{τὰ ἔδειξα}\). But a "seventh voice," after "the seven thunders uttered their voices," is unmeaning. As the Syr. stands, we must rather understand "from the seventh heaven." See note on Greek text.

5. \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησεν} \) I supply the point, the word being partly effaced in Ms.

\(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησεν} = \text{τὰ ἔδειξα}\) So Psh., Lk. v. 3; where Hkl. has the usual \(\text{προφήτων}\), as \(\Sigma\) here. But \(\text{προφήτων = ἐρώτησε}, \text{Mt. xxiii. 15 (Psh. and Hkl.)}\).

6. \(\text{προφήτων}\) Note that this word is here fem., which is exceptional; so again xxii. 1 (bis), though not else in \(\Sigma\). In these three places, the material heavens are denoted. The usage of Psh. (not of Hkl.) is the same; see (e.g.) Mt. xvi. 2. In \(\Sigma\) (see De Dieu in loc.), it is fem. here only \([n\ as\ as\ as\ as\ l;\ not\ d\ p\],\ not\ xxii. 1 \([n\ there\ defici]\).

7. \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησεν}\) Correct \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\).

11. \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} = \text{δεί κείμαι}\) See note on iv. 1.

XI. 1. \(\text{δεί κείμαι} = \text{μετρητοσον}\) So \(\text{S}\) uniformly, as also \(\Sigma\). Psh. in N.T. uses the \(\text{aph.}\) and \(\text{ethp.}\) of \(\text{δείυς}\) for \(\text{μετρωσ OD}\), and makes \(\text{μετρωσ OD} = \text{χρωσ OD}\) or \(\text{άλειφω}\): but in O.T. sometimes as here; e.g., the plll., Ezek. xl. 5 (also Hxp.). Hkl. mostly as Psh. N.T.: but renders \(\text{μετρωσ OD}\) by \(\text{πα.}\) of verb here used, 2 Cor. x. 12, where Psh. om. But both Psh. and Hkl. have \(\text{δεί κείμαι} = \text{μετροσ OD},\) Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 13, and elsewhere (as \(\text{S}\) and \(\Sigma\), xxii. 15, 17); but sometimes also \(\text{περίκειμαι}, \text{περίκειται}\).

4. \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησεν} \ldots \text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) The use of \(\text{stat. absol.}\) here, where \(\Sigma\) uses \(\text{emph.}\), seems to indicate that \(\text{S}\) read \(\text{δείκνυαι}, \text{λυθρίαι},\) without art. See note on Greek text, and cp. i. 12 and note on \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) there; for \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} \) (in Psh. N.T. always \(\text{emphat.}\)), cp. the plll., Zech. iv. 3, 11, (Psh.).

5. \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} \ldots \text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) Note these two varied renderings of \(\text{ἐπὶ τοὺς}\) in two consecutive sentences. But probably the latter represents \(\text{ὁστιν},\) — see note on iii. 20,—also note on Greek text here; and cp. xiii. 10.

\(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} \ldots \text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) Note also these varied renderings for \(\text{θλω}\). \(\Sigma\) has \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) in both places, and throughout: \(\text{S}\) everywhere except this one place. In Psh., \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\) is usual, especially in this phrase \(\text{πρότερον}\); and \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} = \text{θλω}\) is rare, but occurs Act. xxiv. 6, 1 Tim. v. 11 (in which places Hkl. has \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\)). So too, \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} = \text{θλω}\) (but Cod. A reads here \(\text{ηβουλήθηση}\)), 3 Joh. 13 (Poc., where Hkl. has \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε}\)). But 2 Joh. 12, \(\text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} = \text{βουλομαι}\) (Poc. and Hkl.).

\(\text{πρότερον = ἀδικήσατι (bis)}\) \(\Sigma, \text{καὶ ἐρώτησε} \) (bis; also ix. 19, where \(\text{S}\) om.) from a verb which is not found (see note on xvii. 14 ἀναπόθεμεν for a seeming
NOTES.

See notes, here and xxi. 19, on Greek text. In Psh. (not Hxp.) we find ἰωάννης, Exod. xliii. 19, Ezek. xxviii. 13; but in neither case can it be satisfactorily identified with its Greek equivalent in LXX, the order of the stones named being different in LXX and Hebrew.

18. ἱστορία] Stat. absolv.; so xi. 6, xv. 6, 8,—the pl. noun in these places following a cardinal number; and so Jer. xv. 3 (Psh.). In other cases S uses emph., as Σ always; and likewise Psh. N.T. and Hkl.

20. ἵσσος] Σ uses here stat. emph. followed by σ. Psh. N.T., where the expression recurs, renders as Σ, Hebr. ii. 7 (=Ps. vii. 6 [7]); as S, Hebr. i. 10 (=Ps. cii. 25, [ci. 26]); and Act. viii. 41 (=Jer. i. 16): but Psh. O.T. as S in the plls. [in Ps. viii., editions vary]; Hkl. and Hxp. as Σ. Cp. Act. xvii. 24 (Psh., not Hxp.).

αιτοί = τὰ δαμόνων] S renders by ἐπιτελεῖς, xvi. 14, xvii. 2; but may perhaps in these places have read δαμόνων for—ὄνωιν. Neither word occurs else in Apoc. Σ always has ἵσσος; as also Hkl. Psh. uses both words indiscriminately, but prefers σ.

21. ἵσσος = τῶν φαρμακεύων αὐτῶν] Supply ἵσσας, as in Σ.

23. ἵσσος = τὸν φαρμακεύων αὐτῶν] So Σ here; and so S in the other instance of the Greek word in Apoc. xviii. 23. There, Σ uses ἵσσον,—as do Psh. and Hkl., Gal. v. 20 (the only other place where φαρμακεύω occurs in N.T.); and so Phx. and Hxp., Esa. xliv. 19; but Psh. ἵσσος. Again, Psh. (not Hkl.) has ἵσσος = μαγεία, Act. viii. 11, and ἵσσος = μάγος, xiii. 6, 8. Note that for φαρμακοί (xxi. 8, xxii. 15) both S and Σ have ἵσσος (so pointed in S)—i.e. ἵσσος, distinguished from ἵσσον or ἵσσες, the word here used. For the latter, cp. 2 [4] Kin. ix. 22 (Psh., and Hxp. = φάρμακα, LXX).

X. 1. ἵσσος] Σ, ἰωάννης.

 matière = τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ] See notes on iv. 3 and 7. In Psh. and Hkl., matière never = πρόσωπον: once (Lk. ix. 29) = εἴδος in both.

ἱστορία = ἀνθρακῶν] Correct ἰστορία (so Σ), = στήλαι which is the unquestioned reading of the Greek.

3. ἰωάννης = μυκταί] So Σ. Not in Psh. or Hkl.; but in Hxp.

4. ἰωάννης = ἐκεῖ] Lit., ἵσσος, ἵσσος, ἱστορία, ἵσσος, ἵσσος, ἵσσος, as viii. 6, ix. 7, &c.; also Mt. iii. 3, &c., (Psh. and Hkl.). Elsewhere in S μελῶ = ἰστορία: in Σ and in Hkl. always; in Psh. usually.

ἰστορία = ἔκ τοῦ ὑπομονοῦ τοῦ ἐθνοῦς] No other authority supports S in inserting ἰστορία here. Possibly it is meant
NOTES.

ix. 11—17.

[Correct τάσ.] So Σ; i.e., "Bondage"; in Psh., only τάσαλων (emphat.) is used. The translator has mistaken the root ταλ for τάρ; see τάραλο, xvii. 8 (S and Σ).

[Instead of translating the words ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ . . . Ἀπολάον (note the reading), S substitutes "in the Syriac, Looser." So lat. vg. adds, "et latine habet nomen Exterminans." For ταλ, cp. ταλ = λύσον, verse 14; in Psh. and Hkl. it commonly = λύς, ἀπολός (e.g. Mt. 1.19, ν.19). Σ (like A.V.) transliterates, ἀπολάον [π], ἀπολάει [διπ]. Barsal., in loc., attaches to this word the marginal note ταλ ἢ ταλον ὥστε καὶ ἀπολαεῖ, ἀπολασεῖ; = "Sender-forth, or Destroyer, or Looser,—the first and third relating to Ἀπολάον, the second to Ἀπολάων.

12. Note that S divides by σ after τάρταλο, so as to make a new paragraph begin with τάρταλο ὅταν, omitting the σ before τάρταλο. This is probably a scribe's error; for our translator's usage is to write ὅταν τάρταλο at the beginning of a sentence; see note on iv. 1.

14. [In verse before, τάρταλα, which is the usual mode in S of expressing the ordinal; see note on ii. 11.

16. τάσαλων = στρατευμάτων] So xix. 14; but xix. 19 (βίο, τάσαλα (also interpolating τασάλα, see note in loc.). Σ gives τάσαλο here, and τασάλα in the other places.

τασάλον = τῶν ἵππων] Lit., τῶν ἵππων, as Act. xxiii. 23, 32, (Psh. and Hkl.). Σ, more exactly, τασάλει; as Hxp., Hab. iii. 8[8], = ἅπασισία.

17. ἄρτοι . . . ἐξοντας = καὶ τῶν καθημένων . . . ἐξοντας] S om. the opening words of the verse, καὶ οὖν εἰδόν τῶν ἱππῶν ἐν τῇ ὑπόσει (which would be τασάλει τῶν ἵππων ἐξοντας, and thus ἐξοντας (the transitive verb of which it is the object having disappeared) is left to depend on ἄρτοι, and the Syr. literally represents καὶ οἱ καθημένοι . . . ἐξοντας or ἐξοντας. See note on Greek text.

τασάλος = πυρίνος] So Psh., Ezek. xxviii. 14, where LXX has πυρίνος, and Hxp. renders by τασάλος (adjective), as Σ here. Cp. xii. 3.

τασάλος] Lit., καὶ καρχιθδοςα. The word recurs xxi. 19 = χαλκηδων (or καρχιθδον); but here is presumably = ύακινθος, though that word is represented, xxi. 20, by the transliteration σωμαθαι (similarly Σ in both places). S as it stands represents an unsupported reading καὶ ύακινθον θειωδη (for καὶ ύακινθον καὶ θειώδη); but is probably to be amended into conformity with the Greek by writing α for ε before τασάλος.
that "a more ancient translation existed" from which Σ "was interpolated," and that the right rendering in xix. "may be referred to the more ancient version." This acute conjecture is now verified by the discovery of S, and the facts as stated above confirm the opinion that it is prior to Σ. It would of course be more accurate to say that Σ is based on S, rather than "interpolated from" it.

IX. 2. ιεράσανθος = καινομένης] So Σ: but elsewhere both versions make ιεράσανθος = καινομένης, as Psh. N.T. and Hkl. usually; and ιεράσανθος occurs nowhere else in S or Σ, or in Psh. N.T., or (at least as = καινομένης) in Hkl. In O.T. (Psh. and Hxp.) it is found, though not often; e.g., Ezek. xxiv. 5, Dan. iii. 19. The coincidence here between S and Σ is specially notable in a word so little used.

5. βασανοσμός (bis)] In all the six places where β. (not else in N.T.) occurs in Apoc., S renders thus, or (xviii. 7, 15) by the cognate ιεράσανθος. Σ mostly agrees, except xviii. 7, where it has ιεράσανθος. In Psh. and Hkl., ιεράσανθος = βασανοσμός, also = κόλασις (Mt. xxv. 46). But ιεράσανθος is not found in Psh.: in 2 Pet. ii. 4, however [Poc., and Hkl., with ιεράσανθος], it seems intended as = κόλασις. The verb βασανοσμός uniformly renders βασανοσμός in S and Σ, as in this verse; and so in Poc. and Hkl., and (with one exception) in Psh. N.T.

7. ἕρεμος . . . . ἕρεμος = τὸ ὄμιλομα . . . . ὄμιλον (or ὄμιλον, or ὄμιλον)] See note on Greek text. Σ ins. ἕρεμον before the last two words, thus rendering the last word twice over,—first in its own usual manner, then in that of S (see note on i. 13). This is a clear case of conflation, and evidently in the Syriac, not in the Greek original; the latter member of the conflate text being derived from S. Hence again we infer that Σ is dependent on S.

Σε διαίρεσιν τὸν ἑτερόκλιτον] In S and Σ always = ἑτερόκλιτον: but ιεράσανθος = ἑτερόκλιτον. ἑτερόκλιτον . . . . ἑτερόκλιτον] Rather perhaps, ἑτερόκλιτον . . . . ἑτερόκλιτον. Ω. viii. 9, and see the like instances in verses 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, infra.

10. ἐπιτομή An obelus is set before this word, as iv. 4. See note on ii. 5. ἐπιτομή (bis)] For the regular ἐπιτομή, and so verse 19: so Σ, in both verses. The agreement in this anomalous and rare form, recorded else only in Psh. (not Hxp.), Judg. xv. 4, cannot be casual.

11. ἐξομολογηθεῖσα = ἐξομολογηθεῖσα ἐν αὐτῶν] Σ, more accurately ins. Σε διαίρεσιν between these words. The use of ἐπιτομή after ἐπιτομή here is different from that noted on xiii. 17.
NOTES.

in Apoc. (x. 10), S uses the *pe* (instead of *ethpalp.*) of the same verb; as does Σ in both places. In the only other instance of it in N.T., Col. iii. 19, Ἡκλ. (not Psh.) renders as S here; and both Psh. and Ἡκλ. use the same form = παροξυνόμοι, Act. xvi. 16. Its *aph* = πικραίνω, x. 9 (S and Σ).

12. ἡμέρα = ἐπιλήγη] So Σ, but in neither does ἡμέρα recur but once, xii. 16, = καταπίνω, of which it is the invariable equivalent in Psh. N.T. and Ἡκλ., and similarly in Psh. O.T. and Ἡπρ. It = δέρομαι, Lk. xii. 47, 48 (Psh. and Ἡκλ.); also Mk. xiii. 9 (Ἡκλ. only); and in Psh. (not Ἡκλ.) is used in like sense, 2 Cor. xi. 24. See also Lk. xxii. 51, where Psh. has ἡμέρα εἴλα, = τοῦ πληγέντος, with one Greek ms. Barsal. writes *etph.* here.

The reading here followed by S is practically identical with one which has some small Greek support (see note on Greek text), and is consistent. Σ reads ὁ ἡμέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ὡς ἐφαύλω] The reading here followed by S is practically identical with one which has some small Greek support (see note on Greek text), and is consistent. Σ reads ὁ ἡμέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ὡς ἐφαύλω] This is an evident conflation: in its crude form in Ἡκλ.; adjusted into meaning in the later texts, Ἡκλ.; therefore most probably pertaining to the Syriac of Σ, not to its Greek original. If so, it is evidence of the posteriority of Σ to Ἡκλ., whence the second member of the conflation appears to be borrowed, for ἡμέρα (pl.) has no other authority.

13. ἐν μεσοπροσώπῳ, which S renders exactly by ἐν μεσοπροσώπῳ (without prefix) in the other two places where it occurs (xiv. 6, xix. 17). So Σ (but with prefix) in the third only of these places. Its monstrous misrendering in the first and second is well known; and ἐν μεσοπροσώπῳ is purely an abbreviation here (= ἐν μέσῳ ὑπάρχειν αἵματα ἔχονται), in xiv. 6 (where ἔχονται follows) εἰς ὑπάρχειν αἵματα ἔχονται (= ἐν ὑπάρχειν, αἵματα ἔχοντα). Perhaps the translator of Σ had before him a Greek copy reading here (as Σ reads, xiv. 6), εἰς ὑπάρχειν αἵματα.

Above, Part I, Dissertation, p.lxxxii, I have mentioned the remarkable forecast of J. D. Michaelis (Intro. to N.T., ii, pt. i, ch. vii, s. 10 [Marsh]), who, noticing the fact that the wrong rendering of Σ in this verse is not repeated in ch. xix [he erroneously says xiv], accounts for it by supposing
renders σαλπίζω by ἁρπάζω (aph., here and verses 7, 13 only; pe., verse 8 and the rest) throughout: Σ by ἁρπαζω, with Hxp., Num. x. 6 (so Psh. there), and also Hkl. in the two places where σ. occurs in N.T. outside Apoc. (Mt. vi. 2, 1 Cor. xvi. 52). Psh. (N.T.) uses neither verb as = σαλπίζω, but has ἁρπάζω = ἀνακράζω (Lk. iv. 33, pe.), = κράζω (ib. 41, aph.). Hkl. makes it (aph.) = βηοςω, Gal. iv. 27, = Esa. liv. 1 (where in Hxp. it = βοω [LXX]). It is mostly used of the human voice, but also of the trumpet, Ephr. iii. 209 (Thes. S., s.v.). Cp. ἁρπαζω, xviii. 22, and note there.

7. ἐμμιμοῖον = μεμυγμένον] So xv. 2, the only other instance of μίμημα in Apoc. Σ renders as S here, but ἐμμιμοῖον in the second place, as Psh. and Hkl. where μ. occurs (Mt. xxviiii. 34, Lk. xiii. 1); and so Barsal. cites it here. See for the latter word, note on xiv. 10. In Psh. N.T., ἐμμιμοῖον is not found; in Hkl., only its ptcp. pa. (= ποικιλος). In Psh. O.T. and Hxp., this ptcp. peil is rare (but see Levit. xix. 19, Psh.); and except as above, the verb is not recorded as = to mix.

8. ἐμμιμοῖον = ἐν ἔκκαρτοι] So Σ l n; Σ d, ἐμμιμοῖον; Σ p alone ἐμμιμοῖον, possibly a conjectural correction of the editor's—to suit the Greek αἴματοι, which all other authorities (see note on Greek text) exhibit. However, I find ἐμμιμοῖον also in Barsal., in loc.

Here then is another very notable instance of agreement of S and Σ—this time as to text (not rendering)—against all else.

9. ἐμμιμοῖον = χόρω] So ix. 4 (the only other instance of χόρω in Apoc.), and so Psh. frequently; but = χόρω χωρός, Mk. vi. 39, which perhaps is what S here intends,—else, χωρός is omitted (see note on Greek text). Σ gives ἐμμιμοῖον here and ix. 4, as Hkl. always for χόρω (in the sense of grass). So Hxp., and Psh. now and then.

9. ἐμμιμοῖον] So Σ ins. ἐμμιμοῖον [in l with ♦]: all else give τῶν κινομάτων without πάντων. Here the ♦ can only (as it seems) refer to πάντων, and therefore to S; thus attesting its priority.

10. ἐμμιμοῖον] Note the use of ἐμμιμοῖον for Σ here, and xiii. 18.

11. ἐμμιμοῖον] Rather, ἐμμιμοῖον; see Thes. S., s.v. For the two forms of the word in this verse see notes on Greek text. The Mss. of Σ vary, but all write both forms differently from S; and Barsal. (in loc.) differs from both versions. Neither form occurs in Psh., which renders "wormwood" by ἁρπαζω (Lam. iii. 15, 19—also Hxp.)

ἐμμιμοῖον = ἐπικράνθησαν] Where the passive πικράνωμαι recurs
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NOTES.

(vii. 15—viii. 6.  

\(\text{οἰ} = \sigmaκνηύωσε].\) So Σ [\(\text{βνǐ} \text{without} \text{κ; not} \text{κνί} \text{for} \text{κνί} \text{at} \text{other places where} \sigmaκ\text{κ occurs in} \text{Apoc. (xii. 12, xiii. 6, and xxi. 3) both use} \text{κηιων; a remarkable instance of the connexion between the two versions. The Greek verb is found in N.T. else only Joh. i. 14, where Psh. and Hkl. render as} \text{κ and Σ here.}"

16. \(\text{κηιων} = \kappaα\ukappaαι];\) Σ renders \(\kappaα\ukappaαι [d\pi p; \text{l alone} \kappaα\ukappaαι, wrongly], here and in the other place where \kappaα\ukappaαι occurs (not else in N.T.), xvi. 9; as S also in that place. In Psh. \kappaα\ukappaαι is not found in N.T., but is frequent in O.T.; e.g., Isa. xlix. 10 (here quoted), where LXX has κα\ukappaων (which would be more suitable here), and Phx. and Hxp. as well as Psh. render by \(\text{κα} \text{κα}.\) But \kappaα\ukappaαι is always used in N.T. (Psh. and Hkl.) = κα\ukappaων, Mt. xx. 12, Lk. xii. 55, James i. 11: also in Psh. and Hxp., as Gen. vii. 22, Isa. xviii. 4, = κα\ukappaαι [LXX]."

17. \(\text{ουω} = \delta\epsilon\gamma\gamma\gamma\sigma\varepsilon\iota;\) The Greek verb is not else found in Apoc.: Σ renders it by \(\text{ουωκε},\) as Hkl. and Hxp.: Psh. by \(\text{ουωκε},\) nowhere by either of the former verbs. But we find in both Psh. and Hkl. \(\kappaα\ukappaαι = \pi\tau\rho\iota\beta\sigmaς,\) (e.g., Mt. iii. 3); also in Psh. O.T., Phx., and Hxp. (e.g., Isa. xlix. 11).

\(\text{ουωκε} = \epsilon\pi\tau\iota;) Rather = \(\pi\tau\rho\iota\) (as in Psh.): Σ has \(\delta\kappaα.

\(\text{ουωκε} = \pi\gamma\gamma\sigma\) So S throughout (viii. 10, xiv. 7, xvi. 4; xvi. 6). Σ makes \(\kappaα\ukappaαι = \pi\gamma\gamma\sigma\) everywhere; and so Psh. N.T., and Hkl.; also Poc., 2 Pet. ii. 17. But in Psh. O.T., \(\kappaα\ukappaαι\) also occurs in this sense, 1 Sam. xxix. 1; and \(\kappaα\ukappaαι,\) Gen. xvi. 7 (Hxp. \(\kappaα\ukappaαι\)), &c.; also pl. \(\kappaα\ukappaαι,\) Exod. xv. 27 (Hxp., \(\kappaα\ukappaαι\)), 2 Chr. xxxii. 3, 4. Some writers use also \(\kappaα\ukappaαι.\) See Thes. S.

VIII. 1. \(\text{ουωκε}\) So Σ; also Psh. O.T. (not N.T.), and Hxp., as Cant. iv. 1.

4. \(\text{ουωκε} = \delta\kappaαπώς\) So Σ. Elsewhere, both uniformly render κ. by \(\kappaα\ukappaαι\); as do both Psh. and Hkl. in the only other place where it occurs in N.T., Act. ii. 19;—making \(\text{ουωκε} = \delta\tau\mu\iota\sigma,\) in same passage; as also Psh. and Hxp. of Joel ii. 30, which is there cited.

This is another remarkable token of the close relation between S and Σ.

[\(\text{ουωκε}\)]. Σ, \(\text{ουωκε}\). Cp. Act. xi. 30 (Psh., \(\text{ουωκε};\) Hkl., \(\text{ουωκε}\))."
NOTES.

(not else in N.T.): Σ in both places, ἔστιν. But in O.T. all the versions render as S; e.g., Is. xlv. 6.

[SN, Σ, as also Σ.]

[SN om. Σ from this verb, and from ἐπιτυγχάνει in next verse; as does Σ. Cp. ix. 4, xi. 5; also ii. 11 and note, vi. 6, &c.]

[Σ ἔστιν Χριστός] So Σ: used in Psh. O.T. (not N.T.), and Hxp. This passage proves that ἔστιν in this phrase is prep., not noun.

4. ἐλέησον] SN ἐλέησον ἐλέησον; Σ, sing. emph.: see note on v. 5.

5. ἐλέησον (ter)] SN writes ἔστιν throughout.

[SN writes this word throughout without the third point (see on vi. 15). Where it first occurs in this verse, SN subjoins ἐπιτυγχάνει, with Σ; and om. same word from end of verse 8 (see note on Greek text).

7. Note that SN om. the clause concerning Levi, but a later hand has supplied it on marg. S misplaces it, after instead of before Issachar. This looks as if the common source of S and SN did not contain the clause.

9. ἐλέησον] Correct by prefixing ὁ,—accidentally omitted in printing.

[ὅ ἀρδευμένοις ἀντίνοις] Lit., ὁ εἰς ἀρδεύμων: equivalent to ἐλέησον of Σ, which perhaps ought to be substituted in S.

[SN om. Σ always uses the latter, as does Psh. (N.T.). The sing. ἐπιτυγχάνει occurs in Σ [dlt; not n]; but S avoids it, as does Psh. (N.T.). Psh. (O.T.) uses all these forms (e.g., both pl. absol and sing., Gen. xxxv. 23).

13. ἐλέησον = ἀπεκρίθη] Ἀποκρώνομαι (not else in Apoc.) is here rendered by Σ, ἔστιν, which is the regular Hkl. equivalent for it: Psh., habitually uses that of S; the other seldom.

14. For ἔστιν (a typographical error), correct ἔστιν.

[Πλωμὼ also is not else found in Apoc. except the doubtful instance, xiii. 14 (not in S or Σ)]; and in N.T. else only Lk. v. 2, = ἔστιν (which else = νιπτῶ in both), Psh. and Hkl., as Σ here. But Πλωμὼ occurs in this sense in Psh. O.T., (not N.T.), and in Hxp. (e.g., Num. xix. 7) = πλώμω. In apoc. it occurs, Mt. xii. 5, = βεβηγίζω (Psh.).

15. ἔστιν = λατρεύωνοι] So xiv. 3 (the only other instance of λ. in Apoc.), and so Σ in both places. The Syr. verb rather = διακανώ, ὑπηρέτο; while λατρεύω = ἔστιν uniformly in Hkl., and mostly in Psh. (but = ἔστιν, Rom. i. 9, 25, 2 Tim. i. 3; and so Num. xvi. 9, as also Hxp.): but in Hebrews, Psh. usually, and Hkl. twice, render it as S here.

Note that the point over Σ has been accidentally omitted in printing.
NOTES.

of Σ [n defect] give قَتَّلَ, xix. 18, but vary here [ln, تَمَّدَدُ, d. as S]. It is remarkable that Psh. N.T. always renders خطَّاء; but Hkl. once (Mk. vi. 21), مَتَّعَ.

[Σ] S always thus, or absol. (as vii. 4, &c.): Σ mostly خطَّاء (= χαλάδες); and so Hkl., but Psh. as S. Note the triple pointing here and elsewhere (except v. 11, vii. 4, xiv. 1, xxi. 16) for both forms.

[Σ] = αἱ δυνάμεις] Σ has خطَّاء = οἱ ἀρχοῦσιν (or οἱ δυνατοῖ), which perhaps we ought to substitute here.

[Σ] = [τῶν] ἐλευθεροι] So Σ (but in sing.). In Apoc., α. recurs xiii. 16, xix. 18; where Σ renders as here. In the former place, S follows a different reading (see note in loc.); in the latter, has خطَّاء simply. Psh. uses both renderings: Hkl. always as Σ, except Rom. vi. 20 (خطَّاء; as also Psh., there and in some other places).

17. سيлим = diyat] So again xiii. 4; elsewhere خطَّاء, خطَّاء, as Σ here and throughout. Psh. often as S here.

VII. 1. For this and the following seven verses, we have a second authority, a copy of which I append to the preceding text (page 35 supr.). In the notes on verses 1-8, I distinguish it as Σ n.

[Σ] S n subjoins خطَّاء; and for خطَّاء reads خطَّاء.

[Σ] = τὰς γονίας] So in the other place where γ. occurs in Apoc., xx. 8. Σ has خطَّاء in both; and so Hkl., Mt. vi. 5, but else always uses خطَّاء (absol.). Psh. renders as S commonly in O.T., and in N.T. (except Act. iv. 11, xxvi. 26); never as Σ: but Hxp. as Hkl.

[Σ] = [Σ] (Cp. Mt. xxiv. 31, Psh.). S n, Σ خطَّاء, as Σ. Thus S n and Σ make خطَّاء (= ἀνεμος) fem. (see above on vi. 13); yet, just after, join it, as S does, with the masc. verb خطَّاء.

[Σ] S n, خطَّاء; Σ, خطَّاء. This noun is not found in stat. absol. in Psh. N.T.; but in O.T.—e.g., Gen. i. 29.

2. سيлим = ἀναβαλλόντα] Though partly effaced in S, this word is so far legible that there is no doubt of its letters: but the position of the point is uncertain (see the autotype Plate), and I therefore insert brackets. In S n, the point is clearly placed under, as I have printed it. Thus read, the word may represent either pres. or aor. ptp. (see note on Greek text): with the point above, the pres. only. For the former pointing = pres. ptp., cp. x. 1; for the latter, xi. 7, xiii. 11. Σ [In p] reads خطَّاء; [so d, but without point: De Dieu misprints a for n].

[Σ] So in the other instance of this phrase, xvi. 12.
occurs, and in each of the other two he supplies vowels. We find σεισμός else only xi. 13 (bis), and (a second time) xvi. 18, in which three places S (inconsistently) renders κίη (motion); and so Σ here [d np; l writes κίη by error], and throughout: likewise Psh. and Hkl. uniformly.

κίη] For κίη (cp. κίης, i. 11). But κίη = ἀσκός (Mt. ix. 17, &c., Psh. and Hkl.), which possibly S may have read for σάκκος.

13. κίη = βδόλονσα] So Σ; a remarkable agreement, seeing that elsewhere both always make κίη, κιήν = βδόλον—except that S has κίη again, xvii. 21. Both use it (ethpe.) in superscription, q.v. It is found in Psh.; also (rarely) in Hkl.

κιήν = ἀνέμου] So Σ; and so Psh. in the pll., Isaiah xxxiv. 4 (not Hxp.).

κιήν = ἀνέμου] Note that κιήν here is fem., in both versions; but masc. in vii. 1, where also it = ἀνέμος. In Psh. it is always fem. in this sense; in Hkl. it varies, as in S and Σ. In all, it is fem., when = πνεῦμα, except (as ii. 7 supr.), where the Holy Ghost is spoken of.

κίηκα] So the Ms. apparently; but a fine vertical line is inserted (prima manu) before Σ, correcting the word into κρεκεκεκ. Here, it = μεγας: but S makes κίηκα = ἰσχυρός in two of the places where that adj. occurs in Apoc., xvii. 10, xix. 18. Not so Σ (which has κραηκη here, and elsewhere κραηκη = ἰσχυρός,—see note on v. 2); nor Hkl.; Psh. (N.T.) uses it only James iii. 4, and the verb κεκα only (= κατασχέω) Lk. xxiii. 23. But in Phx. the adj. = ἰσχυρός (LXX), Esai. xiii. 16 (where Hxp. renders as Σ); and the verb = κατασχέω), xliii. 25; and both not uncommonly occur in Psh. O.T., and in Hxp.

14. κραηκη] Correct κρεκεκεκ. The reading of text = έτακη, which gives perhaps better sense (cp. the pll., Esai. xxxiv. 4, LXX), but has no other attestation. Perhaps we ought to emend further by transferring Α from the following κόπη to the termination of this verb, and removing from the following noun the plural sign. See notes on Greek text.

καρακάσα = τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν] Here, and wherever τόπος means an abiding-place, S uses καρακάσα; but where it means space (as xvi. 8, xx. 11), or locality (as xvi. 16), we find ἵδε, κιθαρίς. Σ does not distinguish, but always renders as here. Both words are common in Psh. In 2 Pet. i. 19 (Poc.), we find κιθαρίς, used properly as in S; where Hkl. has καρακάσα.

15. κοπατ = σι χιλιαρχοι] So xix. 18, where alone χ. recurs in Apoc. (cp. Exod. xviii. 21, Psh.; Hxp., κόπμι; LXX, χ.). The copies
NOTES.

from Σ. If we prefer (i), we must point καὶ ἐνίκησε, which is the reading of Σ for καὶ ἦνα νικήσῃ, and this I have adopted in the accompanying Greek text. It is to be noted that Σ may be claimed as supporting either ἰδιαὶ [dip], or οὐκ [n]; the fact being probably that n is right; that Σ, literal as usual, originally had ἰδιαῖ, with ἰδιαί as a note on the margin (such as are found in d), which afterwards made its way into the text, as has often happened in case of the marginalia of Hkl. Thus the result is: S originally read

either (i) ἵδιαι = νικῶν καὶ ἐνίκησε καὶ ἦνα νικήσῃ:

or (ii) ἰδιαί = νικῶν καὶ ἦνα νικήσῃ.

5. ζελέλα] After this word, ζελε, or ζελέλα (as xiii. 17), is wanting.

ζελέλα] Rather θελε, as Σ.

6. θελε οὖν οἱ θελε] . . . . θελε = χοίνες . . . . χοίνκες] Psh. makes θελε = θελε (2 Kin. vi. 25; and so Hxp.; [LXX, κάθος]), which measure (about a quart) fairly agrees with χοίνες. Σ, θελεθε; and so Ezek. xlv. 10, 11 (Hxp.), θελεθε: but there χ. [LXX] represents χόν, very incorrectly.

θελε = κράθε] Σ has the more usual plural. In sing., θελθε (stat. emph.) is mostly found, as 1 Cor. xv. 37 (Psh.).

8. θελε] S uniformly (xiv. 8, xix. 14) uses this ptep.: Σ uses poel here, but peil, xix. 14; Hkl. varies likewise. Psh. always as S where the verb = ἀκολούθω as here.

10. θελε] Or θελε,—the word is defaced in Ms.

διαθελε διαθελε διαθελε, as Σ.

11. θελε = θελε καρποῦ, or θελε] These words though defaced in Ms., can be deciphered; and the brackets in the printed text are superfluous. Σ renders by διαθελε. Cp. Dan. vii. 12, 25 [Psh.]; and for διαθελε, see xii. 14 infr.

πληρωμά] Σ has πληρωμά, which both versions make = πεπληρομένα, iii. 2 (the only other instance of πληρομά in Apoc.). Neither version is consistent in its use of πληρομά as regards conjugation; nor is Psh. (cp. Joh. xvi. 11 with xvi. 24). S and Σ sometimes have πληρομά, as τελοῦμαι; e.g., xvi. 1. So Psh., as Lk. xii. 50.

12. θελε] Read θελε.

ζελε] Read ζελε (= σεισμός), as viii. 5, [xi. 19], xvi. 18. This word (properly tremour) is not in Psh., but is found in good authors (see Thes. S., s. v.). It must have been unfamiliar, for our scribe has written it wrongly in two (first and third) of the four places where it
9. \( \text{ἐραμέθα} = \text{ἐδούντες} \text{φύσιν} \) So Ps. cxliv [cxliii] 9 (Phsh., not Hxp.); also, (S and Σ),\(^{supr.}\), xiv. 3, xv. 3 (where cp. pII., Exod. xv. 1, Phsh.). Neither Greek word occurs else in Apoc.; in N.T., they are found only in Eph. v. 19, Col. iii. 16; in the former of which places, but not in the latter, Hkl. renders the verb as S and Σ here, but not the noun. Phsh. renders both otherwise; and makes (as also Hkl.) \( \text{ματί} \) and \( \text{ἐραμέθα} = \text{ὅμως}, \text{ὁμος} \).

Note that, in S, the noun, whether \( = \text{φύσι} \) or \( = \text{δόξα} \), is always fem., and the masc. use of it alleged by De Dieu (on Σ \text{in loc.}) is an error \([\text{of l}]; \text{not supported by}\ \text{δνπ}].\\ 10. \( \text{ἐραμέθας} \text{μᾶς} \text{μετά} \text{καθήμενος} \) A conflate reading; see note on Greek text. Σ reads \( \text{καθήμενος} \). It is questionable whether the conflation was in the Greek original of S (as in case of ii. 13, where see note), or has been introduced into the Syriac, either by the translator, or by a scribe (from Σ or otherwise). The first hypothesis seems best.

11. \( \text{καθήμενος} \) So Σ (see also ix. 16); and so Phsh. (after Hebr.), Dan. vii. 10; where Hxp. has \( \text{καθήμενος} \text{μετά} \text{καθήμενος} \) (see note on vi. 15).

12. \( \text{ἐραμέθας} = \text{ἰσχύς} \) So again vii. 12 (the only other instance of \( \text{ἰσχύς} \) in Apoc.; it is misread, xviii. 2); likewise Σ in both places. Not a common word (cp. note on vi. 13), found also Esai. xlv. 1 (Phx.; not Hxp., which has \( \text{ἐσφάγμα} \)); also 2 Pet. ii. 11 (Poc. and Hkl.): but not elsewhere in Hkl., nor in Phsh. N.T. (both making \( \text{καθήμενος} = \text{ἰσχύς} \)); though sometimes in O.T., Phsh. as well as Hxp.

\( \text{καθήμενος} \) Correct printed text by removing the points \text{under} the line of contraction here, and in next verse.

13. \( \text{καθήμενος} \) Observe that S begins a new section with this word. See note on Greek text.

\( \text{καθήμενος} \) Observe the prefix, and the interpunction of the preceding words, which make \( \text{καθήμενος} \) the first word of the ascription.

VI. 2. \( \text{καθήμενος} \) \( \text{καθήμενος} \) A conflate reading, the second word being an alternative, either for the first, or for the third. As above, v. 10, the question arises, whether the conflation (i) was in the Greek, or (ii) has been brought into the Syriac. If we adopt (ii), the explanation will be, that S originally rendered \( \text{νεκών} \) by \( \text{καθήμενος} \), lit. \( \text{νεκώντας} \) (cp. Rom. viii. 37, Phsh. and Hkl.), and that the more literal \( \text{καθήμενος} \) was added, first on the margin, then in the text of the Syriac,—possibly
NOTES.

v. 1—8.

= the seal (of God), confirming. Σ is less consistent as regards the nouns, giving ἡμῶς (unsuitably), v. 5, 9, and ἔστω (combined with verb ἢσσος in next verse), vii. 2. In Psh. O.T., ἔφθαρσε occurs, but rarely; in N.T., ἡμῶς alone is used (and properly), Rom. iv. 11, 1 Cor. ix. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 19; in Hkl., in the third of these places only; ἐστιν in the other two.

2. ἓναι = ἵνα Χρόνον] So Σ, here and throughout, and S with but two exceptions, xviii. 10 and xix. 18, where ἔστι is used (for which see note on vi. 13). Psh. varies; Hkl. as Σ, except Mt. xiv. 30.

5. ἄνοιξα = τῆς φυλής] See note on ii. 27. Except here and xxi. 12, S renders φυλή (viii. 4 et passim) by ἄνοιξα (absol. or emph.): so Σ here and always (emph.); Hkl. likewise. Psh. varies as S, but mostly avoids absol.

This is untranslatable. Perhaps we ought to prefix Σ to the former verb (= ἄνοιξαι), or to read ἄνοιξα (= οἱ ἄνοιγμα). Σ agrees (against wellnigh all else) in reading ἄνοιξα (but with ἐστι [marked in l with •] before it). Σ omits ἵνα, and inserts ἓναι. See note on Greek text.

6. ὑπαρχεῖ = ὑπαρχεῖμεν] In Σ ὑπαρχεῖ always = σφάλμα; in S ὑπάρχει is used (vi. 9, xiii. 8, xviii. 24); and so in Psh. and Hkl., 1 Joh. iii. 12 (bis). The latter verb elsewhere in S, and always in Σ, ὑπαρχεῖμεν, as in Psh. and Hkl.: the former in Psh. = θύμω: not in Hkl. See note on xiii. 3.

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

 Apparently for ἐστιν; marked with an obelus, as for correction: but it recurs xvi. 14, with no mark. Possibly a recognized form of contraction.

8. ἐλαβεῖ = ἐλαβέτε] So S occasionally (as also Psh.; Hkl. more rarely). Usually (as verses 7, 9) S makes ἐλαβεῖ = λαμβάνω, as Σ here and throughout. 'Cp. xvii. 12 infr., for variation of usage. In both, ἐλαβεῖ = αἴρω, xviii. 21; and by implication = φορῶ, xii. 15.

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

[This note is not clearly visible in the image.]

This seems to be an unusual use of ἵνα, which in Psh. N.T. occurs only Mt. xxvii. 25, 26, = πάρουσι. Barsal. in loc. explains ὑπαρχεῖ [sic] by ἓνα, with the addition ἕνας ὑπάρχει. Cp. for these words Exod. xxv. 29 (Psh., and (for ἰ) Hxp.). See Thea. Syr., where ἰ is rendered patella, scutella, but Syriac lexicographers are cited as explaining it = ἡμῶς, which = ἵνα. Note that S here and always makes this noun fem., with plural ἐστη, (xv. 7, &c.).
on ἀνά. See on Greek text; and cp. the pl., Ezek. i. 27 (Psh. and LXX) for a like expression.

[Διαταγμ] This pl. absol. is rare; it recurs xii. 14, where Barsal. also has it. Z uses emphat. only: Psh. as S; Hxp. as Σ, Ezek. i. 6, &c.

[Σελοσανανω] S renders this word by ἀναπαυωνω, xiv. 11 (the only other instance of it in Apoc.). In both places Σ gives σελοσανω, by which Psh. and Hkl. render the same word. In Psh. σελοσανω occurs, but = γαληνη, or ἡνυχία.

[Σελοοτοι Σαβαονανω] See on i. 4. Note that in text, Σ is wrongly printed for Σο in the preceding μονοσ.

9. ἐκαστοιοντας = εἰκαστικιαν] So S and Σ, here, and vii. 12 (the only other instance of εἰκαστικιαν in Apoc.): never found in Psh. (N.T.) or Hkl., which use ἐκαστοιοντας; but in some of the titles to Pss. in Psh. O.T.

10. Λευκά ᾶνε] Displaced, probably by accident, from following ἀνοοο.

11. Σοο θεογητοι = νεκος εί] Here, and v. 9, 12, θεογητοι = νεκος ἦμε. For the subjoined Σοο, see Nöldeke, Kursg. Syr. Gramm., § 221.

[Σοο] Properly = δια τοῦ θεληματος σου, but cp. xii. 11, xiii. 14, where (as in A.V.), the same inexactness of rendering occurs. Elsewhere, S often renders δια with accus. correctly by ἡνυχία, as Σ always. But note that here Σ has a seemingly conflate reading, ἀνοοο, which occurs only in the first member and Σοο in the second; probably borrowing Σοο from S.

V. 1. Σελοοτοι = γεγραμμένον] So xx. 15 only: elsewhere ἀνοοο, as Σ uniformly (but Barsal. here as S). The verb Σελοοτοι = χαιράσω (Σελοοτοι = χαιράξωμα, S and Σ always): in Psh. N.T. and Hkl. nowhere = γράφω; but = εντυπω, 2 Cor. iii. 7 (Psh.): used as here, Dan. v. 24, 25 (Psh., not Hxp.).

[Σοο = ἡγωθεν] So xi. 2; but Σοο, xiv. 20 (with genitive following; so Psh. and Hkl., as e.g. Mk. vii. 15). For Σοο, S (iii. 12, xxii. 15) uses Σοο simply. Σ follows like usage, but here reads ὑπαθεν.

[Σοο] (which in Psh. means to sink) = ἐσφράγισεν, xx. 3; also Σ in both places as Hxp. sometimes. Everywhere else, both versions make ἐσφράγισεν as Psh. and Hkl. always. S uses the latter word where the sealing confirms (yet hardly so, x. 4, xxii. 10), the former where it closes. So likewise S uses Σοο = σφραγις here and throughout; except vii. 2, ix. 4, where Σοο
and so Ηξρ. (not Psh.) in the pll., Prov. xxv. 22: else in Psh. and Hkl. Σ always = κρανίων, in Hξρ. = κορυφή (Ps. vii. 17). Elsewhere used in S only of beasts (ix. 17 (βίος), xiii. 1 (βίος), 3); never in Σ.

5. κρανίων = λαμπάδες] Σ, κρανίων, and so viii. 10 (the only other instance of λ. in Apoc.), where S has κρανίων. Both Psh. and Hkl. always render as Σ. Elsewhere in Σ κρανίων is an adjective: but we find it in Σ = φωστήρ, xxi. 11 (as Phil. ii. 15, Psh. and Hkl.), where S has κρανίων (elsewhere = φως).

6. κρανίων = κρανώτατον] So xxii. 1. In both places Σ merely transliterates the Greek word (which does not occur else in N.T.); and so Psh. and Hξρ., Isai. liv. 12, Ezek. i. 22 (where Targ. of Jonathan has רָמָּם). S seems to render it mistakenly as if meaning is (so always in Psh. O.T.); but in expressing κρανώτατον (xxi. 11) uses the same transliteration as Σ. In the inedited Commentary of Barsalibi on Apoc. (Brit. Mus., Rich. 7185, fo. 22r, line 3), which follows the text of Σ, I find, in loc., the character of Σ, with the note, κρανώτατον = א".

[From "נָו — Σ = מָו] Stat. absol., as often in S, and so Barsal. in loc.; also Psh. (not Hξρ.), Ezek. i. 5: never in Σ, nor Psh. N.T., Hkl., or Poc., all of which uniformly use stat. emph. κρανίων. S also uses κρανίων as = θηρίων, in which sense Σ always writes κρανίων, as Hkl. and Hξρ. passim; and Psh., Deut. xxxii. 24. The word is always fem. in S, as (apparently) in Psh., Hkl., and Poc.; but Σ makes it masc. when = θηρίων, except xi. 7 (where the symbolic Beast is first introduced), and xviii. 2. See Thes. Syr., s.v.

[From הָלִיך] Σ and Hkl. ins. חָלִיך after this verb: S and Psh. apparently never; nor does Hξρ., Ezek. i. 18, x. 12.

7. Note that S here, and habitually, expresses the ordinal numbers by the cardinals with s prefixed (and so Barsal. here and often); but see note on ii. 11 for an important exception: Σ, in adjectival form.

[From רָסַפ] So Σ habitually, but see x. 1, and note there: Σ always רָסַפ, as Hkl. (but Barsal. here as S). In Psh. N.T. both are used. In Ezek. i. 6, &c., Psh. as S; Hξρ. as Σ.

8. רָסַפ = רָסַפ = רָסַפ] So Σ (also vi. 6, where S om.). This coincidence is notable, the form being an unusual one; in Psh. N.T. (also Hkl.) only Mk. xiii. 27: but Psh. and Hξρ. have it in the pll., Ezek. i. 16.

[From מַיִּיתְם מַיִּיתְם] Possibly this was originally a gloss (erroneous)
NOTES.

3. ἡμῶν = ὁρασε (bis) Cp. for this word Ezek. i. 5 et passim, Psh.; also (= ὁρασε) Hxp. S uses it else only x. 1, where it = πρόσωπον. Σ gives ἡμῶν here; but ἡμῶν ix. 17 (the only other instance of ὁρασε in Apoc., where S om.). In this latter place ὁρασε means a vision (ὁραμα, which usually = ἡμοῖ in Psh. and Hkl.). Else, ὁρασε in N.T. occurs only Act. ii. 17, = Joel ii. 28, in which places Psh. renders ἡμῶν; as also Hxp. (Joel): but Hkl. (Act.), ἡμοῖ.

ἐμαυτός] Wrongly written ἐμαυτός in all other instances in S, viz., xxi. 11 (where Σ [d l p] has ἔμαυτός, as here), 18, 19 (Σ, ἔμαυτός). Psh. as S here, Exod. xxviii. 20 [18]; but Ezek. xxviii. 13, as Σ d l p here (Hxp. in both places, ἔμαυτος [so Σ n here]).


ἐνεκάτιος = ἐπικάτιος] Cp. ἐνεκάτιος Σ (x. 1): Σ in both places, ἐπικάτιος; cp. Ezek. i. 28 (Psh. and Hxp.), for a like rendering (but with ἐν for ἐν). No other instance of ἐπικάτιος in N.T.

κατακότι] S uses this form, or the constr., sing. or pl. (κατάκοτι, verse 4; κατάκοτε, v. 11), indiscriminately, for κυκλόθεν, κύκλο: also ἐν κατακότι, iv. 8. Σ has ἐν κατακότι in the last-named place: in the other places as here, only prefixing ἐν for κυκλόθεν and omitting it for κύκλο. The first three renderings are to be found in Psh. (κατακότι in O.T. only); but not the two of iv. 8; both of which occur in Hxp.; the latter also with slight variation, in Hkl., Lk. ix. 12.

κατακότι] So again xxi. 19; and so Σ [d p; l n, κατακότι] here: but κατακότιοι there. Psh. as S, Ezek. xxviii. 13; Hxp. Σάκοι.

4. κατακότιοι κατακότιοι = τοῦ θρόνου θρόνος] So S in every place, before and after this, except xx. 4, where the θρόνος (= seats of judgment) are = κατακότιοι, as Col. i. 16 (Psh.). In this verse, for the first time, Σ, which up to this renders as S (i. 4, ii. 13, &c.), introduces κατακότιοι for the former—that is, for the Supreme Throne, as distinguished from the surrounding thrones; but afterwards uses it uniformly for θρόνοι, except xx. 4 (κατακότιοι). So Psh. distinguishes, Mt. xix. 28; where, however, Hkl. uses κατακότιοι only. Both have κατακότιοι for The Throne, Mt. xxv. 31: but it is not found elsewhere in Psh. N.T., nor (apparently) in O.T.; in Hxp. rarely, as Ezek. i. 26.

κατά] Obelized in Ms.; see note on ii. 5.

τάς κεφαλᾶς αὐτῶν] So Psh. (not Hkl.) Rom. xii. 20;
NOTES.

(dios), (see also xvii. 8; and cp. xiii. 12), as by Σ uniformly. The expression is not found in N.T. except in Apoc., but cp. Act. iv. 16 (Psh.).

14. ἐδοξεῖ = ἡ ἀρχή] So xxi. 6; but xxii. 13 (the only other instance of ἀρχή in Apoc.), ἢ ἀρχή. Σ gives ἢ ἀρχή in all three places. Both have ἐδοξεῖ = ἀπαρχή, xiv. 4. Psh. and Hkl. use all three words for ἀρχή.

15. ἦς ἐξήθησα] Probably to be corrected, ἦς ἐκθέσθη.

τεῦτον = ζεστός] So Σ; and so Psh. O.T. (as Josh. xiii. 6), and Hxp. (= θερμός, Jer. xxxi. 2): in Psh. N.T. only = σεσαρωμένος (Mt. xii. 44).

καὶ ἔδρα = ὀφελοῦν] In Psh. ἔδρα is frequently thus rendered. Σ has ἔδρα [d n p; l incorrectly ἔδω], found in Psh. O.T. (not N.T.). Neither rendering occurs in Hkl., but Hxp. uses the latter.

16. ἠγάπησεν] Read rather ἠγάπησα: see note on Greek text.

ῥημάζει] So Σ: not in Psh., Hxp., or Hkl.; but elsewhere found.

17. ἔλαβεν] Read ἔλαβεν for ἔλαβε: see note on Greek text.

χρησάμεν ἐκώ] Elsewhere (xxi. 28, xxii. 5, only) S uses ἐκώ. Σ here gives ἐκώ and ἐκείνω, and similarly in the other places. Psh. uses both renderings of S (e.g., Mt. iii. 14, vi. 8), never that of Σ. Hkl. sometimes renders as S here, sometimes as Σ.

18. ἐπράτησε = ἔστα ἐπιβάλλη] So Σ, though both render the preceding and the following subjunctives after ἔστα by fut. indic. with prefix ἐ.

ἐστάει] So Σ: not in Psh., Hxp., or Hkl.; but elsewhere, e.g., Philoxenus, Discourses, xiii., p. 522 (Dr. Budge’s edition, 1894).

ἐλαβε] So Σ; and so Psh. O.T. (2 Kin. ix. 30), and Hxp., not in N.T.

19. ἔλαβε] Σ, with needless periphrasis, ἔλαβε ἐκάθεν.

20. ἔλαβε] So Σ, for ἔλαβε (here only in Apoc.), elsewhere uniformly for ἔλαβε. The latter, S renders by ἔλαβε, ἐκάθεν. Psh. uses all three renderings: Hkl. mostly that of Σ.

21. ἔλαβε] Σ has the more usual ἐκάθεν as prefix.

22. ἔλαβε] S (with Σ) in these two instances uses this form properly for emphasis; but (between) writes ἐλαβε, not as Σ ἐλαβε, where there is no emphasis.

IV. 1. ἔδω = μετά] So usually in S, at the beginning of a clause; elsewhere, ἔδω simply. In Psh., ἔδω is rare; rarer in Hkl.; never in Σ.

ἵλαρα]Probably we ought to correct by prefixing ἐ, as Σ [n; d p Ἐλαρά]; l wrongly Ἐλαρά.

τεῦτον = δει] So S throughout (except i. 1, where see note); more fully ἔδω = δει, x. 11: Σ always δει, as Psh. sometimes and Hkl. usually,—also 2 Pet. iii. 11 (Poc. with Hkl.). Peculiar to S.
NOTES.

ptcp. (of ethn.) is not elsewhere found in S, nor in Σ [in xi. 3 it is wrongly given by De Dieu, against his own Ms.] In all other places S uses instead ptp. of pa. or aph., or peil: Σ, ptp. pa. or aph., never peil. But in both versions the infin. of ethn. occurs, verse 18; the fut., xix. 8. For the verb, see on i. 12. Psh. (N.T.) mostly avoids it; but the peil is found Mk. xiv. 51, xvi. 5, and the ethn., Act. xii. 8. The usage of Hkl. agrees with that of Σ.

ελαλέσο = ελάλεσα. So S where ελάλεσα recurs, vii. 17, xxi. 4. Σ agrees, here and vii. 17, (but reads xxi. 4 otherwise). So also Psh. (O.T.) and Hxp. sometimes, as Ps. i. 1, 9 [i. 3, 11]. But Psh. N.T. renders by ελαλέσα in the only two places where ελάλεσα occurs (Act. iii. 19, Col. ii. 14); as also Hkl.; and so Psh. O.T. often, as Exod. xxxii. 32, Ps. lxix. [lxxxviii.] 28 [29], where however Hxp. uses ελαλέσα.

τῆς βιβλίου. So xvii. 8, xx. 12 (ter). In all other places, S renders βιβλίον, and βιβλίων, by βιβλίον; Σ always, as also Hkl. Note that where S uses τῆς βιβλίου, it is the Book of Life, or of Judgment; but the Book of Life is τοῦ ζωῆς, xiii. 8; and so in Phil. iv. 3 (Psh.). Psh. uses both renderings: in Exod. and Ps.; ut supr., Psh. has ἔτοι; Hxp., ζωῆς.

7. τῆς βιβλίου (bis) With ptp., = oδηγεῖς with 3 pers. sing. pres. indic. So S mostly; as Psh., Isai. xxi. 22 (here cited): but see ii. 17, iii. 8, xiv. 3, for the usual τῆς βιβλίου which Σ uniformly gives. Psh. (N.T.) renders as Σ usually (but see Mk. x. 18, 29, &c.); Hkl. apparently always.

8. τησ σου] Accurately, τησ σου; see ii. 2.

9. τησ σου = δεῖ] So v. 9, xii. 12; but Σ gives the more usual τησ σου; as S, verse 8 and generally. Cp. Lk. xiii. 14, (Psh. as S here; Hkl. as Σ).

τησ δασος] Masc., agreeing with τησ δασος. So S consistently, omitting τησ δασος (fem.) after τησ,—see note on Greek text. Σ also has τησ δασος, though it reads τησ μεταβαλα. Therefore, unless Σ follows a reading τησ δασος τον πειρασμον του μεταβαλαντος (for τησ μεταβαλαντος,—unknown to all authorities), we have here clear evidence that Σ is based on S.

τῆς οικουμένης] So again xvi. 14; (but τησ δασος, xii. 9, the only other instance of τησ οικουμένη in Apoc.). So Psh. O.T., sometimes; but in N.T. only (without τησ) Rom. x. 18, as in Ps. xix. [xviii.]. 5 (Psh., = διᾳ τησ οικουμένης; Lxx.; but τησ οικουμένης, Hxp.), whence it is cited in that place. In Psh. N.T., oikouμ. usually = τησ δασος, or τησ μεταβαλαντος; in Σ always = τῆς οικουμένης (unknown to Psh. but found in Hxp.) and in Hkl.

τῆς οικουμένης = τοις κατοικούντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] So S usually, and Psh. O.T. (Hxp. rarely); but the phrase is rendered literally, xiii. 14
NOTES.

i. 8 (= Ps. xliv. 6 [xliv. 7]), where it has ἐκλέγει, with Psh. and Hxp. S (not Σ) makes ἐκλέγει, v. 5 (where see note), xxi. 12, only.

Stat. constr. (so Mk. vii. 4), as Psh. of Ps. ii. 9 (here cited): Σ uses stat. emph. followed by ι, as Hxp., ib.

συντρίψεσθε = συντρίψετε] Rather συντρίψετε (-τε for -ται),—see note on Greek text for an explanation of the difficulty attaching to these words. Another solution would be to read ἔστη συντρίψεσθαι = συντρίψεσθαι αὑτῶν (Ps. ii. 9, LXX; so Hxp.). Σ has συντρίψεται (= συντρίψεσθαι).

Psh. (N.T.) uses μεικτικός, Lk. ix. 39, Rom. xvi. 20, = συντρίβω : but Psh. (O.T.) has συντρίπτει, Ps. ii. 9. The agreement of Σ, here and rarely elsewhere, with Hxp. rather than Psh. may be a token of the hand of Polycarpus, whose version of O.T. was the basis of Hxp. (See Assemani, B.O., tom. ii, p. 82; also Smith's Dict. of Christian Biography, vol. iv, pp. 431, 433, s.v. Polycarpus (5): also Dissertation, Part I, supr., p. xcvii).

28. τιμήματα] Stat. constr.; and so xxii. 16 (cp. Job xxxviii. 7, Psh.). Σ has in both places stat. emph. followed by τιμήματα (adjective) [so ὁματὶ here; ἤ writes τιμήματος (noun), wrongly].

III. 1. θορύβοι] Note the pl., stat. absol. (fem.) here and iv. 5 only: never in Σ; rarely in Psh., as Lk. xi. 26. Elsewhere, S uses emphat. θορύβοι, as Σ; once θορύβων, xxii. 6.

δύναται, ἐξωτικόν] Adject., stat. emph. Σ has δύναται (stat. absol.), so that the usage of the two versions is here inverted.

2. τέλος τῆς ἄνω = γίνον γρηγορῶν (an Aramaism)] A verbally exact rendering of the Greek: Σ gives τέλος τῆς ἄνω = γρηγορῶν (the versions again, as in last note, exchanging characters). See Mk. xiii. 37, where Psh. expresses γρηγορῶν as S here; Hkl. as Σ.

τέλος τῆς ἄνω = εἴπερ] This would be = τὰ λογαριά τὰ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐμὲλλες. Probably we ought to om. the second so as to restore α (for αὐτῶν ὅτι), with all Greek authorities. See note on Greek text.


4. ἀρχήν τοῦ ἱμάτιος αὐτῶν = τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν] So S throughout: Σ uses ἀρχήν instead (except xvi. 15; xix. 13, 16). In both versions ἀρχήν = σκέδος (ii. 27, xviii. 12). The usage of Psh. and of Hkl. as to these words varies.

Σκέδος] Perhaps an error for ἀρχήν.

5. περιβάλλεται] Lit., περιβαλλόμενος: so Σ. This
NOTES.

16. ταχύς = ταχύς. So S everywhere except xxi. 7 [?] and 20, where it gives ταχύς, which is the proper equivalent of εν ταχύς;—so both versions, xxi. 6 as well as i. 1. For ταχύς Σ here and always gives ταχύς (without τοῦ); and makes ἐν ταχύς = εὐθέως (iv. 2, as S also there; Psh. similarly). In Psh. also, ταχύς with or without τοῦ stands for ταχύς, εν ταχύς: Hkl. varies.

17. διάμορφον. Read διάμορφον, as Σ. Cp. verse 7.

διάμορφον Read διάμορφον, as Σ. See notes on Greek text of this verse.

διάμορφον] (See verse 10). (i) Read instead, διάμορφον, as Σ.

(ii) After this word there is an omission, for which see note on Greek text.

If this be chargeable on the Syr. text, the words διάμορφον are to be subjoined, as in Σ.

18. διάμορφον . . . . διάμορφον] Read διάμορφον . . . . διάμορφον, as in Σ. These misreadings are probably the result of an editorial attempt to give sense to the Syr. text which the accidental errors pointed out in the preceding notes had made unintelligible.

19. διάμορφον] Perhaps only a loose rendering for μετανόησον.

20. διάμορφον . . . . διάμορφον] So the pll., Jer. xvi. 10 (Psh.; not Hxp.): Σ (with Hxp.), διάμορφον; but (with Psh.) διάμορφον for μετανόησον of Hxp.

21. διάμορφον . . . . διάμορφον] So the pll., Jer. xvi. 10 (Psh.; not Hxp.): Σ (with Hxp.), μετανόησον; but (with Psh.) μετανόησον for μετανόησον of Hxp.

elsewhere οὐκ (occasionally with a second οὐκ where οὐκ follows; once οὐκ without οὐκ, xx. 13), as Σ uniformly, and Hkl. usually,—also in Joh. vii. 53 (Peric. de Adultera): Psh. mostly renders by οὐκ οὐκ, very rarely (as Hebr. xi. 21) as Σ.

On mg. of this verse is written in small strangolo character, apparently prima manu, διάμορφον, with a small obelus prefixed, but no mark in text for place of insertion.

22. τοῖς λοιποῖς] S always uses τοῖς thus; simply, as here (with Psh.), or with τοῖς prefixed. Σ mostly prefixed demonstr. pron. and τοῖς, as here, τοῖς λοιποῖς, (with Hkl.).

23. τοῖς λοιποῖς] S always uses τοῖς thus; simply, as here (with Psh.), or with τοῖς prefixed. Σ mostly prefixed demonstr. pron. and τοῖς, as here, τοῖς λοιποῖς, (with Hkl.).

24. τοῖς λοιποῖς] So S always: Σ, always τοῖς λοιποῖς; but Hxp. as well as Psh. gives τοῖς λοιποῖς, Ps. ii. 9 (here cited). Psh. (N.T.) usually renders as S; but as Σ, 1 Cor. iv. 21 (where the sense is lower), and Hebr. xi. 21 (= Gen. xlvi. 31, so Psh.). Hkl. always as Σ, except Hebr.
its margin, and one (in Jude 7) interpolated into the text. And it may safely be inferred from what has been shown above (i. 1–8, note) that the scribe of our Ms. must have had at hand a copy of Σ. But on the other hand it is to be observed that Σ, though it agrees with Σ as regards the leading word ἀντείσις of the first member of the conflate reading, differs from it not only in omitting the αὐθεντεύω before ἀντείσις, but also in omitting εἰρήνῳ after it, and in inserting οὐ before the preceding ἀντείσις and omitting ἀνεμοῖο after it,—all which three variations imply a different Greek original (see note on Greek text).

But the true explanation of the facts proves to be that Σ here represents a conflate Greek text. The ms. 152 of Apoc. (Vatcian, 370) reads here (see supr., Part I, p. 49, note on ii. 13), ἀντείσις [sic] ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστὸς, ὅτι πᾶς μάρτυς πιστὸς. We may therefore conclude without hesitation that the original of Σ contained here an interpolation almost identical with that of ms. 152 (see Greek text), and that Σ ἀνεμοῖο = οὐ ἑδραν here, as iii. 8 infr., et passim.

The coincidence between Σ and Σ in the use of the unusual verb ἀνεμοῖο, and their variations in other points, are then to be accounted for by supposing that the translator of Σ had before him Σ (representing a Greek copy with conflate text as I have printed it), and a Greek copy (reading ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αἰς ἀνεμοῖο ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστὸς μου); and that he followed Σ in its rendering of the first part of its conflate text, adapting it to the varied readings of his Greek copy.

14. ἐνδιδαχόμενον = τῶν διδαχόμενον] So Σ here, and also verses 15 and 24 (the only other instances of Σ in Apoc.); but in the latter two places Σ has ἐνδιδαχόμενον, thus distinguishing "teaching" in the former case, from "doctrine" in the latter. Psh. and Poc. always use ἐνδιδαχόμενον = διδαχή: Hkl. always ἐνδιδαχόμενον, which in Psh. = διδασκαλία (Tit. ii. 7).

15. ἀντείσις = τῶν νῦν Ἰσραήλ] Note the use of stat. constr., where Σ uses stat. emph. followed by ἀ. Σ, with Psh., habitually employs stat. constr. in a limited class of cases, of which the present is a typical example. Σ for the most part avoids it, as does Hkl. Yet Σ with Σ has in this verse ἀντείσις ἑδραν to represent the compound ἐδωκόθητα. Not so Psh., 1 Cor. viii. 1, &c.

15. ἀντείσις = ἀνεμοῖο] So again viii. 12 (the only other instance of ἀνεμοῖο in Apoc.). In both places Σ gives ἀντείσις ἑδραν. So too, Mt. xxii. 26, &c., Psh. renders as Σ here; Hkl. as Σ.
ferring ἁμάρθωθεν as "magis Syriacum," after De Dieu (in loc.), who regards it as "vere Syriacum," and ἁμάρθωθεν as "Chaldæicum."

13. ἡμᾶς] After this word, μι (cursive, but prima manus) is interlined.

[ἀντιπας] Correct ἁμᾶρθωθεν = ἀντεπίπας, the translator having taken ἀντεπίπας (= Ἀντίπας) for a verb. So in Σ; d l need the same emendation, but n p give the true reading. The verb is now and then found in like sense in Ps. (e.g. Mt. xii. 19, = ἐπίξω, as also Hkl.); and so in Hxp., Esa. l. 5, = ἀντιπέξω, LXX.

This is another striking coincidence between S and Σ. It is hardly possible that two independent translators should have hit on ἁμᾶρθωθεν as a rendering for ἀντεπίπας. The verb is not a familiar one, as is shown by the fact that it has been misread by our scribe, and by two scribes of Σ. It would have been more obvious to use ἡμᾶρθωθεν, as Ps. and Hkl. do for ἀντεπίπας, Acts iv. 14; and Hkl. again, Lk. xxi. 15 (the only other example of ἀντεπίπας in N.T.).

[ἐπιξω] The prefix is supported only by two mss. (see note on Greek text): perhaps we ought to read ἐπιξω, as Σ.

[ἀντιπας] These words [rather ἡμᾶρθωθεν = ἀντιπας (or ἀντεπιπας)] seem at first sight to be meant to represent Ἀντίπας, treated as a significant appellation rather than a proper name; as ἡμᾶρθωθεν = Ἀπολλώνιος, ix. 11, where Σ is content to transliterate the Greek: and in my Memoir, Transactions, R.I.A., vol. xxx, pp. 397, 407, I have so explained it. Yet ἡμᾶρθωθεν, rather than ἀντιπας, would be the proper equivalent of ἀντιπα in this sense.

If this were so, the words ἀντεπίπας [καὶ] ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός would be represented twice over,—

(a) ἡμᾶρθωθεν ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός

(b) ἡμᾶρθωθεν ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός

—and we should have to suppose,—either, (i) a deuterograph (or double rendering) on the part of the translator, in doubt whether to read ἀντεπίπας as a verb or a noun: or (ii) a conflation, due to a Syriac scribe who interpolated S from Σ,—or who perhaps, finding (b) in his text, borrowed (a) from Σ and placed it on his margin, whence it was transferred by a subsequent scribe to the text.

Hypothesis i would be admissible as a solution of the problem, failing a better one.

In favour of ii is the parallel fact that one of the Mss. which contain the Poc. Epistles (Amsterdam 184) has Harkleian renderings written on
Note that S usually renders ὦν by ξ simply, while ξ habitually marks the final sense of the conjunction by prefixing ἄσ, which is also the usage of Hkl., but not of Psh. In S, ἀσ occurs in this sense, xiii. 13; else only = ὦς (iii. 21, and xviii. 6). We have ἀσ = τὸς, iii. 3.

So always (absol.), even before a numeral, for pl. (anarthrous) of ἡμέρα; and so too Psh. sometimes: but else, ἄσα (emphat., as Psh. usually), ii. 13, ix. 6, x. 7, xi. 6. In these four places ξ agrees;—a notable coincidence: whereas here (and xi. 3, 11) it gives ἄσα (not found in S; once only, Gal. iv. 10, in Psh. N.T.; but sometimes in Hkl. and Hxp.)—never ἄσα.

11. ἵστατ = ἀδικηθήγ ξ, ἰστάμ. Usually ἵστα in pe. = ἐριζῶ (so 4 Kin. xiv. 10, Hxp.): elsewhere in S and ξ, and Psh. N.T., it is found only in aph.—So, vi. 6, and throughout S, ἵστα = ἀδικάω, (except xxii. 11 (ὅς) where see note); and so in Psh. and Hkl. once, Lk. x. 19. Hence it follows that ἵστα (pe.) = ἀδικοῦμαι, as here; but this meaning is unrecorded in the Lexicons. ξ varies in its rendering of ἀδικάω: see note on xi. 5.

ἄσιθ = δευτέρων] ξ and ξ agree in this rendering only here, xx. 6, xx. 14, and xxi. 8,—the four places where the “second death” is spoken of,—a signal instance of their close affinity. Note that ἄσιθ ἄσιθ occurs twice in Aphraates (Demonstr. vii. 25; viii. 19). Yet, as Parisot points out (Præf., cap. iii, p. xliii), he may have derived the phrase from the Targums. Elsewhere, S always uses ἄσιθα, and ξ (except xix. 3, where ἄσιθα = advb. δευτέρων) ἄσιθα. In Psh. N.T. ἄσιθα is generally found, and likewise in O.T.; ἄσιθα and ἄσιθα nowhere in N.T.; the former now and then, but the latter seldom (if ever), in O.T. But in Hxp. and Hkl. ἄσιθα is frequent.

On examining Ceriani’s photozincographic reproductions of the Ambrosian Mss. of the Psh. and Hxp. O.T., I find many instances of ἄσιθα in the latter, but none of ἄσιθα. In the former, “second” is not once rendered ἄσιθα in the Book of Genesis; twice ἄσιθα (vi. 16; xxxii. 19); usually ἄσιθα or ἄσιθα.

Probably ἄσιθα is a formation of the later Syriac, and = ἄσιθα exactly, as expressing the ordinal; while ἄσιθα, in the four places cited (ep. also Eccl. iv. 15, Psh.) means “repeated” (in order), “succeeding” (as secundus) rather than (numerically) “second”;—so in Psh. the title ἄσιθα for Deuteronomy. If so, Schaaf (s.v.) is wrong in pre-
NOTES.

in S as in Psh. O.T. (= לֹא) not N.T., nor in Hkl.; Σ, here and usually, gives participle.

20. Note that the stop before ἀμετρέω is a scribe’s error.

Σ, μετρέω. S prefers to represent the copula by the personal pronoun (enclitic), or to omit it.

II. 1. ἐν σταυρῷ = ἐν μέσῳ] Here only in S; nowhere in Σ; rare in Psh. N.T.; rarer in Hkl.; but used = ἐν, 2 Pet. ii. 8 (Poc. and Hkl.).

2. ἅρπαξ (peil) is to be written, iii. 8, vii. 9, xv. 8.

ἐστερεύω = ἐστερεύω] So in S usually, as in Psh.: Σ, ἐστερεύω, here and elsewhere, as Hkl.

5. ἐκπέπτωκας] Lit., ἀκεκλίθης (as Mt. viii. 12 (Psh.): cp. ἀκεκλήθη, xi. 2 ἰν. Σ has ἀκεκλήθη, probably reading πέπτωκας (see note on Greek text).

ἐφημασμένοις = εἰ δέ] In iv. 4, &c., ἡμ. preceded by ἢ, where no ἢ corresponds in the Greek, is obelized in Mss.; see note on Greek text.

ἐκπέπτωκας = ἐκπέπτωκας] So verse 22, also (= εἰ μὴ) verse 17, and elsewhere; but also ἐκπέπτωκας sometimes for εἰ μὴ. Σ here (and usually) writes ἐκπέπτωκας, as Hkl.; Psh. varies.

6. ἠκεκλήθη] Present, = ἠκεκλήθη = μισθόν, as Σ.

7. ἀκεκλήθη] Except in this recurring sentence, S makes ἀκεκλήθη = λέγει, and ἠκεκλήθη = λέγω: as does Σ, here and uniformly.

8. ἔισθαι = καὶ ἔπεσεν (as Σ) = καὶ ἔπεσεν. Cp. iii. 1.

9. ἐκπέπτωκας (bis)] For the more usual ἐκπέπτωκας; so also iii. 9. Σ gives the longer form here; but at iii. 9 [ἐκπέπτωκας], not ἐκπέπτωκας the shorter.

10. ἐκπέπτωκας ὑπὸ διάβολος] So S uniformly, as in Psh.; and so Σ here, and xx. 10: but in the other three places where δ. occurs in Apoc., Σ has ἐκπέπτωκας, which is frequent in Hkl.; never found in Psh.

11. ὑπὸ βάλλει] Σ, ὑπὸ βάλλει. S often prefers to represent the infinitive thus, especially when a purpose is indicated, by a fut. with σ prefixed; while Σ renders by infinit. with σ prefixed, as here,—as S does in ordinary cases; e.g. in the earlier part of this verse.

φυλακῆν] So (but without ἀνήκει) xx. 7; but xviii. 2 (the only remaining instance of φ. in Apoc.), ἀκεκλήθη; as also Σ, which gives ἀκεκλήθη here and xx. 7, as Hkl. usually does. Psh. generally uses instead ἀκεκλήθη; but ἀκεκλήθη (without ἀνήκει) = φυλακῆ, Hebr. xi. 36.
NOTES.

15. Ἰδωσ — ἤμισυ αὐτοῦ] Not elsewhere in S. Σ (which renders by ἰδοθεία here, as Hkl., Joh. xi. 44) uses ἠμίσυ, iv. 3 only, for ὀρασις. It occurs Lk. xxiii. 48 (Psh. and Hkl.) = θεωρία: 2 Pet. ii. 8 (Poc. and Hkl.) = βλέπμα.

16. Ἰδωσ] The ptep. following is fem., here and in Σ (though the verbs are different); whereas elsewhere neither version treats Ἰδωσ as fem.—a notable coincidence. But while S, consistently, writes the next word ἠμίσυ, Σ has ἠμίσυ Ἰδωσ.

17. ἴδωμεν = λέγων] This gerundive use of infinitive is frequent
10. άλλως = ἐν Πνεύματι. Σ, ἄλλως. S (with Psh.) prefers stat. absol. in rendering anarthrous nouns: Σ (with Hkl.) indiscriminately uses emphat. άλλως. Σ, ἄλλως; but ἄλλος [marg. of άν, (prima manus)]. Note that Psh. writes as Σ, ἄλλος; Hkl., ἄλλος.

11. τις μέλλει = ἄτη. This pronoun so used (especially in plural) is characteristic of S; as likewise of Poc., and of Phx.: Σ (though here it has τις ἄλλος = ἄτη) habitually uses τις μέλλει or τις μέλλει; which are rare in S, but frequent in Hkl., and in Hxp.

So Σ n. Not preterite, but ἄτις ἀλλος, which Σ d l p give.

12. ἀλλάθει τέτοια ἐπιστρέφωσα . . . ἐπιστρέφωσα. S renders inconsistently here: Σ has ἀλλάθει in both cases (better). For ἐπιστρέφω (= ἐπιστρέφω, transitive) see xi. 6. Cp. Mt. xii. 44, Lk. i. 56, &c. (Psh. and Hkl.), and 2 Pet. ii. 21, 22 (Poc. and Hkl.), where it = ἐπιστρέφω, intrans., as here; also Esai. xlv. 13 (Phx. and Hxp.). For ἀλλάθει in this sense, see Job xxiii. 9 (Psh.); xxx. 15 (Hxp., = ἐπιστρέφομαι, LXX); Lk. ii. 43 (Hkl., = ἐπιστρέφω): it usually = περιβάλλω (see iii. 5 infr.).

ἐπιστρέφω = εἰδέναι (for βλέπειν). Σ renders ἐπιστρέφω, literally.

Not as Σ with prefix ἁ; see note on verse 3, and cp. 20.

13. τις μέλλει = ἄτις. Σ, τις μέλλει, here and elsewhere (but see note on verse 7), as Hkl. usually.

λυχνίας = λυχνίας. Note the stat. absol. (after cardinal number; but cp. verse 20 (bis), ii. 1); also xi. 4; a form not found in Psh., nor recorded in Thesaur. Syr.: but for τῶν λυχνίαν (verse 13) ἄλλος; and so verse 20 (bis), ii. 1. Σ has ἄλλος throughout.

14. ἄλλος προφ. [Lit., ὁς ὁμοίωμα (with gen.),—for ὁμοίωμα (with dat.)] cp. Ezek. i. 5, 22, 26, x. 1, (Psh. and Hxp.). So S in most cases, or without ἄλλος, or with ἄλλος, or with ἄν or ἄλλος instead (i. 15, iv. 7, ix. 7). Σ renders exactly, ἄλλος, here and usually, as Psh. N.T., and Hkl.; but sometimes as S (e.g. ix. 7, but see note there). S also (see iv. 3) uses ἄλλος (stat. constr.) without ἄν or ἄλλος (cp. Lk. iii. 22, Psh., not Hkl.): again (iv. 6) ἄλλος ἄλλος ἄλλος; again, sometimes as Σ. See iv. 7 for variety of rendering.

ἐξ τοῦ αἰῶνα τῶν αἰώνων = εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων] So Σ [d; but l p point both words as pl.]. Elsewhere Σ always renders this phrase by ἐπεμέλεια (as Psh.); Σ usually as here (as also Hkl.).

7. ἔρματοι = ὁμονεῖοι] So Σ: nowhere else in S, which uses ἔρματοι, for ὁμονεῖοι: Σ usually gives ἔρματοι ὁμονεῖοι when the antecedent denotes persons. So Hkl., Act. ix. 35.

κατὰ ἄδειαν] Cp. Psh., and Hxp. [Aquila and Theodot.], in Zech. xii. 10 (the passage here followed); also Psh. and Hkl. in Joh. xix. 37 (Zech. quoted), for ἀνεμός; in Mt. xi. 17, for ἀνεμός.

κατὰ ἄδεια] So Σ [n, which begins here; but ἂν, d l p].

8. ἐπεμέλεια] Note that here, and in the parallel, verse 17, S and Σ express the substantive verb; but Σ only (not S) in xxi. 6, xxi. 13.

Σ ομ. prefix.

9. In this verse occur the first substantial differences between S and Σ, both as to underlying Greek text, and as to rendering.

κροκό πατὸς = κροκό πατὸς ὑπὸν: Σ, κροκό πατὸς = κροκό πατὸς ὑπὸν. Here (i) the rendering of S is more idiomatic: cp. (in Psh.) for like renderings of Greek compounds of σύν, Lk. i. 58 (συγγενάς); Act. xiii. 1 (σύντροφος); Phil. iv. 3 (σύνυγος). It seems, however, that κροκό πατὸς ὑπὸν would be more consistent with analogy. (ii) Apparently Σ read κοινωνός (with many mm.), for συγκρ. of S;—cp. Adler, N. T. Versiones Syr., p. 78, on the lack (as he wrongly supposes) of "Harkleian accuracy" in this. (iii) S and Σ agree, against all else, in inserting ὑπὸν.

κατὰ ἃτελέως] S is supported by Σ d l p, against all or nearly all else, in omitting ὑπὸν after this word; but as n ins. it, it ought no doubt to be restored to the text of Σ. See note on Greek text.

κατὰ ἃτελέως = τῇ ἐν ἱησοῦ] Σ agrees (against all else) in the former prefix: but differs in supporting the addition Xρος."
NOTES.

2.  ἔμπροσθεν [Σ, ἔμπροσθεν].

τῷ ἐπεφάνετο = ὄστεα] So Σ [ὅτε οὖν; but ὅ with ο before ἔλεος, which word ο̣ om.]. For this rendering, not elsewhere used in S (yet see ii. 24), cp. Σ, ii. 24, xiii. 15, &c.; and Hkl., Mt. vii. 12, Act. iv. 28.

3. ἀπὸ ἅχταλης = μακάρως] So Σ uniformly (as Hkl.): nowhere else in S; see on xiv. 13, and cp. xx. 6.

Note that it is not the usage of S to prefix Ἀ to the object (other than a person) of ἀποκρίνεται; but in Σ, as in Hkl., it is employed indiscriminately: after ἔρπην, it is seldom if ever used in S, but usually in Σ (as sometimes in Hkl.). Cp. the parallel verses, xxii. 7, 9, 18, (S and Σ).

In general, the use of Ἀ as prefix of the object is habitual in Σ (as in Hkl.), exceptional in S (as in Psh.).

ἀπὸ ἃ ἡμῶν = ὃ γὰρ καταφέρσῃ] Pron. for art.; similarly verse 5 (τερ): usual in Σ and Hkl., but rare in S and Poc., as in Psh. Cp. the parallels (to this verse) in xxii. 10; and (to verse 5) iii. 14.

4. ἀρέσκει = ἐρήμη] Cp. vi. 4 (the only other occurrence of ἐρήμη in Apoc.), where Σ renders as here, but S has ἀρέσκεται. The latter is usually found in Psh., and also uniformly in Poc.: the former in Hkl. Similarly, in Phx. we find ἀρέσκεται for ἐρήμη everywhere, while Hkl. has ἀρέσκει.

ἀπὸ] Note that here, and in verse 8, this equivalent for ὅ is prefixed, as in Σ, to every member of the sentence; whereas in the parallel passage, iv. 8, S prefixes it only to the first, Σ (as here) to each of the three. Cp. also xi. 17, xvi. 5.

ἀπὸ] Σ om. prefix here: also before ἀποκρίνεται, verse 7.

5. ἀρέσκει] Nowhere else in S: in Σ, only vi. 15 [Ἰν; but not ὅτε], in which place S has ἀρεσκεῖ, which, conversely, Σ gives here; (note that ἀρέσκεται of x. 11 is a misreading, [of Σ Ἰ, alone]). In Psh. N.T., only Lk. xviii. 18; but frequent in Hkl., Hxh., and Phx.

ἀπὸ ... ἀρέσκεται ἀπὸ] S and Σ here agree against the other authorities, translating as if the Greek were ὅ ἄγαπων ... καὶ λόγων, (for dat.).

ἀπὸ] Σ points ἀπὸ.

6. ἀπὸ = ἱππᾶν] Or ἱππατεῖται. So Σ. Here again S and Σ agree against all else, which read ἱππεῖς or ἱππατεῖται. The adj. ἀπὸ does not occur in Psh., O. or N. T.: but in Hkl. is found = ἱππᾶς, 1 Cor.
NOTES.

SUPERSCRIPTON.

A heading almost identical with this is prefixed to Σ [fpl; but not d; n has lost its first leaf]; but it omits ραις, and substitutes ροις for ροις, ροις, ροις before δαι [sic].

Cp. verse 9. Σ writes ρ after ρ.

The point over ι is omitted in Ms.

So Σ [fpl; but ρ ι ρ ι].

So Σ [fpl; but ρ ι ρ ι].

I. 1–8. Note that the text of these eight verses is substantially (in verses 1, 3, and 6, absolutely) identical with that of Σ. On the one hand, it shows peculiarities of that version foreign from the usage of S elsewhere; on the other, the differences between the two texts, whether as to diction, or as to the underlying Greek, are few and trivial, such as are to be expected in two independent copies of the same text. See following notes for details. Probably the scribe of our Ms. had before him an exemplar which had lost its first leaf, and borrowed these verses, and the heading, from a copy of Σ.

1. Cp. this verse with its parallel, xxii. 6, on the following points:—

αἰτεῖν (ter)] This separate mode of rendering the possessive pronoun by αἰτεῖν with suffix, elsewhere exceptional in S (as in Psh. and Poc.), but habitual in Σ (as in Hkl.), is uniformly used in verses 1–8; and the proper rendering, by suffix alone, takes its place for the first time in verse 9.

Here and throughout the eight verses (see 2, 3, 4, 7), ἐρχεται, ἐρχεται, and ἐλευθεροῦνται are employed according to the usage of Σ (and Hkl.), where the usage of S would lead us to expect ἐρχεται (see note on verse 11), or ραίς (as xxii. 6).

Nowhere else in S (see on iv. 1): uniformly in Σ; frequently in Psh. and Hkl.
ABBREVIATIONS AND CONTRACTIONS USED IN THE FOLLOWING NOTES.

S, The Syriac Version of the Apocalypse, as printed in this book from the Crawford Ms.
Sn, (in chap. vii.) The fragment of same (chap. vii. 1–8), contained in the Nitrian Ms.,
Brit. Mus. Add. 17193, fo. 147v; for text of which see page 35.
Σ, The Syriac Version of the Apocalypse printed by De Dieu (1627), and in the Paris and
London Polyglots and subsequent editions of the Syriac New Testament. I have
used all the available authorities for this version, distinguishing them as follows:—
d, The Dublin Ms. (Trinity College, B. 5, 16, Ussher's), written A.D. 1625;
inedited; complete.
f, The Florence Ms. (Library of S. Marco), said to have been written 1582; now
missing, and only known in the fragment (superscription and chap. i. 1, 2)
printed by Adler, Versiones Syr., p. 78.
i, The Leyden Ms. (Cod. Scalig. 18), probably of late 16th century; the copy
whence De Dieu derived his text; complete.
n, The Nitrian Ms. (Brit. Mus. Add. 17127), written A.D. 1088; inedit;
has lost ff. 1 and 83, so that verses 1–6 of chap. i, and 6, 7 and part of 8, chap. xiv,
are wanting: text (mixed with Commentary) otherwise complete down to
xiv. 11, after which verse omissions occur, increasing so rapidly in frequency
and extent that of the last six chapters but fourteen verses in all are given.
f, The Paris Polyglot text, repeated by Walton; derived in whole or in part from
a Ms. or Mss. now unknown, but certainly distinct from all the above.

xi. 26 to end, Bessy's (1889).
Hxp. The Syro-Hexaplar (in some Books properly Syro-Tetraplar) Version of the Old
Testament (LXX).*
Phx. The fragmentary Version of Esaias (LXX), preserved in Brit. Mus. Add. 17106,
printed by Ceriani in Monumenta S. et P., tom. v. fasc. i.; supposed to be part
of the translation made in A.D. 508, by Polycarpus for Philoxenus of Mabug. It
includes only xxviii. 3–17, xliii. 17—xlix. 18, lxvi. 11–23.
Poc. The Version of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, first edited by Pococke, in 1630,
and printed in the Polyglots, &c.
Peh. The Peshitto Version, of Old and New Testaments.†
The appended initials, A. E. J., H. J. L., distinguish the Notes suggested by the Rev.
A. E. Johnston and the Rev. H. J. Lawlor, respectively.

* For the earlier Books extant of this Version, I have used the printed texts of Ceriani (Genesia; 1863);
Lagarde (Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, 3 and 4 Kings; 1880: also the posthumous reissue of the same, with Genesis,
Judges, and Ruth, by Rahlfs, 1892; and 1 [2] Exodus; 1861), and Skt-Böradam (Judges and Ruth; 1861): for
the rest, Ceriani's photographic facsimile edition of the Ambrosian Ms., C. 313 isf.; testing by it the printed texts
of Bugatti (Daniel and Psalms; 1788 and 1820), Norberg (Jeremiah and Ezekiel; 1787), and Middendorpf (remaining
Prophets, Job, and Solomon; 1835).
† I have used Walton's Polyglot, and Lee's editions; and (for N.T.) Schaaf's, with occasional reference to
Widmannstäd't.
APPENDIX.

The following is a fragment of the version above printed, contained in the Ms. Add. 17193 (British Museum), in which it is No. 34. See Wright's Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 992.

Fo. 14°, line 12.

VII.

...
APPENDIX AND NOTES.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يُلمح إلى محتوى محدد في النص. النص يتضمن جمل متشابكة وصوياً، لذا لا يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي.
[This and the ensuing pages of the MS. contain
the rest of the New Testament, ending with the
Epistle to the Hebrews, of which the latter part is
wanting, two leaves having disappeared. The last
leaf of the MS., however, is preserved, and is occupied
by—(r), an enumeration of the sections, canons, &c.,
of the whole Book; and (v), the scribe's concluding
note. These are as follows:—]
[This space in the MS. contains the opening words of the Acts, with superscription.]
هل دخلت إلى بسماضه؟
فضح، محاسبته وسلمه.
ومظفره بما يرامه.
وجزاه بما أرسله.
فدخلت بهما بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
فسبح بسماضه.
متفكرو مقسمة مقتله، مستعدون، مقتبل بمقابل.
سلسله ملحوظ، مطلأ.
مذلول، مجنون، نعمه.
أدرك مجنونه، نعمه.
و سلمه فلمداخله.
وقبلهم سلم دابة، سلم.
ثكد أهله، فقدل.
تعد أعمال، فقدل.
أدرك مجنونه، نعمه.
لمضمون حكمة لل migli.
أدرك مجنونه، نعمه.
لمضمون حكمة لل migli.
أدرك مجنونه، نعمه.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا تجد له محبة. فهذا من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
لم يجد محبة من أحرار عصره.
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لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
سماحة سماحة، خيلين
 الشرق والغربي، ينحو لـ
 تعيين معاً، في الحرم
 الحرم سماحة. سماحة
 حريصون على العقليه.

Susan, Susan, خليين
 الشرق والغربي، ينحو لـ
 تعيين معاً، في الحرم
 الحرم سماحة. سماحة
 حريصون على العقليه.
سماه به، فَضَقَّهَا لِلْعَلَّم،
دَعَاهُ لِلْعَلَّم
حَدَّ فَسَقَفَهُ قَلَمًا مَّلِئًا،
فَلَمۡ يَجِدَ لِلْعَلَّمِ لَهُ مَهَامًا.
مُّكَلَّفًا لِلْعَلَّمِ،
۱۰۰۰۰ مُّكَلَّفًا لِلْعَلَّمِ.
۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱۱
لمعلمة تحمض. سناة
ملحمة هلالٍ. بعيد لتمٌّ
لحمه حمل ندم. جنَّ
سادة لسبهانٌ ملهمٌ
outilموه حمله قعدة.
تقمَّر لسلاك السفاح.
سيمٌّ هلالهن سبحة.
كتمٌّ هو سبأٌ. يبنُه.
سياحته حمله مستقبلي.
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سلمٌّ تحمض. سناة
هللها هلالٍ. بعيد لتمٌّ
لحمه حمل ندم. جنَّ
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سلمٌّ تحمض. سناة
هللها هلالٍ. بعيد لتمٌّ
لحمه حمل ندم. جنَّ
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خليج فتحًا جمعه
ويلظه لبسفة نارزة نارزة
لسر مغامرة بنكطم نسبة
لما نبرز حكم له ذلك تمس
لولبه تمسكة. مسحة
عند ذلك بعبدو له
لولبه تمسكة. هيذال
مازته: حذرت مصطفى:
مشتهراً. مصطفى:
لديه تمسكة. دَبْنَيَت
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنة. الجبنة
لولا الجبنت
لمع مسماءه معمد.

فَمَرَّتْ خِزَّةُ نَبِيٌّ نَبِيٌّ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُحَجَّرٍ حَجَّرَهُ,

فَهُوَ لَحَدَّ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ. مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُحَجَّرٍ حَجَّرَهُ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.
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مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.

مَعْلُولَةَ لَحْدَ مُجْرَمٍ مُجْرَمَ.
للحنين، للحنين، للحنين، للحنين.

للمثال، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

للمثال، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

للمثال، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

للمثال، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

ليس لحnums، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

ليس لحnums، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

ليست لحnums، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

ليست لحnums، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

لمعنى، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

لمعنى، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

لمعنى، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

لمعنى، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.

لمعنى، للمثال، للمثال، للمثال.
مراجع.

"هذا النص غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي. يحتمل أن يكون نصًا مكتوبًا بشكل غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي."
ص. 1—8.

فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى.
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى.
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى،
فَكَرَ مَالَكُ مَالَكَهُ الْعَالَمَةُ عَانَى.
لم تسمح لنا، هكذا قالت.

18 لم تعلم، لم تعلم، هكذا قالت.

19 بما كنت تعلم، هكذا قالت.

20 جنحت، هكذا قالت.

21 هكذا قالت:

22 سلم الله عليه:

23 لم يجد، هكذا قالت.

24 لم تسمح، هكذا قالت.

25 لما أحب، هكذا قالت.

26 لما أحب، هكذا قالت:

27 سلم الله عليه:

28 لم تفعل، هكذا قالت:

29 لما أحب، هكذا قالت:

30 لما أحب، هكذا قالت:

31 لما أحب، هكذا قالت.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.

صلى الله علیه وسلم

الله جل جلاله
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۱۱. ۱۱-۱۸

۱۱. ۳

۱۱. ۵-۱۱
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة بشكل طبيعي.
الصباح

وداعاً يا سمك علبة

حيلة
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