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It has long been a current statement in works on the criticism of the New Testament, that Archbishop Ussher possessed a MS. unique in containing the entire New Testament in Syriac. The existence of such a MS. has been asserted, and its loss lamented, by several successive biblical scholars. Bishop Marsh seems to have led the way, in the notes to his translation of J. D. Michaelis's *Introduction* (1793). He cites (vol. ii., p. 544) from the London Polyglott (tom. v., p. 440) a note, in which Walton acknowledges his obligation to Ussher's "*instructissima bibliotheca*" for the Syriac text of the passage known as the *Pericope de Adultera* (John vii. 53—viii. 11); but adds the remark—"Since that time [1657] no one has ever heard of this MS. of Archbishop Ussher, nor is it enumerated in the catalogue of Ussher's MSS. in the *Catalogus MSS. Angl. & Hib.*" In quite recent times, Dr. Tregelles, both in his *Introduction* (1860), and in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1863, vol. iii., Art. Versions, Ancient Syriac), has pointed out that De Dieu of Leyden, twenty-six years before Walton, had printed the same passage of St. John, and had referred likewise to Ussher's MS. as its source. "It appears (he says, *Intro.*, p. 282) from De Dieu that Archbishop Ussher sent him a Syriac MS. containing *all* that is deficient in the Peshitto." And again (p. 284): "If the MS. which De Dieu received from Ussher could be traced and discovered, it would be of considerable value in relation to the question of the authorship of the supplementary parts of the Syriac Version, as it seems to be the *only* copy of which we have any
knowledge which contains every part of the N. T. in Syriac.” And so lately as 1883, Dr. Scrivener has written to the like effect in the last edition of his invaluable Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T. (p. 315).

I propose, accordingly, to trace the MS. in question; and to show that it is not lost, but is and has been for more than 200 years in the possession of Trinity College, Dublin; and farther, that its contents have been misdescribed in such a manner as to have hitherto prevented its identification, and caused it to be overlooked.

The MS. which I thus identify as that which De Dieu and Walton have referred to, is catalogued as B. 5. 16. Its bulk is inconsiderable, and it can claim no venerable antiquity. It is a small quarto, written on paper; its age is little more than two centuries and a-half; and its present binding (dating, I am told, about 1820) gives it quite a modern appearance. But I hope to show that its history and contents are sufficiently interesting to warrant me in inviting attention to the account of it which I now proceed to give.

It is written entirely in the Syriac language, in the cursive character usually found in Syriac printed books and in MSS. of recent date, often called Maronite. It consists of two distinct divisions, of which the first is exclusively biblical, containing not by any means the whole N. T., but only the following portions of it:—(1) The Pericope de Adultera; (2) the Four Minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, and Jude); (3) the Apocalypse. The second division contains a tractate of Ephraim Syrus, ‘On the Love of Wisdom and Knowledge.’ It is with the first of these two divisions that I am about to occupy the space at my disposal: a few words will convey all that I have at present to say about the second.

The principle of association on which the six portions of Scripture which I have mentioned are here brought together, is evident on the face of it. They are, as is well known, the portions of the N. T. which are not contained in the ancient Peshitto, the Syriac Vulgate.

When the Syriac N. T. was sent to Europe by Ignatius, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, about the middle of the sixteenth century (1552), and first printed at Vienna (1555) under the auspices of the Emperor Ferdinand, these deficiencies were at once noticed. Widmanstadt, the editor, apologizes
for them in two notes, prefixed to the Gospels and to the Catholic Epistles severally; and in the subjoined Epistle to Georgius Gienger and Jacobus Jonas he affirms that the portions in question are extant in Syriac, and that Moses of Marden, the agent whom Ignatius had commissioned to procure the printing of the Syriac text, had gone back to his native Mesopotamia, and would bring copies of them with him on his return thence. It is now admitted on all hands that the Peshitto (from whatever cause) never included these parts of the N. T. as it is usually received in the West. But it seems that Widmanstadt, and the scholars of the sixteenth and even of the following century, attributed the absence of them from his edition to the defectiveness of the Patriarch's MS. Accordingly we find that our own illustrious Ussher, when he began to collect MSS. of Oriental versions of the Scriptures, before the first quarter of the seventeenth century was completed, had instructed an agent in the East to procure for him a Syriac version of the missing portions of the N. T. None of Ussher's letters to this person (Thomas Davies, a British merchant at Aleppo) is preserved; but the purport of the instructions given may be gathered from Davies' replies, six of which are printed in Parr's Life of Ussher, and reprinted in Elrington's (Letters 71, 73, 90, 102, 116, 125), together with two which had escaped Parr (388 and 401). The first of this series, dated August 29, 1624, acknowledges one from Ussher, which apparently conveyed his first directions concerning the purchase of Syriac and other MSS. Davies' subsequent letters relate his successes and failures, the difficulties and delays that hindered the execution of his commission: and so early as January 1628, he writes as follows:—"Those parcels of the N. T., viz., the History of the Adulterous Woman, the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle of Jude, with the book of the Revelation, I have procured, and sent them, together with the five books of Moses, and a small tract of Ephraim, by the ship Patience of London" (Letter 102). In this passage (it is to be observed) the mention of "the five books of Moses" is to be read parenthetically, for they have been described just before as a distinct purchase. In another letter (90), which, though it stands before the one I have quoted, I shall presently show (p. 281) by internal evidence to be misplaced, and to belong to the latter half of 1626,
Davies inquires whether "the five books of Moses, with those parcels of the N. T. (which your Lordship writ for) in the Chaldean tongue, sent you ten months ago," had come safely to hand? In the former letter he had explained that he uses the words "Chaldean" and "Syrian" as synonymous. I may remark, in passing, that in those days letters from Aleppo were often six, and apparently never less than four, months in reaching Ireland. In this case the books sent in January seem to have been received in June, 1626, by Ussher, who was then in London. He writes thence on the 23rd of that month to Dr. Ward at Oxford (Letter 110), to inform him that he had "received out of Mesopotamia an old MS. of the Syrian translation of the Pentateuch"; and also had "received" (but he does not state from what source) "the parcels of the N. T. which hitherto we have wanted in that language (viz., the History of the Adulterous Woman, the 2nd Epistle of Peter, the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of St. John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelation); as also a small tractate of Ephraim Syrus in his own language." Here it is to be observed that the tractate of Ephraim is again associated with the "parcels of the N. T." References to this MS. recur in his correspondence; but one only need be cited: it is in a letter (154) to De Dieu of Leyden, dated October 1, 1629. This eminent scholar had forestalled him, as regards one important part of his acquisition, by publishing, in 1627, the Revelation in Syriac from a MS. in the University Library of Leyden. Ussher accordingly, in the letter referred to, compliments him on his publication, and informs him that he had diligently compared it with his own MS. Just about the time when Ussher was writing thus to De Dieu, another noted Orientalist, Edward Pococke, who had found in the Bodleian Library a MS. of the Syriac text of the Four Epistles I have mentioned, was completing at Oxford his edition of them, which he soon after entrusted to De Dieu, under whose superintendence it was published at Leyden in 1630. Thus the MS. sent by Davies to Ussher was not collated in time to serve as basis for the text of these Epistles or of the Apocalypse; and the only new biblical matter that remained for it to supply was the Syriac of the *Pericope de Adultera*. Accordingly, it appears that Ussher, shortly after the date of this letter, with a liberality that was characteristic of his generous nature, sent the MS. to De Dieu, who from it printed, in 1631, the *Pericope* in ques-
Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.
But in the latter work he betrays a misgiving as to the accuracy of this construction of De Dieu's words, by adding in a note the query, "Does this mean that it merely contained what was wanting previously, or the whole including such parts?" And he proceeds to adduce (but unfortunately from Todd's Life of Walton, vol. i., p. 194, not from either of the Lives of Usher, where he would have found the solution of his doubt) Usher's own description of his MS., in the letter (110) I have already cited, "I have received the parcels of the N. T. which hitherto we have wanted in that [Syriac] language." Here the word "parcels" obviously indicates a collection of separate portions, not a continuous whole: but Tregelles prefers to abide by his misinterpretation of the sentence, and to wrest it into meaning an entire N. T.,* on the ground that "it seems strange if this section of St. John stood alone." It will presently appear how much misapprehension is involved in these words: for the present it suffices to point out that they are refuted by the first page of the MS. actually before us, in which that section does "stand alone."

I assume then, as the result of the evidence adduced, that the MS.

* I may here state that no MS. of the whole N. T. in Syriac is now known to exist. The famous copy in the Cambridge University Library (0o, 1, 2) gives the Peshito complete, with the Four Minor Epistles subjoined in the ante-Harklesian version, but lacks the Apocalypse; as does also the recent important acquisition of the same Library (Add. 1700), which gives all the other N. T. books in the Harklesian version, and adds the First and (so-called) Second Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Catholic Epistles. The MS. No. 184 in the Library of the Seminary of Remonstrants, Amsterdam, of A. D. 1470, seems to have originally contained the N. T. minus the Apocalypse: but to the Four Epistles (which like 0o, 1, 2, it gives in the older version) it appends two attributed to the same Clement, On Virginity, which were published by Wetstein from this MS. in 1782. (See Bp. Lightfoot's Clement of Rome, pp. 16, 288; Beelen, S. Clem. R. Ep. de Virginitate, Prolegg., pp. x, xiii, xvii; and Wetstein, Due Epp. S. Clem. R., Prolegg.). For this MS. see farther, note below, p. 813. Ridley's two MSS. (New Coll. Oxon. 883, 884) are described below, pp. 289, 804. I find only one record of the existence of a complete MS. Syriac N. T., as follows:—"Novum Testamentum Syriacum Paulo V. tradidit correctum, Latinum quoque redditum, cum Apocalypsi tribus [?] que Epistolis, et Historia Adulterae, quae desiderantur in Bibliis Regius: Pontifex vero commisit hae omnia Card. Bellarmino" (Le Long, Biblioth. Sacra [Berner's ed., 1709], tom. 1., p. 184).
sought for is one not of the whole Syriac N. T., but only of the six portions specified, viz., the section John vii. 53–viii. 11, the four minor Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse. And without going farther, I might already fairly claim to have made out a strong case for identifying the Trinity College MS. before us as the missing MS. It contains exactly these six portions of the N. T., and no others. No second MS. answering the description is known to exist, or has ever been recorded as existing, in any British Library; nor I believe in any Library elsewhere—* certainly not in that of the University of Leyden. No writer on the Syriac N. T. has described any such MS. It was unique, so far as our information extends, as regards the combination of its contents, among the MSS. brought from the East up to and in Ussher’s time: as in our own time the Trinity College MS. is in like manner unique among Syriac MSS. known to scholars. And if the combination of these six portions were arbitrary as well as unique, I might regard the identification as sufficiently proved, and close here. But the combination, as I have pointed out, so far from being arbitrary, rests on a very obvious ground of association. It must be admitted as not improbable that some other seventeenth-century scholar as well as Ussher may have sought and obtained a copy of the portions of the Syriac N. T. not given in the then printed editions. And it may be suggested that Ussher’s MS. may have been lost in the many removals of his library between the years 1641, when it was in the siege of Drogheda, and 1661, in which year it became the property of Trinity College:† or, as Tregelles supposed, it may have been retained by De Dieu, and may now be lying hid somewhere in Holland. And the MS. before us may have been acquired by the College otherwise; e.g., as one of the gifts of Provost Huntingdon in the latter years of the century (1683–92), who was a great Orientalist, and might have procured the MS. while he was British Chaplain at Aleppo, 1671–1682. But there are many considerations to be taken into account against such hypotheses. It is unreasonable to imagine a possible MS. acquired by some

* The nearest approach to it that I can find is the MS. noted xxxi. in the Catalogue Biblioth. Reg. (Paris, 1789). But though its contents otherwise agree with the description, the Apocalypse is not among them.

† Journal of the Irish House of Commons, May 81, 1661.
other collector and given to the College, when it is certain that a MS. exactly corresponding with that which the College actually possesses was in Ussher's collection. The list of Ussher's MSS. as made over to the College is not in existence, so far as I know; but the alphabetical Catalogue of MSS. written in 1688 mentions this MS. (as noted A. 4), and states its contents accurately. This is the earliest dated evidence of its existence in the Library; but a local Catalogue,* apparently older, mentions it likewise. Neither of these Catalogues marks it as Ussher's, nor does the MS. itself contain his signature or any notes identifiable as written by him. But prima facie the presumption is, that any MS. not expressly noted as having come into the College Library from some other quarter came from Ussher. And it is noteworthy that these earliest Catalogues associate with it (then A. 4), as standing on the same shelf A, three other MSS. (A. 5, A. 6, and A. 11), two of them immediately beside it—all of which are still in the Library: all exactly similar to it in form, size, paper, and every other respect; all written, as the very marked handwriting shows, by the same Syrian scribe; and all bearing the inscription "Jacobi Armachani" in the great Primate's autograph. I may here mention that it is recorded twice over as A. 4 in the printed list of Usserian MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, in the Catalogus MSS. Angliae & Hiberniae (1697), but in such wise that Marsh deserves no blame for failing (see p. 269) to find it—first under Ephraim, then under Historia [Adulteræ]! Again, the Trinity College MS. is dated; and its date, November, 1625, as given in the colophon at the end of St. Jude, suits Ussher's MS. well, if we suppose it to have been, as it probably was, a transcript made to Davies' order, and newly completed when he sent it in January, 1626. But into the question of these dates I shall have to go more fully just now. The facts I have brought together so far, form a body of evidence whose cumulative force I believe it would be hard to resist, even if the six "parcels of the N. T." (as Davies and Ussher call them) were all we had to go on in claiming for the MS. before us that it is the identical copy procured by Davies for Ussher, and sent by Ussher to De Dieu. But farther: with those N. T. "parcels" there was forwarded by

* These Catalogues are D. 1. 6 and D. 1. 7 in the Catalogue of MSS., T.C.D. See also D. 1. 8.
Davies, as he twice states, a Tractate of Ephraim; which statement Ussher confirms. Whether it was separate or not when so forwarded does not appear; but it is certain that when the N. T. "parcels" reached De Dieu it was bound with them so as to form one book. His words as I have cited them make this plain; and also inform us that the tract was entitled "On the Love of Wisdom." Now the MS. before us contains, and the Catalogues prove that at least as early as 1688 it contained, with the biblical matter already specified, a Tractate of the same author, bearing the same title, of which no other copy is anywhere recorded. In view of this fact the proof becomes irresistible. That after the arrival of Ussher's MS. in 1626 a second Syriac MS. should have been imported into Ireland before 1688, containing exactly the same six portions of Scripture, is, as I have admitted (however improbable), a tenable supposition, because a definite reason is assignable why those six portions should be associated. But that two MSS. so imported should agree in subjoining to those six portions the same tract of Ephraim—a tract which as it stands in the T. C. D. copy is unique, and moreover bears no imaginable relation to the biblical matter which precedes—is incredible. I conclude therefore with confidence that this T. C. D. MS., B. 5. 16, is no other than the MS. procured by Davies, possessed by Ussher, and used by De Dieu.

Further proof may well seem superfluous; yet it may be worth while to test this conclusion by comparing the text of the Pericope de Adultera as contained in this MS. with that printed by De Dieu from the MS. sent by Ussher. I find the two texts to agree verbatim et literatim—a fact of weight, for every other existing copy of this passage in Syriac varies more or less from the printed text, and they all vary inter se. This agreement extends even to the heading of the section, which is in the MS. as in De Dieu's text and Walton's, "The Lesson which is concerning the sinful woman, which is not in the Peshitto" (ךפ nuclei אֶּלֶּה הַגַּם הַגַּם שֶּׁלֶשֶׁת בָּלַעְשָׁתָה). And also to the words supplied at the end of the passage to join it on to the next verse (John viii. 12), "When therefore they were assembled together, Jesus spake, saying, I am the light of the world, et cetera" (ךפ nuclei אֶּלֶּה הַגַּמְּלִית הַגַּמְּלִית שֶּׁלֶשֶׁת בָּלַעְשָׁתָה). Again, the
vowel signs and diacritic points agree almost as perfectly as the conso-
nants; and this is not a necessary agreement, for the writer of the MS., as
is usual with Syrian scribes, inserts the vowels not uniformly, as in Hebrew,
but at his discretion, only where they seemed needed to prevent mistake.
There are little more than thirty vowels in the passage as it stands in the
MS. The printed text inserts none which is not in the MS., and omits but
three of those which the MS. inserts. Nor is this all. The writer of the MS.
enjoys indifferently (according to the usual practice) the two equivalent
sets of vowel signs, the Syriac (combinations of points), and the Greek
(letters borrowed from the Greek alphabet). The printed text reproduces
these faithfully—Greek letter for Greek letter, Syrian point for Syrian
point. Now, inasmuch as the equivalence of these two forms of vocalization
is absolute, so that the employment of this or that sign for any given vowel
is in every case purely arbitrary, this coincidence of usage between the MS.
and the printed text, complete and without exception as I find it to be,
cannot be the result of chance, and would alone suffice to identify the MS.
as the basis of De Dieu's text. Yet again, one contracted word only
(ver. 7, ẓām) appears in the MS.; the same word and no other is found
contracted on De Dieu's page. And finally, one clear mistake only is to be
laid to the scribe's charge—the omission of a word from verse 11. This
mistake is not indeed reproduced in the printed text, but it is sharply chal-
lenged by De Dieu, who corrects it by supplying between brackets the
much-needed negative [?] in the closing sentence, "Go and sin no more."
These brackets are perpetuated in Walton's Polyglott, where they are a
standing witness to the claim of our MS. to be the source of Walton's text
as of De Dieu's before it. It is to be added that this MS. has the undesir-
able distinction (analogous to that possessed by the "wicked" Bible) of
being the only one to omit this negative, which is duly given by the other
Syriac copies of the passage. Were it otherwise, one might naturally con-
clude that the ground of the omission of this much-disputed narrative from
the Syriac N. T. was a well-founded objection to the precept, as our MS.
gives it, "Go and sin more"!

Such, then, are the results of the comparison of the written with the
printed text. The internal evidence thus obtained is at least as convincing
as the external evidence already adduced. It is not too much to say, that even if this MS. came before us without a particle of the ample external attestation I have produced, we should be obliged to admit its identity with that from which De Dieu derived his text, as proved to demonstration.

I know of but two difficulties that remain in the way of this conclusion, now that the difficulty arising from the misdescription of Ussher’s MS. has been removed. One, as I have said, has been raised by Tregelles. De Dieu, in his profuse acknowledgments of Ussher’s benefits, appears to speak of the MS. as given by Ussher to him: and Tregelles accordingly writes, “The MS. itself had been sent as a present to De Dieu” (Introduct., p. 284; Dict., p. 1636). But a careful reading of De Dieu’s words dispels this misconception. He first expresses his gratitude for the gift of a Samaritan Pentateuch; and then for other favours which he clearly distinguishes from it as being loans. As regards the former, he describes himself as being “amplissimo munere beatus”; as regards the MS. containing the six N.T. portions and the Tractate of Ephraim, and many other MSS. which he enumerates, he uses the verbs “mittere,” “transmittere,” merely. It is unlikely on the face of it that even Ussher, generous as he was, would give away a MS. which he so highly prized, and whose contents were so rare, in part unique. In point of fact, while his letters show unbounded liberality in lending* even

* E.g., to Selden several books (letter 98); to Const. L’Empéreur (a stranger to him) his MS. of the Horren Mysteriorum of Gregory Barhebræus (192, 196); to Arnold Boate, his MS. of the Catena in Evang. of Dionysius Barsalbaeus (218). The last was duly returned, and is now in T.C.D. Library (B. 2. 9): from it Dudley Loftus published in 1672 his Exposition of Dionysius Syrus on St. Mark, and in 1695 his similar volume on St. Matthew. It is evident that foreign scholars, even with no plea of personal acquaintance, freely applied to him for such loans in confident expectation of a favourable response. Much light is thrown by these letters, and others that follow them, on the generous character of Ussher, on his relations with contemporary men of learning in England and abroad, and on the arrangements for the interchange of letters and packets between England and foreign countries in his time. Thus, in 1692, we find him taking an opportunity of sending his Syriac Pentateuch to De Dieu by the hands of Frey, the travelling tutor of Viscount Dungarvan, eldest son of the Earl of Cork (then one of the Lords Justices of Ireland), who was at that time setting out from Dublin to make the “grand tour” (Letter 184: see also 189). Other like instances occur in the correspondence. More regular means of transmission, through Dutch merchants and their London and Dublin correspondents, are indicated in Letter 184.

2 T2
to strangers whatever treasures his library contained, I find no instance of his giving away any MSS. except those of which (as of the Samaritan Pentateuch) he possessed duplicates. Moreover, I have traced some of the other MSS. which De Dieu mentions as “sent” or “transmitted” to him by Ussher, and I can prove that they were returned to their owner. Three are stated by De Dieu to have contained selections from Ephraim Syrus: these are mentioned by Ussher also (Letter 188) as sent by him to De Dieu; and one at least of them is identified, by his enumeration of its contents, with a MS. which I have already mentioned (p. 276) as being now in T. C. D. Library and bearing Ussher’s autograph, formerly catalogued as A. 11 (now B. 5. 19). Another is the Syriac Pentateuch, already mentioned as sent by Davies along with our MS.; and a third is a Syriac Psalter. Both these Ussher reclaims as loans, writing to De Dieu in 1637 (Letter 210), “remittas Pentateuchum Syriacum et Psalterium que olim tibi commodavimus.” His intention then was to use them in printing the Old Testament in Syriac; but this he never carried out. He must, however, have got them back, for he lent them not long afterwards to Walton, who used them for the Syriac O. T. text of his Polyglott. They are now in the Bodleian (the Pentateuch being Bod. Or. 121, and the Psalter, Bod. Or. 51).† Indeed De Dieu himself, in the very page where Tregelles supposes him to speak of the MS. in question as a gift, proceeds to express himself in terms which proved that he regarded it and the rest as lent: exclaiming, “omnia haec MSS. . . . te in tam dissitas oras, per tot pericula, ad peregrinum hominem, dubius an unquam esses receptorus, transmisisse!” And there is no reason to doubt that he returned it and all the other MSS. to Ussher, as I have shown him to have done in the three cases which I have traced.

The other difficulty I have to notice arises out of the dates. I have said that the former division of our MS. is dated November 1625; I have to add

* Or triplicates: thus he gave Cotton a third copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, retaining one which is now, I believe, in the Bodleian (Letter 148; see Macray’s *Annals of the Bodleian*, p. 107; and cf. *Cat. MSS. Angl. and Hib.*, p. 186). Again, of his three copies of the Arabic Psalter he gave one to Laud; another, which he lent to Bedwell, seems to have been lost (Letter 184).

that the latter division is dated 1626 (no month). Now Davies' letter (102) states that he sent the MS. on or before 16th January 1625. So far all is consistent; for Davies no doubt followed the then English style, and his date is to be understood as 26th January 1626:* while the Syrian scribe (whom for the moment I assume to be a Maronite) would follow the Gregorian style (which was adopted in 1606 in the Maronite Church†), and reckon 1626 from 1st January. We have therefore only to suppose that the second division of the MS. was completed so early in January as to be ready to be placed in Davies' hands before the 26th.

But a doubt seems to be cast on this conclusion by a letter (90) which stands before this in Elrington's collection (as in Parr's), in which Davies inquires concerning the safe arrival of "the five books of Moses, with those parts of the N. T. which your Lordship writ for, . . . sent you ten months ago." This letter is dated July 1625, the day of the month not being specified. If this were correct, the MS. referred to must have been sent in the autumn of 1624, and therefore could not be ours, neither part of which was completed (see p. 276) before November 1625. But it is quite certain that this letter is misplaced, and that its date has been either misprinted or wrongly supplied by Parr's conjecture. For as it was written ten months after the sending of the MSS. specified, it must be nearly ten months later than the letter (102) written, as we have seen, in January 1626, which speaks of them as then just sent. And a comparison of the other contents of these two letters gives a like result. In Letter 102 Davies gives as "the news from Bagdat," which city was then in the hands of the Persians, that its siege by the Turkish Vizier was then in its third month. In Letter 90 he speaks of the siege as at an end, and relates how the Vizier had been forced to raise it at the end of eight months, and after several marches and disasters, had fallen back on Aleppo, and proposed to winter there.‡ I infer, therefore,

* The internal evidence of the letter proves that this is so: for it speaks of a letter, in answer to one of September 1624, as "received 8th of July past," which must mean July 1625.
† By the Patriarch, Joseph II. (Assemani, Bibl. Or. t., p. 558; quoting the Chron. of Steph. Edenensis).
‡ Cf. Bocault's Hist. of the Turkish Empire (1687), pp. 5, 6.
that this letter belongs to the autumn (probably October) of 1626. It is perhaps the letter "of the 20th October, per the ship Rainbow," mentioned in Davies' letter (388) of 13th March 1626. It is certainly prior, but not much prior, to Letter 116, written by Davies on the 14th November 1626 in reply to one in which Ussher, writing 31st July 1626, acknowledged the receipt of "the books sent by the ship Patience."

Thus the comparison of these letters, which at first sight seemed to cast a doubt on our MS., proves on examination to confirm the note of identity yielded by the dates. All the facts of the case fit in, when we assume that Ussher's MS. was a transcript made to Davies' order, in 1625 and the early days of 1626, and delivered to him by the scribe in time to be forwarded on the 26th of January of that year. The question is thus raised: Where was the MS. written? and the probability suggests itself that it was somewhere not very far from Aleppo. Now, three or four quarters are indicated in Davies' letters whence he hoped to procure MSS.: Jerusalem and Damascus, (but these, as it seems, for Samaritan MSS. only); Amid (Diarbekr) in Mesopotamia; and the Lebanon country. Amid seems too remote to be a probable source for our MS.,* and there remains therefore the Lebanon. This is the obvious quarter to look to for its origin, for the style of the writing seems to be Maronite. Besides, Davies' letters (see 71, 102, 90, 116, 388, 125) show that from 1624 he was for two or three years in active negotiation for MSS. with the Maronites of that region; and that there he procured the only other new transcript of any part of Scripture which he is known to have sent to Ussher—a copy of the Old Testament in Syriac, wanting only the Psalms. This copy was completed (Letter 125) on Davies' order, and forwarded more than two years after our MS., in 1628; its subsequent history is the same as that of the Syriac Pentateuch and Psalter I have already mentioned, and it is now with them in the Bodleian, bearing date 1627, and catalogued as Bod. Or. 151.† These facts suggested to me the idea that a comparison with this Bodleian MS. might lead to a

* Ussher seems (Letter 127) to speak of it as coming from Amid; but he is merely repeating the account given by Davies (102, 110), which really relates to the Pentateuch MS. only.

† Walton, ut supra (p. 280); Payne Smith, Cat. p. 280.
more definite conclusion with respect to the origin of ours. Accordingly I have taken the T. C. D. MS. to Oxford, and have placed the two side by side. The result is, as I anticipated, that ours proves to be written in the unmistakable hand of the scribe who wrote the earlier and greater part of the Bodleian O. T. In a colophon appended to the Book of Susanna he gives us all particulars of persons, place, and time, as follows, f. 3346: "Here ends this book by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year of Christ, 1627, in the month Thammuz [July], on the first day at the sixth hour, by the hands of a man sinful and vile, dust of the highways and dirt of the dunghill, the miserable Joseph, son of David, of the city beloved and blessed of Christ, Van of Mount Lebanon. It was written in the Monastery of Kenobin in the days of our venerable and blessed father Mar Peter, whose name is Mar John, Antiocchian Patriarch. . . ." This Joseph, then, was the scribe of both these MSS., and also of the other three in T. C. D. Library, which I have referred to (p. 276) as being in the same hand (B. 5.17, 18, 19; formerly A. 5, 6, 11). He is probably the person* whom Davies (Letter 90, cp. 116) "sent to Libanus to take a copy" of the "only one old copy of the O. T. extant" among the Syrians of those parts, which was "in the custody of the Patriarch of the Maronites, who hath his residence in Mount Libanus, which he may not part with on any terms; only there is liberty given to take copies thereof, which of a long time hath been promised me." In making this transcript of the O. T. he was assisted, as two entries in the MS. show (ff. 569b, 600b), by one Cyriacus, "Jacobite priest and monk," whose very different hand shows itself in a large part of the latter portion of it. The prelate named in Joseph's subscription is known as John XI. [Macluphius],† Maronite Patriarch 1609—1633; his other name, Peter, being that borne officially by all Patriarchs of this Church,‡ as that of

* The "minister of the sect of the Marronites, and by birth a Chaldean, but no scholar" (Letter 71), with whom Davies first tried to deal, seems to be a different person, and to have disappointed him (see 90).
† Le Quien, Oriens Christ., tom. iii., col. 68.
‡ Ib., 46, 65. The designation Antiochenus was given by the See of Rome to those Patriarchs, beginning (as it seems) from the time when Hieremias II. attended the Fourth Lateran Council (1215); see Le Quien, ib. 6, 41, 65. Syriac writers trace the title back to the time of Joannes Maro, circ. 700 (Steph. Edenens. ep. Assem. B. O. i., pp. 496—508).
Ignatius by the Jacobite Patriarchs. The monastery of Kenobin (= Κωνόβιον) was founded by Theodosius in the fourth century; and has been the seat of these Patriarchs since the time of John X., who died there in 1445. It has been visited and described by many travellers, who are eloquent in their admiration of the sublime beauty of its rock-hewn site on the western slope of Lebanon. In its library, then, was the original MS. of the Syriac O. T. which the Patriarch was bound (no doubt by an anathema inscribed in it, such as is often found in Syriac MSS.) not to sell, though he permitted the copy now in the Bodleian to be made from it:—and with it, no doubt, the originals of those "parcels of the N. T." which the T. C. D. MS. contains; and probably the originals likewise of the Tractate of Ephraim, and other like matter, which are found in the other MSS. written by the same Joseph. It may still retain these treasures, and others well worth looking after. Burckhardt indeed, writing in 1810, described it as being, when he visited it, empty of the books it once possessed: but Lord Lindsay (afterwards Earl of Crawford), twenty-seven years later, in 1837, saw several, both MSS. and printed, in the Church. He especially mentions one, a Syriac Bible (possibly the archetype of the Bodleian copy) kept apart in a chamber over the entrance gate, but so carelessly that, as he rode up, some leaves of it "flew out of the window and lighted at his feet." Possibly it may not yet be too late for some explorer to rescue what remains of these treasures, if their present guardians should prove to be as open to negotiation as the monks of the Nitrian Monastery, whence so rich a

* Apparently it contained also a copy of part at least of the Syro-Hexaplar O. T. version of Paul of Tella; for to this Bodleian O. T. are appended 1[3] Esdras and Tobit, both headed "according to the LXX." Of these, the latter has been shown by Dr. Ceriani (Le Versiones Siriacae, p. 22) to belong (in part) to that version, by comparison with the citations of Tobit, given by Andr. Masius (Syrorum Pecul.)) from his lost Syro-Hexaplar MS. I have in like manner identified this 1[3] Esdras as Syro-Hexaplar by means of one of the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum (Add. 12188), a Catena which among other extracts expressly described as from the version of Paul, gives the following portions of 1[3] Esdras:—ii. 1-16, 24, 26; iv. 88-40, 49-57; v. 47—vi. 2; vii. 6—viii. 29; viii. 69-78; viii. 98—ix. 10; ix. 46, 47—all of which agree with the text as first printed by Walton from Usn., i.e., Bod. Or. 151.

store of Syrian MSS. has within these last fifty years been acquired for the British Museum.*

I have thus traced the journeyings of our MS. from Kenobin on Mount Lebanon, by way of Aleppo, to Ireland, and thence to Leyden and back. It must have resumed its place among Ussher's books before his death, and have been seized with the rest by Cromwell, and deposited in Dublin Castle; and thence have been transferred, as part of that splendid collection, by order of the Irish House of Commons, May 1661, in the name of King Charles II., to its present and rightful abode in Trinity College. But an incidental question arises here, which needs a word in reply. Did our MS. ever come into Walton's hands? I am confident it did not. He refers to it, as I have said, for the Pericope de Adultera, but nowhere else. There is no trace of his using it for the text of the Epistles or of the Apocalypse: in fact the Syriac variae lectiones of his Polyglott (tom. vi., iii.), as collected for him from MSS. by Thorndike, relate to the O. T. only; while for the N. T. he was content to follow printed texts, chiefly that of the Paris Polyglott (ib. p. 50). The text of this Pericope (unless Ussher sent him a transcript of it from the MS.) he probably derived from De Dieu's, with which it agrees litteratim, even to the heading prefixed, and the bracketted [l]. No change is made except that the vowels are fully supplied, so as to correspond with the full vocalization adopted throughout Walton's N. T. text. Had the MS. before us been lent, as Ussher's other three MSS. which I have specified were lent, to Walton, it would not be now in Trinity College Library. Those three MSS., with others, after Ussher's death in 1656, remained with Walton. After Walton's death in 1661 they were treated as his (whether by right of purchase or by mistake); and when Walton's collection was sold in 1683,† they (three at least of them) were purchased.

* As an example of the reluctance of Syrian ecclesiastics to let the contents of their libraries be known, see the reply of the Maronite Patriarch, Stephen II. (Edenensis) to Huntington, in which, only fifty years after Davies obtained these transcripts for Ussher, he disclaims all knowledge of MSS. existing at Kenobin or elsewhere (Life, p. viii, prefixed to Smith's edition of Huntington's Epistolae, 1704).

† Todd's Life of Walton, i. 160.
by the University of Oxford.* Thus it appears that Trinity College owes acknowledgments to De Dieu, not only directly, as the honest restorer of the MS. he borrowed, but also indirectly, as the means of keeping it from passing, as all the other MSS. of Ussher's collection which are cited in Walton's Polyglott have passed into the Bodleian.

I proceed now to give a detailed account of the composition of the MS., and of its contents:

The sheets of paper (very thick, and smoothed so as to resemble parchment) of which it is made up are arranged in quires, mostly of five sheets, but occasionally of less. Thus, as the book now stands, its first quire has but four sheets, and likewise its last; while the first, or biblical, division of it ends with a half-quire of two sheets. The leaves bear no numbering, but the quires are numbered in the usual Syrian manner with Syriac letters, except two half-quires of inferior paper which have been inserted (apparently by the original Syrian binder) before and after the five quires which contain the Apocalypse. These five quires are numbered 1 to 5; while the quires which stand before them (containing the Pericope and the Four Epistles) are marked 6 and 7. It thus appears that the scribe originally arranged the seven quires which formed the first or biblical division of the MS., so that the Apocalypse should stand first, and that the Pericope with the Four Epistles should follow it. We cannot tell whether he had any precedent for disposing them in this order; for, as to these Epistles, the few Syriac MSS. which exhibit them as part of the N. T. place them variously; and as to the Apocalypse, we have, as will presently appear, no manuscript evidence at all of its place in the Syriac canon. But no doubt when he changed them into their present order he did so in order to adapt his work to the Western ideas of the purchaser. The rest of the book, i.e., the second division of it, containing Ephraim's Tractate, consists of four quires, which are numbered separately 1 to 4. In both parts the headings of the books, and also the appended subscriptions, are written in vermillion. In the punctuation also vermillion is used throughout: two red spots placed colonwise, with a black

spot between, serving for a colon or period; while paragraphs are divided by the usual lozenge of four red spots surrounding a black mark, usually an irregularly circular ring. These lozenges are uniformly used throughout the text of Ephraim, and pretty regularly in the Apocalypse; but in the two preceding quires but two occur—one in the middle of 2 Peter, one at the end of Jude. In the first division the vowels also are mostly given in vermilion, but some also in black; the latter no doubt written with the letters, and the former supplied afterwards. These red vowels are very capriciously added or omitted; but on the whole they are most frequent in the early chapters of the Apocalypse, and rarer in later quires. In the second division they are not found at all; and the few vowels that are written are in black. The chief points, including ribui, are in black all through the MS. In the first division elaborate head-pieces in black and red are prefixed to the Pericope and to the Apocalypse, and a simpler one to 2 John; and a similar one stands at the beginning of the second division. The use of vermilion has proved unfortunate, for the pressure the book has undergone when last bound has transferred a good deal of the pigment from page to opposite page, in some places gluing the leaves together so as to injure the surfaces when they are separated. With this exception, the excellent handwriting of the scribe is as legible as when it first came from his pen. The other specimens of his handiwork in the T. C. D. collection are by no means so uniformly good; being in parts carelessly and roughly written with inferior ink on paper imperfectly smoothed. In one of them (B. 5, 19, formerly A. 11), which contains extracts from Ephraim, several leaves are written in another hand—I believe that of the Cyriacus who has signed the Bodleian O. T. MS. as his collaborator.* I am sorry to add that the disparaging epithets which, in the colophon cited at p. 283, "Joseph, son of David" so freely takes to himself, are proved by this MS. to be by no means unmerited. The MS. is made up as follows. First come nine short tractates of Ephraim, of which the ninth (ending a quire) is left incomplete, all in the writing of Joseph. Then follow two quires in the writing of his assistant, who had, as it appears, chanced to begin a copy of the same collection,

* I cannot affirm this positively, not having compared this MS. side by side with Bod. Or. 151.
Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac MS.

for these quires simply repeat the Tractates which stand first and second, but are inserted as if they were new matter. And that this is no oversight, but done with design of utilizing them to swell the book, is evident, for they are continued in the hand of Joseph, and numbered continuously with the preceding quires. He then begins a new Tractate (the 10th, or as he numbers them, the 12th), breaks off abruptly in the second page, and so closes the volume; which Davies, being, as he tells us, unable to read Syriac, or to find any adviser who could read it, bought and sent to Ussher, in ignorance of the fraud practised on him. Two marginalia in Ussher's hand note this repetition of the first and second Tractates. I may here mention that for this and other similar Ephraim MSS. in T. C. D., and the Bodleian transcript of the whole O. T., and a MS. Syriac Grammar (also in T. C. D.), together with sundry Samaritan fragments, Davies appears to have paid on Ussher's behalf but £39 18s. (Letter 401; cp. 388, 125). I find no statement of the cost of our MS.; the only one priced separately is the O. T. transcript, the original estimate for which was £10 (Letter 71).

But to return to our MS. The Pericope de Adultera begins on the recto of the first leaf (as the quires now stand), and ends on the recto of the second. I have already mentioned how it is headed, and how terminated; and that De Dieu reproduces it faithfully in both points. Walton, though (as I have said) he retains the heading, rejects the modification of viii. 12* with which it closes, and reads that verse as in the Peshitto and Greek—"Again then Jesus spake unto them, saying, . . ." The end of the passage is marked in the MS. by the usual δέος (= explicit), prolonged across the page.

Our MS., though the first authority from whence this passage was made known as existing in Syriac, is not now the only one. Three others have since come to light.† Of these copies, much the earliest (a) is in the British Museum, written in a ninth-century hand on a leaf prefixed to a Peshitto MS. of the Gospels of the fifth or sixth century (Add. 14470). It is introduced by the following note:—"Yet another chapter from the

* This reading of viii. 12 is countenanced by two old Latin MSS.; b, which gives "rurum autem congregatis illis," and c, "iterum autem cum convenissent."

† For two other MSS. said to contain the Pericope, see pp. 274, 275, notes.* I know nothing further of either.
Gospel of John son of Zebedee. This σώραξ is not found in all copies; but the Abbat Mar Paul found it in one of the Alexandrian copies, and translated it from Greek into Syriac, according as it is here written; from the Gospel of John, canon tenth, number of sections 96, according to the translation of Thomas the Harklensian.” It then starts from vii. 50 (“Nicodemus saith unto them . . . .”), giving it and the two following verses as in the Harklensian text, then proceeds with the disputed passage, beginning vii. 53, and ends with viii. 12, modified as in our MS. A note nearly the same, but abridged, is found in a Paris MS. (xxii., Catal. Bibl. Reg.) of the Harklensian Gospels, dated A. Gr. 1503 (i.e., A. D. 1192, not 1202, as Adler wrongly states), which also contains the Pericope; appended to, but not inserted in, St. John’s Gospel. This copy (b) begins with vii. 53, and ends with viii. 11, to which it subjoins the note. Adler has printed the whole, Verss. Syrr., p. 57. In the third copy (c) the Pericope takes its place in the text of the Gospel: this is another Harklensian MS., known as Cod. Barcalibae, now in the Library of New College, Oxford (No. 334), from which White has printed the Pericope as an appendix to his edition of the Harklensian Gospels (p. 559). In this MS., viii. 12 is given in its altered form. A marginal note states that “this σώραξ is not found in all copies”; when the Greek word, evidently a blunder for σώραξ, points to a common origin with the notes in the two MSS. last mentioned. Thus in these three MSS. the Pericope appears associated more or less directly with the Harklensian version. But of the four extant copies of the Pericope, one only (c) is exhibited in loco as part of the Gospel; while the others stand apart from any context: a fact which if known to Tregelles would have saved him from misapprehending the nature of Ussher’s MS. so widely as we have seen he did. The variations among the four copies are about a dozen, none being material. In one verse (viii. 5) all four differ: and in more than one reading each of them stands alone. The British Museum copy has not been printed, but I have transcribed it carefully, and find, as its superior age might lead one to anticipate, that its text is the best. The Paris copy,

* A mistake for 86. The number of sections in the Harklensian St. John is the same as in the Greek, 282 (Adler, p. 68; Rosen-Forshall, Catal., p. 27; Wright, Catal., p. 75; Payne Smith, Catal., pp. 86, 89).
which is the only one of the four I have not seen, is not very correctly printed by Adler, and seems, even after allowing for typographical errors, to be the least accurately written. The original of this version must have differed considerably from all existing Greek copies; keeping at first pretty close to the Textus Receptus, but approximating especially towards the end to that of Cod. Bezae (D), which is the oldest extant Greek of the passage. It can hardly be doubted that the Abbat Mar Paul, who is stated to have found the passage in Greek and made this translation of it, was Paul of Tella, the translator of the LXX. into Syriac. No other Syrian Paul is recorded as a translator of Scripture, or as visiting Alexandria. He is known to have been there, engaged on his version of the O. T., in the same year, 616, in which Thomas of Harkel was similarly at work on the New, and actually under the same roof—of the Antonine monastery.* Both were Monophysite Bishops, seeking refuge there from troubles in Syria, together with Athanasius, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch. The versions of both are marked by the same servile manner of reproducing the Greek verbatim, at whatever sacrifice of Syriac idiom. Of this manner, the most conspicuous feature is the expression of the possessive pronoun as a separate word by means of the particle \( ^\mu\), instead of suffixing it, after the Semitic use, to the noun. In the passage before us a possessive pronoun occurs, in viii. 5, as read in three of the four copies, "Now in our law..." and they render it accordingly, in this separate form, \( ^\mu \). In Ussher's MS. this pronoun does not appear, perhaps correctly—certainly in conformity with the best Greek text;† but at the cost of losing this mark of the translator's hand. If we assume, then, that the London and Paris MSS. rightly name Paul as the translator of the Pericope—in other words, that the translation, though not made by Thomas of Harkel, was made by a contemporaneous and kindred hand—we have a fair explanation of the relation in which we find it placed with regard to the Harklensian version, associated with it, yet

* Cp. the Harklensian subscriptions (Adler, p. 45) with that of the Byro-Hexaplar MS., Add. 14487, in Wright's Catal., p. 84); and see also Ceriani, Monumenta Sacra et Prof., t. i. fasc. i., Prolegomena, p. iii.

† There is, however, good authority for \( ^\mu \), and better for \( ^\mu \).
not usually as of it. Another and an earlier translator had, however, been previously suggested. Dr. Gloucester Ridley, the original owner of the Cod. Barsalibœ, in his account of that MS. (De Verss. Syrr. Indole, p. 17), asserts that the passage in question was translated by Maras, Bishop of Amid,* also a Monophysite, in 522. Marsh, in his edition of Michaelis (pp. 545, 580), following Ridley incorrectly, attributes the translation to Mar Aba,† a very different person. Tregelles (Introduct., p. 282) corrects Marsh's blunder, but strangely makes another as to date; printing in his text 622, and from this false datum drawing the true conclusion that Maras cannot have been the translator: while in his note he cites the figures accurately as given by Ridley, dxxii. And further it is to be observed that both Marsh and Tregelles err in understanding Ridley to say that a note in Cod. Barsalib. is his authority for ascribing the translation to Maras in 522. That MS. contains no such note;‡ and Ridley in thus specifying the writer and date is but giving his own opinion. Before the evidence pointing to Paul of Tella came to light, this view of Ridley's was a very defensible one; having apparent support from Assemani, who (Bibl. Or., ii., pp. 53, 61) in his summary of the History of Zacharias Rhetor,§ mentions a version of this passage cited by Zacharias from this Maras. But the History of Zacharias is now accessible, having been published by Land (Anecdotœ Syr., iii.) from an early MS. (circa 600) now in the British Museum (Add. 17202, see f. 1446); and the version of the Pericope it exhibits (bk. viii. 7) proves to be not only distinct from that before us, but to give a redaction of the narrative differing widely from any other known form of it, Greek or translated. It is, moreover, cited with the sectional number 89 (instead of 86), which places it not before John viii. 12, but after John viii. 20.|| And, moreover,

* Consecrated 519–20; banished soon after; lived at Alexandria from 527 till his death, 540.
† A Nestorian; Catholicus, 587; died 592.
‡ I have myself inspected the MS.; and Mr. Margoliouth, Fellow of New College, who has kindly examined it further, confirms what I have above stated.
§ Bishop of Mitylene, 596.
|| I have compared the text of this passage in Add. 17202 with another copy in Add. 17198, and with that given by Dionys. Barsalib., in his Commentary on the Gospels, as exhibited by the Abbé Martin (Introduct., Partie Prat., iv. p. 281) from two MSS., one being Add. 7184 of British
it appears that the work of Maras which contained this passage was written in Greek, and that the Syriac is due to the Syrian translator and continuator of Zacharias (see Land, ut supr., Introd.). There is thus no ground for regarding Maras as a translator at all, and the claim of Paul to be accepted as the translator of the Pericope stands unaffected by the existence of this other earlier Syriac form of the same passage. A version of the Pericope distinct from both the above is contained in the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary.

It also is printed by Adler (p. 190), and seems to approach nearer than that of Ussher’s MS. to the text of Cod. Bezae.

Museum. They agree substantially; though with some variations which make the sense here and there somewhat uncertain. I append a translation:—

“And it came to pass on a certain day, as Jesus was teaching, they brought unto him a certain woman which was found with child of adultery, and informed him concerning her. And Jesus said unto them (for he knew, as God, their lusts of uncleanness and their doings), In the law what does it command? Then said they unto him, In the mouth of two or three witnesses she shall be stoned. But he answered and said unto them, According to the law indeed, one pure and free from these lusts of sin, and confidently and with authority (as being himself not guilty in this sin) bearing witness, let him bear witness against her and first cast a stone at her, and the next likewise, and let her be stoned. They then, because they were vile and guilty in this lust of transgression, went out one by one from before him and left the woman. And when they had gone forth, Jesus was gazing on the ground. And as he wrote on the dust thereof, he said unto her, Woman, these which brought thee hither, and were desirous to bear witness against thee, when they gave heed unto the things which I said unto them, which thou hast heard, have left thee and departed: Go thou now, and do not this sin any more.”

Zacharias prefaced the passage with this statement, that it belongs to John’s Gospel, but is found in no other copy except that of Maras. All the above MSS. agree in referring it to “Canon (= section) 89.” The relation pointed out by Ewald (Die Johannischen Schriften, p. 271; see Bp. Lightfoot in Contemp. Rev., vol. xxxvi., p. 847) between this narrative and John viii. 15 is well brought out by thus subjoining it to verse 20. The reference to a second witness in the version of Maras makes a further point of contact with verse 17. It is worth mentioning that the Synopsis, wrongly attributed to Athanasius, which however is a careful if not very ancient compilation, places (ch. 50) the Pericope immediately before verse 21.

* It is remarkable that this is the recension of the story cited by Dionys. Barsalib, in his Commentary (see last p., note ||, also Assem. n., p. 88); though in the Cod. Barsalibei, which purports to be corrected by him (Ridley, p. 60), the other recension is given. The latter is also the recension known to Gregory Barhebræus (Assem. n. 169).
Immediately after the final punctuation mark subjoined to the *Pericope*, on the recto of the second leaf of our MS., stands the heading of the first of the Four Minor Epistles, "Further we begin to write the Second Epistle of Peter (Peteri epistula secunda)." It ends f. 8 v°, and is subscribed "Ends the Epistle of Peter the Apostle." Then comes a horizontal rope ornament, in red and black, across the page; and then the heading, "Second Epistle of John." The conclusion of this Epistle (f. 10 r°), and the beginning of the Third, are similarly denoted, "Ends the Second Epistle of John," and (without any break between) "Further we write the Third Epistle of John." At foot of f. 11 r° this Epistle closes with "Ends the Third Epistle of John"; and at head of f. 11 v° we have "The Epistle of Jude brother of James." The final colophon is subscribed to Jude, f. 14 v°, being sixth of second quire, as follows: "Ends the Epistle of Jude the Apostle (his prayer [be] with us. Amen). And the completion of it was in Tezhrin the latter [November], year 1625 of Christ." (The dates are given in Arabic numerals.) The remaining four leaves of the quire are left blank.

The text of these Epistles is the least valuable part of our MS. It does not vary materially from Pococke's. Notwithstanding some errors, chiefly of omission, it is rather more accurate than the latter, but its points of superiority are mostly corrections of obvious mistakes which Pococke had set right conjecturally in his notes. Pococke's MS. is still in the Bodleian (Bod. Or. 119). When he printed his text from it in 1630 he was aware (see his *Pref.*, and also De Dieu's *Pref.* to *Apoc.*) that another copy had previously been in the hands of Etzel, a learned Jesuit of Mayence, whose Latin version of these Epistles from this Syriac text is given by Nicolas Serarius, also a Jesuit of Mayence, in his *Commentat. in Epp. Canon.* (Mayence, 1613), pp. 53, 54. In his *Prolegomena Bibliica* (p. 80, quest. 1) Serarius states that this was a copy brought to Rome by Maronites, and that it contained the Apocalypse also. I find no record of it as now existing, nor can I learn whether Moses of Marden ever fulfilled his promise of bringing a copy of these portions with him on his second visit to Europe, as De Dieu
(Pref., as above) affirms he did. But it seems to me certain, judging by the amount of deviation from Pococke's text shown by that printed soon after (in 1633) in the Paris Polyglott (which Walton adopted without change), that Gabriel Sionita, the editor of the Paris Syriac text, did not merely reprint Pococke's, with conjectural emendations, as is usually stated, but based his text on an independent MS.* A comparison of the Paris text of its Latin version with the Latin of Etzel satisfies me that Sionita's MS. must have been also distinct from that used by Etzel. If this be so, Sionita's MS. may probably be in some French Library. Possibly it may be identical with the MS. which, as I have stated above (p. 274, n.*), is mentioned by Le Long, in connexion with the name of Le Jay the publisher of the Paris Polyglott, as having been sent to Bellarmine, and which is described as containing the whole N.T. in Syriac, including all the supplementary portions. However this may be, it appears that more than one of the Syriac MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris contain these Epistles: and not a few † copies of them exist elsewhere. Of these, the most numerous and important belong to the Nitrian collection in the British Museum. Another, a valuable one, has recently been made known by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of Philadelphia; it is contained in the "Williams MS.," a copy of the N.T. wanting the Apocalypse; apparently of the fourteenth century. He has issued a beautiful photographic reproduction of the leaves which exhibit these Epistles, and their text is much better than that of Pococke's MS. I have collated with Pococke's text this of Ussher's, that of Williams', and three complete and two defective Nitrian copies; and have obtained from them ample materials for substantially amending the ordinary printed text.

* In this opinion I am confirmed by the judgment of Dr. Davidson. See his Bibl. Criticism, N.T., p. 630 (edition 1854).

† Professor Hall (Syrian Antilegomena) says "six or seven," but this is an under-estimate. In British libraries alone there are not less than nine: in London six or more, Oxford one, Cambridge one, Dublin one. Professor Hall (in a paper quoted below) speaks of one MS. as being only a transcript from the Paris Polyglott. This seems very improbable. I do not know what MS. he refers to, but I venture to guess that it will prove to be the copy used by Gabriel Sionita; the original of the Paris text, not a copy from it. For the Amsterdam MS., formerly Wetstein's, see note * p. 274. Judging by the few specimens of its text given by Wetstein, it must be worth collating. (See farther, note at end, p. 818.)
One Nitrian MS. I would specially indicate, Add. 14623: it is much the earliest existing authority for the Syriac text of these Epistles, bearing date A.Gr. 1134 (= A.D. 823); and shows, as might be expected, the purest text. A text critically revised on such authorities is a real desideratum; not merely from the point of view of Syriac scholarship, but as an important contribution to the textual criticism of the Greek of this part of the New Testament. Dr. Scrivener (Intro. p. 646, n.1) justly characterizes this Syriac version as "well deserving careful study, . . . of great interest, and full of valuable readings." Where texts vary, it is found usually on the side of the oldest and best Greek MSS., and the instances in which it exhibits readings unsupported by good authority of MSS. or of versions, are not many. And I find that a text restored by means of the Nitrian and other early copies would approach still closer to the best Greek standard, and would be almost or altogether freed from the few anomalous or inferior readings which disfigure the text as printed. Professor Hall (Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis, June—December, 1884, p. 42) has noted that one of these readings, صلدمأ ("in the world") for the similar صلدمأ ("in the people"), of 2 Peter ii. 1 is corrected in his MS.; the Nitrian MSS. agree here with his against Pococke's (which latter Ussher's follows). Another, of more importance, is worth mentioning. It is well known that in 2 Peter iii. 10, for the usual reading (of A and L, and of most cursives) "the world and all the works therein shall be burnt up" (κατακαίησεται), most of the uncials, headed by Χ and B, give "shall be found" (εὑρεθήσεται; i.e., as the margin of our Revised Version renders, "shall be discovered." Hitherto this Syriac version has been cited by all critics as almost the sole authority (the Sahidic version seems to be the only other) for a reading unknown to Greek MSS., which, by inserting a negative before the verb, yields "shall not be found"; i.e., "shall be no more seen." And it is true that Pococke's MS. exhibits the "not" (ὁ), as does Ussher's and one Nitrian (Add. 17226). But the earliest Nitrian MS., which as I have said is 700 or 800 years older than these, agrees with the best Greek text, giving "shall be found," without the negative; and in this I find Professor Hall's MS. supports it. The margin of the Harklensian (which I am about to show preserves the readings of this version) also gives "shall be found"; (the [P]
of White's edition is his interpolation). It is easy to understand how a scribe, taking on himself the function of critic, inserted the "not" to make sense out of an obscure expression which seemed to him unmeaning. Nay, I have lighted on direct evidence of the making of this interpolation. One of the Nitrian copies I have referred to (Add. 14473) is an eleventh-century appendix to a very early Peshitto MS., and is written in a clumsy imitation of the old estrangelo character—presumably therefore a transcript from an ancient estrangelo original. In this copy (which is second in age among the copies I have seen) the η does not appear in the estrangelo text, but is inserted, I believe by the scribe himself, in the ordinary character in the margin. It is not often that one can thus catch a scribe (flagrante delicto) in the very act of tampering with the text of his exemplar. Here I venture to digress, so far as to mention another confirmation which I have just observed of this difficult reading: In the discourse usually known as the 2nd Epistle of Clement of Rome, which though admittedly not the work of that Father, is certainly a second-century composition, there is what seems a free citation from 2 Peter iii. 10, 12 (combined with Malachi iv. 1) in ch. xvi. (being one of the chapters recently recovered by Bryennios). It is as follows: 

\[\text{τακῆσουται τινες τῶν σφαλαχών, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ . . . ἔπι πυρὶ τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ . . . ἔργα τῶν ἄνθρωπων.} \]

This passage seems clearly to prove not only that 2 Peter was read in the second century, but read (as the last verb indicates) with εἰρεθῷσεται in the verse in question. The correction of this reading is the most important one I have arrived at from the study of the copies I have referred to. But there are many others worth attending to. An analysis of my results for the first chapter of 2 Peter will give a fair idea of their amount. In this chapter I observe twenty-five places (most, but not all, of them noticed in Tischendorf's eighth edition of the Greek Testament) where Pococke's edition appears to yield evidence bearing on the Greek text. In eleven of these instances the Syriac seems to have no good authority on its side. But in four of them the translator has mistaken the meaning, or has been misunderstood. Of the seven that remain, five are corrected and disappear by collation of the copies I have used; and two real misreadings only are left—the omission of ἡμῶν (ver. 3), and the insertion of ψμᾶς (ver. 8). In all these five corrections I have the authority of
the oldest Nitrian MS.; in four of them it is supported by the second oldest; in three by Professor Hall's; in but one by Ussher's. Taking this chapter then as an average example, it may be calculated that the text is likely to be improved by aid of these MSS. to the extent of the removal of five-sevenths of the imperfections found in it as it stands in Pococke's edition.

The version being of so much value, it becomes matter of interest to inquire by whom and at what date it was made. Though we find in Syriac writers no express reply to these questions, we have, I think, the means of answering them conclusively. Several scholars (Dr. Davidson, I believe, most definitely; Professor Hall most recently) have conjectured that in this version of these Epistles we have a surviving remnant of the translation of the N. T. which is recorded* to have been made A. D. 508 for Philoxenus, Monophysite Bishop of Mabug, by his chorepiscopus Polycarp; which is not otherwise extant except in a few minute fragments preserved by Wiseman (Hor. Syr. p. 178). This suggestion may, as it seems to me, be advanced out of the region of probable guesses, well-nigh into that of demonstrated truths. The Harklensian version of the N. T. has a note† appended to it by the translator, Thomas of Harkel, in which he states that in it he used as its basis the Philoxenian version, correcting it by the aid of Greek MSS. which he had access to in Alexandria. Now on comparing the version now before us with the Harklensian version of the same four Epistles, it appears beyond doubt that the two versions are not independent of one another. Verse after verse they are substantially identical: the diction of each reflects that of the other: the chief words of one reappear in the other: we find in both not merely the same renderings, but (what is conclusive) the same misrenderings. So in 2 Peter i. 20, both versions (though varying slightly from one another) fall into the strange mistake of making $\epsilon\nu\lambda\omega\sigma\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma$ a nominative. So again in Jude 6, both are misled by a false etymology to render $\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\varsigma$ "unseen." And it is equally certain that of the two it is the Harklensian version that is founded on the version before us, and not vice versa. Where they agree substantially, as they mostly do, the Harklensian is simply the other version grecized, according to its

---

habitual manner, by transpositions out of the Syriac into the Greek order; by insertions—as of the third personal pronouns in lieu of the definite article which the Syriac lacks; and by the characteristic separation of the possessive pronoun already noticed, which in the Harklensian is usual, whereas in the other version it is but occasional and serves for emphasis, or to represent ἔσως in the Greek. Where they differ, they usually represent differing Greek texts: and in such cases the priority of the other version is attested by the critical apparatus attached to the Harklensian; for the readings of the former are frequently retained on the Harklensian margin, or stand marked with * in its text. So, e.g., in the passage I have already dwelt on (2 Peter iii. 10) the Harklensian reads κατακαθήσεται, but on its margin gives εὐρέθησεν. It thus appears beyond doubt, on the internal evidence, that the Harklensian is simply a revision of the other version. But it is equally beyond doubt that the Harklensian version, on the evidence of its author, had for its basis the Philoxenian version of Polycarp, and no other. It follows, therefore, by necessary inference that the version before us, holding as it does to the Harklensian version the unique relation which the version of Polycarp is known to have held, is in fact the version of Polycarp; or, as it is usually described, the original or unrevised Philoxenian. This conclusion is an important one to bear in mind in the study of the Harklensian version, and of its marginalia and critical marks. It has been taken for granted by many that Thomas of Harkel retained the Philoxenian text, and added alternative readings derived from his Greek authorities on the margin; and there are many instances confirmatory of that supposition. But the comparison of the two versions in case of these Epistles yields many instances to the contrary, where the Philoxenian readings are relegated to the margin, and readings indicating a different Greek original replace them in the text. It appears to me probable that Thomas of Harkel formed his text by the exercise of his critical judgment, in selecting the readings he thought preferable, and not by mechanical rule; and that the margin accordingly registers neither (on one hand) the Philoxenian readings only, nor (on the other) new readings from Greek MSS. only; but merely those which he thought less probable than those he inserted in his text, yet worth recording. A still
more important result of the identification of the version before us as that of Polycarp, and of the comparison of the two versions, is this. We thus learn that in the opening of the sixth century a Syrian scholar, presumably in Mabug, the capital of Euphratensis, had within reach a Greek text closely akin to that of the best uncialis now extant; and distinctly superior to that which another Syrian scholar, rather more than a century later, was able to find in Alexandria.*

I pass now to the third and largest part of the *first* or biblical division of our MS.—that which contains the Apocalypse, and consists, as I have stated, of five quires, numbered 1 to 5, though now placed after the quires already described, which are numbered 6 and 7. The first leaf of the first of these five quires is blank. The Apocalypse begins on the recto of the second leaf (being f. 24, if all the blank leaves are included in the numbering). This page is written, not as the former part, in lines of its full width, but in two columns, as are the two following pages, and also f. 52v° and f. 53r°. These lapses into the columnar arrangement probably show that the scribe was accustomed to write on paper of such size as to require to be divided into columns; and in point of fact the pages of the Bodleian O. T., which is from his hand, are so divided. The rest of the book is in lines of full-page width. The first column of the first page (f. 24r°) is headed thus: "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, on the strength of the Holy Trinity, we begin to write the Revelation of John, which is Abocalebsis "(אֲבֹכַת אֶלֶּבֶיס). Over this stands an ornamental head-piece in black and red, elaborate, but small, being of the width of the column, not of the page. Under it the scribe has written in minute characters (נִשְׁמַח בְּנֶמֶד [וֹדָהוּ]), "The sinner find mercy who painted and wrote [this]." So in the head-piece of another T. C. D. MS.

* A large fragment of a version of Isaiah, preserved in a Nitrian MS. (circ. 600) in the British Museum (Add. 17106), is on independent grounds considered to be probably part of this same original Philoxenian version. Its style agrees well with that of the version above treated of; and on comparing it with the same part of the Isaiah of the Hexaplar version of Paul of Tella (which, as before stated, is a version of the O. T., practically forming one work with the N. T. of Thomas of Harkel), we find exactly the same relations of agreement and variation between their renderings as have been above shown to exist between the two versions of the Four Epistles—an interesting confirmation of the result above arrived at.
from the same hand (B. 5, 19), we read the similar words (Verse),

"Pray for the sinner who painted [this]" introduced into the intervals of the pattern. The Book is divided into the same twenty-two chapters as in our Bibles, "chapter two" (Due), and so on, being written in red (in the text), except in case of the first and third chapters: and the address of each of the seven Epistles is written in red likewise (the first partly, the rest entirely). There is no peculiarity to be noted, with one important exception: that of the marginalia which appear in six places. The Book ends on f. 65r, the third leaf of the fifth of the quires which it occupies; this is numbered 5, and is a half-quire of two sheets only, its last leaf being blank. The subscription is brief: "Ends: and to God [be] glory for ages"

I take up first the questions which the peculiar numbering of the quires suggests at first sight. Why did the scribe originally set the Apocalypse first? What is its usual place in the Syriac N. T.? And here we are met by a fact which greatly enhances the value of this part of Ussher's MS.: the extreme rarity of MSS. of the Apocalypse in Syriac. In the last century Ridley (writing in 1761) could only name two; and neither Adler (the best informed Syriac scholar of his day) in 1789, nor J. D. Michaelis in 1788, was able to add to this meagre list. In our own day the Abbé Martin (Introd. à la Critique du N. T., 1883) enters but one of these in his Table of Syriac N. T. MSS., at p. 132, and adds the other at p. 134. None of these scholars was aware of the existence of the MS. now before us. Of the two they knew one was of course the Leyden one, whence De Dieu first printed the text. The other is said to have been in the Library of S. Marco, in Florence, n° 724; and in 1784 Bandini sent Adler a transcript from it of Rev. i. 1, 2. The Leyden copy is still in the library of Leyden University (Cod. Heb. Scal. 18). Its colophon gives the scribe's name as "Caspar, from the land of the Indians." The colophon of a liturgical MS. from the hand of the same scribe (in the library of the Orphan House at Halle), describes him as from Malabar, and is dated at Rome, 1580. The Florentine copy is stated by Tregelles (Introduct. p. 28) to have been written by the Caspar who wrote

the Leyden MS. If this were so, its text would probably be practically the same as that printed by De Dieu, and therefore of little interest. But Le Long (Biblioth. S., i. p. 191), on the authority of Montfaucon, describes it as written at Rome in 1581, by one Jacob, described as of Hesron (a Maronite therefore, for Hesron is in the Lebanon Patriarchate). It would thus be an independent authority; and there is therefore the more cause to regret that it is no longer forthcoming. Bernstein, writing in 1854 (De Harkl. N. T. Transl., p. 8), informs us that on visiting the library of S. Marco he could find no trace of it. The monk in charge supposed it to have been carried off by the French. It is not, however, recorded in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and must be set down as missing. Its loss, however unfortunate, is in no small measure compensated by the recovery of Ussher's, also (as I have shown) a Maronite copy, only forty-four years later than the missing Florentine one. Its inferiority of age to the Leyden copy is about the same; and on examination I find its text to be distinctly superior. When Ussher, in 1627, wrote of it to Selden (Letter 127), "The Syriac lately set out at Leyden may be much amended by my MS. copy," he was not misled by partiality for his own. And he showed his usual soundness of judgment in fixing on the Apocalypse as the most important item of the contents of our MS. It is the only part which he tells us he himself studied —writing to De Dieu (Letter 154 (on 1st October, 1629), "Ex Apocalypsi tua quam cum Ms° meo diligenter contuli...." No notes of his collation, however, are known to exist; nor have we any record of use made of it by De Dieu (so far as I can ascertain), though it was in his hands, as we have seen, for some years. In the Paris Polyglott the Apocalypse in Syriac was printed for the second time, but with so many corrections of text as to satisfy me that its editor must have had a MS. of his own, and that he was thus as independent here of De Dieu as I have already said I believe him to have been of Pococke in the text of the four Epistles. His MS., however, if he had one, is not forthcoming; nor (as I have said, pp. 274, 293) have I found any record of the fate of the MSS. reported to have contained the Apocalypse, which are associated with the names of Moses of Marden, Etzel, and Bellarmine. Thus it appears that the number of available MSS. of the Syriac text of this Book, which was two a hundred years ago, after being
reduced to one by the loss of the Florence copy, is now raised again to two by the recovery of Ussher's. This result, however, is subject to an important modification. I pass by the collection of extracts from this book in Syriac in the Bodleian (Thurston 13), because it extends only so far as chap. xvii., and is even more recent than Ussher's (1628). But I have to mention that among the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum there is one (Add. 17127), written A. D. 1088, which contains an elaborate commentary on the Apocalypse, embodying apparently all, or nearly all, the text. I have not learned that anyone has as yet performed the laborious task of putting together the pieces of the text, which would be a matter of much time and patience. I have spent some hours over it, and in the few chapters I have examined here and there I have found it complete, and agreeing substantially with the printed text. If, then, we may assume that this MS. will yield a full text of the Book, we have the total number of available copies raised to three, the last-named copy having the great advantage of being 500 years older than the elder of the other two. But we are no nearer than before to ascertaining how the Syrians placed the Apocalypse in their N. T. For in this Nitrian copy it stands alone, as in that of Leyden, and as (according to Le Long) it stood in that of Florence.* Ussher's is thus the only one in which it is associated with any other N. T. book. In the description (above, p. 274, n.) of the contents of the MS. sent to Bellarmine by Paul V., the Apocalypse is named before the Four Epistles. This is perhaps accidental, but it may possibly imply that such was the order in that MS. And thus the volume out of which the scribe employed by Davies copied the "N. T. parcels" of Ussher's MS. (if, indeed, we are to suppose them to have been derived from any one such volume), may have presented them in the like order; the Apocalypse following first after the books recognized by the Peshitto canon, and then the disputed Pericope and the four Epistles classed as Antilegomena, subjoined as an appendix. But it seems more likely that the priority given to the Apocalypse was casual, or determined by its greater length only; and that the exemplar whence the scribe copied it was a several volume, separate from that whence he derived the four

* The Abbé Martin (l. l.) regards this Florence MS. as a complete N. T.; but this seems to be a misapprehension.
Epistles; possibly, like the Leyden copy, containing the Apocalypse alone. The Apocalypse, as it stands in Ussher's MS., contains three more or less distinct series of evidences that the original which it reproduces was of different character from the original of the Four Epistles which are bound up with it. The first is the *punctuation*: but on this I do not lay stress. For though it is observable, as I have said, that the lozenges, which in the Apocalypse mark all the larger divisions, occur but twice in the four Epistles; yet this may be accounted for by the shortness of the Epistles, rendering such divisions less necessary. But the second is more significant—the *capi-tulation*. The division of the Apocalypse into the usual Western twenty-two chapters, while 2 Peter is divided only once, at the 9th verse of chap. ii., where a Syrian lesson began, leads us to conclude that the immediate exemplar of the Apocalypse of our MS. was one which had, while that of the Four Epistles was one which had not, come under Western influences. The third is the *marginal notation*. No notes are found on the margin of the Epistles; six stand on that of the Apocalypse; all within the first 34 of its 83 pages—a fact which suggests that the exemplar would have supplied more had the scribe's industry not abated as he went on. At least it had some marginal notes; and therefore was presumably detached from, and unlike, the exemplar of the Epistles, which (in this MS., and usually) are not furnished with any marginalia.

But a more interesting question than this of the immediate derivation of the text lies behind—that, namely, of the authorship of the version. When the existence of the Apocalypse in Syriac was first made known, the suspicion was thrown out that the version was a recent one, made by Maronite scholars. De Dieu (*Præf. in Apoc.*) sufficiently refutes this surmise, by pointing out that the Greek text underlying the version as he published it often widely differs from that printed under Papal authority, or that implied by the Vulgate, such as the Maronites, being entirely under Romish control, would certainly have followed. But since the Nitrian MS. (*Add. 17127*) above described has come to light the antiquity of the version is vindicated, inasmuch as it is thus directly demonstrated to have been in currency over 800 years ago. However, no Syrian authority on the subject of the version of the Bible has named the translator of the Apocalypse;
and we have only the negative fact, admitted by all, that this Book was not in the Peshitto, while we are not informed whether either of the later versions contained it. Yet when we read that Polycarp in 508, and Thomas in 616, translated the N. T., we may fairly presume that the statement includes the Apocalypse—especially as in case of Thomas we know, and in case of Polycarp have seen good reason to believe, that it does include the Four Epistles which are associated with the Apocalypse as being omitted from the Peshitto. One external testimony only has been adduced in the matter: it is that of Jacob of Hesron, the scribe of the Florence MS., who, as it is stated, cited in his colophon a subscription from his exemplar, professing to be written by Thomas of Harkel and to claim the version as his. Against this is to be set the negative evidence of the recently acquired Cambridge MS. (Add. 1700), which contains the N. T. in the Harklensian version, omitting only the Apocalypse. Unfortunately, the only other MS. of the Harklensian N. T. which seems ever to have been complete (another of Ridley's, in New Coll. Library, No. 333) is mutilated at the end, so that it is uncertain whether the Apocalypse ever formed part of it. But though we are thus unable to verify the statement of the scribe, it must be admitted that the internal evidence of the Syriac text gives it much probability. After the Harklensian manner, it græcizes: it forces words out of the Syriac into the Greek order, uses the third personal pronoun to represent the Greek article, separates the possessive pronoun as in Greek, and often adopts Greek words, merely transliterating them into Syriac (as θρόνος, φωλη, ἀψυθος, and the names of the precious stones throughout, &c.). I incline therefore to the opinion, advanced in the last century by Ridley and by Storr, and recently adopted by Davidson, that this Syriac Apocalypse belongs to the Harklensian N. T. Adler, followed by Marsh, and of late by Tregelles, has controverted this view (p. 78). His arguments are far from convincing, and in brief come to this, that some of the peculiarities of Thomas's method of rendering do not appear in this book so uniformly as in the books known to be rendered by him. We may grant all this, and yet refuse to admit it as conclusive against the opinion that the version was made by Thomas; for he may well be supposed to have relaxed somewhat of the rigidity of his very artificial manner as he
drew near the close of his long work. But in some points Adler has overstated his case against the Harklensian authorship of the version. One Harklensian characteristic which he instances as infrequent in the Syriac Apocalypse, the adoption of Greek words, is, as I have shown, largely found in it; another, the writing of proper names in the Greek form, is a matter in which the usage of transcribers even of acknowledged Harklensian texts is found to vary. Of deviation in this Book from the close reproduction of the Greek which Thomas affected, he adduces but two definite examples; and these both break down when examined. The translator, he says, (a) omits the explanatory words, δραχή καὶ τέλας, which follow τῷ ά καὶ τῷ Ω, in i. 8; whereas Thomas never fails to translate such words: and (b) in i. 9 he neglects to represent the συνοφογόνος; while in the other N. T. places where the word occurs (but three in all) Thomas resolves it into two words, so as to express the compound. But (a) the Greek text which the translator had before him probably omitted δραχή καὶ τέλας from the former verse, as our Revised Version does, with the majority of the best authorities: and (b) in the latter verse it may well have read the simple κοὐμονός, as many (though not most) Greek cursives do. Probably the Florence MS., if it could be recovered, would yield information bearing on this question of the Harklensian authorship of our version; if one may judge by the two verses (i. 1 and 2) which are all we now have of it, already mentioned as printed by Adler from Bandini's transcript. They contain a token of Harklensian workmanship which Adler failed to perceive. In the Harklensian text, as is well known, asterisks are attached to certain words, usually to denote insertions into the text, sometimes to refer to Greek words written in the margin. Now, in the second verse as given in the Florence text, in the words σορὰ εἶδον, the σορὰ is resolved into two words (σόρα, τοῦ), and to the second word (τοῦ), which is pleonastic, an asterisk is attached, which does not appear in the Leyden text, nor in Ussher's. But it is noteworthy that, whereas the asteriscised word is omitted from the Leyden text, I find it inserted in Ussher's. Thomas of Harkel's rendering of this word σορὰ varies; but when I point out that a similar pleonastic rendering of σορὰ is found in the Harklensian version of the σορὰ ἐτιν ἀλήθη of Philipp. iv. 8, with an asterisk similarly attached to
refer to the Greek ὁσα which is written in the margin, it will be seen that the asterisk of the Florence MS. at i. 2 probably indicates that ὁσα was on its margin or that of its exemplar, but dropped out in transcription. And thus this asterisk, trivial as it may seem, becomes a significant piece of evidence. (See farther, below, p. 314).

I now proceed to the testimony of Ussher's MS. on this question, which I can show to be ampler and more distinct on the same side. It is derived from the marginal notes, six in number, which I have mentioned as peculiar to this part of the MS. Among the earliest are two notes on the names of Ephesus and Smyrna, the first two Churches addressed. In the first, Ephesus is styled "the assembly of the Apostles" (Ἐφεσός ἡ ἡγκαθίστα Ἰερουσαλήμ). In the second, Smyrna is explained "bitterness," and is styled "the heap of the witness" (ὁ Σμύρνη ἡ ἄμοια ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ). The presumption is, that in the exemplar whence these notes were derived, like notes were attached to the names of the remaining five Churches. Notes of the same nature are found on the Harklensian margin. So at Acts xii. 13 the name of Rhoda is explained ἡ ὑπάρξεις Ἰωάννης. And at Acts x. 1 the name of Cornelius has an interpretation appended which I do not quote for its philological value, ἡ Ὕσυρα ἡ ἡγκαθίστα Ἀναγκαστική, i.e., "the pupil of the sun," as if κόρην + ἔλασσο! Again, the note at 1 Pet. iii. 3, where ἡρωία is explained "various jewels" (ἡ ἡρωία ἡ ἄμοια Ἔρας Ἀραβική), and that at 2 Pet. i. 13, interpreting σκήνωμα to mean "body" (σκήνωμα ἡ ἄμοια Ἐρωτική), are precisely analogous to those on the churches named Rev. ii. 1, 8. Of the rest of the marginalia I pass over two as possibly mere scribe's corrections; but the two which remain are noticeable as indicating the translator's knowledge of various readings of the Greek. One is at ii. 25, where for the ἕν ("I come") of the text, he offers on his margin the alternative ἐπίσκεψιμα ("I open"), showing that he was aware of the reading ἐνοίξω (for ἐν ἐξοίκω), which is found in one uncial (B) and many cursive Greek texts. The remaining one is at ix. 19, where the Received Text reads ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν only, omitting καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν, which the best MSS. add. The Syriac as given in the Leyden MS. renders these words. Ussher's omits them, but inserts them in the margin; thus apparently preserving evidence that the translator had both readings before him.
The result then is, that the margin of our MS. adds appreciably to the evidence, already considerable, in favour of the opinion that this translation of the Apocalypse into Syriac was made by Thomas of Harkel. If it was his (I may here observe), the question of the place of the Apocalypse in the Syriac N. T. is settled so far as his authority can settle it. For in the New Coll. MS. (333), for the Apocalypse no place is left but the last, and it can hardly have stood anywhere in the archetype of the Cambridge MS. (Add. 1700) but at the end; else that MS. would not have left it out. One argument has been advanced against his authorship to which little weight is due—that, namely, which rests on the alleged inferiority of the translation of this book in comparison with the recognized work of Thomas. For generally no translator is always equal to himself, and in the course of a long work, especially towards the end, weariness will admit errors. And in particular such errors are naturally to be expected in the version (by whatever translator made) of a book in which the guidance of the Peshitto was wanting. How capable Thomas was of blundering under such circumstances appears from the two instances I have already adduced from the Four Epistles (2 Pet. i. 20; Jude 6), where, in the absence of the Peshitto, he has allowed himself to be misled into following Polycarp's mistakes; though, in case of the word δίδωσι, he had translated it correctly in the only other place where it occurs in the N. T., Rom. i. 20. The fact is, I suspect, that this version has been unduly discredited by one mistranslation which disfigures it, so signal that every writer on the subject mentions it, and so ludicrous that no one who has ever heard of it can forget it. In viii. 13, the words ἀετὸς πετομένων ἐν μεσούριάματι are rendered "an eagle flying in the midst which had a tail of blood"! Λευκόν φτερὸν τοιοῦτον, έν αὐτῷ | ἀετῷ ἐν τοίσιν | μεσοῦριάματι, ἀετὸς πετομένων ἐν μεσοὺριάματι. This blunder, amazing as it seems, is easily explained. The word μεσούριάμα, not previously found in the N. T. (though it occurs in two subsequent places of the Apocalypse), was strange to the translator, and it resolved itself in his eyes into three, μέσυ, οὐνά, ἥματι (which last he read as ἀματι). The rest he supplied, with the unhappy result as it stands.* In xiv. 6, where the word is next met with, in the sentence ἀγγελε-

* As if to show that a deeper depth of absurdity was not unattainable, De Dieu has
λον πετόμενον ἐν μεσουρανήματι, ἑχοντα ἐναγγέλιον αἰῶνον, it seems to have struck the translator that the tail, which in the former passage he naturally assigned to the eagle, would not suit the angel: and accordingly he drops it, reads οἴραν as οἴρανφ, but retains αἵματι, rendering, “an angel flying in heaven, having in blood the everlasting Gospel.” It is extraordinary that at xix. 17, where the word appears for the last time, he renders τοίς ὄρεσιν τοῖς πετόμενοι ἐν μεσουρανήματι quite correctly. To have made so huge a blunder, then by degrees to have found it out, and yet not to have turned back and corrected it, undoubtedly shows a strong case against our translator of ignorance at first and carelessness afterwards. But it is worth while to point out how this extreme instance illustrates the quantity of information derivable from a translation that strives to be faithful, even though it bears here and there marks of ignorance or carelessness. (1°) As to the nationality of the translator. I infer that Thomas was a Syrian trying to translate Greek, and not a Greek trying to write Syriac; for the utter unconsciousness of case-endings apparent in this blunder bespeaks a writer born to the use of a Semitic tongue to which case-endings were unknown. The misrendering of ἐπίλοσεως (2 Pet. i. 20) gives ground for a like inference, extending to Polycarp. (2°) As to his identification. I consider that this misrendering, so far from being an argument against ascribing this version to Thomas, goes the other way. The instances I have given show what enormities in the shape of Greek Thomas was capable of; and I submit that the man who made αἵματι out of the last three syllables of μεσουρανήματι may well be the same as he who read Ἴλος in the last three syllables of Κορνήλιος—to say nothing of the analogy between the pendent accusatives, οὐραν in the one case, and κόρην in the other. (3°) As to the Greek text. I remark that if he had rendered μεσουρανήματι correctly in viii. 13, we should have missed two facts which we gather from his mistakes. For, first, by finding “a tail” in the middle of the word, he shows that he was unaware of the reading ἄγγελος (for δερός), which is that of the Authorized (though not of the Revised) Version, after the Received mistranslated this mistranslation, thus, “In medio cauda qua sanguinem habet.” The Paris Polyglott, followed by Walton, corrects this.
Text and many cursives. And, secondly, by reading the end of the word as αἷμαρ, he testifies that his Greek MS. wrote μεσοφαράγματι, and not in the alternative form, μεσοφαράγκατι. (4°) In another way, I have found this same blunder of use in giving a ready answer to a question which might else have been hard to solve. In examining the MS. Syriac Commentary on the Apocalypse which I have mentioned, I became curious to ascertain whether it was the work of a Syrian divine, or a translation from a Greek one; when it occurred to me that the note on viii. 13 would serve as a test. I found it to run as follows:—"An eagle which flew in heaven, which had a tail of blood. Here he teaches, in saying that he had a tail of blood, that the God who spake with Moses, and went before the sons of Israel by night in a pillar of fire, and by day in a cloud—even he, though he was God, in the latter times came as flesh, and was killed and died for our salvation. Because of this John saith that he had a tail of blood." My question was answered. It was clear that the author of this comment knew the Apocalypse only in Syriac.

But I do not by any means imply that the value of this version lies merely or mainly in the facts which may thus be indirectly inferred from its aberrations. Its mistakes are far from numerous, and the one I have instance anything but a fair sample of the entire work. On the whole, it renders its sublime original correctly and with dignity: indeed there are parts of it where the revelations made to the Apocalyptist seem to find happier utterance in the Syriac than in the Greek in which he wrote them down. Every reader of the opening salutation must have felt how the Greek language labours and breaks down under the strain put upon it when charged with the enunciation of His eternal Being from whom the greeting comes, ἀπὸ ὑπὸ καὶ ὁ ὁ ἔρχομενος. In the Syriac (as in our English) the happy lack of inflexions clears away the solecisms that mar the Greek phrase, and the thought, as St. John conceived it, discloses itself in worthier expression when read back into the congenial diction of an idiom closely akin to the native speech in which it first shaped itself into words within his spirit—ἐν ὁ ὁ ὁ ἔρχομενος ὁ ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ὁ ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ὁ ὁ ἔρχομενος.

The importance of this version for critical purposes is not slight. In several passages it yields such decisive evidence of the readings of the MS.
which was its original, as to be a considerable accession to the authorities, not very abundant, for the Greek text of this part of the N.T. Accordingly it has been largely used by Tischendorf and others who have laboured in the field of textual criticism: and in order to bring out its evidence in a more correct and distinct shape, I believe it will be well worth while to make that complete comparison of our MS. with De Dieu's text which Ussher indicated 250 years ago as a work that ought to be done. The British Museum copy also awaits, and (considering its much higher date) is still more likely to repay, thorough collation. Possibly the Florence MS. may some day be recovered, and other missing copies may turn up, or copies hitherto unrecorded may be acquired in the East. Thus an approximately perfect text of the version may ultimately be restored, and the question of its authorship finally settled. Meantime, as a first step towards these results, I have made some progress in a collation of this MS.

In all that I have thus far written, I have assumed that this Syriac Apocalypse is not part of the same version as that to which the Four Epistles associated with it in our MS. belong; for on that head the internal evidence is conclusive. Its method is quite distinct from theirs, and is unquestionably Harklensian; insomuch that the critics who refuse to admit it to be the work of Thomas ascribe it to a translator who tried to imitate his manner. The question however remains—Did the translator (whether Thomas or another) translate directly from the Greek, or did he work, as Thomas is known to have done in all his recognized translations, on the lines of a version made a century before by Polycarp for Philoxenus? I find only two pieces of evidence adducible towards solving this question. The first is a copy in Syriac of the passage Rev. vii. 1—8, contained in another Nitrian MS. in the British Museum (Add. 17193, f. 146), of A.D. 874, resembling, but not identical with, the rendering of the same passage given in the version as printed; which latter varies from it in much the same manner and degree as the Harklensian text of the Four Epistles varies from that which I have discussed above. The second is a like extract from Rev. xvii. (3—6), found in a Syriac catena on Genesis which is printed among the works of Ephraim Syrus (Roman ed., tom. i. (Syr.), pp. 116 ff.; see p. 192), but is known to consist in part of selections from the writings of Jacob of
Edessa (circa 700). In this passage the variations from the printed version are on the whole similar in kind to those that are found in the former one; but they are more considerable in amount, and include (within four verses) evidence of two various readings of the Greek. Both passages thus lend themselves very well to the hypothesis that they may be fragments of a lost version by Polycarp, used as a basis by the author of the existing version. But, as regards the second passage, it may well have been rendered by Jacob of Edessa himself, who is known to have been a translator of Scripture (though we are not informed that he translated any part of the New Testament). And we have no proof, as regards either passage, that it ever formed part of a complete translation of the Book to which it belongs. Both may have been translated merely as detached extracts; and it would be unsafe to build on either, or both, an hypothesis of a version by Polycarp, or anyone else, preceding and underlying the version before us. If conclusive proof of the existence of such a version should hereafter come to light, it will in some measure modify the evidential results obtainable from the existing version. So long as we accept this version as the work of Thomas, or an assistant or disciple of his, we must estimate it for purposes of Greek textual criticism as simply equivalent to a Greek MS. which was in repute in Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century. But if we discover that he based it on a previous version, its proper and direct evidence becomes mixed with that which it repeats at second-hand from another MS. of a different place and of an earlier date.

I have now completed my account of the first or biblical division of the MS., and have left myself room for but a brief survey of the second, of which indeed I have as yet been able to make but a superficial examination. It is separated from the former division by a blank half-quire, similar to that which separates the Apocalypse from the Epistles, and it is made up of four quires, numbered 1 to 4, the last being of four sheets only, the others of five. Of the thirty-eight leaves it thus contains, the first only is blank; the rest are occupied with the Tractate of Ephraim, which is the whole of its contents. At the top of the second leaf of the first quire stands a headpiece in black and red, resembling in design that which is at the beginning of the Periopoe de Adulter. Then comes the heading, “In the name of God
that liveth for ever, we begin to write a little from the tractates of our father, honoured and blessed, Mar Ephraim, concerning the Love of Wisdom and Knowledge (ץمصאא סחכה יעץ). And there are twenty-two sayings. The first, in which is the letter Olaph." Then follows accordingly the first of these "sayings," or sections, beginning with י; and then the rest in order, twenty-two in all, after the number of the Semitic alphabet, each beginning with its letter (as in Ps. cxix.). Each, moreover, consists of twenty-two verses, having a like alphabetical arrangement (as in Lamentations), the first beginning from י and ending with ל, the second from נ and ending with נ, and so on; till the last, beginning with ל, ends withNAL. The colophon is simply "Ends; and to Jah [be] סוכא. Year 1626." (ץمصאא יעץ)

Similar alphabetical compositions are frequent among the writings of Ephraim; but I have not met with any other arranged exactly after the elaborate fashion of this. This copy of it is, so far as I know, unique; and I find no trace of it in the great Roman edition of Ephraim, or in any collection of his works, Syriac or translated, to which I have had access. A much shorter Tractate, also alphabetical, with a similar title, On the Love of Learning (ץمصאא יעץ), is well known; it was by order of Pope Gregory XIII. printed for distribution among the Maronite youth. A Latin version of it is included in Gerard Voss's Latin edition of Ephraim (1603), p. 267; and the Syriac text is given in the Roman edition (tom. ii. (Syr.) p. 336), where it is printed among the Sermones Exegetici, with the text Prov. v. 1. A copy of it is among the Homilies of Ephraim in another T.C.D. MS. (B.5.19), which I have mentioned above (p. 280) as described by Ussher in a letter (188) to De Dieu in 1633, and as bearing his autograph signature. But this composition contains but forty-four verses, two for each letter, and is thus much shorter than the Tractate in the MS. now before us, from which it is quite distinct. Ussher had read it; for in this letter he notices that it is one of those included in Voss's version, and adds that Isaac Sciadrensis had printed it in Syriac at Rome in 1618, but had failed to observe its alphabetic structure; having displaced the first word so as to make the first verse begin with נ instead of צ. The first line is (ץمصאא יעץ יעץ), "O God, bestow learning on him
that loves learning." It is thus of the nature of a prayer or hymn. The Tractate in the present MS. is rather a hortatory treatise, following the manner and often adopting the words of the Book of Proverbs; which Ephraim imitated also in his tracts Kατὰ μίμησιν τῶν Παρομιῶν, extant in Greek, and printed in the Roman edition, tom. i. (Gr.), p. 70. Its opening is:

"I. 1. O thou that desirest to be made wise, pray that thou mayst hear; and in thy understanding fix my sayings with my interpretations.

"2. With all thy possessions and with all thy goods, buy my instructions; which are very sweet, and make thee wise and make thee glad."

It closes as follows (cp. Prov. xv.1; x.10):

"XXII. 21. The words of the mouth turn away anger, if they are soft: but if they are grievous, they stir up clamour with contention.

"22. He maketh peace who reproveth his neighbour openly: and he that winketh, causeth sorrow."

NOTE ADDED IN THE PRESS.*

Since the above Paper was read, I have seen two of the MSS. above referred to: the Amsterdam N.T. (No. 184), and the Leyden Apocalypse. I subjoin a brief note of the results of my inspection.

I desire to express my thanks to Dr. H. C. Rogge, Librarian of the Amsterdam Seminary of Remonstrants, for his kindness in permitting me to collate the text of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles from the former MS.; and to Dr. M. Th. Houtsma, Adj. Interpres Legati Warneriani, of the University of Leyden, who gave me every facility for examining the latter.

I. Wetstein's MS. (Amsterdam No. 184) contains the Acts, with Epistles as specified above, p. 274, n., written on seventeen quires (each of five sheets), numbered from 18 to 34 inclusive. The first has lost its first three leaves, and the last its concluding leaf, so that 166 leaves remain. Thus the first 17 quires and 3 leaves of the 18th, of the book as originally made up in 34 quires, are wanting. On the recto of leaf 1, being 4th of the quire numbered

* In the foregoing pages I have not mentioned the Cambridge MS., Oc. 1, 2, which contains the Apocalypse, but is described as modern.

34
18 (now 1st quire), the Book of Acts begins, with its heading duly prefixed. The volume has therefore been intentionally divided at this place, and the 173 leaves which have been removed no doubt contained the Gospels. For them about 130 leaves would suffice, so that there would be some 40 leaves over. These may have been occupied by preliminary matter; but may possibly (though not probably) have also contained the Apocalypse, which would fill about 20 leaves. The Four Minor Catholic Epistles in this MS. are of the ante-Harkleian version (which no doubt is what Beelen means when he describes it as "Philoxenian,"—Prolegg., p. x.). The text, though inferior to the older Nitrian and probably contemporary Williams MSS., is superior to the Maronite text of the Oxford and Dublin copies. It omits the interpolated negative from 2 Pet. iii. 10; but exhibits the faulty reading of ii. 1 (see above, p. 295). In four places it gives, prima manu, alternative readings on the margin, all from the Harkleian version (viz. 2 Pet. iii. 5, 10; 2 John 8; 3 John 7). The scribe must therefore have had a Harkleian copy at hand; and this probably accounts for the Harkleian rendering (countenanced by no Greek MS.) which has crept into the text, Jude 7.

II. Scaliger's MS. (Cod. Scalig. 18 (Syr.) Leyden) is written in a Maronite hand. The scribe divides the text throughout by the usual lozenge and other like marks, but does not note the chapters or verses as given by De Dieu. The chapters have been marked on the margin by a later hand, which has also supplied sundry corrections. One important feature of this MS. De Dieu has omitted to reproduce—the insertion of asterisks. Of these, 37 or 38 occur in the text, all prima manu: most of them probably—several certainly—relating to various readings or renderings of the Greek. Thus the closer examination of this MS. adds manifold confirmation to the argument for assigning this version to Thomas, which I have above (p. 305) drawn from the single asterisk recorded from the Florence MS. The following is a select list of words whose Syriac equivalents are in this MS. marked*. Apoc. ii. 9 (also 13) τὰ ἐργα; iii. 3, ἐπὶ σε; v. 7, τὸ βιβλίον; xi. 1, καὶ ὁ ἄγιος εἶστήκει; xi. 5, οὕτως; xi. 16, τοῦ θρόνου; xiii. 10, συνάγει; xiii. 17, τοῦ ὄνοματος; xiv. 5, γάρ; xiv. 18, ἐξῆλθεν; xv. 6, οἱ ἁγαν.; xix. 1, καὶ ἡ τίμη; xix. 12, ὁ ὄνοματα γεγραμμένα καὶ; xix. 15, διότομος; xxi. 3, Θεὸς αὐτῶν; xxi. 8, καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶς; xxii. 14, οἱ πνεύματες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτῶν.
X.

ON A SYRIAC MS. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIBRARY OF THE EARL OF CRAWFORD, AND AN INEDITED VERSION OF THE APOCALYPSE INCLUDED IN IT. BY REV. JOHN GWYNN, D.D.

(Plate XXI.)

[Read January 23, 1888.]

In a Paper read by me before the Academy in May, 1886, and printed in its Transactions† (vol. xxvii., pp. 269—316), I had the satisfaction of announcing that a long-missing Syriac New Testament manuscript of Archbishop Ussher's collection was not, as had been supposed, lost, but is identical with the manuscript classed B. 5. 16 in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. This discovery was, however, in some measure a disappointment, inasmuch as it brought to light the fact that (as shown in that Paper) the Ms., far from being as had been supposed a New Testament complete in all its Books, included, as Ussher and his correspondents had described it as including, only so much of the New Testament as the Peshitto excludes—namely, the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, the Apocalypse, and the section of St. John's Gospel known as the Pericope de Adultera.

In the present Paper, I am happily able to offer a more than adequate compensation for that disappointment, by giving some account of a Ms.—one much older than Ussher's—with which I have since that time become acquainted; which (so far as I know) has never been described or made generally known to Biblical scholars; and which is, what Ussher's Ms. had erroneously been supposed to be, a New Testament in Syriac not only containing the entire Peshitto version, but also supplementing it by the addition of all the other Books commonly received as canonical. This Ms.,

* Since this Paper was read, considerable additions—the results of further investigations and of information obtained—have been made. October, 1893.
† On a Syriac Ms. in the Collection of Archbishop Ussher.
moreover, not merely stands alone among the Mss. which have reached us from the East, in exhibiting the Apocalypse (as well as the Four Epistles) as an integral part of the New Testament, but assigns to it a place of conspicuous honour, and (as I shall proceed to show at large) exhibits it in such a form as to constitute an important accession to the not very abundant materials hitherto available for the textual criticism of that Book.

For my knowledge of the existence of this remarkable Ms., I am indebted to the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B. D., Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford, the editor of the forthcoming Revised Text of the Peshitto Gospels which is about to be issued from the Clarendon Press. In reading my account of the Ussher Ms. above referred to, he had observed a note (to p. 274) in which I had stated that no Ms. of the entire New Testament in Syriac was known to exist. In correction of this statement he was so good as to write, in December, 1886, and inform me that among the Syriac New Testament Mss. which he was engaged in collating for the purposes of his work, there was one, the property of the Earl of Crawford, which exhibited all the Canonical Books without any exception. In the following year, on his kind invitation, I visited him and inspected the Ms. With his consent—indeed, at his suggestion—I made application to Lord Crawford, and obtained his permission, granted with a ready generosity which I desire to acknowledge with cordial thanks, to bring the Ms. home with me for more minute examination, of which I now proceed to detail the results.

The Ms. in its present state consists of 249 leaves of strong vellum, measuring 10½ by 7½ inches. The general arrangement of the sheets is in quinions (quires, or gatherings, of five sheets, making ten leaves). Of these quires there are 24, making 240 leaves; but of these leaves three are lost. There is, over and above these, an odd leaf at the end—the half, apparently, of a single concluding sheet of which the former leaf is also lost. Thus the original number of leaves must have been 242, of which four are wanting, and 238 remain; and the above total of 249 is made up by eleven leaves inserted into the middle of the book, to which I shall return presently. Of the missing leaves, one is the first of the first quire, which contained the opening verses of St. Matthew; so that the Ms. now begins
abruptly with ᾽αβίου ὁ ἀνήλιον ("Zorobabel begat Abiud"), St. Matth. i. 13. The latter part of the Ms., in which the Pauline Epistles stand last, has suffered more severely. The first leaf of the last quire has disappeared, leaving a gap from Titus i. 15 to the end of that Epistle; and likewise the last leaf of the quire with it, causing the Epistle to the Hebrews, with which the Ms. closes, to break off in xi. 28, with the words ωκός οἰκον ἔνδυς ἡμί. The remainder of that Epistle, however, could not (as I find by measurement) have been contained in one leaf: I infer therefore that it ran on into another lost leaf—the first of the final extra sheet of which, as above stated, only the latter half survives. This last appears to have been always, as it now is, the closing leaf: it contains on its recto side a summary of the contents of the Ms.; and on its verso, a long concluding note, now much defaced; both of which I shall describe in due course. In the second quire one leaf, and one in the fourteenth, have suffered serious mutilation; and two more leaves of the fourteenth have been similarly but less seriously injured. But with the exception of these, and the four lost leaves, the Ms. is in admirable preservation, and is as legible as when it was first written; save that here and there the action of damp has caused the heavily-chalked surface to come away in flakes, thus occasioning the disappearance, in part or whole, of a few words;—but in very few instances without sufficient traces left to enable the reader to recover them. Each page of the text exhibits its contents arranged in two columns; but the supplementary matter contained in the last leaf is written across the full width of the pages. Except in the last page the character is estrangelo, written with admirable firmness and regularity, in the formal manner of a professional scribe. It is, however, by no means of the oldest type of this mode of writing, but exhibits the later forms of many letters, especially of dolath, he, and rish.* The last page is written in a cursive

* See the accompanying autotype Plate (XXI.), which reproduces two columns of the Ms., the second of fo. 124 [113] r°, and the second of fo. 134 [123] r°. The damage done by damp is observable in the lower part of the latter, and in the upper part of both. Here, and throughout this Paper, I give the numbering of the folios as they are actually marked in the Ms. (in pencil, by a recent hand)—subjoining [in square brackets] the corrected number, allowing for lost and inserted leaves as above specified.
character, but to all appearance of the same age and by the same hand as
the body of the book; and it is noteworthy that throughout the Ms. the
letter olaph frequently, and sometimes also tau, especially near the end of a
word, tend to pass from the estrangelo into the cursive form, where the
scribe is trying to economize space towards the close of a line. Now and
then he has also interlined a word in the cursive character. The vocaliza-
tion is very sparingly indicated, by the usual points, occasionally applied.
The Greek or Jacobite vowels are here and there inserted, but mostly in
case of words adopted from the Greek or otherwise exceptional,—as far as
I can judge, prima manu.*

The Gospels, as usual, stand first in the Ms., arranged in their familiar
order, each having a brief subscription attached to it, followed by the
equally brief heading of the next Book, no break beyond a blank space of
an inch or two being made to mark the interval. They are of the Peshitto
version, as are all the Books that follow, so far as that version extends. I
have made no examination of their text, knowing that the collation of it is
in the hands of a scholar so competent as Mr. Gwilliam. I have only to
note that the Pericope de Adultera is not included in, or appended to, the
Fourth, or any of the Gospels in this Ms.

But now comes the feature which distinguishes our Ms. from all others
hitherto known to us. Immediately after the Gospels, beginning in the
same column as that in which St. John’s Gospel ends (fo. 120 [109] r° a),
and following it as closely as St. John’s follows St. Luke’s, comes the Apo-
calypse,—placed in this order, no doubt, because of the common authorship,
as is suggested by the words of the superscription prefixed to it: “Farther
we write the Revelation which was [given] unto Saint John the Evangelist,
when he was in the island Patmos, where he was sent by Nero Caesar”.†
After this the text of the Apocalypse proceeds, occupying nearly 29 pages
(ff. 120 [109] r°—134 [123] r°), and subscribed as follows: “[Here] ends
the Revelation which was [given] unto Saint John the Apostle and Evan-

* See the photographic facsimile on page 398.
† This superscription is in substance identical with that prefixed to the commonly-known
version of the Apocalypse, as attested by the Leyden and Florence Ms., and printed in the
Polyglots. For these Ms., see pp. 300, 316, of my Paper referred to, p. 347, note †.
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gelist; his prayer [be] with the sinner that wrote it. Amen.” Then follows, in the same column, the Book of the Acts, separated by the usual brief interval, and superscribed in the usual terms.* Then the Catholic Epistles, all seven, arranged in their customary Greek order, the Four Minor Epistles with the rest (2 Peter after 1 Peter and before 1 John, and the remaining three after 1 John)—these latter being of the version commonly known as “Pococke.” Last of all (as above stated) come the Pauline Epistles, ending with that to the Hebrews.

The whole book is divided into the 165 sections,† known as ραπαπη, which are found in so many Mss. of the Syriac New Testament, Peshitto and Harklensian alike: but of these only 164 now appear, the last having perished with the lost leaves at the end. These sections are noted by marginal numbers. Another set of marginal numbers marks a Lectionary system by which the New Testament is portioned into 468 or more lessons for the Sundays and holydays of the ecclesiastical year, of which but 467 remain. These lessons are farther marked by rubrics inserted in the text;‡ and many other lessons, for special days and occasions, are denoted by like rubrics, but without marginal numbers. Both these arrangements, sectional and lectionary, belong properly to the Peshitto text only. The “Pococke” Epistles bear on their margin no numbers, of either system; though portions of 2 Peter, and the whole of each of the

* For this superscription, and the preceding subscription to the Apocalypse, see second column of autotype Plate XXI., which represents fo. 134 [123] r° b. The superscription to the Apocalypse, with preceding subscription to St. John’s Gospel, is on fo. 120 [109] r° a; but I am unable to give an autotype of it, the inner column of every page being impracticable for photographic reproduction in the present state of the Ms., the modern binding of which is too tight to allow the leaves to lie flat.

† This total is made up as follows:—St. Matthew, 22; St. Mark, 13; St. Luke, 23; St. John, 20; Acts (with Catholic Epistles), 32; Pauline Epistles, 55. For these sections (which are peculiar to Syriac usage) see a valuable note by Dr. I. H. Hall, in Journal of Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis (June–Dec., 1882, pp. 11 and 12). Cp. also Wright, Catal. of Syr. Mss., Brit. Mus., p. 41 (where they are set forth as given in Add. 14448, a New Testament written circ. a.d. 700) and passim.

‡ Column 2 of the autotype Plate XXI. shows both these marginal numberings—lesson 1 and section 1 of the Acts, and also an inserted rubric assigning the lesson to “The Ascension of our Lord.”
other three, are appointed for certain days by inserted rubrics. The Apocalypse alone has no mark to show that any portion of it was read in Church. It however, in common with the rest of the New Testament in this Ms., is divided into verses (ρηματα, κομματα, or ρηματα), by the usual lozenge-groups of dots (●). These marks, as well as the marginal numbers with the ornaments attached to them, and the rubrics, and the superscriptions and subscriptions of the several books, are in red pigment.

The notes which occupy the penultimate page, 249 [242] r°, which is enclosed in a many-coloured border, relate to these divisions of the text, and may therefore conveniently be described here.

Its first paragraph (1°) is the only part of it that contains anything bearing on the special contents of the Ms. The opening sentence, written in red, is as follows: "[Here] ends the writing of the books of the New Testament, in which there are sections (κομματα, as above) one hundred and sixty-five, besides the Revelation and the four Epistles, 137 [3]" (the fourth digit is uncertain). At this point a word is lost—probably the equivalent of "verses",—owing to a hole in the vellum, which extends also through words in the two following lines. Then begins a second sentence (of which the words printed in italics are written in black) as follows: "Now there are verses (κομματα) of the Gospel; nine thousand .... and sixty 3 and of the Acts four thousand one hundred ... [verses and of the Apostle six thousand four hundred and 71]."* The next paragraph gives (2°) a reckoning, not very completely set forth, of the "Chapters" (κεφαλαια), "Canons" (κανονες, i. e. Eusebio-Ammonian sections), "Miracles" (οραματα), "Parables" (οραματα), and "Testimonies" (οραματα, i. e. Old Testament citations), of each Gospel severally. The final paragraph gives (3°) a similar reckoning of the "verses" of the several Gospels, as follows:—St. Matthew, 2520; St. Mark, 1275; St. Luke, 3083;

* The absence of the numbers which I have indicated thus (...), is due to the hole above-mentioned. In Rich. 7158 (Brit. Mus., probably of cent. x.), there is a similar reckoning, giving to the Gospels 9863 verses; Acts and Catholic Epistles, 4149; Pauline, 6473. These numbers enable us to fill up the gaps in f. 249 r° with probable accuracy. See Rosen-Forshall, Catal. Codd. Mss. Orient., Pars i., p. 20.
St. John, 2532. The sum of these numbers, 9410, does not agree with the total number of verses stated above in the first paragraph, which is 9[.]63 (probably 9863); but I have not been industrious enough to ascertain by actual counting which of them, if either, agrees with the number of verses into which the text is, as I have said, actually divided. The Chapters and Canons which are reckoned in the second paragraph are nowhere indicated in the text or margin of our Ms. These reckonings agree pretty nearly with similar lists in many other Mss.*

The concluding note which fills the verso of this leaf is, as I have said, more than usually difficult to read, being disfigured by damp and friction. With the kind assistance of Mr. Gwilliam, for which my special acknowledgments are due, I have been able to recover its contents in a form all but complete. In this note, the scribe describes himself as “Stephen, a monk of the monastery of Mar Jacob the Egyptian Recluse, and of Mar Barslabba, near the town of Salach, in the country of Tur'abdin, in the dominion [rašqa, shultona] of Hesna d’ Kipha.” He asks the prayers of his readers for himself, and for (among others) his “paternal uncles, the monks Mas’ud deceased, and John and Simeon, who ministered to me according to their ability,” and for his “maternal uncles, monks and presbyters, deceased, Gabriel and Jacob, who also took care of me in the matter of instruction, and writing, and so forth”, and for five others, monks, whom he mentions by name; “and for all who have taken part by word or deed in the work” of producing the Ms. Finally he informs us that the book was written at the expense and for the use of Rabban Gabriel, apparently a different person from the uncle of the same name above mentioned, “monk and priest, deceased, of the town of Beth-Nahle”; for whom he asks special prayers, “and for his fathers, and for his brother Denha, deacon, deceased,” and for another deceased deacon, Sahda, and a youth named Moses. It is disappointing not to find, among the many persons here named, even one Patriarch, or Bishop, or Abbot, whom one might be able to identify, and thus to determine the date of the Ms. But,

* Cp., e.g., the notes appended to the Gospels in the Bodleian Mss., Hunt. 587 (cent. xiii.), and Or. 361 (cent. xiv.); Payne Smith, Catal. Codd. Mss. Biblioth. Bodl., Pars vi., coll. 86, 91. In the former, the (Syriac) sections, and the lessons, are also reckoned for each Gospel.
as I shall presently show, this note yields enough to make the date a matter of probable inference, though not of actual proof. It seems likely that a shorter note, giving the date of the writing, and perhaps the name of the contemporary Patriarch, may have been subjoined to the close of the text of the New Testament, on the verso of the lost penultimate leaf.

I now turn back to describe the eleven leaves which I have mentioned as inserted into the middle of the Ms. (now numbered ff. 109–119). They contain a Harmony of the narratives of the Passion, as given in the four Gospels, arranged so as to form a continuous history, taken not from the Peshitto, but from the Harklesian version; the extracts of which it is made up being assigned to the Evangelists to whom they severally pertain, by their names entered over against each on the margin. The whole of this Harmony is portioned into lessons for Good Friday. These leaves seem to be written by the same hand as the text of the New Testament, or by a very similar and contemporaneous one: but the ink is different, and the red pigment of its rubrics and marginal notes is not the vermillion which is used in the body of the book, but an inferior substance, apparently red lead. This interpolated matter was intended to follow the Gospels, and is inserted after the eighth leaf of the eleventh quire (fo. 108), which leaf is occupied by the latter part of the fourth Gospel. But inasmuch as the last verse of that Gospel runs on into the first page of the ninth leaf of that quire, being the page on which the Apocalypse begins (properly fo. 109 r, but now in consequence of the interpolation, 120), and extends to four lines followed by three lines of subscription, the scribe, in order to make these eleven leaves read continuously with what precedes, has repeated these seven lines at the head of the first column of the recto of the first interpolated leaf (now fo. 109), so that the portion of the Ms. containing the Gospels, plus the Harmony of the Passion, should, if separated, form a complete book. He then proceeds to introduce the Harmony with the superscription: “Further we write the lessons of the redeeming Passion of Christ our Lord, which are gathered from the four Evangelists, Harklesian version.” It occupies twenty-one pages, ending on the recto of the eleventh of these leaves (fo. 119), and is subscribed: “[Here] end the select lessons of the great Friday of the Crucifixion, gathered from the
four Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John." This Harmony is substantially identical with one which follows the Gospels in a Paris MS. (No. 31, Zotenberg's *Catal. des Mss. Syriques de la Biblioth. Nat.*) of the Syriac New Testament (dated A. Gr., 1514), and with the Good Friday portion of the "Lessons for Passion Week" in the Lectionary 7169 Rich (probably of twelfth century) of the British Museum—which is found also in other Mss. The verso of this eleventh leaf (fo. 119) was left blank by the scribe, but has since been scrawled over by a clumsy hand with sundry entries, of which the first records a change of ownership of the Ms.: "I bought this book of the New [Testament], I Simeon of Hatacha, [named] Taibu, Patriarch, from Saliba son of the deacon Joshua, son of the presbyter Simeon, for one hundred and twenty 'athmanih (アトマニ)."† The date is added, "1845, Canun the latter, 28" (January, 1534, A.D.).

I now proceed to summarize the results which the evidence yielded by the Ms., as above stated, enables us to draw, concerning its age and history.

In the first place, it is a Ms. of Jacobite origin. The fact that it embodies the "Pococke" text of the Four Epistles—a Jacobite version—raises a presumption in this direction, which is confirmed by the presence of the associated eleven leaves containing the Harmony of the Passion, compiled from the Harklensian Gospels—also a Jacobite work. Moreover, the vocalization by Greek letters, found here and there in the text, is a Jacobite characteristic; and (as I shall show more particularly hereafter) the estrangelo character throughout is distinctly of a well-marked Jacobite type. To these internal indications, yielded by the contents and handwriting of the Ms., is to be added the independent testimony of the final note on its last page. It was written, as we there learn, in the very head-quarters of the Jacobite Church, in "the convent of Mar Jacob the

* See Rosen-Forshall, *Catal.*, p. 34.
† A Turkish coin, said to be worth about 7*ç. The book would thus have been sold for £3 15*. See Payne Smith, *Catal.*, coll. 611, 612, for the note of the sale of the Bodleian Ms., Hunt. 163 (Lexicon of Bar-Ali), forty years later, for 200 'athmanih (£6 5*).
Egyptian recluse and of Mar Barshabba, near the town of Şalach, in Tur'abdin, in the dominion of Hesn-Kipha. Tur'abdin* is a district of northern Mesopotamia, now included in Kurdistan, and known as Jebel-Tur—a hilly region, as its name (= Mountain of Servants) implies;

bounded on the north and north-east by the Tigris. Its western limit reaches within a few miles of the city of Marde, now and for seven

* See the accompanying map, which is mainly from Ritter's map, with a few details added from Badger's; some also from that prefixed to J. G. Taylor's "Travels in Kurdistan," printed in Journal of R. G. S., vol. xxxv. (1865), p. 21, in which he describes what he saw of Tur'abdin and the adjoining parts in 1861. The south-western limits of the district of Tur'abdin is indicated by the dotted line.
centuries past the seat of the Jacobite Patriarch. It was once full of Jacobite convents, and is still noted as the chief abode of the dwindled and dwindling Jacobite community, still ruled by three Bishops, to one of whom it gives the title of "Metropolitan of Jebel-Tur." Concerning the convent where the Ms. was written, and its eponymous saints, a detailed narrative is to be found in an inedited volume (Syriac) of Lives of the Saints (Brit. Mus., Add. 12174, No. 71, a Ms. to which I shall again have occasion to refer), a Jacobite collection, written A. Gr. 1508 (= A.D. 1197) for a Jacobite community, under the sanction of the then Jacobite Patriarch, and preserved (until it was removed some fifty years ago to London) in the library of another Jacobite community in the Nitrian Desert of Upper Egypt,—the first life in the series being that of Barsauma, founder of the

* The importance of Tur'abdin, and its Bishops and their people, in the Jacobite communion, appears again and again in the latter centuries of the Chronicon Ecclesiasticum of Barhebrseus, and is made conspicuous by the fact mentioned below (p. 359, note *), of the schism of A.D. 1364, when a rival Patriarch of Tur'abdin was set up, which continued for 130 years. "Tur'abdin is my right-hand" was the exclamation of the Patriarch Ismael (Ignatius VI.), under whom this breach took place, as recorded by the continuator of Barhebrseus (Chron. Eccles., i. 99, col. 801 of the edition of Abbeloos and Lamy, to which I refer throughout); and within the last fifty years the Jacobite Bishop of Mar Mattai (near Mosul), in conversation with Mr. Badger, spoke of the same district in like terms, saying of it, "There our strength lies" (Badger's Nestorians, vol. i., p. 52). Mr. Badger, when he visited it in 1850, found upwards of 5000 Jacobites in some half-dozen towns or villages, one or two of which were occupied exclusively by Jacobites (ib., pp. 53 ff.).

A Syriac dialect is still the vernacular of this region; see the work of Prym and Socin, Der neu-aramäische Dialekt des Tur-Abdtn (Göttingen, 1881), and the Einleitung by Prym, who travelled through Tur'abdin in 1870. The priests can read the Syriac of their Lectionaries and Service-books, but many of them do not understand it. Few of the laity can even read it (Nestorians, i., pp. 54, 61).

In Marde, Mr. Badger reckons (p. 49) the number of Jacobite families at 600, out of a total of 2780. The Patriarch's abode is near this city, in the convent of Mar Ananias, called Deir Zaferan. Under him are eight Metropolitans and three Bishops. Three of the eleven belong to Tur'abdin, as above stated (ib., p. 60).

The other centres of the scanty Jacobite population are, Diarbekr (Amid), Mosul, and Urfa (Edessa). In Mr. Badger's book further details are to be found, also in the earlier Narrative of Southgate (1840), and in Prym's Einleitung, as above.

† See Wright, Catal., pp. 1123, 1135 seq.
Jacobite sect. Šalach, the town to which the above-mentioned convent was "near," is known as a Jacobite see, apparently at one time the chief see of Tur'abdin,—for the continuator of Barhebræus records† that when the Jacobite Church of a later day was divided (A. Gr. 1675, = A.D. 1364) by a schism (which lasted till near the close of the next century), it was the Bishop of Šalach, one Saba, that the Tur'abdinese Bishops elected to be "Patriarch of Tur'abdin," and it was in this very convent of Mar Jacob that the election took place. Ḥesn-Ki̇pha, as we may infer from the note as above cited, was, at the time when our Ms. was written, the civil capital of Tur'abdin. It is stated in the Ms. above referred to (Add. 12174)‡ to have been built by "Constantine [Constantius] son of Constantine the Great," as a frontier fortress against the Persians. It is to be found in modern maps as Ḥisn-Ki̇fa, on the Tigris, where it forms the northern boundary of Jebel-Tur. It is worth while to add that the only other town mentioned in this note, Beth-nahle, appears to have been also in Tur'abdin; for its name (not otherwise known) occurs in another Nitrian Ms. (Add. 14719)§ of evidently Jacobite origin, in connexion with that of a Tur'abdinese monk.

How long our Ms. may have continued in its first abode, we have no means of determining. The entry on fo. 119 v° informs us (as we have seen) that in A. Gr. 1845 (A.D. 1534) it was the property of one Šaliba, who in that year sold it to "Simeon Taibu of Hatacha, Patriarch." This Simeon||

---

* Šalach retains its name, and is marked in Taylor's map, some twenty-five miles south of Ḥisn-Ki̇fa.
|| A Simeon named Taibutho (a fuller form of Taibu), from the title of a book written by him, but of a much earlier age, is recorded in the list of distinguished physicians, *op. Assem., Biblioth. Orient.,* II. p. 315. He is reckoned (ib. p. 425, and Barhebr., *Chr. Eccl.*, II. 29, c. 139) as contemporary with Ananjesu, the Nestorian Catholicus, who was consecrated A.D. 684–6. See also *B. O. III. (pt. 1.)* p. 181. A Simeon of Hatacha, named in the continuation of the *Chr. Eccl.* (op. Assem. *B. O.* II. p. 382) as one of the Bishops who elected the Patriarch A.D. 1293, is also excluded by his date from identification with the Simeon of A.D. 1534. His name does not appear in the Ms. 7198 Rich, whence Abbéloos and Lamy derive the continuation printed by them (I. 97, c. 781 sqq., 785); but is given, as in Assem., in that which they append, c. 907, from the Bodleian Ms., Hunt. 1. Hatacha is presumably the Attach of Taylor's map.
cannot be with any confidence identified with any one of the Patriarchs recorded in the Jacobite lists. It was usual in the Jacobite Church for a monk when consecrated Bishop to take a new name; and it was the fixed custom, from and after A.Gr. 1604 (a.d. 1293) that anyone, Priest or Bishop, when elevated to the Patriarchate, should be styled Ignatius.* It is therefore possible that the purchaser of our Ms. in a.d. 1534 may have been Ignatius XIII., the Joshua of Kelath who in the Barsalibæan list of Patriarchs printed by Assemani† is stated by the continuator to have “hagarized” (apostatized to Islam), but afterwards to have recanted and resumed his throne. The date of this prelate’s apostasy was A. Gr. 1828 (a.d. 1517);‡ but that of his death is unrecorded, and I know of no means of ascertaining whether in 1534 he still lived and styled himself Patriarch. Of the next two Patriarchs, Ignatius XIV. and XV., we are only informed that they were Jacob of Damascus and David of Ma’adan, their dates being unrecorded. The probability is that our Simeon may have been Ignatius XVI., also known as ‘Abdallah of Hesna d’Atta, who appears under that name next

* To give one example out of very many: the Patriarch elected a.d. 1293, as mentioned in last note, Bader Zokhe, otherwise Barvahib, was called Joseph as Bishop of Marde, and took the name of Ignatius when elevated to the Patriarchate, as did all his successors thenceforth. He is commonly reckoned, however, as Ignatius V., four of his predecessors having borne the same name, though not all of them in immediate continuity. (Assem., B. O. II. p. 381; Barhebr., Chr. Eccl., I. 97, c. 783.) So too the Saba who was chosen (see above, p. 357, note *) to head the schism of Tur’abdin, a.d. 1364, was named Basil as Bishop of Salach, but when he assumed the Patriarchate, assumed with it the name Ignatius. (Barhebr., Chr. Eccl., I. 99, c. 797, 801; Assem., B. O. II. p. 383.)

† B. O. II. pp. 323-4, note.

‡ This is stated in a note found in the Ms. 7197 Bich. (see R. F., Catal., p. 89); compare also the note in Add. 21580 (Wright, Catal., p. 625), written apparently by this Joshua himself. In this Ms. is also an entry (a deed of sale) purporting to be written by ’Abdallah (Ignatius XVI.). I have compared the handwriting of both these notes with that of Simeon’s entry in our Ms. That which is attributable to Joshua, though very like Simeon’s in general character, is decidedly better and stronger; and on examination proves to be distinguishable from it in many points. That which is in the name of ’Abdallah shows no resemblance, and if really written by him would be conclusive against identifying him with Simeon. But it may be merely a copy of a memorandum written by ’Abdallah,—as in Add. 12174 we find an attestation purporting to be given under the hand of the Patriarch Michael, which according to Dr. Wright (Catal., p. 1187) is in the hand of the scribe of the Ms.
in the list above cited (see also Assem., B.O., II. p. 482), and is mentioned as Patriarch in two entries, dated respectively A.Gr. 1839 and 1847 (A.D. 1528, 1535), found in two Mss. of the British Museum, Arundel Or. 11 and 53.* However, in treating of persons of whom so little is known, belonging to a time when the apostasy of a Patriarch and his restitution can hardly have failed to result in a disputed succession, it is not possible to solve this question of identity with anything like certainty. But Hatacha, Simeon's abode—probably his see—was a Jacobite episcopal city, near the more important see of Maipherak (Mejafarkin), also Jacobite, thirty or forty miles north-west of Ḥeṣn-Kipha (see map). If then the new owner of our Ms. lived at Hatacha, it would there be still within the North-Mesopotamian region: if he occupied the patriarchal abode near Marde, it would be in a convent on the very borders of Tur'abdin, still less remote than Hatacha from the place of its origin—the monastery where the Jacobite Church had and still has the centre of its life.†

It appears then that the Ms. continued in Jacobite ownership down to the second quarter of the sixteenth century. Beyond the year 1534 its history is a blank. We have no means of knowing when, or how—by purchase or by force—it was removed from the possession of the successors

* See R.-F., Catal., pp. 61, 95, where the editors wrongly propose to identify him with, or place him immediately after, Ignatius XIII. Kelath is no doubt the Killeth visited by Badger (Nestorians, i. p. 53, and map). Ḥesna d'Atta, i.e., Woman's Castle, is probably the place near Marde now known by the equivalent Arabic name Kalaat-ul-Mara, in memory of its successful defence by a woman in the fourteenth century, when besieged by Tamerlane. (Ib., p. 51.)

† It is to be mentioned that a Simeon appears to have been Nestorian Patriarch at the date given in this entry; in fact three successive Simeons occupied the throne between A.D. 1504 and 1551 (Assem., B.O., II. p. 457; III. (pt. i.) p. 621), one of whom may have made this entry. But the handwriting of the entry, and the other circumstances of our Ms., seem to exclude the probability of its having passed into any but Jacobite hands.

Yet it appears that in the sixteenth century Nestorian prelates and people had a footing in three important Jacobite cities of the region of which I have treated, Marde, Amid, and Ḥeṣn-Kipha. And it is certain that the Nestorians of that time, and as it seems from the time of Babueus, A.D. 498, gave their Catholicus the style of Patriarch (Assem., B.O., III. (pt. ii.) p. cxvii.; cp. the epistle of the Nestorians to Pope Julius III., A.D. 1552, ap. Assem., B.O., I. p. 526.)
of Simeon of Hatacha, nor through what hands it passed until,—at Marde perhaps, or more probably at Diarbeekr, or Aleppo,—it became the property of someone who carried it to England, from whom it was ultimately purchased by the late Earl of Crawford, a nobleman eminent in learning no less than in rank and birth, and found a secure and worthy resting-place in his library.

But when we seek to determine the age of the Ms., we find the evidence of time by no means so distinct as the evidence of place. As I have said above, the concluding note, long as it is, gives no date, nor among the many persons named in it does one whose date can be determined. On the back of the modern binding in which the book now appears, it is lettered "Circ. A.D. 1000"; but by whom, or on what grounds, this date has been assigned, I am not informed. We are thus thrown back on the judgment of experts, and the evidence of the handwriting. The estrangelo character in which it is written, as I have already stated, is of a type that cannot be regarded as archaic. A glance at the autotype Plate (XXI.) will satisfy anyone who is familiar with the estrangelo Mss. of the fifth and sixth centuries, that we have here a work of much later date. The rectangular dolath and rish (ı ı), and the open he, vau, and mim (m m), which are usual in early Mss., and which are imitated more or less exactly in the type used in this Paper, as in most fonts of estrangelo type, are in our Ms. replaced by curved forms of the first-named two letters, and closed forms of the remaining three,* as shown in the autotypes. The Greek (or Jacobite) vowels, which in our Ms. are occasionally inserted, prima manu as it appears, are unknown to the earlier scribes; and if we may trust the tradition reported by Assemani,† which assigns their introduction to the latter half of the eighth century, we can hardly suppose it to have been written much before A.D. 800. As to the modified forms of the consonants, the inference to be drawn from them is ambiguous. On the one hand, the rounding of the dolath and rish appears

* This is so without exception in the text; but the archaic forms are used, as in most Ms., as numerals in the quire-signatures, and in the numbering of sections and lessons.
† B. O., I. pp. 64, 521.
no doubt in Mss. of the seventh century, or perhaps earlier; but it was followed by a reaction in favour of the archaic or square forms, which is supposed to have been due to John of Kartamin (consecrated A. Gr. 1299, A.D. 988),* and to characterize the best strangelo writing of his time and the succeeding century. On the other hand, it is certain, as I am about to show, that some Mss. of the eleventh century and more of the twelfth show a reversion to the rounded forms. For so far, therefore, the palæographical indications may be interpreted either as pointing to a date for our Ms. as early as the close of the eighth century, or to one as late as the twelfth. And in point of fact, of the experts to whose judgment the Ms., or photographs from it, have been submitted, some have been disposed to assign it to the earlier and some to the later period. The conjectural date above mentioned, A.D. 1000, though at first sight it may seem to commend itself as a compromise between extremes, is really less probable than either A.D. 800 or A.D. 1200; inasmuch as it falls in the period of the revival of those archaic forms which, as I have said, the writer of our Ms. avoids in his text.

It is plain, therefore, that the tests which palæography furnishes are insufficient to solve even approximately the question before us. The evidence of the Greek vowels gives at most a superior limit, and that by no means a certain one, for the age of the Ms. The evidence of the modified letter-forms leaves us unable to decide between two periods which differ from one another by three or four centuries.

This being so, it appeared to me desirable to try, by direct inspection of dated Mss., how far the supposed tests of age could be relied on. The first Ms. I chose for examination with this view was a Jacobite Lectionary, dated A. Gr. 1311 (A.D. 1000), classed Add. 12139 in the British Museum. Its general resemblance to the Crawford Ms. will be perceived by anyone who compares the facsimile page in Wright’s Catalogue (Plate X.) with our autotypes. The same forms of all the letters above mentioned appear in it throughout; it yields one instance of the lapse of olaph and tau into the cursive character which occurs in our Ms.; and one word is furnished with Greek vowels of the same type (see above, p. 350). At first sight, then,

it was plain that, without going further, we have in this single page a proof that the supposed characteristics of the period when the school of John of Kartamin prevailed are untrustworthy. But when I extended my scrutiny to the other pages of this Ms. I soon arrived at the further perplexing result, that the forms in question—those at least which are most marked and have been most relied on, the rounded dolath and risk, and the closed he,—are used only in the earlier pages, and in the latter part of the book are replaced by characters of the archaic type. Nor can this fact be accounted for by supposing a change of scribe. The subscription names but one (Romanus), and the handwriting is in all else so uniform as to confirm this statement. Moreover, the transition from the later to the earlier forms occurs, strange to say, in the middle of a page (fo. 84 r, line 9) where there is no break in the text. In the rest of that page the forms are mixed; but before it I have observed no instance of the early forms, and after it no instance of the later forms.

Thus the evidence of this Ms. (a Ms. of importance, a Lectionary written under the directions of the Patriarch Athanasius V. for the Convent of Mar Barsauma) utterly discredits the test of age as supposed to be deducible from the presence or absence of the archaic forms of the letters above mentioned. It is plain that these forms were liable to be (as in this case) disused or resumed at the fancy of the scribe, or perhaps according to the taste of his employer. It may not improbably be found on closer investigation that, in general, such and such forms prevailed at this or that period in certain districts, or among the penmen of certain schools.*

* It appears to me that the statement of Barhebræus above referred to, which is also cited by Assem. (II. 352), concerning the revival of the ancient estrangelo under John of Kartamin, has been wrongly understood as regards the extent and permanence of its results. It does not necessarily convey more than that he originated an important and active school of caligaphy for his own convent, in which the archaic forms were revived. Kartamin (now Kerdamin) was in Tur'abdin, and yet, as I shall show presently, the later forms, if they were ever superseded under his influence in Tur'abdinese usage, had resumed their place in Tur'abdinese writing before the end of the twelfth century, even in Kartamin. In the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, one of the Ms. to which I am about to direct special attention as characterized by precisely the same forms as those which belong to the Crawford Ms., was written (as the subscription tells us) in Nov., A. Gr. 1506 (A.D. 1194), by one Simeon of Mido (in Tur'abdin), who was trained in the convent.
But the example I have adduced is a warning that such generalizations, unless in cases where they are supplemented by special evidence in some other shape, are not to be relied on as sufficient to determine even approximately the date of any individual Ms.

Finding then so little to rely on in this direction, I turned to another, and proceeded to inquire whether the notes of place, which are so distinctly given in the subscription of our Ms., might serve to help out the deficiency of notes of time. The Ms. was certainly written in a convent of Tur'abdin in Northern Mesopotamia. It seemed worth while therefore to look for dated Mss. proceeding from North-Mesopotamian convents, and to compare its handwriting with theirs. To one such Ms. especially my attention had been directed. The late Dr. William Wright, to whom I had sent a photograph of a page of the Ms., gave his opinion, though guardedly, that it was of the twelfth century, and added, “The writing seems to me to be very like that of Add. 12174”: and Dr. Karl Hörning, of the British Museum, to whom I afterwards showed the Ms. itself at the Museum (without telling him Dr. Wright’s opinion), expressed the same judgment as to its date, and confirmed it by producing Add. 12174, the very manuscript which Dr. Wright had named. The resemblance between the two Mss. when laid side by side was most striking. Now Add. 12174 is the Nitrian Ms. to which I have referred above (p. 357) of Mar Simeon of Kartamin (see below, p. 369, No. 41). One short note only (fo. 176 r*) in this Ms., in which the scribe asks the reader’s prayers, is in the older estrangelo, with angular forms.

The passage of the Chronicon, relating to John of Kartamin, runs as follows:—

“Mar John, Bishop of the Convent of Kartamin renewed the writing of estrangelo in Tur'abdin, which had been disused for the space of a hundred years; and by examination of written books the prelate himself learned it, and taught his brother’s sons. But there was given perfect grace in writing to Emmanuel, and in painting to Nahe his brother. And the prelate sent Peter their brother to Melitene, and he brought parchment; and Rabban Emmanuel wrote seventy copies of the Peshitto, Septuagint [אכ, Syro-Hexaplar], and Harklensian [versions]; and a volume of Homilies in three divisions; and gave them to the Convent of Kartamin, books which have not their equal in the world.”

[The word which I render “in painting” is misunderstood by Assem., and by Abbeloos and Lamy, and transliterated as part of the name of the brother of Emmanuel;—“Nahabsajorutha,” A. and L.].
as the authority for the history of the convent where the Crawford Ms. was written, and of the foundation of Hesn-Kiph. It is dated A.Gr. 1508 (A.D. 1196), and was written by Joseph a monk, in and for the Jacobite convent of Mar Barsauma of Melitene, as we read in an appended note,* purporting to be attested by the then Patriarch, Michael I., sur-named the Great, who had formerly been the Abbot of that convent. The name of this prelate—a great promoter of learning, the friend and contemporary of the chief light of the Jacobite Church of the twelfth century, Dionysius Barsalibi†—favoured the supposition that these carefully executed Mss. might be among the fruits of the impulse given to literary and theological pursuits in the Jacobite Church by him and Barsalibi, in the region where their influence would naturally be chiefly felt—the region including and adjoining Tur'abdin, reckoning among its principal cities Marde, to which he transferred the patriarchal seat—Amid, where his predecessors had sat and to which when he left it he transferred Barsalibi—Melitene, the birthplace of both these prelates and to the last the favourite residence of Michael.‡ Led by this idea, I proceeded to search, by the help of the Catalogues of the British Museum, for dated Jacobite estrangelo Mss. of the Scriptures, written in this region. It was not however among the volumes of the great Nitrian collection that I found the evidence I sought, but among those acquired earlier by the Museum, which had been collected by Rich in his sojourn in Mesopotamia in 1820, at Mosul and elsewhere.

Of these I will first mention 7154 Rich. It is a Jacobite Psalter, dated A.Gr. 1575 (A.D. 1204), written by Simeon a monk, “in the convent of the Theotokos called Beth-Aksenoye (the Guest-house), in the Mount of Edessa,” for the use of Moses, a monk of Salach in Tur'abdin. The estrangelo of this Ms. not only bears a close general resemblance to

* Wright, Catal., p. 1137.
† See, for Michael, Barhebr., Chron. Eccles., I., 89, 90, c. 523, 533 and sqq., 605;—for Barsalibi, ib. 513, 539, 543, 559. The latter died 1171 A.D., the former 1199.
‡ Amid is less than 100 miles from Melitene, and 60 from Marde, which city is within 20 miles of the border of Tur'abdin, about 30 from Kartamin and 40 from Hesn-Kipa. Edessa is within 100 miles of the first-named three cities. The length of the entire district including all these places is about 200 miles. See map, p. 356.
that of the Crawford Ms., but reproduces each and all of its characteristic peculiarities as above specified.

Hardly if at all less close is the resemblance shown by 7160 Rich, a Jacobite copy of the Peshitto New Testament, written a year earlier than 7154 Rich, in another convent of the same "Mount of Edessa," by a monk Abulpharag of Amid, who emphatically records that he was educated from childhood "at the feet of Mar Michael Patriarch of Syria,"* thus connecting his work, as the scribe of Add. 12174 connects his, with the name of that great patron of letters.

The evidence, then, of these two Mss., taken with that of the Nitrian Ms. Add. 12174, makes it impossible to maintain that the palæographical characteristics of the Crawford Ms. assign it necessarily to the eighth or ninth century, or to any period earlier than the latter part of the twelfth. They prove that, at least among the Mss. of Northern Mesopotamia, the same characteristics mark those written shortly before, or shortly after, A.D. 1200. A comparison of them, moreover, with our autotypes, will convince anyone familiar with Syriac Mss. of different periods, that the resemblance pointed out by Dr. Wright and Dr. Hörning is no mere casual or superficial one, but that the Crawford Ms., not only as regards the forms of particular letters and other special peculiarities, but also as regards the general aspect and style of the handwriting, comes very much nearer to this late group of three Mss. than to the Ms. with which I at first compared it (Add. 12139), or to any Ms. of earlier date. It is to be added that, in these three Mss., the resemblance is twofold; for it shows itself no less markedly in the cursive which is used in their notes (as in the final note of the Crawford Ms.), than in the estrangelo of their text.† It will be observed that the local indications by which our inquiry was guided to the period now under consideration, are as distinct in the two Rich Mss. as in the Nitrian one. As it names Melitene, so do they name Amid and

* See Rosen-Forshall, Catal., pp. 8, 22. The writing of these Mss. is there described as "Nestorian"; but this is a mistake, corrected by Wright, Catal., pp. 1202, 1203.

† In Add. 12174, and in 7160 Rich, the final note is written in cursive: in 7154 Rich it is in estrangelo, but on fo. 84 there is a footnote in cursive. In these three cursive notes, the writing is much the same in style as that of the last page of the Crawford Ms.
Salach. All three alike are written by, or for, monks of convents situated within the region on which our attention has been fixed, the region to which the Crawford Ms. belongs—one of them (7154 Rich) for a monk of the very convent in which the Crawford Ms. was written.* A farther token of the affinity between the latter Ms. and the two Rich Mss. is yielded by the subscriptions whence we have gathered the notes of place. They bear in form and substance and even in wording a close resemblance to the longer subscription of our Ms., a resemblance much greater than is to be found (so far as I have observed) in any Ms. of earlier or much later date. So close is the coincidence of phrase that in the difficult task of deciphering the final page which exhibits it, material help is to be had from comparison of the other two with it.†

It was clear then that the evidence of the British Museum Collection pointed towards the period just before or just after the year 1200 A.D. for the probable date of our Ms. But it seemed to me desirable to test this conclusion by obtaining fuller evidence elsewhere. Zotenberg's *Catalogue* of the Syriac Mss. of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris showed that several *estrangelo* Mss. of the period thus indicated were to be found in that collection; and further, that most if not all of them belonged to the same geographical region with which, as I have shown, the above-mentioned

* It may be worth while to note the coincidences between our Ms. and 7154 Rich as regards the persons mentioned in their subscriptions. In the latter there are but five: Moses is the owner of the Ms., Simeon the scribe of it, and his collaborators are Joshua, Stephen, and Gabriel. Four of these names recur in the Crawford Ms.; Stephen is the scribe, Gabriel the owner, another Gabriel and a Simeon are among the scribe's near relatives, and the list of persons recorded by him ends with a Moses. These names however (except Stephen, which is not often met with) are too common in Syriac use to give more than a faint probability of identification of persons; and as regards Simeon, it will be shown presently that the person of that name who is mentioned in the Crawford subscription is more likely to have been a Simeon who died some years before the Rich Ms. was written.

† I may add that 7164 Rich, a copy of the Harklesian Gospels, written by Gabriel of Kephar-Salta (in Tur'abdin, see below, p. 369, on the Paris Ms. No. 46), is a well-marked example of the same form of *estrangelo*; not dated, but assigned (Rosen-Forsshall, p. 27) to the "eleventh or twelfth century." Another Ms. of the same general type is 7171 Rich, a Lectionary written in a convent near Mosul, A. Gr. 1484 (A.D. 1173).
British Museum Mss., in common with the Crawford Mss., are connected. The probability therefore that our Ms. belonged to that period would be much strengthened or weakened according as the palæographical peculiarities which characterize it in common with the British Museum Mss. above described should or should not be found on examination to be exhibited by these Paris Mss. likewise. I accordingly proceeded to inspect all the New Testament Mss. of the Bibliotheque Nationale which are in the estrangelo character, and bear date circ. a.d. 1200. I may state the result of this inspection briefly by saying that all the Mss. (eight in number, Nos. 31, 35, 39, 40, 41, 46, 54, and 55 in Zotenberg) which come within the above description are of North Mesopotamia, and that each and all of them, when examined, proved to possess all the palæographical characteristics in question—all of them, moreover, so closely reproducing the general handwriting and style of our Ms. and the similar Mss. above specified, as to suggest the belief that they all proceed from one well-marked school of caligraphy—with the single exception of No. 55, which though it has all the distinctive features of the rest, is in a hand of different character. I subjoin the particulars of time, place, and person.

No. 31 [Ancien fonds 14], a Peshitto New Testament, was written A.Gr. 1514 (a.d. 1203) for a monk of Salach, Theodore,—as was the nearly contemporary Ms. 7154 Rich for a monk of the same town. The scribe of No. 31 does not give his name.*

Nos. 35 [Suppl. 43], and 39 [Anc. f. 19], two copies of the Peshitto Gospels, were written by the monk Joseph of Hesn-Kipha; the former in the convent of Mar Saliba in Tur'abdin, in which convent, as the subscription to the latter states, he was bred. No. 35 was written for Thomas of Mido (စီးဖြူ) in Tur'abdin. Its date is partly obliterated "one thousand . . . and thirteen"); but as No. 39 is dated A.Gr. 1506, a.d. 1194, and is unmistakably the work of the same scribe, it is safe to fill up the blank by "five hundred," thus assigning it to a.d. 1202.†

* Zotenberg (in loc.) makes Theodore the scribe: but wrongly, as I read the note in the Ms. where these facts are stated.

† Zotenberg (in loc.) has failed to observe the identity of the scribe, and supplies "three hundred," thus making the date A.Gr. 1313 (a.d. 1002). He suggests that Mido may be the same
Nos. 40 [Anc. f. 24], and 54 [Anc. f. 23], both of them copies of the Gospels, the former Peshitto, the latter Harkensian, were written by the monk Joshua of Castrum Romanum, the former A.Gr. 1502 (A.D. 1191) for the monk Ananias of Marde; the latter A.Gr. 1503 (A.D. 1192) for the monk Barsauma of Alin in Tur'abdin; both in convents of the Theotokos on the Mount of Edessa, the former called Beth-Yihudoye (Beth-Midijahd) = Anchorites' House, the latter Beth-Aksenoye (Beth-Midijahd) = Guest-house, the same convent in which 7154 Rich was written.

No. 41 [Anc. f. 25], also a copy of the Peshitto Gospels, was written in the convent of Mar Jacob on Mount Izla, by Simeon, priest and monk, a native of Mido, bred in the convent of Mar Simeon of Kartamin; with the help of his brother John, also a priest; who adds the final note stating these particulars, and records the death of Simeon in the month Teshrin II., A.Gr. 1506 (Nov., A.D. 1194). This note is written in an estrangelo differing little from that of the text written by Simeon.

No. 46 [Suppl. 36], containing the Acts and Catholic Epistles (Peshitto), was written later than the rest, A.Gr. 1529 (A.D. 1218), in the convent of Mar Ananias, by Simeon of Kephar-Salta, with the help of the monks Reuben and Simeon of Saliba, and of their sister a nun. The latter convent is probably that of Tur'abdin in which No. 35 was written: the former no doubt was the well-known house near Marde, at that time and to the present day the abode of the Patriarch. That Kephar-Salta was in Tur'abdin, we gather from the history of the death, A.Gr. 1542 (A.D. as Modiad (on Ritter's map Midijahd; in Badger, p. 54, Midyat); but the Mido mentioned by Badger (p. 57; also marked by Ritter) is more likely. See under No. 41; also map, p. 356 above.

This is the Ms. described by Adler, N.T. Versiones Syr., pp. 55 seq. He gives the date A.Gr. as above, but wrongly makes it = A.D. 1212.

† See Abbeloos and Lamy, note on Chron. Eccles., I., 89, c. 533.

‡ Assem., B. O. III. (pt. ii.), p. cxiii., writes this name Elyan, and mentions it in connexion with the Tur'abdinese towns Haḥ and Ṣalach. It still exists,—see map; also Prym's Introd., p. vii., for all three places.

§ Between Marde and Nisibis: see Abbeloos and Lamy, note on Chron. Eccles., I., 26, c. 87.

|| Probably the same as the place mentioned under No. 35. It is mentioned also by Assem., B. O., III. (pt. ii.), p. cxiii. (written as here with yud not olaph), immediately before the note relating to Ṣalach and Haḥ (see above, note †).
1231), of Dionysius the Maphrian, who was of that town, as recorded by Barhebraeus.*

It appears then that the evidence yielded by the Paris collection strongly confirms the surmise as to the age of the Crawford Ms. suggested by comparison of it with the British Museum Mss. above described. We have seen that its handwriting is closely and in all its characteristics similar to that of those three Mss., written like itself in Northern Mesopotamia, all of them dated about A.D. 1200. We now find that the Paris New Testament Mss., eight in number, which bear date about that time, were written in the same region and exhibit the same peculiar forms in their handwriting;—nay more, that all of them, with the single exception of No. 55, are connected (as is proved by the mention of Ṣalach, Ḥesn-Kipha, Mido, Alin, Kartamin, Kephar-Salta, and Marde) with that very North-Mesopotamian district, Tur'abdin, to which the Crawford Ms. belongs;—and in all but that one the affinity of handwriting extends beyond the characteristic forms which have been specially dwelt on, and seems to mark them as the product not only of the same period but of the same school. It is to be added that in most of these Paris Mss., no less than in the three of the British Museum, this affinity appears not only in the estrangelo of the text, but in the cursive of the notes appended to it;—and further, that it extends to the form, substance, and diction of these notes, as well as to the handwriting.

In confirmation of the idea that such a school must have existed at the period and in the region specified, I would call attention to the fact that in the above list of but eight Mss., there are two instances where two Mss. have been written by one and the same scribe (35 and 39 by Joseph of Ḥesn-Kipha, 40 and 54 by Joshua son of John of Castrum Romanum). This seems to indicate that the writers of these carefully elaborated Biblical Mss. (all on vellum, though written at a time when the so-called "cotton paper" was in common use) were a limited class, who had received special training. Other facts may be noted which point in the same direction. A monk of one convent in many cases (as in Nos. 35, 40, and 54, and 7154 Rich) is employed to execute a Ms. for a monk of

* Chron. Eccl. II. 59, cc. 403, 405.
another. In the subscription of Add. 12174 we read that the scribe was specially sent for from a distance. Again, the scribe sometimes records the name of the convent where he was bred (as 39, 41), or the persons by whom he was educated, as does the Stephen of the Crawford Ms.

In one of these Mss. I find what may perhaps be a clue to a closer approximation to the date of the Crawford Ms. It will be observed that though I have confidently assumed that the Joseph of No. 35 is the same as the Joseph of No. 39, I cannot propose to identify the Simeon who with his brother John wrote No. 41, with the Simeon of 7154 Rich, or with either of the Simeons named in the subscription to No. 46. The first-named died A.D. 1194: the work of the second is dated 1204; that of the other two 1218. But he may well have been the Simeon whom Stephen, the scribe of the Crawford Ms., names (see above, p. 353) as one of his three "paternal uncles, the monks Mas'ud deceased, John, and Simeon," whose good offices he records, placing them first in the list of those for whom he asks his readers' prayers, and who, as the following sentence of the note conveys, together with his "maternal uncles," reared him and taught him to write. This Simeon, therefore, had a brother John; both were monks and (as seems to be implied) scribes; both (as may be inferred with certainty from the mention of Mas'ud as "deceased") were living when this subscription was written. Simeon, no doubt, is a very common name, and John still commoner; but the double coincidence of name carries weight. We have seen ample reason to believe that our Ms. is of the same period as the Ms. No. 41 of Paris; we find that the two are closely akin in handwriting, and that both are the work of scribes of Tur'abdin (ours of Salach, the other of Mido and Kartamin); and we may presume that "the paternal uncles John and Simeon" from whom Stephen learned his skill, belonged to the same region and wrote a hand similar to that in which they trained their nephew. It is surely improbable, then, that there were at this time, and in this not very wide region, two pairs of brothers named John and Simeon, both monks belonging to the class—a limited one, as we have seen—of scribes engaged in producing elaborate Biblical Ms. on vellum, in
an estrangelo of a very marked type, characterized by many notable peculiarities.*

If then we accept this identification of the John and Simeon of No. 41, with the John and Simeon of the Crawford Ms., it gives us a close approximation to the age of the latter by fixing an inferior limit for it. Simeon was alive when it was written; but he died after writing No. 41, in November, 1194. The Crawford Ms. was therefore written before that date, probably about 700 years ago.

However this may be, it will, I think, be admitted, that a strong case has been made out, on the evidence of the London and Paris Mss. adduced, for assigning to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century a Ms. written in North Mesopotamia—especially in Tur'abdin—showing the palaeographic peculiarities which characterize our Ms. For so far, all the Mss. I have been able to find which are similarly characterized belong to that region and to that age. Further research may bring to light instances to the contrary, and thus show that an earlier date is possible; but meantime, unless and until a similar Ms. of higher antiquity can be pointed out, we are justified in assigning to our Ms., provisionally at least, as I have done above, a date a few years before or after A.D. 1200.†

It is to be added that there exists independent evidence, direct and apparently worthy of credit, which serves to limit the range of inquiry by proving that, unless we claim for our Ms. a date as early as the tenth century, we must place it in the latter part of the twelfth, no intermediate term being admissible. The record of the life of John, Bishop of Marde

* This Simeon seems to have been the Simeon who wrote the liturgical Ms. (cursive, on paper) Add. 14690 (Wright, Catal., p. 205). Another instance tending to show that trained scribes were a very limited body is worth noting. The British Museum copy (7184 Rich) of the great Commentary of Barsalibi on the Gospels (A.Gr. 1205) is, as I find on examination, the work of the same scribe, Matthew son of John, who eight years earlier (A.D. 1197) had written the copy of the same in the Library of T.C.D. (a. 2. 9). Both are cursive, on "cotton paper."

† Since the above was written, I have observed in the Bodleian Library a Ms. (vellum) of Lives of Saints, dated A.Gr. 1488 (A.D. 1177), in a similar estrangelo, the work of two scribes, of whom one is of Kephar-Salta (see above, No. 46, p. 369), its owner being nephew of the Bishop of Tur'abdin. (See Payne Smith's Catal., col. 543.)
who died A.D. 1165), derived from his own autobiographical memoranda (ap. Assem., B. O.), assures us that when he entered on his see (A.D. 1125) he found the convents of Tur'abdìn as well as of his own diocese deserted, in ruins or alienated, so that "there was not a monk left," and all knowledge of monastic institutions had ceased. And his panegyrist informs us that of the convents which he rebuilt and reopened, and refurnished with books and requisites, some had lain waste two or even three hundred years. This state of things in Marde and its suffragan dioceses, our authority attributes to the troublous times, the changes of rule—frequent and violent, as other writers testify—through which the cities of these parts, and the convents with them, had passed during the period referred to; and in which, no doubt, Tur'abdìn and its convents shared. Even allowing for some exaggeration as to the extent of the desolation alleged, and its duration, these statements make it highly improbable that a Ms. executed in a Tur'abdìnese convent belongs to the earlier years of the twelfth century, or to the eleventh. They serve also to account for the large family of late twelfth-century Mss. executed in northern Mesopotamia, which is represented by the extant specimens I have described above; due, no doubt, to the restoration of the Jacobite convents and churches in which this John of Marde was the precursor of the work done by Barsalibi and by Michael the Great.

I have gone to tedious length, and perhaps into over-minute detail, in the foregoing investigation of the age of our Ms., and of the peculiarities of handwriting, and notes of places and persons, which may supply its want of date. But I have thought it worth while to record the results of my researches for the sake of the light which I hope they will be found to throw on the palaeography of a little studied but not unimportant period of the literary activity of the Jacobite Church of the East. The attention of Syriac scholars and palaeographers has naturally been drawn rather to the documents of higher age and value with which the Nitrian Collection abounds; and the result has been that the later Mss. have hardly been examined with the care which their interest and importance deserve.

* II., pp. 216, 220–223, 328.
Two farther points may be noticed here, as independent confirmations of the view that the twelfth century is the earliest to which our Ms. may safely be assigned.

(1) For the first, I turn back to the final note appended to our Ms. It was written, as this note informs us, in a convent near Salach "in the country of Tur'abdin, in the dominion [or principality, = kalâk, shultono] of Ḥesn-Kipha." It belongs therefore to a time when Ḥesn-Kipha was politically the capital of, and gave its name to, a district containing or coinciding with the region known locally and ecclesiastically as Tur'abdin. Now it is certain that at the close of the twelfth century such was the position of Ḥesn-Kipha. For in the place where it is first mentioned in the Chron. Eccles.,* we read (A.D. 1200) of a Shalito (kalâk) of Ḥesn-Kipha who ruled in Tur'abdin, and who is distinguished from the Shalito or "Lord" (kol) of Amid, from the Shalito or "Lord" of Marde, and from the "Lord" of Melitene.† This title Shalito is correlative to the cognate noun shultono in our note, and explains the employment of that noun in the not very usual sense of a district, geographical or political,—its proper meaning being the abstract one of power or authority. From the Annals of Abulfeda we learn that this Shalito was of the Turcoman family of the Ortokids, sprung from Socman son of Ortok, into whose possession Ḥesn-Kipha came, A.D. 1101, and by whose descendants it was held until and after the close of the twelfth century.‡ Previously it had belonged to the Lords of Diarbekr;§ and though as a fortress of unusual strength it must always have been an important place, it does not appear to have been the seat of a ruler, or to have ranked as the capital even of a vassal principality, until the Ortokids got it into their hands, rebuilt it, and made it their residence.|| It is probable, therefore, that this note, in which Tur'abdin is described as being "in the shultono of Ḥesn-Kipha," was written in the time of the Ortokid rulers,—that is, not earlier than the twelfth century.

(2) The second indication pointing in the same direction is to be gathered from the contents of the Ms. and their arrangement. It not

---

only incorporates in the New Testament the four Catholic Epistles of
the "Pococke" version, which are not in the Peshitto, but (as we have
seen) places them as in Greek copies and in the Græcizing Harklensian,—
2 Peter after 1 Peter, 2 and 3 John and Jude after 1 John,—thus treating
them as being completely on a par with the other three. Now the only Ms.
extant which contains these Epistles, and can be assigned with certainty
to a time earlier than the twelfth century, is Add. 14623 of the British
Museum, dated A.Gr. 1134 (A.D. 823). This Ms. ranges the Seven Catholic
Epistles, as of equal authenticity, in the order, 1, 2, 3 John; 1, 2 Peter;
Jude: but it is only a book of miscellanies and may be set aside as not
properly entering into the scope of our inquiry. The few Syriac New
Testament Mss. which include the four in question place them usually
together, after the three of the Peshitto. This is so in all the copies
which seem to be as old as our Ms., or older,—namely, Add. 14473 (Acts
and Catholic Epistles),* the Cambridge New Testament, Oo. i. 2,† and
the Paris New Testament, No. 29 [Suppl. 27].‡ None of these can be
reckoned earlier than the eleventh century (all three being undated);
and the two latter are apparently of the twelfth, presenting the same type
of estrangelo, with the same characteristic peculiarities, as our Ms. and
the similar Mss. treated of above. Even Wetstein’s Ms. of the Acts and
Epistles (Amsterdam No. 184—see my former Paper, p. 314), written
so late as A.D. 1470, separates the four from the three. Williams’s New
Testament Ms. (Utica, U.S.A.), written A.D. 1471, which arranges them
in their Greek order, is the earliest dated Syriac Biblical Ms. which so
places them; but 7162 Rich, undated but probably of the fourteenth
century, follows the same arrangement.§ In the face of these facts, it

* This Ms. is composite; consisting of (1) a very early copy of the Acts and (Peshitto) Catholic
Epistles; (2) a copy of the four minor Catholic Epistles, in a clumsy angular estrangelo, perhaps
of eleventh century.
† I believe the most competent authorities assign this Ms. as I have ventured to do, to the
twelfth century.
‡ I find No. 29 exhibits every token of affinity with the group of Paris Mss. above described.
Its date is uncertain, the last leaves being lost; but it is set down by Zotenberg as of twelfth
century.
§ I have given a summary account of these Mss. in Hæmorrhæa for 1890 (vol. xvi. pp. 285–9),
would be unsafe to assign a date earlier than the twelfth century to a New Testament Ms. arranged in an order of which no other example can be found in that century, nor at any time prior to the fourteenth.

I proceed now to give an account of those portions of the Ms. which, as being of special interest, and bearing on the subject of my former Paper, I have examined with care and collated,—those namely which it exhibits in common with the Ussher Ms., but which it alone, so far as I know, among Syriac Ms. (excluding transcripts made in Europe, or for European use), embodies in the New Testament as an integral part of it,—the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

Of the position these Epistles occupy in the Crawford Ms., I have treated above. The facts as there stated make it probable that this is to be regarded as being the earliest among extant Syriac Ms. to recognize them on equal terms with the other Epistles, with no note of doubt attached to them save what may be implied in the omission (above noticed, p. 351) to include them in the series of sections or of lessons. This omission, however, merely indicates that these sections and lessons were arranged for the Peshitto text only. I may note, however, that the beginning and end of 2 Peter, and the beginning of 2 John, are in our Ms. distinguished by an ornament gaudily coloured in red, yellow, green, and blue, and that preparation seems to have been made for a similar one at

and of all Ms. then known to me as containing these Epistles. I have since learnt that they are also to be found in a Ms. (No. 5) in the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, appended by a very late hand to a very early copy of the Pauline Epistles. I owe this information to the kindness of the late lamented Professor Benally, who was so good as to communicate it to me in a letter written from Egypt on his way home, a few weeks before his untimely removal by death from the labours from which so much was expected by all who feel interest in the Syriac language, literature, and antiquities.

Since the above was written, Mr. F. C. Burkitt has kindly sent me an account of an Arabic Ms. discovered recently by him in the same convent. It is apparently of the ninth century, and contains the Acts and Catholic Epistles, in their Greek order, translated, as the internal evidence proves, from the Syriac,—the Acts and three longer Epistles from the Peshitto, the four shorter from the “Pococke” version. If we are to infer that the Syriac copy, whence this translation was made, followed the same order, the force of the argument of paragraph (2) is much weakened by this discovery.
the end of Jude. These ornaments however can hardly be supposed to have any relation to the question of the canonicity of these Epistles, for one of like pattern is placed before 2 Timothy—an Epistle which forms an unquestioned part of the Peshitto. It is worth while to mention also that we here find 1 Peter and 1 John described in their subscriptions, though not in their superscriptions, as "the first epistle of Peter," "the first epistle of John"; whereas in Syriac Mss. they are usually entitled simply "the epistle of Peter," "the epistle of John." This is a farther recognition of the claim of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John to rank with 1 Peter and 1 John in the canon. For the text of these Epistles the highest authority is, presumably, the copy contained in the Nitrian volume above mentioned, Add. 14623,* which is no doubt the oldest by three or four hundred years. But I find that our Ms. gives them with an accuracy hardly, if at all, inferior to it, and certainly inferior to no other.† With the great Cambridge Ms. and the Paris Ms. No. 29, above referred to, it forms a group of three apparently contemporaneous (twelfth-century) copies of good character, and of the three it is the best. Like the Nitrian Ms., it omits the negative before ἐφεδρήσεται in 2 Pet. iii. 10; and in many other places it confirms that Ms. where it witnesses against the mistakes of the text of Pococke or of the Polyglots. I have even noted a few places where its text is free from errors into which the older Ms. falls. Thus it correctly writes (supported only by the Paris and Cambridge copies), τίμα (τίμας), for τίμω (τιμᾶς), in 2 Pet. i. 4; and in Jude 7, it stands alone in giving the true reading, ἡμῖν ἡμῖν (δέιγμα πυρός), for ἡμῖν ἡμῖν (ὑπὸ πῦρ).

I pass now to the Apocalypse, which I have reserved for the last in this account of the Ms., though in so doing I deviate from the order in which the Ms. itself arranges its contents. I have done so, partly because to place the Apocalypse last is with us so habitual as to seem natural; but

* In this Ms. we find "the first of Peter," "the first of John," in the superscriptions and subscriptions alike.

† I have collated all the accessible copies of this version of the Epistles (sixteen more or less complete), and have printed a summary of the results in Hermathena, xv., as above referred to.
mainly for convenience' sake, because there is very much more to be said of the Apocalypse as given in this Ms. than of any other part of its contents. Of the rarity of copies of this Book in Syriac, I have treated in my former Paper (pp. 300 sqq.). I have there stated that only two complete copies of it were available—that of Leyden (late sixteenth-century), and that of Dublin (early seventeenth). I have now to add that the older copy of the same—the only really ancient one hitherto recorded—that of the Nitrian Ms., Add. 17127,* which I have since transcribed, proves on examination not to contain, and never to have contained, a continuous and complete text of the book. Not only has it lost i. 1–6, and xiv. 6, 7, and part of 8, the first leaf and leaf 82 having perished, but after xiv. 11, no chapter is given in full; so that of the last six chapters but fourteen verses appear, chap. xx. being altogether passed over. This being so, it was welcome tidings to me to learn from Mr. Gwilliam of a Ms. of considerable antiquity, certainly many centuries older than the Leyden and Dublin copies, which exhibited the Apocalypse entire, and not like those Ms. and the Nitrian Ms. in a separate form, but ranked among the books of the New Testament. The place assigned to it in the volume, moreover, immediately after the Gospel of that Evangelist to whom as author the Church ascribes it, was in itself a fact of special interest to me. In the Paper I have referred to above, I had raised the question, Where would a Syriac New Testament place the Apocalypse? and I had suggested (p. 302) as a possible answer, that it would stand after the books of the Peshitto canon, with the Four Minor Catholic Epistles but before them. But in a note added some weeks later, after an examination at Amsterdam of Wetstein's Ms. of the latter half of the Syriac New Testament, I ventured to offer (p. 316) what I then regarded as a hazardous guess, that in the missing former half of that volume the Apocalypse may have been subjoined to the four Gospels. Not long after, my attention was caught by the fact that in the Short Commentary of

* In this Ms., though it is earlier than the North-Mesopotamian group above discussed by a century, similar characteristic forms are found to prevail. It does not, however, resemble them in its general style and aspect, and is singularly destitute of points of any sort. It was written in Egypt by a Jacobite Syrian monk, Samuel, from Ma'adan. See Wright, Cural., p. 1020.
Barsalibi on the latter Books of the New Testament, which though inedited
is extant in two Mss. (7185 Rich, and Bodl. Or. 560, the latter much
mutilated*), this is the order actually observed—the Apocalypse preceding
the Acts and Epistles. This fact seemed to me to give some definite
ground for the conjecture which I had previously suggested as barely
worth considering, and led me to admit it as probable that such would
prove to be the normal Syriac arrangement of the Books.† It was to me,
therefore, a matter of satisfaction rather than of surprise to find that such
was the arrangement followed in this the only complete Syriac New
Testament that as yet is known to have been brought from the East
into Europe.‡

But a much more important result was shortly after obtained from
this Ms.,—a result which gave me not merely the satisfaction of another
conjecture verified, but (what is immeasurably more valuable) the dis-
covery of an important accession to the materials for the critical deter-
mination of the text of that Book of the New Testament for which such
materials are least abundant. Mr. Gwilliam, in July, 1887, before I had
seen the Ms., was so good as to send me a collation of its text of the
Four Minor Epistles, and with it a collation of the opening chapters of the
Apocalypse. In a previous letter he had informed me that “the variations
are many and great,” between this Ms. and the current printed text of
these Antilegomena,—as compared with the other New Testament Books.
On examining his record of its variations in the Apocalypse, it appeared

* See for these Mss. R. F., Catal., p. 71; Payne Smith, Catal., p. 415; also pp. 409, 410,
of Hermathena, No. xiv.
† Probably the Old Latin version, at least in its African form, followed a like order. In the
Fleury Palimpsest it appears that the Apocalypse stood before the Acts, and that the Epistles
‡ I take the opportunity here of noting that the note to p. 274 of my former Paper, in
which I have stated “that no Ms. of the whole N. T. in Syriac is now known to exist,” needs
to be qualified as above, by limiting it to Mss. of Oriental origin. The fifth and last volume
of the complete copy of the Syriac Bible in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Zotenberg 1-5, Suppl. 75)
is occupied by the Books of the New Testament, complete, in their Greek order; the Apocalypse,
in the version given in the printed editions, of course coming last. But this copy was written
in Paris, A.D. 1695, many years after the publication of the Paris and London Polyglots.
to me that they were remarkable not only in their number and degree, but in the peculiar common character which marked a large proportion of them,—so strongly as to suggest the belief, or at least the surmise, that the text which exhibited them was not that of the version hitherto known, but of a distinct though cognate version, written in Syriac of a more idiomatic type. In my Paper of 1886 (p. 310) I had speculated on the possibility that such a version existed and had served as basis for the other,—in the same way as the "Pococke" text of the Four Epistles is the basis of the Harklensian version of those Epistles. And I had called attention to a passage from Rev. vii. (1-8), which stands as No. 34 in an inedited Syriac book of Extracts in the British Museum (Add. 17193, fo. 14 νο.), noted by Wright (Catal., p. 992), as "not according to the ordinary version";—and had ventured to suggest that this extract might be not a version of a Greek fragment, but—a fragment of a Syriac version,—presumably the supposed basis-version. I lost no time therefore in putting this conjecture to the test: I sent Mr. Gwilliam a complete copy of the extract in question (which I had transcribed some time before in the British Museum), begging him to compare it with the corresponding part of the Apocalypse as given in the Crawford Ms. The agreement between the two texts proved to be absolute, in all points where both vary from the printed version; while inter se they vary only in a few minute points, such as may usually be detected in comparing any two copies of the same original.* Since then, I have had Lord Crawford's Ms. in my hands (as I have stated above) for many months, and have transcribed from it the entire Apocalypse, comparing it as I proceeded with the text of the common version as printed by De Dieu and in the Polyglots, and also with the two inedited Mss. of the same,—that of the British Museum (Add. 17127), and Ussher's, T.C.D., B. 5, 16.

This careful study of the text enables me to state the following conclusions as established beyond doubt:

(I.) That the two versions are distinct,—the difference which Wright

* The other Syriac fragment of the Apocalypse (xiv. 3-6) mentioned by me in the same Paper (ib.) attributed to Jacob of Edessa, proves on comparison with the Crawford version to differ from it as widely as from the printed text.
perceived in the extract from chap. vii. being observable throughout,—a
difference in literary style and linguistic character; the Crawford version
being idiomatic and free, the other Graecized and servilely literal.

(II.) That the difference reaches yet deeper, and extends to the
underlying Greek text; the instances being numerous where, the Greek
authorities being divided, our two Syriac versions take opposite sides.

(III.) That at the same time they are, though distinct, not inde-
dependent; the relation between them being such that one must have
served as basis for the other.

These propositions I state with full confidence that no one who com-
pares the two texts will ever call them in question. And with hardly less
confidence I add, as a further conclusion,—

(IV.) That of the two the Crawford version is the earlier, the other
being founded on it, and in fact a revision of it.

(I. and II.) To establish the first and second of these conclusions,
it is only necessary to refer to the examples subjoined to this Paper
(Appendix A, notes a to j; and B, notes a, b, c), as illustrative of the
nature and extent of the differences by which the versions are distin-
guished from one another: (a) in diction, (b) as regards the implied
readings of the Greek text underlying them.

(a). Under the former head, the results may be briefly summed up by
repeating in a sentence the epithets I have already used: the Crawford
version is idiomatic, while the other is Graecized. In the former, Greek
words are very rarely transliterated, more rarely than even in the
Peshitto;—never, unless the Syriac supplies no adequate rendering: in
the latter, words so translatable as γονία, ζώνη, θρόνος, φυλή, are
written in Syriac letters.* In the former, the Syriac idiom and ordo
verborum are never supplanted by the Greek, as they consistently are in
the latter. More particularly: in the Crawford version, the possessive
pronoun is as a rule rendered by a suffix, and but rarely (where emphasis

* Adler has remarked (N. T. Vers. Syr., p. 78) that transliteration is rarely used in the
printed version of the Apocalypse; but a careful examination will show that, on the contrary,
it is habitual. See below, Appx. A, note f.
is required) as a separate word formed by the particle $\Lambda_{-}z$ with a suffix attached; the definite article is not represented by the illegitimate substitution of the third personal pronoun, but omitted, or (if necessary) legitimately expressed by the use of the *status emphaticus* of the noun, which is not allowed to supplant the *status absolutus*; the use of the *status constructus* is habitual in a large class of cases; the ordinal numbers as a rule (with one significant exception, to be noted presently) are expressed by prefixing $\pi$ to the cardinals, and not by adjectival forms. In all these respects the usage of our version is that of the Peshitto, the earlier and genuinely Syriac usage,—as opposed to the method of the other version, which is that of the Harklensian, introduced as it seems (or at least systematically adopted for the first time) by Thomas of Harkel and his contemporary and fellow-translator of the Bible, Paul of Tellia, in the first quarter of the seventh century; the method which attempts to mould the reluctant Syriac into conformity with the Greek,—as (e.g.) by expressing the possessive pronoun separately; by turning the third personal pronoun into a definite article; by obliterating the distinctive force of the *status emphaticus*; by ceasing to employ the *status constructus*; and by the uniform use of numeral adjectives to express the ordinals:—on the whole, by a general substitution, so far as practicable, of the alien Greek idiom, and even Greek words, where Syriac would have served at least as well. By this method the Harklensian and, following it, the closely allied Syriac version of the Apocalypse (as printed) attain a high standard of verbal fidelity, with nearly uniform representation of each Greek word by one and the same equivalent: while the version of the Crawford Ms., following the freer method of the Peshitto, endeavours more intelligently, and often with marked success, to render the different shades of meaning assumed by any given Greek word in different contexts, by varying the Syriac equivalent accordingly—so far as the resources of the Syriac language permit. Thus we are amply justified in asserting that the Crawford version is distinguished from the other, not merely by numerous and characteristic points of linguistic usage, but by a fundamental difference of method, indicating a different

* See Appx. A, note d.        † See Appx. A, note e.        ‡ See Appx. A, note b.
(b). Under the second head, in addition to the ample evidence of independence of text yielded by the appended collection of variants (Appx. B, notes a, b, c), I have to state the following results of a comparison between the two versions:

(a). There are very many instances where the Crawford version represents readings of the Greek differing from those followed by the other version, and from the majority of other authorities,—sometimes from all of them.*

(b). In a considerable number of these peculiar readings, it is supported by some one or more of the most weighty authorities:†—among the uncials, frequently by Cod. Sinaiticus (not seldom against all else), and sometimes by Cod. Alexandrinus; among cursive, by the exceptionally good copies, 36, 38, 79, 95; among versions, by the Old Latin of Primasius and Cod. Floriacensis (h) and that of Cod. Gigas (g), and by the Vulgate.

(c). More generally: the cases where the two versions yield decisive evidence as between (on the one hand) the reading supported by the weight of older authorities, and (on the other) that of the bulk of the cursive, usually with the uncial Cod. Basileensis [Q—Tischendorf's B] heading them, are in number over 220. In not less than 140 of these cases, the two versions are on the same side; the remaining cases, about 80—nearly three-eighths of the whole number—are a measure (though not a full measure) of the extent to which the Greek copies used by the two translators varied inter se. It is to be added that of the two, the Crawford version more frequently agrees with the text of the older Greek MSS.—in nearly fifty of these cases, as against little more than thirty of the other version (five-eighths of the whole).‡

Thus the internal evidence, as exhibited in the appended notes, establishes beyond doubt that the two versions are the production of two

* See Appx. B, note b.
† See Appx. B, note c.
‡ See Appx. B, note a, for a list of 55 of the above 80 cases, in more than five-eighths of which the Crawford version is on the side of the older authorities.
translators, working by different methods, and with different aims, on two distinct Greek originals.

III. But a farther examination into the versions establishes also, and with equal certainty, the close affinity subsisting between them,—so close as to indicate that the second translator must have had before him not only his independent Greek text, but also the work of his predecessor.

This affinity is twofold,—(a) linguistic, (b) textual.

To deal with the latter head (b) first. Instances where the two versions agree in readings which have an appreciable amount of other support are, of course, indecisive,—for in such cases the agreement may well have been in the Greek copies used by the two translators. But readings in which they agree against all other extant authorities, or which have but faint and obscure evidence elsewhere, cannot well be accounted for except by the supposition that they have passed into the later of the two versions from the prior one. Such cases are not infrequent, as the list given in Appendix B, note d, attests. Moreover, I find that, on the whole, the instances where the Crawford version is supported by the other version are considerably more numerous than the instances when it is so supported by any other authority whatever;—a fact which cannot be supposed to be due to accident, or to any cause except the use by one translator of the previous work of the other.

Under the former head (a), the indications of affinity are no less marked. Not only are there many cases where whole passages in the two versions coincide in rendering with none but minute variations, but the coincidences often appear in their coincident use of rare words and unfamiliar expressions. Thus, both render μετρῷ by μετρῷ (xi. 1 and elsewhere); χάραγμα by χάραγμα (xiii. 16 and elsewhere); γνώμη by γνώμη (xvii. 13, 17 bis);—in each case contrary to the usage of the Peshitto New Testament and with but partial countenance from the Harklensian: and also πονηρός by πονηρός* (xvi. 2, instead of πονηρός), a form unrecorded in the Lexicons. Moreover (what is of special weight), it is observable that where the common version departs from its usual habit of uniform rendering, the variation it adopts proves on examination

* So in the Nitrian MS. (Add. 17127).
to have its counterpart in an identical variation in the Crawford version. Thus, both versions render δεύτερος by ἔκτος in the four places where it is an epithet of θάνατος (ii. 11; xx. 6, 14; xxi. 8), and not elsewhere;* both render βάλλω by ἔρχεται once only (vi. 13), elsewhere by ἐστι, ἐκείνος; both render σκηνή by ἐκεί once only (vii. 15), elsewhere by ἔστι; both render καπνὸς by ἔσται once only (viii. 4), elsewhere by ἔστι; both render θεραπεύω by ἔστω once (xiii. 3), but by θεοῦ in the only other instance where it occurs (xiii. 12); both render δίκαιος by δίκαιος twice only (xv. 3; xix. 2), elsewhere by δίκαιον; both render κόκκινος by κόκκινος once only (xvii. 3), elsewhere by κόκκινον; both render κρατῶ by κρατεῖ once only (xx. 2), elsewhere by κρατέω; both render σφραγίζω by σφραγίζεται once only (xx. 15), elsewhere by σφραγίζω.

Thus we have two independent lines of evidence—that of the readings of the underlying Greek, and that of the diction of the Syriac,—both irresistibly leading to the same conclusion, that we have here two versions so closely akin that the one must be regarded as a revision of the other, wrought on the basis of the other; yet so far distinct that the later of the two must have been the work of a reviser who had a method of his own, and used an independent Greek Ms. or Mss.

IV. Which then of the two versions is the original, and which the revision?

The answer can hardly be doubtful. It is, of course, possible that a version of baldly literal character, marked by unidiomatic phrases, and by transliteration of words such as bespeaks the perplexities of an unskilled translator, might be rehandled in the interests of linguistic purity by a reviser, as Jerome rehandled the Old Latin Gospels. But the case now under our consideration is not such a one. Of the two versions we are comparing, the one which is servilely literal is no work of a rude and unlearned age; it is literal with the literalness not of unskilful simplicity, but of scholarly, or rather pedantic, accuracy: not the literalness of the Old Latin, nor of the Curetonian Syriac, but that of the

* This is the only ordinal rendered adjectively (see above, p. 382) in the Crawford version. In these places, second has more than a mere numerical force: elsewhere, it renders this ordinal, like the rest, by the cardinal with prefix; the other versions, by a different adjectival form.
version to which, as I have already said, it is obviously and unmistakably affiliated,—the Harklenian. To claim priority for such a version, and to suppose the Crawford version to be a recension of it with the diction restored to vernacular propriety, and the text modified by the help of an independent Greek copy, is inadmissible—as inadmissible as it would be to conclude that the version of the Seventy is posterior to that of Aquila because he renders the Hebrew word for word where they use the Greek idiom; or to that of Theodotion because he writes θεούνι where they give σελοπνευς, and so forth. I have little doubt that the verdict of every competent critic who compares the two versions will be, that the freer and more truly vernacular one is the earlier, and that the other, with its careful reproduction of Greek idioms, its frequent adoption of Greek words, and its studious endeavour to represent each word of the original by a uniform equivalent, is the later—is in fact an elaborate recension of the former, executed by a scholar who displays industry indeed, but no full mastery of the spirit of his text or of the resources of his own language, or adequate apprehension of the translator's functions.

But over and above these general considerations, I have some special facts to adduce, which seem to give powerful confirmation to the verdict I have thus ventured to anticipate.

(a). The first I would mention is the fact above touched on,—that in the exceptional cases such as I have cited, where the printed version deviates from its principle of uniformity of rendering, it is usually found to agree with a varied rendering given by the Crawford version. Such coincident variations are naturally to be explained as instances where the language of the version which habitually varies has been by oversight allowed to pass unchanged into the version which is habitually uniform; and they are only to be accounted for, so far as I can see, by assuming that to be the original version, and this to be a revision of it.

(b). So again in another matter,—that of the transliteration which I have noted as characteristic of the printed version. In one case it deviates from its habit in this respect, giving for χλιάρχοι (vi. 15, xix. 18) αὐτοὶ, where the Crawford version has the almost identical rendering, αὐτοὶ. This is specially remarkable, seeing that
the Peshitto always (as the Harklesian usually) transliterates this word 
(חָלִילְתִּי). Thus in this single instance the influence of the Crawford 
version on the other is doubly betrayed—by the fact of translation in lieu 
of transliteration, and by the employment of the status constructus, which, 
as above noticed, the Crawford version affects (especially in rendering 
compounds), and the other, for the most part, avoids.

(c). This instance leads me to mention another in which it would have 
been well for the reputation of the printed version if the translator had 
fallen back on his usual expedient of transliterating, and had forborne to 
attempt a vernacular representation of a compound word. It is that of 

dευτοῦ πετρομένου ἐν μεσοπανήματι (viii. 13), of which, as I have stated in 
my former Paper (p. 307), he gives the unhappy perversion, "an eagle 

flying in the midst, which had a tail of blood" (as if he had read, ἐν μέσῳ 

οὐράνος αἵματι [ἐχοντος]). He however corrects his blunder in part by 
dropping the "tail" at xiv. 6, and completely at xix. 17, these being the 
only places in which the word μεσοπανήματι recurs. In the Crawford 
version the word is rendered heaven, or mid-heaven, in all three places. 
Now it is noteworthy that J. D. Michaelis, in his Introduction to the 
New Testament, written more than a hundred years ago, noticing that 
this misrendering appears in the earlier part of the Book and disappears 
from the later, ventured to account for the fact by conjecturing that the 
printed version was based on an earlier one. He writes as follows*:

"Another circumstance which corroborates the opinion that there existed 
two or even more [Syriac] translations of this book [the Revelation] 
is that the above-mentioned μεσοπανήματι is translated properly in the 
latter half of the book, in the former half improperly. . . . . It is 
reasonable, therefore, to conclude that there were two or more trans-
lations, and that one was interpolated from [he ought rather to have 
said, 'based on'] the other; and, if I am not mistaken, the proper 
translation of μεσοπανήματι is to be referred to the more ancient version, 
and the latter to that of Philoxenus [by which he means the printed 
one of which he is treating]." Whether Michaelis in this matter argued 
logically, I am not concerned to inquire; his forecast, verified as it has


now been after the lapse of a century by the discovery of the version exhibited by our Ms., is unquestionably a conspicuous example of critical sagacity. And the fact that so acute a scholar was led, by examination of the version known to him, to divine the existence of a prior version free from the gross blemish in question, may surely be claimed as a farther argument in favour of the priority of the version which has thus come to light in fulfilment of his anticipations.

(d). Again, the Leyden Ms., whence De Dieu printed his text, yields farther evidence of the posteriority of the version it contains. In a supplementary Note (II.) appended to my former Paper (page 314), I have called attention to the fact, unnoticed by De Dieu and, so far as I know, by other critics, that in nearly forty cases asterisks are inserted in this copy, such as in Harklesian Mss. are employed to note places where a doubt exists as to the insertion or omission of a word or sentence. I now find on comparing the Crawford text, that in a large majority of these cases, these asterisks may be accounted for as references to something omitted from or inserted in that text. The reference may no doubt be, in many of these cases, to some other authority; they may note variations found by the translator on the margin of his Greek copy, or observed by him in comparing copies if he had more than one. But there are a few instances which can hardly be accounted for except by supposing that the translator who inserted the asterisk had the Crawford version in view. Thus, v. 5, for ἀνοιξει (or ὁ ἀνοιγών as others have it) it seems that the author of the Crawford version read ἀνοιξε, which is recorded only in one Greek ms., where it is probably a misspelling of ἀνοίξει; while the other version renders as if αὐτὸς ἀνοίξει, with an asterisk before the pronoun in the Leyden text. Again, viii. 9, both versions render as if ἀντων (unknown to all other authorities) stood in the text before τῶν κτισμάτων; but the Leyden Ms. marks the equivalent of ἀντων with an asterisk. Lastly, it prefixes an asterisk to the words καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ in xix. 16; of which the only explanation is the very adequate one, that in the Crawford version, and in it alone, the copulative is omitted and the following noun is read in the plural;—a small variation, but involving a notable change of meaning. For,
according to this reading, the inscription, "King of kings and Lord of lords," is written—not "on His vesture and on His thigh," but—"on the vesture [that was] on His thighs." If then it is admitted, as I think it must be, that in these three instances the asterisks in question establish a relation between the two versions, they increase the probability that many (though not all) of the other asterisks are to be similarly interpreted, and that the version which is distinguished by them, is thus marked as being posterior to the other.

(e). It is to be added, that a few other signs exist which look as if, besides these asterisks, an apparatus criticus similar to that of the Harklensian version, with side-notes recording variants (inter alia), had formerly been attached to the version which is, as I have shown, so closely akin to the Harklensian in its style and diction;—some of which, surviving in the Ussher Ms., I have recorded in my former Paper (p. 306). None of the notes in that Ms., however, throws any light on our present inquiry. But on the margin of the Nitrian Ms. I find entered, over against the word (i. 10) καισαββάδων (= τῆς κυριακῆς), the note ἄνω τῶν σαββάδων, i.e., καὶ τῶν σαββάδων (= τῆς κυριακῆς), by which words the Crawford version represents τῆς κυριακῆς. Instances occur also in the text of the printed version of conflate readings, apparently due to the intrusion into the text of marginal variants from the other version;—of which the most noteworthy is in viii. 12, where καὶ ἐκκοσμίασθησαν, as in the Crawford text, is made to follow ἀλλὰ καὶ κακοῖς (= ἔνα σκοτισθῇ, the usual reading), to the destruction of grammar and meaning alike. The former reading has little if any authority except that of the Crawford version, and was in all probability derived from it by the other. Yet this may have been the doing of a scribe, and not of the translator; and therefore I do not urge it. But in the inedited Commentary of Barsalibi, who used for his text the version which I seek to prove to be the later one, I find many signs of a knowledge of the renderings of the Crawford version. I will only mention a few. He cites the κρυστάλλω and φιάλας and χρυσόλιθος, of iv. 6, v. 8, and xxi. 20, in their transliterated form from the version

* So in the Nitrian and Leyden Ms.; in Ussher’s, and the Polyglots, the interpolation is modified so as to save the grammar.
he follows, but he explains them by the Syriac words ܐܠܗܐ and ܐܡܐ, (the first probably a misrendering, the second a rare word) used by the Crawford translator. And so in treating of the name ܐפܘܠܘܘܢ (ix. 11), though in his text he writes it as transliterated, he gives on the margin as explanations the alternatives ܕܝܠܐ ܘܟܐܠܐ (Destroyer or Releaser), the latter being the Crawford rendering (following the variant ܕܡܠܐ). Such instances may perhaps indicate that Barsalibi had access to a copy of this version;—or that his copy of the other version was furnished with marginal readings derived from the former. The latter seems the more probable supposition; and if it be well founded, it materially strengthens the grounds for believing that such an apparatus of marginalia was (as in case of the Harkleian) an original adjunct to the version which they accompanied—in fact, an integral part of the translator's work—and therefore that the version so annotated was dependent on and posterior to the version which furnished part at least of the annotations.

Nay, further, in the body of the printed version there are to be found, if I mistake not, unquestionable traces of the other which the second translator (or reviser) has by inadvertence allowed to remain. Four such I will instance.

(a). For ܕܝܠܐ ܕܐܒܫܒܐ ܬܒ:\, the Crawford version reads (iii. 10), ܕܐܒܫܒܐ ܕܐܒܚܒ (ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܐ), omitting ܕܝܠܐ and making the participle agree with the remaining noun, which in Syriac and in Greek alike is masculine. The other version restores ܕܝܠܐ, but leaves the participle unchanged in gender, though the restored noun ܐܠܗܐ is feminine in Syriac as in Greek. But no authority supports the reading ܕܝܠܐ ܕܐܒܫܒܐ ܕܐܒܚܒ, and the Crawford text is the sole authority for ܕܐܒܫܒܐ ܕܐܒܚܒ (without ܕܝܠܐ). The inference therefore is, that the second translator, having his predecessor's work before him, corrected it from his Greek copy so far as to insert ܐܠܗܐ, but neglected to change the participle ܐܠܗܐ into the feminine ܐܠܗܐ.

(b). The word ܐܢܐܘ (= ܐܢܝܐ) is sometimes masculine, but more usually feminine. In the printed version, vii. 1, where ܐܢܝܐ and ܐܢܝܐ occur,
the former is rendered as feminine, as shown by the numeral accompanying it, the latter as masculine, being followed by a masculine verb. The masculine verb is also used in the Crawford version, but the numeral is so expressed as to leave the gender of ἡ σόι (= ἀνήγοης) indeterminate. The inconsistency as to gender in the printed version is thus accounted for: the second translator, in dealing with the Crawford rendering, altered the form expressing the numeral (which is one that he usually avoids); in so doing he treated ἡ σόι as feminine; but forgot to alter the gender of the verb which, in the next sentence, marks ἡ σόι as masculine.

(c). For ἵνα μὴ τις δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἡ πωλήσαι (xiii. 17), the Crawford translator writes ζοζος της ἐρξάται ἐκ τῆς πληγής αὐτῆς, which reading, though unrecorded elsewhere, he probably found in his Greek copy. The other version brings this into conformity with the usual Greek text by inserting χρονος (= δύνηται) after ἵνα, but has neglected to prefix σ to the following verb as the grammar requires.

(d). In xviii. 4, all authorities read ἐξελθεῖτε .... ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῆς, καὶ ἵνα μὴ λάβητε ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς αὐτῆς,—except the Crawford version which omits the καὶ. This is not a casual or purposeless omission, for it is emphasized by the rendering of the second ἵνα μὴ differently from the first, with the purpose apparently of marking the second clause as subordinate to, not coordinate with, the first: ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῆς, καὶ ἵνα μὴ λάβητε ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς αὐτῆς, that ye be not partakers .... that so ye receive not''. The other version restores the copulative, but retains the variation in rendering ἵνα μὴ, though that variation loses all meaning when the two clauses are thus coupled on equal terms. Here then again we seem to detect the hand of a reviser, correcting the version of a prior translator by aid of a Greek text, but failing to harmonize his correction with the language of that version.

It appears then that examination into details confirms, so far as it has gone, and gives ground to expect that farther examination will more fully confirm, the impression made by a general survey and comparison of these two versions. It tends to prove that the version which is characterized by freedom, spontaneity, and vernacular strength, the version
whose diction is cast in a more archaic mould, and which represents a Greek text of more archaic type, is of the two the earlier work—the production of a translator working at first-hand on the original: and that the other—artificial, laboured, and servile—is a subsequent revision of it by a scholar who recast it after strict rules of uniformity and accuracy, into a forced compliance with the Greek idiom.

I now proceed to inquire into the probable age and origin of this version of the Apocalypse,—as they may be inferred from evidence—

(1°) external; (2°) internal.

(1°). The external evidence is undeniably scanty, and at first sight might seem, so far as it goes, to point to a recent date for the version, seeing that it is found only in a Ms. written probably (as I have endeavoured to show) not earlier than the close of the twelfth century. But a prima facie presumption such as this seldom carries much force, and is always liable to be displaced by further investigation, bringing new facts to light. In the present case the presumption against the antiquity of the version is greatly weakened when the state of its text as exhibited in the Ms. is examined. It shows distinct signs of being much older than the Ms.—older by generations, perhaps by centuries. This portion of the Ms., though on the whole carefully and accurately written (like the rest of it), is not seldom disfigured by textual blunders due evidently not to the translator but to a scribe—the scribe of our Ms. or of one preceding it,—blunders consisting in the substitution of one Syriac word for another closely similar one, where no similarity exists between the corresponding Greek words,—blunders which therefore cannot be accounted for by any supposable misreading or misrendering of the Greek, but are indubitably mistakes made in transcribing the Syriac.* Farther, in some cases an attempt has been made, by change of interpunction, or insertion of prefixes, to force some meaning into the passages affected by these blunders. These attempts prove that the scribe who made them has been in some measure editor as well as copyist; that he had before him a text which

* See Appx. C.
came into his hands in such condition as to need editing, contained in a Ms. in parts imperfectly legible, or in a transcript unintelligently made from a Ms. imperfectly legible. This imperfect legibility of the archetype was mainly due (we may safely assume) to mere age—not to the wear and tear of much use, for the Apocalypse was little studied in the East, and was never read in public. Thus from the state of the text of our Ms. we infer that it was copied, immediately or mediately, from another Ms. of much higher antiquity. And in confirmation of this inference it is to be noted that the blunders I refer to are not scattered at random through the text, but tend to occur in groups,—a fact which suggests the explanation that the places where these groups occur are places where the archetype had suffered from accident or decay. I see reason, moreover, to believe that the first eight verses of the book do not belong to the same version as the rest of it, but have been supplied from the other version;* and this I regard as an indication that the first leaf of the archetype had been lost, or had become quite illegible. On these grounds it seems probable that the date of the archetype, and therefore (a fortiori) the date of the version, is very much more ancient than that of our Ms.

But another piece of evidence is at hand which enables us at once, definitely and with certainty, to carry the date of the version three centuries back. I have already mentioned the fragment, Rev. vii. 1—8, included in the (inedited) volume of miscellanies, Add. 17193 of the British Museum, which is indisputably an extract from our version. This Ms. bears date A. Gr. 1185 (a.D. 874), and thus gives us direct and conclusive proof that in the latter half of the ninth century the version in question was in existence, known and accessible to compilers of such collections.†

(2°). The internal evidence of the version itself, as obtained by comparing it with the other version, is of course quite independent of the external evidence of the documents as above stated, and seems to point distinctly to a still earlier date. The latter version, as I have shown, is to

* See Appendix D for the facts which lead to this conclusion.
† It is to be noted that, as regards the other version, the earliest evidence we have of its existence is the Ms. Add. 17127, above referred to, written A. Gr. 1399 (a.D. 1088).
be regarded as—if not actually part of the Harklensian New Testament—at least a Harklensian supplement, presumably added not long after the completion of the work of Thomas of Harkel in A.D. 616; to be assigned, therefore, to the seventh century. If I am right in my contention that, of these two undoubtedly cognate versions, the Crawford version is the earlier, and has supplied the basis on which the other is constructed, it follows that this version cannot be with probability assigned to a period later than the preceding century. If this be so, we have carried back its date,—as before, from the twelfth century to the ninth, so now again, three centuries farther—from the ninth century to the sixth.

So much for the age of this version: let us now consider whether we have any clue to its origin.

(a). To take the internal evidence first. In case of the printed version of the Apocalypse no student can fail to observe its Harklensian character above referred to; and hardly if at all less unmistakable is the affinity between the Crawford Apocalypse and the version of the Four minor Epistles known as the "Pococke." They belong unquestionably to one and the same period of the language when it still retained its fresh idiomatic vigour, and had not degenerated into the pedantically Graecized form imposed on it by the seventh-century translators. I confidently anticipate that any Syriac scholar who compares them will agree with me that they show such a general resemblance as is to be expected in versions made in one period by translators of one school of learning—not improbably by one and the same translator. Moreover, there are not wanting special points of coincidence between them, sufficient to confirm the theory of a common origin thus suggested by their general affinity in style and diction. In Appendix E I have put together the instances I have noted of agreement in rendering between the Crawford Apocalypse and the Pococke Epistles,—distinguishing (a) the cases in which the Pococke rendering is not retained by the Harklensian, and (b) the cases where the Harklensian exhibits the same rendering as the Pococke, though contrary to Harklensian usage elsewhere,—in
which, therefore, it may be presumed to have borrowed from the Pococke.*

(6). To this body of internal evidence is to be added the external evidence (quite independent, I again repeat, of the other) yielded by our Ms., in the fact that with this text of the Apocalypse it associates the Pococke text of the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, to form a complete Syriac New Testament. When Stephen the scribe and his collaborators thus supplemented the Peshitto by incorporating with it the Books of the New Testament Canon not comprised in it, the presumption is that the version whence they borrowed the Apocalypse was the same as that whence they borrowed these four Epistles.

Thus by a twofold line of probability we are led to conclude that the translator to whom we owe the Pococke Four Epistles, is also the author of the Crawford version of the Apocalypse. If then this conclusion be accepted, it follows finally that the Crawford Apocalypse is, as in my former Paper I have shown that the Pococke Epistles must be held to be, a portion of the version made for Philoxenus Metropolitan of Mabug, by Polycarpus the Chorepiscopus, A.D. 508,—which is known to have been the basis of the Harklensian, and is usually spoken of as the “original”, or “unrevised”, “Philoxenian”.

To sum up the results of our investigations:

1. Of each of the two portions of the New Testament not included in the Peshitto,—viz., a, The Apocalypse; b, the Four Minor Catholic Epistles,—we have before us two Syriac versions.

2. As regards a, the newly-discovered version has by two centuries the earlier attestation (A.D. 874 as against A.D. 1088), belongs to an earlier stage of the language, and represents a Greek text of earlier type.

3. This version of a bears to the other a relation exactly similar, in its nature and extent, to that borne by the Pococke to the Harklensian version of b.

* In some instances the Crawford Apocalypse agrees also with the renderings of the (supposed) Philoxenian Esaias, (Brit. Mus., Add. 17106; see Ceriani’s Monumenta S. et P., tom. v., fasc. i).
4. This version of A is (moreover) closely akin, in style and diction, to the Pococke version of B; and it is in the Crawford Ms. associated with the Pococke B to supply the defect of the Peshitto.

5. The other version of A (the one hitherto known and printed) is, in like manner, and even more closely, akin to the Harklensian version of B. [It is to be added that, though not as yet found included in any New Testament Ms. with the Harklensian or any part of it, it is associated with the Harklensian B in the inedited Commentary of Barsalibi above referred to, pp. 378, 379, 389.]

6. As regards B, the relation between the two versions has been proved to be, that the Harklensian is a revision of the Pococke,—the Pococke being a part of the "original" or "unrevised" Philoxenian.

7. It is therefore a natural and probable inference, that, as regards A, the printed version (which is akin to the Harklensian) is a revision of the Crawford version (which is akin to the Pococke): and this inference is confirmed by direct comparison of the two.

8. And finally, that the Crawford version of A (the Apocalypse) is, like the Pococke version of B (the Four Epistles) a part of the Philoxenian proper, as made by Polycarpus, in the first decade of the sixth century.

* Against the identification of the printed version of the Apocalypse as part of the Harklensian, I know of but one valid objection, and that a negative one; that it is not included in the Cambridge Ms. (Add. 1700) of the Harklensian New Testament. Its absence from the Oxford copy (New Coll., 333) is inconclusive, that Ms. being mutilated at the end.

But the force of this objection is not such as to overpower all other considerations. Omission does not necessarily indicate intention to exclude: and the custom of the Church, by which the Apocalypse was passed over in lectionary systems, supplies a sufficient reason for leaving it out, in case of a Ms. meant for Church use, as was Add. 1700. Even among Greek Ms., as is well known, copies of the Apocalypse are not very numerous—about 180 in all; and in nearly 80 of the mss. where it is found it stands apart—usually (as in the case of the Syriac Add. 17127) accompanied only by a Commentary.

On the other hand, to counterbalance the negative evidence of Add. 1700, we have to set the fact (above noted) that Barsalibi, in his Commentary on the latter books of the New Testament, derives his text of the Four Epistles from the Harklensian, and his text of the Apocalypse from this version which is so evidently akin to the Harklensian. See, for this Commentary, the Catal. of R.-F. (p. 71, 7185 Rich); also Hermathena, xiv., p. 397 sqq.; xv., p. 137 sqq., where I have given some account of its contents.
It is to be observed that this argument to shew that the Crawford Apocalypse is Philoxenian, and the other argument to shew that the printed Apocalypse is Harklensian, mutually strengthen and confirm one another. In each case, direct and independent internal reasons exist for believing that the translator of the Apocalypse is identical with the translator of the Four Epistles,—as I have stated above, under heads 4 and 5. We are not therefore reasoning in a circle when we assert that if the printed version is admitted to be Harklensian, the probability is increased that the Crawford version is Philoxenian; and vice versa.

Of the version which the Crawford Ms. has thus added to our stores of Syriac Biblical literature and to our authorities for the text of the Apocalypse, I have but to say in conclusion that when it is accessible, as I hope shortly to make it,* to Biblical scholars, it will be found well worthy of study. Though its readings are frequently unsupported by other authorities and no doubt aberrant, it is in the main an important accession to the number of early witnesses to the text of the book for which, of all the books of the New Testament, such witnesses are least numerous. Its merits as a translation stand high. Setting aside cases where it represents false readings of the Greek, its actual errors are few: I have noticed but one or two which seem due to the translator and not to copyists. Thus, it renders 'Ἀντίνας (ii.13), Ἰκα[...] (= ἀντὶ πάντων) as if it were a significant compound appellation and not a proper name; for κρύσταλλος (iv. 6, xxii. 1), it has δακτυλίων (apparently taking it to mean icer); for ἄρχαῖος (xii. 9), ἐδακτύλιον (as if chief;—but xx. 2, ἐκβολομεν correctly); and now and then (as xii. 11),† but not always, for διὰ with accusative, διὰ, through. On the other hand, it is free (as above noted) from the ludicrous misrendering of μεταπάσχω into which the later translator has fallen in seeking to improve upon his predecessor; and from another less gross one,—for κατάθεμα (xxii. 3), κατάθυμ, deciduous. As regards its general tone and manner, we may justly claim for it

* The entire Syriac text is in type; and with preliminary and accompanying matter which is now in the press, will be published at an early date.
† In A. V. the same inaccuracy occurs here.
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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 (with the help of such examples as I have brought together in Appendix F) 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 later 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”, wellnigh 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” (Rev. i. 8).
Appendix A.

The Diction of S compared with that of Σ.

(a). Examples in which the rendering of S is more idiomatic than that of Σ; the former for the most part following the usage of the Peshitto, the latter that of the Harklensian and Hexaplar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 9, συνκοινώνας ομίων</td>
<td>ἄμαχος ἵνα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 17, et passim, λέγων</td>
<td>ὑπέρ του</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 2, et passim, εἰαυρών</td>
<td>ἡμέρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 24, et passim, λοποί</td>
<td>ἀκόμη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ib., et passim, οἰνωπεῖς</td>
<td>ὑπόθεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 4, et passim, ἰμάτια</td>
<td>ἐνδέχεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 7, et passim, οὐδείς</td>
<td>ἐνδέχεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 10, xvi. 14, ἡ οἰκουμένη</td>
<td>ἡ οἰκουμένη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 11, v. 9, ἄξιος εἶ</td>
<td>ἐξενθέσθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 10, κρίνεις</td>
<td>ἐξεγνώθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 2, ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχοσα</td>
<td>ἐκλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 9, et passim, διάβολος</td>
<td>ἐκλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 13, et passim, μακάριοι</td>
<td>ἐκλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 21, σφόδρα</td>
<td>ἐκλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix. 21, τὰ ὀρνέα</td>
<td>ἐκλήθη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b). Examples where S varies the rendering of a Greek word, so as to bring out variation of meaning: Σ not so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Syriac Rendering</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Syriac Rendering</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>διδασκάλι</td>
<td>διδασκάλιο</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>διδασκάλι</td>
<td>doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τόπος</td>
<td>τόπος</td>
<td>position, abode</td>
<td>vi. 14</td>
<td>τόπος</td>
<td>space, region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφραγίς</td>
<td>σφραγίζεω</td>
<td>seal (for confirming)</td>
<td>vi. 2, ix. 4</td>
<td>σφραγίζεω</td>
<td>v. 1, et passim (for closing up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφαίξ</td>
<td>σφαίξ</td>
<td>to wound</td>
<td>xiii. 3, xiii. 6, xiii. 6, xix. 3</td>
<td>σφαίξ</td>
<td>xiv. 13, et passim, μακάριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκηνη</td>
<td>σκηνη</td>
<td>(divine abode)</td>
<td>xvi. 16, xx. 11</td>
<td>σκηνη</td>
<td>xx. 6, (mere predicate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The renderings which I have marked with asterisks are given uniformly by Σ. For σφραγίς, it has σφραγίζεω, ix. 4, and (where it is unsuitable) v. 5, 9; but σφραγίζεω, v. 1, 2; vii. 2, and everywhere else. For μακάριος, see under (a) above.

In the two places where S has σφραγίς, it preserves the paronomasia (σκηνη, σκηνη), which Σ misses.

It may be added here that S, xi. 12 (but not 11), distinguishes θεωρεῖ, from σύν = δρῶ, βλέπω: Σ fails to do so.

(c). Instances in which S uses rare words or forms, not found in Σ, and seldom or never elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Rare Syriac Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| κεκρυμμένον | κεκρυμμένον | (v. 6 with obelus, xvi. 14); κεκρυμμένον | to hold, for xvi. 14; (xiii. 17 et passim); κεκρυμμένον | δικομαι | (ii. 11); κεκρυμμένον | for xiii. 17; κεκρυμμένον | (xix. 13); κεκρυμμένον | δικομαι | (iv. 1 et passim); κεκρυμμένον | μονοκατά, an ingenious reproduction of the sound of the Greek, but formed regularly from κεκρυμμένον, (xviii. 22); κεκρυμμένον | βουλαρέω | (xix. 11); κεκρυμμένον | δειλός | (xii. 8).

(d). Words used in stat. absol. by S, where Σ uses stat. emphat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Rare Syriac Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| κεκρυμμένον | (vii. 1); κεκρυμμένον | (vii. 9); κεκρυμμένον | (xiv. 20); κεκρυμμένον | (xii. 14); κεκρυμμένον | (xi. 4); κεκρυμμένον | (iv. 6); κεκρυμμένον | (vi. 1); κεκρυμμένον | (ii. 10);
(e). Instances of stat. constr. in S, where Σ avoids using it.

i. 18, Ἰωάννης Ἰλαρίων; ii. 14, Χάρις Λαμπρός; ii. 27, Παύλος Ηλιάς; vii. 2, Ἀδριανός Βαρθολομαίος; ix. 20, Ἰωάννης Κώστας; xi. 18, Πάντας Ερατοσθένης; xiv. 6, Ἰωάννης Κύριλλος; xvii. 14, Κύριλλος Κύριλλος; xviii. 17, Κύριλλος Κύριλλος; xix. 22, Κώστας Κύριλλος; xx. 20, Κύριλλος Κύριλλος; xxii. 15, Κύριλλος Κύριλλος.

The following two instances are anomalous:—

xvii. 8, Ἀλέξανδρος Ελευθέριος; xviii. 17, Ἀλέξανδρος Ελευθέριος.

(f). Words idiomatically rendered in S, but in Σ transliterated or adopted from the Greek; as are most of them in Hkl. and Hxp., and some also in Psh.

ἀκρατος (xiv. 10), λαμπᾶς (iv. 5), εἰκόνις (v. 8), καθερμής (xviii. 17), χρυσόπλασιος (xxi. 20).

But the following are adopted from the Greek in S as well as Σ:—

ἀψυθος, ἀψυθος (viii. 11); διαθήκη, κιβωτος (xi. 19); στάδιον (xiv. 20); στολή (vi. 11); χρυσόπλασιος (xxi. 20).

* Where θρόνος occurs before iv. 6, Σ renders it as S.
APPENDIX B.

THE TEXTUAL EVIDENCE of S AND Σ SEVERALLY.

(a). Notable rival readings in which the two versions differ.

The following list will show: (1°) that the versions are, in great measure, textually independent of each other; (2°) that S is, of the two, more frequently on the side of the weightier authorities. In each case I have marked with * the better attested reading, and have subjoined a brief summary of the evidence. It will be seen that in thirty-five out of the fifty-four instances collected, the asterisk stands in the S column.

[The notation I have used is as follows, in this and the following notes:
For the MSS: ἀ C P as in Tischendorf, &c.; Q, Cod. Basileensis (Tischendorf's B).
For the MSS: as in Tischendorf; and "most", "many", &c., mean "most mss", "many mss", &c.
For the Latin versions: g, cod. Gigas; h, cod. Floriacensis; pr, Primasius; vt, the consent of the foregoing Old Lat.; am, cod. Amiatinus; arm, cod. Armachanus; cl, Clementine text; vg, consent of chief authorities for Vulgate; latt, consent of vt and vg.†
For the copies of Σ: n, the Nitrian (Brit. Mus.); l, the Leyden (De Dieu's); d, the Dublin (Ussher's).]

S
i. 9, ἐν Ἰησοῦ* (ἀ C P, 38, g, am; ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ or ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ A reads ἐν Χριστῷ).
ii. 5, ἔρχομαι σου* (ἀ C P, g, vg).
,, 7, τοῦ Θεοῦ* (ἀ C P and some).
,, 9, οἴδα σου* (ἀ C P and few, latt).
,, 13, οἴδα* (ἀ C P, 38, latt).

Σ
i. 9, ἐν Ἰησοῦ (Q and most, h, pr, cl).
ii. 5, ἔρχομαι σου (Q and most, pr).
,, 7, τοῦ Θεοῦ (Q and most, latt).
,, 9, οἴδα σου (Q and most).
,, 13, οἴδα (Q and most).

† For pr, I follow Hausleiter's text (1891); for h, Berger's (1889); for g, Belheim's (1879,— in a copy corrected by recollation with the original Ms, for the use of which I am indebted to Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury); for am, Tischendorf's (1850). I have given one or two readings of arm, from the Ms.
ii. 13, τὴν πίστιν μου καί* (A C, 91, vg).  
ib. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις* (A C, am).  
ib. ὁ πιστός (Ν P Q and most, latt).  
", 14, φαγεῖν* (Ν A C P and many, latt).  
,, 16, μετανόησον οὖν* (A C Q and many).  
,, 17, [ἐκ]τοῦ μάννα* (Ν A C Q and many, vg, pr).  
iii. 2, ἐμελλες (Q and most).  
iv. 5, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου* (Ν A P and few, latt).  
,, 7, ὡς ἀνθρώπου* (A and few, vg, pr; Q and most om. ὡς; Ν differs; also g).  
,, 11, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν* (Ν A P and some, latt).  
vi. 1, ἐξωθέν (P Q and most, latt).  
,, 3, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* (Ν A P and many, latt).  
,, 4, ἰνα (Q and most).  
,, 5, ἔρχον* (Α C P and many, g, am).  
,, 7, ήκουσα φωνῆ* (Ν A, vg).  
,, 8, καὶ ἔσβη* (Q and most).  
,, 10, κέντρα ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν* (most mss, g, vg; h, pr, ambiguous).  
,, 11, ἔχουσιν ἔχουσιν (Q and most).
ix. 12, 13, δύο οναί [και] μετὰ ταῦτα [και] (Ν Q and many).
,, 13, τῶν τεσσάρων κεράτων (P Q and most, pr, cl).
x. 6, οὗτοι (Ν A and few, vt).
,, 8, τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι (C P Q and most, vt).
,, xii. 14, ὅπως τρέφηται (Q and most).
,, 18, ἐστάθην (P Q and most).
xiv. 1, μετ' αὐτοῦ (Ν A C P and many, latt).
,, 3, ὃς φίδην (A C and some, vt).
,, 4, οὗτοι οἱ (Ν A C P, 1, 38, vt).
ib. ὑπάγει (Ν P Q and most, g, vt).
ib. ἡγοράσθησαν (Ν A C P and some, latt).
,, 18, αὕτη (Ν A C P and many, latt).
,, 19, τὴν μεγάλην (Κ and many).
,, xv. 6, ἐνδεδυμένοι (Ν A C P and many, latt).
xvi. 3, ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (P Q and most; Κ, ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ).
,, 8, ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος (Ν and many, pr, cl).
,, 9, ἢβλασφήμησαν (Ν A C P and few, latt).
xvii. 4, αὕτης (2nd) (A and many, vt).
,, 8, τὰ ὄνομα (Ν P and many, latt).
xviii. 14, ὄπωρα σου (Ν A C P and few, am, pr).
xix. 12, ὄνομα γεγραμένον (Α P and many, latt; Κ, ὄνομα only).
,, 15, ὄξεια (Ν A P and some, am, g).
xx. 2, ὃ σατανᾶς* (Ἀ Π and some, latt). ὃ σατανᾶς ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην διήν (Q and most).

xxi. 5, ἀληθωἱ* (Ἀ Π and many, latt). ἀληθωἱ τοῦ θεοῦ (Q and many).

,, 6, γέγοναν [-αυς]* (Ἀ, 38; latt, γέγονε). γέγονα (NP Q and most).


,, 24, τὴν δόξαν [αὐτῶν]* (Ἀ Π and many, ντ). τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν τιμήν (Q and many, ντ).

ib. εἰς αὐτήν* (Ἀ Π and many, latt). τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς αὐτήν (Q and many).

xxii. 1, καθαρῶν καὶ λαμπρῶν (many mss [without καὶ]). λαμπρῶν* (all MSS and most mss, latt).

,, 3, ἐκεῖ (many mss). ἐκ* (Ἀ Π and many, latt; 8 om.).

,, 5, ἐκεῖ (many mss). ἐκ* (Ἀ Π and many, latt; Q and many om.).

(b). Readings in which S stands alone.

[I record here only such variations as may reasonably be supposed to have been in the Greek whence S was derived. I pass over such as may be accounted for by oversight, loose rendering, or mistake, on the part of the translator; and such as are probably errors of transcription, especially omissions, or insertions, or confusions, of prefixes consisting of a single letter. The chief instances of blunders evidently due to the scribe are to be found collected in Appendix C.]

1. Omissions.

ii. 5, καὶ μετανόησον: ib., ἕκ τοῦ τάπου αὐτῆς: ii. 26, ἀρξή τέλους:

iii. 10, τῆς ὄρας: iii. 12, ἕκ τοῦ οὔρανοῦ: iii. 17, καὶ τυφλός: iii. 18, τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου:

iii. 20, πρὸς αὐτῶν: iv. 1, ἡ πρώτη: vi. 16, τοῦ καθημένου: vii. 11, καὶ προσεκώπησαν τῷ θεῷ: vii. 17, ὁ θεὸς:

ix. 17, καὶ οὕτως . . . τῇ ὥρᾳ: ix. 19, αἱ γὰρ οὕραι . . . ἀδικοῦντε:
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2. Insertions.

iii. 1, ἢτι before νεκρός: iv. 8, ἡ ἄνυχων αἰτοῦ καὶ after ἔχων: vi. 2, καὶ ἠκουσα after ἤδε: vi. 9, ἰησοῦ (without Χριστοῦ) after μαρτυρίαν: viii. 8, ἐγένετο before ὅς: x. 4, τοῦ ἐβδομοῦ after οὐρανοῦ: x. 5, ὃς before ἤρε: x. 14, ἰδοὺ before ἢ [ορ αῖ] οὐαὶ: xiii. 17, ἢτι after παλιῆται: xvii. 1 ὁπίσω μοῦ after ἀεύρο: xvi. 11, καὶ ἀ δράκων before καὶ τοῦ θηρίων: xvii. 17, τούτω after τῷ θηρίῳ: xviii. 8, ἐπ̃ before αὕτης: xviii. 14, βλέψεις καὶ αὐτά after αὐτά: xix. 19, καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ after τὸ θηρίον: xx. 21, ἐς before ἀνὰ ἐς: xxii. 16, καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ after Δαυῖδ. Also, on margin (ii. 23), καὶ παιδεύουσι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν.


ii. 25, ὁ ὀν, for πλὴν ὃ: iv. 8, ἄνω, for ἀνά: vi. 5, ἤνοιχὴ ἢ σφαγίς ἢ τρίτη, ἢ ὑμεῖς τὴν .... τρίτην: vi. 6, ἢ μέσῳ, for ἐν μέσῳ: vi. 9, τὰς ἐσφαγμένας, for gen. masc.: vii. 17, ζωήν καὶ ἤπι, for ζωήσ τ ζώσας: viii. 11, ὡς ἐπικράνθησαν τὰ ἔθιστα, for ἐκ τῶν ἔθιστων ὡς ἐπικράνθησαν: viii. 13, τῆς φωνῆς, for τῶν λοιπῶν φωνῶν: ix. 5, πέση ἤπι, for παιζή: xi. 6, στρέφει τὰ ἔθιστα, for ἐπὶ τῶν ἔθιστων στρέφει αὐτά: xi. 7 (xvii. 8), βαλάστης, for ἀβύσσου: xi. 13, ἀνθρώπων: xi. 14, αἱ οὐαὶ αἱ δύο ἀπῆλθον, for ὡς οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα ἀπῆλθε: xii. 12, αὐτοὺς, for ὑμᾶς: xiii. 6, τῶν .... σκηνοῦσαν, for αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς .... σκηνοῦσας: xiii. 8, αἱ οὗ γεγραμμέναι, for ἡ οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὄνομα: id., πρό, for ἀπό: xiii. 16, δεισπότας, for ἑλευθέρους: xiv. 3, καὶ, for ἐ μὴ: xiv. 10, Κυρίον, for Θεῖον:
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xiv. 20, ἐνί, for ἀπό: xv. 3, δικαια καὶ ἀληθινὰ τὰ ἔργα, for δικαια . . .
aὶ ὅδε: xvi. 3, βάλλασσα ὡς νεκρός, for αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ:* xvii. 4, xviii. 18,
κεχρυσωμένα, for fem. sing.: xvi. 18, ἐκλαυσαν αὐτήν, for ἐκραζόν [or
-ζαν]: xviii. 21, εὐρήθης, for εὐρεθῇ: xviii. 22, κιβάρας, for κιβαρφδῶν:
xviii. 23, ἐπιλάνησας, for 3rd pers. pl. pass.: xix. 5, τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ, for
αὐτῶν: xix. 15, αὐτῶν . . . πατάξωσι, for sing.: xix. 16, ἐπὶ τὰ ἰμάτια
αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μηροὺς, for ἐπὶ τὸ ἰμάτιον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρόν: xx. 3, λύσαι,
for λυθήναι: xx. 9, τὴν πόλιν τῆς παρεμβολῆς, for τὴν παρεμβολήν: xx. 12,
κρίσεως, for ζωῆς: xxi. 4, ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῆς. Καὶ, for ὅτι τὰ πρόσωπα:
xxi. 8, ἢ, for ὅ: xxi. 14, νῦν, for ἄρνιον: xxi. 15, μέτρον κάλαμον, for
μέτρων κάλαμον [or καλάμου]: xxi. 21, ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῇ, for διανήγης: xxi. 27,
οὗ ἔσται ἐκεῖ, for οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν: ὃ, τὰ γεγραμμένα, for masc.:
xxii. 2, αὐτῶν, for τοῦ ξύλου: xxii. 5, βασίλευς αὐτῶν, for βασιλεύσοντιν.

4. Mixed, or Conflate, readings.

ii. 9, Ὀυδαίον Ὀυδαῖοι.
ii. 13, ἀντίτας [καὶ] ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός· ἀντίτας ὁ μάρτυς μου
ὁ πιστός.
iii. 2, ἐμμελεῖς ἀποθανεῖς, for ἐμμελεῖς ἀποθάλλεις, or ἐμμελον ἀποθανεῖν.
v. 10, βασιλείαν καὶ λερεῖς καὶ βασιλείας.
vi. 2, νικήτης καὶ νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ.
or νικῶν καὶ ἐνίκησεν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ.
xi. 11, πνεῦμα ζών ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς . . . καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς
ἐπέσω ἐπὶ αὐτούς.
xviii. 17, πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πλοίων ἐπὶ τόπον πλέων [?].†
xix. 19, καὶ ἔδωκα τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ· καὶ τοὺς
βασιλείς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν.

Of these, vi. 2 (if the reading which stands first is accepted), and
xi. 11, seem to be instances of double renderings rather than of conflation.

* But see in Appendices C, and F (e), below. † See in Appendix F.
(c). Readings in which S has the support of some one, or very few of the weightiest authorities;—mostly against Σ,—but with it the instances specially noted.

i. 10, for σάλπηγγος λεγομένης: S reads accus., (with ἃ, pr, Σ).

ii. 11, ἂ: ἂ, (38 &c., pr).

ib. Σμόραν: Σμόραν, (N, am).

15, πεπεραμένης [or -οι]: dat. sing., (N, latt, Σ).

iii. 5, οὖν : om., (pr).

8, for Σμόρνη: gen., (Α, latt).

9, ἐκ : τὴν ἐκ, (N, Σ).

13, ὑμῶν : gen., (95).

18, τῆς : τῷ, (Α, pr).

iv. after ὀφθαλμοῦς[ or- ὃν]: om. αὐτοῦ,

20, προφήτων: add ἐδώκας, (N).

iii. 3, οὖν (1st) : om., (N, 14, et).

ib. for οὖν (2nd): ἐς, (36).

5, περιβαλλέσθαι: pres., (C, Σ).

14, ἡ ἀρχή : presī καί, (N).

iv. 9, τῶν αἰῶνων : add ἄριστό, (N, 95).

v. 4, for οὕτω βλέπειν αὐτό: καὶ λῦναι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, (pr).

5, τὰς σφραγίδας: prefix λύσαι, (N, latt).

13, for ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης : ἐν with dat., (N, latt, Σ).

vi. 8, καί ἰδοὺ ἵππος χλωρός: accus., and om. καὶ ἰδοῦ, (pr).

vii. 1, ἀνέμους: add τῆς γῆς, (38, el).

2, for ἀνάτολης: plur., (Α).

9, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥς χλωρός πολύς: accus., and om. καὶ ἰδοῦ, (Α, latt except g).

viii. 2, for ἐστήκασι: plupf., (38, g, Σ).

8, ἐγγέλος : om., (N).

9, for ἵππας: sing., (N).

11, ἐς: ὡς, (ά, pr).

ix. 2, μεγάλης καί καυμάκης: μεγά-

lης καυμάκης, (36, 38, g).

7, τὸ ὀμοιώματα: sing., (g, Σ).

11, [θο] δομα αὐτῆς: φ δομα, (18, latt except g).

12, 13, δύο οὖν, μετὰ ταῦτα. Καὶ ο: δύο οὖν. Μετὰ ταῦτα δ, (N).

16, μυράδες: accus., (N).

17, τῶν στομάτων: sing., (latt).

18, τῶν στομάτων: sing., (91, 95, latt).

x. 3, τὰς . . . φωνὰς: dat., (N, 7, g).

5, τὴν δεξίαν: om., (Α, 1, 36, νγ).

8, for ἡ φωνὴ ἡν: φωνήν, (7, ετ, ελ).

xi. 2, τὴν ἐξωθήν: τὴν ἐσωθεν, (N, some).

8, τῆς πλατείας: plur., (g, εγ).

10, χαίρουσιν: fut., (38, latt, Σ).

12, ἡθεώρησαν: impf., (38, 97).

15, Κυρίου: Θεοῦ, (28, pr).


xii. 2, ἄδεινονα: prefix καί, (Α, Σ).

4, for ἐστηκεν: plupf., (C, Σ).

6, ἔχει: impf., (38, Α, ετ, Σ).

8, αὐτῶν: dat., (36).

xii. 10, for ἐν τῷ οὐδαμῷ: ἐκ with gen.,
(95, g, pr [not h]).

xiii. 10, ,, [συνάγει]: ἀπάγει, (33, 35,
vit, cl, Σ).

ib. ,, ἀποκτενεῖ: pres., (₦, 28, 35,
79, 95, g, Σ).

ib. ,, δεῖ αὐτῶν . . . . ἀποκτανθήσαναί:
ἀποκτανθήσεται, (g).*

,, 14, ,, πλανᾷ: fut., (am, Σ).

ib. ,, ὅς : ὁ (νγ).

,, 15, ὥσα καὶ . . . τοῦ θερίου : om.,
(C, 14, 79, Σ l).

ib. for ποιήσῃ: fut., (14, 79).

,, 16, ,, ποιεῖ: fut., (νγ, Σ).

,, 17, ,, τὸ γνώμα: gen., (C, arm and
some νγ, Σ).

,, 18, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ : om., (₦).


,, 19, for εἰς τὴν γῆν: ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, (A,
38, 97).

xvi. 4, ,, ἐγένετο: plur., (₦, 36, 95,
vit, Σ).

,, 12, ,, ἀνατολής: plur., (A, 1, 38,
79).

,, 15, ,, ἔρχομαι: 3rd pers., (₦, 38,
47, pr).

,, 16, ,, συνήγαγεν [or -ον]: fut., (cl).

xvii. 8, ,, ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον: ἐν with dat.,
(79, 95, latt).

,, 15, ,, λέγει: εἶπε, (A, latt except
g, Σ).


* Thus γ alone supports 8 in all its notable read-
ings in this verse.


ib. καὶ φυλακῇ παντὸς ὀρνέου ἀκα-θάρου: om., (P, 1, 36, 38, 79).

,, 3, τοῦ θυμοῦ : om.,
(pr).

ib. for πέν[τ]οκαν (or -κε): πεπότικε,
(36, 79).

,, 4, ,, τῶν πληγῶν: sing., (g).

,, 12, ,, λίθου[ς] τιμίου[ς]: gen. pl.,
(pr, Σ).

,, 14, ,, τῆς ἐπιθυμίας: nom.,
(pr).

ib. ,, ἀπώλετο: ἀπῆλθεν, (1, 79).

,, 17, ,, τὴν θάλασσαν: ἐν with dat.,
(vit, Σ).

,, 20, ,, εὐφραίνου: plur., (pr, Σ).

,, 22, καὶ πᾶς τεχνίτης . . . ἐτε: om.,
(14, 92, Hippolytus).

ib. καὶ φωνῇ μιλοῦ . . . ἐτε: om.,
(₦, 38, &c, Hippol.).

,, 23, φανῇ ἐν σοι: om. ἐν, (C, vit, am, &c).

xix. 1, ὥς: om. (1, 38, &c, &c, Σ).

ib. for ὄχλου πολλοῦ: plur., (latt except
g).

ib. ,, τοῦ Θεοῦ: dat., (36, 47, latt
except g, Σ).

,, 2, ,, χειρὸς: plur., (latt except g).

,, 6, ,, ἄχλου πολλοῦ: plur., (pr).

ib. ὁ Θεὸς: om., (pr).

,, 10, for προσκυνήσαι: καὶ προσκυ- κήσαι,
(P, 79).

,, 12, φλόξ: πρέβας ὥς, (A, 36, 95,
latt, Σ).

,, 14, for ἐνδεδυμένοι: dat., (₦,
Origen.).

,, 17, for ἐνα: ἀλλον,
(₦, 36).
xx. 1, for ἐπὶ τὴν χειρὰ: ἐν with dat., (N, 38, latt, Σ).

,, 4, τὴν χειρὰ: plur., (ηγ).
,, 6, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: dat., (38).
,, 11, ἐπὶ: ἐπάνω, (N, 38, Σ).
xxi. 6, γέγονα: 3rd pers.pl., (A [latt 3 p. sing.]).

,, 12, ὀφέματα: add αὐτῶν, (N).
,, 14, δώδεκα ἀποστόλων: om. δώδεκα, (am).

v. 13, S arranges thus: Καὶ ἠκούσα λέγοντας τῷ καθημένῳ. . . . ἀρνεῖ· Ἡ ἐυλογία, καὶ . . .: (Q, g [?], arm).

(xd). Readings found in S and Σ alone, against all or nearly all other authorities.

i. 9, after συγκοινωνίας, ἵνα ὤμοι, ὀμ.
,, 13, after μάστοσι, ins. αὐτοῦ.
,, 19, for ἀ, ὤ.

iii. 9, before τῶν λεγόντων, ins. ἐκ.

iv. 1, for σάλπιγγος, accusat.

v. 11, for μυριάδες, χιλιάδες, sing.

viii. 7, for αἰματι, ἐδατ [ἐν]*.
,, 9, before τῶν κτισμάτων, ins. πάντων.
,, 13, for τοῦ σάλπιγγος, plur.

ix. 3, ἐξουσίας, om.

x. 9, for σοῦ τὴν κοιλίαν, σοι τὴν κοιλίαν σου.

xiii. 4, after θηρίῳ (3rd), ins. τούτῳ.
,, 16, for δῶσῳ [or δώσῃ], δοθή.

xxi. 18, for χρυσίων καθαρῶν: gen., (pr, am, Σ).
ib. for χρυσίων καθαρῶν: gen., (pr).
,, 27, τῆς ζωῆς: om., (pr).
xxii. 5, for ἔχουσι: fut., (latt, Σ).
,, 12, ἀς: κατά, (79, latt).
,, 17, ἐρχέσθω: add καὶ, (ε1, Σ).
ib. θέλων: om., (g).
,, 20, ἀμὴν: om., (latt).

See also the preceding note (c), in which will be found many readings which S and Σ have in common, with little or no Greek support.

* Σδ represents ὁφανε, prefixing a single letter to the word = ὁφανε, as read by ις.
APPENDIX C.

ERRORS OF TRANSCRIPTION IN THE SYRIAC TEXT OF S.

i. 16, κησοι = πνεῦμα
ii. 13, σωμάτων = ὄμορφας
ii. 17, θάνατος = ἀστίων
ib. χέρι = φυλακήν
iii. 17, δικαίωμα (1st) = ei
vi. 12, τοίοι = φῶς
ib. κοι = ἀσκός
ii. 14, διάδοσις = ἐτάκτη
ix. 11, κασαπατός = ἀγγέλων
x. 2, κασαπατός = ἀνθρακεῖς
ii. 7, λ (2nd) = οῖκ
xi. 6, τάπεινώσαται = ταπεινώσαται
,, 19, πει = πῦρ
xii. 1, κακαθών = ἀκακίων
,, 7, κακά = δεύτερου
,, 10, κοῦ = Ἰδίος
xiii. 2, κακαθών = λειώνης
,, 3, δικαστήριον = ἀνήθη
,, 12, ὄργανον = παρελεύσεις
,, 14, καλύψει = καλύψει
xvi. 1, άλλας = τάπεινώσαται
xxii. 8, κακαθών = ἀλλας
xv. 11, [[γε]] = ἐπαύθαντο

* But see in Appendix F (e).
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xvii. 12, διανέμει = ἐναντίον for διανέμει = ὄρναν
,, 14, κατ = ἀδικήσει
,, 16, κατά = ἐπισκέπτωται
xviii. 8, θάνατος = πληγή
,, 16, ἔστω = θάνατος
xix. 9, αἵ = πάλιν
,, δικαιοίας = τῆς δικαιοίας
,, 17, ἰσοτίμως = καὶ συνήθησαν
xx. 3, ἑνεκε = ἔδωκε
,, 6, δάκρυσ = θάνατος

Perhaps we may add:

xvi. 3, διαλέοντας δὲν = θάλασσα ὡς νεκρός, for διάλοιπας δὲν = αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ.

In ii. 13, ii. 17, xii. 7, the context has been editorially modified so as to make the erroneous reading yield an intelligible meaning.

APPENDIX D.

Instances of agreement between S and the "Pococke" Epistles; against Σ.

(a) Against the Harklensian version (of these Epistles):

i. 9, 10 et passim, the possessive pronoun is expressed by suffix, as in Poc. passim, without ἦν.
,, 11, 19 et passim, the relative is expressed by ζ = ἀντίθετα (and so in singular), as in Poc. passim, for ζ = ἀντίθετα.
ii. 12 et passim, κοινοίσα = βουμφαία, 2 Pet. ii. 12 [= διάλογος], rare; for κοινοῖσα
,, 15, 24 (not 14, see Appx. A, b), κοινοῖσα = διαχώ = διαχώ, 2 Joh.

* See in Appendix F (e).
vi. 4 (not i. 4; see Appx. E), περί = εἰπήν, 2 Pet. i. 2, et passim in Poc.; also in Philox. Esaias (see above, for p. 395, note).

xi. 5 (only), περί = θέλω, 3 Joh. 13;

xii. 8,

xvi. 16, (not else; see Appx. A, b) περί = τόπος, 2 Pet. i. 19;

xx. 11,

xiv. 13, αποθεωσίων = απόθεσις (for θάνατος);

xviii. 12, et passim (except xvii. 4), περί = τίμος, 2 Pet. i. 4

It is not out of place to add here, as a notable point of coincidence,

xix. 10, δικαιοσύνη = μαλλον, is interpolated, without countenance from any other authority, after παρά = παρά, (= τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον). So 3 Joh. 5, the same adverb is read in Poc. alone before παρά (= ξένους).

(b). With the Harklensian (against its general usage elsewhere):

i. 16, ἄνευ = ανεύ, 2 Pet. ii. 8 [= βλέμμα], rare; for ἄνευ

ii. 1, ἄνευ = ἐν μέσῳ, 2 Pet. ii. 8 [= ἐν];,, ἄνευ

xiii. 6, ἄνευ = βλασφημῶ, Jud. 10 [cp. 2 Pet. ii. 12]; (here only in S; once only in Psh. N.T.)

xviii. 14, ἀπόρος, Jud. 12 [ἀπόρος = φθονον], πορνεία, rare;

xx. 10, ἀπόρος = ἀπόρος, 2 Joh. 7 bis [= πλανος], Jud. 13 = [πλανητής], rare;

xxii. 13, ἀπόρος = ἀρχηγός, 2 Pet. iii. 4; 2 Joh. 5; 6; Jud. 4;

(used in Hkl., elsewhere; but not habitually).
Appendix E.

Results of a comparison between S and Σ, in the passage, Rev. i. 1-8; (showing that this passage has been adopted into the Crawford Ms. of S, from a copy of Σ).

(a). As to Diction:—

i. Three verses, 1, 3, and 6, are absolutely identical.

ii. In the other five, only the following few and minute variations are to be found in S:—ver. 2, οὖθος for οὖθος: 4, ins. ο before οὖθος: 5, οὖθος for οὐθος: ib. οὐ for οὐθος: 7, ins. ο before οὐθος: 8, ins. ο before οὐθος.

iii. In the following points of agreement, the usage is that of Σ, and is contrary to that of S elsewhere:

a. The possessive pronoun is everywhere expressed by θέω with suffix.

b. For the relative, θέω [θέω, θέω] are uniformly used:
   S elsewhere usually θέω.

c. (ver. 1), θέω = δει: S elsewhere always δει.

d. (ver. 3), θέω θέω = μακάριος (of felicitation): S elsewhere always θέω θέω.

e. (ib.) θέω = ἀκούοντες [τοῖς λόγοις]: S elsewhere prefixes θέω to the object of this verb only where it denotes a person.

f. (ib.) θέω = Ϝ θεός (and in other instances): S elsewhere avoids using personal pronoun for definite article.

g. (ver. 4), θέω = εἰρήνη: S elsewhere always εἰρήνη.

h. (ib.) θέω is prefixed to each of the three members of the sentence (ἀπὸ δω καὶ ...): whereas in the parallel passages, iv. 8, xvi. 5 (cp. also xi. 17), S prefixes it only to the first.
i. (ver. 6), ἔλεγεν ἵλεμ = ἐς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων: S elsewhere always ἴλεμ ἵλεμ.

j. (ver. 7), ὁμορραγήσεις = οἴρυνος: S elsewhere always ὁμορραγήσεις.

(b). As to underlying Text.

a. None of the variations noted above (a, ii.) implies difference of text, except the two insertions of a, verses 4 and 7; and these are probably due to the scribe of S, with whom this particular insertion is habitual.

b. The following readings, within these eight verses, have no extant Greek authority, and are peculiar or nearly so to S and Σ:

verse 3, ἵνα ταύτης (vgl. only).

" 5, the participles in nominat. case, for dat.

" 6, ἴερατικήν (or ἴεράν), for ἴερεύς.

" 7, δύονται πάντες ὄφθαλμοί, for sing.

Appendix F.

Variants in the text of the Apocalypse, suggestive of the hypothesis of an Aramaic original.

If anyone should be disposed to entertain the idea that the Apocalypse—the Book which of all the Books of the New Testament is unquestionably the most Aramaic in diction as well as in spirit, and which Vischer and Harnack maintain to be in the main a Jewish work,—may have been not only conceived by an Aramaic-speaking author, but actually written originally in some dialect of Aramaic, the following are examples of evidence from S adducible in support of such an hypothesis. It is at least as defensible as Widmanstad’s belief that the Peshitto text gives the original of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or Cureton’s claim that the version discovered by him exhibits the original of St. Matthew.
416 Rev. Dr. Gwynn—On a Syriac Ms. of the New Testament.

(a). xiii. 3. ἑβαυμάσθη διὰ ηγ. ἡ γη ὑπίσω τοῦ θηρίου.

Literally rendered, this would be in Syriac, ḫawāštā ḫawāštā ḫawāštā ḫawāštā. The expression, whether in Greek or in Syriac, is a forced and very strange one.

For ḫawāštā, S has ḫawāštā, = ἀνήχθη (as Psh., Mt. iv.1), which gives a clear and natural reading. Thus the question is raised; May it not be that we have here a survival of the Aramaic original?—that ḫawāštā reproduces the true reading, which having been misread ḫawāštā by the Greek translator (by the easy substitution of ḫ for ἡ), became in his version ἑβαυμάσθη?

This explanation has the advantage of accounting for the use, else wellnigh unexampled, of the passive form ἑβαυμάσθη (for ἑβαυμάσθη), which seems to be the true reading, attested by A, C [= ἑβαυμάσθη], and some good cursives (1, 36, 79, &c.), and adopted by Westcott and Hort, by Weiss, and also by Tregelles (though the last with the cursives reads wrongly ἐν διή τῆ γη). In rendering the ethpaal verb into Greek, the translator would naturally prefer the passive form, though its use in middle sense is very rare. So again, xvii. 8, Westcott and Hort read, with A and P, ἑβαυμάσθησαί for ἑβαυμάσθησαί.

(b). xv. 3. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων.

S and Σ adopt this reading (ではありません、ではありません), in preference to the alternative ὁ β. τῶν ἥθνων. The former has few but weighty supporters (N C and the good cursive 95, and ἕγ): the latter attested by Ἁ Π Ο and nearly all the ms, and ἕτ. Whichever reading is the true one, the variation is naturally accounted for if we suppose the original to have been Aramaic: for ではありません could readily pass into ではありません (= ἥθνων), or vice versa. This variation actually occurs in the text of the Pococke version of 2 Pet. ii. 1, where the printed text, following the Bodleian copy, reads ではありません (= ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ) for ではありません (ἐν τῷ λαῷ).

It may be, however, that the variation arose in the Greek, from an itacism. ではありません, written ではありません, would easily be mistaken for ではありません.
(c). xviii. 2. καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεῦματος ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὄρνεου ἀκαθάρτου.

S (against Σ, but supported by P and the good cursives 36, 38, 79) gives only καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὄρνεου ἀκαθάρτου, omitting the latter half of the passage. It seems highly likely that S is right in the judgment which this omission implies—that we have here a double rendering, or rather a conflation. Nothing can be weaker than the repetition in the passage as it stands above: one half merely echoes the other, and one or other is probably spurious. But it seems also that S and its supporters have retained the wrong half. The double reading may well have originated thus. The original text gave only καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὄρνεου ἀκαθάρτου. On ὄρνεον, a note gave the gloss πνεῦματος, which passing into the text produced the variant καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεῦματος ἀκαθάρτου. The combination of these two, then, resulted in the conflate reading as we have it.

But this substitution would be much more likely to occur in an Aramaic than in a Greek original. Between ὄρνεον and πνεῦματος there is no resemblance to eye or ear; whereas in Syriac, ἐκκοτ (πνεῦματα) and ἐκκοτα (ὄρνεα—lit., περνα) differ but by a letter. Thus ἐκκοτ written on the margin as a gloss would be more readily mistaken for a correction of ἐκκοτα and substituted for it in the text. I may add that, though in S ἐκκοτα stands for ὄρνεον in the second clause, in 4, (the Leyden Ms.) ἐκκοτα is written by error for ἐκκοτ in the first; a mistake the exact counterpart of that which I have above supposed.

(d). xviii. 17. πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πλέων πλέων.

This not very intelligible expression is attested by Ν Α C Q, and most mss and versions; but P and some mss read τῶν πλοίων for τῶν πλέων. S gives what at first sight seems a conflate reading, καὶ πᾶς ὁ πλέων. But καὶ πᾶς ὁ πλέων is probably only a periphrastic rendering (= “all that go in ships”) of πᾶς ὁ πλέων, and thus S really represents the reading of the majority. The fact, however, that πλέω has no proper equivalent in Syriac suggests the possible existence of a prior Syriac text in which
the reading was simply καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ,—i.e., "every voyager" (as distinguished from the "shipmaster", the "sailor", the "trader"). This, though really πᾶσιν ὀ πλῶν only, would lead to the seemingly more exact rendering πᾶσιν ἐπὶ τῶν πλοίων πλέων, which again would pass into the awkward πασὶ ἐπὶ τόπων πλέων,—a reading which, though strongly supported, is in itself an improbable one.

To these may perhaps be added—

(e). xvi. 3. ἐγένετο αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ.

In this reading all authorities except S agree. According to it, when the second vial was poured out on the sea, "it became blood as of a dead man"; after which (ver. 4) the third vial was poured out on the rivers and fountains and "it became blood". Thus read, the description may be taken as expressing, though not distinctly or adequately, the contrast between (on the one hand) the sea turned into a standing pool of dead blood, foul and unfit to sustain animal life within it,—and (on the other) the streams and springs flowing with blood, to be the drink of the bloodshedder. But the former part of the contrast is surely given with far stronger vividness if we read with S, ἐγένετο ἡ θάλασσα ὡς νεκρός, "the sea became as a dead man". The image is even more terrible than "the very deep did rot" of the English poet;* the sea lies a corpse, no life to stir its tides or people its waters, in its stagnation dead and the abode of death. If then this be accepted as the true reading, it follows necessarily that the Syriac, ἐγένετο ἡ θάλασσα ὡς νεκρό, is the original, and that the Greek is but a rendering of a corruption of it, with σ substituted for σ in ἡ θάλασσα and a second σ prefixed to καρπος, so as to give the result καρπὸς καρποῦ καρποῦ, as in Σ.

* Rime of the Ancient Mariner, pt. ii.