

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

Notes on the Beirût Syriac Codex.

BY PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.

I. *History and External Description.*

Some months after the discovery of this MS., or rather, of the character of its contents, I published a hasty account in *The* (London) *Academy*, 2d vol. of 1877, p. 170, and in *The Independent* (New York), August 23, 1877; and later, a rather more extended summary in the *Proceedings* of the American Oriental Society for October, 1877, pp. xvi. ff. As all these accounts contain a few errors, partly of oversight, partly inevitable, it will not be out of place to begin from the beginning, although that course involves some repetition.

The codex I found in the library of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirût, kept as an unknown curiosity, and kept no more carefully than the other books there. No one there had skill to read it, except perhaps Dr. Van Dyck, and he was not aware of its existence, much less of its presence in the library. As the manuscript had suffered from some former exposure to water, and was still suffering from incipient renewed decay, I took measures for its more careful keeping, and at the same time proceeded to read and examine it. When Dr. Bliss, the president of the college, returned in the autumn of 1876 from a two years' stay in England and America, he informed me that it had been brought from Mardin by one 'Abd ul-Messiah (not the man of the same name who accompanied the explorer Layard), who had been employed as superintendent of the native workmen in the erection of the main college building; and that he (Dr. Bliss) had induced him to present it to the college.

Proceeding with my examination, I found that the Gospels were evidently of the Philoxenian or Harklensian version, though I had of that version at that time only the specimens in Bernstein's *Kirsch's Chrestomathy* (Lips., Knobloch, 1832), and Tychsen's *Elementare*

Syriacum (Rostoch, 1793.) The rest of the codex was the Peshitto. From its state, material, and style of writing, I judged it to belong to a period limited by the eighth and tenth centuries. But wishing to have a more competent judgment, I mailed six loose leaves* to Dr. Antonio M. Ceriani, the well-known critic at the Ambrosian Library at Milan, to whom I was already indebted for valuable favors, and requested his opinion. He soon replied, saying, "immediately I saw the fragments are part of a New Testament of about the IX. century, of Jacobite origin." Some days later he returned the leaves with a longer comment. A quire signature on one of the leaves had enabled him to compute very closely the size of the manuscript, with a number of interesting particulars beside. He concluded with the remark: "Omnino inspiciendum si habet Apocalypsim, quia fortasse esset antiquissimus omnium codicum pro hoc libro. Contuli folium tertium [third of the one I sent, No. 128 of the codex as it is] cum edita Harklensi translatione, et lectionibus variis in vetustissimis libris; textus in summa melior est illo editionis White."

The codex at present, or as found, consists of 203 leaves of pretty fine parchment, though the fineness is not uniform; two of them mere fragments. The size of the leaf is $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length and breadth; the writing in two columns to a page, each column $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches high by 2 to $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches wide, and regularly 32 lines to a column. Very rarely the lines in a column number 31 or 33. The margin or space between the columns is about half an inch wide, so that the whole written portion of the page is generally $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ inches in height and width. The codex is made up of *quiniones*, that is, in quires of five folios, or ten leaves, each; each *quinio* numbered on the middle of the lower margin, at beginning and end, after the common fashion of Syriac MSS. From the general appearance of the codex, and other obvious reasons, I conclude that it originally consisted of 24 *quiniones*, and contained the books which compose the ordinary Peshitto version; that is, all the New Testament except the second and third Epistles of John, the second Epistle of Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse.

In its present state the codex begins in its original *quinio* 2, in Matthew xii. 20; and ends in its original *quinio* 24, in Titus i. 9. The order of the books is the following: the Gospels in the usual order; then Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John; then the Epistles of Paul

* These leaves were numbers 1, 62, 98, 128, 202, 203, of the codex in its present condition.

in the usual order, without the Epistle to the Hebrews; which last doubtless came at the end and completed the codex. Except two long omissions, and in places where a leaf is gone, the *lacunæ* are inconsiderable. The missing leaves, besides those gone from the beginning and end, are usually those at the beginning or end of a *quinio*, or both; as the outer folio would soonest wear through at the back. The first leaf is a mere fragment, containing portions from Matt. xii. 20-48. The *lacunæ* of one leaf or more are the following: Matt. xiii. 28-57, one leaf; xvii. 20-xix. 12, one leaf; xxv. 11-xxvi. 31, one leaf; Mark iv. 2-35, one leaf; Luke xix. 38-xx. 21, one leaf; John viii. 31 (20 of Syriac numbering)-ix. 31, two leaves; 2 Corinthians xiii. 8-Galatians ii. 17, two leaves; Philippians ii. 15-Colossians i. 8, two leaves; 1 Timothy iii. 3-2 Timothy iii. 5 (except that a fragment preserves a few words in 1 Timothy ii. 10-19; iii. 1-3), two leaves and a large fragment.

The other two important *lacunæ* by omission are 2 Corinthians x. 1-14, and Galatians iii. 15-29. In addition to these defects, the passage Acts xi. 2-19 is transposed with the next one, Acts xi. 19-39. In this case the scribe copied one church-lesson out of its order by mistake, and supplied the defect as soon as he came to the end of the lesson first written. He also marked the place by leaving a space of four lines, and writing the vermilion lesson-note therein more conspicuously than usual. The other two defects mentioned had an origin nearly similar. That in Galatians omits a church-lesson, giving its rubricated title, but skipping over to the matter of the following lesson, and omitting the title to the latter.

An easy computation shows that the end of the twenty-fourth *quinio* would have just included the whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with part of a page for subscription and colophon. The Apocalypse would have required two *quiniones* in addition to that; and I cannot believe that so much could ever have been removed without leaving the evidence on the binding at the back. It seems beyond a doubt that the Apocalypse was never there. It should be stated here that not every *quinio* was originally full. *Quinio* 5 never contained but 9 leaves, and *quinio* 16 only 8.

A word is proper here with regard to the deciphering. The age of the codex alone would cause some difficulties; but time alone, apart from other agencies, has dealt tenderly with its legibility, though it shows its work abundantly upon the firmness of the material. But at some time or other the upper portion of the codex had been soaked in water, so that nearly throughout the whole manu-

script the upper half of each page is difficult to read, requiring the greatest patience and a skillful use of light. Sometimes a word requires hours to make it out. In damp weather some portions are illegible which can be read when it is dry. For this reason much of the codex is easy to read in this country, which could not be read in winter at Beirút. Sometimes writing set off on an opposite page helps the decipherment; at other times it hinders it. Sometimes the ink is entirely gone, but has left the letter etched into the surface. In many places the writing is hygroscopic, and becomes plain for a few seconds when the surface is dampened; in such cases appearing either instantly or after the lapse of half a minute to a minute. In other places a roughened surface conceals the ink which has penetrated to the interior of the membrane, and shows the writing when the surface is rendered transparent by moisture. But the artifices of deciphering are numerous, and perhaps as tedious in the full recital as the work itself has been. It needs only to be added that every letter, and most of the vowels and points, of the text are decipherable. A few of the section-numbers which belong in the margin I cannot find. They may have faded out, or they may never have been written. Sad work has been often made with the rubricated portions, which wash away readily with water; but, after all, most of them are decipherable. The vermilion title to Timothy is almost the only important one that has been wholly obliterated.

After the soaking in water mentioned above, which made so many holes, and took off a number of upper outer corners by decay, a very late second hand has re-written a few spots, and re-inked a few vowels, besides adding here and there a new vowel not in the first writing. But the aggregate of such re-writings is insignificant, and nowhere interferes with the deciphering of the first hand. This second hand writing is of the more recent Jacobite style, but doubtless a century old, at least. To a similar period belong a few scrawls on the margins, made by some unthinking idler.

But, still later, the codex had some usage that may have been even rougher. It was this time soaked in *muddy* water; and when I found the codex there was so much absolute mud—earth and water—within it, caked on the leaves, that *quinio 22* could not be read at all without first a scaling off and then a washing. (But in the six years since that process its writing has come out plainer than in most other portions of the codex, though the parchment shows a yellower color.) To this day some caked mud remains in minute spots, for I have not ventured to wash except where absolutely necessary in order to

read it. Indeed, in order to decipher it, the whole codex had to be taken apart; and the mass of rotten cord and cloth and mud, which represented the remnant of the ancient binding, had to be removed. Mixed in with the latter were sundry grains of wheat and barley—as if the book had stood cornerwise in the mud of a grain bazar. This rotten back was washed out, and proved to be a curious fabric of twine and cloth, wrought by the binder's needle. It would have been preserved; only the moths and roaches of the East soon put it beyond hope.

In addition to all that, the damp climate of Beirût—rain in winter and the sea in summer—had started the decay anew along the edges, especially where the former visitation of water had left it ragged. And as if that were not enough, a great fat moth, one of the very juicy kind common in Beirût, had been squeezed between two leaves as the MS. stood in the library, leaving the impression of his wings to this day, along with a fearful decay of membrane over nearly the whole of two pages, seriously damaging the substance of the parchment itself. I was kindly permitted—indeed the suggestion came from Dr. Bliss—to bring the MS. to America, in order to finish my work with it. It had to be watched and kept from damp on the sea voyage, or the old spots would show dissolving edges. The climate of this country is more favorable to both its legibility and its preservation, than the climate of Beirût.

II. *Internal Description.*

As to the style of the writing, it is of the transition from Estrangela to Jacobite, but not yet progressed so far as to have lost entirely a resemblance to the old Nestorian. The pure Estrangela style and letters are perhaps more conspicuous in the Gospel of Mark than elsewhere, but they occur throughout the whole codex. The Jacobite style which it resembles nearest, is altogether the Mesopotamian, not at all approaching the Palestinian or the Maronite. It is easy to read to one who is familiar with the Estrangela; but not very easy for one who knows only the common Jacobite of the printed books. It is pretty well supplied with diacritic points, which belong mostly to the simpler and older systems; such as the sign of the plural, the sign of the feminine in the suffix pronoun, the points which distinguish between two nouns with the same spelling, between a verb and a participle, between the first personal pronoun used as the subject of a sentence and the same used as the substantive verb, and so on.

easy to determine whether it leans (virtually; for it often merely follows the slope of a letter-stroke), or whether any difference of meaning attaches by reason of its inclining one way or the other, or standing vertical. It is the rule for the lower one of this double to coincide with the heavy end of an unjoined final *nun* — that is, when placed after a word with such final. Thus these cases have the appearance of a single dot placed at the top of the line, like a Greek colon. But there is no other case, at least no clear one, of this single dot at the top, in the Gospels. In the Acts and onward, it does occur, and not infrequently. The double dot, also, often has its lower one under the final letter, especially in case of an *aleph*. In this case, sometimes, the upper one is omitted; though it sometimes seems to have been thus omitted designedly. These two cases present the only difficulty in copying the MS. in printed type.*

The ambiguities in reading are the usual ones; viz., the difficulty of deciding whether a *shin* or an *'ee* is preceded by a *yud* or a *nun*, or by neither; whether a letter is *'ee* or *kaf*; or whether another is *yud*, *nun*, or *shin*; which last again is sometimes farther complicated by the liability of one of them to be confused with one stroke of a *hheth*.

The punctuation seems to vary with the scribe. Both that and other indications seem to show that the latter part of Luke and all of John were written by a different hand from Matthew and Mark. In the Epistles, also, the variations in punctuation, together with a more modern shape given to the *aleph* when the writing is crowded, and (a very few times) to a *mim* when made by correction from a *waw*, seem to indicate still another scribe.

Sometimes a punctuation mark, especially in the case of the quadruple dot, is transferred from the end of one line to the beginning of the next.

In the Acts and Epistles, quotations from the Old Testament are frequently marked by a short oblique stroke in red, at the beginning of the lines throughout the quotation. Sometimes a black angular mark makes an arrow-head to the inner end of this red mark. The MS. is too much decayed and faded to show whether *all* quotations from the Old Testament were originally so marked.

The evidences of both carefulness and competency on the part of the scribe are abundant in every part of the MS. The errors that

* A difficulty which I observe is overcome in the later printed Syriac books.

occur are usually such as to be considered mere slips of the pen, and not mistakes of the understanding. The writing is carefully and neatly done ; but yet the manner of crowding letters and words here and there to make a line come out even, as well as the expansions for the same purpose, show the hand of one who was more than a mere copyist; of one who was writing with the freedom of familiarity with the text, and not mechanically copying an unfamiliar tongue or unfamiliar matter. (Just here it may be mentioned that among the Nestorians formerly an ecclesiastic was not ordained till he had copied the necessary service-books with his own hand. Whether that remains the case since the introduction of printing, I am unable to say.) Abbreviations are rather rare in the *text*, but common in the lesson-notes or captions, next to be mentioned.

The writing is continuous, without a break from the beginning of a book to its end; but the titles and subscriptions to each book begin and follow it, and the captions or notes of the church-lessons are inserted in proper place, done in vermilion with the points in black. Rather oftener than not, the punctuation is wanting both before and after the lesson-note. The number of the lesson is given in red in the margin, and signifies only its number in the order in which it occurs in the text; the other necessary information being contained in the note or caption just mentioned.

At the end of each book, after its subscription, about four lines, or three in the case of the Pauline Epistles, are devoted to ornament. This is of the same sort as that perpetuated in the modern MSS.; which, again, are regularly copied with scrupulous care from the most ancient exemplars to be had. At the beginning of Luke the ornamentation runs across the top and for some distance down the sides; and in its little squares are the words: "John who is a sinner, the monk, wrote it." In the little squares in the ornament at the beginning of Mark is the word "John," which probably refers to the same scribe (and not to John Mark). In addition to these ornaments, others of more or less elaboration surround the *quinio* numbers, besides occurring occasionally at the right hand upper and outer corner of the *verso* of a leaf. In this last position a small diamond of black dots (sometimes a pair of them) is almost always present; but it does not seem to have any connection with the symbol of the unity and trinity of God, which regularly holds the like place in Nestorian sacred MSS. Still further, the numbers of the lesson-notes, and those of the larger sections, or chapters, presently to be mentioned, have an unpretentious ornament composed of dots.

Besides the numbers of the lesson-notes, the numbers of the *τίτλοι*, or *κεφάλαια*, of the Gospels are given in the margin in red. These correspond almost exactly with those of the Greek as given in Küster's Mill. Certain differences will be noted in another connection.

The only other divisions noted in the margin are the *ἑσῆς*, or larger sections, the numbers being written in black.

This word *ἑσῆς* is identical with the Arabic word employed to denote the modern chapters; but in Syriac it means a different division. It is also used indefinitely, in the sense of *pericope*, or passage of Scripture; and in the plural for the whole Bible, or the whole New Testament, or for a version. In the Gospels these sections are numbered consecutively through the four Gospels as one series, and also separately for each of the four. There is consequently a double set of numbers for them in all the Gospels except Matthew. The Acts and the Catholic Epistles, that is, here, James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, are likewise divided into *ἑσῆς* and numbered in the margin as one book. Through these books, also, the church-lessons are numbered consecutively, as if one book. In the same way, also, the Epistles of Paul are divided and numbered as one book, both as to *ἑσῆς* and as to church-lessons.

The *ἑσῆς* are evidently the same as those in use among the Nestorians, as can be seen both from the Nestorian MS. (12th century) of the Peshitto New Testament at Boston, and from that excellent and very useful edition of the Bible in Ancient and Modern Syriac, the work of Dr. Justin Perkins, printed at Urmî (Oroomiah) in 1846. Indeed, the testimony given by this Perkins Bible is of a rather unusual sort. As printed, the order of books in the New Testament is the same as that of our English Bible, yet the numbering of the series of *ἑσῆς* which begins in Acts, and is interrupted by Paul's Epistles, is resumed again at James, and carried through 1 Peter and 1 John, without any regard to the interposed book, 2 Peter. The latter, as well as 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse are not divided into *ἑσῆς*; but, on the contrary, each of these books has a note at the beginning, stating that it "is not included in the *ἑσῆς* that is commonly called the Peshitto, but nevertheless is written in other ancient *ἑσῆς*." All this goes to show that this division, or capitulation, is very ancient, and antedates the separation of the Nestorians and Jacobites from the general Syrian church. It shows also

a like antiquity for this order of books in the New Testament, which coincides with that now received among the critical editors of the Greek N. T., except only that it places the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the Pauline Epistles — numbering it, however, as one book with them.

As these *hainy* are peculiar to the Syriac versions, and neither very well known nor very accessible, a list of them is here given for that division of the New Testament which comprises the Acts and the Catholic Epistles:

1. Acts	i. 1.	12. Acts	xiii. 4.	23. Acts	xxv. 13.
2. "	ii. 4.	13. "	xiii. 44.	24. "	xxvi. 24.
3. "	iii. 11.	14. "	xv. 4.	25. "	xxvii. 33.
4. "	iv. 24.	15. "	xvi. 10.	26. James	i. 1.
5. "	v. 29.	16. "	xvii. 10.	27. "	ii. 20.
6. "	vii. 11.	17. "	xviii. 12.	28. "	v. 7.
7. "	vii. 54.	18. "	xix. 24.	29. 1 Peter	ii. 6.
8. "	viii. 35.	19. "	xx. 22.	30. "	iv. 1.
9. "	ix. 32.	20. "	xxi. 27.	31. 1 John	i. 7.
10. "	x. 30.	21. "	xxii. 30.	32. "	iii. 21.
11. "	xi. 22.	22. "	xxiv. 1.		

Of these sections, Matthew had 22; Mark, 13; Luke, 23; John, 20; and the Four Gospels together, 78. The Acts alone had 25; the Acts and Catholic Epistles together, 32. The Pauline Epistles, including Hebrews, had 55, (but the last one visible in the MS. is at 2 Timothy iv. 1, number 47). For the whole Peshitto, therefore, the number was 165; and as to the Philoxenian or Harklensian, this MS. shows the division to have coincided with that of the Peshitto through the four Gospels.*

Besides these numbers in the margin, other matters are noted in the subscriptions to the Gospels, which are not marked in either margin or text; unless perhaps in respect to one matter shortly to be

* Further testimony to the antiquity and wide use of this capitulation may be seen in a British Museum MS. of the Syriac N. T., (No. 7157), written at Beth-kuko, A. D. 768. See Dr. W. Wright's article *Verse* in the 2-vol. ed. of *Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* (New York, 1855), vol. ii. p. 914. Also, Wright's *Cat. of the Syriac MSS. in the Brit. Mus.* vol. i. (London, 1870); No. 161 (Br. Mus. Add. 12,138), pp. 101-107; a MS. dated A. D. 899; in which the subscription to the notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews gives the numbers of these sections. Wright states that they are "regularly marked on the margin throughout the whole manuscript." Gregory Bar-hebræus uses the same sections in his Commentary.

mentioned. These will best appear by translating one of the subscriptions. The following is the subscription to Matthew: "Ends the Gospel of Matthew the apostle, which he spake in Hebrew in Palestine. His prayer for us, Amen. There are in it *kephalaia* 70; and the number of *canones* 360. And signs 25, and parables 25, and testimonies 32. And lessons 74, and sections 22. Pray, for our Lord's sake, for the sinner that wrote [this]."

Arranged in tabular form, the numbers given in the subscriptions to the Gospels are as follows:

	<i>Keph.</i>	<i>Canon.</i>	<i>Signs.</i>	<i>Par.</i>	<i>Test.</i>	<i>Less.</i>	<i>Sect.</i>
Matthew, -	70.	360.	25.	25.	32.	74.	22.
Mark, - -	49.	240.	22.	6.	17.	40.	13.
Luke, - -	83.	348.	22.	27.	16.	72.	23.
John, - -	20.	232.	8.	5.	15.	48.	20.

(I have been the more careful to insert these numbers here, because as originally given in the *Proceedings* A. Or. Soc. mentioned above, they contain a few mistakes; though these are corrected in a subsequent number.)

The *canones* are the Eusebian canons, or their Syriac substitute. Unless these are marked by the largest punctuation mentioned above, viz., the vermilion diamond with a black centre, they are not marked in the text. In a number of places this punctuation does exactly mark off the Greek canons; but that it is anything more than a coincidence, I should not venture to say. For, as might be supposed, the same punctuation occurs regularly at the beginning (or end) of the *κεφάλαια* and the *λεξή*, except when they coincide with the beginning of a lesson; and then punctuation of every sort is usually omitted; as if the rubricated note was warning enough, and supplied the place of punctuation.

For the "testimonies," etc., so far as the items are liturgical, we must look to the service-books for information. So far as I can discover, they are not marked in any way in the text. A hint of the use of the "testimonies" may be seen in the captions to the Psalms in some editions of the Syriac Bible; especially in the Psalter which was the "first labor" of the American press at Urmî, in 1841.

Farther than as above stated, the margin contains nothing except here and there a word or more that had been omitted by mistake, and is thus supplied *a prima manu* by writing between the lines or in the margin, and marking the place in the text by a small +, †, >, or . . , after the fashion of our * etc., to show where the correction

belongs. (The second-hand corrections, a few in number, are so late that I do not notice them here.) There is no Greek margin, nor anything to correspond with what is commonly known as the Harklensian (some still call it the Philoxenian) margin. Only in two or three cases is there a real marginal note; and those are explanatory, and all in the Peshitto Portion. One is at Acts x. 6, where the transliterated *βυρσεῖ* has a marginal note, duly marked by a †, and reading, "that is, a tanner"; this marginal word for "tanner," by the way, being the one still in use with that meaning in the colloquial Arabic, but having a different meaning in the literary language and the lexicons. A note is also given to explain Paul's appealing to Cæsar (Acts xxv. 11), which it does by calling it "swearing by Cæsar."

It is also to be stated that the codex contains nothing which answers to the *obeli* or asterisks of certain Harklensian MSS. and of White's edition.

Before leaving these accessories of the text, it is proper to speak of their relation to those of other codices which bear some resemblance to this one. In the absence of the Harklensian margins, this MS. agrees with the Codex Mediceo-Florentinus (*anno* 757), described by Adler (*N. T. Versiones Syr.*, pp. 52, ff.), and by him thought to be the true Philoxenian; though thought not so by Bernstein (*Ev. d. Joh.* pp. 1, 2). It likewise agrees with the same codex in the numbers above given from the subscriptions to the Gospels; except only in the *κεφάλαια*, and in the fact that the lessons and sections are wanting in the Cod. Flor. The differences in the *κεφάλαια* are shown in the following comparison of the two codices with the Greek numbers as given in Küster's Mill:

	Beirût MS.	Cod. Flor.	Küster's Mill.
Matthew, - - - -	70	68	68
Mark, - - - -	49	48	48
Luke, - - - -	83	83	83
John, - - - -	20	19	18

In the Beirût MS., the difference in John is made by dividing *κεφ.* 18 into three *κεφάλαια*, so as to add two; and the case is similar in Matthew and Mark. However, the *last* number in John (20) and the last in Matthew (70) either never were written or have become obliterated. So it is barely *possible* that the unnumbered beginning of the Gospel was counted in making up the numbers given in the subscription; but the cases of Mark and Luke seem to forbid such a supposition.

The same absence of Harklensian margin appears also in the Cod. Parisinus, described by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.* pp. 55 ff.); but that codex differs in other respects, both external and internal, from the Beirût MS. It agrees with it, however, in giving 70 κεφάλαια of Matthew; but again it gives 40 in Mark—very different from both the Beirût MS. and the Cod. Flor. Its date is A. D. 1212.

The Codex Angelicus (Adler, *idem*, pp. 59 ff.), of unknown date, but about cent. XIV., has some margins, but they seem to be totally different from that known as the Harklensian margin, besides being of a later origin and different purpose. This codex is thought by Bernstein (*Evang. d. Joh.* pp. 3, 4) to be probably the true original Philoxenian.

Other codices of the Harklensian revision or version differ so widely in these accessories that no mention of them is here worth while.

The matter of the church-lessons would require too great space for their discussion here. I will only mention that in the Gospels they differ materially from the scheme given in the Widmanstadt Peshitto (*ed. princeps*) of 1555, and substantially followed in subsequent editions; and seem nearer to the Harklensian scheme given in Adler (*idem*, pp. 67 ff.). In connection with the fact that the Acts and Epistles are in the Peshitto version, it may be well to cite Adler on another point. Speaking of what he calls the "*Missale Syriacum, juxta ritum Jacobitarum*," contained in Cod. Vat. XXXV. (*olim xxxvi*), he remarks: ". . . quidem pericopæ evangelicæ ad Philoxenianam, epistolice autem ad Simplicem pertinent," (*idem*, p. 75). And the same is in the main true of the Beirût MS.

III. *Internal, or Textual, Characteristics.*

It is safe, at the outset, to state broadly that the codex represents a very good text, both as regards the Syriac and the Greek; and in the Syriac, as respects both the Philoxenian or Harklensian and the Peshitto portions. In both it presents, in places, a text nearer to the Greek than the printed editions. The question of greatest interest, naturally, is whether it represents in the Gospels the original Philoxenian, or is only one more copy of the Harklensian recension. But in either case it is a MS. of high character. The next question is, how much of a contribution does it form to the material of the New Testament criticism in general, in both Philoxenian and Peshitto.

In discussing the first of these two questions (the only one to be

touched in this paper), it is necessary to keep in mind that the Philoxenian is conceded to have been based upon the Peshitto; and that the Harklensian is, of course, a revision of the Philoxenian.

Two different MSS., as already hinted, have heretofore been supposed to represent the original Philoxenian version. One is the Codex Florentinus, above mentioned, (having several features in common with the Beirût MS.), considered by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.*, p. 55) to be the true Philoxenian on account of the absence of the Harklensian margin; but also admitted by him to differ very little in text from the Harklensian recension. This opinion of Adler was rejected by Bernstein (*D.-heilige Evang. d. Joh., Krit. Anmerk.*, pp. 1, 2), who thought the Roman Codex Angelicus (cent. XII–XIV.) to be a copy of the true Philoxenian. His main alleged reasons are, that though it has a set of marginal notes, they are of a different if not later character, copied from a different class of MSS., and serving a different purpose; that it keeps the old Peshitto renderings in more places than the other MSS.; and also, in general, is much less accurate and faithful, and therefore earlier in composition, than either White's edition or the other MSS. of the Harklensian recension. In support of this opinion and these allegations, however, he only gives a partial collation — or rather, a selection of examples from a partial collation — of the first five chapters of the Gospel of John. This is hardly enough to judge by; especially as the variations given are (1.) not exhaustive, and (2.) not of a character sufficiently marked to serve as a basis for sound judgment. (Within the same space the Beirût MS. presents many more variations from White than Bernstein gives of the Cod. Angelicus.)

But it will be better to give Bernstein's argument in a fuller abstract. He first admits (*idem, Krit. Anmerk.*, pp. 25, 26) — against his own theory — that in some of the instances given, the Cod. Angelicus leaves the Peshitto where the other MSS. and White hold to it. The instances which he gives of this sort are 6 in number, and are explained by him as oversights of the copyist. (With regard to these 6 instances, only one seems to have any probable claim to be called an error. In all the 6 the Beirût MS. agrees with the Peshitto.)

Next he gives his strong point. That is a list of 19 places in which, while the Harklensian shows correction and a closer agreement with the Greek, the Codex Angelicus has retained the Peshitto rendering. (But in making up this list, he has had in one instance to separate White's ed. from the 3 MSS. collated, because it agrees

with the Cod. Angel. in that instance; thus reducing the list to 18. And the rest of the list, though a true one, is not strong enough to furnish an argument. Two of the instances depend upon the position of a diacritic point, and that in respect to the third personal pronoun standing for the Greek article; two are insignificant transpositions; and not one of the instances presents a case where a copyist might not easily slip from the one to the other. None of them affects more than one word, and that usually either a prefix conjunction or a suffix pronoun. The strongest instance—strongest indeed of all the proofs presented by Bernstein—is that where the Cod. Angel. reads ܟܘܠܗܘܢ (*called*) instead of the Harklensian ܟܘܠܗܘܢ (*said*), as a translation of $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta$, in the phrase “a village called Sychar.”—The Beirût MS. agrees with the Cod. Angel. in 4 of the 19, and is on the fence with regard to a 5th, with perhaps a leaning to the Harklensian.)

He next gives a list of “other places, where it [Cod. Angel.] agrees neither with the Harklensian version nor with the Peshitto.” These are 31 in number, and are supposed to exhibit the farther advance in revision made by the Harklensian. But of these 31, in 6 the Harklensian *agrees with the Peshitto* against the Codex Angelicus (!); and one of these agreements is even admitted by Bernstein. In 23 of the remaining ones the Harklensian either agrees so closely with the Peshitto that the difference all but vanishes, or else shows that it is much closer in form to the Peshitto, *i. e.*, it has departed from the Peshitto less, than the Cod. Angelicus. Of the two remaining instances, in one the Cod. Angel. is perceptibly nearer, and in the other *perhaps* a little nearer the Peshitto than the Harklensian reading. (The Beirût MS. agrees with the Cod. Angel. in three of the 31; and in the remaining 27 sides with the Harklensian, though with slight differences.)

A re-arrangement of these selected instances of Bernstein will make the matter clearer:

Where Cod. Angel. and Harkl. differ—			
{	Cod. Angel. coincides with Peshitto in	- - -	18 instances.
{	Harkl. “ “ “ “	- - -	12 “
{	Cod. Angel. nearer to Peshitto than Harkl. in	- - -	2 “
{	Harkl. nearer to Peshitto than Cod. Angel. in	- - -	23 “

In the first pair of numbers, Bernstein’s hypothesis is favored, as the 18 unrevised of the Cod. Ang. are more than the 12 unrevised of the Harklensian. In the second pair, unless reasons shall appear to

show that a re-revision would bring the Harklensian back again nearer to the Peshitto, Bernstein's hypothesis is opposed, as the 23 less revised of the Harklensian are more than the two of the Cod. Angel. That a re-revision *might* bring the text back again nearer the Peshitto is possible, when either the Greek text was sensibly approached nearer by that means, or a better Syriac idiom was thus secured without sacrificing adherence to the Greek. But if the changes are only those which a copyist might naturally make through inattention, then they go against the hypothesis of a re-revision.

To sum up the facts of Bernstein's argument, then, out of the 56 instances selected to prove his point, one disappears, 20 go in his favor, and 35 against him; while in all of them the lack of proper magnitude or character is painfully manifest. We may well turn back upon Bernstein and his list of select variants from the Cod. Angel., his own words respecting Adler and the Cod. Florentinus: "the variants which it contains are, on the whole, not very important, and neither more numerous nor more significant than in other MSS. of this version." Indeed, these variants furnish nothing to compare with the difference between our Common and Revised English Versions in a space of like extent. And it may be added that Bernstein's partial collation (*idem*, pp. 4-10), from which he selects the above particular proofs, shows many more cases where the Cod. Angel. abandons the Peshitto, but the other MSS. and the printed Harklensian adhere to it.

So far as the above throws light on the Beirût MS., it shows that it adheres to the Peshitto by exact coincidence in several more of the selected instances used as above by Bernstein, than White's edition and the Harklensian MSS.; and also, that it thus adheres to the Peshitto in only two less instances than the Codex Angelicus. In near coincidences it has many more than the Cod. Angel., and nearly as many as the Harklensian.

But the Beirût MS. has some characteristics of its own, which show themselves well enough in a fair and even balance. Far more striking than any — or than all of the above combined, and at the same time the most striking instance in the Beirût MS., is to be found in Matthew xxv. For several verses before the commencement of the Parable of the Ten Virgins, the Peshitto and Harklensian coincide almost exactly; but at xxv. 6 they diverge widely. Now the Beirût MS. keeps up the coincidence with the Peshitto quite to the end of the Parable; so that verses 6-11 inclusive cannot be collated with the Harklensian at all, but must be compared with the Peshitto.

No one has yet cited anything from any other MSS. which at all compares with this instance.

In regard to other cases of adherence to, or rather, of less departure from, the Peshitto, it is scarcely worth while here to go through with Bernstein's *Kritische Anmerkungen* in his *Evang. d. Joh.*, since we have found his selected summary on the point so clearly against his supposition. If of any value here, such a course would be so in the direction of an estimate of the Cod. Florentinus; a side issue of rather too wide an extent to be now attended to. Of other available material, there remains only White's edition, text and notes and margins. With these I have compared the Beirût MS.; and of the results of this comparison I propose to give a short specimen summary; premising, however, that I shall pay no attention at present to differences that consist merely in diacritic points, or to differences in punctuation which really change the interpretation; though in a complete treatise both of these must have their weight.

A few general matters, also, may be stated first, in brief, without stopping to give special instances.

In the first place, the proper names in White's edition and the MSS. which it follows, are commonly spelled after the analogy of the Greek; often as a mere transliteration, and even retaining the Greek case-endings; much of it being a mere attempt slavishly to reproduce the Greek phenomena in a way intolerable to the genius of the Syriac tongue. But in the Beirût MS. the regular practice is uniformly the other way. The proper names, with comparatively few exceptions, are spelled after the Syrian fashion. (This is likewise the case with the MSS. used by Bernstein for his Gospel of John (*D. heilige Evang.*, cited above).) It shows that the Beirût does not follow the more thoroughly revised Harklensian, in any event.

In the spelling of Greek and other words not proper names, adopted by the Syriac (words in which the New Testament Syriac abounds), the same rule obtains throughout. This, again, is generally nothing more than a non-departure from the Peshitto; but sometimes the Peshitto has translated a word or phrase into Syriac where the Harklensian has merely transliterated the Greek. Yet in this case, too, the Beirût MS. generally follows either the literal Peshitto or its analogy. This may be illustrated by an example. In Matt. xix. 28, the phrase ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ is not translated in the Harklensian, but transliterated entire into Syriac letters; the whole phrase being crammed together into one word, just like the Greek uncial margin which is given for explanation. But the Beirût MS.

gives a Syriac rendering, **ܚܫܬܐ ܗܝܘܢܝܢ**, strictly equivalent to the Greek in sense, and of a form to be represented exactly by $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. It uses here common Peshitto words, but not the Peshitto rendering, which last happens to be **ܫܘܒܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ**, or "*in the new con.*" Close to the same example (I cite them merely because they are handy) are three other adherences to the Peshitto, either of them stronger than any instance cited by Bernstein in favor of the Cod. Angelicus. In Matt. xix. 24 we have the Syriac for "camel" in place of the Harklensian transliteration of the corrupt $\kappa\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, or cable; in verse 27 we have the Peshitto phrase "Cephas answered and said," for the Harklensian "when Peter responded he said"—a difference in every word of the phrase, as well as in the characteristic idiom of the whole. In verse 28 we have the Peshitto, not the Harklensian, word for "tribes" (of Israel). In the face of such differences as these, which abound in the Beirût MS., the differences alleged for the Cod. Angel. fade away into nothing. But one more example may be given to illustrate another sort of difference just mentioned. In John xix. 2 the "crown" (of thorns), in the Beirût MS. is the Syriac and Peshitto **ܫܘܒܐ**; but White has a transliteration of $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\upsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma$, retaining even the accusative form. But this case is merely one for illustration; for Bernstein's John, with the MSS. there collated, agree with the Beirût MS. in this example; while White's note says that his MSS. give **ܫܘܒܐ** in margin, and that the Codex Barsalibæi has **ܫܘܒܐ** in text and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\upsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma$ in margin. But numerous cases occur where a similar fact is confined to the Beirût MS.

There is one case in the Beirût MS. which at first sight seems to look the other way. In Luke vii. 44, 45, from "she hath washed" to "thou gavest me no kiss," White's ed. follows the Peshitto; while for the last half-dozen words the Beirût MS. gives a rendering entirely after the Harklensian (or Philoxenian) idiom, slavishly reproducing the Greek order of words. But a note of White states that this clause is wanting in the Ridley MS. (the basis of his edition), and that he supplied it from a Bodleian MS. Thus the effect of this case is to show that the Beirût MS. has kept a clause which the Ridley MS. copyist had omitted, and which the editor had supplied from the Peshitto.

But in order to come nearer to a proper estimate of the position of this MS. in this respect, it is best to remark briefly upon the main characteristic differences between the Peshitto and the Harklensian.

Nothing is clearer (to repeat a little) than that the latter is a revision derived from the former, though we know that there was one intervening step. The general genius of the revision may be in some measure imagined by comparing the noble version of Luther with the wooden one of De Wette; but the parallel must not be strained. Aside from characteristics already mentioned, the Peshitto phrases, clauses, sentences, and even passages extending through a number of verses, appear here and there unchanged; then, again, with transpositions, inversions, expansions, and contractions; with the insertion of a word on the one hand, or its omission, on the other; here and there a slight change in only a word or two, and then again a complete difference in words and structure. In short, it shows all the phenomena of a revision from the free, the idiomatic, and the occasionally paraphrastic, to the close and literal. But, still farther than this, there is a continual attempt to exhibit what may be called the surface phenomena of the Greek, such as almost parallels the LXX. use of the preposition $\sigma\upsilon\zeta$ with the accusative to show the presence of אֵל in the Hebrew text. Prominent among such characteristics are the use of an additional word instead of the idiomatic suffix pronoun, thus giving an undue emphasis to the Greek possessive $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$, and the like; the attempt to represent the Greek article by certain pronouns of the third person, often with an effect much less happy than Beza's use of *ille* for a like purpose (though a diacritic point generally shows whether the pronoun has the force of the article, or that of a demonstrative or even relative pronoun); the exchange of the idiomatic succession of two finite verbs with — or even without — a conjunction for ܘܢ before a verb or a participle, in order to represent the various Greek participial constructions; the use of the pronoun ܘܢ (always with a diacritic point) to reproduce the effect (if not the sound and appearance) of the Greek particle $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ *; with other almost constant changes, mostly pleonastic in form, which need not be enumerated, but which no reader of the Syriac versions can miss. It is in the matter of these characteristic marks, rather than in any great variety or essential difference of rendering, that the Philoxenian, or any other intermediate step, from the Peshitto to the Harklensian as we have it, is to be recognized.

Other things being equal, this intermediate revision would be expected, among other matters, to show:

* This peculiarity occurs in Syriac outside of the Harklensian and Pococke's Epistles and De Dieu's Apocalypse, *e. g.*, in *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*, edited by Dr. W. Wright (Cambridge, 1882).

- (1.) A greater number of exact coincidences with the Peshitto.
- (2.) More cases where the departure from the Peshitto in form or phraseology would be less; that is, more cases *nearly* coincident.
- (3.) In cases of difference from the Peshitto in form and shades of rendering, where the Peshitto adheres closely to the Greek: often, but not always, a *less* adherence to the Peshitto; since the later revision would be likely to take a return step in matter, and *perhaps* even in form, provided either a nearer approach to the Greek or a better Syriac idiom with equal closeness to the Greek could be thus secured. (It is this consideration which appears to lie at the basis of Bernstein's argument in his list of places where the Codex Angelicus differs from both Peshitto and Harklensian; as his citations of the Greek in that list would show. But his list shows only very slight differences at best, and those more in form than in shades of meaning; and none of them important; while there is nothing cumulative in the sum. Further, the little weight they seem to have disappears on actual comparison with the Peshitto.) But these cases actually involve some other considerations, such as possible changes in the Syriac language since the Peshitto took its final form, concerning which we have few or no data for judging. And in general, these cases are to be weighed, rather than counted; and to be treated with care and discrimination throughout.

(4.) Though not decisive, the proper names and foreign words should be spelled or transferred after the common Syriac (or at least the Peshitto) fashion, and not merely transliterated into Syriac letters.

Now, to apply this roughly, I have put together the following results from the Gospel of Matthew in the Beirût MS. It begins at Matt. xii. 20, and lacks xiii. 28-57, xvii. 20-xix. 12, xxv. 11-xxvi. 21; leaving about the amount of fifteen chapters as the material here summarized.

Leaving out of view (as already suggested) all differences which consist merely in *points* (though those are often important, and were used by Bernstein in his argument for the Cod. Angelicus), and considering no variations that amount to less than an actual letter of the text, I find in this fragment of Matthew about 347 differences between the Beirût MS. and the edition of White—counting each passage as one difference, without regard to how many minor differences it may comprise.

Of these, first, where both differ from the Peshitto, 32 may be called unimportant differences; but in the large majority of them,

White's ed. gives what we may well call ultra-Harklensian characteristics. In only 2 does the Beirût MS. show a stronger Harklensian tendency than White; while in one, White shows a decided revision of the B. MS. form. It should be said, however, that in 6 of these cases, the B. MS. coincides with readings given in White from the Cod. Barsalibæi, which is apparently one of those Harklensian copies which favor the Syriac genius rather than imitate the Greek. So far, the B. MS. looks more unrevised by a preponderance very great and easy to see, but not easy to express in numbers nearer than 30 to 2.

As to proper names, the differences are about 60. Of these the B. MS. has 55 spelled in the Syriac fashion, and 33 of these in the exact form given in the Peshitto. In the other 5, White is nearer the Syriac fashion, though not once coincident with a Peshitto form; and in one of the 5 the B. MS. would be nearer the Syriac fashion had it not committed an obvious error in spelling—a pure clerical error. Thus the numbers should rather stand 56 to 4 than 55 to 5.

In the matter of differences with respect to Greek words which are not proper names, the B. MS. follows the Syriac style and genius in 16 instances, one of them being the exact Peshitto form; while White follows the Syriac style and genius in only 1. In one instance, White's margin agrees with both B. MS. and Peshitto. Thus this preponderance in favor of the unrevised condition of B. MS. stands 16 to 1; with one of the number showing that the makers of White's text had the variant before their eyes when they did their revising.

Before proceeding to the more important points, it is necessary to make a remark about the manifest errors of the scribe in the B. MS., and those of the printer in White's ed., in the portion here summarized. In the writing of B. MS., they amount to about 23; of which 3 are serious *homoioteleuta*, one a palpable omission, and one a plainly accidental transposition; all the rest being minor ones, though sometimes such as to seem to bear differently from their manifest corrections upon the results of this summary. The errors in W., likewise, I find to be about 6. At the same time, I may mention, that of the more important variations caused by a difference in Greek text, W. is best in about 8 instances; one because of a difference in the spelling of B., and once because of an apparent error in B., though there it agrees with W.'s margin. B., likewise, represents a better Greek text in about 8 instances; one of them, however, being its better reading of the interpolated verse, Matt. xxi. 44. Both these matters, with others to appear, have an important bearing on the numbers next to be discussed.

Of these, first, are the exact coincidences with the Peshitto, where the two differ from each other. At the first rough taking out, there stand 81 coincidences of the Beirût MS. against 65 of White's ed.; or, in coincidences which tally to the very letter, in favor of the superior antiquity of B. in a ratio a little less than 9 to 7. But from the 65 of W. we must first deduct 2, which White in his notes acknowledges as his own corrections of the MS., leaving 63. Ten more must go, where the difference is caused only by a manifest clerical error in B., of omission or the like, palpable to any reader, and two of them mere misspellings; leaving 53. Ten more must go, for letters in B. which either stand for the grammatical contraction of a main word with its expletive, or accidental differences which show no intention to depart from the Peshitto, but a plain intention to adhere to it, and which are actually within the range of the Peshitto's variant readings. This leaves 43; and now we may proceed to examine their essential character. Only 3 of them amount to so much as the omission of or the rendering by an essentially different word on the part of B.; and then B. departs from Peshitto in one place to follow the Curetonian Syriac, once to follow the Greek against the Peshitto, and once to agree with W.'s margin. The rest are differences of slight moment; 3 being by mere transposition; and only 6 by as much as an additional word, and that sometimes only by way of difference in grammatical form (such as frequently occurs in different MSS. or edd. of the Peshitto), and sometimes an insignificant particle. Out of the whole number (whether 65 or 43), it should be stated, B. agrees with W.'s margin in but three instances; which fact may be looked upon as a probable indication of their existence earlier than the text of W., and as possibly reducing the strength of this numerical array by that amount.

But the 81 of B. must be discussed before we can resume the comparison. Here, however, we meet with but 4 which are unessential transpositions, but not one that in any way can be made to disappear. As against the three where W.'s adherence to the Peshitto differs from B. by as much as an essentially different word, and all of those leaning in favor of B.'s priority as a version, B. has 7 adherences which differ from W. by as much as an essential word. As against the 1 of W. by B.'s omission (that, too, being one of the last 3), B. has 11 by W.'s omission, one of them amounting to 4 words. As against the 6 by addition, B. has 10. But in other cases, where the difference is an essential one in the rendering and phraseology, 1 place covers 3 words, 2 cover each 4 words (one of them a

case where W. has adopted a different Greek), and one is a long passage covering 60 words, where W. differs *toto caelo* from the Peshitto.

Now we can compare the 81 with the 65. The 81 stand, while the 65 diminish at once to 43. But the chief one of the 81 is enough to swallow up the 43, and leave still a numerical surplus. But if not so, yet each of the more important ones of the 43 is immensely over-matched in both number and quality out of the 81; sometimes in the ratio of 2 to 1, and sometimes by ratios too large to measure; while its minor ones are outnumbered nearly 2 to 1. In comparison with this, Bernstein's arguments in favor of the Codex Angelicus dwindle to the veriest shadow.

But there remain two more points to attend to. One of these is those cases of difference where the rendering of one or the other is so near that of the Peshitto as to be essentially the same; differing often only by a single letter, and at most only by such small matters as show that no departure from that version was contemplated, unless required by grammatical correction, or some equally minor cause. In this respect, B. has 12 instances, and W. 3. In one of the 3 B. differs only by a manifest error, and in another because it follows the Curetonian Syriac. So the numbers might more justly stand 12 to 2; while 1 of the 2 still furnishes argument for the priority of B. over W.

The last point of the summary concerns those differences in which, though both differ from the Peshitto in rendering, or, at least, essentially in form, one is nearer to the Peshitto in meaning than the other. Up to this time, I have not developed this point as thoroughly as the others, and therefore lay no stress upon it at present; but I will give the numbers. As might have been expected from what has been learned of the other results, the direction of the numerical inequality is reversed. W. stands 36 to B. 18. The 36, however, ought in fairness to be diminished by 2; once because of a palpable omission of B.—an apparent *homoioteleuton*, but really following a better text; and again for its manifest error; thus leaving the numbers 34 to 18. So far, it looks perfectly consistent with the supposition that W. had approached nearer to the Peshitto *in sense* by a re-revising. To this add the fact that in one of the 18 B. agrees with W.'s margin. Furthermore, as if to furnish the proof that the onward course of revisers always has an inevitable back eddy or two, B. has one very striking instance, covering 3 words, where the re-revision of W. (if really such) must be looked upon as resulting in a nearer

approach to the Peshitto in its nice correctness of both sense and language.

Before leaving the subject, just one more important consideration should be added. The dependence of the Harklensian Epistles of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude upon the version first published by Pococke (Leyden, 1627), and since generally published with the Peshitto, has been often noticed. The Harklensian are certainly a revision of the latter, and a great improvement; for whether the latter were the original Philoxenian or not, they do not equal the Peshitto in merit. Now the items which make up this revision plainly lie in the direction above pointed out, in the changes from the Peshitto to the Harklensian. The changes from Pococke to Harklensian are less radical in style (except in mere transpositions) than those from Peshitto to Harklensian; though they are evident enough. In matter of rendering, however, that is, in differences of word or phrase, the differences are at least as great. But all this is to be accounted for from the fact that the Pococke Epistles probably had no Peshitto basis; and at the same time, are a much later work, and more like the later Secular writings in form and style. Revision to the Harklensian style would naturally change the words more, and the style less. But in comparing the Beirût MS. with the Harklensian, there is everywhere manifest the same kind of differences as in the case of the change from the Pococke to the Harklensian; only, as the Beirût MS. came originally from a Peshitto basis (the same basis, indeed, as the Harklensian), the changes in the essential words and phrases of rendering are not relatively so many; while those in form and style are much the same. It is hard to resist the impression that the Beirût Gospels stand to the Harklensian Gospels in about the same relation as the Pococke Epistles to the Harklensian Epistles.

Whether this codex be the lost Philoxenian or not, it certainly presents the strongest claims yet apparent for that identification. It is beyond a doubt an earlier revision than the Harklensian of White; and, so far as I am able to judge, than that of any other MS. known.