

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

The Syriac Apocalypse.

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

I.—*Source of the Text.*

The Apocalypse forms no part of any of the Syriac versions of the New Testament to which we are accustomed to give a collective name. That is, it does not exist in the Peshitto, the Harklensian, the Jerusalem, or the Curetonian. The Peshitto version is now universally provided with a supplement, comprising the Apocalypse and the lacking Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude); but at least eight editions* appeared without it. In 1599 Elias Hutter first supplied these missing books (along with the Epistle to the Laodiceans in *Greek*, &c.), in his dodecaglott New Testament, in Syriac of his own making.

But Hutter's version has not held any important place. In 1627, Louis de Dieu published the Apocalypse at Leyden (Elzevirs, 4 to.), from a MS. that had been bequeathed to the University of Leyden by Joseph Scaliger; and in 1630 Edward Pococke published (also at Leyden, Elzevirs, 4 to.) the four lacking Epistles, from a MS. in the Bodleian library at Oxford. Since then these five books have been published with the Peshitto version, so as to furnish a complete Syriac New Testament; but no new sources of the text have been used. The later editors, moreover, have not scrupled to change or add to the vocalizing, nor to correct what they supposed to be manifest errors; yet not so far as to supply some of the larger palpable omissions in the Apocalypse.

* These were those of Widmanstadt, 1565; Tremellius, 1568 (9), 1571; Plantinus (Guido le Fevre de la Boderie—Antwerp Polyglott), 1571; Plantinus, *n. d.* [*circ.* 1573], 8 vo., 1575, 16 mo.; Paris (Guido le F. de la B.), 1584; Trost, 1621 (22).

conjectured by many (as Le Croze, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, à La Haye, 1724, p. 230, and note (c)), and has been shown by Tregelles (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv., p. 280), that the last word read "Indians" instead of "Hanravites"; the difference being caused by De Dieu's mistaking a *dolath* for a *rish*, by overlooking the point beneath, and then seeing too much in the plural points above.

This MS. was also examined by Tregelles, who says (Treg. Horne, *Introd.*, iv. p. 280), that it "is now No. 18 amongst Scaliger's MSS. at Leyden. It is written on thickish glazed paper, of a small size; the ink is black and distinct, though the corrections in the margin are of a much fainter colour. It is carelessly written, and when the present writer examined it at Leyden, it seemed to have altogether a modern appearance."

There exist a pretty fair set of clues to the date of this MS. The Latin title of a Syriac Liturgy in the library of the Waisenhaus at Halle "says that the book was copied by Gaspar, an Indian of Malabar, at Rome, in 1580" (Tregelles, *ubi supra*). "There is also a MS. at Florence, containing the same version of the Apocalypse in Syriac, also transcribed by this same Caspar in the year 1582" (*idem*. conf. also Le Croze, *ubi supra*). The subscription to this last MS. states that it was copied from a MS. in the writing of Thomas of Harkel, in A. D. 622. But too much confidence should not be placed in this statement; for such statements have many times been copied from an older subscription, and even transferred from one MS. to another of a very different character. The date of 622 is worth notice, however, as it is the same which Ridley's MS. gives to the translation of John viii. 1-11, which has been published in White's edition of the Harklensian version. (See Tregelles, *ubi supra*, and pp. 281, 282; also in Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394. I cite Tregelles, because his account is generally clearest and most comprehensive; though it would be easy to cite a whole series of writers, from Adler down.)

However, though written in the latter part of the sixteenth century, these MSS. of the Apocalypse seem to be copies of an ancient version. Two Brit. Mus. MSS., brought to light by B. Harris Cowper, one (eleventh century) containing the text, another (fourteenth century) a commentary, seem to have a text identical with that of the printed editions. (See Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394, note *a*.) Another MS., once owned by Ussher, by him sent to De Dieu, but now lost, contained the Apocalypse (Treg. Horne, *Introd.*,

iv. pp. 282, 284); but whether it contained the rest of the New Testament, as sometimes supposed, is uncertain. From the language both of De Dieu* and of Ussher† nothing is certain beyond the fact that the MS. contained the fragment, John vii. 53 to viii. 11, with 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, the Apocalypse, and a small tractate of Ephrem Syrus. I incline strongly to the opinion that the MS. contained no more—except that the fragment from John goes on with verse 12 for a few words, and ends with ܐܘܨܘܢ, the Syriac “&c.”

De Dieu could conjecture nothing as to the age of the Syriac Apocalypse, though he rightly supposed it to have been made directly from the Greek. A *quotation* from chap. vii. 14, in the Syriac Grammar (Rome, 1596) of George Michael Amira of Edessa, a Lebanon Maronite, De Dieu found to be literally the same in this version; and he supposed that Amira would not have quoted from the late Jesuit version, turned into Syriac from the Latin Vulgate. J. J. Assemâni (*Biblioth. Orient.*, iii., pt. 2, p. ccxxxii.) conjectured that it was made by Mar Abba (patriarch of the East); but that conjecture seems to be groundless. Others suppose that the version is part of the Harklensian recension of the Philoxenian; others, that it differs as much from the Harklensian as it does from the Peshitto.

In preparing this paper, necessity confines me to the printed editions, and to a portion of them. For the general basis, I have used the original edition of De Dieu, text and notes; chiefly for the reason that it is nearest to the MS. of any edition we have, but also because it appears, on examination, to be a very careful, conscientious, and scholarly piece of work. This edition contains the Syriac text; the same transliterated into Hebrew characters, with a vocalization after the Syriac analogy; an exact Latin translation; and the common Greek text (almost exactly the Elzevir of 1624). De Dieu's own account is worth transcribing. In his “Præfatio,” after mentioning the facts last stated, he says: “Textum Syriacum fideliter descripsi, descriptum contuli, relictis etiam mendis quæ occurrebant, quæ tamen, ne lector alicubi offenderet et hæreret, hujusmodi signo †

**Commentarius in Johann.*, ad Cap. vii. 53, where the fragment is published. The Syriac ends with “&c.”; and De Dieu remarks at the end of his translation, “Hactenus Fragmentum illud Syriacum.” *Conf.* also his remarks in the Dedication to Abp. Ussher of his *Animadv. in Acta App.*, and especially the *Præf. in quatuor Evv.* All these are in his *Critica Sacra*.

† Letter to Dr. Samuel Ward, quoted from Todd's *Life of Walton* in Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Amer. ed., iv. p. 3394, note b.

notavi, et in caractere Hebræo ad idem signum, nisi fallor, emendavi, quod doctiorum iudicio libenter submitto, à quibus hic reprehendi neutiquam erubescam. Ubi verba quædam ad sensum perficiendum deessent, id hujusmodi signo [] spatio aliquo vacuo relicto, indicavi, et in caractere Hebræo ex Græco supplevi. Non est autem dissimulandum, in ipsius autographi margine errata varia à lectore quodam nescio quo, sed alia manu, alio atramento emendata conspici: idem, verba quædam in autographo occurrisse redundantia aut bis scripta, quæ nos è textu resecurimus: quæ tamen singula, ne quid fraudis commississe videamur, in animadversionibus nostris suis locis observavimus." All which appears to be very carefully and conscientiously done. The words which follow are also worth quoting, for they show that he had the true spirit of a faithful critic: "Utinam vero alia quædam exemplaria cum quibus hoc nostrum conferre potuissemus, ad manum fuissent errata exactius corrigere, ac defectus melius supplere potuissemus."*

Upon close examination, however, the edition of De Dieu affords some means of judging both the character of his printed edition and that of the MS. it represents. The printed edition, as already said, is a work careful and scholarly, and the apparent misprints are few. The conjectural alterations are plain restorations in matters of certainty, but even so, they are scrupulously mentioned in his notes. They are generally no more than the restoration of a *rish* for a *dolath*, or the supplying of an obviously omitted letter, or the change of a diacritic point. Yet even this much is done but rarely, although a marginal correction in the MS. would have authorized more. The Syriac text is usually kept faithfully, and the corrections are left to be made in the notes, or in the transliteration in Hebrew letters. The misprints are fewer than those of its reprint by Gerardus Borstius, appended to the second edition of De Dieu's *Critica Sacra* (Amsterdam, 1693, fol.).

In the same connection, it is to be remarked that all the editions of the Syriac Apocalypse, in the New Testaments and Bibles, though

* Ussher sent him the other MS. in 1631, from which Ussher had thought the Apocalypse published at Leyden might be amended. De Dieu purposed a new edition of the Apocalypse, and "ex altero hoc exemplari emendare, et si quæ varia esset lectio, observare." But other labors hindered, and he seems never to have taken the work actually in hand. In 1634 (*Epist. Dedicat. in Act. Apost.*) he regrets his unfulfilled intentions concerning the Ussher MS.; but the next year he died, swept away by the plague of 1635-36.

having only De Dieu's edition as their original basis, have added many conjectural emendations. In consequence, most of the critical notes appended to subsequent editions—those of Gutbier, Schaaf, and Bagster, for instance—record nothing but variant editorial conjectures. Sometimes, too, these represent matters wrongly, and credit De Dieu with a misprint not his own. For example, in chap. ii. 12 is a misprint in Gutbier and others for the word which renders *ὁξείαν*, with a note giving the true reading, and crediting it only to the London Polyglott. But the London Polyglott simply follows De Dieu (that is, MS. authority), while Gutbier has committed an unmeaning, if not arbitrary, error. Other editions, as Schaaf, note the reading given by Gutbier, and leave it to be inferred that De Dieu was in fault.

Of the extant editions, perhaps that in the quadrilingual edition of Reineccius (N. T., 1713; whole Bible, with N. T. again, 1747, Lips. fol.) gives the closest aid to one who wishes to know the MS. text, and has not De Dieu himself to refer to.

Warning might here be given, also, that not even Tischendorf's Gr. T., ed. viii., *crit. maj.*, gives a perfect account of the MS. readings of the Syriac Apocalypse. Though his notes are careful, his work does not cover all the testimony of the Syriac, while it contains a number of slips. For example, at chap. xxii. 11, we find "syr polygl (non Schaaf) ταυτης"; but here Schaaf follows the MS., and the Polyglott had made an arbitrary emendation. Again, at xx. 13, we find Tischendorf saying: "και ο θανατ. και usque τα εργα αυτων . . . syr om"; but the Syriac does *not* omit, either in De Dieu, or in Schaaf, whom Tischendorf usually follows.

But, not to pursue this matter farther, no great fault can be found with De Dieu's ability nor his manner of editing.

II.—*Character of the Diplomatic Evidence.*

As to the character of the MS. itself, we have the word of Tregelles (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. p. 280) that it is "carelessly written"; but that may mean little more than that the penmanship is rapid, and the hand is the epistolary one; as indeed De Dieu says, above. Tregelles also says (*idem*) that "it seemed to have altogether a modern appearance"; which may refer to the same thing; for though "the ink is black and distinct," yet "the corrections in the margin are of a much fainter colour." Moreover, Tregelles knew and mentioned, as stated above, the other means of determining the age of the MS.

It is not to be expected, of course, that even so short a MS. as one of the Apocalypse should be without its oversights. How many and of what sort these are, is best determined by an examination throughout; in which reference must be had not only to De Dieu's notes and the palpable errors, but also to the character of the text it represents.

Many of his notes of its apparent imperfection depend upon its variation from the Greek text which he published along with it. As this text is almost exactly that of the Elzevir N. T. of 1624,* varying only in certain inconsiderable minutiae or oversights, it is natural that many things which De Dieu considered as variations from the Greek, or as imperfections of his MS., would now be thought marks of its better character. In sundry cases, too, where the Syriac has a shorter reading, agreeing with the better texts, De Dieu sagaciously remarked, "pro eo [*sc.* Græco] simpliciter est in exemplari nostro" (as at iii. 12), or the like; and that, of course, without knowing of the better reading. The residue of De Dieu's notes, or, at least, those which remain to be taken into account, refer to errors in diacritic points, or others which are manifest and self-correcting, or else those of greater moment, corrected in the MS. margin.

Other MS. errors are to be detected by a comparison with the Greek text. This, again, involves a rough determination of the form of the Greek text which the Syriac follows; even though, as Tregelles asserts, "its internal character and the nature of its text, as well as the want

*As more exact information may be desired respecting the Greek text of De Dieu, I will state that a careful collation with the Elzevir N. T. of 1633 discloses only about 38 differences, of which only two amount to a real variant, viz.: xvi. 5, D has ὁ ὁσιος for E ὁ ἐσόμενος, and xx. 8, D omits τὸν before Μαγῶν. There are only two differences by misprint of a letter, viz.: vi. 11, D has πληρώσονται for E -σονται; and xvi. 21, χαλώξης for χαλάξης. The other differences are in the use of capital letters (D having Πνεῦμα for πν. in a number of places, and ἀμήν once for Ἀμήν), in punctuation (only one causing a real difference, viz.: xviii. 18, D μεγάλη; for E -λη.), in the separation of the parts of compound or quasi-compound words (as vii. 3, D μή τε for E μήτε *secund.*; or xvii. 7, Διατί for E Διά τί), in the different breathing of αὐτος (xiv. 14, D χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, E χειρὶ αὐτοῦ), or in a wrongly placed or an omitted accent. The variant in xvi. 5 seems to show that De Dieu had simply taken the Elzevir text of 1624. The variant in xx. 8 is probably a happy misprint.—In this connection it may be well to state that Pococke's Greek text of the Epistles, printed at the same establishment in 1630, exhibits generally the Elzevir text, with a few modifications apparently from the Antwerp Polyglott.

of all external credentials, place it indefinitely low as to critical value" (Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. 282.)

As to the basis of the statements to follow, I have compared the two editions of De Dieu, text and notes; also the first edition with the Greek text and marginal notes of Von Gebhardt's Tischendorf's Gr. N. T., and with the text and notes of Tischendorf's N. T. ed. viii. *crit. maj.*; I have also carefully collated the Greek text of De Dieu's first edition with the Elzevir of 1633, and obtained comparisons with the Elzevir of 1624; besides abundant collation and comparison with the later Syriac editions. To present a full statement of the facts thus obtained would require a space many times greater than the whole of this paper; and therefore I keep myself mostly to examples or generals.

In the matter of diacritic points and vowels, the MS. seems to be moderately, but not abundantly, supplied; but I would not call its care or correctness therein extreme. The slips in this respect, as well as in the omission or addition of a letter here and there, seem to show the work of a *mere* copyist; and yet not of a very careless one. Accordingly, I would not place too much stress upon the testimony of this MS. in those respects. For instance, in chapter i. 3, where the plural points make the Greek read τὸς λόγους, with Tregelles and W. and Hort, as against the τὸν λόγον of Von G.'s Tischendorf, I might regard it as of some weight; but where it omits the plural points in cases where the Greek text requires them, I should not regard it. Such cases are ii. 23, making the reading καρδίαν for καρδίας; or vii. 14, σπολήν for σπολάς; or in xvii. 2, so as to read ὁ βασιλεὺς for οἱ βασιλεῖς. So when it has the plural points in a case where it *might* leave them off, I should regard its testimony of little account. A case of this sort occurs in the rendering of τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου in xvi. 13. Here the two portions of the compound word are separated, as necessary in Syriac, and plural points are over the word for ψευδο-. Without them the word is doubtless adjective, and means "lying" or "false"; but with the points it must be noun, meaning "lies." But the construction (omitting *dolath* prefix) seems to show that the word is adjective, and that the plural points are wrongly added.

As to letters either superfluous or omitted, I do not observe that they occur oftener than in other Syriac MSS. A plainly superfluous letter appears in ܣܠܘܕ for ܠܘܕ (πρὸς) in i. 17; since the suffix pronoun could not well remain without prefixing a *lomad* to the next

those readings which appear to be singular; and of these I give some specimens; the Greek text of comparison being that of Von Gebhardt:

- i. 4. *om. καὶ ante ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπτά*; involving one letter in Syriac.
- i. 6. *quasi βασιλείαν ἱερὰν pro β. ἱερῆς*. This is evidently a use of the adjective like that in the second conclusion of Mark, in White's Harklensian and the Greek of Codex L. But as nearly the same phrase in v. 10 is rendered correctly after the Greek, this change may have been the work of a copyist. Yet the use of the equivalent of ἱερὸς for ὁσιος was well established in Syriac before the Harklensian version was made.
- i. 9. *add. ὑμῶν post συνοικωνός* (addition of a word).
- i. 12. *om. ἐμουῦ post μετ'* (a simple self-correcting error; omission of one letter).
- ii. 1. *παντοκράτωρ καὶ pro κρατών*; as if the Greek had added πάντα καί, simply.
- ii. 4. *om. ἀλλὰ ἔχω* (but the phrase shows that the Greek read at least ἔχω, as the omission is of two particles only).
- ii. 4. *om. τὴν ἀγάπην* (but the margin supplies it).
- ii. 6. *om. μισῶ*.
- ii. 13. **ܐܘܬܝܢ**; *pro Ἀντείπας* (clear error of understanding, and doubtless due to the scribe. The later editions vary this word somewhat, but generally still keeping it as a verb. As it is, it changes the rendering into—e. g., De Dieu's: "quibus spectaculum factus est ille testis meus"; omitting, of course, the proper name).
- ii. 14. **ܘܒܐܘܪܝܢ** *pro τῷ Βαλάκ*. This combines two errors. The original must have read **ܘܒܐܘܪܝܢ** (τῷ Βαράκ), and the scribe has made two very easy errors in copying.
- ii. 14, 20. **ܘܒܢܝ ܥܘܕܘܝܢ**; (*sons of idols*) *pro εἰδωλόθυτα*; but the error may be De Dieu's, as he makes no note of any error here. The mistake would be very easy for a printer; since the reading of the first word must have been **ܘܒܢܝ** (*sacrifices*) instead of **ܘܒܢܝ** (*of sons*). Unless a letter was faded, however, the mistake would be gross on the part of a native scribe.
- (ii. 15, 16. ὁμοίος is in verse 16 by punctuation, like the Vulgate Latin.)
- ii. 18. *ἀγγέλῳ καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . pro ἀγγέλῳ τῆς . . . ἐκκλησίας* (plain error).
- ii. 24. *ὡς λέγομεν pro ὡς λέγουσιν*; but this is probably De Dieu's error, as it consists only in mistaking a nun for a yud; a very easy thing.

ii. 27. A clerical self-correcting error of one letter in the word for *σιδηροᾶ* (perhaps only a printer's error).

In chapter ii. I have here noted *all* the errors of moment; and they are nearly all so slight as to cause no trouble. In chapter iii. the errors are a little more serious; yet appearing more so in the Greek than in the Syriac. For example:

- iii. 1. τῶ (*solum*) *pro* τῆς . . . ἐκκλησίας.
- iii. 2. *quasi* τήρησον *vel* τήρει *pro* στηρίσον.
- iii. 4. An error of one letter in spelling, but corrected in the margin, for *Σάρδεσιν*. (Yet this is singular, as it makes the reading "in Paradise" for "in Sardis.")
- iii. 5. πατρός μου *pro* π. αὐτοῦ (error of one letter).
- iii. 8. *add.* καὶ *ante* ἰδοῦ (one letter added).
- iii. 11. Error, perhaps only of the printer, of one letter in word for *τάχῃ*.
- iii. 12. *om.* (*homoioteleuton*) καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μοι.
- iii. 15. *om.* ψυχρὸς εἶ οὕτε (with MSS. of Mai's *Speculum*).
- iii. 15. 𐤒 *pro* 𐤒 for ὕφελον (as if the Greek read *μή pro* ὄφ.).
- iii. 16. *add.* ὅτι *ante* μέλλω (*ut videtur*).
- iii. 21. *add.* καὶ *ante* ὁ νικῶν.
- iii. 22. Phrase imperfect which renders ἔχων (*om.* 𐤒).
- iv. 6. *add.* καὶ ἐνώπιον *post* κόκλῳ.
- iv. 11. *post.* πάντα *add.* καὶ διὰ σου εἰσιν.

These samples show the general nature of the imperfections, whether of the MS. or of De Dieu's copy. For the rest, I shall confine myself to a selection of the more noticeable ones; omitting also the few transpositions of words, as also the (very few) cases which *may* show the influence of the Vulgate as against Greek MSS. To continue:

- v. 6. *om.* (*homoiot.*) ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων.
- v. 11. λόγων *pro* ἀγγέλων (omission of two letters. But a like example in viii. 10 seems to show that this was a contraction only).
- v. 13. *om.* λέγοντας.
- vi. 1. *om.* ἔρχου; but MS. supplies it in margin.
- vi. 2. ἦν (*vel* ἐγένετο) *pro* ἰδοῦ (addition of one letter).
- vi. 12. αἶμα *pro* σεισμός (𐤒; *pro* 𐤒, showing a *late copyist*, but showing also that the archetype had the correct reading).
μαρτυρία pro σελίγη (𐤒; *pro* 𐤒).
- vii. 4. *om.* υἱῶν.
- vii. 8. *om.* ἐσφραγισμένοι.

vii. 14. "And she said" *pro καὶ εἶρηκα* (accidental change of one letter).

viii. 3. ἐνώπιον (ܨܦܘܢ) *pro* ἐστάθη (ܨܘܢ). (Wrong insertion of a letter.)

viii. 4. *om. καὶ.*

viii. 10. *om. μέγας.*

viii. 12. *ad καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα add. ἐσχοτίσθη.*

viii. 13. ἐν μεσουρανήματι is rendered by ܨܘܢܘܨܘܪܢܘܡܐܬܝܝܢ. In xiv. 6 the same is rendered by ܨܘܢܘܨܘܪܢܘܡܐܬܝܝܢ; but xix. 7 it is rendered correctly. The later editions modify somewhat, but retain the essential error. De Dieu's note is worth quoting from, as it gives a sufficient hint of the error: "Ita transtulit Syrus Græcum illud, ἐν μεσουρανήματι, ac si decompositum esset ex μέσος *medius*, οὐρὰ *cauda*, & αἷμα *sanguis*." His Latin rendering of this phrase is "medio caudæ, quæ sanguinem habet," which is strictly correct. The later modifications are worth looking at only as matter of curiosity.

ix. 11. Ἀβαδδὼν is curiously rendered by ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ (served), instead of ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ. The exchange of the initial letter hints at a quasi error of sound, especially as the Syriac kindred word to Ἀβαδδὼν is used to render ἀπώλεια (xvii. 8, 11). The omission of the final letter is probably a mere accident. On the whole, it seems as if the Syrian translator, or a scribe, had mistaken the Oriental word, and was intending to write the word for *servant*.

x. 6. μέγας (vel μέγιστος) *pro* χρόνος (easy error of ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ *pro* ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ).

x. 11. ἄρχουσι *pro* γλώσσαις (error of one letter and part of another).

xi. 5. πῶρ . . . θελήσῃ is transferred by mistake to verse 1 (post καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος of the received text), but the MS. has marks to indicate the correction.

xi. 6. *om. τῆς προφητείας.*

xi. 12. *om. καὶ ἤκουσαν φωνῆς . . . λεγούσης αὐτοῖς.*

xi. 13. *om. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.*

xi. 15. *om. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.*

xii. 9, 11. διαβολος is rendered by ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ (seductor vel impostor, quasi a ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ βύλλω; "as if διαβολος were disjector." Compare ܨܘܨܘܒܘܢ *pro* ἐβλήθη in same connection). In xx. 2, but not xx. 10, the same rendering occurs.

- xii. 16. *om.* καὶ κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν . . . τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.
- xiii. 14. *om.* (*homoiot.*) διὰ τὰ σημεῖα . . . ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. (But Bⁿ, Vat. 2066 has the same.)
- xiv. 7. δουλεύετε (*vel* διακονεῖτε) *pro* φοβήθητε. (Error of whole word; but easy to be made.)
- xiv. 10. θρόνου *pro* ἀρνίου.
- xiv. 11. *om.* (*homoiot.*) καὶ εἴ τις . . . ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.
- xiv. 13. ἐν θεῷ *pro* ἐν Κυρίῳ.
- xiv. 15. *om.* πέμψον . . . τῆς γῆς.
- xiv. 16. *om.* ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης.
- xiv. 20. *om.* ἔξωθεν . . . ληνοῦ.
- xvii. 1. *om.* ὕδάτων. (but margin supplies it).
- xvii. 11. ἐστιν *pro* ὑπάγει.
- xviii. 2. πνεύματος, by error of one letter, is rendered **πνοια**, *quasi* “of wing” or “flying.” The mistake is for **πνοια**, literally ἐν πνεύματι—itself a copyist’s mistake.
- xviii. 2. *post* μεμισσημένου *add.* καὶ φυλακὴ πάντως θηρίου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμισσημένου.
- xviii. 9. *post* κλαύσονται *add.* καὶ πενθοῦσι.
- xviii. 17. πλέων is rendered by a word meaning “swimming.”
- xix. 18. καὶ σάρκας ἰσχυρῶν is repeated in the MS., but only printed once in De Dieu’s edition.
- xx. 3. δὲ λυθήσεται *pro* δεῖ αὐτὸν λυθῆναι. (A clear mistake of the translator; or rather, a misreading of the Greek.)
- xxi. 6. γέγονα ἐγὼ *pro* γέγοναν. (The sense intended is apparently *ego fui*.)
- xxi. 17. μέτρων (*vel* μέτροι), πηχῶν ἀνθρώπου *pro* πηχῶν, μέτρων ἀνθρώπου (perhaps only an idiomatic change).
- xxi. 27. *om.* καὶ ψευδοῦς.
- xxi. 27. καὶ *pro* εἰ μή.
- xxii. 11. ὁ ἀδικῶν, by dropping one letter accidentally, is rendered by a word meaning *intrans* or *ascendens* (**ἀναβῶ** *pro* **ἀναβῶ**).
- xxii. 16. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐκκλησίων *pro* ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (perhaps idiomatic).

From these specimens several results are clear. (1.) The original translator made a number of mistakes, some of which mislead, but some of which, again, by their very erroneous quality, give clear testimony to the Greek text followed. (2.) The Leyden MS. is clearly a copy from some archetype of greater correctness, and every way

better than the extant copy. (3.) De Dieu probably made a few mistakes in transcribing or editing, which demand a re-examination of the MS. (4.) The MS. contains a few additions, and quite a number of serious omissions, which seem chargeable to the copyist rather than to the archetype. (5.) The care with which the extant copy is written is not extreme; nor, on the other hand, is its carelessness gross. It compares favorably with the bulk of Syriac MSS., though many better Syriac Biblical MSS. exist. The most evident lack is that of a contemporary *διορθώτης*. (6.) Its critical value is not great enough to make it a strong reliance; since it does not give either a complete or an accurate representation of the text. But it contains the substance well, and it is of value as testimony to the text in use by the maker or makers of the version, and also, in a less degree, to the genuine text of the Apocalypse.

In addition, it may be said that the rendering is generally very close to the Greek; painfully close, indeed; and nothing at all like the elegant idiomatic freedom of the Peshitto. But more on this last head will be found further on.

III.—*Place among the Syriac Versions.*

More interesting, however, than all the foregoing, are the questions: What place does the Syriac Apocalypse hold with respect to the other Syriac versions? What is its age, and what style of thought and spirit does it reflect? What is its position in Syriac literature? What grade or habit of the language does it typify? These questions, if resolved at all, must be resolved solely by internal evidence, and by comparison with other writings. Standing alone as a Syriac version of the Apocalypse, the comparison is more difficult, and depends more upon the uncertain, and, so to speak, the second-hand, considerations of style and usage, than upon matters tangible by themselves as primary evidence.

It would be a waste of time to argue at length that the Apocalypse is no part of the Peshitto, or of a version of equal date. That is a fact that lies upon the surface. Nor can it be shown that any earlier version underlay it as a basis. Scattered notices in early Syriac writers, notably Ephrem Syrus, prove that the Syrian fathers knew of the existence, at least, of the Apocalypse, and perhaps—or probably—had a Syriac version thereof. It is true, also, that the Syriac Apocalypse, in the version we know, must have had a wide, though probably not a general, currency later; but like the Epistles 2 Peter,

and 2 and 3 John, and Jude, being no part of the principal version (Peshitto), it suffered great neglect. Indeed, of the Peshitto version itself, certain Old Testament portions have been rare among the Syrians. MSS. of the Psalter have been most abundant, of the Pentateuch less so, of the Prophets rare, of the Chronicles very rare, and of the remaining books exceedingly rare. (See, for an illustration, Justin Perkins's *Eight Years in Persia*, p. 15.) It is not at all surprising that a portion of the New Testament which was not read in the churches, which did not belong to the popular version, nor was its equal in antiquity, should fall into disuse.

Concerning the origin (among the versions) of this Syriac Apocalypse, two leading opinions seem to have been held. One is expressed by Eichhorn as well as any one else (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, ed. 1827, iv. pp. 459 ff.): "Erst seitdem die Philoxenische von Thomas von Harkel überarbeitete Uebersetzung des N. T. bekannt geworden ist, hat man entdeckt dass unsre gedruckte Syrische Apokalypse ein Stück derselben seyn müsse." His reasons are, first, the subscription to the Florence Codex mentioned above (which, however, we cannot trust); next, its following the Harklensian style, as he alleges, "in jeder Kleinigkeit," in the prevailing use of Greek words, imitations of Greek structure, representations of the Greek article by Syriac pronouns; next, its resemblance to an apparent revision of the (supposed) fragments of the original Philoxenian preserved by Jacob of Edessa in his commentary on Genesis; and next, in its supposed preservation of the critical marks of Origen in the Florence codex, as shown by the example cited in Adler's *N. T. Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 78.

All these arguments are good to a certain extent. It is undeniable that the genius of this version approaches the Harklensian nearer than even the Pococke Epistles; which last, again, are not without reason supposed to be a fragment of the original Philoxenian. At the same time, all analogy forbids the supposition that either the Pococke Epistles or the Apocalypse were ever based upon a Peshitto original.

The other opinion is well expressed by Adler (*N. T. Vers. Syr.* pp. 78, 79): "Sed tamen a genio Philoxenianæ versionis tantidem difert, quantum a simplice. Accusativum quidem, ut Philoxenus, per Δ præfixum exprimit, sed tot græcis verbis civitatem vel potius peregrinitatem non dedit, voces vel phrases origine syriacas reddidit, nulla superflua explicatione addita . . . et alia multa, nomina propria more Syrorum, non ad Græcorum prononciationem scripsit, verbo,

litteris non tam anxie inhæsit quam Philoxenus. Statuimus, hanc Apocalypseos versionem ab alio quidem, quam versio syriaca vulgata Evangeliorum, factam esse, sed Philoxenum auctorem non agnoscere." This opinion is held by Tregelles, and for the same reasons. (See Treg. Horne's *Introd.*, iv. p. 281.) Other critics might be cited, but their opinions would add little on either side.

The investigation of the questions here presented involves much labor, but results in little that can be presented particularly without the recitation of long tabulated comparisons, with much other material of the driest sort. I have approached the subject by five lines of comparison, as follows:

1. The proper names.
2. The use of Greek words in place of Syriac.
3. The use of peculiar Syriac words, which seem to characterize respectively the Peshitto, the Harklensian, and the Pococke Epistles.
4. The use of structures and forms of expression which characterize respectively the Peshitto, the Harklensian, the Pococke Epistles, and secular Syriac literature as far as practicable.
5. The quotations from the Old Testament. In these, if the phraseology appears to coincide with that of the O. T. Peshitto, it would show a familiarity with that version, and a measurable guidance thereby; but if their alliance was clearly with the Hexaplar, the fact would show an apparent posteriority to that version, and a consequent origin posterior to both the Philoxenian and the Harklensian.

1. As to the proper names. Most of them are such as easily show whether the Syriac fashion or the Harklensian distortion is followed. Jesus, Christ (Messiah), John, David, Israel, Jerusalem, Satan, Babylon, Euphrates, the names of the cities of the Seven Churches, Zion, Moses, Michael, Sodom, Egypt, Judah, Jews, the names of the twelve tribes, Patmos, Magog, Gog, Nicolaitans, and the like, follow the Syriac fashion generally, and not the Harklensian or the Greek. And the exceptions to the general rule seem rather to show an independent rendering than a desire to reproduce the Greek phenomena. These exceptions are such as the following: the name Balak (ii. 14) suffers a double mistake (see above); first, mistaking it for Barak, or changing it by a natural Oriental permutation of the liquids, and second by the transcriber's changing the *r* into *n* and the *B* into *Q*; making the erroneous reading *Qanaq*. In ii. 13, the name Antipas (again see above), by a singular but not unnatural error, is replaced by a word meaning "that appeared." The name of the star Apsinthos (viii. 11) is transliterated, not translated. In ix. 12, Abaddon and Apollyon are both attempted to be transliterated, the

first, however, erroneously (again see above), substituting an 'ee for *aleph* at the beginning, and leaving off the *nun* at the end; as in the case of "Nicolaitans" also. In xvi. 16 Ἀρμαγεδὼν is likewise transliterated; naturally because the Syrian translator would not recognize the Hebrew "Har Megiddo." These, with a double form for "Thyatira," one like the Greek dative, are, if I mistake not, all the cases in which the Syriac genius is not strictly followed in the case of the proper names. It results that in this matter the Syriac Apocalypse is very widely different from the Harklensian genius as shown in White's edition, though not altogether different from that of some of the Harklensian MSS. My own judgment is that the handling of the proper names shows first a copyist, of a grade much inferior to the original translator; and next, as far as the translator can be discerned, it shows a procedure rather different from the extreme Harklensian method.

2. Next, as to Greek words not proper names. Here the Harklensian genius is approached, but by no means fully reached. The word most frequently occurring is *θρόνος*; but it is not uniformly transliterated, being sometimes translated by the Syriac ܐܘܢܘܨ. At first it would seem that the translator intended to observe a distinction between the throne of the Almighty and the lesser thrones, by translating for the first and transliterating for the second. But as one reads the book through, that distinction breaks down, and no other appears to take its place. The word is translated in i. 4; iv. 2, 3, 4; xvi. 17; xx. 4; and, if I mistake not, transliterated in all the other cases. Other words are *ποδήρη*, *ζώνην* and *ζώνας* (keeping the acc. sing. and pl. forms); *κλεῖδας* and *κλεῖδα* (likewise keeping the Greek terminations); *πρόσωπον* (but this is familiar in the Peshitto); the names of the several precious stones, and also *κρύσταλλος*; *κιθάρας* (acc. pl. form); *κιθαρῶδων* and *κιθαρῶδαί* (gen. and nom. pl.); *φιάλας* and *φιάλην* (acc. sing. and pl.); *καῦμα*; *στολάς* (acc. pl.); *γωνία*; *στάδια*; *ἄκρατων*; *εὐαγγέλιον* (but this is naturalized in Syriac); *μουσικοί*; *ναῦται*; *κυβερνήτης*; *λίβανον*; *ἄμωμον*; *κινάμωμον*; *βύσσος*; *στρηγία* (or *στρήγος*), with a verbal form from the same; *γένος* (but this word is naturalized in all the Orient); *τετράγωνος*; *δόμησις*; *χοῖνιξ*. Besides there are others where the Greek has been naturalized, but not transliterated, as the words for *δηνάρια*, *δαιμόνια*, together with a few doubtful cases; which would of themselves lead to the conclusion that the book was translated from the Greek, even if we did not know the fact otherwise. Thus *οὐαί* appears to be transliterated, ܘܘܐ to be translated; *χαλκολίβανω* is partly

translated and partly not, in the phrase ܕܢܫܐ ܕܥܕܢܐ; "in Sardis" is once (ii. 7) rendered "in Paradise" by a scribe's error; and Ἀλληλούια is pretty surely taken from the Greek form. To the same class may belong such cases as a Syriac participle for ὁ κατηγορῶν, formed anew from an adopted Greek word; the distorted form for μαργαρίται; and the possibly coincident ܕܡܘܪܐ for σάξκος. To the usual Greek particles (γάρ, δέ, &c.) is to be added also μέν.

The list here given covers nearly all the cases in kind. It shows plainly a coincidence with the Harklensian method in one respect, viz., in representing Greek case-endings* now and then; and the transliterated μέν looks in the same direction. But this matter is not to be judged altogether by what it shows affirmatively. It is to be compared with the general Harklensian usage, especially in its extent; a thing to be properly treated of in another connection. For the present it is enough to say that in respect to Greek words, the divergence of the Apocalypse from the Peshitto is not so great as from the Harklensian, but apparently greater (though the basis of comparison here is inadequate) than from the Pococke Epistles. The testimony of the Greek words, positive and negative, apparently tends on the whole to show that the Apocalypse is not a piece of the Harklensian as we have it; though the difference might be accounted for by remembering one very apparent fact; that it had no Peshitto basis. In some of its verbal translations it is nearer the Peshitto than to the Harklensian.

It is to be remembered, too, that the use of a Greek word where a native Syriac word might have been used, decides nothing. The only force, one way or the other, of this consideration lies in the *prevailing fashion* of the transliterating of words from the Greek text. To me, the case stands thus: neither the proper names nor the other words retained in the Syriac Apocalypse show any real connection with the Harklensian; but only an attempt to be faithful to the Greek original. If they are to be taken as showing a dependence upon or close connection with the Harklensian, then many a secular composition must fall into the same category, including some that antedate the Harklensian.

(The remaining portions of this paper await some further verification and revision, and will appear in a future number of the Journal.)

* But discretion is needed on this point. The Peshitto itself sometimes reproduces Greek case-endings, e. g. of *στάσις* in Luke xxiii. 19, 25; and of *στάσις* in Mark xv. 7.