

sunt || petitiones || l. 23 ante] apud || l. 24 integra] + et uera || et casta  
*om.* || l. 25 accipistis || in *bis* || retenite || salutare || l. 26 omnes sanctos  
 ...salutant *om. homoeoarct.* || omnes *alt. om.* || l. 27 gracia || nostri *om.* ||  
 Christi *om.* || l. 28 Colosensibus et *om. homoeoarct.* || colosinsium ||

EXPL AD LAODICAENSIS

INCIP: AD HEBREOS

A. SOUTER.

### EUANTHAS.

MOST of the readers of the JOURNAL are no doubt familiar with the passage in Irenaeus (v 30), where he mentions three solutions that had been proposed for the riddle of the number 666; Euanthas, Teitan, and Lateinos. It will be remembered that Irenaeus devotes some little discussion to the last two, but passes over Euanthas with the words 'it does contain the number, but we affirm nothing about it'. Commentators, so far as I know, have followed his example. Dr Swete, for instance, dismisses it as 'the impossible word Euanthas'. Yet it seems to me incredible that the suggestion when first put forward should have been meaningless, or that any one should have cared to put forward a word, which is hardly a name (for there are several Euanthes, but no Euanthas), simply because the letters will add up to 666. Such instances of words and names can no doubt be found by the score, by any one who cares to take the trouble. I suggest that Euanthas when originally proposed was simply a graecized form of 'Florus'.

Gessius Florus, procurator of Judaea in A. D. 64 and 65, is in fact a very respectable candidate for the Beast-ship. The governor whose barbarities are described at length by Josephus, who 'made Albinus by comparison seem a benefactor', whose oppression brought on the fatal war, perhaps according to his deliberate intention, of whom Tacitus says 'duravit tamen patientia Iudaeis usque ad Florum procuratorem', must long have been a name of horror to every Jew and Jewish Christian. If, as I think is probable, before the Apocalypse was written, Gaius Caesar had been described by the number 616, those who wished to solve St John's new riddle would naturally think of a man who typified Roman oppression even more than Gaius. How such persons would proceed can easily be guessed. Like most of their successors they start with a prepossession for a particular man and a willingness to find him at the expense of some straining. They would of course like to get 666 out of Φλώρος, but this being obviously impossible they look for a Greek equivalent. Their choice lies between ἄνθινος, ἀνθηρός, and εὐανθής, and of the three εὐανθής is probably first

choice, because it was actually current as a name, which the others were not. When they find that *εὐανθής* makes 673, and that with the very small and perhaps legitimate alteration of *η* to *α* it will actually make 666, they are probably more than satisfied.

On the same principle, I suspect that those who proposed *Τείραν* really meant Titus.<sup>1</sup> They followed a not very dissimilar line of reasoning. As the name itself will not fit, they proposed one which was sufficiently like it and at the same time embodied the qualities they ascribed to the captor of Jerusalem. It is as Irenaeus says a *nomen tyrannicum*, and suggests the insolence that is doomed to fall *mole sua*. No one could be surprised if Titus was nicknamed 'Titan' by his enemies.

If these suggestions are sound, one interesting result follows. The earliest critics of the Apocalypse were on a level with the moderns. They recognized that the Beast represented the Roman power of the time, rather than an Antichrist to come.

F. H. COLSON.

### SOME CATENAE FRAGMENTS OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW.

THE fragments of Origen in Possinus's *Catena* on Matthew are apparently not derived from the Commentary. But some of those in Cramer's *Catena* appear to come from this source, while those published by Gallandi from Venice *Catena* (*Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. xiv (1781)) are clearly so derived. (Lists of these fragments were given by Mr C. H. Turner in the *JOURNAL* x 106.) Gallandi's extracts are mostly extremely compressed; but nevertheless they seem to confirm the view, suggested by comparison of the Latin version of the Commentary, that the existing Greek text is somewhat abridged from its original form. Here and there Gallandi has in the body of a fragment a sentence not represented in the continuous text of the Commentary; e. g. in his brief summary of Origen's comment on the Parable of the Hid Treasure, the sentence occurs, 'Ἡ δὲ [βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστός, οὗ ἡ γνῶσις κατὰ δύναμιν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν· εὑρίσκειται διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἀγοράζεται διὰ τῶν ἀρετῶν. In that of the Draw-net he has two insertions 'Or the net is the apostolic teaching, which gathers together indiscriminately Jews, Greeks, Barbarians, Scythians, bondmen, freemen, bad and good'; and 'The vessels are the different abodes' (*μοναί*).

But considerable fragments of the Commentary on Matthew are found

<sup>1</sup> I am glad to hear from Professor Burkitt that he has long held this view.