some of the contents, and that the two Councils distinguished by Haddan and Stubbs as the one 'in the cause of the English Church [irrespective of Wilfrid, although after he had reached Rome]',¹ and the other 'to decide upon Wilfrid's appeal',² are really parts of a single council, though the former can only be accepted with a liberal use of the obelus. We can assign it to the definite date of October 679, and we have the list of bishops and priests who were actually present.

REGINALD L. POOLE.

AN UNRECORDED READING OF THE LEICESTER CODEX.

In a recent visit to Leicester I availed myself of an opportunity to inspect the Leicester Codex (69). And among other passages I turned to Rev. ii 13. The reader will be helped if, for the present purpose, he consults this Journal for April 1904, in which Dr M. R. James, in his valuable article on 'The Scribe of the Leicester Codex', furnishes a facsimile of the writing of Emmanuel of Constantinople, whom Dr James, in my humble opinion, rightly identifies with the scribe of 69. The recumbent epsilon of the Leicester MS is characteristically represented by the Greek writing in Dr James's facsimile. The epsilon is written lying on its back and is like our own cursive u. It may easily be distinguished from alpha, which is written like our cursive a. Alpha, so far as I examined 69, in practically every case, is completely formed.

I was somewhat surprised to find that, while Tregelles and other collators had left notes in the margin about the second syllable of ἀρτιπάς, Rev. ii 13, no one had observed what, to my eyes, is the indisputable reading in the final syllable, namely epsilon and not alpha. Mr Payne, of the Town Clerk's office, kindly allowed me to use the MS in his room. Distrusting my own unsupported eyesight, I was glad to find that he agreed with me as to the entire difference of the letter in question from any occurrence of alpha in the context, and in the entire resemblance of the epsilon—as I will now call it—to the other occurrences of that letter.

Persons who have used the MS have frequently been guilty of writing over the text and making notes either in the text or in the margin. And I think the second syllable of ἀρτιπάς has been tampered with. But there is absolutely no trace of interference with the third syllable.

¹ Vol. iii 131. ² Vol. iii 136.
Hence we must take the MS as giving the reading *avτπες* or *avτηπες*. In view of the undoubted reading of the final syllable, we may rule out the first alternative *avτπες*. We have, therefore, in 69 a supporter of the reading *avτπετας*, which W. H. in their ‘Notes on Select Readings’ describe merely as a ‘curious itacism’. The resemblance of *avτπετας* to the proper name is a sufficient indication of the manner in which the other variants probably grew up. Any way *avτπετας* (I assume the earlier form to have occurred in the earliest MSS) was read by the scribe of 69 as a verb, and here he followed the precedent of several Eastern Versions. 69 therefore gives us: καὶ οὐκ ἠρνησθο τὴν πιστὶν ἐν ταῖς ημέραις αἰς *avτηπες*.

What followed? A fifteenth-century MS of Revelation, 2302 (Greg.), contains the important variant *οτί πας μαρτῦς πιστὸς κατοικεί* instead of *οἱ αὐτοκαθαρθῆ—σατάνας* (I quote from Greg. Textkritik des ΝΤ. 1207). The same MS also, like 69, omits the καὶ before *ἐν ταῖς ημέραις*. Our results may now be summed up in the provisional reading: καὶ οὐκ ἠρνησθο τὴν πιστὶν ἐν ταῖς ημέραις αἰς *avτπετας* [στὸν ο σατάνας κατοικεί]. I bracket the last passage as doubtful, and omit *ο μαρτῦς μον ὁ πιστὸς μον* as a gloss inserted to explain *avτπετας* when it was understood as a proper name.

An important contribution to the history of the passage is furnished by a Sahidic MS of the twelfth century edited by Dr Budge.1 ‘The Coptic’, he says, ‘does not mention Antipas and reads: “Thou hast kept hold upon my name, thou hast not denied my faith, and thou didst stand firm in the days in which my faithful martyr was put to death among you; the place in which the throne of Satan is set up.”’ ‘Thou didst stand firm’ corresponds to *avτπετας*, so that we may add the Sahidic to the Bohairic as supporting the verb. And this brings us to the meaning of *avτπετας*. In popular use ‘contradiction’ passed over into the stronger meaning of ‘opposition in act’.2 The Coptic version, therefore, is evidence not only for the reading *avτπεπας* but for the meaning of the verb.

Why did the scribe of the Leicester Codex write *avτπετες* rather than *avτπετας*? Probably he himself would not have regarded the variation as needing explanation. According to Jannaris,3 *εἰπες* is the regular form in post-classical and Byzantine Greek, whereas *εἰπες* is the regular form in post-Byzantine Greek, and Emmanuel would naturally use the latter. *εἰπες* is found with the best of attestation in two places only in the gospels, Mark xii 32 and John iv 17. It seems probable that the form *εἰπες* here is rather a relic of earlier grammatical usage, than a vernacular use contemporary with the scribes of N or D.

Only after a minute examination of the evidence, may we allow

---

literary considerations to come into play. In the first place, 'Thou didst not deny and thou didst resist' illustrates the combination of a statement of fact with the denial or its contradictory which is especially characteristic of the 'Johannine' gospel and epistle. Not only so: the reading before us is anticipated in its style by a previous passage in the same chapter: 'Thou hast patience and hast not grown weary.' In admitting this affinity of style, we do not bind ourselves to identifying the author of the Revelation with the author of the 'Johannine' writings.

Lastly, we can trace the historical conditions which gave rise to the corruption. The evidence of the versions shews that the verb ἀντεπάστημι was currently read at least as late as the beginning of the third century. Before that time martyrdom was not a frequent occurrence in the Christian Church. The persecutions which raged from about A.D. 250 onwards, and the consequent interest in those passages in the scriptures which bore upon martyrdom, may perhaps explain how the apparent name Antipas was seized upon and glossed. Fortunately we are still able to recover what, I venture to suggest, is the primitive text.

FRANK GRANGER.

MACARIUS OF EGYPT: HIS EPISTLE AD FILIOS DEI IN SYRIAC.

It is unfortunate for the elucidation of the mysterious problems connected with the name of Macarius of Egypt that the only literary production, which competent scholars unanimously ascribe to him—the Epistola Sancti Macarii ad filios Dei—is preserved only in a Latin translation. It has long been my desire to discover the Greek original, in order to possess an indubitable criterion of style, by which other works professing to come from the same author might be tested. I have not succeeded in this search, but have found the letter in a Syriac version. The Syriac, like the Latin, is a translation from the Greek. It is, however, of value in so much as it enables us to correct

1 Expositor, May 1916, p. 358.
2 Origen, c. Celsum, iii, p. 116 (Spencer).
3 It is worth consideration whether the reading of Ν in Mt. xiii 54, ἀντιπάστημι for παστημι, is to be explained by comparison with the passage which we have been studying.
4 Migne P. G. t. xxxiv coll. 405–410.
5 See Add. Or. in Brit. Mus. 14,612 fol. 168 [Wright DCCLIII. 29].