

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 *αυτας*, 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 *αυτας* 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 *αντιπες* or *αντειπες*. In view of the undoubted reading of the final syllable, we may rule out the first alternative *αντιπες*. We have, therefore, in 69 a supporter of the reading *αντειπας*, which W. H. in their 'Notes on Select Readings' describe merely as a 'curious itacism'. The resemblance of *αντειπας* to the proper name is a sufficient indication of the manner in which the other variants probably grew up. Any way *αντειπας* (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 : *και ουκ ηρησω την πιστιν εν ταις ημεραις αις αντειπες*. What followed? A fifteenth-century MS of Revelation, 2302 (Greg.), contains the important variant *στι πας μαρτυς πιστος κατοικει* instead of *ος απεκτανθη—σατανας* (I quote from Greg. *Textkritik des NT*: 1207). The same MS also, like 69, omits the *και* before *εν ταις ημεραις*. Our results may now be summed up in the provisional reading : *και ουκ ηρησω την πιστιν εν ταις ημεραις αις αντειπας* [ουπου ο σατανας κατοικει]. I bracket the last passage as doubtful, and omit ο μαρτυς μου ο πιστος μου as a gloss inserted to explain *αντιπας* 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 *αντειπας*, so that we may add the Sahidic to the Bohairic as supporting the verb. And this brings us to the meaning of *αντειπας*. 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 *αντειπας* but for the meaning of the verb.

Why did the scribe of the Leicester Codex write *αντειπες* rather than *αντειπας*? Probably he himself would not have regarded the variation as needing explanation. According to Jannaris,³ *ειπας* is the regular form in post-classical and Byzantine Greek, whereas *ειπες* is the regular form in post-Byzantine Greek, and Emmanuel would naturally use the latter. *ειπες* 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 *ειπες* here is rather a relic of earlier grammatical usage, than a vernacular use contemporary with the scribes of *8* or *D*.

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

¹ *Coptic Biblical Texts*, lxxv.

² *Vocabulary of Greek Testament*, s.v. *ἀντιλογία*.

³ *Hist. Greek Grammar*, p. 261.

