I close by reproducing this list of agreements as a contribution to the question of recensions :---

Syr .	•	•	•	23	261	•	•	•	•	•	10
Arm.	•			19	55	•	•	•			9
Lat .		•		18	253		•	•		•	9
Aeth				16	296		•	•			9
s				20	V (=	23	Н	P)		•	8
Α.				16	254		•				8
248.				13	155			•			6
SyrHex				II	68.		• •		•		5
157.				II	$\mathbf{B^{ab}}$	•					4
Compl				10	C (fre	om	viii	5)	•	•	3
106.				10	Sca					•	2

D. P. BUCKLE.

A MUTILATED LATIN NEW TESTAMENT OF THE MEROVINGIAN PERIOD.

In the period 1913–1914 there came into the possession of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, a manuscript which is thus described in Monsieur H. Omont's catalogue:—

⁶[MSS latins: Nouvelles Acquisitions] [petit format] **1063**. Novum Testamentum, praeter Acta et Apocalypsim. Provient de la cathédrale de Beauvais, puis du château de Troussures; no. 2 des ventes de 1909 et 1912. VIII⁶ s. Parch. Écriture mérovingienne. 120 feuillets, à 2 col. 220 sur 140 millim. Demi-rel. anc.¹

Monsieur Omont has also called attention to the manuscript in a masterly reconstruction of what remains of the valuable cathedral library of Beauvais.² In the present note one or two points of interest connected with the manuscript are alluded to, in the hope that it will receive from the hands of an expert a treatment of its textual character such as its age merits.

¹ Bibliothèque Nationale : Nouvelles Acquisitions du Département des Manuscrits pendant les années 1913-1914. Inventaire sommaire, par H. Omont (Paris, 1915), pp. 16 f.

² Recherches sur la Bibliothèque de l'Église cathédrale de Beauvais (Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome xi) (Paris, 1914), p. 77. The Gospel text would appear to be certainly Vulgate, as the Eusebian section numbers are in their places, and are an integral part of the manuscript. But the title and subscription to the usual Latin prologue of the Gospel of St Luke are of special interest :---

(f. 24 r a) $\begin{array}{l} EXP:-EVANGL^{M} \\ \hline SCNDM : MARCM \\ \hline INCP: PREFATIO \\ SECVD & LVCA \\ \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \\ LVCA \\ SYRUS etc. \\ \end{array}$

That the two erased lines were of some interest is shewn by the subscription to the prologue, which is intact :--

> (f. 24 v d) EXPL¹CIT PREFATIO SECVNDVM LVCANVM INCIPIT EVANGELIVM EIVSDEM.

This subscription provides another instance of the Old Latin accusative form *Lucanum* to which Mgr Mercati and Mr C. H. Turner have already called attention in the JOURNAL¹

A second point of interest about the manuscript is the occurrence after the Epistle to Philemon of the Epistle to the Laodiceans (f. 118 r bv a). I give a collation of the text of this with that printed in my Text and Canon of the New Testament (London, 1913).²

> EXPL AD FILEMONE INCP AD LAVDICENSIS.

1. I homine] hominibus || 1. 2 Laudiciae] laodice || gracia || 1. 3 nostro om. || gracias || 1. 4 Iesu Christo || oracionem || permanentes estis ||
1. 5 promissum expectantes || 1. 6 iudicii || distituant || uaniloquia ||
1. 7 se om. || sed peto om. || ut habet sed non ne || 1. 8 faciet deus || sint om. || 1. 9 in] ad || 1. 10 sunt om. || 1. 11 palam sunt || pacior || 1. 13 quod] + est (?) || oracionibus || administrantē sīpm sīm || 1. 14 uiuere] + uita ||
1. 15 ipsum] in ipsum || misericordiā suā || 1. 17 ita om. || retenite ||
1. 18 in timore] amorē || aeterna] in aeternum || 1. 19 uos || tractu ||
1. 21 optimum om. || gaudite || 1. 22 sorditus || in omnibus] omnes ||

¹ Vol. vi (1904–1905) pp. 256 ff, 435. ² p. 193 f.

Н2

100 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

sunt || peticiones || 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 $\Phi\lambda\omega\rho\sigma$, but this being obviously impossible they look for a Greek equivalent. Their choice lies between $a\nu\theta_{\nu}$ os, $a\nu\theta_{\nu}$ pos, and $\epsilon va\nu\theta_{\nu}$ s, and of the three $\epsilon va\nu\theta_{\nu}$ s is probably first