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INTRODUCTION

Sometime during the tenth century, a painter/scribe named Maius produced an illuminated copy of the Beatus Commentary on the Apocalypse now owned by the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York City, Morgan 644.¹ This copy is dedicated to St. Michael, and more than likely was done for a monastery dedicated to that archangel saint within the borders of the kingdom of Léon in northern Spain.² Maius' Beatus has many qualities in common with, and belongs to a small, obviously interrelated group of Beatus manuscripts from the second half of the tenth century.³ This group has a third edition text, Visigothic script, and Mozarabic illuminations employing elaborate compositions seemingly deriving from the late Antique or the late Carolingian period. However, the date and place of origin of the Morgan 644 are not clearly delineated due to its ambiguous colophon.⁴ These two points have led to much scholarly comment and controversy for over a century, with the result that the actual historical placement of the manuscript is still equivocal.

In 1852, when writing of M644,⁵ the dealer Libri, who sold the book to Lord Ashburnham, noted it to be "un des plus beaux manuscrits à miniatures qui existent en Europe".⁶ Many years later, its unique aesthetic qualities so entranced Meyer Schapiro that he showed it to a series of modern artists, including Léger, Masson and Matta, and it became quite influential on their work.⁷

Aesthetically, the M644 is indeed remarkable. Its illuminations include many sumptuous full-page miniatures and diagrams, some compositions extending across the
facing verso and recto pages of an opening, others occupying it fully,\(^8\) and most having carpet borders; numerous partial-page illustrations, most of which are also enframed; and a sizable quantity of decorated initials and ornaments. The imagery is spread before one like a splendid oriental carpet which has lost somewhat its original luster, with the illustrative narrative presented in a flat, iconic manner set against richly and often brightly toned, horizontally banded backgrounds. The artists' copious use of strong and complementary colors gives some of the illuminations an intensity which is almost electric in quality in some parts of the book, while in other areas more subtle hues have less brilliance.

Attention had been drawn to this extraordinary volume long before Schapiro began introducing it to his painter friends. In the early part of this century, Gómez-Moreno made a suggestion that its painter/scribe, Maius, could possibly be the author of the entire Beatus iconography.\(^9\) He further noted that its "barbaric" style with its exotic, half-oriental appearing character was the reflection of the indigenous Spanish culture, created in part by a mixture of the Christian and Islamic societies which confronted each other across a political frontier which was unique in Europe of that period.\(^10\) Gómez-Moreno felt that M644 dated from the earlier part of the tenth century, or 926, and as many scholars accepted this date or an even earlier dating, the manuscript became known as the oldest of the thirty-some remaining Beatus manuscripts and fragments.\(^11\) This added enormously to its prestige and hardly a scholarly discussion of the Beatus manuscripts failed to mention M644 from that time on.\(^12\) As a result of this, Maius became almost as much of a national hero, from many scholars' point of view, as Beatus himself.\(^13\)

However, the later studies of the text of the Beatus commentary by Sanders,\(^14\) and of both the text and some of the illustrations of the Beatus group by Neuss,\(^15\) indicated the possibility that the Beatus iconography was at least in part added to the commentary during
the lifetime of the author of the text, and that there were several editions or groups of
recensions of the original text. Neuss even suggested that though the illustrations were
based on Early Christian examples, there was a single archetype for the Beatus group, one
produced within Beatus' lifetime. He firmly indicated that the Saint-Sever Beatus, a
manuscript produced in Gascony in the mid-eleventh century was the best extant exemplar
of that archetype.16

M644 could have become the center of a controversy, with some scholars taking
Gómez-Moreno's position literally, and others taking Neuss' differing views had not the
scholarly world been preoccupied with other issues.17 Even in Spain, the great Claudio
Sanchez Albornoz, the acknowledged Don of Spanish history, while accepting the dating
and probable provenance of Gómez-Moreno did not indicate that Maius was responsible for
the design of the Beatus manuscript illuminations.18 Instead a general scholarly agreement
developed that there indeed did seem to be different family groups among the Beatus
manuscripts, but many scholars still didn't quite know how to account for this, despite the
work of both Sanders and Neuss. And in their disagreements with Neuss over his choice
of the Saint-Sever Beatus as the closest to the archetype, the possibility of M644 as the
archetype for the Beatus iconography was almost completely overlooked.

In an attempt to reconcile the dissimilar views of Gómez-Moreno, Sanders and
Neuss, Menéndez Pidal in 1954, at least relative to the various editions of Sanders and the
single archetype of Neuss, offered the suggestion that Maius was the designer of a revision
of the Beatus imagery which occurred in the early part of the tenth century. Such a revision
which would account for the elaborate iconography found in many of the Beatus
manuscripts from the tenth century, with vestiges continuing into the eleventh, twelfth and
even the thirteenth centuries, the "Escalada" and "Tabara" groups.19 However, Peter
Klein in 1970 and O. K. Werckmeister in 1973 both pointed out that Neuss had shown by careful comparisons of the text and iconography of the manuscripts most closely associated with M644 that M644 could not be the "mother" manuscript for a revision of the Beatus iconography. Furthermore, Klein, who in his 1970 study, developed for the first time a pictorial stemma separate from the textual stemma of the Beatus manuscripts, noted several revisions of the Beatus iconography (Figs. 295, 296). It was thus possible that the illuminations which Menéndez-Pidal had attributed to Maius could have been added to the Beatus imagery at an earlier time. Klein's work, which employed in part a statistical method of analysis in developing his pictorial stemma, reinforced Neuss' assessment that M644 was neither the manuscript that most closely exemplified the archetype for the entire Beatus group nor the archetype for the tenth-century revision.

When Klein presented a summary of his dissertation results at an international congress on Beatus studies in Madrid in 1976, the new implications for M644 were immediately noted by the great Spanish scholar, Manuel Díaz y Díaz. During the discussion which followed Klein's paper he noted the importance of the questions raised by Klein's work, remarking that, as Klein's results had shown the manuscript of "Magio" to no longer be the "head of the line", so to speak, as has been firmly considered in "all the other" stemmata, one must now consider the problem of the relationship of M644 to the other manuscripts.

Following this statement, the precise purpose of this dissertation is to examine, using Klein's methods, the place of M644 in the Beatus pictorial stemma in order to determine whether Klein has correctly related the manuscript to the others in the Beatus family group. As we have briefly seen, the place of M644 in the Beatus pictorial tradition has over the years been variously defined. Three closely related questions have
consistently arisen. In chronological order they are: (1) the relationship of M644 to the archetype for the entire Beatus group, (2) its relationship to the archetype for the revision of the Beatus iconography which took place some time during the early part of the tenth century, and (3) its actual place in the Beatus stemma, i.e., its relationship to its nearest relatives on the Beatus family tree.

In reversing the order of these three questions, we see, along with Díaz that the logical place to begin a study of M644 now is the problem of the relationship of Maius' manuscript to the other Beatus manuscripts, in short, to examine the validity of the position which Klein has given it on his pictorial stemma. This essay will thus address itself only to the primary issue of the place of M644 in the Beatus pictorial stemma. It will, therefore try to answer the question raised by Díaz y Díaz in Madrid, which that distinguished scholar clearly felt needed to be investigated. But it will as a matter of historical and at the same time current scholarly interest, address itself to the other two questions noted above, respectively, the outmoded thesis of M644 as the archetype for the Beatus illuminations; and the now discarded, but not entirely abandoned by some, view that M644 was the archetype for the tenth-century revision of the Beatus iconography.

Thus this study will begin in Chapter I with a description of the manuscript in question, including a brief discussion of its provenance and date in a typical library catalogue style. Next, in Chapter II it will deal with the development of the pictorial stemma for the Beatus manuscripts. Following this, Chapter III will concentrate on the statistical research of including run-outs of statistics of both Klein and myself in support of our art historical conclusions. The questions of the archetype for the Beatus group and prototype for the tenth century revision of the Beatus iconography, will then be briefly analyzed in Chapters IV and V. Chapter VI will present conclusions. The result of this
dissertation will clarify the critical question raised by Díaz y Díaz in 1976, especially through the further application of the statistical analysis employed by Klein in developing his pictorial stemma of the Beatus group.

In order to further strengthen my conclusions regarding the place of M644, I have provided some of Klein's and my statistical support materials in a series of Appendices. These will be found in Appendices B-E. Appendix A is a special one, as it contains a collation and reconstruction of M644 which William Voelkle and I have been working on. It is still work in progress, but it stands along with the statistical work of this dissertation, as an additional demonstration that M644 is correctly placed in the Beatus family group. As we continue to use modern techniques along with the more traditional ones, the hidden truths about 644 will finally be revealed. Our work is particularly timely since the manuscript is currently undergoing restoration work, providing us a unique opportunity to examine the details without the incrustations of the past.

The last Appendix F offers a brief historical note on Beatus of Liébana and his Commentary, for those not so familiar with this eighth century monk. Though this Appendix does not actually address itself to the question at hand, it is intended to provide useful background. Among other things, it will ask the tantalizing question of whether in fact Beatus truly was the author or compiler of this important and significant commentary, a question which the current scholarship is also beginning to ask.

We will begin this study, then, with a description of the manuscript in question.
Notes to Introduction


2. The colophon, fol. 293, refers to the receivers and potential readers of the codex as being part of a community dedicated to St. Michael. See below, Chapter I, 23, 24, note 61, and also Map, Fig. 302.

3. Branch IIa of the Beatus Family Tradition. Further discussion of this group, see Chapters I, II and III, and Neuss' List of Alphabetical Equivalents for the Manuscripts at the beginning of Chapter II, Section B below. There are two members of this family group which are dated later, one from the eleventh century, and the other begun in the eleventh century but finished in the early twelfth, the Facundus manuscript done for King Ferdinand and his Queen Sancha (J), (using Neuss' letter abbreviations), and the Silos codex (D), respectively.
4. However, the others of the group are fairly securely dated, and their place of origin is known. See below, Chapter I, for more on the problematic colophon of M644.

5. The Morgan 644 will be referred to as M644 or "M", Neuss' (See the list of Neuss' alphabetical equivalents, Chapter II, beginning of section B, 57-59) signifying letter, throughout this dissertation for the sake of brevity. His abbreviation list is on 60-61 of his 1931 study.


8. I appreciate very much a conversation with William Voelkle dealing with the term "extending across a single opening", as some of the compositions in the manuscript, such as the Burning of Babylon, fols., 202v-203 of M (Fig. 207-209), have "spilling over", i.e., the illustration does not, as in the case of the World Map, fols. 33v-34 of M (Fig. 138,140); and the Last Judgment, fols. 219v-220 of M (Fig. 219-220), both of which entirely fill the two pages involved. Thus fols. 202v-203 (Fig. 207) could be considered "extending" across a single opening, but not fully occupying it. Therefore the term, "extending across a single opening", though often used by manuscript scholars is simply not specific enough. For example, there is at least one column of text involved on the far right of the recto fol. in the instance of the Burning of Babylon pages, yet the illustration extends across the centerfold. This is a characteristic of Early Medieval manuscripts, and will be discussed more fully in Chapter III below.

9. Manuel Gómez-Moreno, Iglesias Mozarabes, 1919, 362. Although he does indicate that ",... y es Maio o Magio, el inventor probable de le ingente (underline mine) serie de códices de Beato, puesto que el suyo está fechado en 926, al parecer, y sus discípulos le imitron fielmente", this discussion takes place within the framework of the
development of Mozarabic illumination in the tenth century, thus leaving open to interpretation whether he meant the entire body of Beatus MSS as a whole, or just those which his disciples faithfully initiated, i.e. those of Branch IIa in particular; at any rate, he believed that Maius had used earlier models in his work, for this see idem, 1951, 399, 405, in which the fine line between inventor or copier is discussed. This problem will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV below, 111,113, note 2, Chapt V, 129.


11. Gomez-Moreno, 1919,131. Of course at that time some of the manuscripts and fragments that we know of today were still not known. For the earliest cataloguers of the Beatus manuscripts, see M. A. Pascal d'Avezac, Une digression géographique à propos d'un beau manuscrit à figures, Paris 1869; and H. L. Ramsay, "Manuscripts of the Commentary of Beatus of Liebana on the Apocalypse", Revue des Bibliothèques, 1902, 75-76. For the latest on these manuscripts and their bibliographies, see Ansario M. Mundo and Manuel Sanchez Mariana, El Comentario de Beato al Apocalipsis.
Catalysto de los Códices. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1976, a catalogue prepared for
the Beatus Congress held in Madrid that year. Also see Richard Kenneth Emmerson
and Suzanne Lewis, "Census and Bibliography of Medieval Manuscripts Containing
Apocalypse Illustrations, c. 800-1500", Traditio, 40 (1984), 337-379, esp. 347-379 (I
am grateful to Suzanne Lewis for an off-print of this article at a time when it was not
available to me elsewhere, and for help in trying to obtain some of the lastest
bibliographical references.); and Los Beatos. Europalia 85 España, (for which I am
thankful to Peter Klein, who attended that conference for obtaining a copy for me) a
work in association with a Congress and exhibition held in Brussels, 26 Sept.-30
Nov., 1985, at the Chapelle Nassau, Bibliothèque royale Albert Ier. The catalogue
portion of this book, 99-150, was again done by Mundó and Sánchez Mariana, and
brings the number of extant manuscripts and fragments to thirty-four. Some of these
manuscripts and fragments are not illuminated. Consult the reference list of the Beatus
manuscripts in the present work, which appears below, Chapter II, Section B, 57-59,
and an addendum, in note 8 of the same chapter, which is based principally on this last
catalogue.

12. The complete bibliography for M644 is enormous. However, many of these references
simply are not relevant to the present work. I have been particularly selective in this
regard and, in this note have only indicated references which I felt would build upon
the topics at hand. Thus I have only included those works dealing primarily with the
date and provenance of the codex helpful for Chapter I; for I will consider the date and
provenance of this manuscript in separate studies. In addition, for the sake of brevity, I
have not included references here which are listed in note 1 and the other notes above,
except to refer to them by their last names and dates, a practice which I shall follow
throughout this work. The works which I found to be most pertinent are: Libri
Carruci, 1852; d'Avezac, 1869; J. Tailhan, "Appendice sur le bibliothèques espangoles
du haut Moyen-Age", Nouveaux mémanges d'archéologie, d'histoire, et de littérature sur
manuscrits de l'Apocalypse de Beatus", Mélanges de paléographie et de bibliographie,
Die Weltkarte des Beatus, Stuttgart, 1895, 10, 12; H. L. Ramsay, "Manuscripts of the
Commentary of Beatus of Liebana on the Apocalypse", Revue des Bibliothèques, 12
(1902), 74-103, esp. 77-79; L. Delisle, "La collection des manuscrits de M. Yates
Thompson", Journal des Savants, 1 (1903), 52; Antonio Blasquez, "Los manuscritos
de los Comentarios al Apocalipsis de S. Juan por San Beato de Liébana", Revista de
archivos, bibliotecas y museos, 1906, 257-273, esp. 262; E. A. Lowe, Studia
palaeographica, Munich, 1910, No.43, 65, 79; J. A. Herbert, Illuminated Manuscripts,
London, 1911, 9, 210 ff.; Gómez-Moreno, 1919, 131; Wilhelm Neuss, Die
katalanische Bibelillustration, Bonn, 1922, 63; E. A. Lowe, "On the Date of the Codex
Toletanus", Revue Bénédictine, 35 (1923), 270-271; W. W. S. Cook, "The Earliest
Painted Panels of Catalonia", Art Bulletin, 6 (1923), 46. Pl. XIV, Fig. 19; C. R.
Morey, "The Illuminated Manuscripts of the J. Pierpont Morgan Library", The Arts, 7
(1925), 189-214, esp. 193; W. W. S. Cook, "The Earliest Painted Panels of
Catalonia", Art Bulletin, 8 (1925), 71, Fig. 20; idem, "The Earliest Painted Panels of
Catalonia", Art Bulletin, 10 (1927), 159, Figs. 11, 12; W. Whitehill, "A Beatus
Fragment at Silos", Speculum, 4 (1929), 102-105, esp. 103-105; J. Domiguez
Bordona, Spanish Illumination, Florence, 1930, 13-15 (he also published La miniatura
out to me, and for sending me a photocopy of it); Henri Stierlin, *Le Livre de Feu*, Geneva, 1978, 163-164, 169, 171, 180, 193, 196-197, 210, 214, various figures; *Actas del simposio para el estudio de los codices del "Comentario al Apocalipsis" de Beato de Liébana* (Grupo de Estudios Beato de Liébana, I, Centro de Estudios de Bibliografía y Bibliofilia), I, Madrid, 1978, (hereinafter referred to as *Actas I*) 170, 171-173, 177, 185-189, 251-257; V. García Lobo, "El Beato de San Miguel de Escalada", *Archivos Leoneses*, 33 (1979), 205-270; John Williams, Review of Peter Klein, *Der ältere Beatus-Kodex Vit. 14-1*, Art Bulletin, 61 (1979), 633-636; *Actas del simposio para el estudio de los codices del "Comentario al Apocalipsis" de Beato de Liébana* (Grupo de Estudios Beato de Liébana, I, Centro de Estudios de Bibliografía y Bibliofilia), 2, Madrid, 1980, hereinafter referred to as *Actas II*, 22, 57, 62, 69, 75, 97, 99-104, 109, 110, 115, 208, 209, 210, 217, 320, 324; David Raizman, "The Later Morgan Beatus (M. 429) and Late Romanesque Illumination in Spain", Ph. D. Dissertation, Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1980, 6, note 25 from same page, 16-17, with accompanying notes 26-28, 32-33, 41; Jacques Guilmain, "On the Chronological Development and Classification of Decorated Initials in Latin Manuscripts of Tenth-Century Spain," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 63 (1981), 369-401, esp. 387, 388; Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, *Codices Visigórticos en la Monarquía Leonesa*, Colección "Fuentes y Estudios de Historia Leonesa", ed. Jose M. Fernandez Catón, No. 31. Leon, 1983, No. 41, 336-338, Apéndice I, 483-503 (I am greatly indebted to Peter Klein for sending me a photocopy of this work.); Noureddine Mezoughi, *Le fragment de Beatus illustre (sic) conserve (sic) a Silos (1ere partie)*, *Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa*, No. 13 (1982), 125-151, esp. 135, 136, 143, note 103, Fig. 6; idem, "Le fragment de Beatus illustre conservé a Silos (Intermezzo)*, *Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa*, No. 14 (1983) esp. 2nd page (pages not numbered in this issue); John Williams, "Las pinturas de Comentario", *Los Beatos*, 19-21, esp. 21, 30 and Fig. opposite 60 and Fig. opposite 84 and Fig. opposite, and 86 and Fig. opposite; idem, paper delivered at that conference, which he refused to share with me, but I was able to get notes from several who attended the conference; idem, Paper given at the International Congress at Kalamazoo, May 1984, "The Beatus Commentaries: Some questions"; *El "Beato" de Saint-Sever, ms. lat 8878 de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris*, Madrid, Edilan, 1984, (facsimile, 2 vols., herinafter referred to as *Saint-Sever*, 1984) 14, 24, 25, 26, 31, 51, 100, 239-242, 244, 246, 248, 272-273, 283-284, 288, 290, 292, 317-324; John Williams, paper presented at the Morgan Library in New York, April 2, 1986, in conjunction with the exhibition held at the Morgan, "The Apocalypse: 950-1800." (Again, Williams would not comment with me on this paper, but I was able to get notes from people who attended the lecture; and also was able to listen to a tape made of it which is available in the Morgan archives.); *Saint-Sever, millénaire de l'abbaye*, Colloque international, 25, 26 et 27 mai, 1985, Comité d'études sur l'histoire et l'art de la Gasconne, Mont-de-Marsan, 1986, (herinafter referred to as *Saint-Sever, 1986*) 293, 296-298, 300-302, 304-307, 312; Jerrilyn Dodds, *The Enemy within: Studies in Early Medieval Spanish Architecture*, forthcoming. (I am grateful to her for her generosity in providing me with portions of her typescript.)

13. See Appendix F, below.


16. This was because of its "classical features". Neuss, 1931, 237 ff. For further on this see Chapter III below 82-83.

17. For example, evaluating Emile Mâle's theory that the Beatus illuminations were influential upon the tympana of later, large French church portals, L'art reliequeux du IXe siècle, Paris, A. Colin, 1947 (5th edition) 4 ff. and Fig. 2. In addition, they were preoccupied with Arthur Kingsley Porter's contention that it was Spanish art, in fact, which was influential upon the art of the developing French Romanesque; as for example in his famous article "Spain or Toulouse? and other Questions" which appeared in Art Bulletin, 7 (1924), 1-50; and "Leonese Romanesque and Southern France", Art Bulletin, 8 (1925-26), 235-250, which though was a review of Gómez-Moreno's Provincia de Léon. Catalogo Monumental de España, Madrid, Ministerio de Instrucción Pública, 1925, 2 vols., which was in essence an apologia for Gómez-Moreno's stand on early Spanish art, in particular the Visigothic and Mozarabic, noting, 235, that Geomez-Moreno's Iglesias Mozárabes, was "...more than a successful vindication of the Visigothic thesis against the attacks that had been made upon it ... it was the definitive and well-nigh perfect presentation of one of the most interesting fields which exist in the history of art; it made clear for the first time the importance of the Moorish elements in Spanish and other European architecture and painting; and it revealed the aesthetic beauty of Mozarabic art, hitherto hardly suspected."

18. As for example, 621, in his 1980 work (see note 13 above), where he mentions that Maius did the Morgan Beatus at Escalada in the year 926, but does not note that Maius was responsible for a school of illumination in Spain in the tenth century, or a "renaissance" of book illustration in that century in Spain, which has been suggested by other scholars, such as Williams, 1977. (See Below, Appendix F for more on this topic.) Furthermore, in part of the seventh chapter of Sanchez-Albornoz's same study, which is in part based on his earlier "Libros Leidos", Cuadernos de Historia de España, I and II (1944) 222-238, he notes instead, 641, the great disproportion between the classical books to those of the Early Church Fathers, amongst the donations to monasteries during that period, emphasizing that the fundamental book read was the Bible and the Fathers who explained it. He concludes, 643. "El siglo X fue en el reino asturleonés un siglo de un rudeza incompatible con el florecer de la vida del espíritu." For the career of this dominating scholar in Spanish history, see Jose-Luis Martín, "El occidente español en la alta edad media, según los trabajos de Sánchez-Albornoz", Anuario de Estudios Medievales, 4 (1967), 599-611. Furthermore, Fray Justo Pérez Urbel in Los monjes españoles en la edad media, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1954, I, 360-361, especially, 361, questions the Escalada origin of the work of "Magio", and notes that the Silos fragment is an earlier Beatus, thus implying that Maius' work could not have been the first to be illuminated. Gómez in the face of it all, repeats his theories in 1951 (see note 13 above), 399, so he obviously subscribed to the position that Maius was the inventor of the Beatus iconography throughout his life.
19. 137-291, esp. 146, where he notes that he is trying to resolve the problem. For Maius as inventor, see, 226-227. For the "Escalada" group see 263-265, which is basically Neuss' Branch IIa: M, U, V, J, and D. For the "tabarese" family, see 265-266, which is Neuss' Branch IIb: T (his Tabara A), G (his Tabara B), Tu, M, H, Ar. For more on his stemma, see Chapter II, and Fig. 291 below, which appears on his 264.


21. This work, Klein, 1976, will be discussed more fully below, Chapters II and III below.

22. The papers for this congress were published in two volumes (see above note 12). Klein's presentation was in the second: "La tradición pictórica de los Beatos", Actas II, 83-106.

23. Actas II, 109. I have loosely paraphrased his remarks which in Spanish were: "Pienso... que hay dos o tres puntos que tendriamos que discutir en sesiones menos apretadas de tiempo que éstas, porque ciertamente hay ahí un problema muy importante: a usted le resulta que el manuscrito de Magio no es cabeza de línea, digamoslo así, como has solido considerarse en todos los otros stemmata y, consiguientemente, esto plantea unos problemas de relación con otros manuscritos, alguno de los cuales tendremos ocasión de discutir aquí."

24. These are quite vexing questions which will be addressed in future studies.
CHAPTER I
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF M644

Manuscript No. M644, or the "Early" Morgan Beatus,\(^1\) contains the Commentary on the Apocalypse, and Jerome's Commentary on the Book of Daniel, followed by additional written material which will be referred to below.

A. Description

M644 is a large book presently in an unbound condition,\(^2\) and is currently undergoing conservation work.\(^3\) There are 301 parchment (vellum) leaves, measuring 15 x 11 1/16 inches or 38 x 28 cm. in size\(^4\) with very uneven margins, and many folios give evidence of having been cropped.\(^5\) Many also show stains, particularly at the bottom corners, which turn up as black or "sandy" marks in the illustrations (Figs. 130 and 154).\(^6\) Furthermore, the vellum is quite warped and even crinkled in some places, showing the lack of care typical of many Spanish MSS of this period and earlier. In addition, many of the pages have been patched using later vellum (Fig. 176).\(^7\) The illuminations are scratched, with the paint rubbed off and smudged in many places (Fig. 113).\(^8\) A few folios appear to have been detached and folded up at some point (Fig. 116),\(^9\) but evidence of this kind of rough treatment is not unusual to find in early Spanish manuscripts.\(^10\)

Despite the wide attention that has been given to M644, the codex has actually been collated only a few times: by James in 1902, Ramsay the same year; by the Morgan Library after a reordering of the folios and a rebinding ca. 1940; by V. García Lobo in 1979; and
by William Voelkle, Curator of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts of the Morgan Library, and myself in the past few years.\footnote{1}{James' foliation shows how out of order the manuscript was while in the Thompson collection, and one can assume that Thompson made no changes in the binding after purchasing the codex from Lord Ashburnham.\footnote{12}{The Morgan collation done after the rebinding of ca. 1940 indicates that the quire numerals begin with fol. 15 (really 15v) and appear subsequently in the lower margins on the verso of every eighth folio.\footnote{13}{García's 1979 collation follows the Roman numerals marked up to XXXVIII, and Q marks, for example, q 6 Q, but these do not always consistently appear.\footnote{14}{Yet, at the same time, he indicates that he is using a microfilm, and therefore, one wonders how accurate his reconstruction could be under these circumstances.\footnote{15}{The present collation of the manuscript, done by William Voelkle in September 1985, and added to it by myself is in Appendix A below.\footnote{16}{The collation was done under the best of circumstances, with the manuscript gatherings completely open and available for study, and so should be considered authoritative.\footnote{17}{The reconstruction portion, on which we tentatively agree, however, must be regarded as work in progress.\footnote{18}{As was noted above, M644 includes the Beatus Commentary on the Apocalypse and Jerome's Commentary on Daniel. In addition to these two books, there is prefatory material before the Apocalypse Commentary proper, and additional written work in the last quire of the manuscript, following the colophon at the end of the Commentary on Daniel. The major indicators of the content according to the present collation are:}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{fol.1} & Dedication page, a rectangular framework appearing almost diamond shaped,\footnote{19}{within which is a grid with a play on the abbreviations for the words "Sancti Micaeli Liber", repeated in all directions, but emanating from the center (Fig. 90). [Note: for further information, see D below.]}

\hline
\textbf{fol. 1v-4} & Gospel Book-type Evangelist/Frontispiece Pages, which to me are traditio pages\footnote{20}{(Figs. 91-116).}

\hline
\end{tabular}
Genealogy tables, beginning with Adam and Eve and ending with the rulers of Persia, Rome and Judea (Figs. 117-129).

Beginning of Text proper; Preface: In Nomine Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Incipit Liber Revelationis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi (Figs. 130, 131).

Beginning of Jeromes's Prologue (Fig. 132).

Beginning of Jerome's Explanation of the Apocalypse

Beginning of Apocalypse Commentary; Liber Primus: Incipit tractus de Apocalypsisin Iohannis in expleton suae... (Fig. 133).

Excurus on the Church and Ark (Figs. 154-155).

De Anti-christo.

Anti-christ Table (one is missing in M644) (Fig. 192-2nd table).

Recapitulario.

End of Commentary on Apocalypse. Signature of scribe, Maius Memento (Fig. 225).

De adfinitatibus et gradibus.

Table of Consanguinity (Fig. 226).

Tree of Consanguinity (Fig. 227).

Picture of Babylon (Fig. 228).

Beginning of Jerome's Commentary on Book of Daniel (Fig. 229).

Colophon in small uncials, with thirteen lines excerpting from Jerome's Commentary on Daniel appearing in a later hand below it (Fig. 245).

A note in a XIV century Spanish hand: "Know all who may this letter that I John Lopez am in great trouble with Jews because of moneys which I owe them - I beg God the Father that he may wish to save me from them for his mercy's sake Amen. And I beg these Mozarabic writings that they may help me" (Fig. 248). Below on the same page is the inscription "Obiit Petrus levita C S R" (Fig. 245).

The Morgan Notes indicate that this is a "Discussion of the Apocalypse and comments on Beatus' work" (Fig. 249 for first page, fol. 294). (fol. 298) the unknown author says: "Quod dum dicit Beatus"...and "Idem Beatus qui interfecto anti Christo..." Begins: "In nomine Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Incipit Liber Apocalypsis..." The notes further remark that it is written by the scribe of the thirteen lines below the colophon on fol. 293, which does
not always make the distinction. The hand is later than that of M644 proper and is comparable to that of the Tavara MS dated 968-70.28

The text of M644 conforms to Beatus' third edition of 786, as postulated by Sanders, or Sanders' 1st class of MSS, which includes M D V U and J using Neuss' terminology, or Sanders' Y S V U and M, respectively. (Neuss' Alphabetical list, Chapter II, Section B, 57-59 and Figs. 293, 294.) This edition contains the chapter De Anti-christo as Chapter 6 of Book VI.29 Neuss and Sanders support each other's conclusions regarding the category to which M644 belongs, as Sanders' third edition of the commentary is found in Branch IIa of Neuss' stemma of the Beatus manuscripts (Figs. 293, 294).30

Ramsay, in 1902, noted regarding the text of M644 that "there can be no doubt as to its general excellence; indeed it is not unlikely that this MS will take rank as the principal authority - as the earliest representative of the best textual tradition.".31 Sanders notes: "The first class of manuscripts gives the third, or 786, edition of Beatus in quite uncorrupted form, though the individual manuscripts at times show signs of the influence of other types of text... Y [M] is the oldest and best."32 he continues, "Good passages in which to compare all of the manuscripts of this final edition are the Preface," 1, 9, which contains the dedication to Etherius, the passage having the date of the present era, IV, 5, 16, and the additions, II, 2, 83-90 and VI, 7...33

James, 1902, after consulting with Ramsay, noted a number of leaves of text missing in M644. His references to folios numbers are now out of date as the folios have been reordered; and in addition his text references are to Florez, which is now hardly ever in use, but nevertheless, his point can still be seen.34 Even after the 1940 rebinding, the Morgan Notes report that there are in M644 "a great many leaves of text" missing, corresponding to the portions printed by H. Sanders.35 My research indicates that there
are at least 41 pages missing. Thus there is about twice as much lost than the twenty pages suggested by García Lobo.

In considering the script itself, the Morgan Notes indicate that the text is written in a "medium" Visigothic minuscule by at least five scribes. The Morgan Notes point out that the ı-longa is used and the ti sounds are differentiated. The Notes also state that "the method of dating Visigothic MSS by the form of quae and bus suspensions advanced in 1910 by Dr. E. A. Lowe is disproved by this MS where none of the scribes makes a distinct separation between the dot and comma stroke, though this form is to be found in the Tavara MS".

According to García, the body of the text is, indeed, written in minuscule, but in contrast to the Morgan Notes, he suggests it was done by three hands: that of Maius (fols. lv-293), a scribe who corrects Maius throughout the MS and, a scribe responsible for fols. 294-299. In describing the script of M644, García notes the use of both majuscule and miniscule. The majuscule, he remarks, appears only in the labyrinth dedication, Incipits, Explicitis and Finitis, the subtitles and the initials which appear after the subtitles.

This is in keeping with other manuscripts written in Visigothic script, where the titles contain a mixture of majuscules and letters in an enlarged miniscule form (as for example, Figs. 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 152, 169, 213, 218. The paleographical characteristics of this codex is not the central focus of this study, and thus the matter of the number of scribes is presently not under consideration. Yet five scribes working on one book, as has been suggested by the writer of the Morgan Notes, would seem to be a large number for a scriptorium in a monastery within a realm which was hardly more than a dark ages kingdom.

The Morgan notes also compare the script of 644 with that of Vitr. 14-1 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, a manuscript which has been traditionally attributed to the Castilian monastery of San Millán, and finds the comparison quite favorable. Klein, 1976,
placed the Vitr. 14-1 in León, and would therefore be in agreement with the writer of the Morgan Notes, who seems to feel that both manuscripts came from León. Yet Díaz y Díaz has in several places pointed to a Castilian origin for Maius' handwriting. In the research for the present work, I consistently found that the script of M644 could easily be closely related to a number of Castilian manuscripts of the period, particularly those coming from the scriptorium of Cardena, but these comparisons are as yet inconclusive, for this portion of my investigation has yet to be compiled and systematically analyzed.

While the script is written using various shades of "brown black" ink, running titles, which give the Book numbers, appear in red somewhat inconsistently throughout the codex. There are various marginal rubrics, which are correctly described by the Morgan Notes as follows: "numerals I-vii written opposite the text, correspond to the number of the angel mentioned. The fols. 11-13 have a numerals c-ccc in rubrics for the corresponding verses of the Apocalypse text which are in rubrics throughout. They were not continued in the MS and do not conform to present Vulgate textual divisions. Omissions are indicated at the place by (desunt hic) and supplied in the lower margin followed by the abbreviation SR for super." I have found that often marginal corrections and footnotes appear in other forms, as is seen for example on fol. 130 (Fig. 167).

In considering the page preparations, the ruling is not exactly consistent throughout (Figs. 46, 47), something which Díaz has referred to in pointing out which parts of the manuscript might have been done by Maius himself. The pricking to guide ruling is done for the most part down the center, and though the Morgan Notes indicate that there are "small slits in lieu of pin-pricks", this again is not consistent and will have to be examined more closely later. The writing is mostly in two columns, with about 34 to 35 lines per column. There are numerous titles and acrostics and many footnotes, as noted by the Morgan Notes, and many insertions and corrections, as we have already seen on Fig. 167.
M644 is richly illustrated by miniatures in Mozarabic style.\textsuperscript{54} The illuminations include 62 sumptuous full-page miniatures and diagrams, some extending fully across a single opening, and most having carpet borders; 48 partial-page illustrations, most of which are also enframed; and numerous decorated initials and ornaments. We will first briefly discuss the illuminations.

The Morgan Notes indicate that:

\ldots The outstanding characteristics of the artist's work are neatness, symmetry and care. The illustrations to Daniel are by another, somewhat mediocre artist who does not frame them. One of the outstanding features of Maius' work are his frames, consisting of decorated bands whose ornament is composed of remarkably varied interlace and linear ornament and corner fleurons. The illustrative character of the miniatures is emphasized by the careful labelling of action and elements of interest in the compositions in near uncial letters. The figures have an archaic, unearthly quality. This is due to the intensity of their gazes, achieved by reserving white spots for the almond shaped eyes, whose large black pupils and heavy black outlines contrast with the reddish brown flesh tones. The drapery of the figures is voluminous and by swirling folds and patterns the miniaturist compensates for poor anatomical understanding. A mixture of eastern influences are evident. Some of the bearded, mustached figures are reminiscent of the Gudohinus Gospels from Fleury now at Autun. The headdresses and attitudes of the warriors, as on fol. 142v and the types of Abraham fol. 6, can be duplicated on Greek vase paintings. The short deep skiffs with six oars, that are drawn upon the sea of the world map appear also upon Roman mosaics.\textsuperscript{55} Fol. 177v (sic) has an ancient Roman wine press of the type still in use in Spain, one of which may be seen at Argentona in Catalonia. On fol. 183v there appears a gate, fastened in a way used by the Arabs also still common in Spain. Some of the same stylized patterned animals and high Phrygian caps are found in 8th century Irish art. In certain MSS of St. Gall the swathing, patterned garments may be duplicated. These, with their multicolored linear decoration compensate for the artist's disregard of natural body movement and proportions, entire emphasis being placed on the surface ornamentation.\textsuperscript{56}...

These observations are for the most part correct, but if I would be giving a full description of this aspect of the manuscript, I would have added a classicizing or late Carolingian tendency, in addition to the oriental and insular aspects indicated by the writer of the Morgan Notes.\textsuperscript{57}
The initials and decoration of M644 have been variously dealt with. But James, 1902, gives Maius a better estimation in his decorative work than in his figurai work: "as a designer of ornament our artist is a great deal more successful. Each picture is surrounded by a patterned frame, and the designs of these frames vary throughout the book. There are also at the end of many of the sections rosettes or medallions of conventional ornament which are exceedingly well done."\(^58\) (Figs. 134, 144, 161, 181)

While James did not mention specifically the initials, they are certainly part of the decoration of the book. Guilmain and Williams are among the recent scholars studying the initials, but their inclination has been to deal mostly with the large initials on fol. 10 and fol. 239 (Figs. 130, 131, 229), though Klein, 1976, has reproduced some of the smaller initials which are quite remarkable in themselves.\(^59\) In general, these scholars tend to late Carolingian qualities in these initials.

Taken as a whole, M644 displays typical characteristics of mid-to-third quarter illumination in tenth-century Spain: initials with late Carolingian interlace, stylized floral motifs, semi-Carolingian figures with Islamic intrusions, all placed in front of colored, banded backgrounds reminiscent of the late antique, but hardened into stylized sections. But we have yet to what the date of this manuscript might be.

B. Date

The actual date of production of M644 is still unknown. The problem of the dating is tied in large part to a portion of the colophon which is written in the form of a conundrum now partially erased. The colophon, following M. R. James and V. García Lobo, reads:

Resonet uox fidelis. resonet et concrepet. maius quippe pusillus/exobtansque iubilet et moduliter resonet et clamitet.
Mementote enim mihi uernuli xpi quorum quidem hic degetis cenobii summi dei nuntii Micahelis arcangeli.
Ad paboremque patroni arci summis* scribens ego. imperansque abba
uiotis/equidem undus amoris eius libri usione Iohanni dilecti discipuli.
Inter eius decus urba mirifica storiarumque depinxi per seriem/ut scientibus
tereant iudicii futuri aduenti peracturi saeculi.**
Ut suppled uidelicet codix huius inducta reducta quoque duo gemina/[erased words]
terna centes et*** terna bina era.
Sit gloria patri soli filioque spiritu simul cum sancto trinitate/per cuncta secla seclis
infinitis temporis (Fig. 246).60

The "free" translation of this colophon by E. A. Lowe in 1940 was:

Resound, ye voices of the faithful, let Maius also, puny though he is./
Let him also rejoice, resound and shout.
Remember me, servants of Christ, you who dwell in the/
Abbey of the Messenger of God the highest, the Archangel Michael.
In fear of the exalted patron I write this at the behest of Abbot Victor/
In love for the book which treats of the vision of John the Beloved disciple/
The glorious words and comments I have illustrated in sequence/
So that those who know may be smitten with fear of the judgement/which will
come with the world's end
And the time taken to finish this book from beginning to end/
Represents the era of two pairs of three times three hundred/
And three times ten twos ( = 960 - 38 = 922 A.D.)
Glory to the Father, to his only Son, also to the Holy Ghost and the /Trinity. From
the generation to generations, to the end of time.61

The dating for this codex varies according to how one interprets the part of the
colophon which refers to the date, the third and fourth lines from the bottom of the text.
For example, James, while describing the manuscript indicates that it was done "in the year
932 (1. 10). This... date is do doubt given according to the Spanish era, which is 38
years in advance of ours. In our reckoning the date is 894 A. D."62 Lowe, in Oct. 1940,
suggested to the Morgan the following: "And the time taken to finish this book from
beginning to end represents the era of two pairs of three times three hundred and three
times ten twos...", which he postulated would be 960, and which, subtracting 38 years
for the Spanish era, would be 922. Rand, the following month, offered: "Since now the
two halves of this finished book have been brought on and brought again in the era an
hundred times thrice three and thrice ten and two...", which he read as 894 A.D. of the
Spanish era.63 Other suggestions have been as follows: Gómez Moreno, 926; Neuss,
922, Camón Aznar, first 952 and then 958. These later dates Camón obtained by interpreting the "duo gemina" right before the erasure as referring to the content of the codex, the Commentary on the Apocalypse and Jerome's Commentary on Daniel, and not to the date, as Gómez Moreno had done. His calculation is thus based on the words "ter terna centies et ter dena bina era", and is: 3 three hundreds + 3 thirties + 3 twos = 996 in the Spanish era, or 958 A.D. However, Díaz points out the curious conundrum of the year given by the form "duo gemina...ter terna centies et ter dena bina era". He continues that he is interested in pointing out only that the word "centies" is impossible. Remembering that Magio died in 968, according to the colophon of the Beatus of Tábara, he thinks that the solution of Ramsay gives more reasonable results, that is to say "duo gemina decies" = 40, "et ter terna centies" = 900, "et ter dena" = 60, which would give the year 1000, or 962 of the Spanish era. He goes on to note that this date is later than that proposed by all the scholars who tenuously suggest a date in the first quarter of the tenth-century. What is clear here is that there are varying opinions on the exact date of this book based on the colophon, and those are not likely to change as long as the cryptic nature of the colophon, and the erasures cannot be deciphered and understood. Other means of dating this manuscript are by its script and its style. Even Neuss, though he read the colophon as 922, indicated that by its script it was datable to the first half of the tenth century, and more probably to the end of that half. Nordenfalk and Klein have followed him in this, thus lending some credence to Camón's interpretation of the colophon.

While the exact date of M644 is ultimately important for placing the manuscript within the frame of reference of tenth-century Spanish manuscript illumination as a whole, it has small bearing on the main topic of this dissertation. As so many learned scholars have not been able to find an exact date in the puzzle of the colophon, we will, instead turn
to the problem of the provenance, which like the date of the manuscript is also still in doubt.

C. Provenance

If one accepts the theory of García Lobo, M644 may have been in the monastery of San Miguel de Escalada during the fourteenth century due to a fourteenth century inscription found on fol. 293v of the MS, "Obiit Petrus levita C S R (canonicus Sancti Rufi)" (Fig. 248); and in the fourteenth century Escalada was in the hands of the congregation of St. Rufus of Avignon. It was reasonable for García to suggest this as "Petrus de Valencia levita canonicus Sancti Rufi" appears in one of the funeral inscriptions of Escalada published by Gomez Moreno, Catálogo. The MS was given to Convent of Uclés in 1567 by the archbishop of Valencia, Martin Pérez de Ayala. It remained at Uclés until the nineteenth century, when it was acquired by Roberto Frasinelli c.1840, who was under the impression that it had come from Valcavado. It was obtained by G. B. Libri Carruci, c. 1847 by way of Francisque Michel, and sold to Lord Ashburham, c. 1852. As Libri indicated to the Earl that the MS had come from Valcavado, it was for a time confused with the Valladolid MS. In spite of the confusion of the origins surrounding it, the manuscript was acquired by the Earl, and was later sold to Thompson in 1897. While it was in the Thompson collection, the confusion with the Valladolid manuscript was alleviated by James. It subsequently entered the Morgan collection in 1919 via Quaritch.

There are a few details in the book itself which may be pertinent in the consideration of the provenance of the manuscript. While some of these may be really useful for the earliest history of the book, others may be less so. For example, on fol. 1 at the lower left there appears a decorative, somewhat heraldic design, which has not been mentioned in the literature, and at first I thought it might be some sort of library signature (Fig. 90), I now
tend to believe that it was some sort of heraldic symbol associated with the production of
the manuscript. If such a symbol could be found elsewhere, we might be able to make
further suggestions as to the origin of the manuscript. In addition, on fol. 10, there is an
ex libris note with the words "de real Biblioteca del Escorial", apparently added by Libri,
but this is so entirely obliterated that it is hardly visible today. More encouraging is some
interesting tracery on folio 3v (Figs. 107, 108) which has been added in brown ink to the
plain red background in the center of the page to the left of the column which separates the
standing and seated figures. This tracery appears to be later than the other portions of the
artwork, probably thirteenth or fourteenth century in origin. There are also scribblings
throughout the manuscript, for example in the margins, which are in a 17th century
Spanish hand, indicating that the MS was still in Spain at that time (Figs. 250, 251, 252,
253).81

Most promising, though, is a decoration which appears at the end of the second
column of writing on fol. 152 (Fig. 153), and which looks very much like a tenth century
signature and might possibly give some clue as to the area in which the manuscript was
produced by carefully comparing it with other examples of signatures from León during
this period (Figs. 183, 255). In addition, similar signature types appear on fol. 193
(Figs. 204, 257), though these, which appear under the lower right arcade, might rather be
construed to be hands or fingers pointing to abbreviations above them for "sanctus"
repeated twice. These marks along with the "signature" notation have not to my
knowledge been commented upon elsewhere in the scholarship on M644.

The place of origin of M644, is still not determined, though Gómez-Moreno
suggested in 1919 that it might have been done at St. Miguel de Escalada, due to the
dedication page to St. Michael, fol. 1, and the colophon on fol. 293 which indicates that it
was produced for a monastic community dedicated to St. Michael (Figs. 90, 247). Most
scholars tentatively accept this suggestion, as the manuscript is Mozarabic in style, and
Escalada was founded by Mozarabic monks c. 913 (Figs. 261, 262, 263, 264). Other monasteries have been suggested, however, and the Morgan Library Notes include some of these: San Miguel de Sorba near Leon, San Miguel in Valle Ardon, near Valcavado, San Miguel de Burgos, San Miguel de Camarzana, and San Miguel de Obona near Ovideo. The writer of the Morgan Notes seems to favor San Miguel de Camarzana. Some have suggested that Maius the painter/scribe of the MS was a monk of Tâbara, and thus perhaps the manuscript was produced there. However, the most recent published assessment of the provenance problem is that of García Lobo, who sees it as originating from and dedicated to San Miguel de Escalada.

Though, as noted above, the third and fourth lines from the bottom of the colophon, by which the date is computed have generated the most controversy in the past, the lines which are interesting in this instance are three through five at the top. The interpretation of these lines is the problem. As we have already seen, the Morgan Notes give two slightly different translations of the colophon, both by renowned scholars in their field, one by Lowe and the other by Rand.

However different these translations may be in their interpretations, there is the clear implication that the manuscript was done either at, or for a monastery dedicated to St. Michael at the command of an Abbot Victor. The search for the geographical location for the monastery has, therefore, been traditionally tied to "Abbots Victors" wherever they might have been. The dating of M644 has been associated by some this way as well.

However, García Lobo has offered a different interpretation of the colophon which is of some interest. He feels that in line five of the colophon, the noun, "victoris", in the genitive, does not seem to refer to "imperansque abba", in the nominative, but rather to "Michaelis arcangeli", as do "summi Dei nuntii" and "patroni arci summi". He therefore is claiming that this is a reference to Michael's victory over satan. He associates the words "exobtansque", "scribens", "imperansque", and "abba" with Maius himself, who he
suggests was not only the painter and scribe of the manuscript but was the abbot of the monastery as well.93

As with the question of the date of M644, the problem of the provenance of M644 is outside the area of direct concern of this dissertation. However, the dedication to St. Michael leaves us with the interesting problem of why the book was dedicated to a saint and not to an abbot. This may have something to do with the usage of the book.

D. Use of the Book

We have noted above that García has given a new interpretation to the colophon based on a different reading of the Latin.94 His interpretation has basically changed the emphasis in the colophon from Abbot Victor to Maius.95 We will now explore the possibilities which García Lobo’s theory offers us.

The "Book of Michael" (SCI MICAELI LB) which is on the Ex-Libris page of the M644 (Fig. 90) is apparently in this instance equivocated with the Apocalypse, as St. Michael is the conveyor of souls to heaven, and is called upon in the Mass of the Dead in most rites.96 The dedication page in M644, is generally taken to read "SCI MICAELI LB" (some say LIBRUM rather than LB, and some say LIB SCI MICAELI), or "Sancti Micaeli Liber". It is, like the colophon, a conundrum, with the letters moving outward from the center in all directions. These letters do not reverse themselves. Furthermore, though this grid-like diagram has often been referred to as a "jeu de lettres", which has been seen occasionally in manuscripts since antiquity, there may be some mystical significance in the way the letters are arranged, namely, St. Michael as the "freer" of the souls rather than the "book" of him.97

In the commentary, a traditional meaning is given to St. Michael, which is to say that, according to Beatus, Michael is not only interpreted as the dragon fighter, but as the protector of the people named in the Book of Life as well. A dedication to St. Michael for a
commentary on the last book of the Bible is therefore not strange. In the Beatus Commentaries St. Michael appears fighting the dragon, along with a small army of angels, for example, in one of the illuminations in the M644, fols. 152v-153 (Figs. 184-186), can also mean the weigher of souls of the later Middle Ages. Yet it is clear that there was a cult which developed in the primitive church around Michael, and as he was the protector of souls, he was one of the saints early venerated in the church. This is evidenced by the attention given to him in the Bible and by the Early Church Fathers. I am surmising that the "Book of Michael" which some scholars referred to in the dedication page, not only relates to a monastery of St. Michael, but also is associating the abbey with the Apocalypse in various ways. One of these is possibly the Mass of the Dead, involving the weighing of the souls.

Michael is appealed to as an intercessor for the Souls at death in the Roman Rite, and since the cult of St. Michael originated in the east it could at some point been an influence on the Mozarabic Rite. However, Jungmann indicates that the Spanish Liber Ordinum contains a mixture of old Roman Materials. No matter what the source, it is possible that this Beatus copy was done for a monastery dedicated to Michael, giving the patron and the painter/scribe the perfect opportunity to express an iconographic program which may in fact have had similar meanings for other monasteries as well, though the program worked especially well for this particular monastery, dedicated as it was to the messenger of Christ and who like Christ was also a victor over Satan.

There also may be some significance in why "Maius memento" appears at the end of the Apocalypse (Fig. 225), and on the colophon page (Fig. 247). The "memento" implies not just a "remember me" sort of signature, but according to Catholic liturgy, is an intercessory prayer, or diptych, which can be offered in mass for either the living or the dead. Therefore, Maius was asking for serious consideration on the part of his readers, when he twice implored them for a "memento".
The rest of García's argument is, briefly, that in the acrostic of the colophon, the first letters of the alternating lines spell out R-M-A-I-U-S. He accounts for the "R" as referring to the actual name of the abbot, Recesvintus, who was abbot at Escalada in 940 or within the generally accepted lifetime of Maius. The "Maius" portion of the abbot's name, then, García accounts for as a surname to distinguish it from other Recesvintuses who were abbots at the time. This could possibly be the case. However, in the Roman Rite, there is a feast of St. Michael celebrated in May, which could account for the "Maius". This feast, celebrated until recently was on May 8th, and commemorated an apparition of the saint on Mt. Garganus in the time of Pope Gelasius. The abbot, whose name started with an "R" could have also taken as a name or used the word of "May" to emphasize the special message implied in his special book which he was leaving to his monastery. If one could somehow establish through a reading of the colophon that García's somewhat inventive interpretation is correct, that could also explain in part the new iconography which appears in the book.

In Studi Medievali Werckmeister showed the connection of the St. Sever Beatus with the Mass of the Dead, and in Actas II he demonstrated that Vitr.14-2, the Beatus of Fernando and Sancha, was a part of the King and Queen's preparation for death. He furthermore indicated in the same paper that the Silos Last Judgment was also connected with the Mass of the Dead. As Werckmeister argues, the connection of M644 with the Mass of the Dead seems at this point to be even stronger than Werckmeister suggested, based upon my interpretation of the dedication page as has been discussed above.

M644, obviously has a program attaching the Apocalypse to St. Michael, and implications of intercessions for both the living and the dead. Werckmeister indicates firmly in his article in Actas II that Maius was not offering Christological concepts to his readers in the colophon to the manuscript, but was writing in fear of the judgment: he quotes the lines "Inter eius decus uerba mirifica storiarumque depinxi per seriem ut
However, I believe that the basic program of the M644 is highly Christological, and canonical in nature, and for this reason, apart from the dedication page which can be interpreted as referring to Michael as the "liberator", the codex is made up of the following component parts: (1) the authoritative "traditio" pages where Christ gives the authority to the gospels and to their authors to preach them; (2) the genealogy pages which deal with the ancestors of Christ and the events leading up to his birth; (3) the storiae of the Apocalypse and the accompanying commentary, including the additional material in the prologue to Book II on the Synagogue and the Church and the addenda to Book II on the Ark, all adding up to the dramatic final moments of the Last Judgment and the Vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem; (4) the Anti-christ Tables and the Table and Tree of Consanginuity which help guide the faithful to prepare for the Last Judgment; (5) the Commentary on Daniel, a lesson of faith also in preparation for the Last Judgment. (6) The Cross of Oviedo, fol. 219, right before the scenes of the Last Judgment, placed so as to give a sign of victory, or the triumph of Christ to the faithful before the final judgment takes place; (7) the words MAIUS MEMENTO, at the end of the Apocalypse, probably acting both as a signature and as an appeal to intercessory prayers; (8) finally, the colophon, with its appeal to those who live in the monastery dedicated to Michael, the saver of souls, and its cryptic double reference to MAIUS also reinforce the message.

Furthermore, unlike Werckmeister suggests, I do not believe that the terror of the Last Judgment and Christology should necessarily imply two separate issues. The orthodox belief in the union of the Divine and human natures of Christ is stressed throughout the commentary as a prerequisite for salvation at the final judgment. The terror of the judgment, should, therefore, be an adequate inspiration for one to contemplate and accept the true nature of Christ.
In addition to the religious usage of the book, there are also political ones in the Beatus Commentaries, and particularly in the Silos Beatus, where there are a total of five crosses: three prefatory crosses, one right before the Last Judgment, and one at the end of the codex (Figs. 268, 269, 270, 205, 271). These crosses, particularly the one right before the Last Judgment seem to equivocate the victories of the kings of the Astrolonese kingdom with Christ's victory over the Anti-christ and death. Though it is no longer extant at the beginning of M644, the collation reconstruction shows that a Cross of Oviedo was possibly there (Fig. 2). The traditional suggestions have been that this cross, Merovingian and Visigothic in inspiration, and long used by the Asturian and Asturoleonese kings, is a political as well as a religious motif (Figs. 272, 273, 274, 275, 276). It is very likely that M644 was produced in a closed court circle in which the neo-Visigothic ideal was vigorously being called upon to rally together a nation experiencing economic and political difficulties. However, in the midst of the production of the book, a new influence which could be most properly called "Carolingian" was incorporated into the work. This stylistic element, while not necessarily religious in character, carried with it an impact which had not previously been seen in the Christian Kingdoms of the Peninsula. It was somewhat retardaire and classicizing, leaving one to speculate just what the late-Carolingian references might be. Apparently, the leaders of the Astrolonese kingdom had finally come to the conclusion that in the latter part of the tenth century, the kingdom needed a sort of cementing, both religiously and politically. They were two centuries behind Charlemagne, but not too late. They had, in fact, their own rather successful way of dealing with their political and religious problems.

One of these can be seen in the theme of the Feast of Beltasaar, which is presented in M644, and has been called upon many times to demonstrate the Islamic influences in that manuscript. The scene which appears on fol. 255v (Fig. 239), shows the feast enclosed within an arch having voussoirs which alternate between red and white, which has often
been considered as an obvious reference to the Mosque at Cordoba (Fig. 277). However seductive to the Christian North El-Andalus must have seemed, this scene in M644, reveals the political nature of the real situation of the times: the power structure of the Christian North and the Islamic South of the Iberian Peninsula had intermarried, and cousins, and even more closely related individuals were often not on easy terms. The same scene in the Valcavado Beatus, fol. 204, (Fig. 278) is even more indicative of the way the northern Christian kingdoms felt about the lascivious character of the Islams than in M644, with Beltazaar and his comrades looking very evil and enjoying themselves very much. This illustration could well be the product of an impoverished northern court looking south with jealous eyes. Certainly the Cordoban court had assets even well beyond those of Rome at that time, and the Northern Christian Kingdoms could not fail to note the difference. Dodds believes that this scene is a political statement made by Mozarabs who had come north from Cordoba and were still smarting from the problems which they had experienced under Islamic rule. Dodds also strongly feels that the Mozarabs who came north almost burst out with their ideas which had been constrained under the Islamic rule; I feel as well that they brought with them the old Visigothic traditions. I am certain that she is correct in her examination of the problem; and that in addition, this particular scene of Beltazaar's feast reveals more of the Christian court's attitude towards the opulence of the southern part of the peninsula at that time than we elsewhere.

Thus M644 undoubtedly must have had a dual purpose: both religious and political. It attempted to prepare the Christian monks for the impending death and rebirth in Christ; and at the same time brought attention to the fact that there was a daily struggle of the Christian kingdoms against the "heathens" or the "infidels" who had invaded their peninsula.
Notes to Chapter I

1. As opposed to the "Later" Morgan Beatus, M429 of 1220 from Las Huelgas, or "H". See Chapter II, Beginning of Section B, below for a list of Neuss' alphabetical equivalents, and Raizman, 1980. The Early Morgan manuscript, as was noted above in the introduction, will be referred to as M644 or M throughout this dissertation. There is now a new Morgan Beatus, M 1079, which has recently been purchased. I am grateful to my friend William Voelkle, Curator of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts at the Morgan Library for sending me the following "preliminary" description of this new manuscript:

"M.1079 MISCELLANY of genealogical documents and autograph letters from ca. 1479-1618, together with 7 seventeenth-century colored drawings of a lost Beatus manuscript.

"The most interesting contents in this miscellany, compiled in the seventeenth century by the Aragonese historian Juan Francisco Andres de Uztarroz (1605-77), are the 7 colored drawings at the beginning of the volume. Made in 1635 by the historian Vincente Juan de Lastanosa (1607-84) at the request of the provincial father of the monastery of San Francisco de Monte Aragon in northern Spain, the drawings faithfully copy seven pages from a now lost Beatus manuscript. The first two drawings, an Antichrist table and a second, unidentified table (fols. 6v-7), are followed by an Oviedo Cross, a popular Spanish symbol for victory over the Saracens (fol. 10v). The cross faces an acrostic table which repeats the words LIBRVM VRBI LABBA (fols. 11v-12). The last drawing reproduces the original incipit page of the Beatus text (fol. 12v).

"The monastery of Monte Aragon was founded in 1086 by King Sanchez V Ramirez of Aragon (d. 1094). If the "Rex Ranimirus" mentioned in the acrostic tables is in fact Sanchez V, it is tempting to think that the manuscript copied by Lastanosa was a gift from the king to the monastery of Monte Aragon at the time of its founding.

"Although only copies, the drawings in our miscellany do document the appearance of an important and otherwise unknown Beatus manuscript. They therefore make welcome additions to the two Beatus codices already in the Library ( M. 439 (sic), [should be 429], M. 644).

"The miscellany was later in the collection of the noted "vellomane" Sir Thomas Philllips (1792-1872)."

It is included in the addendum to Neuss' list, found in note 8, Chapter II below.

2. The Morgan staff speaks of it as "dis-bound", or unstitched and completely taken apart, a condition in which it is. The Morgan Notes indicate that it was formerly bound in English nineteenth century purple velvet over boards, and then rebound by M. Lahey in 3/4 niger in c. 1940. This was the cover when I first saw the book in the late '70's, except that the back of the binding had been released in order to photograph the codex.
3. The gutters are being meticulously scraped and cleaned of excessive glue by the conservator, something which is quite necessary as the amount of glue on the back of the spine obscured much of the foliation in many parts of the codex.

4. James, 1902, 304, notes that there are 302 fols., as does Sanders, 1930, XII. García Lobo, 1979, 231, notes, however that there are 301 fols. His reconstruction would make the MS originally have 327 fols., of which these 301 have survived. James, ibid, notes the fols. size to be 15 x 11 inches. Sanders, ibid, indicates 14.87 by 11 inches, or 38 by 28 cm.

5. Libri notes in a letter of April 19, 1848 that "Les marges du parchemin étaient en tres mauvais état et tombaient partout. Je les fis restaurer avec soin, sans toucher nullement ni aux miniatures, ni à l'écriture". García, 1979, 230, "Las cubiertas son lisas, quizá de piel, con los lomos reforzados. Quizá de deba al propio Libri, quien su día intervino en el manuscrito." While the covers he is referring to are actually twentieth century, I suspect that Libri did in fact "operate" on the book, as by his own admission he felt he must do. Thus he is very likely the one who cropped the margins, taking away the most damaged portions, but I am not sure who is responsible for some of the other repairs to pages, as the conservation of this manuscript is not referred to in the Morgan Notes, and no one at the Morgan until now has been actively concerned with this problem. As to whether Libri actually did not touch the miniatures or the writing, that remains to be seen.

6. James, 1902, 304, notes that "the lower R. corners of the leaves have suffered from damp, especially at the beginning."

7. An example is on fol. 140-140v.

8. Some of the poor condition of the waxy paint is due to simply being worn from meeting the opposite page, which often crinkles in a slightly different way.

9. In addition to fol.4 (Fig. 114), this can be seen on fols. 1-1v and 3-3v (see Figs. 92 - 113, noting particularly the details).

10. The story of manuscript pages used to wrap items is told often by old monks in Spain, and it can quite readily be seen in some of the pages of the manuscripts which have been retrieved and inserted into their appropriate place.

11. Also a collation has been done by Debra Evert, the Morgan Conservator, as she took the book apart, and to which I am grateful for her sharing with me. I also understand that John Williams has recently done a collation in preparation for his forthcoming corpus on the Beatus manuscripts. For further references see the footnotes to the following discussion.

12. James, 1902, 304. Ramsay, 1902, 78-79, also noted this, and mentioned that this was so particularly in the first part. Consulting with each other they tried to reconstruct it,
and their results are found not only in their separate works, but in James' Appendix III, ibid, 373. Neuss, 1931, used the fol. enumeration from the old nineteenth century binding, and so as a consequence, many of his fol. nos. for M644 are incorrect. As a matter of historical interest, James' foliation, ibid, is as follows: 1 fly leaf 1 a4 (4 canc.) b4 || ii6 (wants 2) iii10 (5 canc.; nothing after 8) iiiii8 v8 or (+ four after 2:) + 4*: vi6 viiiii8 x6 xi8 xiiii8 xviii8 XVIII viiiii8 xx8 (wants 1,2) xiiii8 xvi8 (wants 4, 5) xiiiiiiii8 xvi8 xvi8 (wants 4) xvi8 (wants 2) xviixii8 (wants 8) xixiiii8 xxxii8 xxxiiiiii8 xxx (wants 7, 8 blank?) x xi8 xxxviii8 xxxvi8 xxxviiii8 (wants 8 blank) || xil8. One fly leaf. Thus James' collation has forty quires. He notes, 373-374, after consulting Ramsay, the true order of the leaves and the missing pages, but the fol. numbers were not given in his collation.

13. This is not exactly true, as some are missing. See collation in Appendix A. James, 1902, 304, notes that "The quires are numbered wrongly, by an old hand, on the last leaf of each." These marks are done in the tenth century style, but an analysis of the ink should be made to see if they might be later attempts to copy an earlier style. The fact that the first of these appears on fol. 15v has led some scholars to believe that the first fifteen pages of the book were added later. See, for example, García, 1979, who puts all 15 first pages of the book into his first quire (see note 14 below). The foliation given by the Morgan Notes as follows: 18-3, 28-4, 38-2, 48, 58-2, 68-6, 78-5, 88, 98, 108, 118, 126, 138, 148, 158, 168, 178-1, 188, 198, 208, 218-2, 228, 238, 248-1, 258-1, 268, 278, 288-1, 298, 308-2, 318, 328, 338, [where are 34, 35, 36, 37, 38?] 398-2, 40, 418, 428, 438, 448, 458, 468-1, 478-1= 300. Sanders, 1930, XII, notes the last 7 leaves to be from another MS. A letter to the Morgan library from him dated 12/3/1940 notes: "In my notes of long ago I find the statement that the extra quire was made up in the 11th century from the Daniel and Apocalypse commentaries. Brief examination confirms this view, though there are many extracts which I did not locate in either work . . . I can refer them to no known ms. certainly not to No. 644. Perhaps some relationship to the Silos type. This quire is not an Apologetic (sic) a part thereof. I know no other Beatus Ms that has similar added material." See Morgan Notes, 2.

14. As we remarked above, note 5, Libri probably cropped the worst portions of the margins, and I originally thought that this might account for some of the missing quire marks. However as our new collation/reconstruction shows (See Appendix A) the missing quire marks are due to missing last pages of some of the quires. García's, collation, 230-231, is as follows: I, del 1-15=16 [fols.]; II, 16-23=8; III, 24-29=7; IV, 30-31=2; V, 32-34=3; VI, 35-42=8; VII, 43-50=8; VIII, 51-58=8; VIII, 59-66=8; X, 67-74=8; XI, 75-80=7; XII, 81-88=8; XIII, 89-96=8; XIII, 97-104=8; XV, 105-111=7; XVI, 112-119=8; XVII, 120-137=8; XVIII, 128-135=8; XVIII, 136-143=8; XX, 144-149=5; XXI, 150-157=8 (Su orden correcto es: 150, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 152 y 153); XXII, 158-164=7; XXIII, 165-171=7; XXIII, 172-179=8; XXIV, 180-187=8; XXVI, 188-194=7; XXVII, 195-200=6; XXVIII, 201-208=8; XXVIII, 209(20)-215=7; XXX, 216-223=8; XXXI, 224(20)-230=7; XXXII, 231-238=8; XXXIII, 239-246=8; XXXIII, 247-254=8; XXXIV, 255-262=8; XXXVI, 263-270=8; XXXVII, 271-278=8; XXXVIII, 279-286=8; XXXVIII, 287-294=8, XL, 295-300=6. His foliation indicates 40 quires of 8 fols., with the exception of his first
one which as we have already noted, has 16. We get 43 quires instead of García's 40 (the 43 not accounting for the quire added later).

15. Ibid, 230. Appendix A (Figs. 1-45) below shows that there are many more pages missing than the pages suggested by James and Ramsay in 1902, and by García's collation.

16. Voelkle's collation follows one that I made in 1981 remarkably closely, though I had some difficulty making exact determinations in some places due to the large amount of glue which was then on the back of the spine, which his collation, with the glue almost removed and the gatherings revealed, now makes clear.

17. M644, according to Voelkle, will be rebound in the near future in two volumes, I= fols. 1-150, and II= fols. 150-end. This new binding will be done loosely enough for future archaeological study of the MS. The collation of the individual Beatus manuscripts is important. For example, in the case of M644 it can help us reconstruct iconography which was originally in the codex but which is no longer extant. This has an important bearing upon our consideration of the interrelationships of the manuscripts. See the discussion in Chapter III below.

18. For a page by page description of the contents of the book, in addition to all the illustrative material reproduced in my figures, see García Lobo, 1979, 231-244. I have recently received Noureddine Mezoughi's notes on the manuscript through the courtesy of Mirelle Mentré to whom I am very grateful. I will, therefore, put these together with my own notes and publish a new description, as Noureddine and I had planned to do prior to his death. As for the color of the illustrations, since it is not the primary aim of this dissertation, I refer the reader to the reproductions of Williams in his work of 1977, for an idea of the color appearance of the book.

19. A true diamond shape is essentially a tilted upright rhombus, wherein the top and bottom angles are unequal to the side ones. The shape on the dedication page in M644 may also be called a lozenge, as James, 1902, 311 termed it, as it is a four-sided equilateral form whose opposing angels are equal. Compare this with the dedication page in the St.-Sever, fol. 1, where the inner lozenge with the word-play is overlapped by a larger, decorative diamond interwoven with a larger foliated rectangle, as is reproduced, 248, in Saint-Sever, 1986.

20. See my unpublished MA Thesis, "Christus Traditor: The Traditiones on the Evangelist Pages of the Beatus of St. Sever", Ohio State University, 1971; also my unpublished paper, "The Evangelist Imagery in the Beatus Manuscripts: A Reconsideration" given at Kalamazoo in 1982, where I argue this point. Williams, 1965 and 1980, takes a different view, that the figures on the left-hand side of each pair of pages are the evangelists with witnesses. For more discussion on this, see below, Chapter V, 135, and note 36.
21. For these, see Neuss, 1931; Williams, 1980; and Zaluska, 1984 and 1986. But there is much early material to which they have not referred. See for example, A. R. Millar, Assyrian Eponym Lists, Brill, London, 1977. Though such schemata are still to be seen on a few Roman cemetery walls, Charles Sciglia has indicated to me that one immediate source for Spanish manuscripts, both Bibles and Beatus Commentaries might be Carolingian court genealogies. This suggestion calls for further investigation.


23. See Neuss, 1931; Klein, 1976; and Appendix A, below, Fig. 27. I have included one of the Anti-christ Tables in V (Fig. 217), to give an approximate idea of the missing table, though the borders and some of the internal material are probably very different in character from M.

24. This page is out of order, and belongs between the present fols. 233 and 234. See James, 1902, 327, who notes it as 235v, and Ramsay, 1902, 79, who indicates it to be fol. 234v, which is closer to where it really belongs. The fact that there is a discrepancy between the numbering of James and Ramsay which to my mind may be overlooked in the greater consideration that when the book was rebound in 1940, the fol. was simply misplaced, perhaps due in some part to Ramsay's remark, ibid., that fol. 234v (actually 233 bis at this point: See Appendix A, Fig. 36 below) was a "Picture of Babylon, apparently connected with the Commentary of S. Jerome on Daniel which commences a few pages further on." This leaf was loose when I first examined the book in the late '70's, but I felt strongly by 1980 that it should belong right after the end of the Beatus Commentary proper. My instinct was confirmed by my friend Noureddine Mezoughi, whose intelligence and sensitive perception is greatly missed, in one of our discussions on M644 in Paris, summer of 1984, and who subsequently published what we both believed to be the true place of this fol. in his article, "La place de Babylone entourée de serpents entre l'Apocalypse et le Livre de Daniel dans les Beatus", Saint-Sever, 1986. See also Y. Zaluska, "L'image de Babylone et le cycle de Daniel", Saint-Sever, 1984, 315-320, esp. 319, where she notes that she concurs with Mezoughi that the Morgan Babylon is currently out of order.

25. The Morgan Notes, 2, indicate that this is a hand that does not make the ti distinction. This notation probably comes from both Lowe and Rand.

26. Ibid. The identity of the individual who made the translation is unknown, and in addition the century of this hand needs to be confirmed. It is interesting that the author of this note, presumably written in the fourteenth century, was appealing to "these Mozarabic writings" for help, almost as if Mozarabic writings had some powerful way of alleviating his problem.

27. Ibid. This inscription is one which led Garcia to believe that M644 had been produced at Escalada. For more on this see below, Provenance.
28. Ibid. Again as the case of the other material following the colophon, this attribution would need to be confirmed, but Díaz y Díaz has dealt with this material in Codices Visigoticos en la Monarquía Leonesa, Leon, 1983, 486-503, and has found that it to be basically a summary of the Beatus Commentary and that of Daniel. He indicates, 486, that for the Beatus portions he has used Sanders, 1930; for the De ad finitatem, the edition of the Etymologies of W. M. Lindsay; and for the Commentary on Daniel, the edition of G. Glorie, LXXV, A. Turnhout, 1964, editions which I have used in my research, but never connected with the last quire of the book. Again, I must gratefully thank my friend, Peter Klein, for sending me a photocopy of this material.


30. Neuss, 101. See also Klein's stemmata, Figs. 295, 296, 300 below, as well, as they integrate the work of Neuss and Sanders into an understandable diagram.

31. Ramsey, 1902, 79. He also noted that the text of the MS. "has suffered a good deal of "correction" by a later hand. See discussion below of script.

32. Sanders, 1930, XVII.

33. Ibid.

34. Lames' Appendix III, 373-374. His lacunae are as follows: after fol. 8, one leaf missing; after fol. 12, some genealogical table missing; fol. 15, the lower half "wanting"; after fol. 16, probably two leaves missing; after fol. 20, several leaves (Florez, p. 60 5-76.11); after fol. 28, several leaves (Florez 81, 28-98.15); after fol. 105, one leaf missing; after fol. 144, one leaf missing; after fol. 145, one leaf missing; after fol. 170 (which should follow fol. 160), one leaf missing; after fol. 169, one leaf missing; after fol. 190, one leaf missing; after fol. 195, one leaf missing; and after fol. 208, one leaf missing. Taking the "true order" of the fols. of M644 into consideration, which he notes above his lacunae list as follows: fols. 8-12, 30-33, 1-7, 21-26, 13-20, 27-28, 35-39, 29, 34, 40-160, 170, 161-169, 171-end, one can compare with what we now have in order to reconstruct the proper order of the MS. Compare with Appendix A.

35. Sanders, 3. These are, according to the Notes, 54-61, 73-91, 98-127, 432, 436, 472-474, 500, 590-593.

36. See Appendix A

37. See García Lobo, 1979, 231.

38. Morgan Notes, 3. I am not exactly certain of what "medium" Visigothic minuscule means, and at this point I should not like to speculate, since the text, as I have
mentioned elsewhere, is not my concern in this work. On the same page the Notes give the characteristics of each "scribe" with the blanks left for drawing in the forms not having been filled in. I have left these blank in brackets, however, and have included them for the paleographers of the future who will be studying this manuscript. "Scribe I (probably Maius, from comparison of per form with colophon, fols. 10, 15v, where he appears on one paragraph of the first column, 27, 34, etc. He is characterized by short stems below the line, little shading and evidence of even pressure. He abbreviates per as [ ]. Uses ti distinction, viz. [ ] for gratiam and [ ] for Ticonio. Scribe 2 begins on fol. 11, column 1. His hand is more cramped, with long tapering shafts to the letters, both above and below the line. His per is not always contracted, as he writes, and sometimes gives [ ]. He uses the ti distinction, viz. [ ] for vitia and [ ] for cotidie. Scribe 3 on fol. 16 is related to Scribe 2 but turns up the ends of letters below the line, viz. [ ]. He writes out per or uses the [ ] symbol. He introduces blue ink caption on fol. 270, their only occurrence in the MS. Makes the distinction, viz. [ ] for antiquus and [ ] for resurrectionis. Scribe 4 (fol. 95) is similar to Scribe 1 in having a firm, clear hand, though it is larger and less inclined to separate the words. His per is [ ]. Bus and quae are [ ]. On fol. 117 [my notes say not on this fol.] he writes: Finis Storia Alleluia Amen. Makes the distinction viz: [ ], incogitatione, and humilitatis. Scribe 5 (fol. 269-292v) writes with dash and liveliness. His per is [ ]. He introduces blue ink caption on fol. 270, their only occurrence in the MS. Makes the distinction, viz. [ ] for sanatio, and [ ] for vertitur." For Visigothic miniscule and its development, see Lowe, 1910; Z. Garcia Villada, Paleographia Española. Madrid, 1923, esp. 108-113; and Tomas Marín Martínez in Gerona II, 91-92; and Actas I, passim. Also note the extensive bibliography of Manuel Díaz y Díaz.


40. Ibid. Lowe's theories on classification and dating of Visigothic text have often been criticized. See Barbara A. Shailor, "The Scriptorium of San Pedro de Berlangas", Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Cincinnati, 1975, iii-vii, where the author points out what she believes to be the pitfalls of Lowe's method of dating Visigothic manuscripts, and her dissertation purpose to "begin preliminary investigation into the regional development of Visigothic hands, and to attempt to isolate and to identify those of a specific scriptorium", something she felt that Lowe did not do. See also J. Williams, Review of Klein,1976) 1979, 635, where he notes that "Klein suggests, yet with no more authority than Loew's (sic) primitive scheme for dating Visigothic script, a date not later than 950, but possibly earlier [for Vitr. 14-1]."

41. García Lobo, 1979, 245-246, who indicates only three scribes, Maius, a hand who later corrects him, and the scribe of the final quire materials to the manuscript. Ramsay, 1902, 79, also notes corrections to Maius' script, but neither make suggestions as to when the "corrections" to Maius' script might have taken place. One can safely discount the final fols. as they were not part of the original work. See García Lobo, 250-251 for examples of script and abbreviations used in M644.

42. Even if there was royal patronage involved, it is difficult to assess what constituted what that patronage would be, for in the mid-to-latter part of the tenth-century, the
Leonese kingdom was struggling to survive. See Collins, 1983, 244-245, for some examples of royal patronage of monasticism. In considering monastic patronage itself, the number of monks which could be spared to do the work, is another matter, but it could not have been many. For example, in the famous tower scene from the Tábara Manuscript, Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional, cod. 1097B, (T) fol. 167v, there are only two scribes, with what must be an assistant cutting vellum, a situation which must have been typical of that period. For reproductions of this, see Raizmann, 1980, Figure 127; Gómez-Moreno, 1919, LAM LXXVIII (in drawing form, and used by Williams, 1977, as his Frontispiece). Raizmann, 1980, Figure 113, also reproduces the M429 (H), fol. 183, copy of this tower which shows the figures more clearly than the original in T, where deterioration has obliterated part of the illumination. The lower portion of the M429 copy is reproduced as Fig. 111, in George Zannecki, The Monastic Achievement, New York, 1972. For a full-page color reproduction of the tower, T, fol. 167, see Los Beatos, 1985, 138. Perhaps the writer of the Morgan Notes was over-zealous in pointing out the differences in the style. Handwriting, after all, done by one person can change from time to time, depending upon fatigue and other elements. I must admit that I have not carefully analyzed the script of this manuscript for the numbers of scribes which might be involved, but the difference between five scribes and one with corrections does seem to warrant further study.

43. Notes, 3, where it is indicated that it is of an earlier 10th century date than M644, for the quae-bus suspension mark is a veritable semicolon in that manuscript. Otherwise, the Notes say, the character of its writing appears most comparable to that of M644.

44. Klein, 1976, 274-275, 281-286. In addition to the script, he based some of his attribution on the decorations, as well, including the initials of the Vitr. 14-1, which he found close to M644 and the Léon Antiphonary, León, Archivo de la Catedral, Cod. 8. See Morgan Notes, 11, and C. Provenance below for possible monasteries of origin for M644 in León.

45. In Actas I, for example. While this view of Díaz's causes some problems relative to Maius' traditionally proposed Mozarabic origins, it is a position with which Williams could probably agree, as in his review of Klein's 1976 work, 635, he admits that Klein may be right in making the Vitr. 14-1 Leonese, but is quick to point out that M644 and the Léon Antiphonary "seem, on the face of it, to be based on the figure and initial style of Castile. Vitr. 14-1 must represent an earlier influence of Castile, around mid-century."

46. Morgan Notes, 3. My observations which come from examining the manuscript itself, coincide with these remarks.

47. It has been well documented that Beatus used a pre-vulgate text: Sanders, Neuss, Díaz, Klein, Mezoughi. "Vetus Latina", was to me the best description, used by Mezoughi in the Saint-Sever, 1984, 26. See note 93 below.

48. See Morgan Notes, 3-4, and most importantly the manuscript itself, for example, fol. 130, Fig. 167.
49. I am indebted to William Voelkle for sending me these two examples, which show the unevenness of the page preparations.

50. Actas I.170: "La autoría caligráfica de Magio sería, pues, indiscutible si no estuviera ya acreditada por la mención del fol. 234; es de notar que el código es obra de Magio sólo a partir del fol. 34 y hasta el fol. 293 (29A juzgar por la escritura y técnica de pautado.)" Barbara A Shailor has used codicological characteristics such as page preparations, along with other palaeographical characteristics, in trying to attribute manuscripts to certain scriptoria, for example in her article, "The Scriptorium of San Pedro de Cardeña", Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, 1979, 444-473. However, in checking her work I found that in the preparations which she noted for some of the specific manuscripts, she did not note the numerous variations which may occur within one manuscript. Whether the scribe himself or someone else prepared the pages could make a difference in this, so relying on codicological characteristics alone to determine scribes and even place of origin, to my mind, is a risky business. Division of work or the work order for any given manuscript, as has been so carefully studied by François Avril, 1980, and Zaluska, 1984 and 1986, can also be an important consideration in determining critical questions of iconography and iconology, as well as the intent of the patron. For example, in the Beatus group, A2 and the Silos are well known in scholarship for being written first and illuminated later, at least in part, and there have been suggestions that this is the case with the Urgel Beatus as well. In the colloquium following Díaz y Díaz’s paper, Actas I, there was the following interesting discussion between Díaz y Díaz and Mundo, 188-189: Díaz y Díaz: Después de ver en estos días directamente el manuscrito de la Seo de Urgel, me parece claro hoy que los dibujos han sido hechos antes de escribirse muchos por le menos de los cuatemiones que comprende el código. La prueba está en que habiendo una pauta muy bien marcada y trazada con gran regularidad, siguiendo las técnicas de los diferentes escribas de este código, el copista se ve obligado a anchar enormemente las columnas, en algún caso incluso a rebasar por arriba y por abajo la pauta prevista, porque de lo contrario no le da tiempo a llegar con el texto al sitio donde debía quedar interrumpido para dar paso a la miniatura. Esto significa evidentemente que hay dos momentos distintos. Y parece haber pequeñas diferencias de stemma entre el texto y todo lo que constituye el aspecto iconográfico. Mundo: El profesor Díaz y Díaz ha hablado del código de Urgel: evidentemente, es posible que se iluminara antes de escribir el texto, pero ¿es creíble? Creo más fácil pensar que cuando había una ilustración, se escribió en una sola columna, a líneas tirada. (Hemos comprobado precisamente ahora, al hacer el catálogo para la Exposición, que el A1 tiene bastantes páginas-páginas que tienen miniaturas grandes- a línea tirada. Lo mismo secede en el escurialense que llamamos de San Millán.) Pienso que la explicación puede ser ésta: cuando el copista del Beato tiene delante un modelo con miniatures, deja un espacio, apretando o agrandando la escritura, para obtener un recuadro en blanco en que cupiera el modelo que tenía delante, es decir, Díaz y Díaz: En todo caso, son dos fases claramente distintas. Este manuscrito tienen tres o cuatro manos; pudo ser ésa u otra la manera de componer, de ir adelantando el trabajo. For more on the Urgel, see Albert Vives, "El Beato de la Seo d’Urgell: descripción temática e artística de las miniatures", Urgellia, VI, 1983. I am indebted to Peter Klein for a copy of this article.
51. Morgan Notes, I. My notes show numerous examples of variations from this form, which need to be further examined in order determine the work order in the production of the manuscript.

52. This is an average, as it varies throughout the codex and thus sometimes caused me difficulties when I was trying to determine the number of column lines missing from Sanders' edition in the text.

53. Morgan Notes, 4; and also my notes indicate this as well.

54. "Mozarabic" is from the Arabic word must'rib or "Arabized", which curiously enough appears first to have been used by Christians as a pejorative term, and not by Muslims, particularly during the martyrdom movement of the late ninth century, Glick, 1979, 176-177, who is in part quoting Vicente Canterino: "The Ninth Century Cordoban Mozarabes: Did they Really Know Arabic?" (unpublished typescript); for background on the problems of the Mozarabes in Spain see Cagigas, I, 1947. II, 1948, passim; Maravall, 1964, 163-203; Canterino, 1978, passim. For the historian, there is the problem of whether to consider these people as an ethnic group or a cultural phenomenon underlying the development of the Spanish consciousness. The problem for the art historian is whether to consider as Mozarabic, only the artwork produced by the Christians living under the Islams in the south of Spain, or to extend that to art produced by the Mozarabic Christians who entered the northern territories from the Arab dominated parts of Spain in the late ninth and early tenth centuries. There is an extensive bibliography on Mozarabic art, but only a few references dealing with illuminations will be listed here, with more discussion to be introduced below in Chapter IV. Gómez-Moreno, 1919; idem., 1925; Dominguez Bordona, 1930; Neuss, 1922; Neuss, 1931; M. Schapiro, 1939, (now in Romanesque Art, 1977); G. Ménendez-1954; A. Thiery, "Note sull'origine della miniature mozarabica, Commentari, 17 (1966), 241-265; M. Mentré, "Note sur les perspectives utilisées dans les miniatures mozarabes", L'information d'histoire de l'art, 14 (1969), 115-122; C. R. Dodwell, Painting in Europe, 800-1200, Harmondsworth, 1971, esp. 105-113; J. Guilmain, "Some Observations on Mozarabic Manuscript Illumination in the Light of Recent Publications", Scriptorium, 30 (1976), 183-191; Klein, 1976; M. Mentré, "Les representations mozarabes", Les Dossiers de l'Archeologie, 1976 no. 14, 68-75; Fontaine, 1977, 49-59 and passim.; J. Williams, 1977. The last reference has to be handled with care concerning the question of Mozarabic art, for the author tends to negate the Mozarabic contribution to the art of tenth century northern Spain, and postulates instead the development of a geographic school of painting termed "Leonese". J. Dodds is preparing a book on Mozarabic architecture, which examines the Mozarabs and their patronage of church buildings in some detail, and which presents certain aspects of the Mozarabic character that have been hitherto unexamined (see notes 121 and 122 below).

55. Here the writer of the Morgan Notes refers the reader to Fr. Moll: Das Schiff in der bilden den (sic) Kunst, 1929, BXa (sic).
56. Morgan Notes, 4.

57. See my remarks in note 18 above.

58. James, 315. Note also Porter, 1924-26, 235, where he partially explains the view of James and others, such as Ramsay, as well as the "crudity" of the art work and the "barbarousness" of the script of the early Spanish manuscripts of this period. See Chapter IV below for more on this.

59. See Guilmain, 1960, 1961, 24-25, and Figs. 4 and 5; 1980, 69 and Figs. 1 and 2, and 1981, 387, and Plate II, Fig. 14; Williams has confined himself to the initial on fol. 10, which we will refer to below in Chapter V. In Klein, 1976, see 707, Fig. 152 a, b, c and d.

60. *"arci summi" by James, "arcisummi" by García, 1979; **"saeculi" by James, "seculi" by García; ***erased letter which is assumed to be a "t".

61. Another reading of this colophon was suggested about the same time by E. K. Rand as follows:

Let the faithful voice resound and shout aloud, aye, let Maius, small but eager sing in jubilation, melodiously sing, rouse the echoes and loudly call. So be mindful of me, ye servants of Christ, aye you who dwell here in the monastery of the Supreme Messenger, the Archangel Michael, inasmuch as I write in awe of our Arch highest Patron, at the behest of Abbot Victor, out of sheer love, this book on the vision of John the beloved disciple. Amidst (as part of) its adornment, I have also (que) painted pictures for the wonderful words of its stories in order, (sic) that to those who know it the coming of the future judgment of the transitory world may bring terror. Since now the two halves of this finished book have been brought on and brought again in the era a hundred time thrice three and thrice ten and two, be glory to the Father and His only Son, together with the Spirit, Trinity.

62. James, 1902, 312

63. Morgan Notes, 2.

64. This date, Camón feels, Gerona II, 93-94, fits better, supposing that Maius is in fact the same Magius from the monastery of Tábara who worked on the now fragmentary Beatus from there, which was finished by Emeterius. Almost all Beatus scholars, excepting Neuss (Chapter V), who casts some doubt on the theory, believe that the two Maiuses are the same person.

65. Actas I, 170: "Recordemos que el curioso acertijo da el año de copia bajo la forma: duo gemina; Ter terna centies et ter dena bina era; que hay una rasura ante ter terna fue señalado por Ramsay, que creyó descubrir huellas de centies et, conjetura que suele repetirse."
66. Ibid. I have loosely paraphrased: "Me interesa sólo señalar que centies es imposible. Si recordamos que Magio muere en 968 según la noticia del Beato de Tábara, creo que la solución esperable resulta más fácil: done supuso Ramsay centies et se había escrito decies et, con lo que la compleja fórmula dice duo semina decies = 40, et ter terna centies = 900, et ter dena bina = +60, lo que significa 1000, es decir, el año 962. Esta cronología la entrevieron casi todos los estudiosos al indicar tímida que debería ser algo posterior a las fechas que se le atribuyan en torno al primer cuarto del siglo XI."

67. More precisely, he says: "Esta cronología la entrevieron casi todos los estudiosos al indicar tímida que debería ser algo posterior a las fechas que se le atribuyan en torno al primer cuarto del siglo X". Ibid., note 26, where he notes, "Así, por ejemplo, Neuss, 16, donde apunta a soluciones menos verosímiles y no seguras, como ter dena o bis dena, en lugar de mi lectura. Por 958 (332x3=996) se decide Camón Aznar, que prescinde de la frase duo gemina (Beati, 89)."

68. Neuss, 1931, 16.


70. García Lobo, 1979, 268. He seems to accept the fourteenth century attribution without question. The Morgan Notes, 2, offer the suggestion that C S R might stand for Convento Sancti Romani, which perhaps could refer to San Roman de Hornija near Toro, south of Tabara.

71. García Lobo, 1979, 268, Gomez Moreno, 1925, 113.

72. G. de Andres, "La biblioteca de un teólogo renacentista: Martín Pérez de Ayala", Helmántica, 27, no. 82 (1976), 91-111, esp. 101.

73. Rodríguez-Moñino, 1956, 286.

74. Miller, 1895, had it confused with V. Delisle, 1880,122-124, noted the need to clarify this point. James, 1902, 312-314, pointed out that it was not the V. King, 1930, 22, note 3, however, continued to believe it was from Valcavado.

75. Morgan Notes, 11.

76. 1902, 312-314.

77. Ibid.

78. Furthermore, this design appears at the lower right as well in Dominguez Bordona, 1938, Lamina XV. Though barely visible in 1938, it is entirely obliterated today.
79. Morgan Notes, 11. This library signature also appears in M191, which was also a manuscript sold to Morgan by Libri.

80. This still needs to be confirmed by comparisons with other manuscripts from known locations.

81. However, the date of these notations need to be verified as they might possibly be nineteenth century additions made by Libri. Prof. James John of Cornell University promises to help me with this problem.

82. See examples from Rodriguez, 1972, passim; and many examples throughout the works of Sanchez Albornoz, Perez de Urbel, and other scholars working with the period. Even if it would turn out to be only a decoration copying a type of signature, that could be perhaps useful in helping to locate the origins of the manuscript, or at least the artist or scribe who placed it there.

83. See Cappelli, Dizionario di Abbreviature latine ed italine, Milano. Hoepli, 1967, 341. Hands and fingers, in addition to these, pointing to certain parts of the text are drawn in the margins in several places in the manuscript, especially interesting is the one in the left margin of fol. 233v (fig. 225), which points to words found in Sanders, 645, 5. 32: civitas sancta ecclesis est; et sive bona sive mala in hoc libro scripta sunt, ibi suppliciorum pena, ibi gaudia sempiterna. testes sunt ipsi librorum scriptores, qui legem et evangelium testifican Domino Iesu Christo, qui testis fidelis.

84. Gomez-Moreno, 131. Also see the discussion of implications of the dedication page below under Usage.

85. Morgan Notes, 11. One could point out here that the recipient of the book should be distinguished, perhaps from the place of production. It is not necessary, after all, to consider that the manuscript was produced in and for the same monastery.

86. Ibid.

87. This suggestion also follows Gomez-Moreno, 1919, 131, who simply mentions that the Tabara manuscript (T) was finished by a disciple of Maius, who had perhaps created M644 for San Miguel de Escalada. It was more recently made by Augusto Quintana Prieto, "San Miguel de Camarana y su scriptorium", Anuario de estudios medievales, 5 (1968), 65-105, esp. 85.

88. See above, note 27.

89. For further, my survey in section B. Date above, esp., 23-24, and note 61.

90. Ibid. The problem as indicated elsewhere in this study is with the Latin text, which is not Classical in character, and not yet Vulgate. It is rather, as Mezgouhi, 1984, passim, called it, Vetus Latina. See note 93 below.
91. As indicated in note 85 above, there is a clear separation in these two things. Just because a manuscript was commissioned for an abbey dedicated to Michael, it does not mean that it was produced in the same monastery.

92. The Morgan Notes, 11, indicate that Gómez-Moreno, 1919, 131, cited a document published in España sagrada, 16, 430. He did, in fact, do this in note 3 of the same page, in which he noted that: "Un abad Victoris regía el monasterio donde fui escrito el códice en cuestión; el el miso probablemente, que figura en una confirmación real de 920 (España sagrada, t. XVI, p. 430), sin que conste el nombre de su monasterio; pero con ello se afianza la hipótesis de su proximidad a León.". However, this is not solid proof that this was the Abbot Victor we might be looking for.

93. The pre-Vulgate form of Latin, called "Vetus Latina" by Noureddine Mezoughi in Saint-Sever, 1984, is a post-classical and pre-medieval form of Latin which is very hard to work with, and thus is open to many interpretations. This needs, from my point of view, to be confirmed by specialists other than T. Marín Martínez who was the supervisor of García's thesis. I am not a specialist in Vetus Latina, but for me García's argument seems to be very seductive. For a related problem of interpretations of Michael's role, see section D. Use of the Book below.

94. See note 93 above.

95. See García, 1979, 265-267.

96. See notes 100 and 101 below.

97. This interpretation is based on the probability that the abbreviation LB can also be "liber" used as an adjectival noun, meaning the one who "frees" some one or something, and for that matter, LB may be the noun "liberator" in the same sense, rather than "book". The word "liber" as a noun could also refer to an instrument for weighing the weight of the souls as Michael is often referred to in the later Middle Ages. The translation of LB to mean "book" does not make sense since Michael has written no "book" as such; John the Evangelist wrote the Book of Revelation! Werckmeister, 1973, 617, refers to "Libera me ..." [Free me ...] in the St.-Sever Apocalypse (fol. 108). The word "libera" is the imperative form of the verb "liberare", meaning "to set free". The two words, "liber" and "libera" (or "liberare"), share the common root, namely the concept of "liberating" A from B, in our case, the souls from death. In order for St. Michael to be able to accomplish this "liberation", he has to first "weigh" the souls, so that he can determine the values of the souls. These observations were made by my husband, Yoshio Kusaba, and we intend to co-author an article on this aspect of the manuscript. For Carmina figurata and geometrically ordered acrostics see D. Schaller, "Die karolingischen Figurengedichte des Cod. Bern 212", Medium Aevum Vivum. Festschrift W. Bulst, Heidelberg, 1960, 24-27; Hrabanus Maurus, De laudibus Sanctae Crucis. Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat des Codex Vindobonensis 652 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, introd. K. Holter, Graz,
1973. For palindromes see H.-G. Müller, Hrabanus Maurus- De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis. Studien zur Überlieferung und Geistesgeschichte mit dem Faksimilie-Textabdruck aus Cod. Reg. lat. 124 der varikanischen Bibliothek (Beih. 11 zum Mittelalterzeitlichen Jahrbuch, ed. K. Langosch, 1973). For medieval diagrams and conundrums from the ninth to the fourteenth century, see Madeline H. Caviness, "Images of Divine Order and the Third Mode of Seeing", *Gesta*, 22/2 (1983), 99-120, esp. 99, where she explains that "A method of expressing divine order through abstract structures is traced back to early neo-Platonic and north European pagan images in a variety of genres, including perfect geometric forms, symmetrical schemata, palindromes, and monograms. These are seen to provide the syntax, or underlying structure, for images of heavenly beings, of those that are spiritually enlightened, and of man's position in an ordered universe. Schemata were adapted, by the addition of representational elements, to pictographs and figured diagrams, and they provided the hidden structure for fuller renderings of visionary subjects".

98. Apoc. 12.7, and Daniel, 12.1 see below, note 101. The equation of Michael as the "weigher" with the dragon fighter is natural because both "libra" and "libere" (from "liberare" as in St.-Sever) basically mean the same thing. Also see note 97 above.

99. St. Paul, 1 Thessalonians, 5:16, "At the trumpet of God, the voice of the archangel will call out the command and the Lord himself will come own from heaven; those who have died in Christ will be the first to rise, and then those of us who are still alive will be taken up in the clouds together with them, to meet the Lord in the air...". Though Michael is not mentioned by name in this instance, he is by the use of the term "archangel", implied as the conveyors of the elect to God at the Last Judgment. This is made clearer by the use of the same term in Jude 9, where the name of Michael is used: "Not even the archangel Michael, when he was engaged in argument with the devil about the Corpse of Moses dare: to denounce him in the language of abuse; all he said was 'Let the Lord correct you'. (The footnote to this quotation in the Jerusalem Bible indicates that this is "Almost certainly a reference to the apocryphal Assumption of Moses."). So there was already a cult surrounding Michael during Biblical times. In addition, the Early Church Fathers added their own various interpretations to Michael. He appears in Isidore of Seville, Etymologies. VII, 5, 1-15, Migne, Patriologia Latina (hereinafter referred to as PL), 82, 272 ff.; idem. "De ordine Creaturam", II, PL, 109, 58 ff.; Hrabanus Maurus, PL, 109, 58 ff.; idem. "Homily in Revelationis St. Michaelis", PL, 109 60-63; Gregory of Tours, "Historium Francorum", 6, 29, PL, 71, 415 ff.; idem, "Libri Miraculorum", 1, 4, PL, 71, 708. (I have quoted only the western fathers, but there are many in the east who could be consulted due to the fact that the cult of St. Michael arose in the east by way of the Hebrew Apocrypha, i. e. the Book of Enoch and the Testament of Abraham. See The Catholic Encyclopedia, 9, New York, 1967, 794.) In modern times, there has been much literature devoted to St. Michael, some of which appears in note 100 below.

100. The Saints, ed. John Coulson, New York, 1957, 550-551, notes that "In the offertory anthem of the mass for the dead, Michael is charged with the care of all departed souls that be the holy standard bearer (may) introduce them to the holy light, which thou didst promise of old to Abraham and to his seed". On 58 it notes that the Bible mentions Michael three times: Daniel 10:13, 21; Jude 9; Revelation 12:7. The
Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, eds. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, Oxford, 2nd ed., 1974, 913, indicates that in Daniel "he is represented as the helper of the Chosen People". In Jude he is "disputing with the devil over the body of Moses", while in Rev., he is "fighting the dragon". "He also plays an important part in the apocryphal literature, e. g. in the 'Assumption of Moses', in Enoch, and in the 'Ascension of Isaiah', where he appears as 'the great captain' who is set over the best part of mankind'. In connexion with the Scriptural and apocryphal passages he was early regarded in the Church as the helper of Christian armies against the heathen, and as a protector of individual Christians against the devil, esp. at the hour of death, when he conducts the souls to God, a belief echoed in the Offertory of the Roman Mass for the Dead until 1970: 'Signifer S. Michael repraesentet eas in lucem sanctum'. His cult originated in Phrygia, where he was chiefly venerated as a healer, and many hot springs were dedicated to him both in Greece and Asia. The cult soon spread to the W., and in the Leonine Sacramentary St. Michael is named in four of the five Masses for 30 Sept. of a dedication festival of a basilica erected in his honour on the Via Salaria. This feast, which is kept throughout the W. [Western] Church on 29 Sept., is identical with that of the BCP [Book of Common Prayer] of St. Michael and All Angels... The cult of St. Michael in the W. Church received a strong impetus from the famous apparition on Mt. Garganus in the time of Pope Gelasius (492-6), in commemoration of which a feast was kept in the RC [Roman Catholic] Church on 8 May until 1960. Through the Middle Ages St. Michael enjoyed general veneration. His feast, 'Michaelmas Day', is connected with many popular usages and numerous churches are dedicated to him. He is usually represented with a sword, standing over, or fighting with, a dragon. Feast day in E., 8 Nov."Acta Sanctorum. Sept., VIII (1762), 4-123; W. Lueken, Michael. Eine Darstellung und Vergleichung der jüdischen und der morgenländisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael (1898); O. Rojdestvensky, Le Culte de Saint Michel et le moyen âge latin (1922); A. M. Renner, Der Erzengel Michael in der Geistes-und Kunstgeschichte (Saarbrücken, 1927); H. Beseler, H. Roggenskamp, Die Michaeliskirche in Hildesheim, 1954; J. Lemaié, O. S. B., "Textes liturgiques concernant le culte de S. Michel" in Sacris Erudiri, XIV (1963), 277-85; C. Heitz, Recherches sur les rapports entre art et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne, 1963, esp. 221-228, 274; R. H. Charles in Dictionary of the Bible, edit. J. Hastings, 4 vols, 1898-1902, with extra vol., 1904, iii (1900), 362 ff.; G. Löw, C.S.S.R.-É. Josi et al., in Enciclopedia Cattolica, ed. P. Paschini et al. (12 vols, 1949-54), (1952), cols. 948-54; F. Spadafora, M. G. Mara, Bibliotheca Sanctorum, Rome, Istituto Giovanni XXII della Pontifica Università Lateranese, 1967, 9, cols. 410-46.

101. In the Beatus Commentary, in the Explanatio to the Storia Mulieris et Draconis (Apoc.12:1-17, esp. 7-8), it notes, Sanders, 466, 2.41 ff.:"et factum est bellum in caelo, id est, in ecclesia, ubi draco superadictus pugnat cum sanctos. Michael et angeli eius pugnar cum dracone. Michaelae Christum dicit et angelos eius sanctos homine. nemo est prater Dominum, qui habet angelos, nisi Dominus Iesus Christus, sicut Daniel ait: tunc ad id tempus adventit Michael, archangelus ille major, qui filius populi sui praeeest et eo tempore erit pressura populi tui, qualis nunquam fuit, ex quo gentes esse coeperunt usque ad illud horae." The Jerusalem Bible, Garden City, 1966, N. T. 440, quotes Apoc. 12.7 as saying: "And now a war broke out in heaven, when Michael with his angels attacked the dragon. The dragon fought back with his angels but they were defeated and driven out of heaven". The next portion is taken from Daniel 12.1,
from the last vision of Daniel, the man dressed in linen, which reads, quoting The Jerusalem Bible again, O. T. 14:46: "At that time [the time of the end of the persecutor] Michael will stand up, the great prince who mounts guard over your people. There is going to be a time of great distress, unparalleled since nations first come into existence. When that time comes, your own people will be spared, all those whose names are found written in the Book [of Life]." Verses 2-4 continue, "Of those who lie sleeping in the dust of the earth many will awake, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting disgrace. The learned will shine as brightly as the vault of the heaven, and those who have instructed many in virtue, as bright as stars for all eternity. But you Daniel, must keep these words secret and the book sealed until the time of the End..."

Though it must be remembered that Beatus was using a pre-Vulgate Bible text, one can easily see this association of the prophecy in this vision of Daniel with the judgment to come at the end in the Book of Revelation. So in this Biblical sense, Beatus is giving Daniel, along with Michael, the role of the watcher over the souls of those whose names are written in the book of life. In fact this is given as much emphasis as Michael's and his angels' defeat over Satan, which is explained on Sanders 467: Et draco pugnavit et angeli eius. In essence this explanation expresses the words of revelation that "the great dragon... known as the devil or Satan, who had deceived all the world, was hurled down to the earth and his angel were hurled down with him... Victory and power and empire for ever have been won by our God, and all authority for his Christ, now that the persecutor... has been brought down" (Jerusalem Bible, N. T., 440). This sort of typology was used throughout the writings of the early Church Fathers, on which Beatus, as we now know liberally drew. The passages found in Sanders 2, 41-43, according to S. Alvarez Campos, "Fuentes Literarias de Beato de Liébana", Actas II, pp. 117-62, esp. 154, 133, are based upon Tyconius Commentarius in Apocalypse, Pr 874D [this is now lost, so we don't know where Alvarez got this specific reference]; Caesareus Arelatensis, Espositio in Apocalypse, ed. Morin, Caesarii op. omnia, II, 101-237, esp. 242/25-30; and Bede, Explanation Apocalypse, PL 93, 129-206, esp. 167BC. The readings in Férotin, 1904, (see note 107 below) for the Masses of the Dead in the Visigothic/Mozarabic Liturgy are, 393-447, but there is no indication of an intercession to Michael in them. This may be due to the Codices which Férotin was using. However, in the Mass for Michael's Feast day in the Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum, Férotin, Paris, 1912, 446-453, he is represented as the most eminent soldier of the angels, who is waiting for his hour of action. In addition he is mentioned as the intercessor for the dead to give them everlasting peace. For example, at the end of the Alia, 448: "...Homin etenim militia Angelorum Michael eminentior manet in officio actionum: ut ordinatum dispositi manet in obsequio Conditoris, et uota deferent populi omnium Creatori. Amen...". The Post Nomina reads: "Recensita, Domine, tuorum nomina familiarum, pietatis tuae imploramus misericordie donum, ut precum nostrarum portitorum tum nuntium destines Michaelem: ut petenda nos congrua doceat, et petitionibus nostris ipse tibi intercessor adsistat, ut uiuis imperando tutelam, et defunctis adquirat requiem sempiternam. Amen. Quia tu es uita uiuentium". Thus, he is represented as mentioned in the Beatus Commentary, which in itself is a preparation for death and the judgment to come. While he was not called upon in the Mass of the Dead in the Codices which Férotin examined, there was a definite connection with Michael as discussed in notes 97 and 98 above. There was also an implicit understanding that
Michael, who had already done battle with Satan and defeated him, would guide the souls to their eternal and everlasting peace in death.


103. It might also be possible that this particular program followed in part an earlier, Visigothic one which has long since been lost.

104. Jungmannn, 1950, I: 50, 54, 55-58; II: 153, 159, 160, 163, 164, 165, 168, 181, 237, 241, 244, 245, 250. This would be related to the "witnessing" done by the Mozarabic scribes as noted by Dodds in Chapter II of her forthcoming book (see notes 121, and 122 below) but it would be definitely asking for prayers of intercession for the life to come hereafter.

105. Garcia, 267. Yet a problem is that this acrostic R with a cross above it (fig. 246), looks almost like an hybrid Chi Rho, not really a Greek one as would be found in Insular manuscripts, such as the Book of Kells, but perhaps a contrived one on the part of the scribe. It is also quite thinner, as my husband, Yoshio Kusaba, has noted, than the "MAIUS" letters. Others, such as G. Menéndez Pidal, 1954, 200, have made observations on this acrostic. Díaz, *Actas I.*, says it is "incomplete" and refers, therefore to "scriptor" "Quiero recordar que la suscripcion es acrostica y que esta actualmente incompleta; la perdida se note en al manuscrito, y se descubre con la leyenda actual: (...) R MAIVS, lo que me hace sospechar que pondria SCRIPTOR MAIVS o algo asf a partir del cual comienza un manuscrito diferente.(Otro comentario incompleto al Apocalipsis." In his footnote 28, he remarks that "Acrosticos similares, con identicos alardes de erudicion y rebuscamiento, son conocidos en el siglo X; baste mencionar a Florencio de Berlangas y a Vigilán. Sobre ello vuelvo en otro lugar." If this is the case, then perhaps Spanish scribes were, in fact, using a hybrid type of Chi Rho acrostic as a matter of course since it appears in other Spanish manuscripts of the tenth century. This topic deserves further study.

106. Ibid, esp. note 16. An interesting coincidence is the fact that there was also a Recesvinto who was abbot of Cardeña in mid-tenth century (Salutiano Moreta Velayos, El Monasterio de San Pedro de Cardeña, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca, 1971, 54). This abbot was involved in a battle of ownership of properties and might have called on St. Michael to "battle the dragon" for him. As Michael was the protector of the church, he may have been asked to help with the problems which the monastery was having. However, Cardeña was not dedicated to St. Michael, but to St. Peter, and if the colophon is read correctly, the monks are dwelling in a monastery dedicated to St. Michael. Would there have been a monastery within the Cardeña dependency dedicated to St. Michael?
107. Unfortunately, I have not yet found record of such a date being celebrated in the Mozarabic calendar provided by Férotin in his Appendice I to Le Ordinum un usage dans l'église Wisigothique et Mozarabe d'Esagne du cinquième au onzième siècle, Paris, 1904. However, the codices which Férotin is examining in this Appendice are from the eleventh century, and may not reflect tenth century practices in Spain. He certainly was known to the early Mozarabic Apologists, as he appears in Samsonis Apologeticus, II, VIII. Quod simplex natura sit Dei ed quod blasphemie sit decere: Nos autem per subtilitatem Deum credimus infra omnia esse et non per substantiam. 2. 19-25, along with other angels and with astrological subjects in a different context, but one which is not entirely disassociated from as those we have been discussing above, in that this apology is dealing with God as the creator, and thus with orthodoxy and faith. See Ionnes Gil, Corpus Scriptorum Muzarabicorum, 2, Madrid, 1973, 577-579, esp. line 24. I think that writings like these support the view that the cult of Michael was widely practiced in Spain, and I very much appreciate a discussion with Arnold Klukas regarding this problem; including the fact that there were very many churches dedicated to St. Michael, especially around León, which was the capital of the Arstuoleonese kingdom during at least most of the tenth century under consideration. I also appreciate bibliographical references from him which have helped me understand the Visigothic liturgy more fully: R. Donovan, Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain, Toronto, 1958; Fontaine, 1977, Chapter 3; Robert Amiet, "La Liturgie Wisigothique", Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa", 1978, 73-100.

108. There is a chance that this monastery was alone, or one of the few influenced by and beginning to practice the Roman Rite at an early date in Spain, and that could help in locating the monastery. After all, with the Morgan 644, we are dealing with a book with strong northern connections in its composition and style. Furthermore, as indicated on 30 above and note 102, the Visigothic liturgy contained a mixture of Roman and other liturgical materials as well.


110. In other words, the connection of St. Michael with the book of the Apocalypse in M644, might be a part of the cult of St. Michael which was active in Spain, and which could possibly lead to other venerations of the the Book of the Apocalypse in connection with death, which the eleventh century books were following by established tradition.

111. Werckmeister, 170.

112. See below, Chapter V.

113. See below, Chapter V.

115. Crosses of Oviedo appear on fols. 2v, 3v, 4v, as the beginning of the codex; on fol. 205, right before the Last Judgment, as in M644; and on 278 at the end of the book. Crosses of Oviedo appear right before the Last Judgment in V, fol. 180 (Fig. 265), and Tu, fol. 168 (Fig. 267), as well.

116. See below, Appendix A, Fig. 2.

117. This has been examined by many scholars: for example, King, 1929, 317-326; H. Schlunk, "The Crosses of Oviedo; a Contribution to the History of Jewelry in Northern Spain in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries", Art Bulletin, 31 (1950), 91-114; Peter Lasko, Ars Sacra, Harmondsworth, 1972, 149ff. Also see the many works of Gómez-Moreno and Sanchez-Alborno, which are full of references to these crosses; for example Sanchez-Alborno, 1980, 625-626, for the uses of and inscriptions on the crosses, which ultimately goes back to Pelayo's (or Pelagius') victory at Covadonga: Collins, 1983, 184, 228-230. In addition, Dodds, forthcoming, Chapter II, 250 and note 161.

118. For color reproduction of this, see Williams, 1977, Pl. 19b; also see Klein, Actas II, 97, and note 121 below for more discussion of this topic.

119. These relationships could often be quite complex, and the story of Sancho the Fat is worth telling as a demonstration of the situation, which could often prove embarrassing, if not fatal. (See Collins, 1983, 199, 241-242). Following the death of Ramiro II in 950, there were several candidates for the throne. One of these was his eldest son, Ordoñón III (950-55), who managed to succeed and rule for a short while. (See Fig. 314) Though Ordoñón was married to Urraca, the daughter of Feman Gonzalez of Castile, his father-in-law supported his half-brother, Sancho, instead, and joined with King Garcia Sánchez of Pamplona-Navarre in attempting to expel Ordoñoon from León. When this attempt failed, the two conspirators withdrew and Ordoñoon repudiated his wife. However, a few years later, Ordoñón died, and Sancho succeeded as Sancho I "The Fat". Sancho ruled only two years (955-57), and then was expelled by his subjects due to another intervention by Feman Gonzalez, but he may have been unpopular due to his obesity as well. (He was so fat that he could not even mount a horse.) He was supplanting by Ordoñoon IV "The Bad" (957-960), a cousin, who then married the above noted Urraca. Upon the advice of his uncle, King Garcia Sánchez, who was also related by marriage to the Caliph, Abd al-Rahman (See Fig. 315) Sancho appealed to Cordoba for medical and military help. The Caliph sent his Jewish physician, Hasdai ibn Shaproud, to Pamplona where Sancho had taken refuge, and a cure was effected. A militar alliance was concluded following a humiliating journey to Cordoba which Sancho was forced to make with his grandmother, the queen of Navarre. Appropriately slender, Sancho returned to León with a Muslim army to regain his throne, whereupon the expedient Feman Gonzalez made his peace with Sancho and Urraca, and accordingly repudiated Ordoñoon. The diposed Ordoñoon made his way to Cordoba, where his supplication before the Caliph was described in some detail by the chronicler Ibn Hayyam.
120. In the consideration of the propaganda problems of the north, and the disparity between the two portions of the peninsula in the late tenth century, see Collins, 1983, 200, where he describes the awe with which Ordono IV was struck by the splendor of the palace of Al-Hakem II. In addition, the northern Christians must have been well aware of the cultural and economical gap between them as more than one member of the royal house of Christian Spain was married to someone within the family of the Caliph in Cordoba in the tenth century. Thus this sort of intermarriage could prove to be a concern to those who were anxious not only in reuniting the peninsula, but in continuing and propagating the orthodox Christian faith.

121. She notes this in her typescript of Chapter II of her forthcoming book, 236-237.

122. In essence, for them building churches became a witness to their faith. These instances are noted in her typescript, 227-228, 233, 239, 244, 246, 251, 254, 256 and passim. Though she tends to see the politically strong emotion dying out later in the tenth century, I feel to the contrary that it had great holding power over the northern Christians throughout the later part of the century, particularly as part of their political propaganda program necessary in the face of a stronger enemy to the south, an enemy who was not only a military rival, but one who was seductive culturally and socially. See Maris Soledad de Silva y de Verastegui, "Neovisigotismo iconografico del siglo X: ordo de celebrando concilio", Goya, 1981. I am indebted to Jerry Dodds for pointing out this article to me. While the illuminations in these Council Codices show figures with more stylized stances than those in M644, the facial expressions in many cases are similar. Furthermore, they certainly point through this stylization which pervades not only the figures but the composition as well, toward the illuminations found in the Silos Beatus which was produced in the following century. The costumes, like in the Silos are almost caricatures of more Carolingian or earlier Mozarabic types, for example in the dramatic folds at the bottoms of the garments which are so reminiscent of the Gerona Beatus.
CHAPTER II:
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PICTORIAL STEMMA OF THE BEATUS GROUP

A. Introduction

In writing of constructing pictorial genealogies for the illustrated Septuagint manuscripts, Kurt Weitzmann stated:

These genealogies or stemmata will have to be drawn according to principles similar to those used by text critics who are accustomed to working out stemmata of interrelated texts. Here the picture critic is less fortunate than the text critics, who can utilize a long tradition of methodical treatment of manuscripts. Generations of philologists have worked on classifying and grouping the manuscript material of the most important classical and biblical texts, and they have refined the technique... In the field of manuscript illustration only a few such attempts have been made so far... Naturally the picture critic must use the stemmata worked out by the text critics and must carefully compare them with the results yielded by a study of the pictures. The picture critic should not adapt a text stemma mechanically, however, as has been done so often; but he must work out his own stemma. The fact... will emerge then, that text and picture stemmata are not invariably identical...1

Weitzmann might as well have been speaking of the group of Beatus Commentaries on the Apocalypse, for until recently with the work of Peter K. Klein,2 no systematic attempt had been made to set forth a formal stemma for the pictorial tradition of the Beatus family of manuscripts. Even in the work of the great theologian and scholar, Wilhelm Neuss, who published what was to be for half a century the authoritative study on the Beatus manuscripts in 1931,3 the content of the illuminations of the Beatus manuscript group was clearly considered only after the textual stemma had been worked out. The
illustrations were simply assumed to match the textual genealogy in a manner which
Weitzmann would certainly question, as noted in the above quotation from his Studies.4

The study of the Beatus manuscripts had begun, as in the case of many other late
antique and early medieval manuscript groups, with the bibliophiles of the eighteenth and
nineteenth centuries, and thus at first, was the province of philologists and paleographers.
The question immediately arises, then, why a textual stemma, or genealogical tree was so
long in being developed. The fact is that during the later part of the nineteenth century and
the earliest part of the twentieth, much of the effort in Beatus studies was placed on
attempts to identify the extant manuscripts with descriptions of Beatus manuscripts by
earlier writers such as Morales, who had seen a number of them on a journey undertaken in
the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.5 As new fragments or manuscripts were
found, the first question was to determine the provenance and a possible date. This was
almost always done by means of textual and palaeographical analysis,6 but apparently the
field of Beatus study was still too undeveloped and somewhat "exotic" to deal with matters
such as producing an organized textual stemma.7

B. Various Editions, Groupings and Stemmata

At the outset of this section, it would be helpful to list Neuss' alphabetical
equivalents, since they have come to be the most widely used in the groupings and
stemmata which we are about to discuss throughout this study in some detail. These are as
follows:


A2 - Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia Cod. 33 (Klein, 1976, has further
signed the Mozarabic portion of the book as A2Moz; and the Romanesque
portion, A2Rom)

B - Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Theol. lat. fol. 561.

C - Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana (Accademia dei Lincei), Cod. lat. 369, (40.E.6).

D - London, the British Library, Add. MS 11695.

E - Escorial & II 5.

Ex - Escorial f I 7.

F - Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca Monasterio, fragm. 1-3.

Fc - Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca Monasterio, fragm. 4

Fi - Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional Vit.14-2 (5 folios bound into the beginning of Vit. 14-2).

G - Gerona, Archivo de la Catedral.

H - New York, Pierpont Morgan Library. Ms. 429.


L - Lisbon, Archivo Torre de Tombo.

M - New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Ms. 644, or M644

N - Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. acq. lat 1366.

O - Burgo de Osma, Archivo de la Catedral, Cod. 1.

Pc - Madrid, Museo Arqueológico, ms. 2; Paris, Col. Particular, formerly Col. Marquet de Vasselot, Biblioteca Conde de Heredia Spínola (Col.Zabálburu); and Gerona, Museo Diocesano.

Pp - Salamanca, Biblioteca de la Universidad, ms. 2632; formerly, Madrid, Biblioteca Privada del Rey, 2 B 3.

R - Manchester, The John Rylands University Library, Cod. 8.

S - Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. lat. 8878.

T - Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional, 1097B

Tu - Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, ms. I.II.1

U - Seo de Urgel, Archivo de la Catedral.
It is some of the most pertinent of these manuscripts and their relationship to each other which we will be discussing in this study. Even though we noted above that a proper stemma for the Beatus manuscript group was long in developing, some scholars such as Delisle in 1880 began to note that there appeared to be different "families" of the Beatus manuscripts, which made it possible that there were at least two different editions, or "redactions". In 1930, Sanders published an edition of the Beatus Commentary in which he attempted an explanation for the variations in the text of the Beatus manuscripts. Although he grouped the known manuscripts into several editions, he did not present an actual textual stemma (Fig. 293). Shortly afterward, however, there appeared the work of Neuss on the Beatus Apocalypse manuscripts in which the first textual stemma, or family tree, for the group was finally drawn (Fig. 294). Neuss disagreed with Sanders over the problem of various editions of the Beatus text, taking the view that all the manuscripts from the group were descended from a single archetype. So the question of how to account for the variations in the text in the Beatus codices appeared in the 1930's and 40's to be far from settled.

In addition, the study of the pictorial tradition, with its rich and varied iconography, was in even a more rudimentary condition. It is granted that various aspects of the iconography were indeed remarked upon by nineteenth-century scholars, as for instance, Tailhan who had noted that the Beatus imagery continued very early Christian iconography. However, in contrast to the growing number of Beatus manuscripts being recognized and catalogued, no systematic attempt was made to organize all their illustrations into classifiable iconographical recensions. This was clearly noted by Delisle
who as early as 1880 called for more study of the illuminations of the Beatus codices, an indication that little attention had been given to them. Groupings of the manuscripts by scholars such as Domínguez Bordona and G. G. King were suggested, but these groupings were based on observations related to opinions about provenance and text as much or even more than to pictorial content.

There were two attempts to create a stemma for the Beatus group of manuscripts based on its pictorial imagery, but these dealt only with one specific illumination, the World Map. The first of these was made by the geographer, Miller, who in 1895 analyzed the Beatus World Maps as a part of a much larger study of maps of the world. Miller's stemma (Fig. 290), however, was plagued with difficulties, not the least being that he confused M644 with the Valcavado manuscript, or at least believed that M644 came from Valcavado. Furthermore, Miller was ill-informed about some of the manuscripts, which places his entire stemma in doubt. However, Miller did note, as had Delisle, a division of the Beatus manuscripts into two family branches. He termed these A, or the Osma Branch, and B, or the Valcavado Branch (again, note Fig. 290). He divided these two branches into two ramifications each, making a total of four recensions: (a) composed of S and N; (b) made up solely of O; (c) containing M V J D; and (d) encompassing T G Tu H and Ar.

A close examination of the interrelationships between the manuscripts in these branches clearly shows that Miller was erroneous in much of his analysis. For example, though he did note that V and J were in part derived from an earlier ninth-century source common to M as well, his stronger line of derivation for V and J comes directly from M. He also derived D directly from M as well, but on a separate branch of its own. However faulty Miller's stemma was, it is surprising that later scholarship did not pick up on his basic suggestions of the four family branches, and simply try to modify them.
Furthermore, it is especially significant that with only limited information he had noted a possible source in the Beatus group from the later part of the ninth century, which was common to V, J and M though he did not have this relationship well worked out.21

The second stemma based on the Beatus World Map was proposed by Menéndez-Pidal almost a century later (Figs. 291, 292).22 This stemma, was also incomplete, not only because it was part of another context, the relationship of the Beatus map to the Isidorian/Orosian tradition, and thus, like Miller's stemma, dealt only with the interrelationship of one illumination found amongst the manuscripts; but it dealt primarily with Branch II of the group as defined by Neuss.

Menéndez-Pidal divided this Branch into two groups: Ila, or the "Escalada family", and Ilb, the "Tabara family" (Fig. 291).23 In Branch Ila U, V and D all stem directly from M while J stems as a side ramification coming out of the main branch below U and V. Branch Ilb, derives from M through T (from which H is directly descended), with an offshoot comprised of Tu from which Ar is descended. R descends from T as the end product of the side branch beginning with G.24 Even though Menéndez-Pidal had the stated purpose of trying to combine the theories of Gómez-Moreno and Neuss,25 his consideration of M644 as the manuscript from which all the others in Branch II derived shows that he really did not understand the stemma of Neuss, and therefore his assessment was based in part on a faulty evaluation of the problems involved. Thus for our purposes the stemma of Menéndez-Pidal remains as merely an art historical curiosity.26
C. The Stemma of Neuss

In any Beatus study, the importance of the work Neuss cannot be overstated. As Werckmeister accurately observed, the encyclopaedic study of Wilhelm Neuss published in 1931 on the Beatus cycle was complex and detailed, which Menéndez-Pidal unfortunately did not "properly take into account". Furthermore, Dorothy Miner in her review of this exceptional body of research quite rightly enumerated the points Neuss had made, namely: (1) an analysis of the commentary of Beatus on the Apocalypse; (2) a brief description of each of the twenty-seven extant illustrated manuscripts, together with a synopsis of the scholarly literature concerning them; (3) the establishment of the relationship of the various manuscripts, based on a comparison both of text and of certain illustrations; (4) a descriptive enumeration of all the miniatures occurring in the Beatus manuscripts and a comparison of the various examples of each, with; (5) a separate discussion of the Daniel illustrations; (6) an attempt at reconstructing the original prototype of the paintings and establishing its date and stylistic affinities; (7) a discussion of the relation of other early Apocalypse cycles to the Beatus group; and (8) general conclusions based on the material presented.

Most pertinent to our particular study is Miner's point (3), the fact that Neuss offered for the first time a stemma based on a textual relationship to at least some of the illustrations accompanying the Beatus Commentary. However, Neuss had assumed that the first edition Commentary was illustrated, and was a single archetype from Beatus' lifetime. Therefore, his stemma was presented as if the textual and pictorial recensions were the same (Fig. 294). Neuss' stemma shows the Beatus manuscripts split into two family groups, Branch I and Branch II. Branch II is further divided into two families, Branch Ia and Ib. Branch I MSS are S A1 A2 E Fe O C B N L Ex and Vt; Branch Ia are Fi M V U J D; and Branch Ib is comprised of T G F Tu Pp R Pc Ar and H.
Once again, similar to the weight found in the case of Miller's study, Neuss presented some important groundwork for a better understanding of the pictorial relationship between the manuscripts of the Beatus group. Yet because some scholars became preoccupied with several of Neuss' conclusions with which they disagreed, the scholarly discussion relative to Neuss' work for many years was diverted from the stemma to a polemic over the archetype and its origins.

Neuss' results, at least from a textual point of view, were confirmed by the work of Sanders noted above. While Neuss did not agree with Sanders on the point of successive editions for the Beatus Commentary, his stemma groupings were almost completely in accord with those of Sanders (Figs. 293, 294). Thus Sanders' First Edition: A1 S; Sanders' Second Edition: A2 E B N O L C Vt and Ex (both of these editions in Sanders' Third Class) correspond with Neuss' Branch I. Sanders' Third Edition: M D V U J (Sanders' First Class) are the same manuscripts found in Neuss' Branch IIa; and Sanders' Later Recension of the Third Edition: T H G Tu Ar R Pc and Pp (Sanders' Second Class) are the manuscripts in Neuss' Branch IIb.32

Moreover, when one carefully looks at the many observations Neuss made in his comparisons of the number of illustrations in the Beatus Commentary and the Commentary on Daniel, one is astounded at how acute his analysis was in many cases. These observations by Neuss provide much to build upon in understanding the complexities involved in the iconographical relationships of the Beatus manuscripts, but were not reflected in his stemma. On the whole, rather than closely examining the contribution made by Neuss, most scholars were content to unequivocally accept his publication as a lexicon, and straightforwardly used his lettering system for reference to the Beatus manuscripts. But they failed to understand the depth and extent of the scholarship Neuss had established.33 Until Klein's critical work was published in 1976, Neuss' was, even with
its conspicuous faults, the most complete, detailed study that had existed relative to the
Beatus group of manuscripts.34

D. The Stemmata of Klein

In his dissertation which he developed in the late sixties, but was not published
until 1976, Klein studied Neuss' work carefully, and his dissertation has radically changed
the field of Beatus studies in several significant ways.35 Klein's approach, as Neuss had
been, was detailed and encyclopaedic. His specific intention was to study Vit. 14-1 (A1),
the older Beatus from the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. Yet in order to place this
important manuscript in the proper textual and iconographical context relative to the Beatus
manuscript group, he had to make a thorough investigation of Neuss' studies.
Furthermore, he went beyond the work of Neuss in trying to determine the exact place of
Vit. 14-1 in tenth-century Spanish manuscript illumination, and thus made stylistic
analyses, both textual and pictorial, of all the major scriptoria of Spain during that
century.36 But it is his work on the Beatus stemma which is pertinent to the study at
hand.

Confining himself first to textual analysis, Klein scrutinized in complete detail the
stemma of Neuss and placed it into perspective with other scholarly works on the Beatus
manuscripts.37 For example, by closely observing the editions postulated by Sanders, he
saw that there was indeed the possibility of several editions of the Beatus text, not the
single archetype which Neuss had suggested; and he argued in support of Sanders'
successive editions, though he modified the dating of these.38 Secondly, in the
consideration of the illustrations, he examined not only Neuss, but the work of Menéndez-
Pidal as well.39 Klein agreed that there had been a revision of the original Beatus
iconography in the late ninth or early tenth century. However, in contrast to Menéndez-Pidal, he was not so eager to personalize the author of that revision, and instead examined first the precise relationship of the entire extant manuscript group in so far as possible, and then put this relationship into a reasonable historical perspective.

But by far one of the most significant factors which Klein introduced into Beatus studies was to incorporate the theories of Weitzmann, especially the fact that the textual and pictorial stemmatas do not necessarily take place simultaneously. Klein applied Weitzmann's theories to solving the problems involved in the Beatus manuscript group, and separated the stemma suggested by Neuss into textual and pictorial recensions (Figs. 295, 296). Thus Klein was able for the first time to consider the complex interrelationships found in the Beatus manuscript group not only by means of textual analysis, but by detailed iconographical examination as well.

To support the necessity of developing a separate pictorial stemma, Klein gave at least four instances of variations in the textual and pictorial recensions in a paper delivered in Madrid in 1976, summarizing the most salient points of his dissertation (Fig. 300): (1) S, a MS of Branch I, and along with A1 the only two extant MSS containing the first edition text; was found to be equally close to Branch I and Branch IIab iconographically, though closest to A1 textually; (2) A2, again a MS of Branch I, with a second edition text, and a MS illuminated partially before the Romanesque period, (A2Moz) and partially during the Romanesque period (A2Rom), was found to have its earlier illuminations (A2Moz) correspond to the text; yet its later Romanesque illustrations (A2Rom) were shown to have little correspondence with the other Branch I MSS, displaying instead a closer relationship to S and the IIab MSS; (3) Tu, a MS of Branch IIb, having a revised third edition text which corresponds most closely with that of the unillustrated Beatus from Poblet (Pp), iconographically, was found to be a direct copy of G which is not as close a
textual brother to Tu as Pp; and (4) Ar, another MS from Branch IIb, again having a revised third edition text, but having a surprising number of coincidences in its illustrations with those of Branch I MSS. The special case of B, he did not include in this discussion, but referred to it in his 1976 work. In his Madrid paper, Klein indicated that in all other instances, his iconographical analysis confirmed the classifications of Neuss and Sanders, in which the textual and pictorial recensions coincide.

In order to verify more accurately the results of his comparative studies, Klein employed in part a correlation method of statistical analysis. Thus, to the best of my knowledge, he has become the first art historian to combine such a technique with traditional visual analysis in dealing with comparisons of iconographical motifs. This method, which has been routinely used for years in many other fields of study, though perhaps appearing unconventional to art historians, enabled him to define mathematically the degree of correlation (likenesses and differences) of a number of iconographical factors contained in the twenty-odd manuscripts of the Beatus group. He then employed a more traditional, and for many conservative scholars, a more comfortable historical method of analyzing the gradual development of the Beatus iconography found in the various family groups. He has thus made a significant contribution to the study of a large body of early medieval manuscripts whose interrelationships are complex and difficult to reconstruct.

These interrelationships, which will be discussed in more detail below, can be summarized briefly as follows (Figs. 295, 300): The original text edition of the Beatus of 776 was probably unillustrated, or only partially so. Therefore, the oldest illustrated edition was the second edition of 784. The illustrated manuscripts of this textual family are: A2Moz E N Fc L O C (with the special case of B), and a fragment in León. A later version of this first pictorial recension is found in A1 and the earlier model for S, both manuscripts of the first textual edition, and it is unclear whether this edition was
Whereas this second version of the first pictorial recension is a sub-branch without "later consequences", there is another slightly later revision which lays the ground for the second pictorial recension. This "in between" revision is represented by the illustrations in A2Rom, which as pointed out above is a manuscript of the second textual edition, having in part Mozarabic illuminations deriving from the first pictorial tradition.

As Klein noted, the second pictorial recension is accompanied by the third textual edition, and a later textual revision, or Neuss' families IIA and IIb, both of which are from a later time than the first two editions of the Beatus Commentaries. IIA is made up of M V U J and D; and IIb is composed of T G Tu Pc R Ar H (Figs. 295, 300), and a fragment in Mexico. Islamic architectural and figural traits characterize the illuminations of this recension, and so this recension would be from the Asturoleonese kingdom not before the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century. The second pictorial model of S is descended from the early phase of the second tradition before its separation into IIA and IIb. Of the two recensions of the second pictorial tradition, IIA, especially M, gives mostly the older version; however, one cannot here as in the first pictorial tradition separate the two parts distinctly into an older and newer recension (Figs. 295, 300).

Although Klein's work on the Beatus stemma has been well accepted by European scholars, its importance has not yet been well understood by North American scholars. The most recent American scholarly works have, rather, been focused on issues other than those of the precise interrelationships of the Beatus family tree, being concerned more with the date, author, place of origin and the possible sources for the tenth-century revision of the Beatus iconography; or with the influences on and chronology of tenth century Spanish manuscript illumination in general. In addition, in the last two decades American dissertations in the Beatus field have either been concerned with specific
iconographical aspects of certain Beatus manuscripts, or with the placement of a Beatus manuscript within the stylistic framework of its period.

Furthermore, in his review of Klein's published dissertation for Art Bulletin, Williams was not interested in the carefully realized stemmata which Klein has produced. He did note that Klein "demonstrates the truth of a principle clearly enunciated but then not applied by Neuss, namely, that a given text and the set of pictures adorning it may have separate histories. Unlike Neuss, who delineated a single stemma for texts and picture cycles, Klein finds it necessary to construct separate stemmata for the two". Williams then continues, "Presumably some changes will be introduced into Klein's stemma as other manuscripts are subjected to monographic treatment, but they will be analyzed in emulation of Klein...". But, in contrast to Christe, Williams makes little attempt to explain the stemmata which Klein has produced. Instead, assuming that the reader already understands well the complexities of the Beatus manuscript group, Williams enters into a discussion which reflects upon his own well-known interests and comparisons, namely the date and location of the Vit. 14-1 (A1), particularly in reference to the works from Valerancia in Castile, and when the actual revision of the Beatus iconography took place. Thus, an essential opportunity to explain the detailed research of Klein to the American scholarly community was avoided, and quite another discussion took place, which, while related to the problem, cannot be considered until the underlying question of the interrelationships of the remaining Beatus manuscripts to each other are better explained.

Consequently, the best place to start a study of any of the Beatus manuscripts from now on should be a careful examination of the place to which Klein has assigned them in his stemma. Once this is accomplished, other considerations, such as the date, style, or whatever, would gain more relevance than when they are studied in isolation. Since Klein has finally developed a comprehensive stemma for the Beatus pictorial tradition, there
is the tacit understanding that more sophisticated work for art historians in Beatus studies can begin; and the complex iconographical interrelationships of the various manuscripts can be studied and better understood.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine carefully all of the consequences of the detailed work of Klein. This would be an effort beyond the scope of the present essay. It is, however, the stated intention of this discussion to examine Klein's work relative to the manuscript in question, M644, and to point out problems involved in trying to determine the true place of this codex in the stemma of the Beatus pictorial tradition. My research in this regard will be described in Chapter III below.
Notes to Chapter II


2. 1976, Fig. 35. (See Fig. 295 below.) This was his dissertation, which was originally presented at Bonn in 1970.


4. Neuss, 1931, himself states that he has used comparisons of the text to build his stemma, 107; and does so again in the Prolegomena to Gerona I, 1962, 55, "We thus have no small number of Beatus MSS to examine if we wish to throw a reliable light upon the problem of their pictorial decoration. As mentioned previously, we did an important piece of preparatory work when we drew up a genealogical tree by subjecting all the MSS. to very careful textual criticism." Klein 1976 also mentions this, 521, in note 481, "Vgl. Neuß 1931, 107: 'Unser rein aus der Textvergleichung gewonnener Stammbaum...', ebenso idem 1962, 56" (here he refers to the original German portion of the text in the Prolegomena, and I have referred to the English translation portion) as well. In the same location Klein also quotes from Weitzmann 1970 (Roll and Codex), 189: "Picture critics have often adopted this method [of using a scheme called a stemma] from textual criticism in order to bring the mutual relationship of miniature cycles into a similar scheme, but they usually content themselves with making the text stemma, just as it is, the basis for the explanation of the pictorial relations, a usage for which the stemmata of the illustrated Prudentius and Terence manuscripts are well-known examples." Neuss' 1962 use of the word "preparatory" refers only to his textual comparisons, so he falls into the category which Weitzmann is describing. From personal conversations with Neuss, Klein remembers that Neuss felt "his book to be the definitive study, with only doubts about his main results". It must also be remembered that Neuss believed that the archetype of the text and illustrations were one and the same, contrary to Weitzmann's later observation, Studies, 66, that "the archetype of an illustrated manuscript is, as a rule, not as old as the archetype of the text, since it must have been an extremely rare event for the autograph exemplar to have received illustrations; and often some time, occasionally several generations, elapsed before the text became sufficiently popular to lead to the production of an illustrated luxury edition". Werckmeister, 1973, 565-566, also notes that Neuss built his stemma on the text, and links the illustrations to that text, believing, 566, "that the original work, as edited by Beatus himself, was already illustrated... he therefore linked the question of the original form of illustration to that of the original text". For more discussion on this, see below, Chapter IV.

5. Morales, 1765. For other early bibliography on the Beatus Manuscripts, see Ramsay, 1902, 75. One such example of questionable identification was M644 itself, which was confused for some time with the Valcavado Beatus. See above, Chapt. I, note 74, and below, note 18.
6. The Silos fragment, published by Whitehill, 1929, 102-105, is a good example of the point in question, as it was at first placed in the tenth century due to its script (Fig. 307). The Morgan 644 is another example, where by its script it was placed as early as 894 by Rand and others (see above, Chapter I, 24, and note 63). A full discussion of the Silos Fragment was included in the Madrid Congress in 1976, and is published in Actas II, 315-328, where many important observations on it were made. For the most recent work on this fragment, see Noureddine Mezoughi, 1982; idem, 1983; Dodds, forthcoming, also discusses this fragment. In addition, see below, Appendix B. 3.

7. Klein has kindly pointed out to me that the reason was that no one had yet done a critical evaluation of the text. His view is substantiated by Archer M. Huntington, Initials and Miniatures of the IX, X, and XI Centuries from the Mozarabic Manuscripts of Santo Domingo de Silos in the British Museum, New York, 1904, who notes on the first page of his introduction, that few people outside of the Iberian Peninsula had studied the text of these manuscripts before the later part of the nineteenth century. He gives the credit of introducing these “Visigothic Codices” (which includes some of the Beatus manuscripts) into France to Natalis de Wailly by way of reproducing a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale “which had been brought from Spain by Gotiscalcus of Puy in 951 and copied by a monk of Saint Martin d’Albelda” in his “Elements de Paléographie” of 1832. But this is very early in the nineteenth century, and the fact of the matter is that only a few antiquarians really cared about these codices.

8. I have tried to update the locations and signature numbers of these manuscripts for the convenience of the reader. I did not take into consideration Sanders’ alphabetical classification, for I felt that since I was dealing only with the illustrations and not the text, it would not be necessary to do so. Also, there have been some new fragments of Beatus manuscripts found in the intervening years since Neuss made his list. I have included them now, as a matter of general interest, since they will ultimately have to find places within the Beatus pictorial stemma (I included even those with no illuminations, since they may provide some clue as to where they belong according to their text. The ones with space for illustrations but no illustrations have an asterisk*, those which actually have illuminations have two asterisks**):

1. Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragon, Cod. fragm. 209.*
2. León, Archivo Histórico Provincial, Fragm. 1.**
3. Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, Alcobaça 247.**
5. Montserrat, Biblioteca de la Abadía 793-VIII, and Valladolid, Archivo de la Real Chancillería, Pergaminos, carpeta 80, n. 9 y 8 (Fragms.)*
6. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M1079 Miscellany, which is a 1635 copy of 7 leaves from an 11th century Beatus.** See Chapter I, note 1 above for more information on this new purchase.
7. San Pedro de las Dueñas (León), Archivo del Monasterio, fragm. 1.
8. Zaragoza, Col. Canellas and Col. particular, fragms.
I thank Peter Klein for sending me photocopies of articles which contain additional information on two of these fragments: For more information on No. 2, see Díaz y Díaz, "Un nuevo fragmento de Beato", León y su historia, 4, León, 1977 9-18; Taurino Burón Castro, "Fragmentos de códices en el Archivo Histórico de León", Archivos Leonenses, 32, 1978, 137-164. For No. 4, Rafael Cómex, "El documento más antiguo del Archivo General de la Nación (fragmento de un Beato del siglo XIII), Archivo de la Nación, 1985, which also makes reference to M644, 24, and Lam. I. I also am grateful to William Voelkle for sending me the information on the new Morgan Micellany. (See complete description above, Chapter I.)

9. Delisle, 1880, 137.

10. He did present a classification listing on XXIV of his introduction. See Klein's Fig.32b, and Fig. 293 of this study, showing his different alphabetical assignments to the manuscripts which have not been as widely accepted as those of Neuss.

11. Neuss, 1931, 111.

12. Ibid, 2, 109. The question of the archetype will be discussed further in Chapter IV below.


14. Delisle, 1880, 137: "Les peintures qui ornent les anciens exemplaires de l'ouvrage de Beatus n'ont pas encore été l'objet de l'étude approfondie qu'elles méritent et dont l'importance a été rapidement esquissée par M. Didot".

15. These groupings are as follows: Domínguez Bordona, New York, 1930, 15, six categories: (1) (his category A: Silos frgm., 9th century; (2) (his category B): M T V G F i U J S; (3) (his category C): O C; (4) (his category D): E; (5) (his category E): A2 (he notes that the second part [A2Rom] is related to M); and (6) (his category F: 14-1. Klein, 530, note 552: D. B.(1929, 27f.; 1930, 19-21): B: M T G U Fi J S Tu Pp B Pc N H R Ar L (where is V?, and where are Tu Pp B Pc N H R Ar. and L in the English version of the Florence edition, which has only fourteen mss listed?). Neuss, 237, note 2, indicates in regard to Bordona's groupings, "Von M sollen dann nach Bordona D L A2 (nichtmoz. Min.),) Pc N N B Tu C (nichtwestgot. Teil) H Ar R abgeleitet sein. King, 1930, 6: (1) Valcavado group M T V J U; (2) San Millán Group: E A2 O and Silos leaves, 14-1 (C and B have been assoc with it on textual grounds); (3) G Tu some of AsRom S and D; (4) (separate but derivative group) R H (Burgensis) N; (5) Pc and Ar (I believe she thinks R and H depend upon Pc and Ar but to her the relationship is unclear); (6) L (being Cistercian, a thing apart). See Klein, 1976, 530, note 553: bei King (1930 6-8) findet sich die Unterteilung der Beatus-Hss. in eine Valcavado-Gruppe (M V T J U), eine San Millán-Gruppe (E A2moz O Pc F A1 C), eine leonesische Gruppe (G A2rom Tu S D) und eine zisterziensische Gruppe (H Ar R Pc N L)." He thus comes up with four as opposed to my six groupings, for I apparently interpret what King says in regard to R H N and L differently from Klein does. King, furthermore, placed M644 in the Valcavado group, because, like Miller (See note 18 below), she was convinced that it had come from Valcavado, King, 22,
note 3. Unfortunately her article is discursive, and while full of interesting information, is now extremely dated.

16. Fols 33v-34 of Morgan 644 (Figs. 138, 139, 140).


18. See James, 1902, 313-314, who points out Miller's confusion, and settles the situation. He thus basically solves the problem which had been noted by Delisle in 1880. But G. G. King believed as late as 1930 that M644 came from Valcavado, see above, note 15, and Chapter I, note 74.

19. See a full discussion of Miller's stemma in Neuss,1931, 63-65; Menéndez-Pidal, 1954, 223 ff.; and Klein,1976, and note 690, 546. Refer to the beginning of section B above for the manuscripts represented by the letters.

20. Klein, 1976, 176, also notes "Diese Thesen von Miller treffen zwar in wichtigen Punkten zu, sind jedoch als Ganzes von der folgenden Forschung nicht aufgegriffen worden." Klein's point is made all the more striking by the fact that his discussion unlike the present one is chronological in nature, and he moves directly on to the 1919 thesis of Gómez-Moreno that Magius the author of M was the creator of the Beatus imagery, which clearly ignores the work of Miller, and then on to "groupings" of Bordona and King referred to above which likewise make no real attempt to be systematic.

21. But this point was to have later significance for it is similar in the broadest sense to the suggestion made by Klein for his whole Branch II pictorial stemma, i. e., that there was an earlier recension from which the tenth-century manuscripts drew upon (see Figs. 295, 300).


23. Menéndez-Pidal, 263-265.

24. Ibid., 265-266. O and N, then, were ramifications off the stem of the archetype from which M was descended, and modified by Magius.

25. That is to say, the theory of Neuss that the Beatus iconography was in part derived from early Christian iconography, first set forth in Die katalanische Bibelillustration. Bonn, 1922, 66, and made following Tailhan, see 59 and note 13 above; also Neuss,1931, 237-246, esp. 246 regarding M; and the suggestion made by Gómez-Moreno, 1919, 131, 362, that the Beatus iconography was an invention of tenth-century Christian Spain and that Maius, the author of M644 was probably the designer. Though the theory of Gómez-Moreno was stated as probable, it has since been often repeated without that qualification. For more on this, see below, Chapters IV and V.
26. This remark is intended in no way to diminish the work of Menéndez-Pidal in relating the Beatus maps to the Isidorian tradition (see Fig. 292 where he places some of the Beatus maps in context with the rest of the Isidorian tradition), or in other matters of discussion.

27. Werckmeister, 1973, 565, note 5, where he notes that the work of Menéndez-Pidal "purports to give a survey of the problem [of the Beatus cycle of illustrations], yet does not properly take into account Neuss' detailed researches."


29. See above, same page, and note 11. Observe Werckmeister's, 1973, comments on this, 565-566; also see Klein, 1976, 172-174; 1980, 85-86.

30. A problem for this stemma is that some of these manuscripts, for example, Ex Vt F and Pp contain no illuminations. And since, as Werckmeister and Klein have pointed out, Neuss' iconographical comparisons were restricted to four motifs, this stemma can hardly be understood as one which gives full consideration to the pictorial recensions of the Beatus group. Although, since Klein, 1976, 487, note 309, places the Anti-christ tables, which Neuss analyzed, in the pictorial rather than textual tradition, this would make five motifs instead of four; this still is not enough to fully demonstrate the pictorial relationships between these manuscripts.

31. Miner's review, 388-389, discusses some of the major questions Neuss' work raised: "the hypothesis of a North African origin for the Beatus illustrations, his conceptions of the famous Beatus of St. Sever as presenting the clearest notion of the Hellenistic style of the archetype, and his discussion of the group of early illustrated Apocalypses of non-Beatus character." Her review goes on to argue against these points for many reasons, some of which will be discussed below in Chapter IV. Neuss caused some of this problem himself, as Werckmeister 1973, 568, noted, by "presupposing his thesis" of the St.-Sever being closest to the archetype for the Beatus group in his discussion of the illustrations "instead of demonstrating it again".

32. Sanders, 1930, XII-XV; with explanation of his classes XV-XVIII. Sanders used a different lettering system from that of Neuss, which has not prevailed in the scholarship as has that of Neuss, (except that Menté used it in her work, *Contribution*, 1976) listed on XXIV: M=Y; D=S; V=V; U=U; J=M, T=A, H=B, G=G, Tu=T, Ar=C, R=R; A1=N, S=P, A2=H, E=E, B=F, N=Q, O=O. The biggest problem with this system arises when using Sanders' footnotes. See Ansari Mundo and M. Sánchez Mariana in their catalogue developed for the Madrid Congress, *El Comentario de Beato al Apocalipsis. Catalogo de los codices*, Madrid, 1976, 68, for chart with other, mostly numerical references to the Beatus manuscripts. See also the catalogue for the Brussels Symposium, *Los Beatos. Europalia 85 España*, 1985,127, as well, which incorporates the catalogue of Mundo and Sánchez Mariana, with a few additions of newly found fragments of Beatus MSS.

33. Neuss' fol. references, many of them now wrong due to rebinding of some of the manuscripts, especially M644, were still used in 1976 by Mundó and Sánchez Mariana
for their catalogue. This information in turn, as mentioned in note 11 of the Introduction, was simply repeated for the catalogue for the Brussels Beatus Symposium, Los Beatos, 2-3 December, 1985. The use of Neuss as a reference did not stop scholars from continuing to take issue with him relative to such problems as the archetype, and to pointedly disagree with him on the Saint-Sever Beatus (see discussion below, Chapt IV.)

34. Just as Sanders' collation of the Commentary until quite recently was the only authoritative edition. In his preface, Sanders explains the circumstances which led him to very hastily put together his edition. Almost for want of something better, Sanders was reprinted in the Prolegomena volume to the Gerona Facsimile, Beati in Apocalipsin Libri Duodecim Codex Gerundensis, Madrid, Edilan, 1975. A translation of the commentary into Spanish has been included in the recent Edilan facsimile of the St.-Sever Beatus, 1984, 103-217. Also a new collation is under way at the University of Santiago, under the supervision of Díaz y Díaz, and another edition by Eugenio Romero Pose, of the Accademia dei Lincei, in Rome, has been published by the Vatican, 1986/87. I am grateful for this information to both Peter Klein and Sra. Angela Franco, Conservadora de Arte Medieval, of the Museo Arqueológico Nacional, in Madrid. However, for purposes of this study, Sanders' edition has been used, as when the present research was done this newer edition was not available to me.

35. Klein, 1976. He indicated in conversation with me that in his discussions with Neuss, he felt that though Neuss in general supported his research, he did not necessarily share his views. See note 4 above.

36. Like Neuss and James, Klein also studied the large body of Early Medieval Apocalypses outside the Beatus tradition, but this work, published slightly before and after his Beatus dissertation, lay outside his dissertation proper. He is now preparing a Corpus of Medieval Apocalypses outside the Beatus tradition. A few examples of his work outside the Beatus area proper are: "Date et scriptorium de la Bible de Roda. Etat des recherches", Les cahiers de St.-Michel de Cuxa, 3 (1972), 91-102; 1972-74, 267-333; "Der Codex und sein Bildschmuck", R. Laufner, P. K. Klein, Trier Apokalypse (Codices Selecti), Graz, 1975; "Les cycles de l'Apocalypse du Haut Moyen Age (IXe-XIIIe s.)", L'Apocalypse de Jean. Traditions exégétiques et iconographiques, Ill- Xlle siècles (Actes du Colloque de la Fondation Hardt, 29 fev.-3 mars. 1976, Genève), Geneve, Droz, 1979; "Les Apocalypses romane et la tradition exégétique", Cahiers de St.-Michel de Cuxa, 12 (1981), 123-140. Throughout this work, he has grouped the early medieval Apocalypses into four groupings (see Fig. 317), the Beatus group being his group four. The archetype for this group is still, from his point of view, questionable, and is a separate tradition from the other three. Although he did not deal with the archetype of the Beatus in his dissertation, Klein considers this in Actas II, 99-104, follows Neuss in suggesting a North African or Spanish origin for the model of the archetype (104). See further discussion below, Chapt. III. Klein's work on both the Trier Apocalypse, and the published Beatus dissertation was carefully and sensitively reviewed by Yves Christe in the Journal des Savants, 1977, 225-245. I am particularly grateful to Prof. Astrid Gabriel for pointing out this review to me at the time it was published.
37. Klein's work in this regard was mentioned by Werckmeister as early as 1973, before Klein's dissertation was published, when he indicated that Klein was the first author to take into account Neuss' detailed research, and to question and revise many of Neuss' results: Werckmeister, 1973, 565-66, note 5; but it must be remembered that Klein had finished this work by 1970, and it had been read and recognized as significant by Nordenfalk and Williams, who drew attention to Klein's contribution "as an auditor" to a Beatus seminar held at Pittsburgh. Note Williams work of 1977, 6, where he remarked that "Peter Klein... gave generously of his intimate knowledge of Spanish manuscripts..."

38. Klein, 1976, 170-175, 216, esp. 173, where Klein shows that the views of Neuss and Sanders "are not as irreconcilable as Neuss had thought". Here I am quoting from Werckmeister, 1973, 566, note 9. Klein's view that the third edition was done after Beatus' death seems to echo Delisle's question of 1880, 137, "Ou bien, n'y aurait-il la trace des efforts tentés, plus ou moins long temps après la mort de l'auteur, ou rétablir un texte altéré par les copistes et mettre les nombres en harmonie les uns avec les autres?" See below, note 53, and Chapter V, for more discussion on this.

39. Other scholars were accepting a revision as early as the fifties, as does Nordenfalk, 1957,162-165, where he notes stylistically two successive periods for Mozarabic painting, the first being the "Merovingian-Byzantine" and the second being "Islamic-Carolingian". The tenth-century sources and character of the Mozarabic Beatus manuscripts has also been extensively discussed by other scholars, for example, José Camón Aznar in Gerona II,19-178; Guilmain, 1976,183-191; and also most recently Nourredine Mezoughi,1984, 24; Dodds, also will be discussing various stylistic changes in tenth-century Spanish architecture in her forthcoming book. I will refer to her work in more detail below, Chapter V.

40. See Klein, 1976, 298-301, which is mostly based on paleographical indications. For Klein, the new pictorial recension comes with the Islamic influence which he notes, in addition to his discussion in his dissertation, in Actas II, 98; and where Werckmeister, in the Colloquium following Klein's paper, Actas II, 115, encourages him to accept the fact that late Carolingian influence is also a part of the change.

41. Klein openly acknowledges his debt to Weitzmann, see for example his remarks in Actas II, 1980, 88, note 8. Díaz y Díaz praised this aspect of Klein's work in the Colloquium which followed Klein's paper at Madrid, Actas II, "En todo caso, a mí complace mucho subrayar aquí que la ponencia del Professor Klein, de una manera clara y rotunda establece ya definitivamente la diferencia entre el aspecto textual y el aspecto pictórico por lo que hace a la relación entre las distintas familias de manuscritos. Y creo que esto sólo es ya una auténtica novedad en el estudio de los Beatos."

42. Klein, 1976, 85-149. This was a much more detailed analysis from the discussions of aesthetic qualities and sources for isolated iconographical motifs as one finds, for example, earlier in the century in the work of G. G. King, Walter Cook, Meyer Schapiro, and Frits van der Meer.
43. **Actas II.** 89-90. For a fuller discussion of these deviations, see Klein, 1976, 211-215. Also references to B in note 45 below.

44. **Actas II.** 89-90; Klein, 1976, Fig 34 a-c and Figs. 35, here reproduced as Figs. 295, 296, 297, 298, 299. But see his conclusions, 303, point 7, where he includes six examples of lack of coordination between text and picture traditions: "Bei den Beatus-Hss. A1 S A2 Tu Ar B stehen Text und Bilder in jeweils unterschiedlicher Traditionen, Text- und Bildvorlagen dieser Hss. waren also nicht (immer) identisch; außerdem sind bei S Tu (?) Ar B verschiedene Bildtraditionen kontaminiert worden." My issue with him on this question concerns the fact that there is little textual and pictorial fitting together for the whole Beatus group, when one has recensions which start at different times in the history of a group of manuscripts, i.e., if the first textual edition is not illustrated, and the second textual edition receives the first pictorial recension, then something is already not matching. If he believed at the time he wrote his Ph.D. dissertation that the first edition might be partially illustrated in some way, he was not at that time following Weitzmann's principles. However, the illustration of the first edition might have been confined to decoration and abstract symbols such as those which appear for the temple in E, fol. 103v, Klein, **Actas II.** Fig. 14, or in L, fol. 152, Klein, **Actas II.** Fig. 15. See notes 50 and 54 below for more on this problem, especially note 54, where I point out that through personal correspondence with Klein, I finally understood what he meant.

45. For a more detailed examination of Klein's method of analysis, see below, Chapter III. Roland Sanfaçon of L'Université Laval has done a computerized stylistic analysis for architectural features in late Gothic buildings in France. He thus can tell immediately how many windows, doors, etc., there may be of a particular type in what part of France. Though I have seen some of his computer printouts, I do not believe that he has used the same statistical method as Klein has. I think he is dealing more with percentages of stylistic types across France, which of course could be considered statistical in nature. Even if he has used the same formula as Klein, Klein still is the first art historian to employ the Pearson "tetrachoric R" formula to iconographic analysis, and Sanfaçon's analysis would be considered statistically different in type. Also note Ellen Schiferl's "The Romanesque Painted Altar Frontals of Spain: a New Methodology of Dating", Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1980, which though analyzed formal characteristics in order to date these panels, apparently did not use any mathematical formula to order these characteristics, but used a different method instead. Both of the above mentioned approaches are very viable and useful to art historians.

46. Christe, 1977, 238, in reviewing Klein, 1976, noted that Klein "a appliqué au classement des Beatus... une méthode statistique qui étonnera quelques historiens d'art mais qui a fait ses preuves en d'autres domaines". See Klein's discussion of this method in **Actas II.** 88, where he notes that it is "much more exact and objective than the conventional comparative method employed by Neuss, because it does not limit the analysis to the likeness (coincidencias) of the objects compared", but includes the divergences as well. As he wrote to me later "you cannot trick by using only some easy and favorable examples, leaving outside those which do not fit". He returns to this subject, 90, where he demonstrates that statistical analysis has confirmed what
Carlos Cid and Isabel Vigil had found by using conventional comparative methods. For a full discussion of this method, see Klein, 1976, 154-156, and below, Chapter III.

47. This procedure, though not specifically mentioned by Klein in a separate note as such employs another suggestion of Weitzmann relative to iconography and style. Klein first divorced iconography from style, in order to see how the growth proceeded, and then used style to provide an historical framework. Raizman, 1980, 48, note 40 quotes from Weitzmann, 1970, pp. 182-183, "on the importance and difficulty of detaching style from iconography in order to reconstruct a model". Raizman used this technique of Weitzmann's as a part of his own "dual" method of analysis in comparing H with its traditionally presumed model T.

48. He has applied a similar more conventional or traditional comparative procedure to relate the early Medieval Apocalypes outside of the Beatus group as well and has produced a stemma which encompasses them all, for example, 1972-74, 296, Fig. 2; 1975, 112, Fig. 1. He has also employed the same conventional methods in his Endzeiterwartung und Ritterideologie. Die frühen gotischen Bilder-Apokalpsen und der Kodex Douce 180 (Codices Selecti, 70), Graz, 1983.

49. In his dissertation, Klein still thought that perhaps the first edition had been at least partially illustrated. But by the time he gave his Actas II paper, he believed that the 776 edition was unillustrated. This is an interesting compromise between Sanders, who believed that there were three editions of the Commentary produced within Beatus' lifetime, and Neuss, who believed that there was only one edition of the Beatus illustrated within Beatus' lifetime, but also only in a single archetype, rather than several editions. By placing the third edition of the Commentary (containing the second pictorial recension) well after Beatus' death (Klein, 1976, 175), Klein is still agreeing with Neuss that there was only one illustrated edition of the Beatus Commentary within Beatus' lifetime. However, this is only a small, somewhat ironic point. More important is the succession of the editions of the Beatus and how they proceed. In the discussion of Klein's conclusions on the pictorial stemma I am following Klein, 1976, 216-217. For reasons of economy, I can provide only rough translations of his German text in some instances, particularly here. See also his conclusions, 303, point 8.

50. León, Archivo Histórico Provincial, fragm I. See Los Beatos, the Brussels Catalogue, no. 7. This fragment has one miniature, the Church of Philadelphia, and has been published by T. Burón Castro: "Fragmentos de códices en el Archivo histórico de León", Archivos leoneses, 32, 1978, 140-144. I thank Peter Klein, who pointed this out to me, and who assigns it to Branch I. (See note 8, addendum to Neuss' list at the beginning of section B. of this chapter.)

51. Ibid., 216. "Da offen ist, ob die 1. Textfassung ursprünglich ganz. bzw. teilweise illustriert war, bleibt auch unklar, ob diese hier möglicherweise eingewirkt hat." But see note 50 above, and Actas II, p. 96, Fig. 2, where the stemma clearly shows that he has decided that the first edition was not illustrated. Compare this with Fig. 36 of his dissertation (See Fig. 296) of the present essay. I would have thought that A1 and S
would be another possible example of deviation of text from iconography as per Klein's discussion in *Actas II*, and I did not understand this well at first. However, I now agree with Klein, after personal correspondence, that this may be correct for their special circumstances but the same condition does not apply for the rest of the first edition MSS which received the first pictorial recension. In the latter case there is not a divergence of text and pictorial stemma. The situation of the Branch II MSS is different, as the textual and pictorial recensions are later, and thus less pure than those of the first part of Klein's Branch I.

52. See note 51 above.

53. Here we have the problem of the dedication to Etherius, i.e., if this third edition was not done until after Beatus' lifetime, would perhaps Delisle's second suggestion be correct? (See above, note 38) This also touches upon the problem of the original attribution of the commentary to Beatus, which was made by Morales on the basis of the dedication to Etherius which appears in some of the Beatus MSS, Etherius being the co-author with Beatus of a controversial letter to the heretical Bishop Elipandus. For further, see Chapter V and Appendix F below.

54. Archivo General de la Nacion, Ilustr. 4852 (Inquisición, vol. 67, fol. 25v). *Los Beatos*, 18. This fragment also has one illumination (El trono de los justos y las almas de los mártires), y huella de otra. Again, I thank Peter Klein, who called this to my attention; he indicates that this fragment belongs to Branch IIb. In this study refer to note 8 above, addendum to Neuss' list.

55. Klein, *Actas II*, Figs. 20 and 21. See also note 40 above.

56. Klein, 217. We will return to this point and discuss it more fully below, Chapter III.


58. This may in part be due to the recent relaxed language requirements for graduate students in Art History. Whereas in former days German was almost the obligatory second language for students of Art History in the United States, this is sadly no longer the case. While reading courses in foreign languages are usually available to graduate students, and may be required for obtaining the terminal degree, these courses frequently do not deal at all with art historical terminology, and thus on end are not helpful for the proper understanding of complex arguments set forth in the foreign language in question.
59. Guilmain, 1976, 183-191; idem, "Northern Influences in the Initials and Ornaments of the Beatus Manuscripts", *Actas II*, 65-77; idem, 1981, 369-401; John Williams, "The Moralia in Iob of 945: Some Iconographic Sources", *Archivo español de arqueología* (Homenaje a Helmut Schlunk), 45-47 (1972-74); idem, 1977; idem, review of Peter K. Klein, 1979, 633-636; idem, "The Beatus Commentaries and Spanish Bible Illustration", *Actas II*, 1980, 201-219; idem, a paper given at Kalamazoo, May 1984; idem, a paper delivered both at the Beatus Symposium in Brussels, *Los Beatos*, 2-3 December, 1985, and at the Morgan Library April 1986. Williams related to me the fact that the two papers were the same in a conversation at Kalamazoo, Spring 1986.

60. Tassé, 1972; and Growdon, 1976.

61. Raizman, 1980. Growdon, 1976, touched upon Klein's then unpublished stemma in one footnote, 16, note 2; while Raizman accepted Klein's stemma and then moved on to the main body of his discussion, which was to place the painters of M429 into the frame of reference of their time. In addition to these studies, there is the aesthetic approach of the dissertation of Rosa, 1975.

62. Williams, 1979, passim.

63. Ibid., 633-634. He did not say where Neuss referred to this. Klein is actually following the reasoning of Weitzmann, as has been noted above, and in this shows the wisdom of his own scholarship, which is to build carefully upon the best and most clearly reasoned ideas laid down in the past; foundations laid, as it were, by others.

64. 1979, 634. He continues, "with the aid of this work, for it is a treasure house of information." Thus his review is very much in the tradition of Miner's for Neuss - to praise for the detailed content and the valuable information offered, but to take issue with the conclusions, and to direct a good part of the attention to subjects dear to the reviewer's heart.

65. See above, Introduction.
CHAPTER III
THE PLACE OF M644 IN THE PICTORIAL STEMMA OF THE BEATUS

A. Background

In order to place the present work method in an appropriate frame of reference, it is necessary to examine more closely the conventional methods of comparisons used by Neuss, and then go on to evaluate the results of Klein's combined historical and statistical analysis. This will provide the basis for further iconographical comparisons that are relevant in determining the relationships between M 644 and its closest relatives on the Beatus family tree.

1. Neuss' Traditional Method of Comparison

In building his stemma for the Beatus manuscript group, Neuss compared only four illuminations: in M 644, The World Map¹ (Figs. 138, 139, 140), The Halting or Restraining of the Winds (Apoc. VII. 1-3)² (Fig. 162), The Appearance of the Unknown in the Clouds (Apoc. I, 7-9)³ (Fig. 136), and The Flood and the Ark⁴ (Figs 154, 155). He also examined the Anti-christ Tables, as a "decoration between picture and text".⁵ (Figs. 192, 259). After he had critically analyzed the text of all the manuscripts,⁶ he then offered a stemma based on the text and the analysis of the few iconographical motifs noted above.⁷ (Fig. 294). He went on to scrutinize the remaining seventy-six topics relative to
the Apocalypse found in the illustrations of the manuscripts, and twelve additional ones which are part of the Daniel Commentary. Thus in all he examined and compared over 100 iconographical subjects which are illustrated in these codices. It is in these comparisons that the material would have been provided for a separate pictorial stemma, had he not been so certain that the text and illustrations came out of a single source, a source epitomized in the example of the Saint-Sever Apocalypse (Fig.312). Unfortunately, all through his extensive and remarkably presented material, his comparisons were designed to support his already presumed view that the Saint-Sever Apocalypse was the closest exemplar of the archetype. Consequently, in many instances his keen observations did not lead him to the logical conclusions which he could have made, just as many times his approach led him to make errors in judgment. Only one example is necessary to show this, one which Werckemister has pointed out dealing with the flood accompanying the ark, and which so concisely demonstrates the errors in Neuss' thinking on some of the topics which he studied. For example, his insistence that the flood in the Ashburnham Pentateuch was the Early Christian prototype for the Beatus illustrations, yet at the same time considering G, a Branch IIb manuscript which has different iconography to demonstrate the most complete rendering of the scene. Meanwhile, S (fol. 85) does not show the ark, but only the flood with bodies and animals floating in it. As Werckmeister points out, Neuss assumed that both S and G, though exhibiting very different characteristics, were descended from the Ashburnham Pentateuch. Werckmeister continues throughout his discussion to point out the subtitles which Neuss has overlooked, such as which chapter or time in the episode in Genesis being described by the various representations involved. So some of Neuss’ many conventional comparisons did not really prove the point they might have. Neuss apparently was verbally rather than visually oriented, and thus did not have the capacity to connect the illustrations he was comparing with his vast knowledge of theological and early literature. He also
apparently did not have a good eye for seeing the likenesses and differences in the visual material which he was comparing. This heightens the importance of Klein's work. Klein, having a good eye, not only made careful observations using traditional art historical comparisons, carefully supported by his own wide knowledge of theological and related literature; but he also used scientific means to justify his conclusions.

It is to his methodology which we now turn.

2. Klein's Statistical/Historical Method

Klein's work of 1976, while basically centering on the older Beatus manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, the Vit. 14-1 (A1), as has been noted above, was also concerned with the relationship of this codex to the entire Beatus manuscript group and to tenth-century Spanish manuscript illumination as a whole. He examined the place of A1's illuminations within the Beatus manuscript group by comparing all the remaining miniatures in that codex with the rest of the Beatus manuscripts having the same iconography. He then discussed the results of his iconographical comparisons in a statistical manner. Taking these statistics and separating the textual and iconographical material, he was able to construct a stemma for the text and one for the iconography. His textual stemma varied only slightly from that of Neuss, but his pictorial one differed to a larger degree (Figs. 294, 295, and 296). The rest of his work, in particular his Chapters VI-VIII, was a detailed comparative analysis of the stylistic nature of A1 and its associations with appropriate tenth-century Spanish manuscripts from various scriptoria in both northern and southern Spain. While he discussed important stylistic aspects of M, such an analysis is not pertinent to the central problem with which I am concerned in the present essay.
The portion of Klein's work which is of particular interest to us in this study is, of course, his mechanism for building a pictorial stemma for the Beatus tradition. This is found in his Chapter V, 157-169, where he provides tables showing the relationship of the various manuscripts to each other, and in the Appendices, 306-409, where he lists the iconographical characteristics and other data he used to support the results reported in the tables in Chapter V.22 Before presenting the series of three tables found on 157-169, he carefully explains what these figures involved mean. Since the first two statistical procedures, summarized in Tables I and II represent rather simple statistical methods, they gave him certain limitations in considering the precise relationship between the twenty-nine preserved illustrations of A1 and the other Beatus manuscripts. These two statistical tables are based on the pictorial comparisons of his preceding section, Chapt. V, B.23 Thus they deal with common formal elements and qualities which he found in making his comparisons of the manuscripts. Table I counted the characteristics which appear only in the two specific manuscripts being compared. These "Bindemerkmale" or "common elements" are significant, as they are features which are alike. In Table II, only the quantity of the parallels is of importance: all the common formal features and qualities of the illustrations in all the manuscripts he examined are summarized, including those found in the comparisons in Table I. In these tables, the numbers in parentheses which appear to the right of the columns are the actual number of comparisons made, the numbers to the left are the similarities referred to above.24 Thus at first his work appears to be fairly conventional in its comparative approach. However, as the results of these first two tables were quantified by simple statistics, they move beyond a merely traditional method; and the numbers which appear in Table III move even farther from the traditional manner of comparison, since they are the result of his statistical analysis. These numbers are the correlation co-efficients he calculated for the Anti-christ Tables, which he explains belong to the picture tradition and not the textual tradition.25 This is where his work became
entirely unconventional to the more conservative art historical scholar. These figures were calculated by using a simplified version of Karl Pearson's "Tetrachoric R" formula:

\[ V = \frac{ab-bc}{\sqrt{(a+b)(c+d)(a+c)(b+d)}} \]

Where \( a \) = the number of characteristics belonging to both things being compared, in this case both manuscripts;
\( b \) = the number of characteristics belonging to the 1st but not the 2nd;
\( c \) = the number of characteristics belonging to the 2nd but not the 1st; and
\( d \) = the number of characteristics belonging to neither manuscript.\(^26\)

As is easily seen, the values obtained by this formula, can signify a number of critical points. They take into consideration both the likenesses and differences for any given motif or factor being analyzed, and describe the strength of the relationship between the two items being compared. Thus, they are the coefficients of association or similarity. However, these values may be negative or positive, between +1 and −1. The significance of these values can be tested by another formula called the Chi-Square test, or \( X^2 \), which Klein explains involves a margin for error of .05, and where \( X^2 = 3.841 \).\(^27\) Thus as he notes, only \( X^2 \) values of 3.841 or over would be significant enough to consider a strong degree of relationship between two manuscripts being compared. This significance can be calculated by the formula \( X^2 = N V^2 \), where \( N \) is the total number of items compared, and \( V \) is the correlation coefficient (Appendix D below).\(^28\)

Klein then explains his method of working out the correlation coefficients found in Tables III, 157-169, which he did only for the two Anti-christ tables.\(^29\) The procedure is a three-step one: (1) developing a checklist of characteristics to be analyzed (Appendix B),\(^30\) (2) making matrixes from these checklists (Appendix C),\(^31\) and (3) calculating the correlation coefficients by applying the numbers listed on the "Value Table" from the Tetrachoric R formula (Appendix D).\(^32\) To develop the checklist for the Anti-christ Tables, for example, he merely picked out formal elements which he felt were important
enough to compare, 50 for the 1st table, and 78 for the 2nd, or a total of 128 between the
two. He then analyzed which manuscripts have this particular motif or factor, and grouped
them into one of two alternatives, yes and no, or + and -. For the 1st table, this included
16 manuscripts, and for the 2nd, 18 manuscripts.

He subsequently made the matrixes for these two Anti-christ tables, seen in his
Appendix II, by placing the letters of the manuscripts analyzed at the top of a grid, which is
unlined, and which lists the numbers of the motifs or factors along the left margin of the
grid. By cross-referencing with the checklists in the Appendices to his study, he was able
to place a "+" or a "-" in the appropriate spot on the grid. In running quickly down the 1st
two columns of the 1st page of his first table, which compares A1 and E, one can
quickly distinguish the "++'s" (a in the formula), and the "--'s" (d), which show the two
alternative ways in which the two manuscripts in question are alike, from the "+-'s" (b) and
the "--'s" (c), which show the two alternative ways in which the manuscripts are not alike.

The number of each of these can thus be counted and entered into a table such as the
one Klein has made in his Appendix III, where for A1 and E there are 71.5 ++'s, 34.5 --
's, 11.5 +- 's, and 10.5 --'s. When these numbers are substituted for the a's, b's, c's
and d's in the Tetrachoric R formula, the correlation coefficient for the Anti-christ tables of
A1 and E can be calculated as 0.6250, as is seen in the far right column of his table.

The Chi-Square test for probability can then be run on this coefficient by using the
\[ X^2 = N \times V^2 \] formula, where V is the correlation coefficient, and where N equals the four
numbers added together (Tables 2-9 in Appendix D below). This fourth step, which Klein
refers to above, is very easy to do. He did the Chi-Square test in each case, but did not
indicate the actual numerical values on his table, choosing instead to indicate the
insignificant values with an asterisk (Appendix D, 2, Table 1). As Klein succinctly
explained in his Madrid paper, the critical value of this system is that it compares the differences as well as the likenesses between the manuscripts involved, something which more conventional visual analysis such as Neuss employed cannot accomplish.\(^{37}\)

Thus while Klein clearly understood the statistical manner of dealing with the formal elements he chose to compare, he did not have enough time to completely finish this specific aspect of his work, and so was not able to actually calculate all the figures for the entire twenty-nine remaining miniatures in A1.\(^{38}\) His methodology appeared to be the best that could have been used at that time, and his correlation coefficients for the Anti-christ Tables in some cases come very close to those for the average coefficients for rest of the comparisons in the manuscripts involved (Appendix D, 3, Tables 2-9). Nevertheless he was doing pioneering work in establishing a pictorial stemma, and his figures fall close enough to the mark. As he himself indicated, it was the "broad evaluation" of these results which enabled him to construct a new Beatus pictorial stemma.\(^{39}\)

However, because the statistical formula he was using does not take into consideration the variant of the factor of time, i.e., when a particular iconographical motif might have been introduced into pictorial tradition, he used conventional historical analysis in part to demonstrate how the Beatus iconography developed.\(^{40}\) There is also an additional dimension which could, and I feel must be considered: the variant of time as a factor, which can be mathematically computed and could thus be used to determine the iconographical relationships between manuscripts done over a long period of time.\(^{41}\) This specific point is concerned with the problem of the development of the Beatus iconography by accretion or regression, and is especially important to us as Neuss considered the iconographical development to reflect in part of family I at least, a regression from the mean, which would have been his best exemplar of the archetype, the Saint-Sever. As Klein chose to analyze the development of the Beatus iconography in a "structurally
abstract" evolutionary manner, or as those dealing with semiotics, might say "diachronic analysis", there was generally accretion rather than regression.42

But though there are ways to determine the time factor mathematically, and to calculate numerically other aspects of the relationships of these manuscripts to each other, some might ask the question of just how far the art historian needs to use such methods to achieve the best comparative results, and where the line should be drawn between art history and statistics.43 Klein's solution was to take the abstract relationships which his correlation analysis had given him, and to put those into an historical frame of reference which clearly shows the development of certain selected motifs of the Beatus iconography. These carefully reasoned analyses, based in large parts on accepted techniques of analysis developed by Weitzmann, appear in Chapter V of his dissertation, and are summarized in Actas II.44 Thus Klein was able to show how iconographical changes of a pictorial motif, or of a manuscript as a whole could take place.

It is clear, indeed, that Klein not only achieved critically significant work in separating the pictorial from the textual stemma for the Beatus group, but was ingenious in using statistical as well as historical analysis. So he has shown that mathematical study used in conjunction with historical evaluation is very useful in examining the complex relationships between artistic monuments such as the illuminations in the Beatus manuscripts. He has further demonstrated that use of scientific techniques as support tools for studies in art history is invaluable, and that art historians would profit by incorporating new methods of evaluation in their investigations along with their more traditional manner of research.
3. Procedures Used in the Present Work

In the present work we have used three steps: (1) a statistical analysis of the topics which Klein did not fully analyze has been carried out; (2) a conventional formal comparison of selected elements in an illumination in M with some other pertinent Beatus manuscripts; and (3) a statistical analysis of this subject has been completed. A summary of this work has enabled us to make conclusions pertinent to the topics discussed in Chapters IV and V below.

B. Statistical Analysis of Klein's Subjects

As we have explained above, to start with a new formula was clearly beyond the scope of the present work, as one of our objects was simply to examine Klein's stemma in relationship to M644. Furthermore, only one of the Anti-christ tables, and only one of the other twenty-seven illuminations analyzed and placed into checklists by Klein, is missing in M. Thus it was possible to begin by utilizing Klein's characteristic lists for those twenty-seven illustrations which applied to A1.

The first task was to complete the matrixes for the twenty-six illustrations listed in Klein's Appendix IV (Appendix C, 3, below), and then to calculate the correlation coefficients from these matrixes (Appendix D, 3, column V). The Chi-Square test could then be applied to the correlation coefficients (Appendix D, 3, column X). The values of both the correlation coefficients, which it must be remembered determine only the strength of the relationship between the manuscripts, and the Chi-Square test, which demonstrates the significance of the relationship, are shown in Appendix D, 3, Tables 1-8. These values show that Klein's work, while only using a small sample, is directly on course.
Though only partially using correlation analysis, in my opinion, he has laid the groundwork for all future study of the Beatus pictorial stemma.49

Examination of the composite graph for the correlation coefficients (Appendix E, Fig. 79) for Branch IIa using Klein's figures at once indicates that while some of the results were predictable, others were quite surprising. For example, on this graph which compares the correlation coefficients of V U J and D with M, the rise and fall of the lines which describe the degree of relationship of these other manuscripts to M, was different in some regards than one might anticipate. For instance, in numbers 1-3, which show the relationship of three of the seven churches, Smyrna, Pergamon and Philadelphia, respectively, the coefficients for Smyrna in V and U are almost identical, and show a strong relationship to M, while those for J and D, somewhat less identical, show a more distant relationship with M. Yet the relationships of the other two churches compared, Pergamon and Philadelphia are entirely different from this first example. For Pergamon, J and V are almost identical and show a relationship from M slightly more removed than that for Smyrna while D hovers only a bit closer to M. U, however, as in the case of Smyrna, shows a strong relationship with M, but the degree of relationship is not so substantial. In the last case, the illustration for Philadelphia, U is the closest in relationship to M, with J next in proximity. V and D while almost identical to each other in value are more distanced from M.50 This sort of juggling of the coefficient values appears all across the graph, and tends to give a pattern of relationships almost as scattered as in a family where certain genetic characteristics are dispersed not necessarily in a direct line, but throughout the extended family, occurring at times in nephews, nieces and cousins rather than in sons and daughters, and definitely reinforces the view that the ancestor of this iconography was more ancient than M.51
Thus while U appears to be strongly related to M in the case of the three churches, it is by far the most distantly related to M under number 6, the Third Trumpet, where J also shows a weak correspondence, and D and V are almost tied as the closest, albeit rather weakly related to M. Therefore, while the coefficients for the Anti-christ Tables (Appendix D, Table 1, Appendix E, Fig. 78), which rather closely relate U and D, and a little less so for V and J, may appear to be good indicators of relationships between these manuscripts, they do not actually describe a consistent degree of relationship in the question of the other twenty-seven examples involved. As can be seen by the composite graph for IIa manuscripts in comparison with M (Appendix E, Fig. 79), V is closest to M eight times, U is closest seven times, while J and D are six and four respectively. At the same time, D is the most distant from M in nine cases, V and J are in six, U four. Klein must have had difficulty with this as well, for the comparative relationships of U D V and J on his finished stemma shown in his Fig. 36 (Fig. 296) are slightly corrected from their appearance in his stemma demonstrating the statistical comparisons shown in his Fig. 34 (Fig. 298).

In comparing M with pertinent manuscripts outside its family group, I found unexpected results. For example, the statistics for M and S (Appendix D, 3, Table 7; Appendix E, Fig. 80), indicate 67% correlation in Klein's relationships, even though some of those were on the low edge of the margin rather than the high. This is a much closer coincidence than I had thought existed between M and S, and supports the view held by some scholars that the painter/scribe had an M type manuscript as one of the codices he was copying. A2 (Appendix D, 3, Table 6; Appendix E, Fig. 81), however, showed a much lesser degree of relationship than I had expected, having only a correlation of 25%. I was also surprised in some of my comparisons with Branch IIb manuscripts. I chose H, supposedly to be a copy of T, but probably corrupted across the centuries; and G, as examples to compare. The results for H showed a correlation of 43%, while those for G
showed 50% (Appendix D, 3, Tables 8 and 9; Appendix E, Figs. 82 and 83). These figures are about what I had expected. But in all these graphs, the number of insignificant relationships and the scattering of elements demonstrates that M could not possibly have been the parent of the entire Ilab Branch.

The twenty-nine examples Klein used is about a quarter of the number of illustrations in M, and thus constitutes a good sampling. However, it became tempting to analyze at least one topic in M which does not appear in A1. This would mean doing first a conventional description of at least one such subject, and then running a statistical analysis of it.

In choosing an additional subject which would show M644’s place in the most telling way, the task proved to be more difficult than one might think. Most of the illustrations in M have been discussed by Neuss in detail, and many by Klein, Werckmeister and others. A1, the subject of Klein’s work, is a member of the second part of Branch I of the Beatus pictorial tradition, and thus does not contain many of the illuminations found in Branch II ab, for example, the prefatory pages to the commentary and the illustrations which accompany the Daniel commentary appended to the Branch II manuscripts.

While it was tantalizing to consider comparing iconographical motifs such as the evangelist pages, and the Daniel pages which present interesting possibilities since they are rarely discussed; I wanted to include examples from Branch I. Therefore, it seemed that it would be more useful to make comparisons using a subject from the Apocalypse proper which has already been discussed in the Beatus literature, but has not yet been subjected to correlation analysis. In addition, I wanted to use a subject which could be helpful in establishing clear relationships between families I, the "In-betweens", and Ilab.
Therefore, the following topic was examined: The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb, Apoc. V, fol. 87 of M644 (Fig. 158).58

C. The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb (Apoc. V, f. 87 in M644 Compared Conventionally with Those in Pertinent Other Beatus MSS

This topic, which was the subject of a dissertation by Tassé, 197259, was chosen because it has received an in-depth scholarly analysis from a different point of view.60 It does not appear in two of our IIa Branch manuscripts, U and V, but this may be due to losses.61 However, it does occur in M J and D of Branch IIa, and Tu Ar R and H of Branch IIb (Figs. 158, 287, 288, 289, 285, 286, 284). And it appears in A2 N O and L from branch I (Figs. 283, 282, 279, 280). Because it is extant in only some of the manuscripts from each group, it therefore makes a unique subject to explore, and it helps us to demonstrate the relationships between the families I, the "In-Betweens" and IIab, as noted above.

While examining this subject it will become obvious that we have several compositional elements to consider across the various members of the Beatus family group of manuscripts, for example: (I) the external composition, i. e. round or rectangular; (2) how the internal format is composed; (3) whether there are angels at the corners of the composition and what form they take; (4) the form of the beasts, and how they are placed; (5) how many elders are present, if at all, and what they are doing; and (6) most importantly, whether Christ (The Enthroned) is missing, or incorporated into the circle, or as we shall in some cases, above the circle.62
In considering these six elements, we could not have a more diverse group than them. In Branch I, for example, there is O, which shows a mixture of elements from several traditions, and exhibits compositional forms that are very different from the other manuscripts of that family group. Its composition is rectangular, and the Lamb is placed beneath Christ who is seated not on a throne, but on two bands which appear rainbow-like. The lower of these two bands has circles in it (Fig. 279). The four beasts, in anthropozoomorphic form are at the four corners of the full-page illustration, and the elders, for the most part represented as half-length, hold up their musical instruments in a ritualistic manner. Only one angel has the honor of holding the lozenge-shaped mandorla, and he flies in to perform this from the left, holding what appears to be a book in his right hand as he points to it with his left. There are only three inscriptions, "XPS" to the right of Christ, "liber" above an upright rectangle, and "Agnus" above the lamb. Thus Christ, the book and the Lamb are enclosed together within the mandorla, and the angel seems to be the agent tying together the four beasts and their gospels with the book, Christ, and the Lamb, the latter two, being considered as one and the same.63

However, the illustration of this topic in L (Fig. 280), also a member of Branch I, may provide a distinct clue as to how the circular, rather than the rectangular form found in O of the Adoration of the Lamb and the Enthroned, entered the Beatus tradition. The circular configuration of L encloses the Lamb in a central roundel which overlaps those of the four Beasts which are Early Christian or Carolingian in nature and holding books. There is no enthroned being with the Lamb. Nor are there any elders with musical instruments. At first glance the form in L appears very similar to that from a Gospel Book from St.-Amand in the Bibliothèque Municipale in Valenciennes (Fig. 281).64 Yet as one looks at the two compositions more closely, there are many differences. Both are circular in format, with the lamb in the center, and the evangelist symbols divided from each other
by vegetation which extends to the border of the circle. Beyond this, there are variations in composition which are very suggestive. The axis is entirely different. For example, in the St.-Amand illustration the vegetation elements form a cruciform motif around the Lamb which in L and other Beatus manuscripts, particularly those of Branch IIab, is accomplished by the evangelist symbols. Furthermore, in L, the evangelist symbols are full-figured, whereas in the St.-Amand version, only the top two (Mark and John) symbols are represented in the same way. The bottom two symbols are only half figures. The classicizing style of representing these symbols harks back to the Early Christian or Carolingian illusionistic tradition. The St.-Amand Lamb which is at the center of the cruciform composition, is represented in three-quarters view looking to the left. He stands on a book similar to those held by the evangelist symbols. He is nimbed, and between his horns is a small cross.

The artist of L has obviously modified the St.-Amand version, or one similar to it, in many ways. First of all, the evangelist symbols appear full-figured in Early Christian fashion. The vegetation which so obviously supplied the cruciform in the St.-Amand version, is presented on an oblique angle, and thus creates a secondary cruciform motif. Although the four evangelist symbols hold books, the lamb, unnimbed and facing to the right, holds a cross of victory on his right foot. In addition, at the four corners of the circle, there are angels who with spirit appear to be "holding" the central portion of the composition. These areas are left blank in the St.-Amand version, which may either come from an earlier recension, or may have been made up especially for this composition.

The likenesses and differences between the St.-Amand Adoration of the Lamb and that of L may be either accounted for by borrowings from similar Early Christian examples, or alternatively as derivations of the Beatus illustrations from late Carolingian
manuscripts. The most plausible possibility seems that there was, indeed, borrowing from the Late Carolingian manuscripts on the part of Spanish illuminators.

Although we have little proof, we definitely can by the example of L and O that the Spanish painters were developing iconography for a different audience from that in the Late Carolingian Empire. With this in mind, we will turn to comparisons within the other Beatus manuscripts. We will be surprised to that the development of this subject does not take a course which is easily explainable.

In her dissertation Tassé spoke of the cruciform qualities of the four evangelist symbols which extend from the central lamb. However, one must remember that the Lamb was originally in O (Fig. 279), for example, combined with Christ, the book, and the rainbow, all of which Apoc. 4, 5-14 definitely speaks of. However in O there are only twelve elders. This situation is different in A2 Moz (Fig. 283), a family I manuscript as well, though the configuration of the scene is round, rather than rectangular as in the case of O, and the elders do not hold musical instruments. In addition, the four beasts are represented with gigantic, swirling wings which almost obscure the roundels surrounding the lamb, and the symbols. These beasts are Early-Christian in type and thus differ from the beasts which appear at the four comers of the composition in O, which are anthropozoomorphic in configuration.

Furthermore, in H fol. 61v (Fig. 284), a later Beatus manuscript apparently copying T, Christ has been incorporated into the circular format, necessitating a slight accommodation of the symbol of Luke to the right. However, the cruciform composition has remained in spite of this, through the placement of the figure of the Enthroned where Luke would have normally been placed. Although there are only six elders, and four angels at the corners, there has been the addition of John and an angel below the
composition and close to the bottom of the page. Also, contrary to some of the other members of Branch IIab, except for Tu, where the iconography is set forth in a very different way (Fig. 289), the beasts are Early Christian or Carolingian in character. This is also the case with fol. 59 of N (Fig. 282), where though the beasts are Early Christian or Carolingian in type, their roundels, not overlapping, are all enframed within a square carpet border. An angel and John appear from the left, incorporated within the carpet border, but there are no angels elsewhere and no elders.

Consequently, we are already seeing that many traditions are inserting themselves into the Beatus iconography, something all Beatus scholars have long suspected, but the unravelling of the puzzle as to how these traditions are related to each other, especially in regard to this particular topic, will not be an easy task.

To begin with, the circular pattern found in L and A2 Moz of Branch I is typical in the manuscripts of Branch IIab of the Beatus family, especially in M J and D of Branch IIa and Tu A, R and H (to which we have already alluded above) of Branch IIb (Figs. 158, 287, 288, 289, 285, 286, 284). The consistent appearance of this circular iconographical format within textual versions which are entirely separate is remarkable. Yet within and around this circle there are many differences in subject matter and stylistic treatment. We have already discussed the differing circular compositions which appear in Branch I of the Beatus iconography, and our "In-Between" A2Moz. We will now turn to the Branch IIab.

The circular composition incorporating the Enthroned with the Lamb starts out in the Branch IIa family rather tentatively. In M, for example (Fig. 158), the Enthroned is not represented except by the word "tronus". However, in J and D of the same family, the word "tronus" has been replaced by an enthroned Christ (or Unknown) himself (Figs. 287, 288) who extends at the top from the circular part of the composition, with two angels
on either side. In these compositions, as well as in M, the cruciform character of the central portion of the composition has been retained, and the beasts are anthropozoomorphic in character and have disks beneath them, a feature often seen in Spanish works of art. Elders in Branch IIA, normally number twelve, with some playing musical instruments, some holding vials, and others lying down. There are varying numbers of angels at the four corners of the earth, with J having four at the bottom, and D having two at the top (in addition to the two on either side of the Enthroned) and twelve at the bottom.

Yet in the Branch IIb family group, the Enthroned is integrated within the circular format, as for example in H R and Ar (Figs. 284, 286, 285), though as noted above in the case of H, a certain amount of adjustment has been required, i.e., moving aside the symbol of Luke in order to place the Enthroned on the axis of the cruciform. Comparing this with the manuscripts in IIA would lead one to believe that M is an aberrant manuscript, or one having an earlier form of iconography than that used by the other manuscripts within IIA and IIb as well. Furthermore, though we have lost the subject in the case of G Tu with its double-paged, highly different compositional format, leads us to believe that the second part of Branch IIb had outside intrusions. While the globe is not quite like those normally seen in Majesties, but is a large disk overlapping a smaller one, the Enthroned and the Lamb are each given its own space. The four beasts, Early Christian and/or Carolingian in type, are placed in wedge-shaped enclosures and surround the Enthroned in a cruciform manner. Two angels surmount the large globe, but the lamb has four angels with him; this globe is overlapped by the larger one. The elders, in two rows are on the recto side of the next folio. Those in the upper row stand, while those in the lower row kneel. They hold musical instruments and vials. They are twelve in number, as the manuscripts in IIA have,
rather than six which is the number in H and R. Ar has seven large elders and two tiny ones which appear under the wings of the Mark's symbol.

This results in a dilemma which only a very sophisticated historical analysis could solve. It is this kind of complex case that naturally invites the use of statistical analysis first, in order to help shed light on the problem of the diversities involved well before the "conventional" art historical analysis could be applied. This might help us come to our results more quickly. However, before we do this statistical analysis, we must take into consideration the fact that we are dealing with manuscripts done in many different locations across several centuries. There were many artists involved in the production of these codices, and many patrons with programs which they wanted included in their particular Beatus.

D. Statistical Analysis of Additional Topic

The statistical analysis of this one additional topic proceeded in the same manner which I had used for the work which Klein was unable to finish. I used the same methods which he had used, and began by making a checklist of the characteristics which I felt were important in my traditional comparisons. I then made my matrix from this checklist. Subsequently, I calculated the correlation coefficients, and included the Chi-Square test. Not surprisingly, there were some unexpected results.

First of all, since I was dealing with only one topic, it was possible for me to analyze manuscripts of Branches other than Ila. So that I could get a sampling across the lines of the Beatus family tree. (Fig. 84). I had expected that in dealing with the Branch I family to get the very insignificant results that I got with N from the others, 0 and L, but
was surprised to that they ran only slightly below the figures needed for significant relationships between the manuscripts. L was almost the same in degree of relationship as M2Moz, which was my "In-Between", as it was the first of its group to introduce the elders, and as it was Mozarabic in style. This may be because L introduces the Angels at the four corners of the large circle, and the evangelist symbols are, though in roundels, in a cruciform pattern around the Lamb. So the characteristics in L and A2Moz were similar enough to place them right below the level of significance with M. Tu with very different, two page iconography, also placed about the same on the chart (Fig. 84). H, which is supposed to follow T closely, barely made the level of significance. This may be due to intrusions from other sources, as this manuscript is a late one, and has early elements, such as the Early-Christian/Carolingian type evangelist symbols, rather than the anthropozoomorphic types found in the other manuscripts in its Branch IIb family group, Ar and R. Ar and R were both within the margin of significance, with R being the closer of the two. Between J and D, the manuscripts in M's own Branch IIa group, the surprise to me was that D's characteristics were closer than those of J, when I would have supposed the opposite would be the case.

However, in general, my findings were very similar to those which Klein had worked out, and my results showed even more conclusively that the place of M on Klein's pictorial stemma is correct. For example, the scattering of elements, now appears, after having examined these manuscripts to show conclusively that elements of iconography may have been introduced at will by copists fortunate enough to have several books to follow, or as Mezoughi has shown in his work, a specific patron may be responsible for additions, corrections or ideas outside the main body of the Commentary itself.

This exercise was valid in its attempt to arrive at a more accurate assessment of the abstract interrelationships between these manuscripts. But in its statistical portion it is
synchonric and not diachronic. That is to say, it does not describe, like the result of the statistical portion of Klein's work, a chronological development of the iconography of the manuscripts with which we are dealing. The specific topic which I chose to analyze, The Enthroned and the Lamb, obtaining this result with only conventional analysis would have been nearly impossible since the scattering of elements, as with Klein's statistics was very diverse; the human eye would not have been able to perceive the kinds of subtleties involved. Without a time series formula, there is no way to exactly determine the development of the Beatus iconography by way of conventional analysis.
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18. Ibid, 170-175, 176-217. See also his figures 34-36.
20. Ibid, 218-301.

21. However, some of this material will be incorporated into the discussion in Chapter V below.

22. See 94-88 below where his methodology is discussed in more detail, and see Appendix B, where some of his checklists of characteristics are included.


24. Ibid, 154. He also noted that some of the twenty-nine illustrations are missing in certain of the other manuscripts, except for L.

25. Klein, Actas II, 108, 109. While Neuss, 1931, 73 considered these tables to be "decoration in between the text and illuminations", Klein treated them as stemming from the pictorial tradition, 1976, 154, 522, note 487, and especially 487, note 309, where he explains that the tables are really made by the miniaturist and not by the scribes, and therefore, belong to the picture tradition and not to the text tradition. This can be proven, he notes, in a few places in A2, where, for example, the field for the first Anti-christ table remained empty, like a number of other picture fields in the manuscript (as is also the case in A1, S, N, and Ar). However, the text in A2 is complete, and one can see that there is a difference in the color of the ink used the tables and in the main body of the text, while the color of the ink in the tables is similar to those of the inscriptions in the pictures, as is the case in other manuscripts, such as A1 S N and Ar. The question of the empty field for the first Anti-christ table in A2 may turn out to be less easy to answer than Klein has supposed, yet Neuss' (1931), Werckmeisters' (1973), and Klein's own consistent analysis of the inscriptions while comparing the illuminations does in fact point to an important consideration, that often these inscriptions, as in the case of M were added by the miniaturist(s) and not necessarily the scribe(s) working on the main body of the text, and thus belong to the picture tradition of the manuscript and not to the text tradition. However, there is the case of the Lisbon MS, unillustrated, but with the Anti-christ Tables and decorated initials. See Mundó and Sánchez Mariana in Los Beatos. 1985, no. 9, 108. So this matter deserves more attention.

26. Klein, 1976, 155, and Actas II, 88. An easy explanation of this formula in English which Klein used (see 1976, 523, note 492, and Actas II, 88, note 9 for additional bibliographical references.) may be readily found in A. L. Kroeber and C. D. Chrétien, "Quantitative Classification of Indo-European Languages", Language, 13 (1937), 83-103, esp. 98; and David W. Reed and John L. Spicer, "Correlation Methods of Comparing Idiolects in a Transition Area", Language, 28 (1952), 348-359, esp. 350-351. Both articles explain the statistical method of correlation well. However, for a more complete understanding of statistical approaches, I consulted with Prof. Nancy Carter of the Mathematics Department at California State University, Chico, who helped me understand how the 2 x 2 contingencies, or four-fold tables work.
27. Klein, 1976, 156. This is a probability test, and can also be expressed by the formula
\[ X^2_{.05(1)} = 3.841, \] according to Prof. Carter. While Klein correctly referred to his
method as "Korrelationanalyse" in 1976, 154, his use of the word "correlation test" as
a substitute in English in Actas II 88,108, is somewhat misleading, since the process is
really directly translatable into English as "correlation analysis". The "test" involved is
the Chi-Square test referred to here in the text and alternately expressed by the formula
above.

28. Klein, 1976, 156.

29. See ibid, 522, note 489 where he indicates that his comparison material beyond that of
the text, which is enormous, was first put together into rough statistics which were the
basis for his Tables I and II. The complete characteristics list (his Appendix IV, and
the example in Appendix B of this dissertation) was also made following the same
criteria as the correlation analysis which for this larger body of material is for him still
work in progress. So only the Anti-christ Tables were statistically correlated, and the
rest of the work was the starting point for this present essay. On 523, note 491, he
notes that a computer study of these calculations was unfortunately not able to be
carried out. I started using a pocket calculator for the first part of my calculations and
found the work fairly simple to do, but time consuming. I then used Microsoft Excel,
with the help of Jeff McMahon and David R. Taylor Jr. of the Computer Center of
Chico for the rest, including the formatting of the Tables and Figures in Appendices C,
D and E. This was much faster, in fact "light years" faster, so I can see why Klein
picked only the most succinct portions of the work to carry out his points clearly.

translation of one of his checklists (really just the characteristics which he picked out to
analyze), which I provided to make his working method clearer to English readers.

31. His Appendix II, 318-322. My matrixes, including his for the Anti-Christ Tables, are
also in Appendix C.

32. His Appendix III, 323-325, which is entitled "Werte der Korrelation-Analyse". My
Appendix D includes a copy of this Table along with my own Tables.


34. This is the table I referred to as the "Value Table", note 32 above, simply translating
from the German. The .5 values come from a number of -/+ situations, in which Klein
has felt that a manuscript shows in part each of these likenesses and differences. When
adding these up they often cancel each other out, leading to .5 values.

35. See 84-85 above and note 22.

36. I added the numerical values, using the figures in Klein's Anti-christ Value Table,
Appendix III. However, as Klein pointed out to me after reading this portion of my
first draft, he used the asteriks, because to him what really mattered is whether the V
value is significant or nonsignificant, and not actually what the numerical value is. We
will refer to this specific point again below when evaluating our statistical results, as I
was surprised by the varying degree of differences in the figures which might be
termed "significant" values. I used the correlation coefficients in my graphs, as they
describe the degree of relationship between the MSS being compared. See my
Appendix E. below.


38. He himself noted in *Actas II*, 108, that for reasons of "economy of work", he did the
correlation coefficients for only two illustrations, the Anti-christ Tables.


40. The Pearson formula only describes the strength of the relationship between the items
analyzed.

41. This critical possibility was pointed out by my daughter, Elizabeth Wolfe, who was
basinng her observations on statistical analyses she had made during psychology courses
she took while earning her undergraduate degree at Whittier College.

42. I have borrowed the term "structurally abstract" from Professor Ludden. We at first
thought those words adequate to describe the method Klein used, but then decided that
the semiotic terms "diachronic" and "synchronic" might be more to the point, as in
synchrony there is reversible time as well as irreversible time, the problem which
concerned my daughter Elizabeth as indicated in note 41 above. In diachrony the
relationship of elements is more abstract. See Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*,
of Chicago Press, 1968, 237 and passim; *idem*, *Totemism*, transl. Rodney Needham,
Boston, Beacon Press, 1963, esp. 53-54, where he explains synchrony and diachrony
in a different way: as two forms existing in a complementary societal relationship, as
"two different but correlative ways." So in that instance synchrony and diachrony were
interrelated, as may be the case with the relationships in the Beatus manuscript group.
For aspects of semiology applied to art forms see, for instance, *Semiotics of Art*, ed.

43. Questions which were touched upon at the Madrid Congress, *Actas II*, 107-115.
Professor Carter indicates that there are ways to consider the time factor, which could
potentially indicate when a characteristic appeared in the pictorial tradition, but this
would have to be a part of future work. Another factor which could be mathematically
considered would be the relationship of the illuminations to the text, for example, note
in Neuss, 1931, 76, that the relationships of the two Anti-christ tables to the text varies
throughout the extant Beatus manuscripts. Again, as noted in footnotes 36, 40, and 42
above, the correlation formula used by Klein is an abstract, or diachronic one, and does
not place the two works being compared into any other frame of reference, especially a
synchronic one.
44. Klein, 1976, 90-97. See also idem, 178-217, for a much fuller discussion than that in Actas II.

45. These are 1st Anti-christ Table, which would have appeared before 171v, the 2nd Anti-christ Table (there is a problem with the foliation at that point in the manuscript), and the Fowl Spirits (Apoc. XVI, 13-16), which would have appeared between 190v and 191, where at least one fol. is missing. For both these locations, see the collation in Appendix A, Figs.27 and 30.


47. As Klein noted the formula is $X^2 = NV^2$ in 1976, 156 and Actas II, 89. Any value greater than 3.841 would be a stastically significant value, and any value less than this number would not be statistically significant. That is, if $X^2 > 3.481$, there is a 95% probability that the manuscripts are related.

48. As noted above, his coefficients for only the Anti-christ Tables are not far off in some instances from the average coefficient for the MSS involved, and his "rough statistics" in Tables I and II found in Chapter V, 157-169, show that he had a fairly certain understanding of what his finished calculations would be had he been able to carry them out. Furthermore, one could point out that small samplings or "pollings" to determine what favorite items a large populace would like has become a daily fact of life, whether applied to iconography, merchandising, or politics.

49. He has become a basic part of the Beatus scholarship. See, for example Werckmeister, 1973; idem, Actas II, 1980; Raizmann, 1980; reviews noted above, Chapter II, 67, note 57.

50. This means that though Branch IIa MSS were using Branch I iconography, different influences were impacting the MSS in each case.

51. I personally noted this particularly on the occasion of a family reunion celebrating a significant wedding anniversary of my paternal uncle. In a large family setting it was possible to see that the genetic characteristics did not descend as one would expect. Nephews and nieces often looked more like their aunts and uncles, than their parents. Though with human beings, this phenomenon may be attributed to recessive genes, in our manuscript group, "time series", a statistical term, may be a better explanation.

52. One actually sees only 25 examples on the chart, but it must be pointed out that 17 and 18 are missing in U and V respectively, and 25 is missing in M; thus the computer when calculating the chart omitted these three exceptions and came up with 25 rather than 28 topics. This really doesn't matter, as we are only establishing relationships between the manuscripts and illuminations which are still extant. For example, the Anti-christ Tables were combined by Klein when he calculated the correlation coefficients, even though he analyzed two more manuscripts in the second case than he did in the first, and analyzed many more motifs in the second as well, which using this system is perfectly all right for him to do. In reference to a consistent degree of relationship, this is hard to find amongst these four manuscripts, and this problem is
found as well in the relationships of the illuminations throughout the entire Beatus manuscript group.

53. See Klein, 1976, 217, and 546, note 690, where he carefully explains his reasons for the dissimilarity between the relationships shown in his Figs. 34b and 36.

54. I did not run out the statistics for M against the rest of family one, for I felt the relationships would be too insignificant to be useful. However in Fig. 84, where I did a single line graph for my topic, I found more significant values than I had expected. See my discussion of this below 99-100.

55. Also found in the Saint-Sever Beatus, the only member of Branch I to contain this material.

56. My particular choice stems from the fact that my Master's thesis was devoted to this topic, and took a more "traditional" point of view concerning these pages. See above Chapter I, 17 and note 20. I have used quotation marks around the word "traditional" in reference to Zaluska's comments regarding these pages in St.-Sever. 1984, 239-240.

57. For the Daniel illustrations, see Chapter I, 18, above, and Chapter V, 137 below. The Daniel illustrations present challenging analysis in future study as many of the themes are presented on the pages in Branch Ila alone in varied ways, either representing the response of the artist to the space left available to him by the scribe, or reflecting the use of different recensions of Daniel imagery for copying. The problem is made more complex by the fact that almost the same elements are usually there, except that they are laid out in a different way almost every time. A comparison between S and M would show this immediately, and even between those in the closely connected Ila group would confirm this as well. I understand that a study by Shirley Stark on the Daniel portion of the Beatus Commentary is forthcoming.

58. This was one of the topics which Peter Klein suggested, for which I thank him. I had originally planned to analyze more subjects. However, due to pressure of time, as in the case of Klein, I also had to settle for only one topic to be analyzed statistically.


60. Her study was focused on the sources of the circular characteristic of this miniature, and its cosmological significance. She related it and other examples taken from the Beatus miniatures to ancient sun symbolism. See iv-v of her dissertation.

61. Vives, 1983, 473, notes in U a missing fol. between 88 and 89, which he describes as being Apoc. 4, 6; 5-14. V also is missing a fol. between fols. 78 and 79 (There is a blank sheet inserted there.) These are the places in these MSS where the Adoration of the Enthroned and the Lamb would logically appear.

62. There are, of course, many other elements of importance which need to be discussed, but I believe that these six critical elements will serve as a guide to the beginning of our comparisons, and also to establish the checklist of characteristics.
63. For this manuscript, see Neuss, 1931, 37-38.

64. Porcher, et al., The Carolingian Renaissance, 187, from which my illustration is taken (see reference in Figure List for Fig. 239) is careful to note the strong connection between St.-Amand, Salzburg and the abbey of St. Martin; and the influence of the Northern manuscripts on Tours.

65. This is a motif familiar in early Medieval Spanish manuscripts.

66. Klein has suggested more then once borrowing from Late Carolingian works, and I agree with him. I have also discussed the matter with Werckmeister, and he also agrees. In the case of the representation of the heavenly Jerusalem in the Beatus manuscripts, most of which had their crenelated enclosure laid out on a single page, there may be a slightly earlier tradition which came done through the Carolingian one and is represented by examples such as that of the Temple of Solomon, with its columns, curtains and crenelations seen at the outer edges and enclosure laid out flat, in the Codex Amiatinus fols. 2v and 3 (it moves across the single opening), represented in part in David Diringer, The Illuminated Book, New York, 1967, IV-3; and in J. J. G. Alexander, Insular Manuscripts from the 6th to the 9th Century, London, 1978. Even the moving across the single opening in part, or fully occupying both the verso and recto sides of the fols. is found in some of the Beatus MSS, especially S N G (one-half now lost) and Tu.

67. Here, note the remarks of Werckmeister and Klein following Klein's paper at Madrid in 1976, Actas II, 114-115. See Chapt. II. note 40. Also note the work in general of Guilmain and Williams who have long insisted on Carolingian influences on Beatus iconography and decorative initials. See below Chapter IV, note 14; Chapter V, notes 11, 12.

68. See Tassé, 1972, passim., but esp. 74, 91-93.

69. This later addition also is seen in R (Fig.286). John and the angel also appear in N (Fig. 282), but they are squeezed in between the roundels of the beasts on the left side of the composition.

70. Tassé, 1972, 64, indicates this to mean "that heaven, the dwelling place of God, is also this throne." She quotes Isaiah 66:1: "Thus says Yahweh: with heaven my throne/And earth my footstool/ What house could you build me/What place could you make for my rest."

71. Except in this case, the circle is within a square (Fig. 285).

72. In R, this has not been so well accomplished, as the cruciform is a little off-center (Fig.286).
73. For the double-globed format, which comes from St. Denis, but has its origins in pre-
Carolingian times, see the discussion of Cook, 1923-24, esp. 47-59. See 44 for a
discussion of Christ seated on an arc, as he does on O (Fig. 279).

74. We must also remember that U and V have this subject missing, and wonder what
format their illustrations might have followed.

75. See Appendix B, 2.

76. See Appendix C, 2.

77. See Appendix D, 2.

78. I realize that A2Rom is actually more an "In-between" than A2Moz, as Klein has
pointed out (Figs. 296, 300).

79. M2Moz also has the large circle, with the evangelist symbols in roundels, in a
cruciform pattern around the Lamb.

80. Nördstrom, 1976, made a similar observation. I also pointed this out in my M. A.
Thesis, 1971 in reference to S.

81. I am now working out a formula to enable us to help support our chronological results.
All of this means that the discipline of Art History is reaching out to other areas of
study, semiotics and mathematics being two tools which I have used, but there are
many others still to be incorporated.
CHAPTER IV

M644 AND THE ARCHETYPE OF THE BEATUS ILLUSTRATIONS

A. Background

As it has been mentioned in the Introduction, one of the most tantalizing scholarly debates regarding M644 during the major part of this century was the question of its relationship to the original archetype of the Beatus group. Because this issue has been so much discussed in the literature, it is useful to briefly survey the nature of the various problems surrounding this issue and to examine the relative positions.

The persistent questions relative to the Beatus pictorial archetype are the following: (1) Was the first edition text illuminated within Beatus' time? and if so, was Beatus the designer of the illustrations for his commentary?; (2) Was there one original, or possibly more?; (3) What was the source or model for the archetype?; (4) What was the stylistic and iconographical character of the archetype?; and (5) Which manuscript still extant is closest to the original? These questions, which have been examined at length in the Beatus scholarship elsewhere, seem at first to fall outside our stated intention to deal with other matters in this study. They do, however, ultimately have some bearing on the topic at hand due to the fact that M644 was, for quite some time, an important part of the scholarly
debate over the archetype for the Beatus manuscript group because of its apparently early
date. Hence they will be given some attention in this respect. Some of these questions,
which have caused so much scholarly concern, are still not entirely resolved, and so remain
of interest to us today.

1. The Question of the First Illuminated Text

The problem of the first illuminated edition of the Beatus text did not become
significant until the early part of this century when the question was raised as to whether
the iconography was added to the Commentary within the lifetime of Beatus himself, i.e.,
the opinion of Neuss, or was a later invention, perhaps by Maius, the author of M644, a
view somewhat ambiguously suggested by Gómez Moreno in 1919. These views were
made more telling by Neuss' later insistence that there was only one archetype of Beatus'
Commentary, which was illustrated by Beatus himself, an unusual situation from the
point of view of manuscript historians, and especially in view of Weitzmann's now well-
known and accepted theories. Weitzmann, commenting upon methods of picture criticism
noted in regard to archetypes:

... the archetype of an illustrated manuscript is, as a rule, not as old as the
archetype of the text, since it must have been an extremely rare event for the
autograph exemplar to have received illustrations; and often some time,
occasionally several generations, elapsed before the text became sufficiently
popular to lead to the production of an illustrated luxury edition. This, in
turn, may have happened far from the place of origin of the text.

Thus, Gómez Moreno's somewhat veiled suggestion that a much later painter had
added imagery to a text which had been circulating for quite some time could, from
Weitzmann's point of view, certainly be considered correct. However, Neuss and Gómez-
Moreno were both ignoring evidence that scholars as early as the nineteenth century had
given attention to the beginning of the Beatus imagery. The situation was not as simple as either one of them might want to believe.

2. The Problem of the Number of Illustrated Archetypes for the Beatus Manuscript Group

For example, Delisle in 1880, had noted "two families" of Beatus manuscripts based on the "age of the world" found in the manuscripts he know of;5 but this was a textual, not pictorial reference, and he followed that with a suggestion that the pictures needed more study.6 This simply stated suggestion did not have its effect on Beatus pictorial scholarship until much later. Similarly, Miller's stemma of 1895, while describing the archetype as being singular, indicated that this single archetype had two good, though entirely different, exemplars which had given rise to two family groups, a view which though ambiguous also pointed to strong complexities in the Beatus problem (Fig. 290).7

Weitzmann also indicates that:

... there are cases where two members of the same textual family were illustrated independently of each other in different localities, so that two stemmata are needed for the illustration whereas one stemma suffices for the text transmission. Conversely, it is possible for a picture cycle to be taken over without iconographical changes into a new version of the text, a translation, or a paraphrase, so that a single stemma suffices for the pictures, while the text involves different stemmata.8

Either of these probabilities are plausible for the Beatus manuscript illuminations. Boeckler noted in 1930 that there were two archetypes for the Beatus group, but gave no reason for this assumption, which was perhaps based on Delisle's earlier suggestions.9 At the same time, as we have already noted, Sanders' postulated successive textual editions, referred only to iconography in the instance of the third edition, the prefatory illuminations, which he felt were added at the same time as the Commentary on Daniel by Jerome; but he did believe in a single textual archetype.10
Although Gómez Moreno's views on the pictorial inventiveness of the author of M644 were quite compelling, and entirely possible, the Beatus situation, with its several textual editions, and pictorial families was not as simple as he had stated it. For, in considering what Weitzmann pointed out as is quoted above, it could also have been just as possible that several pictorial traditions arose from different sources quite apart from the textual ones, and over the centuries, these became changed by outside sources. Thus the stemmata of Klein becomes more important in trying to sort out the difficulties in the Beatus situation (Figs. 295, 296). 

If there are accretions in the Beatus iconography, as Klein's position indicates, this points to varying sources for the illuminations. This immediately raises the problem of the model and the source for that model. Several scholars have recently discussed this problem and their suggestions bear pregnant thought for the future of Beatus studies. We will now briefly look at some of their ideas.

3. The Source and Model for the Archetype

The origin of the Beatus iconography, has traditionally been recognized by most scholars to be late antique in character. But the question has been whether this iconography was in part imported into Spain as proposed by Neuss and others, or was an indigenous Spanish creation, as was considered possible by Gómez Moreno, Schlunk and others. As we will below, these two theories would basically be postulated as one by Neuss in 1922, and are not really as contrary to each other as the scholars arguing them apparently chose to believe.
Although there has been much argument about the nature of the model almost all of these scholars agreed upon multiple sources, and that it was "Mediterranean" in nature, some pointing to the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and others to the more western, including its southern shores. The major controversial issue in this matter was, of course, Neuss' theory of an Early Christian North African source for the archetype of the Beatus imagery. Klein, in the publication of his dissertation in 1976, did not discuss the archetype and its origins with the emphasis, which Neuss, in 1931 had done. However, in his article in *Actas II*, he offered some hypotheses which might help shed some light on the character and source of the illustrations for Beatus' Commentary.

His most important point was that he disagreed with Neuss' methodology in assigning North Africa as a source for the Beatus illuminations on the basis of the inscriptions in the illuminations, which relied on North-African texts such as Tyconius and Primasius. His argument for this was that Neuss did not consider the possibility that these inscriptions might not have derived from an hypothetical pictorial archetype, but simply from the text of the Beatus. In this case, the coincidences of the inscriptions with Tycho and Primus he indicated were easily explained by the fact that Beatus simply followed those authors.

He then noted the possibility of comparing the illustrations of the Beatus manuscripts with the other early Medieval Apocalypse cycles. But in some instances, he noted that the Beatus illuminations followed an independent pictorial tradition. This does not demonstrate a direct relationship to the other antique pictorial cycles. Klein gave as examples of this the Keys which appear in the illustrations of the Message to Philadelphia and the Fifth Trumpet. Other subjects examined were, The Woman in the Sun and the Dragon; The Dragon Caught and Imprisoned; The Death of the two Witnesses, The Temple Open with the Ark of the Testament. After comparing the text of the Apocalypse and the
Explanations offered by Beatus, Klein concludes that these subjects do not always derive
from the text of the Apocalypse or from the early Medieval Apocalyptic Illustrations but
sometimes, as in the case of the Key in the Fifth Trumpet, can be explained by Carolingian
commentaries such as that of Haimo d’Auxerre and Pseudo-Alcuin. In addition he
observed that certain elements of particularly the scene of the Woman and the Dragon,
while in some instances referring to passages in the Beatus Commentary, in others did not.
The problem was simply that in considering the pictorial archetype for the Beatus
illustrations there were passages of the Beatus Commentary which were taken from
commentaries earlier than those of Tychonius and Victorinus.

Klein therefore asked the question of whether the commentaries studied by Beatus
were illustrated and thus could have served as models for the illuminations of the Beatus.
The specific instances of text and illustrations that he had discussed had after all in many
cases shown a very close relationship between the earlier commentaries and the Beatus
illustrations. This opens the problem, as to whether the pictorial model for the Beatus
illustrations are, as traditionally believed, from an earlier illustrated Apocalypse manuscript:
but rather from an earlier illustrated commentary on the Apocalypse. Furthermore,
Klein noted intrusions into the Beatus iconography from many other sources.

Nordström in two major articles has noted intrusions into the Beatus illustrations as
well. These were not just from commentaries, but, from various outside texts; some
from the apocryphal gospels; but also some from folklore and the literature of
mythology.

But no matter what the influence on the Beatus illustrations were, it was felt by
Klein, that the original model must have come from North Africa or Spain, as it is so
different in character from the other extant early medieval Apocalypses.
However, exactly what the style and iconographical character for that model might have been, as we know, has and continues to be the subject of long debate.

4. The Debate on the Stylistic and Iconographical Character of the Archetype

The main question which arose in the consideration of the stylistic and iconographical character of the Beatus archetype has been whether the late antique model was "Hellenistic" in nature, as Neuss believed, or was as Klein termed it, "plano and linear" - as is reflected in family I of the Beatus group, and particularly in the case of Fc, the Silos fragment (Fig. 307), where the borders are carpet-enframed, but are far more rude than one finds in M644. In fact, the borders of M often appear to be sophisticated renderings of much earlier, much rougher examples set down several centuries before.

In 1902, James had indicated that he believed M644 to be the earliest Beatus manuscript found so far, on the basis of its text, but in referring specifically to its illustrations he noted that "it was not only copy of Beatus which contain these pictures, nor the archetype of all that do contain them". He did not elaborate on this statement, so we have no idea of why he came to this conclusion. Yet James did feel that they were very crude and came from a "better" source. He only thought that Maius was good in his decorative qualities.

However, when in 1919, Gómez-Moreno postulated that Magius, the author of M644, could have been the author of the illuminations for the Beatus manuscripts as a whole, he did so not only in the belief that M644 was the earliest extant Beatus, but also with complete faith in an original Spanish art which had developed out of the confrontation of Islamic and Christian cultural forces on the Iberian peninsula. His strong statement
was also probably as much due to detractors such as Herbert who had argued that these early Spanish manuscripts such as the Beatus' were "barbaric", a view which we have seen had been held by James as well.34

While Gómez-Moreno had likewise used the word "barbaric" in describing these early manuscripts, he clearly had the ability to translate the meaning and character of this word into a more appealing positive setting, which was the artistic expression of the developing early medieval Spanish Christian kingdoms in conflict with a larger, more powerful Islamic domain, and thus was able to make it not only acceptable, but quite fascinating and exotic appearing to the art world outside the Iberian peninsula.35

Gómez-Moreno's success in changing the attitude toward this "sub-antique" Spanish art,36 was largely due to the affirmation of his views by scholars such as Arthur Kingsley Porter37, and by European artists who, following exhibitions of Mozarabic art, focused their attention on its most exciting and exotic qualities.38 But more important to scholars working specifically with Beatus manuscripts, was the question of what the original model or models for the illuminations in the Beatus group were like.

In 1922, as noted above, Neuss suggested that the Beatus imagery was a Spanish reworking of Early Christian iconography, a suggestion which followed that of Tailhan in the nineteenth century, but it was clear that he and other scholars were uncertain as to exactly what was meant by this. Which sort of "late antique" was the model, one similar in style to the Chronograph 354 of which we have only later copies remaining?39 or another "Hellenistic" type book such as The Vatican Vergil, The Cotton Genesis, The Vienna Genesis, or the Ashburnham Pentateuch?40 Or was it perhaps the flat, archaic-looking work of the migration peoples of which the Visigoths were one, heavily laced with eastern influences, the Insular, or the late antique delivered via a late Carolingian school?41
We will leave this question unresolved at the moment, as there will be more discussion of it below as we turn to the theories of Neuss on the remaining Beatus manuscript most like the archetype. Closely tied to this problem, similar to that of the first illuminated text, is the question of whether Beatus designed his own imagery.

5. The Question of the Extant Illustrated Beatus Closest to the Original

Neuss was not the only scholar to have concluded that Beatus himself had a hand in formulating the original illustrations to his commentary. G. G. King had noted the year before Neuss' own work was published, that "the close correspondence of these Leonese manuscripts which follow one another in chronology over a space of three hundred years, amounts very nearly to proof that the Urhandschrift from Beatus' own hand supplied the model." 42

However, Neuss was even more direct than King. For him there was only one illustrated archetype designed by Beatus himself, from which all the others were derived, and the closest extant manuscript to this archetype, both textually and iconographically was the Saint-Sever Apocalypse. (Fig. 312) Thus he apparently felt he had solved many of the requirements for the archetype of the Beatus group, but at the same time, he believed in an exception to Weitzmann's general rule. Furthermore, he argued his case so resolutely that it ultimately diverted attention from some of his other, more valuable work. It definitely did divert scholarly attention from the position of Gómez-Moreno on M644.

Miner's review of Neuss' work noted, for example, "Many scholars other than Beatus specialists will be interested in question raised by Dr. Neuss, "... conception of the famous Beatus of St. Sever as presenting the clearest notion of the Hellenistic style of the
archetype... The author's conclusions regarding the ultimate origin and artistic manner of the first model for the Beatus illustrations are certain to arouse wide attention...".43 So, though Miner found that Neuss' theory of the style of the original Beatus model was correct, and based this assumption of his mentioning "the tendency to full-page scenes, the use of frames, and colored backgrounds, as survivals of antique methods", further noting "that the dress, many of the mannerisms of posing, and much of the ornament point, likewise to a late Latin origin", she went on in her review to point out that "another feature of Dr. Neuss' conclusions which has already aroused considerable interest is his conception of the St. Sever Beatus as reflecting the 'Hellenistic' prototype in style and detail more closely than the Mozarabic manuscripts. So persistent is he in returning to this point that one almost receives the impression that the author supposes the manuscript to be descended immediately from the pre-Mozarabic model produced by Beatus."44 With this statement she reveals her own opinion that the model produced by Beatus was premozarabic in nature, but rather than try to speculate exactly what that style might be, she attempts to strongly suggest that the notion of Neuss that while the Saint-Sever shows mozarabic influences in the color and the ornament, its style, and the closer approach to nature reveal that the manuscript derives from a separate artistic tradition from the Mozarabic which he attributes to its being closer to the original model rather than her own view, meaning "the matured Romanesque heritage from Carolingian Gaul".45 Her subsequent discussion of the Saint-Sever is based entirely on showing that far from being a close exemplar of the model for the Beatus illustrations, it is rather a thoroughly characteristic product of southern French, eleventh century painting. Her only mention of M644 is, in the context of its picture inscriptions, that Neuss has used as "representing the oldest and purest example of these quotations".46
In 1938 van der Meer, indicated that the St.-Sever and Morgan 644 were the extant manuscripts most faithful to the archetype, but his arguments largely follow others in this. That they are the "most faithful... to the archetype" does not necessarily mean that they were the archetype/archetypes. Furthermore, his study was an iconographical one on a single motif rather than one on a stemma especially of the Beatus manuscripts.

In 1970, Klein presented evidence for what had been believed for years by many scholars, that the St.-Sever Apocalypse could not have been the closest remaining exemplar of the Beatus manuscripts. By making conventional historical and statistical comparisons with the St.-Sever and other Beatus manuscripts, he was able to show that instead of being closest to the original archetype for the Beatus manuscript group, the St.-Sever was produced using two illustrated Beatus Commentaries, one from each of Neuss' branches as models.

In 1973, Werckmeister, in an article in Studi Medievali presented arguments which supported Klein's views. Werckmeister's arguments were basically directed toward that of Neuss' assumption that the Saint-Sever Apocalypse was the closest to the archetype for the Beatus group. Werckmeister's article, following Klein's work, left the question of the Saint-Sever as closest to the archetype no longer a viable one to argue, and the point was laid to rest, allowing, finally, more reasonable and profitable discussion of the true place of the celebrated manuscript in the Beatus tradition and in the context of French early Romanesque illumination as well.

Furthermore, Klein's work, in which he placed the Morgan manuscript in Branch II of his stemma, as noted above, and iconographically far removed from what must have been the original illuminated manuscript (Figs. 296, 300), also removes it from consideration as the model for the Beatus illustrations.
Thus the question of the extant manuscript which best displays the character and source of the pictorial archetype of the Beatus manuscript group is still open to question. Perhaps it should be sought after in manuscripts of Branch I, rather than in the "in-between" manuscripts or those of Branch IIab.

B. The Position of M644 with Regard to the Original Archetype

Even though the M644 has some of the oldest forms of iconography and inscriptions, as we have examined, these characteristics in and of themselves are not necessarily an indication of an archetype. Furthermore, our own results in addition to the run-outs of Klein's statistics in Chapter III above have already drawn us to the conclusion that M644 is not the earliest Beatus manuscript in the Beatus group. There can be no doubt that, though M644 shows old iconography in some places, as van der Meer suggested long ago, the idea of M644 being the archetype for the Beatus manuscript illuminations has, along with the St.-Sever, now also been successfully laid to rest.

The newer scholarship, which tends to deal with collations of existing manuscript and possible reconstructions of lost ones in a more archaeological sense will solve this matter sooner or later. The older scholarship, intent on trying to place the remaining manuscripts in relationship to each other as if they were the only ones ever to have existed, and thus derived from or influenced by each other, will no longer answer our questions.

This means that we now, like detectives, have to look for the missing links. Based upon our traditional and statistical examination of M644, the missing links at this point in the case of this particular manuscript, show it not to be the magnificent beginning of a splendid return to the glories of medieval Christian Spain, but rather to be the end result of a development of several centuries of additions and modifications to an older pictorial
tradition. We will thus now turn our attention to another problem with which M644 has over the years been associated, that of its being the archetype for the tenth century revision of the Beatus iconography.
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CHAPTER V
M644 AND THE TENTH CENTURY REVISION OF THE BEATUS ICONOGRAPHY

A. Background

Scholars have long questioned the iconographical differences between a group of Beatus manuscripts produced in the mid-to-latter part of the tenth century (Branch IIa of the Beatus pictorial genealogical tree [Fig. 300]), and those of the earlier Branch I Beatus manuscripts. It was thus assumed by some that there was a revision of the Beatus illustrations which took place during the tenth century. As we have seen in Chapter III above, the detailed work of Klein has shown that this so-called revision may not have come all at once, and his pictorial stemma affirms this view (Fig. 300). However, as these iconographical changes appear only in the extant manuscripts from this period, Beatus scholars still tended to believe that there was a revision about that time. In the discussions surrounding this topic, Maius, the painter/scribe of M644 has been inevitably associated with this revision and M644 has often been considered the prototype for the Branch IIa or for the entire Branch IIa portion of the Beatus manuscript group.

Yet, M could neither be the archetype of all the Beatus manuscripts, nor could it be the archetype for the "tenth century" revision. This assessment of M has been amply borne out through the statistical analysis produced in Chapter III, and the examination of the archetype for the whole Beatus group of manuscripts discussed in Chapter IV.
In light of this fact it is useful to provide a more accurate understanding of the place of M644 in relation to tenth-century Spanish Beatus illumination. This will be accomplished through an historiographical examination of the question at hand and a brief investigation of the iconographic implications of select folios.

1. Menéndez-Pidal's Theory of a Tenth-Century Revision

In 1954 Menéndez-Pidal attempted to combine the theory of Gómez- Moreno of an indigenous Spanish origin for the iconography of the Beatus illuminations with that of Neuss' theory of an Early Christian origin. He also wanted to account for the significant variations in the Beatus iconography. Thus Menéndez-Pidal proposed that there was a revision to the Beatus iconography which took place in the tenth century, and that Maius, the painter/scribe of M644, was the author of that revision. However, in postulating this revision and authorship he overlooked the importance of Neuss' work regarding the place of M644 in the Beatus stemma (Fig. 294). Instead of recognizing Neuss' position that M could not have been the "mutter" manuscript for the Branch II iconography, he drew a stemma based on the World Map, in which he placed M as deriving directly from Beatus' time, at the beginning of Branch II of the Beatus family (Fig. 291). He thus indicated that all other Manuscripts of IIa and IIb followed M without considering the obvious fact that there were many differences or corruptions within the body of iconography in the manuscripts involved.

2. Acceptance of the Theory of a "Tenth-Century" Revision

Menéndez-Pidal's work, however, particularly in his placement of the Beatus maps within the Isidorian/Orosious tradition, was significant enough to generate consideration
Yet the work of Klein, which was reinforced by that of Werckmeister, showed that Menéndez-Pidal, when trying to build a Beatus stemma was incorrect in many ways. Nevertheless scholars in general began to accept his idea that there was, indeed, a revision of Beatus iconography in the tenth century. This was not so much because of Maius' innovative World Map, but was due more to overall stylistic and iconographical features found in the Branch II illustrations. Nordenfalk designated the changes in tenth-century Spanish manuscripts as being in two phases, the first, as exemplified by the Leon Bible of 922, he called Merovingian-Byzantine; the second, coming about mid-century, he termed Carolingian-Islamic. Camon Aznar, slightly earlier had indicated that manuscripts of tenth-century Spain display a triple esthetic: Mozarabic, and Carolingian forms laid over an indigenous Iberian base.

Following Nordenfalk's 1957 suggestion, many scholars began pointing to northern influences which had not previously been considered by Menéndez-Pidal and his predecessors. The prevailing attitude was that the authors of this change were Mozarabic. These Mozarabs, it was felt, brought north with them the Islamic ideas of form and colors which contributed to the change in both style and iconography. In addition some scholars clearly pointed to a Carolingian contribution to the Beatus iconography, though each had his own point of departure as to just what that contribution was. For example, Guilmain indicated that the initials of M showed direct influence of the Anglo-Saxon school of illumination as exemplified by the Second Bible of the Charles the Bald (Fig 303); while Williams found close comparisons for the initial on fol. 10 of M with an initial from the school of Tours (Fig. 304). Thus the question of which of the late Carolingian Schools provided sources for the revision of the Beatus iconography still remains an important and unresolved one.
Furthermore, there is always the remote possibility that Rome, in her readiness to convert the Spanish church to its orthodox liturgy was ultimately responsible for the change by sending into Spain books which could have altered the earlier Spanish point of view. Whether this influence came directly, or via a French connection such as St.-Amand or other late Carolingian monasteries is hard to tell at this point. In addition, there are those "African" connections which cannot be easily discredited.14

We now must look at the various theories revolving around this problem in order to how M644, often considered one of the most "Carolingian" of the Branch II family truly fits into its family group. One of the most important aspects of this has been the attempt on the part of scholars to assign to individuals this change in the iconography of the Beatus manuscripts which took place at that time.

3. Theories on the Exact Date and Author of the "Tenth Century" Revision

We have seen above,15 that there has been a tendency since the ancient Greek times to personalize the artists involved in the production of works of art. Therefore, as we have already pointed out, it comes as no surprise that there have been many attempts on the part of scholars to apply a specific author to the "Tenth Century Revision" of the Beatus iconography, and to go one step further so as to actually try to date the revision as if it came all at once.16

One of the most active scholars in trying to personify the author and to pinpoint the actual date of the new iconography has been Williams, who has attempted to date the tenth century revision of the iconography of the Beatus MSS in a highly speculative and erratic way through various publications and papers.17 In doing this, he is, of course, following
the pattern set by Gómez-Moreno and Menéndez-Pidal, that of presenting Maius and his
more favorite artist, Florentius of Valerancia, as national artistic heroes. For example,
Williams sometimes credits Maius with the Beatus iconography revision, but just as often
he contradicts this theory. He has in several instances implied that perhaps it was
Florentius of Valerancia, rather than Maius who was responsible for the "Tenth Century
Revision", using the argument that because the iconography of fol. 87 of M, the Adoration
of the Lamb (Fig.158) is quite similar in many details to that of fol. 2 in the Moralia in Iob
of 945 by Florentius (Fig. 305), thus giving a terminus post quem for the new iconography
of at least 945. In addition, he speculates that there was a lost Beatus done by Florentius
himself.18 However, he has persistently ignored the fact that the similar iconography, i.e.,
the seraphim and cerubim appearing at the top of the circular format in each case (Figs.
158, 305), could not only be related to each other directly, but could come from an earlier
common source. This point was raised by Werckmeister, Klein and others at the
colloquium following Williams' paper at the congress in Madrid in 1976, and Williams
agreed that it could be possible.19 Furthermore, when Williams entertains these
suggestions, he often fails to build upon established scholarship, such as the pictorial
stemma and discussion of Klein, which clearly show that the "new" iconography was not
introduced all at the same time.20 In short, it is not so much the question of the date of M
that is important to consider, but when particular iconographical forms were introduced
across the centuries, and to try to postulate how these contaminations or "cross-references"
occurred. This problem we will attempt to explain in more detail below.

B. The Place of M644 Relative to the Archetype of the Tenth-Century Revision

There is no question that M644 has in some instances more venerable iconography
than the rest of its family group. But this does not mean that it is the ancestor of the Branch
II iconography. For example, on fol. 23, The Beginning of the Vision, The Lord Sends for John (Fig. 135), there is a distinctive archaic element in the composition and the figures. Furthermore, there is on this folio a definite Visigothic “double brow” on the faces of the people. This brow also appears on the faces of the people who are in the scene, The Unknown appears in the Clouds, fol. 26 (Fig. 136). It also is on the face of John, fol. 52v, John and the Angel of the Church of Smyrna (Figs. 146, 147). This brow is not seen in the later manuscripts of Branch II a or b. However, this type of brow is seen throughout Vitr, 14-1, as Klein, 1976, has demonstrated. The faces of these people are comparable, though not quite the same, to Visigothic sculpture such as the Plaque from Santa Maria de Quintinalla de las Viñas (Fig. 306), and also have some characteristics reminiscent of the Fc fragment from Silos. (Fig. 307). Folio 23 of M644, therefore, represents an older form of “The Lord Sending for John” than we in the other manuscripts of the Branch II family, but though it appears in this one manuscript belonging to Branch II, it does not automatically reflect a parenthood to that Branch. A comparison with the figural and facial types of the next illumination, The Commissioning of John (Fig. 137), will serve to demonstrate the difference very well. In this illumination, the facial and figural types are much more “Carolingian” in appearance, suggesting a different source from that used for fols. 23v and 26. This second source then continues to dominate the illumination of the manuscript, while the first source was apparently abandoned, except in a few cases such as the folios discussed immediately above and below.

In addition, fol. 26, the Appearance of the Unknown in the Clouds (Fig. 136), does not follow the standard for Branch II iconography, which is to use the Ascension motif, as Werckmeister has so succinctly pointed out. It rather comes closer to the appearance of Christ in Early Christian Roman mosaics. Therefore it does not conform
to the rest of Branch II a or b, all of which have Ascension iconography. Thus it is certainly not the parent of IIa and IIb. 25

Another example, the World Map is definitely an older version which does not connect to the Commentary at all. 26 This map may be a vital key to understanding the entrance of that iconography into the Beatus text of Branch II iconography, possibly representing another tradition than that used for the Branch I iconography; perhaps from a treatise from ancient maps or through the Oriosian tradition, though quite modified, to the Beatus tradition, as the established conclusion is that the earliest Beatus maps illustrate the portions of the Commentary which deal with the mission of the apostles. 27

Another early tradition is represented by the shape of the Cross of Oviedo which appears on fol. 219 (Fig. 218) right before the Last Judgment (Figs. 265, 266, 267). This cross is formed in the typical Visigothic manner, with the four extensions tapering diagonally to meet the small circle at the center. This is a form known and used by the Asturian kings from early times (Figs. 272, 273, 274), 28 and thus represents an archaic form of the cross. It normally appears in the late manuscripts of Branch II as a prefatory page, but is extant before the last judgment only on M D in Branch IIa and in Tu on Branch IIb. 29

Furthermore, the initial on fol. 10 of M, is clearly Merovingian in character, i.e., no matter what has been said by the current scholarship, this initial, so often used as an example of "Carolingian" influence on this manuscript, contains within it forms which were used as far back as Merovingian scribes (Fig. 308). This example, now well known initial by scholars (Fig. 131), 30 probably has a history of, first Visigothic scribes who were following Merovingian patterns, and later, Astroleonese scribes who were a part of the Neo-Visigothic revival which occurred in the tenth century (Fig. 309). 31
However, as was noted above, apart from the more venerable Early Christian and Neo-Visigothic iconographical elements, there are definitely Carolingian aspects to the style, composition and iconography of M. A particular example of this can be found in the Evangelist frontispiece pages. These may be Carolingian in their recent ancestry, but the iconography of these double pages needs far more careful attention. The left page containing the Christ and the evangelist is easily early Italian or North African in origin, as later examples of this iconography appear in both places (Figs. 310, 311), giving rise to the suspicion that these versions were following early forms.

Possibly basing his ideas on James, Williams has characterized the figures in the left portion of these pairs of pages as the evangelist with witness. However other scholars, including Nordenfalk, follow Neuss, who after all was a theologian, in considering that the figures involved are the seated Christ and the standing evangelist.

Though I agree with Nordenfalk and the others who follow Neuss that the figures involved are Christ and the evangelist, Nordenfalk in that particular article was dealing with the "Inspired Evangelist" and so presented the Beatus examples in a different light. I feel that this iconography represents a definite canonical procedure, or traditiones, the traditio legis in two instances, and the traditio licentiae in the others, which was the topic of my unpublished Master's Thesis.

Contracts and licenses to preach were an integral part of the early church of which Spanish clergy, though preserving separate liturgy, could not fail to recognize, as they were required by monks in many monasteries. These aspects of Roman legal practice enabled the church to protect itself against heresy, which in the middle part of the tenth century in Christian Spain might be most important, as there have been suggestions of Catharism being a threat to the orthodox church. This iconography, which probably
reached Spain via Carolingian sources, as Williams has suggested, is very old and could ultimately come from a gospel book, particularly from an area where a heresy would have warranted an orthodox reaffirmation.

The angel pages which accompany the traditiones, I believe, also came into Spain from Carolingian sources. It is well known that Charlemagne was eager to use orthodox Christianity to unite his kingdom, and that one of his court advisers, Theodulf, had a mosaic in the apse of his own church which contained angels holding the ark of the covenant (Fig. 313). Through the years the form of this ark may have changed, but the concept was that of Jeremiah 31:31, that God would make a new covenant with mankind. The Christians interpreted that to mean the coming of Christ. This concept, along with the usage of evangelist pages across a single opening found in several instances in Carolingian manuscripts, could lead one to believe that examples such as the angel page in the Trier Gospels could have originally been incorporated into a program which continued across two pages in Carolingian times.

The author of this iconography could have been, perhaps a clever member of the Carolingian court particularly interested in keeping the orthodox view of Christianity intact, or could have been one of the many abbots connected with the major monasteries sponsored by the court. When and how this iconography entered the Spanish Christian kingdoms, is an open question, but the likelihood of it coming from Tours during the tenth century is rather dim, as is commonly known. Tours in the early tenth century was busy defending itself from Viking attacks. I would prefer to believe that this Carolingian iconography entered Spain at an earlier time, but was not employed by Spanish artists until a later date when problems arose with the monarchy and heresy presented itself.
The same holds true for the genealogy pages, which appeared in Spanish Bibles early in the tenth century, but did not necessarily occur in the Beatus manuscripts until much later on when orthodoxy became a tool of the monarchy, i. e., after the middle of the tenth century. These genealogy pages which Williams has pointed out, go back to antiquity. However, since the Carolingian monarches had a predilection for tracing their genealogy back to Troy, and since a later document of this sort of tracing exists, I believe that these genealogies were the direct influence on the Spanish Bibles, and thus at the same time, could have influenced the Beatus commentaries as a common source; though they were not used in the Beatus pictorial tradition until a later time, again, when the interest was to establish strongly the position of orthodoxy and the monarchy.

The initial which introduces the Book of Daniel is, as Guilmain has pointed out, is of the School of the Charles the Bald type (Figs. 229, 303). However, this does not necessarily mean that this represents the date of the introduction of the Commentary of Jerome into the Beatus iconography, but merely that the scribe liked the type and incorporated it into his work. This is only one of the problems attached to the addition of the Commentary on Daniel to the third edition of the Beatus Commentary on the Apocalypse.

Sanders suggested that the dedication to Etherius, the prefatory illustrations, and the Jerome on Daniel were added at the same time to the third edition of Beatus' Commentary. No matter when it became part of the Beatus tradition, its prefigurations and lessons of faith fit very well with the orthodox position of the Church. The iconography of particularly the portion of the manuscripts in Branch II is very old, for the pictures are all unframed.
The dedication to Etherius, if Klein is correct that this edition was produced after
the lifetime of Beatus, gives us the problem of who added this dedication to the third, but
not the last edition of the Commentary. There are three likely suspects: (1) It might have
been a clever court scholar in contact with Elvira who knew just what to do to bring the
sympathies of the people to the cause, which would naturally have been useful to the
interests of the weakening monarchy; (2) or it could have been a clever theologian
fighting a rampant heresy, which fits with the suggestions of Catharism in Christian Spain
in the tenth century; or (3) it could have been just a reminder, again by someone in the
court, that the infidels living in the south of Spain were heretics to be fought with great
zeal, and were at the same time an object lesson in regard to the punishment they would
receive at the last judgment.

We have surveyed some of the problems of the additions to the iconography of M,
the first extant example of the third edition Beatus Commentary on the Apocalypse. But so
far we have no proof that all of these things were added to the Beatus tradition all at once
by a person named Maius or any other personality which we know of operating in tenth-
century medieval scriptoria, and our statistics bear us out on this. Each Beatus was created
under certain circumstances, as Raizman has pointed out, and these circumstances often
account for the difference in the iconography at hand. Political and most especially
theological implications were most likely significant in the choice of subjects beyond that of
the preparation for the last judgment, in the codices done for each monastery in question.

In the particular case of M, in examining closely the collation of the manuscript, it
becomes clear that Maius began at first with an earlier type of manuscript, perhaps one
Neo-Visigothic in character, then changed his style and format when he was introduced to
another book that was more Carolingian in character. This can be shown by what we
described above, that fols. 23 and 26 have decided Visigothic tendencies, and fit into the
manuscript about the place where it was just beginning. The first quire mark in this codex is on 15v, which has led to some confusion on the part of scholars. Some of whom have considered the first quire to be fifteen folios long, but it really means that there were only eight folios before folio 15v; and the prefatory pages, belonging to the more Carolingian examplar were simply never marked (Appendix A, Figs. 2, 3). Furthermore, as also noted above, the initial on fol. 10 is Merovingian/Visigothic in character. The inscriptions on fols. 23 and 26, as well as the initial on fol. 10 belong to the same hand as that of Maius, so it is clear that he is the author of these folios, even though they are quite different from the rest of the manuscript compositionally and figuratively. For example, compare fols. 23 and 26 with fol. 27 (Figs. 135, 136, 137 respectively), where the faces, figures and draperies on fol. 27 are much more classicizing; and the composition much more complex.

I personally feel that the combination of the pages with the Visigothic style, those with the more Carolingian references, and those with the Islamic motifs, has something to do with the time in which the manuscript was produced, which was post mid-century. At this point in time Neo-Visigothic motifs were being used in other manuscripts as propaganda for the weakening Leonese monarchy. It would have been very logical for Maius to begin with this sort of manuscript to copy. The Carolingian portions, with their significant iconographic implications for orthodoxy, and the Islamic motifs which were incorporated into these, show well the time in which the manuscript was produced and the motives for producing it.

However, our statistical sampling shows that at least part of the archetype/s from which M was derived was more ancient than the tenth century, as was suggested by Klein and seconded by Werckmeister Furthermore, the prefatory iconography which more
closely associates M with Branch IIb raises questions. This will have to wait for further study.

Thus, in short, M644, cannot, as Neuss and Klein have already pointed out, be the parent of the entire Branch II family unlike Menéndez-Pidal supposed.
Notes to Chapter V

1. The discussion of the archetype for the entire Beatus group has been given in Chapter IV above, but this Chapter deals only with the "so-called" Tenth Century revision of the Beatus iconography and the archetype for this revision.

2. That is to say that he wanted to be able to account for the differences between Branch I and Branch IIab.


4. Neuss, 1931, 136 ff., esp. 238; and 246 where he indicates that though M is the oldest representative of Branch II, the antique effect is slight, and thus S is the closest to the archetype. The words "'mutter' manuscript" I have taken from Klein, 1976, 546, note 690.

5. See Klein, ibid, which, of course, was published some twenty years after Menéndez-Pidal's work; but this information was already in Neuss, 1931, if one read Neuss carefully enough to find it, as Klein obviously did. See note 4 directly above.

6. See his Figure 192 (Fig. 292 below), which shows the place of the Beatus World Map within the Isidorian tradition.


9. This, of course includes the Beatus MSS. See his 1953 article, esp. 45. He also expressed many of the same ideas in Gerona II, see Chapter IV, note 41 above, and applied them directly to M644. For another proper understanding of the indigenous element in Spanish pre-Romanesque art, see Schlunk, 1945.

10. This was originally an idea of Gómez-Moreno, 1919; but as late as Menéndez-Pidal, 1954, refers to Maius' use of color learned under the Islams, esp. 263, 288. Williams, 1977, however, points out that there is very little likeness between what we know of truly Mozarabic manuscript illumination as typified, for example, by the Biblia Hispalense, Madrid, Bibli. Nac. Cod. Vitr. 13-1 (reproduced as his Fig. VII, and Plate 5), and the later Beatus Manuscripts, particularly those designated as Mozarabic; see his discussion on this, 14-24. Also note similar statements throughout his 1970, 1972-1974, 1980, articles. Furthermore, in analyzing the handwriting of Maius, some scholars have their doubts that Maius came from the south. This subject was brought...
up several times at the Madrid conference in 1976. Díaz y Díaz, Actas I, 177, noted Maius’ handwriting to be Castilian, though Millares Carlo, Actas I, 204, surmised that he may have been from Sahagun in León. Others continued with the premise that he was a Mozarab from Cordoba, so the situation is far from being solved and deserves a complete study of its own.


12. Williams presented this information in a paper given at Kalamazoo. 1985, and later conveyed his comparison (Fig. 304, below) to me via letter, for which I thank him. This does coincide with earlier scholars who had made comparisons with the Beatus manuscripts and Tours, such as Cook, 1923-25, who also noted Touranian contributions to tenth century Spanish art. Williams continued to press this point in his publications of 1970, 1972-1974, and 1980, noted above.

13. Porcher, 1970, gives indications that the provincial Carolingian schools were of similar importance to the Court Schools in influencing later works of art, 171, passim. He particularly notes the Alpine trend originating in Italy in reference to some of these works, 173, and notes the influence of some of these on Tours, 187. Thus while he does not directly mention this influence on the Beatus manuscripts, it may account for some of the "Italianate" influences which have been discovered by scholars working in the Beatus field.

14. For example, see H. Bober, “On the Illumination of the Glazier Codex”, Hommage to a Bookman, New York, 1967 (I thank my advisor Franklin Ludden for bringing this to my attention.); and the Vatican Gospels, Vatican Coptic 9, Reproduced in Baumstarck, Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft, 8 (1915), Tafel 31, Abb. 8. Many other scholars have also dealt with this problem.

15. See Chapter II above, Introduction where it is noted that Gómez-Moreno gave implications of national heroism to Maius.

16. There has been much discussion on this on the part of scholars, but Klein did not believe in this drastic an iconographic change, for example, Actas II, 90. In addition, Fig. 300, showing his stemma clearly indicates that the changes in the Beatus iconography did not come all at once.
17. For example in his review of Klein, 1977, 633-636; in *Actas II*, 201-219. In a paper given at the Brussels Beatus Conference held in 1985, and printed in the elaborate catalogue for that conference, *Los Beatos, Europalia 85 España*, 26 de septiembre-30 de noviembre 1985, "Las pinturas del Comentario", 19-21, esp. 21, (though I am not certain that the printed version is exactly the same as the version which was given at the conference, for when I asked Williams about his paper, he declined to make any comment).


19. Ibid., 223-225. He has also ignored the fact that Díaz y Díaz in "La circulation des manuscrits dans la Péninsule Ibérique du VIIIe au Xle siècle", *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 12 (1969), 385, noted that there were diverse copies of Beatus' book at the beginning of the tenth century, and one of these copies, found in León, could have been the base for M644. Thus, there may have been manuscripts which were precursors to the change in iconography which were in existence long before either Maius or Florentius.

20. Klein, 1976, passim., especially the results of his discussion, 85-149. 153-175 and 176-218, which led to his construction of a pictorial stemma which clearly shows that the iconographical changes in the Beatus iconography were gradual. See also his conclusion, 302-304, and fig. 300 below, which reproduces his pictorial stemma, taken from *Actas II*, Fig 2, 96. It is remarked that in the purest sense of scholarship, the true research is a process of building upon established scholarship for furthering shared ideas and for arriving at unique result.

21. Neuss particularly noted this, 238, 246, see note 4, above. Of course, he was all along giving precedence to the St. Sever Beatus.

22. Klein, 1976, figs. 41, 42, 62, 66, 141, and many more examples.


24. Such as those seen in Dodwell, 1971. fig. I. Rome SS. Cosma e Damiano. the mosaic of the apse, early 6th century; and his figs. 2, 3, and 4 following. Rome. Santa Prassede, Mosaic of Apse, 827/44; Rome, Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, Mosaic of Apse, 817/24, and Rome, San Marco, Mosaic of Apse, 827/44, respectively. Here, of course the suggestion is not so much as the similarity in style, or even the exact circumstances represented (after all, fig. 2 has the word JORDAN written below Chirst, as if to refer to the baptism of Jesus), however, the appearance in the clouds without angels, as is seen in the Ascension iconography is the important point, and there may have been other murals, manuscripts, etc., from the late Carolingian period which influenced the model that Maius was using. The Appearance of Christ in the Clouds, fol. 26, in M seems to be an in-between instance of borrowing from the earlier period. Even van der Meer, 1938, does not seem to be able to properly account for it, 188-196. For more on


26. Here refer to next note below.

27. See Neuss 62-65; Sanders, 116-117; Pérez de Urbel, Hispania Sacra, 9 (1952), 12. Also note Menéndez-Pidal's suggestion that Maius' map comes from the Ostroian tradition rather than the Isidorian one. See 224-225, 228, 230-231 for his discussion of Maius' world map. Carlos Cid, Compostellanum, 10 (1965), 232-273, esp. 253, 267, 270-271, addresses the problem of the Beatus World Maps in a slightly different way from that of Menéndez-Pidal.


29. A close look at the many Crosses of Oviedo in the Silos Beatus (D) gives a visual history of the changes to this symbol. (Three prefatory ones, one before the Last Judgment, and one at the end of the book). However, the shape of the one just before the Last Judgment, fol. 205 (Fig. 266), is basically the same shape as that in the M644, though much more elaborate. The one in Tu,.fol. 168 (Fig. 267), is the same shape, though more simplified.

30. Note the facets on the columns on both the illumination and the sculpture in Figs. 308-309, which are quite similar to those on the initial on fol. 10 of M644.

31. This has been suggested by Dodds as occurring earlier in the century, but at this particular point I am following suggestions made by M. Soledad de Silva y de Verastegui, "Neovisigotismo iconografico del Siglo X: ordo de celebrando concilio", Goya, 1981, 70-75, who examines the Codices Vigilano and Emilianense in the Biblioteca de El Escorial in a manner which suggests the same sort of Neo-Gothic revival I am suggesting for the period in which M was produced. I thank Dodds for pointing this article out to me.

32. Notes 21-33.

33. For example, Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Edili 126, reproduced in Williams, Actas III, Fig. 8, Fols. 137, 138, Christ with SS Mark and John; and in Nordenfalk, "Der inspirierte evangelist", Weiner Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, 35 (1983), Fig. II (Fig. 311 below), Christus und Johannes; Vatican Gospels, Vatican Copie 9,
reproduced in Baumstark, Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft, 8 (1915), Tafel 31, Abb. 8; and in my M. A. Thesis, Ohio State University, 1971, Fig. 19 (Fig. 310 below).

34. James, 1902, 316; idem, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, Manchester and London, 1921, 18; Williams, 1965,75-81,85; 1977, 64, Plate 12; 1980, 203-206. In Williams' 1965 work, he based part of his argument on the lack of cruciform nimbi on the seated figures in these illustration, but he later refers to a lack of cruciform nimbus. Yet see Figs. 99, 100, below. Cruciform nimbi do appear rather indiscriminately on various figures throughout the Beatus group. For example on fol. 94 and fol. 89v of the Gerona, the figure of John has a cruciform nimbus, as does the angel. On fol. 34 of the Gerona, some of the earthly kings also have cruciform nimbi. In M644, some of the angels opposite the traditio pages have cruciform nimbi (see Figs. 104, 115, below). Inconsistencies such as these are probably an indication of the antiquity of the models used for these manuscripts. As we know, there were many inconsistencies in the use of the nimbus during the Early Medieval period. See R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, T. D. Kendrick, and T. J. Brown, Codex Lindisfaromensis, Oltun and Lausanne, 1960, 167. A. M. Friend, "The Picture of the Second Advent, Frontispiece of St. Jerome's Vulgate Gospels, A. D. 384", American Journal of Archaeology, 30 (1926), 89, points out that the Gospels of Xanten, Brussels, MS Latin 18723, which are Carolingian, have Christ with a plain nimbus and the evangelists with no nimbus at all. He notes this to be contrary to Carolingian custom but in consonance with fourth century practice. See also A. N. Didron, Christian Iconography, I, transl. E. J. Millington, New York, 1968 (first published 1851), 47-52 on the use of the nimbus for Christ in the early Middle Ages.

35. Nordenfalk, 1983, Fig. II, 251 (Fig. 311 below); Werckmeister, 1967, 132, note 596; Bruce-Mitford, 167.

36. Nordenfalk, 1983, 179. He represents M, fol. 3v, in his fig 12 with the caption, "Christus und Johannes. New York, Morgan Libr., M. 644" (Fig. 106 below).

37. See note 33 above. Also Biondo Biondi, Il Diritto Romano, Bologna, 1957, 397-99, for the traditio in Roman Law. It also is closely related to the apostolic succession. For this see Karl Morrison, Tradition and Authority in the Western Church, Princeton, 1969, esp. 4. Here one must remember that one of the fols. is missing in M, which would have appeared between the present fol. 1v and 2 (See Appendix A, Fig. 2, c.). I took the liberty of making up these Latin terms, though they are not used in the Latin Canon Law. They must have been made up sometime in the late nineteenth century.

38. The license for a priest to preach in a parish is still in effect in the Catholic church today. For the early church, which was full of itinerant priests each requiring a license to preach from the local bishop, see George F. Schorr, J. C. L, The Law of the Celebrat, Washington, The Catholic University Press, 1952.
39. See Charles Julian Bishko "The Pactual Tradition in Hispanic Monasticism", Spanish and Portuguese Monastic History, Variorum Rerints, London, 1984, for contracts between monks and abbots, esp. 25, where he notes that by at least the 9th century, there were two "distinct yet inseparably linked parts or subpacta: one the well-known covenants of the monks, the pactum monachorum: the other, the abbot’s own declarations, a pactum abbatis or abbatiale. Taken together, both texts constitute what we may call the double, or, preferably, so as to avoid all confusion with double monasteries and double traditiones, the binary pactum”.

40. I believe that this was suggested by Mundo during one of the discussions following the papers in Actas I. Here, unfortunately my research presents a lacuna. However, Histoire de L’Eglise., ed. Fliche et Martin., Vol. 7, Emile Amann, Auguste Dumas, Paris, 1947, note other problems of heresy for that period, but do not refer directly to Catharism, though I am certain through my own research that “pockets” of Catharism and other forms of dualism continued from the late antique period into the early Middle Ages.


42. Note de Palol’s response to Miner’s review of Neuss’ 1931 book, indicating the close connection between Spain and North Africa and the problems of heresy involved in both places. Also note the fact that this particular iconography was included in the St.-Sever Beatus was probably due to a heresy in the time of Abbot Gregor in the 11th century when the St.-Sever was produced. Evidence for this is given to us by Adhemar de Chabannes, who reports that heretics, who he referred to as Manichaens (another dualistic heresy), were burned at the stake in Lyon during that period. In his Chronique, ed. Jules Chavanon, Paris, 1897, 185, notes the occurrence of this heresy in France in 1022: "Nihilominus apud Tolosam inventi sunt Manichei, et ipsi destructi, et per diversas occidentis partes nuntii antichristi exorti, per latibula ses occultar curabant et quoscumque poternat viros et mulieres subvertebant”. On 194 there is a notation of 1-27-1028 which reads: "his diebus concilium adgregavit episcoporum et abbatum dux Willelmus apud sanctum carrofum propter extinguendas haereses, quae vulgo a Manicheis disseminabantur".

43. However these pages could have been added directly to the vocabulary of Spanish manuscripts at any time, as there was the precedent for such a page from late antiquity, e. g. in the Chronograph of 354. Stern, 1953, Pl. 1, Figs. 1 and 2. There is also the Angel Incipit page, fol. 9 of the Trier Gospels, Trier, Domschatz 61 (134), Reproduced in Goldschmidt, German Illumination, I, New York, 1928, Pl. 7. However, the double-paged iconography seems to be a Carolingian format (see examples in A, Boinet, La Miniature Carolingian, Paris, 1913, the works of Koehler, and Mutherich and Gaehde, 1976), which is why I give precedence to the Carolingians on this sort of iconography. This is contrary to the belief of Williams, 1980, 207, who states: "They appear to have been added to the archetypal conception by a Spanish painter."

44. See note 43 above.
45. There are also the examples in H. Swarzenski, *Monuments of Romanesque Art*. Chicago, 1974 (originally published 1954), of eleventh century Gospels, where two angels are holding a beginning plaque to a Gospel, Pl. 43, Figs. 96-97, but these are much larger than those in the Trier Gospels. Nevertheless, they indicate that the late antique tradition of the putti holding the opening plaque was adopted to Christian purposes on at least a limited scale in the early Medieval period.

46. This speculation will be left open at the moment, and will be presented later in a separate work.


48. Williams, 1980, 207-210. See Chapter I, note 21 above. I thank Prof. Shirley Schwartz for pointing out the reference on the Assyrian Eponym lists to me. Schematic genealogies are also found on the walls of Roman cemeteries.

49. *Chronica Regis Coloniensis*. Genealogy of the Carolingians, Brussels, Bibl. Roy. Ms 4609, c. 1238. This was pointed out to me by Charles Scillia, to whom I am grateful.

50. Though one cannot be sure exactly when the monarchical genealogies might have been transferred to the life of Christ. I look forward to Zaluska's publication to solve some of these problems.

51. Guilmain, 1961, fig. 4, 25-28 (here he related this initial to Tours in the time of Alcuin); idem, 1980, fig. 2, and 68, where he notes that "Both (figs. 1 and 2) show the characteristic scroll-like interlace, and belong to the same family as the initials in the Second Bible of Charles the Bald."”

52. Sanders, XVII-XVIII.

53. There is a great deal of speculation amongst Spanish scholars as to when this text and its iconography was appended to the Beatus manuscripts. I refer to Shirley Stark on this subject. However, I will comment on important issue, which is the problem of the relationship of the pictures to the text. This varies from manuscript to manuscript, suggesting that there was either one or several Daniel cycles circulating throughout the peninsula which were used in different ways by the Beatus painters and scribes. As there used to be in the Escorial Library a manuscript which had the Daniel cycle attached to it, many Spanish scholars tend to believe that this manuscript contained a Beatus text as well. I will not go into this problem at this time as it is only a speculation and is not central to the point I am making in this present study.
54. I must bring this up, though I have promised in this work not to deal with the text, but only the pictorial tradition.

55. The kingdom of Leon was the successor to the mountainous Asturian Kingdom (Figs. 85, 86), in the north of Spain. This area had been the nucleus of the development of the northern Christian Kingdoms. Oviedo had been the first real capital of this Dark Age Kingdom, though earlier Cangas de Onis had been a sort of capital in the early medieval manorial sense. By the middle of the tenth century, however, the Asturian kingdom, by now called the Kingdom of Leon (some, as I do, prefer Astroleonese Kingdom, had its capital at Leon, which had originally been a military outpost, but was part of the redevelopment of the Duero wasteland. Fig. 87 shows the difference between the geographical conditions which enabled the Astroleonese kings to expand upon the Meseta. (Though it is a picture of Astorga, I had originally, without success, looked for a view of Leon itself to show what the possibility of moving out of the mountains meant to these people.) At the same time, the area of Castile, which lay between the Meseta to the west and the upper Ebro valley to the east had begun to be developed as an eastern march for the Astroleonese Kingdom. It was a region even less urban than the parent domain, a frontier territory full of castles, as its name implies, and these castles served as fortresses in defending the area against the Islams. Castile in the middle part of the tenth century was ruled by a count who nominally answered to the kings in Leon, Fernán González, and was dominated by a rugged, pioneering aristocracy who were given ample privileges in return for their services in developing and defending the area. This naturally began to cause problems about the middle of the tenth century when the leadership of Castile became embroiled with and tried to take control of politics in Leon. The later part of the tenth century saw the weakening of the monarchy due to the problem of succession; but curiously enough, because of the the delicate balance of power between the Astroleonese Kingdom and its marches following the death of Ramiro III, who died leaving an infant son, rather than elect a king, a regent was appointed, in the person of his Aunt Elvira. This means that the aristocracy of the outer regions, such as Castile, was beginning to gain power enough to make the royal family consolidate its assets by keeping the power with the royal house itself. (To have open elections at that time could have proven to be disastrous to them.) The instigation of a program of propaganda, based both on religious and political concepts was probably the doing of Elvira, who remembered that under Ramiro II, things had been different.

56. My opinion is that all three theories were generated out of Elvira's court in an attempt to thwart any action on the part of her potential enemies in the marches. (All the bibliographical material on this subject can be found in note 10 of Introduction to this study.)


58. Here again do we have an example of two MSS being used as in the case of St.-Sever?
59. As, for example, Garcia Lobo, see his collation, Chapter I, note 13, above. These scholars must be forgiven, however, as the MS has been inaccessible to them for personal examination for many years, as it is in New York and not in Europe.

60. Note the difference between this initial (Figs. 130, 131) and that on the first page of Daniel, (Fig. 239).

61. The Islamic references which appear throughout this second book, I put, not as an indication of a "watershed" of change as has my good friend and colleague Peter Klein believes, but as the continuing acculturation which occurred throughout the tenth century where the hated enemy was also emulated and in fact became quite fashionable. See Glick, 179, 277-299 and passim.

62. See above note 55.

63. See above note 55 on Elvira's regency.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

Any scholarly project is by necessity never really finished. It is instead a little like Bergson's "flow of thought", which we nowadays would call a "continuum" in which ideas proceed seemingly without hindrance from reactions to those produced by others. In this essay I have tried to present a number of observations which I have made regarding M644, building on the thoughts of others before me. Some may doubtless be critical of what I have done; others, sympathetic. But both attitudes will, I hope, inspire future scholars to continue to look with interest at this important manuscript. I will continue to do so, and to share my observations, as well as those of my colleagues with the academic community at large. For, to my mind, that is what scholarship is all about: finding the answer to the puzzle no matter who finds it, and sharing it in good faith with the rest of the scholarly community.

In this particular project I have tried to find some of the answers to questions regarding M644. However, I chose to limit my scope to only those issues which I felt most pertinent to this celebrated work of art at this particular time. Therefore, I have been only able to touch briefly upon other topics which may be of greater interest to many. I hope that in the process I have raised as many questions as answers, and that there will be others who will come forth to continue the discussion.
In dealing with my problem, I started with what appeared to be the most logical point of departure, following the remarks Díaz y Díaz made at Madrid in 1976 (Introduction), that of trying to determine if the manuscript has been correctly placed in the pictorial stemma for the Beatus manuscript group developed by Peter Klein in 1970/76. In order to verify this I had to accomplish two important things: (1) analyze Klein's statistics, adding one of my own to my study; and (2) furnish codicological evidence for his placement of this manuscript within the Beatus group, which I did in a collation with William Voelkle, even though the work is still in progress. I took less seriously other questions concerning this codex, such as its relationship to the pictorial archetype of the Beatus group, and its role as a prototype for the so-called tenth century revision. This is because I assessed that the first two issues were far more important to examine at this time. For without the proper placement of M644 in the Beatus family group, other issues can only be dealt with in an isolated manner.

The findings of this work are not surprising to those familiar to Beatus studies, particularly to those who understand them well. They are as follows:

A. The Place of M644 in Beatus Pictorial Stemma is where Klein placed it, deriving in part from iconography which was in place before the split of Branch II into a and b, but not as distinct from the rest of the group as to put it in an "in-between" situation as A2Rom and S.

B. M, along with S displays some of the oldest forms of the Beatus iconography. However, M644 cannot to be regarded the archetype of the entire Beatus iconography as Klein has demonstrated. That the Beatus iconography began in quite different form is quite clear; it was unlike Neuss suspected as a rich, dense, mass which was later cut down, but quite the opposite is true.
C. Although it is the earliest in date (mid-tenth century) of a group, Branch IIab, of remaining Beatus MSS having similar, elaborate iconography, M644 is not the archetype of this group, since its likeness and differences from the same group indicate a common ancestry rather than an ancestry stemming from it to the others.

D. Maius is not the author of the tenth century revision, though the author of a very unusual book, with a meaning not expressed in the other tenth century Beatus MSS - the book likely dedicated to St. Michael the purveyor of souls to heaven; and the victory cross right before the Last Judgment, make it appear that this particular Beatus has an intense religious as well as political appeal. "Maius memento", which appears at the end of the Commentary on the Apocalypse, is an appeal for prayers for intercession. Just as Werckmeister has pointed out the iconological differences between S and M, there are iconological differences between M and the rest of Branch II MSS.

E. As for the date and provenance, this codex, which will be more firmly dated elsewhere, stems from the mid-tenth century, or slightly later, along with the Léon Antiphonary, and about a decade or so after Vitr. 14-1. Thus, an early dating of 922 or 926 is untenable. This is in part because, as was pointed out in Chapter V, the manuscript, unlike the monastery from which it supposedly comes, does not display the ambience of the earlier part of the century. M644 possesses iconographical and iconological characteristics which lead us to believe that it was probably done under the supervision of court circles wishing to consolidate the areas belonging to the Astroleonese crown after mid-century.

F. The argument that the introduction of the so-called "new" iconography into the Beatus pictorial tradition took place about a certain time in the tenth century, and
that the additions were made all at once is still questionable. It is more likely that the prefatory material and the Jerome Commentary were added at different times, but this is difficult to ascertain without a detailed iconographical survey, as some of this material could have been added earlier than the tenth century.

As it has been summarized above, this study has focused itself on the place of M644 in the Beatus MSS of the tenth century. However, many equally important questions still remain to be answered about this mysterious and luxurious codex. I have tried to use two modern methods to begin to penetrate the secret of this manuscript regarding its relationship to its other, similarly exotic family friends. However, other questions, such as those of the origin and date of M644, will have to remain for a future time. This will be the thrust of a planned monograph on the codex by myself.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
COLLATION

1. Introduction

This collation, done by William Voelkle and myself over the past few years is work in progress, yet should be, as noted above\(^1\) considered authoritative, as the book is currently undergoing conservation, and we have had the folios free from the binding with which to work. Debra Evert, the Morgan conservator, made a preliminary collation as she took the book apart, and this has been very helpful to us in facilitating our work. While some minor areas still need refinement, for the most part our results are sound.

We have not yet tried to establish the original size, the work process of the book, and the way in which it was put together, but I would like to offer some preliminary conclusions. While the appearance of the book for the most part would lead one to believe that it is an in-quarto book, i.e., the upper parts of the pages are cleaner than the lower portions, suggesting a folding over. Yet upon careful observation, in some cases each biunion, or bifolio, is from one skin,\(^2\) as on some of the folios, particularly on the hair side, some "tucking" may be seen at the upper edge of the folio, for example on fol.4-4v (Figs.117, 118).\(^3\) Furthermore, we know that Libri made "modifications" to the book because the margins were, as he said, in such bad condition that he needed to do so.\(^4\)
addition, the codex is 38 x 28 cm in size after much trimming. If we believe Libri, this might originally have been much larger than an in-quarto book.

A strong personal concern I have is about the difference in size of some of the skins used which could be an important factor in the way the codex was put together. In other words, some skins might have been smaller than others, and thus would have to be handled in different ways. This could account for the few inconsistencies in M644 where the top sides are tucked as well as the bottom portions of the pages. Only more study will reveal the answer to this problem.

In the course of our work, we discovered that the page preparations for the folios were different in some cases. The result of our examination so far shows that in 24 cases, a "subtle system", as Voelkle called it, of lining was used (R/I; I/R; R/I; I R, etc.), indicating that the scribe wanted to not only match the hair and flesh sides of the codex, but to line in order to have the best result in the quire from a visual point of view. In 13 instances, however, all the folios were incised on the recto side of the page, regardless the hair or flesh side. There was one incising on just the verso side, 2 part on the recto and part on the verso, and I part on the "sublime system" and part on the recto side of the skin.

The only way we could account for this, other than the presence of a spook in the scriptorium, was that in certain instances, the skins were so thick that they had to be dealt with in a way which would make it possible for the scribe to work on the page in a suitable manner. This is why we also noted whether the folios had been lined once or twice, as we often felt that the thick skins needed relining in order to give the scribe the result he needed.

Since this is still work in progress, we are open to any suggestions which scholars familiar with M644 could offer.
2. *Reconstruction in Progress* by William Voelkle and Myself

While the diagramming system for our collation is somewhat different from that of other scholars, we felt that it showed the essential characteristics of the book better efficiently. The legend, which will pertain to all the Collation Diagrams, is as follows:

- **H** = Hair Side of Vellum
- **F** = Flesh Side of Vellum
- **R** = Raised Side of Incised Markings (Page Preparations)
- **I** = Indented Side of Incised Markings
- **•** = One Lining
- Arabic Numerals = folios which are extant

However, in this collation, the last two single folios, namely quires XLIV and XLV, have not been shown as diagrams since they contain neither texts nor illustrations—they are blank pages. But it is worth noting that the beginning and end of Spanish manuscripts of this period are very significant because of their frequently erroneous placement. In the case of M644, while quire XLIV is contemporary with the rest of the manuscript, the last quire XLV is of later vellum, clearly indicating that this quire was inserted at a later time into the manuscript.
Notes to Appendix A

1. See Chapter I.

2. That is the opinion of Barbara Shailor, who shared it with me in a private conversation.

3. This fol. is part of the prefatory pages, which, as suggested in Chapter I, may well represent skins pressed into service, being intended for other uses. Therefore, these pages may not represent the typical pattern of the rest of the book.

4. See above, Chapter I, note 5.

5. See Kurt Weitzmann and Herbert Kessler, The Cotton Genesis, Princeton, 1986, 8 where they note that the Vienna Genesis is 33.3 x 22 cm. in size and the Milan Iliad is 32.6 x 28.8 cm., practically the cropped size of M644, and call that a "princely" size; and 9, where they discuss the size of in-quarto books, especially note 26, where they indicate that "the calculated measurements of CG, 33 x 25, would only put the manuscript at the outer limits of quarto size". Here they are dealing with the fact that the CG was originally the size of the two above mentioned manuscripts, but has shrunk due to fire damage. M, however, may have had shrinkage due not just to Libri's trimming, but to water damage. For further on the putting together of medieval manuscripts see Léon Gilissen, "La composition des cahiers le pliage du parchemin et l'imposition", Scriptorium, 26 (1972). Also see E. Turner, The Typology of the Codex, Philadelphia, 1977.
Notes:

This is a single blank leaf, which probably once was placed right before folio 10, as the indentation of the Q initial which appears on folio 10 at the end of the titulus and to the right of the bottom part of the large I initial, appears on this folio. There are also marks which indicate that someone has tried to rub out material which might have originally been on the folio.

Figure 1. First Single Sheet
Notes:

a. Maybe an Alpha on the H side and a Cross of Ovideo on the F side, or the reverse.

b. Page Preparation is uneven: the lining is done partially on the verso side (fols. 1, 2, and 4), and partially on the recto side (fols. 3 and 5)


d. 4v (H side), Beg. of Genealogy Pages.

e. Repair in center fold.

f. Also missing page.

Figure 2. Quire I (1-5)
Notes:


b. Indentation here very light in page preparation, and it is hard to tell for sure which side is R and I.

c. Missing folio, perhaps, as in J, the Virgin Mary and Child on the H side. Maybe Bird and Serpent on the F side?

d. Blank folio now in front of Frontispiece of MS.
Notes:

a. No missing text in Sanders, so if these two folios existed, there would have been either empty sheets or some form of decoration or illustration.

b. Beg. of Text, Beg. of Jerome's Preface.

c. Page Preparation has been lined twice, as if to correct mistakes when first lined unevenly.

d. Page Preparation, as in c. has also been lined twice.

e. Repair to centerfold.

f. There is a question of whether the three folios in the next quire could have been these three, i.e., whether it would be possible to combine these two quires (III and IV) in order to have one. However, the look of the skins does not seem to indicate this. Rather, these were small quire with irregular page preparations. This was, perhaps originally the beginning of the manuscript, and there was possibly introductory material now lost.

Figure 4. Quire III (10-12)
Notes:

a. No Stubs. 15 sewn into 14 into 13 (Voelkle).

b. Page Preparation: lined twice, but hard to see.

c. Page Preparation: lined twice, but again, hard to see.

d. Some text missing from Sanders. This needs to be investigated further.

e. First quire mark at base of 15v, 1q.

f. Irregular base and side margins. This part of the manuscript, as noted above in quire 3, is full of irregularities, and it is possible that at this point the painter/scribes were undecided exactly how to proceed. Furthermore, the double lining on the folios occurs often on particularly thick skins in this MS, and thus may be relining, when the original lines did not show through to the other side.

Figure 5. Quire IV (13-15)
Notes:

a. Relining on the right vertical on the lower outer right margin.

b. Vertical incised mark overruns at lower right on outer margin.

c. Text proper begins on fol. 22 of this quire.

d. Second quire mark mid-bottom page of 23 v, Ilq.

Figure 6. Quire V (16-23)
Notes

a. Text missing: part of Explanatio and Storia, Sanders, 54-60. Text deals with the storia on Sanders 60-61, and expalnatio follows on 27v.

b. One folio missing with parts of text referred to in note a. above, and /or decorations.

c. Illumination probabaly sewn in, which would account for the tab.

d. Third quire mark in center of bottom margin of 29v, III q.

Figure 7. Quire VI (24-29)
Notes:

a. A great deal of text missing from Sanders, 72-91, 5-32; but fol. 31 does not follow Sanders 72,4-70, and instead is a different discussion entirely: the Angel of Ephesus. N. B. Sanders’ notes on 73 and 91. Counting up the column lines in both Sanders and M, one could fill in this quire with text, making at least a quire of 8 folios.

b. Fourth quire mark on center bottom margin of 31v, IIIe [q], which means that what remains from the quire are the outer two folios, as they are connected across the center fold.

Figure 8. Quire VII (30-31)
Notes:

a. There are 19 pages of Sanders missing, 98-117, following 32v. This could, counting column lines, account for two folios in the center of the quire, where one might find at least a portion of the missing text (which could, according to my counting be as much as 5 pages of text in M).

b. Folio 33 is blank on the recto side, which could possibly mean that some of the Sanders' text is simply missing, the scribe either didn't finish or was using different materials. This is a matter for future investigation.

c. Folio 34v begins with Sanders, 117, 4-1, "Martyres Graeca lingua". So there is some text missing.

d. No quire mark on 34v, so it probably is not the end of the quire. Also the quires in this MS normally begin and end with the H side of the vellum.

e. We have not yet had the chance to investigate the possibilities for this postulated folio, but this is where the quire mark would have been on the verso side.

Figure 9. Quire VIII (32-34)³
Notes:

a. Here the Page Preparation is similar to that found on the folios in Quires V and VI above. Voelkle calls this the "subtle" system, as it seems as if the scribe is trying to match the openings visually, as he has done with the H and F sides of the vellum. We found this sort of page preparation on 22 of the quires.

b. Quire no. on 42v mid-lower margin, VI Q [q].
Notes:

a. Again, a "regular" quire, with the scribe employing the "subtle system" of page preparation.

b. Quire no. in mid-bottom margin of 50v, VII Q [q].

Figure 11. Quire X (43-50)
Notes:

a. The relining on this folio needs further investigation.

b. Quire mark, mid-bottom margin on 58v, VIII Q [q].

Figure 12. Quire XI (51-58)
Notes:

a. On the lining of this folio we are not still able to agree. Voelkle takes the position that it is I/R. I take the view that it is R/I (R), with the raised lines on the H side coming from a reinsertion done on the F side, which was lined a second time. A possible solution is that it was first done on a double page manner, resulting in Voelkle's I/R, and then corrections were made because the first lining was not adequate. There is also a problem with extra linings down the center margin on the F side, which run out of the central line in several sequences giving the effect of a slightly opened umbrella which has lost its cover. We will have to investigate this folio in more depth.

b. In mid-bottom margin of 66v is the quire mark, VIIIQ [q].

Figure 13. Quire XII (59-66)
Notes:

a. This quire has apparently lost its outer skin.

b. On 67v, the text is different from Sanders, so some further investigation of the text should take place.

c. No quire mark on 72v.
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin 80v, quire mark, XI q.
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin 88v, quire mark, XII Q [q].

Figure 16. Quire XV (81-88)
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin 96v, quire mark, XIII q.

Figure 17. Quire XVI (89-96)*
Figure 18. Quire XVII (97-104)*

Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin c.104v, quire mark, XIII q.
Notes:

a. Illumination: Opening of the First Four Seals missing. Text also missing. Storia. Sanders, 333 T.6.1: 17 lines in all, about 1 column line in 644, so "illum" could appear on one side of folio.

b. We have not yet accounted for the tab. Perhaps this side of folio was sewn in when other side was removed.

c. No quire mark on this page, so perhaps scribe forgot to put it there, or over time it has been erased, or margin has been trimmed which eliminated it. It would appear to be in the correct order, because the previous and following quire marks fit the proper sequence.

Figure 19. Quire XVIII (105-111)
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin, 119v, quire mark, XVIq.

Figure No. 20. Quire XIX (112-119)
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin, 127v, quire mark, XVIIQ [q]

Figure No. 21. Quire XX (120-127)
Notes:

a. Mid-bottom margin, 135v, quire mark, XVIIIQ [q]

Figure No. 22. Quire XXI (128-135)
Notes:

a. Hard to see lines for Page Preparation.

b. Nothing missing here, so sewn in tabs probably have something to do with work order or size of skins.

c. same as b.

d. Can hardly see lines for the Page Preparation.

e. R/I or I/R? Hard to tell.

f. R/I or I/R? Hard to tell.

g. Mid-bottom margin 143v, quire mark XVIII Q [q].

Figure No. 23. Quire XXII (136-143)
Notes:

a. Between fol. 144 and 145v, a folio missing, containing Riders on Fire-Spitting Horses, Apoc. 9:17-19 (see M429, f. 94). Also text missing from Sanders, 432, 8.13 to Sanders 433, 9.1: part of the explanatio Sexta Tubae and Storia Equorum. 27 Lines from Sanders and tituli, so have illumination, on one side of lost folio and text on the other.

b. Here also missing from Sanders 436, 9.16 to Sanders 438.10.1: the rest of the explanatio of the equorum and all of Storia Angeli Fortis. This equals 39 lines from Sanders + titulus, or about one side of a folio missing. There could have been decoration or the text could have finished high upon the page.

c. Oversewn (Evert)

d. Hard to see any lines here.

e. Originally attached to 144 bis, and later sewn in as a tab when 144 bis was removed?

f. Mid-bottom margin, 149v, quire mark, XX q.

Figure 24. Quire XXIII (144-149)
(Voelkle and I came to this conclusion separately. We are agreed that XXIV & XXV were originally one gathering. This is described above in the figure for this quire. We both feel that after careful examination of the text and the skins, this quire could be expressed correctly no other way.)

a. Quire XXIV (Folios 150-153) added as the two outer skins to Quire XXV (Folios 154-157) with numbering the way it now appears.

b. Numbering the way it should appear.

c. Mid-bottom margin, 157v, quire mark, XXI q.

Figure 25. A Combination and Reordering of Quires XXIV (150-153) and XXV (154-157), making this Quire XXIV.
Notes:

a. Lost folio. Missing almost 35 lines from Sanders, ends Sanders 472, 13.10, end of Storia Bestiae et Euisdem Draconis. First part of explanatio is also missing up to Sanders 474, 3.10. With tituli, this means that one side of the folio had an illumination, the Worshipping of the Beast, as in J, 191v, and G, 176v.

b. Voelkle notes that the string is original.

c. Tab probably sewn in when missing folio was removed.

d. Hard to see lines: R/I or I/R?

e. Hard to see lines: R/I or I/R?

f. Mid-bottom margin, 164v, quire mark XXII q.

Figure 26. Quire XXV (158-164)
Notes:

a. Lining hard to see on H side. The skins in this quire are very thick, so I don't think they were lined when laid out one at a time before being assembled. They must have, rather, been lined individually after having being put together. It is hard to tell whether some of them have been relined, or re-incised (for in some places in this MS the lining does cut through the entire page).

b. First Anti-christ table missing, and also text missing from Sanders, 500, 12 lines.

c. Quire mark XXIII q, mid-bottom margin, 171 v.

---

Figure 27. Quire XXVI (165-171)
Notes:

a. The Page Preparations on this quire are mixed. The first two pages of the quire are incised on the F side, and the rest on the H side. This may be due to a change in scribe in the midst of the work on this quire. This needs further examination.

b. The quire mark appears mid-bottom margin, 179v, quire XXIII q.

Figure 28. Quire XXVII (172-179)
Notes:

a. Perhaps work order could account for tabs, as there is no text or illuminations lost. Either page reinforcements were in order because skins were fragile or small, another possibilities pages were removed and then returned and sewn in.

b. See a. above.

c. Voelkle notes that in the Page Preparations all are raised on the verso, and incised on the recto.

d. 187v, mid-bottom margin, quire mark XXV Q [q].

Figure 29. Quire XXVIII (180-187)
Notes:

a. Oversewn. (Debra Evert)

b. The Page Preparations in this quire are all incised on the recto side, which means possibly a different scribe is involved here.

c. Missing folio, with missing text: end 190v, 544, Sanders “hoc est”. Beg. 191, Sanders 545, 7.1, “iam supra draconem diabolum”. So the last part of the Explanatio on Sanders, 544, “Storia de Supradictas Ranas”, and first part of Explanatio on 545 is missing. Sanders notes this, but his notes are not precise. Thus 14 lines text and 2 tituli are gone. This would account for one side of the folio. The other side would be an illumination, the “Fowl Spirits”, as in J, f. 220v.

d. Quire mark, mid-bottom margin, 194v, XXVI q.
Notes:

a. All the folios incised on the recto side.

b. Missing folio: Illumination of Woman on the Beast; and text from Sanders, at least 47 lines: from 557, 17.13 to 560, 2.14.

c. Oversewn. (Debra Evert)

d. Quire mark, mid-bottom margin 201v, XXVIII q.

Figure 31. Quire XXX (195-201)
Notes:

a. Folio 202 sewn into quire. (Debra Evert)

b. All folios are incised on recto side.

c. Last page of quire missing: The Illustration of the Rider with the White Horse, Apoc. XIX, 11-16 as in J, f. 240; plus 31 lines from Sanders missing and tituli: Sanders, 591, T. 19.16 (end of storia) to 593, 1.9 "...descripsimus. calcat enim modo...". So one page of the explanatio is missing, or one-half a folio. The missing illumination would have been on the other side of the folio.

Figure 32. Quire XXXI (202-208)
Notes:

a. All folios incised on the recto side.

b. Middle of bottom margin of 216v, quire mark, XXXIII q.

Figure 33. Quire XXXIII (209-216)
Notes:

a. Just bottom parts of folios remaining, and these were sewn into each other, as small tab appears on 224.

b. "Subtle System" used for lining.

c. Quire mark, XXX q, mid-bottom margin.

Figure 34. Quire XXXIII (217-224)
Notes:

a. This quire was bound with 233 as the last folio. This made a quire of 9 folios rather than 8, and probably was a mistake in the last rebinding of the MS. Folio 233 is the more than likely the first folio of the next quire as reconstructed below, Figure 36.

b. All the folios are incised on the Recto side.

Figure 35. Quire XXXIV (225-232)
Notes:

a. This quire, originally bound as a quire of 4 folios, and is problematic, as it incorporates two folios which originally were in different locations in the MS. The first of these is 233, bound with the previous quire, and containing the end of the text of the Apocalypse (which ends in a slightly different way than Sanders). The second is the picture of Babylon, folio 238 (marked 233bis above) which has been a single, actually loose sheet placed opposite 239, the beginning of the Daniel Commentary, and which is blank on the recto side.

b. The folios are all lined on the recto side.

c. 237v does not have quire marks, so it more than likely is not the last folio in the quire. (Though we have seen that quire marks are missing in some cases where they should normally be.) Furthermore, since 233 and 238 are now sheets without cross connections to other folios, we are probably missing 2 folios at the end of the quire, at least on of which which may have been blank. This obviously needs further attention.

Figure 36. Quire XXXV (233-237)
Notes:

a. This quire now begins with the Daniel Commentary, folio 239, as 238 has been incorporated into the quire above, XXXV. It is now a regular quire of 8.

b. The lining is the "Subtle System".

c. There is a quire mark, XXXIII, mid-bottom margin of folio 246v, so this lends weight to our reconstruction of two quires, although unmarked, in between this quire and our quire XXXIV, which was marked XXX.

Figure 37. Quire XXXVI (239-246)
Notes:

a. This quire begins with "Subtle" lining system for the first two folios, and then switches on 249 to a system where all the folios are incised on the verso side of the folio.

b. Quire mark, XXXIII, mid-bottom margin, 254v.

Figure 38. Quire XXXVII (247-254)
Notes:

a. This quire is lined according to the second system of the previous quire, with all the incised marks on the verso side of the folio.

b. Mid-bottom margin of 262v, quire mark XXXV.

Figure 39. Quire XXXVIII (255-262)
Notes:

a. Folio 263 of this quire has prickings on the side like many MSS from Cardeña.

b. The lining is back to the “Subtle System”.

c. Quire mark, XXXVI, mid-bottom, folio 270v.
Notes:

a. The Page Preparations for this quire have been done by incising on the recto.

b. Mid-bottom margin of 278v appears the quire mark, XXXVII.

Figure 41. Quire XL (271-278)
Notes:

a. The incising on this quire has been done, as on the previous quire, entirely on the recto.

b. Mid-bottom margin, quire mark XXXVIII is on 286v.

Figure 42. Quire XLI (279-286)
Notes:

a. All the folios in this quire have been incised, as in the case of the two previous quires, on the recto.

b. The last folio of this quire is missing. Have we lost, perhaps, an Omega?

Figure 43. Quire XLII (287-293)
Notes:

a. These folios are prepared with the "Subtle System", except for folio 297, which is a maverick.

b. This is material addended to the main text. As it is not our intent to deal strictly with the text of M644 in this particular study, we are only reporting at this point the condition of the book. Díaz y Díaz has published this added material, see above, Chapter I note 28.

Figure 44. Quire XLIII (294-299)\(^6\)
In this collation, the last two single folios, namely quires XLIV and XLV, have not been shown as diagrams since they contain neither texts nor illustrations—they are blank pages. But it is worth noting that the beginning and end of Spanish manuscripts of this period are very significant because of their frequently erroneous placement. In the case of M644, while quire XLIV is contemporary with the rest of the manuscript, the last quire XLV is of later vellum, clearly indicating that this quire was inserted at a later time into the manuscript.
Fig 46. Page Preparation and Measurements, M644, f. 129, drawn by William Voelkle
Fig. 47. Page Preparation and Measurements, M644, f. 159v, drawn by William Voelkle
1. Introduction

The purpose of this Appendix is to demonstrate those characteristics of the Beatus illuminations important enough to be included in a checklist which will ultimately be used for statistical analysis. Some of those included in this Appendix are Klein's, and others my own. These characteristics, which at first could be considered arbitrary and discretionary, prove in the final instance to give factual evidence of the likenesses and differences between the diagrams or pictorial compositions in the manuscripts involved. They especially give support to the art historical evidence of the associations between these codices.

For the present study, it was necessary to first present Klein's own characteristics checklists for the Anti-christ Tables which became the pillar of part of his argument for developing his pictorial stemma. I did not try to translate these checklists, as I felt they should stand on their own. I reproduce them here as they appeared in his work of 1976.

Next, I translated in a loosely paraphrased way the characteristics which Klein chose for the Fifth Seal (M, fol.,109, my Fig. 159, his pages 331-335), for I felt that this subject would be of more interest to art historians, rather than the Anti-christ tables, which are not truly "illustrations" even though they contain interesting and significant elements as
diagrams. I made this translation to show to the English reader the sort of characteristics Klein and myself both picked in order to develop our statistics.

I then went on to make my own characteristics list for the "Enthroned and the Lamb", which appears in M on fol. 87 (Fig. 158). This checklist, established by the discussion in Chapter III above, enabled me to make the matrix found in Appendix C, 4; the table found in Appendix D, 3; and the graph, (Fig. 84.) in Appendix E, 2.

2. Klein's List of Characteristics for the Anti-christ Tables

I. MERKMAL-LISTEN ZUR KORRELATIONS-ANALYSE

A. Zur 1. Antichrist-Tabelle

(A1 E O C L N S V U J D G T H R Ar)

   - = Keine gitter-, sondern kreuzförmige Gliederung der Tabelle: O C L.

   - : O L IIa R Ar.

3. + = Kreuz vor dem "Intra sapiens": A1 E C.
   - : N S G T H.

   - : C N G T H.

5. + = "Octo nominibus" am Rand umlaufend: S IIab.
   - = "Octo nominibus' links neben dem Mittelfeld: A1 E O C L N.

   - = "GENSERICUS" links unten: S IIab.

7. + = Senkrechte Kreuzreihe am linken Rand: S IIab.
   - : A1 E O C L N.

8. + = Kreuz vor "Octo nominibus": IIab.
   - : I.

   - = Bei Mittelfeld umlaufend "ANTICHRISTI": E S O C L N IIab.
   - = Bei oberen diagonalen Zahlen des Mittelfelds "DCLXY": S U V J G T H R.

   - = Bei unteren diagonalen Zahlen des Mittelfelds "DCLXY": S U V J G.

   - = E N O C Ar.

   - = A1 E N L S IIa G T H R.

14. + = Zentrum des Mittelfelds leer: EN.

15. + = Im Mittelfeld Alpha und Omega vorhanden: A1 L A.
   - = E O C N IIab.

16 + = Viermaliges kleines Christus-Monogramm im Mittelfeld: S IIa.

   - = E O C N S IIab.

   - = kleines Christus-Nomogramm im Mittelfeld heilt völlig: E O C N IIb.

19. + = "In fronte et manu" vorhanden: S IIab.
   - = A1 E O C L N.

   - = IIb.

   - = "Per antifrasin" ohne abschließendes "quam decipit": A1 E O C L N.

   - = "Per antifrasin" mit "Post hec": O C L N.

23. + = "Per antifrasin" mit "Per Hoc": IIa.
   - = "Per antifrasin" mit "Per hec" bzw. "Post hec": I.

   - = "EVANTAS" rechts oben: S IIab.
   - = "DAMNATUS" unten links: I la.

   - = Bei senkrechten Antichrist-Namen "ANTICHRISTUM": A I E O C L N.

27. + = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 45 nach "subtractos" als Ziffer "X Y V": A I E O C L N.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 45 nach "subtractos" nicht als Ziffer "X Y V": I la.

   - = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 45 nach "tolle" nicht als Ziffer "X Y V": I la.

29. + = "Bis nomen" mit "reliquos tot biebus": I I lb.
   - = "Bis nomen" ohne "tot" bei "reliquos biebus": A I E O C L N.

30. + = "Bis nomen" mit "diebus": A I E N I I lb.
   - = "Bis nomen" mit "dies": O C L.

31. + = "Bis nomen" mit "reliquos": A I O C L I I lb.
   - = "Bis nomen" mit "reliquis": E N.

32. + = "Bis nomen" mit "adversarius": A I E O C L N.
   - = "Bis nomen" mit "adversitas": I la.

33. + = In "Bis nomen" die Zahl 1335 nach "fiunt" als Ziffer: E L N I I lb;
   - = In "Bis nomen" die Zahl 1335 nach "fiunt" in Zahlworten: I I a; z.T. A I O C L.

34. + = "Per antifrasin ...": I.
   - = "Pro antifrasin ...": I la.

35. + = "Per antifrasin: mit "A et Ó": I.
   - = "Per antifrasin: ohne "A et Ó": I la.

   - = Bei "TEITAN" N=U: J V D.

37. + = Bei diagonalen Zahlen des Mittelfelds "DCCLX...": J D "DCCLX...": I V U I I lb.

   - = Bei "Octo nominibus": "capitibus" u. "cornibus": L R Ar.

40. + = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 1290 vor "anni" in Zahlworten: O C IIa;
   z.T. A1 IIb.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 1290 vor "anni" in Ziffern: E L N; z.T. A1 IIb.

41. + = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 3 vor "menses" als Zahlwort: A1 O C L N IIab.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 3 vor "menses" als Ziffer: E.

42. + = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 6 nach "menses" als Zahlwort: A1 E O C IIa.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" die Zahl 6 nach "menses" als Ziffer: L N IIb.

43. + = Bei "Bis nomen" Absatz nach "menses sex" mit anschließendem "A":
   IIb.

44. + = Bei "Bis nomen" fehlt der Schluß "de regno ipsius antichristi": R Ar.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" ist der Schluß vorhanden: A1 E O C L N IIa G T H.

45. + = Bei "Bis nomen" "quos": A1 E O C L N IIa G T H.
   - = Bei "Bis nomen" "quot" statt "quos": R Ar.

46. + = Bei "GENSERICUS" =CC: Ilb.
   - = Bei "GENSERICUS" =CC fehlt: IIa.

47. + = Bei "GENSERICUS" S=CC: I IIa G.
   - = Bei "GENSERICUS" S=VI: I H R Ar.

48 + = Bei "EVANTAS" (erstes) A=X statt A=I: R Ar.
   - = Bei "EVANTAS" (erstes) A=I: I IIa G T H.

49. + = Bei "EVANTAS" (zweites) A=I: I IIa.
   - = Bei "EVANTAS" (zweites A) =I: IIb.

50. + = Bei "TEITAN": A=I: I IIa G T H.
   - = Bei "TEITAN": A=T statt A=I: R Ar.

B. Zur 2. Antichrist-Tabelle
   (A1 A2mox E O C L S M V U J D G T u T H R Ar)

1. + = Die Tabelle ist insgesamt gerahmt: S G Ty T H R.
   - = Die Tabelle ist nicht gerahmt: A1 A2mox E O C L IIa Ar.
2. + = Die beiden äußeren Arkaden mit seitlichen Eckpalmetten: A1 A2moz E O I1a;
   - = C L S I1b.

3. + = In der ersten Spalte (zu "ANTICHIRSTUM") rechts neben dem B ein C: I1b.
   - = In der ersten Spalte das B allein: I I1a.

   - = In der ersten Spalte das C allein: I I1a.

5. + = In der ersten Spalte rechts neben dem D ein F: I1b.
   - = In der ersten Spalte das D allein: I I1a.

   - = In der ersten Spalte das E ohne die Zahl V: L S.

7. + = In der ersten Spalte das E rechts wiederholt: A1 A2moz E O C S M V U D.
   - = In der ersten Spalte das E rechts nicht wiederholt: L J I1b.

   - = In der ersten Spalte dem H die falsche Zahl VIII beigeordnet: O C L S U G Tu R Ar.

   - = In der ersten Spalte zuunterest statt des T-C-T ein Y-C-Y: O C L.

10. + = In der zweiten Spalte (zu "TEITAN") dem I die Zahl X zugeordnet: A2moz E O C L M.

11. + = In der zweiten Spalte das I rechts wiederholt: A2moz E O C L S I1ab.
    - = In der zweiten Spalte das I rechts nicht wiederholt: A1.

12. + = Om der zweiten Spalte das N rechts wiederholt: A1 A2moz E O C L.
    - = In der zweiten Spalte das N rechts nicht wiederholt: S I1ab.

    - = In der zweiten Spalte das K rechts nicht wiederholt: A2moz E O C L S I1ab.

    - = In der zweiten Spalte unten statt des doppelten T ein doppeltes Y: O C L.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nummer</th>
<th>Anweisung</th>
<th>Beispiel</th>
<th>Alternativ Beispiel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>+ = In der zweiten Spalte unten die Zahl CCC wiederholt: A1 A2moz E L S IIab.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der zweiten Spalte unten die Zahl CCC nicht wiederholt: O C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>+ = In der zweiten Spalte zuunterst als Summe DCLXVI: I IIa T H R Ar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der zweiten Spalte zuunterst als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>+ = In der dritten Spalte korrekt C-C-C: A1 A2moz E O C L M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der dritten Spalte nicht C-C-C: S V U J D IIb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>+ = In der dritten Spalte das D rechts wiederholt: I IIa G Tu T H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der dritten Spalte das D rechts nicht wiederholt: R Ar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>+ = In der dritten Spalte das T rechts wiederholt: G Tu T H R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der dritten Spalte das T rechts nicht wiederholt: I IIa Ar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>+ = In der dritten Spalte als Summe DCLXVI: I IIa T H R Ar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- = In der dritten Spalte als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. + = In der vierten Spalte das F rechts wiederholt: A2moz E O C S Ila G Tu T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das F rechts nicht wiederholt: Al L Ar.

32. + = In der vierten Spalte das H rechts wiederholt: G Tu T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das H rechts nicht wiederholt: I Ila Ar.

33. + = In der vierten Spalte das K rechts wiederholt: IM V U D G Tu T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das K rechts nicht wiederholt: J Ar.

34. + = In der vierten Spalte das N rechts wiederholt: I M V U D T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das N rechts nicht wiederholt: J G Tu Ar.

35. + = In der vierten Spalte das R rechts wiederholt: I Ila T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das R rechts nicht wiederholt: G Tu Ar.

36. + = In der vierten Spalte das (erste) S rechts wiederholt: A2moz E O C L S Ila T H R.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das (erste) S rechts nicht wiederholt: A1 G Tu Ar.

37. + = In der vierten Spalte dem U korrekt die Zahl LXX beigeordnet: A1 E.
   - = In der vierten Spalte dem U die falsche Zahl LXXX zugeordnet: A2moz O C L Ila.

38. + = In der vierten Spalte das U rechts wiederholt: Al A2moz E L S Ila.
   - = In der vierten Spalte das U rechts nicht wiederholt: O C Lib.

   - = In der vierten Spalte neben dem X nicht die Zahl LXXX: Al A2moz E O C L Ila.

40 + = In der vierten Spalte unter dem X ein T: Ilb.
   - = In der vierten Spalte unter dem X kein T: I Ila.

   - = In der vierten Spalte die Zahl CC nicht zuunterst wiederholt: C L J D.

42. + = In der vierten Spalte als Summe DCLXVI: I Ila T H R Ar.
   - = In der vierten Spalte als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.

43. + = In der fünften Spalte (zu "EVANTAS") das (erste) A rechts wiederholt: I Ila G Tu T H.
   - = In der fünften Spalte das (erste) A rechts nicht wiederholt: R Ar.

44. + = In der fünften Spalte das (zweite) A rechts wiederholt: E M.
   - = In der fünften Spalte das (zweite) A rechts nicht wiederholt: A1 A2moz O C L S V U J D Ilb.

45. + = In der fünften Spalte das A links wiederholt (zweites A): M.
   - = In der fünften Spalte das A links nicht widerholt: I V U J D Ilb.
46. + = In der fünften Spalte das E rechts wiederholt: IMVUDG Tu TH.
- = In der fünften Spalte das E rechts nichts wiederholt: J R Ar.

47. + = In der fünften Spalte neben dem G die Zahl III: G Tu.
- = In der fünften Spalte das G ohne die Zahl III: IIa TH R Ar.

48. + = In der fünften Spalte das N rechts wiederholt: IIa G Tu TH.
- = In der fünften Spalte das N rechts nicht wiederholt: A Ar.

- = In der fünften Spalte dem T statt VIII die Zahl VIII beigeordnet: O V.

50. + = In der fünften Spalte als Summe DCLXVI: IIa T H R Ar.
- = In der fünften Spalte als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.

51. + = In der sechsten Spalte (zu "DAMNATUS") erstes A rechts wiederholt: IIa.
- = In der sechsten Spalte erstes A rechts nicht wiederholt: IIb.

52. + = In der sechsten Spalte Zweites A rechts überhaupt wiederholt: A1 A2moz E O C M.
- = In der sechsten Spalte Zweites A rechts überhaupt nicht wiederholt: L S V U J D IIb.

53. + = In der sechsten Spalte zweites A rechts allein wiederholt: E.
- = In der sechsten Spalte zweites A rechts zusammen mit B wiederholt: A1 A2moz O C M.

54. + = In der sechsten Spalte zweites A links überhaupt wiederholt: A1 A2moz M.
- = In der sechsten Spalte zweites A links überhaupt nicht wiederholt: E O C L S V U J D IIb.

55. + = In der sechsten Spalte neben dem D die Zahl III: IIa T H R Ar.
- = In der sechsten Spalte neben dem D statt III die Zahl III: G Tu.

56. + = In der sechsten Spalte das D rechts widerholt: IMVUDG Tu TH.
- = In der sechsten Spalte das D rechts nicht widerholt: J R Ar.

57. + = In der sechsten Spalte das E rechts widerholt: G Tu.
- = In der sechsten Spalte das E rechts nicht widerholt: IIa T H R Ar.

58. + = In der sechsten Spalte das N rechts wiederholt: IMVUDG Tu TH.
- = In der sechsten Spalte das N rechts nicht widerholt: J R Ar.

59. + = In der sechsten Spalte das T rechts wiederholt: A2moz E O C L S M V U D G Tu TH R.
- = In der sechsten Spalte das T rechts nicht wiederholt: A1 J Ar.

60. + = In der sechsten Spalte unter dem X noch ein T: G Tu.
- = In der sechsten Spalte unter dem X kein T: I IIa T H R Ar.

61. + = In der sechsten Spalte als Summe DCLXVI: I IIa T H R Ar.
- = In der sechsten Spalte als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.

62. + = In der siebten Spalte (zu "ANTEMUS") neben dem B die Zahl I: IIb.
- = In der siebten Spalte das B ohne die Zahl I: I IIa.

63. + = In der siebten Spalte das E rechts wiederholt: I M U D G Tu T H R.
- = In der siebten Spalte das E rechts nicht wiederholt: V J Ar.

64. + = In der siebten Spalte das M rechts wiederholt: I M U D G Tu T H R.
- = In der siebten Spalte das M rechts nicht wiederholt: V J Ar.

65. + = In der siebten Spalte das N rechts wiederholt: I M U D G Tu T H R.
- = In der siebten Spalte das N rechts nicht wiederholt: V J Ar.

66. + = In der siebten Spalte das S rechts wiederholt: I M U J D G Tu T H.
- = In der siebten Spalte das S rechts nicht wiederholt: V R Ar.

67. + = In der siebten Spalte das T rechts wiederholt: I M U D G Tu T H R.
- = In der siebten Spalte das T rechts nicht wiederholt: V J Ar.

68. + = In der siebten Spalte das U mit beigeordneter Zahl: I M V U IIb.
- = In der siebten Spalte das U ohne beigeordnete Zahl: J D.

69. + = In der siebten Spalte das U rechts wiederholt: I M U J D G Tu T H R.
- = In der siebten Spalte das U rechts nicht wiederholt: V Ar.

70. + = In der siebten Spalte unter dem X noch ein T: G Tu.
- = In der siebten Spalte unter dem X kein T: I IIa T H R Ar.

71. + = In der siebten Spalte als Summe DCLXVI: I IIa T H R Ar.
- = In der siebten Spalte als Summe DLXVI: G Tu.

72. + = In der achten Spalte Schreibweise von "Axime" mit x: I G Tu T.
- = In der achten Spalte Schreibweise von "Axime" mit xe: I Ia H R Ar.

73. + = In der achten Spalte Schreibweise von "Axime" mit i: A2moz E O C L S Ar.
- = In der achten Spalte Schreibweise von "Axime" mit y: A1 I Ia G Tu T H R.

- = In der achten Spalte rechts oben eine Art X: IIb.

- = In der achten Spalte unter dem S bzw. X kein T, sondern ein h: IIb.
3. Translation of Klein's List of Characteristics for The Fifth Seal

1. Picture with rectangular frame.

2. Picture divided into zones.

3. Picture divided into two zones compared with those divided into three.

4. Picture portion which has altar with closed curve compared with those with three closed curves.

5. Picture with altar with one closed curve.

6. Altar in upper zone compared with altar in middle zone.

7. Altar in the middle.

8. Fabric on the altar.

9. Cup, chalice on the altar.

10. Altar top many layered (tiered)

11. The souls of the deceased represented as birds (A1 bodies, L, birds and bodies, Fe decapitated bodies, also lower part as well as upper part.

12. The bird souls only in the upper portion of the picture.

13. The bird souls above the altar.

14. The bird souls only beside the altar.

15. The bird souls beside and under the altar.

16. The bird souls under the altar.
17. The bird souls in many series superimposed.
18. The bird souls in two series superimposed.
19. The bird souls in three series superimposed.
20. The bird souls in four series superimposed.
21. The lights hanging down above, i.e. beside the altar.
22. Votive disks hanging down from picture frame.
23. Two large votive disks hang down from the side of the altar.
24. Other votive objects hand down.
25. The Lord is pictured.
26. The Lamb is represented.
27. The Lord is in the Middle.
28. The Lord is enthroned.
29. The Lord as a whole figure.
30. The Lord with nimbus.
31. The nimbus is cruciform.
32. The Lord is in hooded dress.
33. The Lord gestures to the right in a speaking manner.
34. The Lord gestures to the right in a blessing manner.
35. The sealed book is represented.
36. The Lord has the sealed book, but not the Lamb.
37. Palms, bushes or trees represented.
38. Palms, bushes or trees represented either beside the Lord or above Him.
39. Corpses of martyrs are by the altar.
40. Corpses of martyrs are clothed.
41. Living martyrs are represented.
42. Living martyrs as whole, upstanding figures.
43. Living martyrs in two lateral groups.

44. The "stolae" of martyrs as priest's "stolen" contrasted with simple robes.

45. An angel beside the martyrs.

46. In the middle upper half of the living martyrs, an enframed altar.

47. Votive objects hang from square frame, crowns or lights.

48. The Lord is represented amongst the living martyrs.

49. The living martyrs are represented as birds.

50. Picture has writing "Ara aurea".

51. Picture has "Ad hos date sunt stolae albae" as an inscription.

4. **My Characteristics List for the Enthroned and the Lamb**

The method of comparison which I have used is slightly different from that of Klein. In order to simply Klein's method, in the following set of characteristics I have examined, the +'s indicate the presence of the factors listed, while the -'s show the lack thereof, and the meaning of the - value is frequently explained in the entry immediately below that for the + value. Thus, often, two succeeding entries are simply reversals of each other.

The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb
(MSS used: OLN A2Moz MJDH ArR Tu)

1. + = One Page Format: OLN A2Moz MJDH Ar R
   - = Tu

2. + = Two Page Format: Tu
   - = OLN A2Moz MJDH Ar R

3. + = Outer Frame Round: L A2Moz MJDR Tu
   - = ONH Ar
4. + = Outer Frame Rectangular: O N H Ar
   - = L A2Moz M J D R Tu
5. + = Outer Round Frame with Stars: M J D R Tu
   - = L A2Moz
6. + = Outer Rectangular Frame Decorative: O N Ar
   - = H
7. + = Roundels within Outer Rectangular Frames: N
   - = O L A2Moz M J D H Ar R Tu
8. + = Roundels within Outer Rectangular Frames Decorated: N
   - = O
9. + = Large Circles within Outer Rectangular Frame: H Ar
   - = N
10. + = Large Circles within Outer Rectangular Frame Decorated: Ar
    - = H
11. + = Enthroned is present: O J D H Ar R Tu
    - = L N A2Moz M
12. + = Ethroned is above the Large Circle Containing the Other Subjects: J D
    - = O H Ar R Tu
13. + = Ethroned is Incorporated into the Large Circle Along with the Other Subjects: H Ar R Tu
    - = J D
    - = R Ar Tu
15. + = Mandorla Oval or Almost Oval: O D H
    - = J R Ar Tu
16. + = Mandorla Like a Little Enclosure: J
    - = O D H R Ar Tu
17. + = Mandorla Round: Tu
    - = O J D H R Ar
18. + = Enthroned on a Throne: J D R Tu
    - = O H Ar
19. + = Enthroned Seated on an Arc: O
    - = J D R
20. + = Mandorla within Larger Circle: H
    - = O J D R
21. + = Circle with Enthroned Overlaps Second, lower Circle for Lamb: Tu
   - = L N A2Moz M J D H Ar R

21. + = Enthroned Nimbed: O J D H Ar R Tu
   - = None

22. + = Enthroned has Cruciform Nimbus: O D H Ar R Tu
   - = J

23. + = Center of Circle is the Enthroned: Tu
   - = L A2Moz M J D H Ar R

24. + = Center of Circle is the Lamb: L A2Moz M J D H Ar R
   - = Tu

25. + = Center of Rectangle is the Enthroned: O
   - = N H Ar

26. + = Center of Rectangle is the Lamb: N H Ar

27. + = Lamb is Enclosed in a Central Roundel: L N A2Moz M J D H Ar R
   - = O Tu

28. + = Central Roundel is Decorated: A2Moz M J D
   - = L N H Ar R Tu

29. + = Lamb Faces Right: L O
   - = N A2Moz M J D H Ar R Tu

30. + = Lamb Faces Left: N A2Moz M J D H Ar R Tu
   - = L O

31. + = Lamb is Nimbed: L H Ar R Tu
   - = O N A2Moz M J D

32. + = Lamb is Multihorned: O N A2Moz.
   - = L M J D H Ar R Tu

33. + = Lamb is Multieyed: O A2Moz
   - = L N M J D H Ar R Tu

34. + = Lamb Holds Cross of Victory in Right Foot: O L J D H Ar R
   - = A2Moz M

35. + = Lamb Holds Cross of Victory in Left Foot: A2Moz M
   - = O L J D H Ar R

36. + = Lamb has no Cross of Victory, but a Book with Seven Seals: N
   - = O L A2Moz M J D H Ar R Tu
37. + = Lamb has a Cross of Victory and a Book with Seven Seals or Decorations: A2Moz D
   - = OLMJHArRTu

38. + = Lamb has a Cross of Victory and a Small Ark: MJ
   - = OLA2MozDHArRTu

39. + = Evangelist Symbols in Roundels: LN A2Moz
   - = 0MJDHArRTu

40. + = Evangelist Symbols in Cruciform Configuration within the Large Circle: L A2Moz MJD Tu
   - = ONHArR

41. + = Luke Symbol Moved to Right to Accomodate the Enclosed Enthroned: H ArR
   - = MJD

42. + = Evangelist Symbols Early Christian/Carolingian in Character: LN A2Moz
   - = OMJDArR

43. + = Evangelist Symbols in Anthropomorphic Form: 0MJDArR Tu
   - = LNA2Moz

44. + = Evangelist Symbols come out of wheels: MJDHArR Tu
   - = OLN A2Moz Tu

45. + = All Four Evangelist Symbols Nimbed: OLNHArRTu
   - = A2Moz MJD

46. + = Evangelist Symbols Winged: ONA2Moz MJDHArR Tu
   - = L

47. + = Evangelist Symbols Hold Books: OLMJDHArRTu
   - = N A2Moz [±]

48. + = Angels at Four Corners of the Circle: L MJDHArR Tu
   - = ON A2Moz Tu

49. + = Number of Angels at Four Corners of the Circle is two: Tu
   - = OLMJDHArR

50. + = Number of Angels at Four Corners is Four: LMHArRTu
   - = JD Tu

51. + = Number of Angels More than Four: JD.
   - = LMHArRTu

52. + = Angels Inside Overlapped Roundel with the Lamb: Tu
   - = OLMJDHArR
53. + = Angel Inside Rectangle Near Enthroned: O
   - = LMJDHAR Tu

54. + = No Angels at all: ONA2Moz
   - = LMJDHAR Tu

55. + = No Elders: LN
   - = OA2Moz MJDAHAR Tu

56. + = Elders Outside the Circle or Rectangle: A2Moz Tu
   - = OMJDHAR

57. + = Elders Outside Unframed: A2Moz
   - = Tu

58. + = Elders Outside Framed: Tu
   - = A2Moz

59. + = Elders Inside the Circle or Rectangle: OMJDHAR Tu
   - = A2Moz Tu

60. + = Twenty Four Elders Shown: A2Moz
   - = OMJDHAR Tu

61. + = Twelve Elders Shown: OMJDTu
   - = A2Moz HA R

62. + = Seven Elders Shown: Ar
   - = OA2Moz MJDR Tu

63. + = Six Elders Shown: HR
   - = OA2Moz MJDAr Tu

64. + = Elders Nimbed: OMJDHAR Tu
   - = A2Moz R

65. + = Elders have Musical Instruments or Vials: OMJDHAR Tu
   - = A2Moz

66. + = Some Elders Lying at Base of the Evangelist Symbols: MJ D
   - = O A2Moz HA R Tu

67. + = John and Angel Included: NHAR
   - = OLA2Moz MJDTu

68. + = John and Angel Included Inside the Frame: N
   - = HA R

69. + = John and Angel Outside the Frame at Bottom of Page: HA R
   - = N
70. + = John and Angel Nimbed: N H Ar
   - = R

71. + = Angel has Wings: N H Ar
   - = R
APPENDIX C

MATRIXES

1. Introduction

This Appendix provides four sets of matrixes. The first part deals with Klein's
own matrixes for the Anti-christ tables M.fol. 171v (Fig. 192) (One is missing in M, see
Appendix A, Fig. 27.) The second section is composed of the matrixes which are derived
from the checklists found in Appendix B, 2. The third portion of Appendix C indicates my
own matrixes made using Klein's checklists for the illustrations other than those of Klein's
for the Anti-christ Tables. (Appendix B, 2) The last section is my matrix for the "Vision of
the Enthroned and the Lamb", M, fol. 87 (Fig. 158), (Appendix C, 4)

2. Author's Matrixes for Klein's Other Subjects (All folio references are to M644; figure
numbers reference pictoral figures in Volume II)

1. Symrna; fol. 52v (Fig. 146)
2. Pergamon; fol. 57v (Fig. 148)
3. Philadelphia; fol.70v.(Fig. 151)
4. The Fifth Seal; fol. 109 (Fig. 159)
5. The Second Trumpet; fol. 137 (Fig. 173)
6. The Third Trumpet; fol. 137v (Fig. 174)
7. The Fourth Trumpet; fol. 138v (Fig. 175)
8. The Fifth Trumpet; fol. 140v (Fig. 176)
9. The Two Witnesses; fol. 149 (Fig. 180)
10. Death of the Two Witnesses; fol. 151 (Fig. 182)
11. The Resurrection of the Two Witnesses; fol. 154v (Fig. 187)
12. Seventh Trumpet; fol. 156 (Fig. 188)
13. Temple with Beast; fol. 156v (Fig. 189)
14. Woman in Sun with the Dragon; fol. 152v-153 (Figs. 184, 185, 186)
   (these folios are out of order, Appendix A., Fig 25)
15. Beast from the Earth; fol. 164v (Fig. 190)
16. Angel with Everlasting Gospel; fol. 176 (Fig. 194)
17. Harvest of Wrath; fol. 178v (Fig. 195)
18. The Seven Angels with the Seven Plagues; fol. 181v (Fig. 197)
19. The Commissioning of the Angels; fol. 185 (Fig. 198)
20. The First Angel; fol. 186v (Fig. 199)
21. The Second Angel; fol. 187 (Fig. 200)
22. The Third Angel; fol. 189 (Fig. 200)
23. The Fourth Angel; fol. 190v (Fig. 201)
24. The Sixth Angel; fol. 190v (Fig. 203)
25. The Fowl Spirits; (Missing in M, see Appendix A, Fig. 30)
26. The Whore of Babylon and the Kings; fol. 194v (Fig. 205)
27. The Burning of Babylon; fol. 202v-203 (Figs. 207, 208, 209)

3. Klein's Matrixes for the Anti-christ tables:
   a. The First Anti-christ Table (Fig. 75)
   b. The Second Anti-christ Table (Fig. 76)

4. My Matrix for the Enthroned and the Lamb
| A1 | S | E | A2 | O | L | N | M | V | U | J | D | G | Tu | R | Pc | Ar | H |
|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| 2  | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 3  | + | - | - | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 4  | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 5  | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 6  | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7  | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 8  | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 9  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 10 | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 11 | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 12 | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 13 | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 14 | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 15 | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 16 | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 17 | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 18 | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 19 | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21 | - | - | - | +? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 22 | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 23 | - | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | - | + | + | + | [+] | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Figure 48. Matrix, Smyrna (M, 52v)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[+] [+] +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 49. Matrix, Pergamon (M, 57v)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50. Matrix, Philadelphia (M, 70v)
|   | A1 | S | E | A2 | O | L | N | M | V | U | J | D | G | Tu | R | Pc | Ar | H |
|---|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|
| 1 | -  | +  | +  |   | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |   |   |
| 2 | +  | +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  |
| 3 | +  | +  | +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 4 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 5 | +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 6 | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  |
| 7 | +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 8 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 9 | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 10| -  | -  | -  | +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 11| -  | +  | -  | +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 12| -  | +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 13| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 14| +  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 15| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 16| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 17| +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 18| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 19| +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 20| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 21| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 22| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 23| -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 24| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 25| +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 26| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 27| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 28| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 29| +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 30| +  | +  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| 31| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 32| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| 33| -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  |

Figure 52. Matrix, Second Trumpet (M, 137)
Figure 53. Matrix, Third Trumpet (M, 137v)
### Figure 54. Matrix, Fourth Trumpet (M, 138v)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 55. Matrix, Fifth Trumpet (M, 140v)
Figure 56. Matrix, The Two Witnesses (M, 149)
Figure 57. Matrix, Death of the Two Witnesses
Figure 58. Matrix, Ascension of the Two Witnesses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 59. Matrix, Seventh Trumpet (M, 156)
Figure 60. Matrix, Temple with Beast (M, 156v)
Figure 61. Matrix, Woman in Sun and the Dragon (M, 152v-153)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 62. Matrix, Beast from the Earth (M, 164v)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 64. Matrix, Son of Man in Clouds, Harvest (M, 178v)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 65. Matrix, The Seven Angels with the Seven Plagues (M, 181v)
Figure 66. Matrix, The Ordering of the Angels (M, 185)
| A1 | S | E | A2 | O | L | N | M | V | U | J | D | G | Tu | R | Pc | Ar | H |
|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|
| 1  | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 2  | - | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 3  | - | - | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 4  | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5  | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 6  | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 8  | - | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 9  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 10 | + | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 11 | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + |
| 12 | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 14 | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 15 | - | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 17 | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 18 | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 19 | - | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 21 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 22 | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 23 | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 25 | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | + | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 28 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 29 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 30 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |

Figure 67. Matrix, The First Angel (M, 186v)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Pc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 68. Matrix, The Second Angel (M, 187)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 69. Matrix, The Third Angel (M, 187)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 70. Matrix, The Fourth Angel (M, 189)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 71. Matrix, The Sixth Angel (M, 190v)
Figure 72. Matrix, The Fowl Spirits (not in M-missing)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>E?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>E?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 74. Matrix, The Burning of Babylon (M202v-203)
Figure 75. Matrix, The First Anti-christ Table (not in M - Missing), Klein, 318-319
Figure 76. Matrix, The Second Anti-christ Table (M, 171v) Klein, 319-322
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 77. Matrix, The Adoration of the Lamb (M, 87)
APPENDIX D

TABLE OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
AND THE CHI-SQUARE TEST

1. Introduction

This Appendix deals with the correlation coefficients and the chi-square test, all of which have been discussed in Chapter III of the main body of the text. The sections are divided into: Klein's correlation table for the Anti-christ matrixes (Part 2 of this Appendix); my tables for Klein's other statistical figures (Part 3) and my own tables, 10-15, from my own additional comparison (Part 4).

As it has been elaborated upon in Chapter III, these tables indicate an abstract relationship between the manuscripts involved, and that some of the values indicated are significant, and other non-significant. The degree of significance of values varies enough that this aspect of study warrants future investigation.
### III. Analyse der Korrelations-Analysis

- **n** = Anzahl der Vergleichspunkte
- **V** = Korrelationskoefizient
- * = nicht signifikante Werte

#### Vergleichspaare, \( a(++) \) \( d(--) \) \( b(--) \) \( c(--) \) \( n \) \( V \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vergleichspaare</th>
<th>( a(++) )</th>
<th>( d(--) )</th>
<th>( b(--) )</th>
<th>( c(--) )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( V )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.7469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( B )</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td>34,5</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( L )</td>
<td>60,5</td>
<td>37,5</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.5842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( N )</td>
<td>22,5</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( C )</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36,5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( C )</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36,5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.5357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( S )</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.3823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^1 ) - ( S )</td>
<td>57,5</td>
<td>22,5</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^2 ) - ( L )</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.2631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( L )</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.6486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( L )</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.4391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( S )</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.4059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( O )</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.3584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( S )</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.3263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( X )</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.9767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( S )</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.9604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E ) - ( O )</td>
<td>64,5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.6753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E ) - ( C )</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.6657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vergleichspaare, \( b(++) \) \( d(--) \) \( b(--) \) \( c(--) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vergleichspaare</th>
<th>( a(++) )</th>
<th>( d(--) )</th>
<th>( b(--) )</th>
<th>( c(--) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( E ) - ( L )</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( C )</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N ) - ( S )</td>
<td>18,5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N ) - ( L )</td>
<td>18,5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N ) - ( N )</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L ) - ( L )</td>
<td>53,5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>56,5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L ) - ( S )</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L ) - ( L )</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^2 ) - ( V )</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V ) - ( S )</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U ) - ( A^2 )</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U ) - ( S )</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U ) - ( U )</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G ) - ( T )</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G ) - ( G )</td>
<td>57,5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G ) - ( K )</td>
<td>56,5</td>
<td>45,5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G ) - ( A )</td>
<td>44,5</td>
<td>41,5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Correlation Coefficient Values for Both the Antichrist Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e</th>
<th>a(++)</th>
<th>d(--)</th>
<th>b(+)</th>
<th>c(--)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.5865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.4782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.4198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.3772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.3142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.2957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.3245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.3237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.3325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.8762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.7777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,5</td>
<td>45,5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,5</td>
<td>41,5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.4589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,5</td>
<td>41,5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.2735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vergleichspaar</th>
<th>a(++)</th>
<th>d(--)</th>
<th>b(+)</th>
<th>c(--)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T - T</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.5865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - H</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.5567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.3599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - Ar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - H</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.9749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - R</td>
<td>54,5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.7375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - Ar</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42,5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.4967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T - Ar</td>
<td>41,5</td>
<td>43,5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.4974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R - Ar</td>
<td>43,5</td>
<td>54,5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.7092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (++)</td>
<td>d (--)</td>
<td>b (+-)</td>
<td>c (+-)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.89188</td>
<td>* 14.31818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.62994</td>
<td>* 06.34921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.90830</td>
<td>* 17.32500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.82213</td>
<td>* 30.41572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.80093</td>
<td>* 19.88632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.29661</td>
<td>02.81524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.75955</td>
<td>* 12.69231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.67018</td>
<td>* 15.27059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.31623</td>
<td>01.80000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.60001</td>
<td>* 21.60043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.33196</td>
<td>* 07.27289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.42601</td>
<td>02.35926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.61539</td>
<td>* 18.17766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.56841</td>
<td>* 27.78529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast/Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.60010</td>
<td>* 05.40179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everi. Gosp.</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.62554</td>
<td>* 15.26095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.64663</td>
<td>* 35.12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.48952</td>
<td>* 10.54378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.81197</td>
<td>* 14.50435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.79057</td>
<td>* 16.87500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.63831</td>
<td>* 08.93639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.79130</td>
<td>* 18.15849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.42404</td>
<td>* 03.95588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.79464</td>
<td>* 14.52352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.64663</td>
<td>* 35.12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.68986</td>
<td>* 18.08469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.74031</td>
<td>* 36.71995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anti-X (Klein)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.46586</td>
<td>* 16.71097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square test Results for M-J
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Smyrna</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>0.89443</th>
<th>* 14.40000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.76389</td>
<td>* 09.91995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.90453</td>
<td>* 16.36364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.91455</td>
<td>* 39.31049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.60256</td>
<td>* 11.25559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.14831</td>
<td>00.68188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.70321</td>
<td>* 11.37363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.66047</td>
<td>* 14.39511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.35227</td>
<td>02.35783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.66705</td>
<td>* 26.69700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.42626</td>
<td>* 11.99217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.42601</td>
<td>02.35926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.54021</td>
<td>* 14.29940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.59980</td>
<td>* 28.78065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast/Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.61807</td>
<td>* 06.11217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.55487</td>
<td>* 12.62295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath Not in U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.84719</td>
<td>* 23.68537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.65714</td>
<td>* 10.36408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.73907</td>
<td>* 14.74790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.62641</td>
<td>* 08.24030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.80917</td>
<td>* 18.98810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.61237</td>
<td>* 07.87500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.75416</td>
<td>* 13.08125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits Not in M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.68196</td>
<td>* 17.67271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.64578</td>
<td>* 13.34488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anti-X (Klein)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.76596</td>
<td>* 45.17597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-U
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a (++)</th>
<th>d (--)</th>
<th>b (+-)</th>
<th>c (+-)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast /Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues Not in V</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits Not in M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>17.30976</td>
<td>6.40923</td>
<td>0.642116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast /Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits Not in M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anti-X (Klein)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Smyrna</th>
<th>Amoz</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>Amoz</th>
<th>5th Seal</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>0.33296</th>
<th>03.32579</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>Amoz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Amoz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet not in A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet not in A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4th Trumpet not in A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5th Trumpet not in A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.16667</td>
<td>00.41667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>00.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.28804</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>04.97813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.46291</td>
<td>02.35714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.44721</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07.80000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.13565</td>
<td>00.95679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>00.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.12599</td>
<td>00.31746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.27966</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>05.31815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.14368</td>
<td>00.51607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>00.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.15811</td>
<td>00.32500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.04029</td>
<td>00.02435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.49728</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>06.67667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.07143</td>
<td>00.07653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.13241</td>
<td>00.29805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits Not in M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.24039</td>
<td>01.84924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.35294</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07.10018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Anti-X (Klein)</td>
<td>A2moz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.145299 = 0.079456</td>
<td>2.145299 = 0.082511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-A2 Rom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a (++)</th>
<th>d (--)</th>
<th>b (+-)</th>
<th>c (+-)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.53452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.31623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.31623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.32733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.22172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.31623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.39771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>not in S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.22740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.46321 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.59115 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.52915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.76447 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.24851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast/Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.61807 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>not in S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>not in S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.51200 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.54787 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.33710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.67532 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.42418 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.18232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.69085 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits</td>
<td>Not in M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>Not in S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.48935 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anti-X <a href="Klein">2</a></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.56409 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a (++)</th>
<th>d (→-)</th>
<th>b (+-)</th>
<th>c (→+)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.15811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.15019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.23295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.17678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.41096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.36949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.38513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wits.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.38681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.82158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.51261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.47265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast/Earth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.63263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.20661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.42452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.50709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.35227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.29417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.36564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.27775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits</td>
<td>Not in M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.28427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.49206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Smyrna</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>a (++) d (--) b (+) c (+) n</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>Not in G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.09449</td>
<td>0.13393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5th Seal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.32399</td>
<td>* 0.461863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2nd Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.45701</td>
<td>* 0.626584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3rd Trumpet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.46278</td>
<td>* 0.663899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th Trumpet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.37505</td>
<td>* 0.323516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5th Trumpet</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.85177</td>
<td>* 24.66769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two Witnesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.28721</td>
<td>0.64983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Death Witnesses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.60564</td>
<td>* 20.54109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ascension Wts.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>0.37219</td>
<td>* 0.727256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7th Trumpet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.82158</td>
<td>* 0.87750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Temple/Beast</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.30600</td>
<td>0.83903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woman/Dragon</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.40109</td>
<td>* 12.87013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beast/Earth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.78881</td>
<td>* 10.57778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ang/Everl. Gosp.</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.49009</td>
<td>* 09.40179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Harvest of Wrath</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.26859</td>
<td>* 05.98762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 Angs/7 Plagues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.35356</td>
<td>* 04.12527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Comm/7 Angels</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.79061</td>
<td>* 15.62677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1st Angel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.58801</td>
<td>* 08.98954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd Angel</td>
<td>Not in G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd Angel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.72807</td>
<td>* 16.43267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th Angel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.82102</td>
<td>* 14.82963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6th Angel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.32757</td>
<td>0.02873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fowl Spirits</td>
<td>Not in M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Whore and Kings</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.86608</td>
<td>* 26.25331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Burning Babylon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.73901</td>
<td>* 37.13759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anti-X [2] (Klein)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-0.17595</td>
<td>0.32184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results for M-G
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-J</th>
<th>M-D</th>
<th>M-H</th>
<th>M-Tu</th>
<th>M-A2</th>
<th>M-O</th>
<th>M-L</th>
<th>M-R</th>
<th>M-Ar</th>
<th>M-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a (++)</th>
<th>d (-)</th>
<th>b (+)</th>
<th>c (+)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.62280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.70073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.30117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.17911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.20190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.17529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.22589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.50220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.41045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.37505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Correlation Coefficient Values and the Chi-Square Test Results
1. Introduction

This Appendix contains the graphs which show the relationships between the manuscripts which both Klein and I have analyzed statistically. It is in three parts, (1) a graph based on Klein's Anti-christ Matrixes and Tables (see Appendices C, 2 and D, 2; (2) graphs showing the results of my run-outs of Klein's other statistics; and (3) a graph showing the results of my own single subject.

The results of these graphs have already been discussed in Chapter III. They are self-explanatory, and they indicate that the work of Klein and myself support each other.
Figure 78. Comparison of $M$ to $U, D, V$ and $J$. 
Figure 79. Relationships Between IIa MSS using Klein's Anti-Christ Matrixs
Figure 80. Comparison M-S
Figure 81. Comparison M-A2
Figure 82. Comparison M-H
Figure 83. Comparison M-G
Figure 84. Relationships of Manuscripts
Beatus of Liebana, whose lifetime may have spanned at least the reigns of the Kings Silo (774-83), Maurgetus (783-88), Vermudo I (788-91), and the early years of the reign of King Alfonso II of the Asturias (791-842), has been considered a political, religious and cultural force during the early medieval period in Spain. In the eyes of traditional scholarship, he stands out almost like a hero of this period. For example, Dubler in Gerona I says of him: "San Beato of Liebana, deeply rooted in his native soil, was able with the visionary powers of genius to see every spiritual trend which would unfold on the Christian side during the Spanish Middle Ages. As far back as the 8th century San Beato of Liebana was able to give expression and form to all those features which determined medieval civilization in Spain". These words very succinctly sum up the attitude of established Spanish scholarship towards the eighth century monk of Liebana ever since Ambrosio de Morales identified him as the author of an anonymous commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John. Because this commentary appears to be the only extant theological work of the period from the nascent Asturian kingdom, Morales' identification gave Beatus, deserving or not, a prestige in Spanish cultural historiography second only to that of the great Isidore.

In addition, Beatus has been considered to be the author, along with Etherius, the Bishop of Osma, of a letter to Bishop Eliphandus of Toledo, soundly castigating that
bishop for his Adoptionist views. Beatus has, therefore, been generally considered a
champion of orthodoxy in the face of all heresy. Furthermore, as there is a reference in his
commentary indicating that St. James had preached in Spain, he is believed to have been
one of the first to lend weight to the theory that the body of James was buried at
Compostella. Some scholars have even gone so far as to consider him the author of a
hymn of praise to St. James. He therefore has been thought to be one of the first prophets
of the Reconquista, as not only was he a champion fighting against heresy and among the
first to recognize and eulogize James as the patron saint of Spain, but he included
iconography which was later to be associated with the Reconquista in his Commentary in
the form of the Cross of Oviedo (Figs. 218, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271).

Because notable scholars of the early part of the twentieth century, such as Barrau-
Dihigo, accepted such ideas about Beatus, later scholarship continued to consider them,
and even considered them as fact. Historians, including the great Sanchez Albornoz,
cling tenaciously to the concept of "Beatus as hero", and wrote of his life, as did Sanders
in the introduction to his edition of the commentary, in terms which suggested a greater
contribution to his age than Beatus more than likely made.

However, following the 1976 conference in Madrid where many of the above
theories were called into question, one can see that there is little or no documentary
evidence to support the belief that Beatus was the spiritual or political leader he has
traditionally been represented to be. The purpose of this Appendix is to briefly examine
some of these problems and to raise questions for future study, questions which fall
outside the main scope of this dissertation, but which may shed some light on certain
aspects of the study of our manuscript.

Paramount in ascertaining the work of Beatus as an historical fact is the
consideration of the life of Beatus, which is mostly supported by references to a
Martyrology of Astorga, reproduced in Migne, and which may be briefly reiterated as follows: Beatus, who was known for his scholarship, became the teacher and advisor of Queen Adosinda, wife of King Silo of Leon (sic - should be the Asturias) (774-783). Beatus became aware of a heresy, the Adoptionist heresy, plaguing Spain at the time, through Adosinda with whom he had retired to a monastery following the defeat and death of her husband by the usurper Mauregato in 783. In 785, Beatus and his pupil Etherius, Bishop of Osma, wrote Ad Elipandum Epistulae II, combatting the heresy. Sanders remarks that the "controversy was bitter on both sides and extended beyond the bounds of Spain. Beatus was supported by the decrees of several Councils and finally Elipandus yielded." Sanders ends these brief facts on Beatus' life by noting his death to be in 798.

Other scholars report with slight variations, the same facts about Beatus' life. However, there is only scant evidence to give support to such ideas. The only remaining document which can be reasonably attributed to Beatus is the Ad Elipandum referred to above. There is mention of a letter which Elipandus indicates to the Abbot Fidelius he received from Beatus immediately after the council of Seville on Oct. 1, 984, but this letter is no longer extant. In addition, there is a letter purporting to be from Alcuin to Beatus, but the date of this letter is not entirely secure, and we have no evidence at the present of a response from Beatus. While this letter discusses the question of the heresy of Adoptionism, it may be from a later period.

In short, Ad Elipandum in Migne, which gives us some indication about Beatus' involvement in the conflict over the heresy of Adoptionism, is the most telling information which we have about Beatus, and nowhere does it mention the fact that he was the author of a commentary on the Apocalypse. In addition, the fact that he and Etherius refer to passages in the Apocalypse when presenting their arguments only means that like most conscientious religious men of their age, they knew the last book of the Bible well.
Furthermore none of the extant manuscripts from the "Beatus" group were mentioned as being by him in the colophon, a curious situation in a country where the painter/scribes normally identified themselves quite clearly and gave elaborate titles to their works. It seems strange, therefore, that a work by a "national hero" such as Beatus would be copied and recopied without any indication of his name.

Furthermore, in closely examining the sources of "Beatus" as outlined and carefully documented by Alvarez Campas in Actas I, one can easily see that the commentary, which incorporates the writings of various early Church Fathers, might well have been done at a time earlier than the eighth century; possibly during the Visigothic period in Spain, or the Merovingian period in France, when library resources were more ample than those in the Asturian kingdom, and when there was more direct continuity with the late antique world. This earlier work could have circulated in several editions which would account for the several "editions" of Sanders; or could have come into the Asturian kingdom in the form in which it may have been copied in 776, and alterations made with later copying. Three editions closely related in date may have been in response to the need for additional copies of the commentary on the Apocalypse for instructional purposes. King notes that by the seventh century, copies of Apringius' commentary, which Ferotin and Fita believed were used for such instruction, were rare. In fact, she notes that San Braulio of Zaragoza "tried in vain to borrow one from Toledo, under guarantees, to have it copied". She further notes that Beatus' commentary served equally as well as Apringius', and the "abbots for whom they were copied intended them for such a use". She connects the use of the commentary with the Mozarabic Rite.

The question of whether this commentary was already illuminated, or whether the illustrations were developed in the eighth or following centuries is still to be solved. By comparing the few early MSS we have, it seems probable that the first edition of the Beatus
commentary was not illuminated. The first ones which finally were, more than likely were very simply illustrated, and the illustrations were altered as time went on and more copies were made. The style of the first illuminations, would have followed the migration style seen in the remaining Lombard, Frankish and Visigothic work, with classicizing references to the late antique. It would account for, therefore, and explain the "retardataire" nature of the Spanish books, which were probably rather faithfully copied, due to the provincial nature of the scriptoria in the crude, developing Christian nations of Spain along the frontier. An example of this would be the Cross of Oviedo which is seen in early Spanish books, and which is often referred to as a "Reconquista" symbol. However, as late as the middle of the tenth century in the Morgan 644 (folio 218), this cross is shaped very much like Visigothic and Merovingian Crosses, and does not resemble the Cross of Victory of Alfonso III in shape at all.\textsuperscript{25} By the tenth century, however, later Carolingian iconography, as well as the Merovingian and Visigothic, was influential on Spanish painters, as was seen in the main body of the text in the discussion of Maius and Florentius.\textsuperscript{26}

If we take all of the above into consideration, and if we accept the position that Beatus was not the author of the commentary or the inventor of the iconography, it does not really make drastic changes in the family tree of the manuscripts in this tradition, which has so carefully been worked out by Klein. What these new considerations do is to call for possible amendments to the earliest portions of Klein’s stemma, and for finding some new way of relating this body of manuscripts to other early medieval apocalypses.\textsuperscript{27}
Notes to Appendix F

1. "Antecedants of the Age of Beatus", Gerona I, 27. He, of course, follows Sanchez Albornoz in this, for he refers to the most polemical of Sanchez Albornoz's work, España un Enigma Historico, Buenos Aires, 1962 (first published in 1956) on 26, note 2.

2. Viaje a los iglesias de Espana, Madrid, 1765, p. 59.

3. Ad Elipandum, Migne, PL 96, esp. cols. 903-904, 913, 914. For a history of the Adoptionist battle between Beatus and Eliphandus, see Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles, Elipando y San Beato de Liébana, Madrid, 1935.


5. This is noted by Pérez de Urbel, Hispania Sacra, 5, Madrid, 1952, 1 ff.; idem Arbor, 24, Madrid 1953, 515 ff.; Sanchez Albornoz, 1962, 269, and Actas I, 28. Luis Barrau-Dighi, Recherches sur l'histoire politique du royaume asturien, Vaduz, 1965 (first published in 1921), 324, indicates that this hymn, which has been published in Blume and Dreves, Analecta hymnica medii aevi, 27, Leipzig, 1897, 186-188, shows that there was a cult of St. James in Spain, but does not refer to Galicia. T. D. Kendrick, St James in Spain, London, 1960, 188-190, gives a summary of the situation in English.

6. Barrau-Dighi, 255: "... en Liébana, où florissait alors Beatus, le contradicteur d'Elipand et commentateur de l'Apocalypse... " However, he gives no reference for this information.

7. Collins, 1983, and Lomax, 1979, are examples as well, as are most art historians, due to the fact that Sanders has been since 1930 the latest published edition of the commentary. An earlier edition of was published by Florez in the late eighteenth century. A new edition is just now out, see Chapter II Note 34 above.

8. Actas I, 47-51, especially, which was the lively Coloquio following the paper of Vázquez de Parga. Also note Collins,1983, 212 who indicates that the Adoptionist controversy has been seen as an attempt at incipient nationalism, but this is not born out by the facts. He refers to R. d'Abadal y de Vinyals, La batailla del Adopcionismo en la desintegracion de la iglesia visigoda, Barcelona, 1949. The truth of the matter was that the main see remained in Toldeo until the eleventh century, and there was no attempt to break away from Toledo.

9. PL, 96, 890-894, and Sanders, XI. Sanders, who bases his references to the life of Beatus on this Martyrology, is often referred to by scholars working outside the Beatus area (see Collins, 1983 and Lomax, 1978, for example) though his use of this source has been called into question by some recent scholars due to the fact that it was not written until the seventeenth century, and thus may not be entirely reliable. For a realistic assessment of what is actually known about Beatus' life, see Luis Vázquez de Parga in Actas I, 33-40, particularly the important discussion in the Coloquio which
follows it, and Raizman, 1980, 13, note 3, who also raises the same questions about the life of Beatus.

10. Sanders quotes PL directly and says "Leon". This mistake is curious and may have some importance in considering the time in which the legends of Beatus were actually put together, possibly the tenth century, or even later. The date of Beatus' association with Adosinda is not given.

11. Migne, 96, 894-1030, Sanders, XI

12. Sanders, XI. Elipandus did not exactly yield, he recanted and lapsed several times before the issue was over. He was supported in this heresy by Felix, the Bishop of Urgel, which led to the intervention of Charlemagne due to the fact that Urgel was in the Carolingian march. See Collins, 1983, 210-212.

13. Noted by Marqués Casanovas in Gerona 1, 39.

14. In Cod. B1007 of the Archivo Historico Nacional in Madrid of the tenth century: Epistola sancti Alcoini Thoronensis diaconi au Beattissimo Beatii famulo Beato patri. Published by B. Capelle, "Alcuin et l'Histoire du Symbole de la Messe", Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, 6 (1934) 249-260, who notes, 251, it to be a letter of encouragement, presumably a copy of an original of the eighth century. Capelle had earlier published "L'origine anti-adoptianiste de notre texte du Symbol de la messe", Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, 1 (1929) 7-20. It was obvious that this matter was very important to Charlemagne, as it involved one of the Bishops on one of his marches, Felix of Urgel. And the symbol, the Nicene Creed, became an important part of the French mass from that time on. This letter has also been published by Juan Francisco Rivera, "A propósito de una carta de Alcuino recientemente encontrada", Revista española de teología, 418-433.

15. However, it is entirely possible that this letter, which is preserved in a tenth century manuscript is a product of that century, written during the reign of Alfonso III (866-910) when attempts were being made to connect with the Visigothic heritage. The "letter from Alcuin to Beatus", then, might be an attempt to establish some sort of credibility of the regime within tenth century León. We do have another letter, also of somewhat doubtful authenticity, which presumers to be from Alfonso III to the Abbot of Tours, ironically enough, precisely the same abbey to which Alcuin retired as abbot following his years of service at Charlemagne's court. This curious letter asks for a crown and offers a payment in return. The letter from Alcuin to Beatus, if it is truly from the eighth century, may have arrived in Spain after Beatus' death in 798 or shortly before that when he was old and might have been too ill to respond. This is merely a guess on my part. Capelle, 1934, notes the letter to be of about 795-798, 253, which would place it about a decade after Beatus' Ad Elipandum, if the dates for both these works are correct. The authorship of the letter, to my mind, is somewhat questionable. Collins, 1983, 236, agrees. There were several Roman church councils dealing with the Adoptionist heresy, but Beatus, for all his presumed involvement in fighting it, did not attend any of them. See Giovanni Domenico Mansi (1692-1769), Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, 53 vols., Paris, 1901-27 for these councils. Yet on the other hand a Carolingian connection with the Christian northwest of Spain is clearly established by the Royal Frankish Annales in 798, the same year as
Beatus' probable death, which reports that Alfonso II sent gifts through envoys to Charlemagne twice during that year. See The Carolingian Chronicles, the Royal Frankish Annals, Transl. Bernhard Walter Scholz with Barbara Rogers, Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1972,76-77. The tenth century letter (see Barrau-Dihigo, 1965, 86-91 on the subject of the authenticity of this letter which was not published until 1663) may also reflect attempts on the part of Alfonso III to identify with the imperial heritage of the Visigoths very much as the Carolingians identified themselves with Biblical kings and the Trojans. See Chapter I of the main text, and note 39.

16. See discussion in Actas I following Vázquez de Pargas where it is noted that the passages quoted by the two men are from Tyconius, who would also be well known as an important early Church Father.

17. It would seem that if these scribes were specific enough to put their names in the colophon, they would, if they knew the work to have been by Beatus, put his name there as well, just as Jerome's name is noted in the title to his commentary on Daniel. (It appears to have been a work well enough known to everyone which did not need identification, or an anonymous one all along.)

18. This attribution remains to be better worked out. It could even have been from the late antique period, as the sources are all from that time. (Apringius is 6th century. Note W. Boussset, "Nachrichten über eine Kopenhagener Handschrift [Arnamegnaenske Legat 1927 A. M. 795 4 to] des Kommentars des Apringius zur Apokalypse", Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse. 1895, Heft II. 187-209; and King, 1931,10.) Or it possibly was introduced into Spain from Carolingian empire during late eighth century where it was copied several times. It was a time, as noted above, when contacts were being made between the two countries over the Adoptionist heresy. It simply would not have been possible to compile such a work without a splendid library, and though Collins, 1983, 246, suggests that Beatus had access to the "princely" library of King Silo, given the conditions which existed in Asturias during the eighth century, it would be fair to suggest that Silo may not have had a library at all. The remaining charter we have from that king is primitive in character, which even Collins himself indicates.

19. This problem needs to be worked out. We do not really know, for example that the eighth century editions were from the Asturian kingdom any more than we know that Beatus was actually from Liébana. On the latter issue refer to the remarks of Díaz y Díaz in Actas I, following Vázquez de Parga's paper. Things such as the "Date of the Present Era" in the genealogies could be modified to suit the time in which the copying was being done. A dedication to Etherius, for example, could easily have been purposely added at some point, as Díaz y Díaz points out in Actas I (Ibid)


22. Ibid, 10.

24. In Actas II, stemma suggests that it was not illustrated at first (Fig. 300), and could easily have followed an earlier illustrated commentary.

25. See the difference between Figs. 275 and 276.

26. Both these painters, however, remain remarkably true to elements of the earlier style.

27. See the stemma of early medieval apocalypses suggested by Klein in Trier (Fig. 301).
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Figure 85. Map of Medieval Spain: Physical Characteristics. After A. Mackay, *Spain in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1977, Map 1
Figure 86. El Puerto de Aliva (Picos de Europa), Historia de España. Ed. R. Menéndez Pidal, Tomo VI, Madrid 1964, Fig. 44
Figure 87. Astorga (León) General Aerial View Historia de España, VI, 218
Genealogical Table I: The Asturian Succession

Pelagius (719/22–37)

Fruilus = Favia (737–9)

Ermusinda

Alfonso I 'the Catholic' (739–57)

Silo = Adosinda Fruela I 'the Grief' (757–68)

Vincente (763–66)

Manrique (768–74)

Aemilius 'the Deacon' (788–91)

Fruela

Peter

Genealogical Table II: The Leonese Succession, Castille and Pamplona

Leon

Ramiro II (930–50)

Sancho I 'the Fat' (955–7, 960–7)

Elvira = Ordinio III (950–5)

Sancho Garces II 'the Bad' of Leon (957–60)

Ramiro (971–94)

Garcia Fernandez Count of Castille (970–95)

Villalba 1 (982–93)

Elvira = Sancho Garces II 'the Tremulous' (994–1000)

Sancho Garces III 'the Great' (1000–35)

Sancha = Berenguer Ramon I Count of Barcelona (1019–35)

Ximena (daughter of Sancho Garcia of Castille)

Pamplona

Garcia Sanches 1 = Teresa

Ana of Ribagorça

Fernan Gonzalez Count of Castille (931–71)

Ximena

Garcia Garces

Sancho Garces = Urraca

Castille

Sancho Garces

Count of Castille (995–1017)

Fernando I King of Castille (1035–72)

Ramiro I King of Aragun (1058–63)

Sancho Garces III

King of Navare (1035–59)

Elvira

Sancha

Sancho Garces

Count of Castille (1017–28)

Ximena

Ramiro I

Count of Barcelona (1019–35)
Figure 89. Lineage of the Muslim Dynasties, After Lomax, 186
Figure 90. M644, fol. I, Ex Libris or Dedication Page
Figure 91. M644, fol. 3v-4, Christ and John and Angels Holding the New Covenant
Figure 92. M644, fol. Iv, Christ and Matthew, with Matthew's Symbol in the Arcade above
Figure 93. M644, fol. 1v, detail, Christ and Matthew
Figure 94. M644, fol. 1v, detail, upper portion of Christ
Figure 95. M644, fol. 1v, detail, upper portion of Matthew
Figure 96. M644, fol. lv, detail, Matthew's Evangelist Symbol in Lunette
Figure 97. M644, fol. 2, Angels Holding the New Covenant, Mark's Apocalyptic Symbol
Figure 98. M644, fol. 2v, Christ and Luke, with Luke's Evangelist Symbol Above
Figure 99. M644, fol. 2v, detail, Christ and Luke
Figure 100. M644, fol. 2v, detail, Head of Christ Showing Cruciform nimbus
Figure 101. M644, fol. 2v, detail showing Christ Holding the New Covenant, or the Gospels and is About to Give it to Luke
Figure 102. M644, fol. 2v, detail, Luke's Evangelist Symbol in the Lunette
Figure 103. Figure M644, fol. 3, Angels Holding the New Covenant, with Luke's Apocalyptic Symbol Above
Figure 104. M644, detail, fol. 3, Head of Right Angel Showing Cruciform Nimbus
Figure 105. M644, detail, Luke's Apocalyptic Symbol in the Lunette
Figure 106. M644, fol. 3v, Christ and St. John, with John's Symbol Above
Figure 107. M644, fol. 3v, detail, John and Christ
Figure 108. M644, fol. 3v, detail, John Holding his Gospel
Figure 109. M644, fol. 3v, detail, Christ Holding Roll of Authority
Figure 110. M644, fol. 3v, detail, Head of Christ showing the Halo with its Powdered Gold rubbed off
Figure 111. M644, fol. 3v, detail showing Gospel and Roll, with the Gold rubbed off the Gospel
Figure 112. M644, fol. 3v, detail showing John’s Evangelist Symbol in the Lunette, and the Inscription from Sedulius Above It
Figure 113. M644, fol. 3v, detail, John's Symbol, showing Poor Condition of the Paint around it
Figure 114. M644, fol. 4, Angels Holding the New Covenant, John's Apocalyptic Symbol Above
Figure 115. M644, fol. 4, detail, Head of Left Angel showing Cruciform Nimbus
Figure 116. M644, fol. 4, detail, John's Apocalyptic Symbol in Lunette, showing Creases in Vellum
Figure 117. M644 fols 4v-5. Genealogical Tables beginning with Genesis, Adam and Eve Represented at the Far Left
Figure 118. M644, fol. 4v, Genealogical Tables, Adam and Eve and Descendants
Figure 119. M644, fol. 5, Genealogical Tables, Adam and Eve (Con'td)
Figure 120. M644, fol. 5v, Genealogical Tables. Noah and His Generations
Figure 121. M644, fol. 6, Genealogical Tables. Abraham and his Generations
Figure 122. M644, fol. 6v, Genealogical Tables. Isaac and his Descendants
Figure 123. M644, fol. 7, Genealogical Tables, Jacob and his Descendants
Figure 125. M644, fol. 8, Genealogical Tables, Ruth, 14, 18-22, The Genealogy of David and David's Sons
Figure 127. M644, fol. 9, Genealogical Tables, Lineage of Kings, Texts of Prophets, Babylonian Captivity
Figure 128. M644, fol. 9v, Genealogical Tables, Emperors of Rome, Two Texts on Rome in Decorative Panels
Figure 129. M644, fol. 9v-10, End Genealogical Tables and Beginning of Text
Figure 130. M644, fol. 10, Beginning of Text
Figure 131. M644, fol. 10, Detail of Initial I
Figure 132. M644, fol. 10v, Beginning of Jerome's Prologue to The Apocalypse
Figure 133. M644, fol. 22, End of Prologue and Beginning of Apoc. 1, 4-6
Figure 134. M644, fol. 22v, Apoc. 1, 4-6, with Decoration at End of Storia
The Lord Sends Word to John

Figure 135. M644, fol. 23, Apoc. 1, 4-6. Beginning of Vision.
The Lord Sends Word to John
Figure 136. M644, fol. 26, Apoc. 1, 7-11. The Unknown Appears in the Clouds
Figure 137. M644, fol. 27, Apoc. 1, 10-29. John is Commissioned to Send the Messages to the Churches
Figure 138. M644, fols. 33v-34, the World Map
Figure 139. M644, fol. 33v, Left Side of the Map
Figure 140. M644, fol. 34, Right Side of the Map, showing Adam, Eve and the Serpent in Paradise
Figure 141. M644, fol. 40, The Four Beasts of Daniel 7, 3-8
Figure 142. M644, fol. 40v, The Statue of Daniel 2:31-35
Figure 143. M644, fol. 42, Apoc. 17, 1; The Scarlet Woman Seated on the Beast
Figure 144. M644, fol. 47v, Apoc. 2, 1-7; Decorations at the End of Story
Figure 145. M644, fol. 48, Apoc. 2, 1-7; John and the Angel of the Church of Ephesus to the left; the Church of Ephesus to the Right
Figure 146. M644, fol. 52r, Apoc. 2, 8-11: John and the Angel of the Church of Smyrna
Figure 147. M644, fol. 52v, detail, John and Angel
Figure 148. M644, fol. 57v, Apoc. 2, 12-17: John and the Angel of the Church of Pergamon
Figure 149. M644, fol. 62, Apoc. 2, 18-29: John and the Angel of the Church of Thyatira
Figure 150. M644, fol. 66, Apoc. 3, 1-6; John and the Angel of Sardis
Figure 151. M644, fol. 70v, Apoc. 3, 7-13; John and the Angel of Philadelphia
Figure 152 Figure M644, fol. 76v, Apoc. 3, 14-22; A Page of Text Illustrating the Placement of Initials
Figure 153. M644, fol. 77, Apoc. 3, 14-22; John and the Angel of the Church of Laodicia, the Church to the left
Figure 154. M644, fol. 79, The Ark of Noah
Figure 155. M644, fol. 79, detail of the Ark
Figure 156. M644, fol. 82v, Apoc. 4, 1-6; Decorations
Figure 157. M644, fol. 83, Apoc. 4, 1-6; John's First Vision of the Heavenly Church: the Prelude of the Great Day
Figure 158. M644, fol. 87, Apoc 4, 5-14; The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb
Figure 159. M644, fol. 109, Apoc. 6, 9-11; The Fifth Seal
Figure 160. M644, fol. 112, Apoc. 6, 12-17; The Sixth Seal
Figure 161. M644, fol. 115, Apoc. 7, 1-3: The Story of the Four Winds (right column).
Figure 162. M644, fol. 115v, Apoc. 7, 1-3; The Winds are Restrained, and the Angel Prepares to Put the Seal on the Servants of the Lord: 144,000
Figure 163. M644, 117, text page, Apoc. 7, 1-3; The End of the Explanatio of the Winds, and the Storie of the Sealing of the 144,000
Figure 164. M644, fols. 117v-118, Apoc. 7, 4-11; Adoration of the Lamb by the Multitude
Figure 165. M644, fol. 117v, Apoc. 7, 4-11; Lamb Adored (left half of above composition)
Figure 166. M644, fol. 118, Apoc. 7, 4-11; John a Witness to the Adoration (right half of above composition)
Figure 168. M644, fol. 131; The Palm with Martyrs under It
Figure 169. M644, fol. 133, Text Page, Showing Apoc. 8, 1: Silence in Heaven
Figure 170. M644 fol. 133, Text Page, Showing Apoc. 8.1; Detail, Silence in Heaven
Figure 171. M644, fol. 133v, Apoc. 8, 2-5; The Angels with the Seven Trumpets
Figure 172. M644, fol. 134v, Apoc. 8, 6-8: The First Trumpet: Fire and Hail
Figure 173. M644, fol. 137, Apoc. 8, 8-9; The Second Trumpet: The Burning Mountain Falls into the Sea
Figure 174. M644, fol. 137v, Apoc. 8, 10-11; The Third Trumpet: The Burning Star
Figure 176. M644, fol. 140v, Apoc. 9, 1-6: The Fifth Trumpet: the Falling Star
Figure 177. M644, fol 142v, Apoc. 9, 7-12; Locusts Like Horses Armoured for Battle
Figure 178. M644, fol. 144, Apoc. 9.13-16; The seventh Trumpet
Figure 179. M644, fol. 146, Apoc. 10, 1-11, 2; Strong Angel and Measuring of the Temple
Figure 180. M644, fol. 149, Apoc. 11, 3-18; The Two Witnesses to Prophecy
Figure 181. M644, fol. 150v, Apoc., 7-10; The Beginning of the Story of the Two Witnesses
Figure 182. M644, fol. 151, Apoc. 11, 7-10; The Two Witnesses are Slain by the Anti-christ
Figure 183. M644, fol. 152, Text Page with Decoration, Possibly a Signature
Figure 184. M644. fols. 152v-153; Apoc, 12, 1-18; Woman Adorned by the Sun
Figure 185. M644, fol. 152v; Apoc.12, 1-18; Left Side of above Composition
Figure 186. M644, fol. 153, Apoc. 12. 1-18; Right Side of above Composition
Figure 187. M644, fol. 154v, Apoc. 11,11-14; The Resurrection of the Two Witnesses
Figure 188. M644, fol. 156, Apoc. 11, 15-18; The Seventh Trumpet: "Hominis Carnis"
Figure 189. M644, fol. 156v, Apoc. 11, 19; The Temple of God in Heaven Opens
Figure 191. M644, fol. 166v, Apoc. 13, 11; Fox and Hen
Figure 192. M644, fol. 171v; Anti-christ Table
Figure 193. M644, fol. 174v, Apoc. 14, 1-5; Adoration of the Lamb on Mt. Zion
Figure 194. M644, fol. 176v, Apoc. 14, 6-8; Angel of the Everlasting Gospel
Figure 195. M6444, fol. 178v, Apoc. 14, 14-20; Harvest and Vintage of Pagans
Figure 196. M644, fol. 181v, Apoc. 15,1-4; Hymn of Moses and the Lamb
Figure 197. M644, fol. 183v, Apoc. 15, 5-8; Giving of the Vials below the Sanctuary
Figure 198. M644, fol. 185, Apoc. 16, 1-2. The Commissioning of the Angels
Figure 199. M644, fol. 186v, Apoc. 16, 2; The First Vial: Sores on Earth
Figure 201. M644, fol. 189, Apoc. 16, 8-9; Fourth Vial: Scorching Heat
Figure 202. M644, fol. 190. Apoc. 16, 10-11; Fifth Vial: Angel Pours Over Throne
Figure 203. M644, fol. 190v, Apoc. 16, 12; Sixth Vial: Angel Pours Water Over the Euphrates
Figure 204. M644, fol. 193, Apoc. 16, 17-21; Seventh Vial: the City Divided into Three Parts
Figure 205. M644, fol. 194v, Apoc. 17, 1-3; The Whore of Babylon and the Kings of the Earth
Figure 206. M644, fol. 200, Apoc. 17, 14-18; The Battle of the Lamb and the Beast
Figure 207. M644, fol. 202v-203, Apoc. 18, 1-20; The Burning of Babylon
Figure 208. M644, fol. 202v, Apoc. 18, 1-20; Left Side of Illustration,
Figure 210. M644, fol. 205v, Apoc. 18, 21-24; The Angel Throws the Millstone
Figure 211. M644, fol. 207, Apoc. 19, 1-10; Songs of Victory in Heaven
Figure 212. M644, fol. 209v, Apoc. 19, 17-18; Angel Standing in the Sun
Figure 213. M644, fol. 211, Apoc. 19, 21; Beast and False Prophet Captured
Figure 214. M644, fol. 212, Apoc. 20. 1-3; Angel Overpowers the Dragon
Figure 215. M644, fol. 214, Apoc. 20, 4-6; The First Resurrection
Figure 216. M644, fol. 215v, Apoc. 20, 7-8; The Second Battle of the End
Figure 217. M644, fol. 218, Apoc. 20, 10; The Devil Thrown into the Lake with Beast
Figure 218. M644, fol. 219; The Cross of Oviedo
Figure 219. M644, fols 219v-220; Apoc. 20, 11-15; The Last Judgment
Figure 220. M644, fol. 219v; Apoc. 20, 11-15; Left Side of Composition
Figure 221. M644, fol. 220, Apoc. 20, 11-15; Right Side of Composition
Figure 222. M644, fol. 222v, Apoc. 21, 1-27; The New Heaven and Earth
Figure 223. M644, fol. 223, Apoc. 22, 1-2; River of Life Rising from the Throne of God
Figure 224. M644, fol. 231v, Apoc. 22, 6-21; Angel Tells John of Truth of Prophecy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 226. M644, fol. 236v; Consanguinity Table
Figure 227. M644, fol. 237; Tree of Consanguinity
Figure 228. M644, fol. 238v; The City of Babylon Surrounded by Two Serpents
Figure 230. M644, fol. 240v-241, Dan. 1, 1-2; The Besieging of Jerusalem
Figure 231. M644, fol. 240v; Left Side of Composition Above
Figure 232. M644, fol. 241; Right Side of Composition Above
Figure 233. M644, fol. 243v-244, Dan. 2, 1-45; Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Statue
Figure 234. M644, fol. 243v; Left Side of Composition Above
Figure 235. M644, fol. 244; Right side of composition above
Figure 236. M644, fol. 248v, Dan. 3; The Worshipping of the Statue
Figure 237. M644, fol. 252, Dan. 4; Daniel Interprets the King's Dream of the Tree
Figure 238. M644, fol. 252v, Dan. 4; Nebuchadnezzar's Dream Comes True
Figure 239. M644, fol. 255v, Dan. 5, 1-28; Belshazzar's Feast
Figure 240. M644, fol. 260, Dan. 6, Daniel in the Lion's Den
Figure 241. M644, fol. 261v, Dan. 7
Figure 242. M644, fol. 266, Dan. 8, 1-14
Figure 243. M644, fol. 268, Dan. 8, 15-27
Figure 244. M644, fol. 268v, Dan. 9, 20-27
Figure 246. M644, fol. 293; Colophon
Figure 247. M.44, fol. 293; Detail of Colophon
Figure 248. M644, fol. 293v
Figure 250. M644, Detail, fol. 131, Writing in Top Margin
Figure 252. M644, Detail, fol. 146, Writing in Top Margin
Figure 253. M644, Detail, fol. 149, Writing in Top Margin
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Figure 254. Signatures of Elvira
Figure 255. M644, Detail, fol. 152, Signature Type of Decoration
Figure 256. Signatures of Ordoño
Figure 257. M, Detail, Lower Right Arcade,
Figure 258. Silos Beatus
Figure 259. Valcavado Beatus
Figure 260. Map of Tenth-Century Spain
Figure 261. External View of San Miguel de Escalada,
Figure 262. Internal View of Porch of Escalada
Figure 263. Internal View of Escalada Looking Towards the Apse
Figure 264. Internal View of Escalada Looking from Right Transept Chapel
Figure 265. V, fol. 180, Cross of Oviedo Right Before the Last Judgment
Figure 267. Turin Beatus
Figure 268. D, fol. 2v, Cross of Oviedo
Figure 269. D, fol. 3v, Cross of Oviedo
Figure 270. D, fol. 5v, Cross of Oviedo
Figure 271. D, fol. 277, Cross of Oviedo
Figure 272. Sacramentarium Gelasianum
Figure 273. St. Augustine, "Questiones in Heptateuchon", Frontispiece with a Cross
Figure 274. Visigothic Decoration Including a Cross with Alpha and Omega
Figure 275. The Cross of the Angels of Alfonso II
Figure 276. The Cross of Victory of Alfonso III
Figure 277. Interior, The Mosque of Cordoba
Figure 278. V, fol. 204, the Feast of Beltazaar
Figure 279. Osma Beatus
Figure 280. Beatus of Lorvão
Figure 281. Gospel Book
Figure 282. Beatus from Navarre
Figure 283. Beatus from San Millán
Figure 284. Beatus from Las Huelgas
Figure 255. Beatus from Arroyo
Figure 286. Beatus from Altamira (Cardeña?)
Figure 287. Beatus of Fernando and Sancha
Figure 288. D, fol. 86v, Apoc. 4, 5-14, The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb
Figure 289. Tu, fols. 76v-77, Apoc. 4, 5-14, The Vision of the Enthroned and the Lamb
Figure 290. Miller's Stemma of the Beatus Manuscripts Based on the World Map
Figure 291. Menéndez-Pidal's Stemma of the Beatus MSS Based on the World Map
Figure 292. Menéndez-Pidal's Stemma of the Beatus World Map
Figure 293. Sanders' Groupings of the Beatus MSS According to Their Text
Figure 294. Neuss' Stemma of the Beatus MSS Based on the Text and Some of the Illustrations
Figure 295. Klein's Stemma of the Textual Tradition for the Beatus MSS
Figure 296. Klein's Stemma of the Pictorial Tradition for the Beatus MSS,
Figure 297. Klein's Statistical Relationships Between the MSS in the Beatus Branch I
Figure 298. Klein's Statistical Relationships Between the MSS in the Beatus Branch IIa
Figure 299. Klein's Statistical Relationships between the MSS in the Beatus Branch IIb
Figure 300. Klein's Stemma of the Pictorial Tradition for the Beatus MSS
Figure 301. Klein’s Stemma of the Early Medieval Apocalypse Tradition
Figure 302. Map of the Northern Christian Kingdoms
Figure 303. Initials from the Second Bible of Charles the Bald
Figure 304. Initial from Zürich, Zentralbibliothek
Figure 306. Plaque from Santa Maria de Quintinalla de las Viñas After de Palol and Hirmer
Figure 307. Silos
Figure 308. Arches on a Decorative Page from a Commentary on Saint Jerome
Figure 309. Visigothic Pillars
Figure 310. Matthew Traditio Page
Figure 311. John Traditio Page
Figure 312. Matthew Traditio Page
Figure 313. St. Germigny-des-Pres