

in the text (e.g. *de syn.* 3, 11, 63, 87: *contra Const.* 23), yet reveals in a note that the older MSS were faithful throughout to the form Ossius: ii 460 c 'in antiquis libris Osi inomen cum duplici ss constanter pingitur, puta Ossii'. In the *fragmenta ex opere historico* he regularly gives Ossius in the text.

(2) In the *libellus de confessione verae fidei* which the Roman presbyters Marcellinus and Faustinus presented to the emperor Theodosius about the year 383, the editor of the *Collectio Avellana*, vol. xxxv of the Vienna Corpus p. 15 l. 1, notes of the unique MS of the collection 'Ossius V, et sic semper per duplicem s'.

(3) Of St Augustine's treatise *contra epistolam Parmeniani* we have now Petschenig's edition in vol. li of the Vienna Corpus: and on the authority of the best MS—Casinensis 163, saec. xi, 'ex archetypo saeculi sexti uel septimi diligenter descriptum'¹—'Ossius' is regularly printed in the text (26. 9, 17; 29. 5; 33. 19, 21).

(4) In Isidore of Seville's supplement to the *de viris illustribus* of Jerome-Gennadius Arevalo's edition gives, it is true, Osius; but a Hereford Cathedral MS of the tenth century, O 3. 2, spells it Ossius, and so do two twelfth-century MSS in the Bodleian, Bodl. 391 from St Augustine's Canterbury, and Bodl. e Mus. 31 from Bury St Edmunds. But I imagine that these three MSS are not independent of one another.

Perhaps it is worth adding that place-names beginning with Oss- are not quite uncommon in the Spanish provinces: the *Corpus Inscriptionum* gives Ossonoba, Osset, and Ossigi.

C. H. TURNER.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE FLEURY PALIMPSEST (*h*).

THE publication of H. von Soden's *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig 1909) has led me to another revision of the text of the Fleury Palimpsest. Von Soden has published a study of the text of *h* for which all students of the New Testament will be grateful, and I have followed his reduction of the text to its corrected form with the greatest interest.

He has left little for any future pen to add, but nevertheless in a few

¹ I should like, in passing, to call attention to its orthography of the name Ezechiel, which is invariably written Iezech-, while in two cases out of five the accusative is Iezechielum: see *J. T. S.* ix (Oct. 1907) pp. 62 ff.

readings and restorations I am not in full agreement with his conclusions; and there are also a few typographical errors (inevitable in a first edition) which I have noted.

To begin with the Acts, v. 36 *nomen* is, I agree, not a blunder and is rightly edited intact; vi. 10 *sp̄ui sc̄o quo loquaebatur et quod reuincebantur ab eo* is the MS text: *et quod* von Soden corrects into *eo quod*; but I am convinced it should be *et quo*: *quod audito* is found in *b* and *ff* for *quo audito*, and in all fifth-century N.T. MSS the ablative and accusative cases are frequently confused; vi 12, 13 *populu]m* is too long and should be *plebe]m*, and *deficit* is too short and should be *quiescit* (*gig.* xx 1 also translates *παύσαι* by *quiesco*); ix 8 *nihil uidens* is the true text; ix 11 *in uicum [qui uoca]tur* or *in uicum [ut uoca]tur* is the reading of *h*, and I see no need to add *rectus*, which is another such addition as *titus* before *iustus* in xviii 6; xiv 9 *nostri dñi fili dī* of the MS appears as *domini nostri* with the last two words omitted; in the next verse von Soden is, I believe, right in restoring *similauerunt*; xiv 13 *accurentes* is a misprint for *accurrentes*; xiv 16 *dimisi omni gentis* is corrected into *dimisit omni genti*: *dimisit omnes gentes* I should give, especially since *omni* is found elsewhere (1 St John ii 23) for *omnis*; xiv 22 the second *in* is not in the MS.

In xiv 20 the text is *cum disce]ssisset populus uespere leuauit se* and von Soden edits *cum surre]ssisset paulus uespere leuauit se*. It is true that *populus* is found for *paulus* in *vv.* 8 and 9, but the context here gives no just reason for suspecting a blunder. The double *s* forbids Berger's restoration *surrexisset*, but allows either *discessisset* or *recessisset*, one of which I am convinced was the original reading. In xviii 8 *quando* appears in the text (not in the notes) instead of *quomodo* (for *quomodo* in *h* vide v 24, 26); xxvi 22 *d[icens eis* should be *d[icens quā*; *lux annuntiabit plebi* is changed by von Soden to *lucem ann. plebi* without any sufficient reason since *annuntio* (*nuntio*) is used intransitively in the MS with a dative of the person evangelized (*cf.* xiv 14, 21); xxvii 5 [*diebus duodecim*] should be [*diebus*] *quindecim*, xv being misread as xii by the editor; xxvii 8 *uenimus* should be *deuenimus*; and in the next verse *plures* is the reading of *h**, not *paucos*, as Mr Valentine Richards first pointed out to me before 1907.

In the Catholic Epistles 1 St Pet. v 7, 8 *de uobis sobrii estote uigilate autem* is the reading of *h**: von Soden edits *de uobis. Sobrii estote uigilate &c.*, and omits *autem*: I would edit, *de uobis sobrii estote. Uigilate autem, &c.* In v 12 *haec* surely is a blunder of the scribe for *hanc* which should be edited: 2 St Pet. i 3 *et [per haec effi]cimini* is corrected (wrongly I believe) into *ut [per haec effi]ciamini*. In the preceding verse the comma after *donantur* should be deleted. In i 4 *effugientes* is the

reading of the MS, not *et fugientes*; i 8 *cognitio*]nem should be *recognitio*]nem, as in *vv.* 2 and 3; i 19 *firmiorrem* is a misprint for *firmiorem*; ii 6 *ut* is misprinted for *et* and *impie* for *inpie*.

In i St John ii 11 the note should be *obscaecauerunt h**; *v.* 13 delete comma after *cognouistis*; *v.* 17 *mundus* should be *et mundus* (*saeculum h*); *v.* 20 I would now edit thus: *nobiscum, sed ut praesto . . . omnes ex nobis et uos . . . sancto. Scitis quoniam, &c.*; *v.* 28 the MS clearly connects *in praesentia* with the text which follows it, and I see no reason for going against the MS and connecting it with the preceding text.

In iii 3 I would punctuate *hanc in eo*, not *hanc, in eo*; in *v.* 10 (note) *facit iniustitiam* should be *non facit iustitiam*. In iii 14 *transiuimus* should be edited: *h** has *-bimus*, *h^a* *-uimus*. In iii 16 *de fratribus* is rightly, I believe, edited without comment: I was once inclined to think *de* an error for *pro*, but *de* in *h* is used elsewhere with the meaning of *propter* or *per*, viz. in Apoc. ix 2 *de fumo* and xv 8 *de claritate dei*.

In the Apocalypse: i 4 *uenturus* [*et a sep*]tem is what I now believe *h* wrote and not *uenturus* [*est et sep*]tem as von Soden edits (for omission of *est* cf. i St John i 9); in the same verse *et quae* is corrected to *qui*, but why not to *et qui* (= *etiam qui*)?; in the same verse *eclesiis* is a misprint for *ecclesiis*; *v.* 9 von Soden's punctuation *patientia, in xpo ihu fui* I now think is right and *patientia in xpo ihu, fui* wrong; ii 1 *angelo* should be *et angelo*; viii 12 *obscu*]raretur is what the MS undoubtedly read here and not *tenebri*]caretur, nor *teneb*]raretur as I once believed—the letters *raretur* are clear: *tenebricauit* was read in ix 2 and von Soden rightly edits it in place of *tenebrauit* which I gave at first after Berger (cf. b St Mark xiii 24); *v.* 13 *in*]habitantibus was, I now believe, the reading of *h*, not *habitantibus*; ix 5 *cruciarent*[ur should be *cruciarent* [*eos*]; xi 16 *sedent* not *sedebant* is the real text of *h*; *profetis* should be *et profetis*; xii 4 *draco* should be *ipse draco*; *v.* 10 *di nostri di* [*die e*]t nocte = *h*; von Soden rejects the second *di* as a blunder: I do not think he is right in doing this; xv 2 *citharas* should have a comma, not a full stop; *v.* 8 *intrare*, not *intrare in*, is the reading of *h* (cf. Acts xiv 22); xvi 2 von Soden supplies *et* before *in simulacrum* rightly I think: *in sim.* = *ad sim.* (or *ante sim.*).

The following are a few additional notes: Acts iii 16 I would edit *super fidelitatem* (so in vii 58 *extra ciuitatem*); iv 13 the comma should be before *persuasi*, not after it; iv 15 *ab* has no need of correction to *ad*, notwithstanding the fact that *adduci* just before is, I agree, a mis-copying of *abduci*; v 27 [*incipit*] is no improvement on [*incepit*]; vii 60 *neci stephani* may, or may not, be a blunder for *necis stephani*; ix 4 *h^b* expunctuated *pauore* and substituted (not added) *terram*; ix 5 I cannot understand why *nazarenus* should be accepted here and *nazaraeus*

thrust into its stead in iii 6 and iv 10; xviii 6 there should be a colon after *ego*, and in v. 9 a comma after *loquere*; xxiii 15 *ad* is corrected to *et*, but more probably it stands for *adq.* or *ac*; xxvi 29 a comma is wanting after *sum*. In 1 St John ii 11 I have recently discovered *h** wrote *am[bulat]*, not *ea[t]*; in v. 14 *ag[nouistis]*, not *co[nouistis]*; in v. 19 *palam*, not *praesto*; and in iii 2 *ignorat*, not *egnorat*. In Apocalypse ix 1 I would punctuate after *fornace* with a full stop, since *qui* which follows must refer to *angelus*.

The brackets employed for restoring clipped away letters might with advantage have been omitted in many places where the Editor has inserted them, viz. 2 St Peter i 5 *subminis[trate in] fide*, v. 7 [*amorem*], v. 11 *int[roitus in]*; Acts xviii 12 [*cum*] *esset*, v. 17 [*se non*] *uidere*; Apocalypse xii 13 [*perse]cutus* and *perper[erat]*. In these and not a few other instances the reading is by context and by space and by surviving letters nowise doubtful.

In conclusion I would take this opportunity to add two new restitutions to the text of *h* in Acts xviii 2, [*iudea pris]cilla* and *claud[ius caesar]*. Also from my recent rescript of the Old-Latin Version of the Catholic Epistles from the Perpignan MS (*p*), which I hope to publish in the next number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, I would supply from *p* in 2 St Peter i 8 *cum* which has fallen out of the MS after *uobis* (von Soden has already proposed *si*), and in v. 17 I would with *p* now edit [*accepit eni-*] for [*accipiens*].

In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July 1910 Dr Alexander Souter suggests that in Acts xxvi 22 *co[nsecutus* should be read in *h* for *co[nfusus]*. The space at the end of a line cannot determine absolutely the number of letters clipped away, and, therefore, though *consecutus* seems a little too long, no argument can be final on merely space considerations. But *gig* has *usus* which looks like a miscopying of *fusis*, and *confusus* I think is more Pauline in thought than *consecutus*. In 2 Cor. ii 4 St Paul joins *confidentiam* and ability to stand. In spite of my learned friend's advocacy of *consecutus*, my own vote is still for *confusus*.

E. S. BUCHANAN.

IRISH PSALTERS.

THE glossed Coupar-Angus Psalter (MS Vatic. Palat. lat. 65), of which I have recently given a short description, prefixed to 'Specimen pages of two manuscripts of the Abbey of Coupar-Angus in Scotland' (*Codices e Vaticanis selecti phototypice expressi, &c.* Series minor. Vol. ii. Roma