

The passage is actually from the first Rule, and corresponds to page 5, ll. 15–20 of Burkitt's edition. Cassiodorus, then, possessed a copy of the *Rules* in the library of Vivarium, and the particular pupil who revised Pelagius's *Commentary on 2 Thessalonians*, remembering the recommendations of Augustine and Cassiodorus, used it in this (perhaps solitary) instance.

But the interest of this quotation is not confined to its existence. Its form also deserves attention. The following is a comparison of its readings with those of Burkitt's MSS:—

(1) <i>Quod</i> Cassiod.	<i>Qui</i> R M V
(2) <i>templo</i> Cassiod. V ^b M	<i>templum</i> R V*
(3) <i>ipse sit</i> Cassiod. V M	<i>ipse est</i> R
(4) <i>quale est</i> Cassiod.	<i>quale</i> R M V
(5) <i>templum</i> Cassiod. R	<i>templo</i> M V
(6) om. <i>se</i> Cassiod.	<i>se</i> R M V

The readings (1) and (2) are Vulgate, which sufficiently explains their presence in Cassiodorus: (3) may also be said to be under the influence of the Vulgate. There remain (4) and (6), which will probably be brought into agreement with Tyconius, when the sole known MS of Cassiodorus is fully collated. We are left with just a suspicion that Cassiodorus's MS of Tyconius was inferior to R, the best MS of Tyconius, and was more nearly related to the less valuable MSS.

A. SOUTER.

A READING OF THE FLEURY PALIMPSEST (*h*) OF ACTS.

IN Acts xxvi 22 *h* reads thus, according to Buchanan's restoration, adopted by Von Soden¹ :—

cum ergo auxilium dī sim co[nfisus]
esto indicans maiori ac minori nihil amplius d[icens] quā
quae profetae dixerunt futura esse scriptum [est enim
in moysen.]

I venture to think that, instead of *co[nfisus]*, we ought to restore *co[nsecutus]*. It seems quite clear from the other lines that something longer than *confusus* is wanted to fill up the space. *Consecutus* is the right length, and seems a proper equivalent for *τυχών*.² The verb

¹ *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig, 1909) p. 566.

² It is, of course, a recognized word of the African Bible to render other Greek words.

τυγχάνειν is unfortunately rather rare in the New Testament, and it is not therefore possible to produce another passage in it, which would shew us the regular 'African' rendering of this verb. The omission from *h* of a rendering for the words *ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης* of the Greek is only one of many instances of the same kind in these later chapters.

A. SOUTER.

SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE *TEXTUS RECEPTUS* OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

- (1) IN his *Canon and Text of the Greek Testament* (Clark, Edinburgh, 1907), C. R. GREGORY writes (p. 444) :—

'The text which has been considered the Received Text by theologians of different places and different years has not always been the same. One general distinction to be mentioned is *that between England and the Continent*, inasmuch as the text of Estienne of the Regia edition of 1550 has for the most part prevailed in England, whereas on the Continent the text of Elzevir, 1624, has held the chief place. *But then the handy editions of the British and Foreign Bible Society have done much to bring the English form into use in other countries.*'

Two years later Gregory repeated the same statement in German in his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, dedicated to A. Harnack (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1909, p. 557) :—

'Doch haben die handlichen Ausgaben der Britischen und Ausländischen Bibelgesellschaft viel getan, um die englische Form auch in andern Ländern in Gebrauch zu bringen.'

That the contrary is true, I shortly pointed out in the new edition of my *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1909, pp. 15, 44): the editions of the B. F. B. S. did not bring the English form to the Continent, but the Continental form into England.¹

It is now just a hundred years since the B. F. B. S. first published a Greek text of the N. T.: *Ἡ Καυνὴ Διαθήκη . . . δίγλωττος* (J. Tilling, Chelsea, 1810). This edition was a repetition of the Diglott of Halle, 1710, which derived its ancient Greek from the seventh edition of Elzevir of 1678. Later on, in the separate editions of the Ancient Greek, since 1843, the B. F. B. S. adopted the text of the first Elzevir edition of 1624 (with few and unimportant variations).

¹ It is worth while to mention that Fell 1675 makes an exception among his countrymen as not following Stephen of 1550, but Elzevir of 1633.