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 epistulam 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'—'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. 39r 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 (4).

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 ɒ 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. 6a 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; vii 10 spui scò 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 deficient is too short and should be quiescit (gig. xx 1 also translates πάντωμα by quiesco); ix 8 nihil uidens is the true text; ix 11 in uicum [qui vocatur or in uicum [ut vocatur 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 dini fili di 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 accurrentes is a misprint for acurrentes; xiv 16 dimisi omni gentis is corrected into dimisi omni genti: dimisi 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 discississet populus uespere leuauit se and von Soden edits cum surreississet 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 surreississet, 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 dicens eis should be d[iens quâ; lux annuntiabit pле 비 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, xu 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 hac which should be edited: 2 St Pet. i 3 et [per haec effic]imini is corrected (wrongly I believe) into ut [per haec effic]amini. In the preceding verse the comma after donantur should be deleted. In i 4 effugientes is the
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reading of the MS, not et fugientes; i 8 cognitio nem should be recognitio nem, as in vv. 2 and 3; i 19 firmiorem is a misprint for firmiorem; ii 6 ut is misprinted for et and impie.

In i St John ii 11 the note should be obscaecaurunt 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 vos... 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 tustitiam. In iii 14 transitiumus should be edited: h* has -bimus, h0 -umus. 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 ecclesiis 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 obscuraretur is what the MS undoubtedly read here and not tenebraretur, nor tenebraretur as I once believed—the letters raretur are clear: tenebricavit 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 habitanti'bus; ix 5 cruciarentur should be cruciare(t) [eos]; xi 16 sedent not sede(b)ant 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] 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 h0 expunctuated pauore and substituted (not added) terram; ix 5 I cannot understand why nazarenus should be accepted here and nasaraeus
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 i St John ii 11 I have recently discovered h* wrote am\[bulat, not ea\[l; in v. 14 ag\[nousitis, not co\[nousitis; in v. 19 palam, not praesto; and in iii 2 ignorant, 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 ins\[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 restorations to the text of h in Acts xviii 2, \[idea pris\]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 nobis (von Soden has already proposed st), and in v. 17 I would with p now edit \[accepit en\] for \[acapiens].

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\[nisus. 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 fisus, and confisus 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 confisus.

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