

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

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]cimini*. 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 [*inceptit*]; 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