

other hand, there are only four passages where the three MSS combine in reading *ἐναρτίον* (25²⁹ 33^{18, 19} 40²¹): *ἐναρτι* occurs in 24¹⁷ A, 27²¹ AF, 28¹⁹ BAF, &c.

The distribution of the two forms in the remaining books of the Pentateuch is noteworthy. Genesis consistently has *ἐναρτίον*. *Ἐναρτι* is the predominant form throughout Leviticus and Numbers: in Deuteronomy it is written almost invariably by AF, while B usually has *ἐναρτίον*.

In the historical books later than the Pentateuch both forms give place to *ἐνώπιον*.

SOME NOTEWORTHY READINGS OF THE FLEURY PALIMPSEST.

THE most striking reading in the Catholic Epistles is found in 1 St John ii 28, 29 *Et nunc filii manete in eo ut cum uenerit fiduciam habeamus et non confundamur ab eo. In praesentia eius si nostis cum qui fidelis est scitote quoniam omnis qui facit ueritatem de eo natus est.* 'And now, children, abide in Him, that when He shall come we may have confidence, and not be put to confusion by Him. If in His presence ye have known Him who is Faithful, know that every one that doeth the truth hath been born of Him.'

The text as given in the Palimpsest obviates two difficulties of the Received Text: (1) The apparent redundancy of *in praesentia*, which is in the Authorized Version mistranslated 'coming'. (2) The expression 'born of Him' in the Received Text can only refer to the Christ, and there is in the New Testament no parallel to the expression 'born of the Christ'. In the text of the Palimpsest 'born of Him' refers naturally to the Father (*qui fidelis est*).

Again, the terms *qui fidelis est* and *qui facit ueritatem* are strictly cognate, while the latter phrase is peculiarly Johannine and occurs elsewhere in the Epistle (i 6) and also in the Gospel (iii 21).

The subscription to 1 St Peter, *Incipit apostoli petri ad gentes epistola secunda*, is worthy of note as regards the authorship of 2 St Peter—especially since the text of the Palimpsest in the Catholic Epistles appears older than the text either of the Acts or of the Apocalypse. The old abbreviation $\bar{\eta}$ (= *non*), found also in *k*, remains in the Catholic Epistles, but disappears in the rest of the Palimpsest. So also 1 St Peter v 5 *minores natu*, which has been corrected by a later hand to *adulescentes*.¹ In fact, the Palimpsest was badly handled in its

¹ The old form *pos* = *post* survives in 2 S. Peter i 15, but has been made to disappear elsewhere. Also *anim* is found for *emin*, *mendas* for *mendax*, *Salutaris* for *Saluatoris*.

phrasing by a sixth-century Vulgate corrector. This good man found the MS containing many expressions that in Jerome's edition were expressed in language more in keeping with the genius of the fourth century, and every one of these he punctiliously reduced to the norm of the Vulgate, often drawing a tell-tale line through the original text.

In Acts vi 2 the Palimpsest reads *discupierentur*, with which may be compared *discupiuntur* in the Codex Bezae. Scrivener asserted without reservation that *discupiuntur* was a mere blunder for *despiciuntur*, but the accession of *h* to *d* disposes of this explanation. The cause of the contention between the Greeks and Hebrews, according to *d* and *h*, was not that the Grecian widows received too little attention, but that they received too much attention from the Hebrew ministrants.

The reading in Acts xiv 14, as I discovered last March by re-examining the MS with the aid of two new photographs, is *nos homines sumus uestri corporis*¹; 'We are men with your body.' This would be a sufficient and forcible reply to the ascription of Godhead to the Apostles. The Received Text ('of like passions') is intrinsically less probable, inasmuch as Jupiter and Mercury were 'of like passions' with men, but the Lycaonians could never have supposed them to be 'of like body'.

To speak of the wording of the Palimpsest must be to draw attention to the number of Latin words it contains which were current in the classical writers of the first and second centuries of the Christian era. Thus *maiores natu* = *seniores*, *minores natu* = *adulescentes*; *Proculus* for *Prochorus* is a name well known in Roman history; *praetor*, *tribunus*, *legatus*, *quadriga*, *imperator*, as Berger has noted, are all truly Roman. Rome itself, as in the Muratori Fragment, which belongs without question to the second century, is called *urbs* ('the City'). *intestabilem* (Acts xiv 17) retains the early popular meaning of the word which we find in Plautus.

I have already referred to the agreement between *h* and quotations from Irenaeus. It is probable that the texts of both *h* and *d* come from Irenaeus's Monastery at Lyons. Certainly the accession of *h* to *d* Iren. has done much to vindicate the faithfulness of the so-called Western Text.

Since the appearance of *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* No. V, I have received two corrections of my work from Mr A. V. Valentine Richards, which I am sorry escaped me when revising Berger's edition: In Acts ix 18 the reading is *tintus* not *untus*, and in the same chapter (at verse 21) *ut finctos* should be *uti uictos*—*f* and *i* being exceedingly alike in the Palimpsest. The former correction will necessitate replacing the

¹ It is noteworthy that *corpus* occurs again in *h* (2 St Pet. i 13, 14) where the Vulgate has the more refined *tabernaculum*.

conjecture *unti* (Acts xviii 8) by *tinti*. *Tingere* for *baptizare* is found in Tertullian and Cyprian, and once even in Ps.-Aug. *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 127. It is an early Old-Latin word which in the fourth century ceased to be used, probably owing to the restriction of *tinctio* to heretical baptism. Its occurrence in *h* lends further support to what has been said about the antiquity of many of the words found in the Palimpsest and altered in the Vulgate.¹

E. S. BUCHANAN.

THE NICENE CREED IN THE CODEX MURATORIANUS.

MR BUCHANAN has done good service in recalling attention to the complete contents of the Milan MS that contains the Muratorian fragment on the Canon: and as I myself have had its version of the Nicene Creed in print for some years, awaiting publication in my *Ecl. occ. monumenta*, I naturally took the opportunity of comparing Mr Buchanan's transcript with my own, and found five divergences between us, of which two were serious. Mgr Mercati has been kind enough to examine the MS at these five points, and I think it better to publish the results in the JOURNAL rather than to stereotype them, so to say, in the apparatus of my book.

1. (fol. 75 a, l. 22) 'In unum deum iesum christum': 'in' is cancelled (as I thought) in the same way as 'caeli' earlier in the line. Dr Mercati holds that the alteration is certainly intentional, and that there can be no question of accidental injury to the letters.

2. (l. 28) I had read 'salute', not 'salutē': and Dr Mercati sees no trace of the sign of abbreviation.

3. (l. 32) I had read 'de substantia': but Dr Mercati agrees with Mr Buchanan that it should be 'de substantiā'.

4. (fol. 75 b, l. 3) Mr Buchanan prints what would be a quite unique reading 'fictus': but Dr Mercati tells me that 'factus', as I had read it, is certainly right.

5. (l. 4) I had read 'conuertibile ut uid', Mr Buchanan 'conuertibilē': Dr Mercati decides that the latter is correct.

May I just add in conclusion that there is no foundation for Mr Buchanan's suggestion (p. 539) that the inscription 'liber sancti columbani de bobio' implies that the archetype of the MS actually belonged

¹ It is difficult, for example, not to believe that *conprobator* is earlier than *consentians*, *effigies* than *figura*, *multa plebs corinthiorum* than *multi corinthiorum*, *arteficio lectari* than *scenofactoriae artis*.