

= Ps.-Primas. (Migne, lxxviii) 544, ll. 19, 37-45, which by a slip of the compiler is attributed to the 'Apologeticus ad Pammachium'. The second is Augustine, *Epistle* 169. 1, § 2 (C.S.E.L. 44, p. 612. 22-6, 613. 4-13) = Ps.-Primas. 543, ll. 9-24.

Among the epistles of Augustine already known to have been used by Cassiodorus and his disciples are 140, 147, 187. In view of Lietzmann's classification of the manuscripts of Augustine's epistles,<sup>1</sup> which he made in order to discover what groups of letters existed in early times, it would have been interesting to be in a position to show that Cassiodorus possessed one of these bundles; but unfortunately neither 140 nor 169 appears in any of Lietzmann's groups and, while 147 appears in his M 59 group,<sup>2</sup> 187 cannot be regarded as belonging to the same group. Until all the works produced at Vivarium are thoroughly examined, it is premature to express an opinion, but meanwhile it looks as if Cassiodorus had possessed no real collection of Augustine's letters, but only a very few single letters.

A. SOUTER

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE PSEUDO-EUSEBIAN COLLECTION OF GALLICAN SERMONS

THIS collection of seventy-five homilies, arranged in forty-three chapters, was, like Beatus of Liebana's compilation on the Apocalypse, omitted from the *Patrologia Latina* of Migne. It has not, in fact, been printed since 1677.<sup>3</sup> As no one would readily trust an edition of that date, I have gone straight to the oldest and best, though incomplete, manuscript, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1316 (1651-2), of the first quarter of the ninth century.<sup>4</sup> That this is the best manuscript I learned from an extremely valuable article by Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., in which *inter alia* he argues with the greatest probability that the author of these homilies was Faustus of Riez.<sup>5</sup>

Nobody with a right to an opinion would doubt that they belong to the fifth century. The prevailing use of the Vulgate Bible would in itself prove a date subsequent to the fourth century, but there are other proofs also. The following references are of undoubted signi-

<sup>1</sup> *Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 1930 (23), Berlin, 1930: see the JOURNAL, xxxii, 188 f.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum* (Lugd.), t. vi, pp. 618 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I am greatly indebted to the managers of the Hort Fund at Cambridge for the research grant which made it possible for me to study the manuscript under perfect conditions at Brussels.

<sup>5</sup> *Z.N.T.W.*, xxxiv (1935), pp. 92-115.

ficance: *Pelagii blasphemias* (f. 2 v),<sup>1</sup> *originale peccatum* (f. 5 v), *Macedonius* (f. 32 r), the definition of *Hierusalem* as *uisio pacis*<sup>2</sup> (f. 57 r), and *Honorati* (f. 82 v). As regards the locality in which they were composed, two among other references point the way: *Rodani se inmittit fluentis* (f. 69 r), and *Arelatensis ciuitas* (f. 84 v). The writer is fond of metaphors from the sea. I have noticed two traces of classical education: Cicero's *dum tacent clamant*<sup>3</sup> and Virgil's *heu regni rerumque oblite tuarum*.<sup>4</sup>

The manuscript was in the Jesuit library at Antwerp in 1599, and was used by Andreas Schottus, who believed that it had come from England. Whether or no, it would seem to have been written either in the Low Countries or in Northern France, and the script is a Caroline minuscule of average quality. The fact that  $\psi$  is used to indicate omissions (ff. 69 r, &c.) and also, for the same purpose, a symbol like the insular symbol for *eius* (f. 81 r) may help towards fixing the exact scriptorium or region where the manuscript was produced. The text is not immaculate: witness *alienuni* (f. 12 r), *barbareis* (f. 18 r), *superstitutiones* (f. 21 v), *sacregerationis* (f. 27 r), *diuiscene* (f. 31 r), *crassaris* (f. 70 v). Yet certain spellings might well have come straight from a fifth or sixth century exemplar: *rennuunt* (f. 27 v), *ammonitionis* (f. 63 v), *amministratores* (f. 67 v), *amministratione* (f. 68 r), *ammixti* (f. 74 v), *quemammodum* (f. 52 r), *euua* (f. 56 v), *quur*<sup>5</sup> (ff. 72 r, 76 r), *querella* (f. 77 v), *forsitam* (ff. 77 v, 82 v), *cottidianus* (ff. 79 v, &c.).

Some forms of a different sort may be quoted: most are unknown to the *Thesaurus*:

abolitur	= aboletur	f. 78 r	delapido	= dilapido	f. 75 v
aminitas	= amoenitas	„ 81 r	deluo	= diluo	„ 59 v
carix	= carex	„ 60 r	deuello	= diuello	„ 3 r
catina	= catena	„ 79 r	dissitientes	= dissentientes	„ 65 v
delacero	= dilacero	„ 53 r	inrico	= inrigo	„ 78 v
trago = traho f. 82 r					

Perhaps the phoneticians may be able to tell us to what region these aberrations specially point.

The quotations from Scripture identified by me number about 260. The Gospel quotations number 77, and these agree almost absolutely with the Vulgate. The same is true of the 40 quotations from the

<sup>1</sup> My references are to the Brussels manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> From Hier. *nom. Hebr.* (t. III, 91 Vallarsi); cf. Aug. *cat. rud.* 20, 36, *Faust.* 12, 42 (p. 369, l. 20); *C.D.* 19, 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Cat.* 1.8, detected by Dr. Alfred J. Smith also in Ambrosiaster in *Rom.* 5. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Aen.* 4. 267, not 367, as in Wetmore's *Concordance*.

<sup>5</sup> The Augustinian spelling.

Psalms. It is most satisfactory to be able to be so precise with regard to the use of these two parts of Scripture in southern France at so early a date, as the Vulgate had to fight for some five centuries to attain supremacy. It is also only fair to the late Abbot Chapman to mention his section entitled 'The Vulgate Gospels and Faustus of Riez',<sup>1</sup> where he works on the problem with Engelbrecht's edition of Faustus, in which Faustus' work could not be properly distinguished from the use made of it by Caesarius of Arles, and at a time when it was unknown that the Pseudo-Eusebian sermons were the work of Faustus. Much earlier Kaulen also had drawn the conclusion from one or two quotations that Faustus in his work on Free Will used the Vulgate.<sup>2</sup>

The following exceptions to the use of pure Vulgate in the Gospels occur. I have appended references to biblical manuscripts where these exceptions agree with their text. Where no such references are added, there is a possibility, or rather a probability, that the quotations are made from memory :

	<i>Faustus</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
	ST. MATTHEW	
i. 23	accipiet	habebit
iii. 3	ego <i>ante</i> uox dei nostri <i>b</i>	<i>om.</i> eius
iv. 16	habitantibus	sedentibus
v. 22	siquis ignis	qui autem gehennae ignis
v. 28	siquis <i>om.</i> DL	omnis qui eam
vii. 3, 5	enim <i>om.</i> <i>om.</i>	autem festucam tui
x. 23	si uos persecuti fuerint alia <i>g</i> KZ*	cum persequentur uos aliam
xi. 13	lex et prophetae	prophetae et lex
xvi. 24	se ipsum sibi <i>q</i> LQ <sup>3</sup>	semet ipsum
xviii. 19	duobus... conuenerit <i>ab ff<sub>2</sub>g</i> quacumque petierit [ <i>ff<sub>2</sub></i> ] C <sup>2</sup> PFJ, etc. eis	duo . . . consenserint quacumque petierint illis

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 167-73 of his ever suggestive *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908).

<sup>2</sup> F. Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata* (Mainz, 1868), p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> So also Chapman, p. 169.

	<i>Faustus</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
	ST. MATTHEW	
xviii. 20	fuering	sunt
	et ego ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) <i>abff<sub>2</sub>gq</i> EQR	<i>om.</i> ( $\frac{2}{3}$ )
xxii. 12, 13	hic ( <i>q</i> )	huc
	manibuset pedibus <i>ff<sub>2</sub></i> DELR	pedibus eius et manibus
	eicite	mittite
xxiii. 26	prius id quod intus est munda	munda prius quod intus est
xxv. 40	ex <i>ff<sub>2</sub></i> QRTW <sup>1</sup>	de
xxv. 42	bibere [ <i>ff<sub>2</sub></i> ] R	potum
xxvi. 72	hominem istum	hominem
xxvii. 52, 53	sanctorum corpora	corpora sanctorum
	<i>om.</i>	qui dormierant
	resurrexerunt BCJO <sup>1</sup> TX	surrexerunt
	sancta ciuitate	sanctam ciuitatem
	uisa sunt	apparuerunt
	ST. MARK	
vi. 18	uxorem uiuentis accipere	habere uxorem fratris tui
	fratris	
	ST. LUKE	
i. 7	eis	illis
	processerant ( <i>gat. G</i> )	processissent
i. 13	oratio	deprecatio
	concipiet	pariet tibi filium
i. 15	siceram <i>bcF<sup>r</sup>rdaur. CD<math>\Phi</math><math>\Theta</math></i>	sicera
	RT, &c.	
iii. 5	directum <i>q</i>	directa
v. 21	donare	dimittere
vii. 28	inter natos mulierum maior	maior inter natos mulierum
	non	. . . nemo
xii. 50	quod uos non scitis	<i>om.</i>
xviii. 1	<i>om.</i>	semper
	numquam C	non
xviii. 11	<i>om.</i>	ago
	homines ( <i>cod -is</i> ) <i>bceff<sub>2</sub>ilr</i>	hominum
	<i>aur. DET, &amp;c.</i>	
	<i>om.</i>	raptores
	non audebat G	nolebat nec
	domine <i>cff<sub>2</sub></i>	deus
xviii. 13	propitiare <i>cff<sub>3</sub>l</i>	propitius esto
xviii. 14	et exiit magis	descendit hic
	illo fariseo T	illo

<sup>1</sup> So also Chapman, p. 169.

	<i>Faustus</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
xxiii. 34	dimitte illis domine quia nesciunt <i>b</i>	pater dimitte illis non enim sciunt
xxiii. 42	memento domine mei ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) memento mei domine ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) ( <i>b q</i> ) <i>r</i> $\delta$	domine memento mei
ST. JOHN		
iii. 5	natus <i>fr</i> D sancto <i>a ff<sub>2</sub> m r aur.</i> CDERT <sup>1</sup> intrare <i>a r B</i> <sup>1</sup>	renatus <i>om.</i> introire <i>om.</i>
iv. 34	patris <i>IR</i>	
vi. 53	sanguinem eius <i>b d ff<sub>2</sub> q</i> habebitis <i>codd. pler. vg.</i>	eius sanguinem habetis
x. 18	animam meam <i>aur.</i> GT	eam
x. 38	creditus $\delta$ <sup>1</sup>	uultis credere
xiv. 6	ueritas KO*RTWZ	et ueritas
xiv. 30	ecce uenit nihil inuenit ( <i>d</i> ) <i>gr</i> ( <i>Aug.</i> )	uenit enim non habet quicquam
xvi. 12, 13	quae dico ( <i>a</i> ) ea portare <i>b (em)</i> ipse uos docebit	dicere portare docebit uos
xvii. 24	rogo	uolo
xx. 19	illa <i>a b f</i> $\delta$ ( <i>er</i> ) <i>Aug.</i> ianuis clausis ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) <i>e</i> ( <i>ff<sub>2</sub></i> ) discipuli congregati <i>c fr</i> $\delta$ <i>Aug.</i> BEH $\Theta$ , &c. discipulorum F dixit <i>d fr</i> $\delta$ <i>gat.</i> D $\mathcal{P}$ <sup>m</sup> RY	illo et fores essent clausae ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) discipuli <i>om.</i> ( $\frac{1}{3}$ )
xx. 25	manus meas <i>a dr</i>	dicit eis manum meam
xx. 29	et credidisti <i>q gat.</i> C $\mathcal{P}$ <sup>m</sup> RT	credidisti

Of the Old-Latin manuscripts *r*<sup>2</sup> is oftenest found in agreement with *Faustus* (14 times), then *b*, the central Old-Latin manuscript (12 times), and then *ff<sub>2</sub>* (11 times). The last is regarded as French, and it would be interesting if we could say that it is of Provence, rather than of any other part of France. Of the manuscripts considered as in some sense *Vulgate*, R (*Rushworthianus*) coincides 10 times, T (*Toletanus*) 9 times, D (*Armagh*) 7 times, and C (*La Cava* and *Spain*) 6 times. We have thus Irish and Spanish connexions running

<sup>1</sup> So Chapman, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> Dublin, Trinity College 55 (A. iv. 15), 'Irish half-uncial (saec. vii in.) . . . written . . . presumably at Bobbio' (Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, no. 271).

pretty close. Very few of our verses are also in Abbot Chapman's list, and there our evidence is in accord with his.<sup>1</sup>

The text of the Psalms used is even more definitely Vulgate, that is, Jerome's second revision of the Old Latin. The following differences occur :

	<i>F.-R.</i>	<i>Vg.</i>
vii. 14, 16	iniustitia ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) capite uertice eius	iniustitiam ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) caput uerticem ipsius
ix. 25	polluuntur ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , &c.) eius ( <i>Sangerm.</i> )	inquinatae sunt illius
xviii. 4	terrae ( <i>Cassiod.</i> )	orbis terrae
xxi. 20	eripe ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , etc., <i>Cypr. cod. A</i> <i>Cassiod.</i> )	erue
xxiv. 7	<i>om. (m)</i>	meae
xxx. 8	dabo tibi ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , etc., <i>Aug.</i> <i>Cassiod.</i> )	tibi dabo
xxx. 8	quam ( <i>Sangerm.</i> ) ingredieris ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , etc., <i>Aug.</i> <i>Cassiod.</i> )	qua gradieris
xliv. 9	circumamicta ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , &c.)	circumdata
xlviii. 17	non enim moriatur accipiet ( <i>m Sangerm.</i> , &c., <i>Ambr. Aug. Ruric. Cassiod.</i> ) simul ( <i>m Ambr. Aug. Ruric. Cassiod.</i> ) domus ( <i>m Ambr. Aug. Ruric.</i> <i>Cassiod.</i> )	quoniam interierit non sumet <i>om.</i> <i>om.</i>
l. 3	peccatum meum ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) agnosco ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) ( <i>Sangerm. Hil. Hier.</i> <i>Aug.</i> ) cogitabo pro peccato meo ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) delictum ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) ( <i>Sangerm. Ambst.</i> )	iniquitatem meam ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) cognosco peccatum meum con- tra me est semper
lxiii. 6, 7	accedit et ( <i>Sangerm.</i> , &c.)	accedet ad
lxv. 13	domo tua cum ( <i>Mozarab. Coislin.</i> )	domum tuam in
ci. 9	sicut ( <i>Hebr. Sangerm.</i> , etc., <i>Pacian.</i> <i>Chromat. Prosp.</i> )	tamquam
civ. 37	in ( <i>Sangerm. Ambr. Aug. Cassiod.</i> )	cum
cv. 24	et non ( <i>Sangerm.</i> ) in ( <i>Rom. Aug. Cassiod.</i> )	non <i>om.</i>

<sup>1</sup> See the notes added to the particular passages above.

	<i>F.-R.</i>	<i>Vg.</i>
cviii. 6	peccato ( <i>Sangerm.</i> )	peccatum
cxxvi. 1	in uanum uigilant ( <i>Rom. Moz.</i> <i>Ambr. Hormisd. Fulg.</i> )	frustra uigilat
	custodiunt ( <i>Rom. Moz. Ambr.</i> <i>Hormisd. Fulg.</i> )	custodit
cxxxi. 9	iustitia ( <i>Hebr. Corb. Prosp.</i> <i>Cassiod.</i> )	iustitiam

Apologies are due for the bracketed notes after the readings in the left column. The notes are mainly derived from Sabatier, and take no account of the recent work done on the Latin Psalms by Dr. A. Allgeier and others, which is inaccessible to me. What is quite clear is the close resemblance to *Sangermanensis* in particular, a resemblance shared by *Ambrosiaster*<sup>1</sup> among other writers.

An examination of the quotations from St. Paul's Epistles has yielded little of value. Here too there are traces of Vulgate readings. There are also one or two passages quoted from memory. Where neither of these statements is true, we find echoes which agree with D (*Book of Armagh*) rather oftener than with other Vulgate MSS., and readings such as we find in the great writers of the period 370-430. All this is what might be expected.

The quotations from other parts of Scripture have also been reviewed by me but do not appear to contain much that is instructive. I will call attention only to a few quotations :

Prou. ix. 12, **fili si malus fueris solus hauries mala** (ff. 51 v, 53 r, 78 v-79 r) (cf. *Ambr.*).

Prou. xiii. 8, redemptio animae uiri **propriae** (∞) diuitiae (f. 76 v) (= *Hier. Rufin.*).

Prou. xviii. 21, mors et uita in **manibus** linguae (f. 64 r) (= *m. Lucif. Aug. Caesar. 165*).

Prou. xxv. 12, inauris aurea et margaritum fulgens qui **loquitur uerbum in aurem audientem** et obedientem (f. 74 v). No Old-Latin testimony in Sabatier.<sup>2</sup>

Eccli. xxiii. 9, **multus** enim casus in illa (f. 74 r).

Eccli. xxiii. 12, uir multum iurans **replebitur iniquitate**, et non discedet **de** domo illius plaga (f. 74 r). (*Caesar.*, who has *de*, but *implebitur*, with variant *repl.*-)

Ezech. xx. 43, **et faciam ut displiceatis uobis in oculis uestris** (f. 65 r). No Old-Latin testimony in Sabatier.

<sup>1</sup> *A Study of Ambrosiaster* (Camb. 1905), pp. 202 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Other Old-Latin evidence in Prou. unknown to Sabatier may be found in Pelagius (*Expositions*, vol. i, p. 161, n. 2).

Iac. v, 14, 15, infirmatur **aliquis** ex uobis, inducat presbyteros ecclesiae, et orent super eum ungentes <sup>^</sup> oleo <sup>^</sup> et oratio fidei saluabit infirmum et **alleuabit** eum dominus et si in **peccato** sit **dimittetur** ei (f. 72 v). (Rufin. and Caesar. differ considerably.)

Before passing to some notes on the vocabulary, there is one interesting coincidence which I think has not yet been pointed out. On ff. 78 v-79 r occur these words: fili si malus fueris, solus hauries mala: suam linguam malilocus maculat, suum cor obtrectator exulcerat, suae mentis lumen iracundus obcaecat, suam inuidus animam uelut quadam rubigine pestifero liuore corrumpet; et sicut exulceratis parentibus nascuntur uiperæ, sicut inquam nasci uiperei fetus disrupti naturam is matris uisceribus asseruntur, ita humana praecordia ipsi primitus quas conceperint passionibus dilacerantur. illa inquam praecordia de quibus uitiorum generatio serpentina profertur, ipsa primitus monstrosa, a partus sui fecunditate uiolantur. de hoc partu dicit sermo diuinus ecce parturiit iniustitia concepit dolorem et peperit iniquitatem, conuertetur dolor eius in capite eius et in uertice eius iniquitas eius descendet.

This is not merely a repetition of what occurred already on ff. 52 v-53 r, but is the same as the homilies of 'Eucherius' Ad Monachos, published in Migne, *P.L.*, L, 8, p. 853<sup>c</sup>-9, p. 856<sup>a</sup>. The textual differences between the three passages are trifling. In our manuscript these two passages are contained in two sermons thus respectively headed: Incipit omelia eiusdem VIII (f. 52 v), *Videte uocationem uestram fratres* (Migne, *P.L.*, L, 855<sup>a</sup>), and Incipit sermo de eo quod ait in euangelio quoniam oportet orare et numquam deficere CAP XXXV, *Viuit dominus noster absque dubio miserere qui se praecepit exorari* (f. 78 r).<sup>1</sup>

After about fifty years' study of late Latin writers one may claim to have some idea of what is distinctive in any particular writer. In the course of reading these sermons in the Brussels manuscripts I made dictionary 'slips' for such words and expressions as seemed to me of importance. I will now present a selection of these. The slips themselves have been subsequently compared with the parts of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* already published (A—D, E—exhorresco, F, G, H—homicidium, I—inclutus, M—matrimonium). Words not found at all in the *Thesaurus* are printed in thick type, and the letters F.-R. (= Faustus Reiensis) are added to such words as are there quoted from already accepted works of Faustus. The lexical material

<sup>1</sup> Certain other identities suggest themselves from the vocabulary printed below.



here published is not devoid of importance for the student of the Latin vocabulary, and, I venture to think, also confirms Dom Morin's view of the authorship of the Pseudo-Eusebius' Gallican homilies.

absento: ff. 15 v, 56 r, 63 v *bis*, 72 r, 77 v. Not one of these exx. in Thes., but F.-R. cited.

adfector: f. 25 r (ex. not in Thes.).

adnumero: f. 79 r (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R.).

amministrator: f. 67 v (F.-R.).

ammirabilis: ff. 22 r, 70 v (F.-R.).

ammonitio: f. 63 v (F.-R.).

adoro (*fig.*) *bedew*: f. 30 r (ex. not in Thes.).

adtenuatio: f. 31 r (= F.-R. spir. 1. 13, in Thes.).

adunatio: f. 3 r (ex. not in Thes.).

aeternitas (*pl.*): f. 68 r (F.-R.).

in ante: f. 56 r (ex. not in Thes.).

**Arriantia**, *Ariandom*: f. 78 v.

basiliscus: f. 83 r (ex. not in Thes.).

bestialis: f. 6 r (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R.).

capitaliter: f. 16 v (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 154. 8, same sermon).

capitellum: f. 59 v (ex. not in Thes.).

carex: f. 60 r (ex. not in Thes.).

commigratio: f. 17 r (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 154. 10, same sermon);  
f. 60 v (ex. not in Thes.).

concupiscibilis: f. 62 r (= MAX.-TAVR. hom. 78, p. 420<sup>c</sup>).

confixio: ff. 12 v, 15 v (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 154. 4).

confusibilis: ff. 22 r, 64 v, 75 v (these exx. not in Thes., but F.-R. *ter*).

competo (*tr.*): f. 82 r (ex. not in Thes.).

conplano: f. 26 r (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 198. 4 = CAESAR. 217 [Morin], almost certainly derived from this).

consuetudinarius: f. 5 r (ex. not in Thes.).

contestatio: f. 80 v (ex. not in Thes.).

conuoluo: f. 65 r (= SALV. eccl. 1. 45).

cribro (*fig.*): f. 3 r (ex. not in Thes.).

damnabiliter: f. 62 r (= MAX.-TAVR. hom. 78, p. 421<sup>a</sup>).

deceptrix: f. 73 r (ex. not in Thes.).

defaeco (*fig.*): ff. 12 v, 20 v, 30 r (these exx. not in Thes., but cf. SALV. epist. 5. 5 (F.-R.)).

definite (*superl.*): f. 14 r (not in Thes., but same phrase, F.-R., C.S.E.L. p. 16. 3).

delectio, *enticement*: f. 73 v (perhaps error for delectatio).

deluo: f. 59 v (ex. not in Thes.).

deprauatio: f. 6 v (perhaps = Ps.-AVG. serm. 62. 4).

- districtio (districtio): ff. 19 v (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 262. 1, which is F.-R., cf. F.-R. serm. 15, pp. 281-2), 54 r, 67 v (also F.-R. *ter*).  
 diuello: f. 3 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 dignans (*superl.*): f. 11 v (= Ps.-AVG. serm. 161. 2).  
 discussio (*fig.*): f. 22 r (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R. *bis* [*fer*]).  
 distentio: f. 53 r (ex. not in Thes.).  
 elongo: f. 74 r (ex. not in Thes.).  
 emundator: f. 31 v (ex. not in Thes., which has only one, from HIL.-PICT.).  
 euagatio (*fig.*): f. 63 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 exarmo: f. 65 r (ex. not in Thes.).  
 xenium: f. 57 v (= *xenium*, which is not yet of course in Thes.).  
**expeccantissimus**: f. 74 v (not in B.-G.<sup>2</sup>).  
 extirpatio (*fig.*): ff. 50 r, 63 v (only *lit.* in B.-G.).  
**exultabilis**, *full of joy*: f. 61 v.  
 exteris, new form of *exterus*: f. 68 r.  
 feruentia (*fig.*): f. 53 r (ex. not in Thes., which has only CANON., Migne 56. 757<sup>a</sup>).  
 formator: f. 4 v (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R.).  
 fundatus (*compar.*): f. 78 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 (h)oloserica: ff. 54 r (= CAESAR. serm. 197. 2), 75 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 hostilitas: ff. 17 v, 18 r *bis*, 82 r (Ps.-AVG. serm. 298. 1, SIDON. CASSIOD.).  
 impressio: f. 6 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 imprimo: f. 68 v (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R.).  
 incessabiliter: ff. 17 v, 55 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 inexsolubilis: f. 77 v (AMBR.).  
 infirmus (**sb.**): f. 11 v (new as sb.).  
 inlapsus (*sb.*): f. 64 v (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R. *bis*).  
 inlisio: f. 2 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 inolitus: f. 85 r (ex. not in B.-G.).  
 impastus: f. 81 r (ex. not in Thes.).  
 impenetrabilis: ff. 17 v, 27 v (ex. not in Thes.) (F.-R.).  
 inpetratio: f. 79 r (ex. not in Thes.).  
 impulsio: f. 60 v (ex. not in Thes.).  
 insuspiciabilis: f. 57 v (vg. ZENO ZACCH. FACVND.).  
 laesura (*sb.*): ff. 14 r, 54 r (TERT. vg. inscr.).  
 laqueo *ensnare* (*fig.*): f. 6 v (IVVENC.).  
 malagma: f. 65 r (= Ps.-AVG. 22. 6) (F.-R.).

<sup>1</sup> In this and some other cases it must be remembered that Thes. does not publish all the examples in its possession.

<sup>2</sup> B.-G. (= Benoist-Goelzer) is referred to where Thes. is not yet published.

- maleblandus : ff. 65 r, 71 v (F.-R. *ter*).  
 malesuadens : f. 73 v (ex. not in *Thes.*).  
 malilocus, *evil speaker* : ff. 53 r, 79 r.  
 mancipatio : f. 31 v (ex. not in *Thes.*).  
 mellifluus : ff. 59 v, 81 r (AVS. ARN.-IVN. CASSIOD.).  
 obduratio, *obstinacy* : f. 62 v (AVG. PROSP. PS.-HIER.).  
 originarius : f. 6 r (RVFIN. ENNOD. GELAS. IURISC.).  
 paganitas : f. 26 r (FILAST. COD.-THEOD. CASSIOD.).  
 persuasor (= grassator [*fig.*]) : f. 6 r (COD.-THEOD. SALV. CASSIOD. IOSEPH.<sup>lat.</sup>).  
 pluralitas : f. 66 r (CHAR. AVG. BOET.).  
 possibilitas : f. 81 r (AMBR. &c.).  
 praeifulgidus : f. 4 r (FIRM. IVVENC. RVFIN. PS.-FVLG.).  
**prolacrimo(r)** : f. 54 r.  
 rancor (*fig.*) : f. 50 r (HIER. &c.).  
 reconsigno : f. 57 v (TERT.) (perhaps re [*abl.* of res] cons.).  
 repausatio : f. 52 v (CASSIOD.).  
 rigatus (∞ ūs) : f. 78 v (AMBR. VEN.-FORT.).  
**sobriolentia**, *sobriety* : f. 53 r.  
 subplantator : ff. 4 v, 61 v (HIER. RVFIN.).  
 temporiuus, *temporary* : f. 62 v (F.-R. SS. vet. Iac. 5. 7).  
**uagito** (vb.), *cry as infant* : f. 68 r.  
 usufructuarius : f. 76 r (Iurisc. eccl.).

A. SOUTER