

W. 284. [*Post communionem.*] Omnipotens sempiterne deus qui facis, &c.

³ *tuos* omitted. ^{4*} *rore* for *rorem*.

[AD FRUGES NOVAS.] Two collects which do not seem to have been printed; the second is of the Gallican type.

Te (de) domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus supplices deprecamur ut misericordiam tuam iugiter nobis concedas sufficienter mensium [cur]sus et fructuum omnium . . . quoque substantiam abu[n]dantem, arborum fetus, proventus omnium rerum adque ab his omnibus prestiferum (*sic*) fidus (*for* sidus) tempestatis universas procellas et grandinis amovere digneris, per.

[*Alia?*] [Misericordiam pietatis tue supplices deprecamur, omnipotens eterne deus, ut oblationes populi tui quas tibi de suis primitiis offerunt benignus (*sic*) suscipere digneris, tribu[e] eis domine in hoc seculo habundantiam tritici, uini et olei, in futuro autem uitam eternam, commemorationem quoque facientibus nobis beatissimorum martirum et confessorum ueniam peccatorum largire digneris, per.]

W. 294. Oramus pietatem, &c. (second collect of Gel. III lxxxviii).

^{2*} *dignatus est* for *dignatus es*. *cfundas* (? for *confundas*) for *perfundas*. The words 'et fructus terrae tuae usque ad maturitatem perducas' have been omitted by the copyist.

[*Benedictio ad fruges novas.*] Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus qui celum et terram, &c., as in Muratori *Lit. Rom. vet.* (Venet. 1748) ii 228, with variants: *novum fructum, offerentium* for *offerentibus, laudis* for *laudes*.

W. 294. Benedic domine hos fructus, &c. i. e. first collect of Gel. III lxxxviii.

The conclusion is 'per quem hec omnia domine' as in W.

„ „ [*Benedictio pomorum*] i. e. Gel. III lxxxix.

Te deprecamur . . . diversis.

novum for *novorum*; *inlustratione* as in MS Reg. 316; *benediccionem* for *benedictione*.

H. M. BANNISTER.

THE ELZEVIR NEW TESTAMENTS OF 1624 AND 1633.

It seems many a long day since I investigated the minute differences between Elzevir 1624 and Elzevir 1633. My eyes were certainly better

then, but Dr Nestle's article in the *JOURNAL*,¹ which I have only just seen, certainly startled me. His remarks are brusque almost to brutality: 'Was Hoskier struck with blindness?' 'Was he mistaken in all these passages?' 'Therefore it is possible that Hoskier's attention did not keep up to the last.' Well, thank goodness, the answer is that I am perfectly right in the reading of *my* copies. I thought I had already guarded myself by remarking that the comparison of printed books is not like that of a single MS with any other standard. Dr Nestle in effect merely signals the fact that while both editions were passing through the press alterations were made in each after certain copies had been struck off.

Heb. ix 12, my copy of 1633 reads *εὐρόμενος*;

Rom. vi 4, ,, 1624 ,, *εἰς θάνατον*,

exactly as I stated in 1890.

Further, as to 1 Pet. iii 19 in the edition of 1624, I am correct in saying that the catchword is not transferred from p. 775 to 776. I am correct. Dr Nestle merely means that in his copy it is so transferred.

He says his copy reads top of 776:

μασι πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυσεν, Ἀπειθήσασι 20

My copy reads:—

πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυσεν, Ἀπειθήσασι ποτε, 20.

I will give the next line for Dr Nestle's benefit; for *ποτε* must be squeezed into *his* next line, or something again overflow into the third line. The second line reads:—

ὄτε ἄπαξ ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυ—

Dr Nestle says, 'Is there no chance of finding the copy which he used?' He refers to my copy of 1624. The answer is that both the copies of 1624 and 1633 which I used in 1889 are still in my possession, and I do not know why he should suppose that they are roving. I shall be glad to submit photographs if any one really cares for such minute matters.

But would it not have been more generous of Dr Nestle to have asked me to verify my references before he pilloried me, and threw doubt on my accuracy? I am painfully conscious of fallibility; but I did take a great deal of trouble over those Elzevir lists, and my eyes were able to detect things in those days with no small accuracy and certainty.

I venture to make this reply, as I expect shortly to bring out another essay; and, although many faults and mistakes may be found in it, I would like the readers of this *JOURNAL* to know that in the main my observations can be relied upon.

Since writing the above, I have found on my shelves another copy of Elzevir 1633 (other than the one which I used in 1890), and in this

¹ *J. T. S.*, July 1910, vol. xi p. 565.

copy, stands, sure enough, at Heb. ix 12, *εὐράμενος*. The change from *εὐρόμενος* is abundantly evidenced by the fact that *ρ* as well as *ο* were changed. In the other 1633 *ρ* is straight: here *ρ* is substituted with a curving tail to the right embracing the lower part of *α*. They had three *rhos* in their cases; for in 1624 the *ρ* is again different from either of these, being straight for a certain distance and then having a small curl.

EUANGELIUM GATIANUM.

IN the July number of the JOURNAL (vol. xi p. 610) I notice that Dr Burkitt, in reviewing the new edition of *gat*, says: 'But there is nothing Irish about Mk, Lk, Joh in *h*. Because there are "Irish" readings in *h* (Matthew) that does not prove that *h* (Mk, Lk, Joh) has an Irish strain in its ancestry, much less that the Irish strain is the primitive "strues", to use Herr Heer's word.' Where did Professor Burkitt get his facts? I was unable to get the readings of *h* outside of St Matthew until I had the rest of the MS photographed for my private use. Now *h* in Mk, Lk, Joh is Irish, was written in Ireland by an Irishman, and has Irish decoration (the earliest of its kind that we know). Its text, however, is quite Vulgate and equals Wordsworth's Z.

THE ANTINOE GOTHIC-LATIN FRAGMENT.

WITH regard to the note on the Gothic (*J. T. S.* vol. xi p. 612) of the new Gothic-Latin fragment *giess*, it is not only *f* that the Latino-Greek part of the Gothic favours. This strain comes through a combination of *a f* and *q*.

See, for instance, at Luke xix 22:—

<i>Gothic</i> :	unselja skalk jah lata
<i>a</i> :	infidelis serve et male
<i>f</i> :	serve nequa et piger
<i>q</i> :	infidelis serve et piger

Here, *b* and *q*, which have so much in common, divide squarely; for *b* says (alone) 'crudelis serve', while it may be remembered, that *e* omits; and *c ff*₂ *l* write: 'O infidelis serve'; *i*: 'infidelis serve' (with Lucifer, quoting Luke xix 12/27 in full, but in his introductory notice: 'Serve nequam et piger')¹; *r*: 'serve infidelis'; *d*: 'serve inique'; and *s* merely 'homo'; [*r*₂ is wanting, and *Durmach Dimma h* and *μ* shew no variation from Greek and Vulgate = 'serve nequam'; *δ* follows Greek order with 'nequam serve'].

Arm plays the variation (according to Sabatier) of *ἄπιστε δοῦλε*, with *Syr S* and five Latins, as above; while all Greeks, with Coptic, write

¹ Tischendorf goes wrong about this Lucifer quotation.

πονηρὲ δοῦλε. This, then, is noteworthy, because the *Gothic* is as a rule so beautifully faithful to the Greek, and adapts itself so readily to it.

Syr cu goes with *a* (but inverting the order) while retaining *āπιστε* or *infidelis*. *Peshitto* with Greek and Coptic. [Not extant in Jerusalem Syriac.] The *Diatessaron* goes with *f*, although quoting in full from St Luke's account. Now this is important, for the phrase is not a simple importation from St Matthew. That the *Gothic* is here supported by *a f q* and *Diatess.* gives food for some thought. Then the *Lucifer* variation in the Luke text of *infidelis serve* (with *c ff₂ i l Syr S arm*) is noticeable. Of course *āπιστε δοῦλε* is the antithesis of St Luke's εὐ δοῦλε πιστέ, just as *infidelis serve et male* is the antithesis of St Matthew's εὐ δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, but St Matthew does not say *infidelis serve et male*, but *πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρὲ* as *f Goth Diatess.* in St Luke. While *Syr cu* and *a* in Luke render 'evil slave and faithless' or 'faithless slave and evil', and *q* 'faithless slave and lazy', none of the five agreeing with St Matthew. And *Syr S arm* and *Lucifer* simply 'faithless slave' in Luke. *Lucifer*, however, prefixes his long quotation from Luke by some short remarks including the phrase 'serve nequam et piger'. Nor does he go on to say 'in alio Evangelio' the account is so and so. But runs on with St Luke. *Gothic* is wanting for St Matthew's account, and *Syr S* badly mutilated in xxv 21/26 with 'and lazy' illegible in verse 26.

Neither Greeks nor other authorities vary here in Matthew from *πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρὲ* in any way except as to the order of *πονηρὲ δοῦλε* or *δοῦλε πονηρὲ*, all having the addition *καὶ ὀκνηρὲ*, and none *καὶ āπιστε*.

The point is that when the *Gothic* runs away at a tangent the reading is very old. This is shewn here by the *Diatessaron* support, as well as that of *Syr cu* and *a f q*, while the *āπιστε* of *Syr S Lucifer* (introduced into their amplified clause by *a q*), and supported by *c ff₂ i l r* also pushes the reading back far. Why then do the Greeks shew no variation?

Excellent as is the *Gothic* version, I do not think we have among our Greek MSS the recension upon which it was based. I expect to cite other examples elsewhere to shew this.

In other words the *Gothic* was based on a Greek document or documents which partook of a very early Graeco-Syriac-Latin stem.

H. C. HOSKIER.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

MR HOSKIER asks me where I got my facts about Codex Claromontanus (Vat. Lat. 7223), known as *h* of St Matthew. I am extremely interested to hear that it was written in Ireland by an Irishman, and I am sure that all readers of this JOURNAL will be grateful if Mr Hoskier will