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 ἄπιστε 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 ἄπιστε δοῦλε is the antithesis of St Luke's εὖ δοῦλε πιστέ, just as *infidelis serve et male* is the antithesis of St Matthew's εὖ δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, but St Matthew does not say *infidelis serve et male*, but πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρέ 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 ὀκνηρέ in any way except as to the order of πονηρὲ δοῦλε or δοῦλε πονηρέ, all having the addition καὶ ὀκνηρέ, and none καὶ ἄπιστε.

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 ἄπιστε 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

publish the colophon or note which establishes this important fact. My own knowledge of *h* is derived from a somewhat hasty examination, during which I was chiefly anxious to test the general accuracy of Belsheim's edition of Matthew, and to make sure that it did not belong originally to the rest of the volume. This indeed is clear ; Matthew is written in quite a different hand, and a blank page (now *fol.* 66 b) separates it from Mk, Lk, Joh. I confess I did not go through this later portion, and so the evidence for its place of writing and the name of the scribe escaped me. The text, as Mr Hoskier says, is Vulgate, but is it really very much akin to Wordsworth's Z ? Does it not read *quippini* in Lk. xi 28, where Z has *quinimmo* ? Does it not have the shorter form of the Lord's Prayer in Luke xi 2–4, while Z adds, ' Thy Will be done', and other things besides ? I would not quibble at a word, but Mr Hoskier has such a well-deserved reputation for minute accuracy in textual matters, and he is so severe on the lapses of other people, that his statement might very well be understood to imply a higher degree of similarity between Z and the Vulgate portion of Cod. Claromontanus than I imagine to exist.

I take this opportunity of making a few remarks on Mr Hoskier's Note about the Gothic version of Lk xix 22. Certain texts, including the Gothic and *f,* add the equivalent of καὶ ὀκνηρέ (from Matt. xxv 26) in Lk. xix 22, where the Greek MSS have only πονηρὲ δοῦλε. Some Old Latin texts (but not *f* or the Gothic) have the equivalent of ἄπιστε instead of πονηρέ or ὀκνηρέ. Here therefore *f* and the Gothic are in close agreement against the Greek on the one hand and genuine Old Latin texts on the other : the only difference is that the Gothic has ' bad slave and lazy ',[1] where *f* has *serue nequa et piger.*

That the introduction of *infidelis* in this passage is very ancient is proved by its occurrence in the ' Old Syriac', and even in the Arabic Diatessaron, as well as most of the MSS of the Old Latin. But I fail to see the cogency of the evidence for the antiquity of the special feature of *f* and the Gothic, viz. the insertion of ' and lazy'. That it is found in the Arabic Diatessaron is one of the indications that in Tatian's Harmony certain incidents and sayings now separated in the Arabic were once welded together into one—though I do not suppose that Mr Hoskier would admit this.

Mr Buchanan has taught us that *b* in Lk. xix 22 reads *o infidelis serue* (with *c ff l*), not *crudelis serue.*[2]

A more important matter is the evidence of Lucifer. Lucifer's works are preserved only in a single ninth-century MS, but happily the text does not appear to have been contaminated from the Vulgate by copyists, and as Lucifer's general method appears to have been to open his Bible

[1] For *unsels = πονηρόσ*, see Matt vi 23.   [2] *Journal of Theol. Studies* x 122.

and go on transcribing passage after passage, only dropping a few sentences or paragraphs here and there, his longer quotations are practically equivalent to extracts from a Latin codex of the fourth century. But Lucifer's shorter quotations, where we have no particular reason to think he had his book open before him, are no better than those of other writers who trust to their memory. In this instance he says (*Hartel* 248 last words, 249): 'Quem me uis inueniri? illumne seruum qui acceperat unum talentum . . . meruit ,etiam ipsum talentum amittere et audire *serue nequam et piger*, an illum qui acceptam quantitatem decies multiplicatam repraesentauerit cuique fuerit dictum *euge serue bone et fidelis, quia in modico fuisti fidelis et in plurimis te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui*? sed istud unde audire potero, si te metuens quae tibi fuerint placita fecero?

'Intuere in Euangelio quid nos facere uoluerit Dominus et desine nos dicere adrogantes : *Homo quidam erat diues*. . . .'

[Here follows Lk. xix 12–27 in full, in surprising general agreement with *b*.[1]]

The long quotation is, as we should expect, very accurate : no doubt Lucifer was copying from a book. But the shorter quotations at the beginning are not so accurate : it is difficult to say whether the second one is meant for Matt. xxv 21, as Hartel thinks, or for Lk. xix 17. Not to tabulate minor points, *quia in modico fuisti fidelis* comes from St Luke, but *in plurimis te constituam* comes from St Matthew. Surely the explanation is simple enough : Lucifer does not open his book till he comes to '*Intuere in Euangelio*', and both the previous quotations are from memory. When, therefore, we find that *serue nequam et piger* is actually the reading of *a ff h*, &c., in Matt. xxv 26, it does not seem a very bold conjecture that these words in Lucifer have nothing to do with his text of Lk. xix 22, but are simply a reminiscence of the parallel words in Matthew.

In conclusion I must add that neither I nor any one else ever supposed that the 'Western' element in the Gothic is confined to what is to be found in *f*: the well-known interpolation in Lk. i 3 is an instance of a Western reading in the Gothic not shared by *f*. The point I have been concerned to maintain is that the peculiar element in *f* which is neither Old-Latin nor Vulgate is akin to the Gothic, and appears to be derived from it. In other words, the type of Latin text called by Westcott and Hort 'Italian', as distinguished from 'European' or 'Vulgate', is not a direct ancestor of the Vulgate text, but a peculiar by-product, a result of various Gothic invasions of North Italy.

<div align="right">F. C. BURKITT.</div>

[1] e. g. in *ver.* 18 both *b* and Lucifer have *mna tua fecit quinque talenta* : a good deal !