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 eternus deus supplices deprecamur ut misericordiam tuam iugiter nobis concedas sufficienter mensium [cur]sus et fructuum omnium . . . quoque substantiam ab[en]dantem, arborum fetus, proventus omnium rerum adque ab his omnibus prestief[erum (sic)] fidus (for sidus) tempestatis universas procellas et grandinis amovere digneris, per.


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

Te deprecamur . . . diversis.

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, 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 signalizes 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:

μαρτ πορευθέντος ἐκλήρυζεν, Ἀπειθήσασι ποτε, 20

My copy reads:

πορευθέντος ἐκλήρυζεν, 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:—

ὅτε ἄπαξ ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθύ—

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,
copy, stands, sure enough, at Heb. ix 12, εὑρόμενος. The change from εὑρόμενος is abundantly evidenced by the fact that ρ as well as o 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 a. 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 “straes”, 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:——

Gothic: unselja skalk jah lata
a: infidelis serve et male
f: serve nequa et piger
q: 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 f f 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’); r: ‘serve infidelis’; d: ‘serve inique’; and s merely ‘homo’; [r is wanting, and Durmack 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 ἄπιστος δοῦλος, with Syr S and five Latins, as above; while all Greeks, with Coptic, write

1 Tischendorf goes wrong about this Lucifer quotation.
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 _ἀπιστε_ 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_ _ff_ _i_ _l_ _Syr_ _Sarm_) is noticeable. Of course _ἀπιστε_ _δούλε_ is the antithesis of St Luke's _εὐ δούλε πιστέ_, just as _infidelis serve et male_ is the antithesis of St Matthew's _εὐ δούλε ἄγαθε καὶ πιστέ_, but St Matthew does not say _infidelis serve et male_, but _πονηρε_ _δούλε καὶ ὁκνηρέ_ 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 Sarm_ 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 Sarm_ and Lucifer simply 'faithless slave' in Luke. _Syr Sarm_ 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 Sarm_ badly mutilated in xxv 21/26 with 'and lazy' illegible in verse 26.

Neither Greeks nor other authorities vary here in Matthew from _πονηρε_ _δούλε καὶ ὁκνηρέ_ in any way except as to the order of _πονηρε_ _δούλε_ or _δούλε πονηρε_, all having the addition _καὶ ὁκνηρέ_, and none _καὶ ἀπιστε_.

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 _ἀπιστε_ of _Syr Sarm_ Lucifer (introduced into _their_ amplified clause by _a_ _q_), and supported by _c_ _ff_ _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 _k_ 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