

A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek m.p.th.f.67

Houghton, H.A.G.

DOI:
[10.1093/jts/flp030](https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/flp030)

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Houghton, HAG 2009, 'A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek m.p.th.f.67', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/flp030>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

A Newly-Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f.67

H.A.G. Houghton (H.A.G.Houghton@bham.ac.uk)

Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing, University of Birmingham

Abstract

Several Latin manuscripts of the Gospels are described as 'mixed texts', which combine Old Latin and Vulgate readings. Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f.67, a ninth-century gospel book possibly of Breton origin, has been called a 'mixed text' although it has not hitherto featured in the list of Old Latin manuscripts published by the Institut Vetus Latina. A full collation of the text of John reveals that in two portions (John 1:1-5:40 and John 12:34-13:10) it may be categorised as Old Latin. Many non-Vulgate readings in these passages are shared with other Old Latin codices (notably Codex Rehdigeranus), while other variants peculiar to this manuscript correspond to citations by Augustine and Jerome. It is also one of the very few Latin witnesses to an additional phrase in John 8:9. Although the Synoptic Gospels have not been collated, they too have a partial Old Latin affiliation, which is particularly extensive in Matthew. As a result of this study, this manuscript has now been given the number Vetusta Latina 11A.

In his definitive survey of the Latin translations of the New Testament, Bonifatius Fischer, founder of the Institut Vetus Latina in Beuron, observes that the Old Latin tradition is characterised only by its dissimilarity from the Vulgate.¹ Most, if not all, surviving manuscripts postdate the revision of the Gospels made by Jerome in the late fourth century. Apart from ordering them in the sequence found in Greek manuscripts and introducing the Eusebian canons, Jerome notes that he restricted his alterations to corrections in order not to introduce too many discrepancies from texts already in circulation.² Nonetheless, despite the ascendancy achieved by this revision, later known as the Vulgate, earlier versions continued to be copied in whole or part for several centuries. During this period, the Vulgate was itself subject to several revisions, such as those of Cassiodorus in the sixth century and Alcuin and Theodulf around the beginning of the ninth century. Given that Jerome did not produce a new translation but revised an existing one, the textual tradition of the Latin Gospels is better described as a continuum rather than discrete epochs. For example, on the basis of the translation of

¹ 'Im Neuen Testament bedeutet der Name [Vetus Latina] heute nur eine Abgrenzung gegenüber der Vulgata' (Bonifatius Fischer, 'Das Neue Testament in lateinische Sprache' in K. Aland (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ANTF 5), Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 1972, p. 4; reprinted in Bonifatius Fischer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltexte* (AGLB 12), Freiburg: Herder, 1986).

² *Quae ne multum a lectionis latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo imperauimus ut, his tantum quae sensum uidebantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant.* Jerome, Letter to Damasus, printed as the preface to the Gospels in R. Weber, R. Gryson et al., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (fifth edition). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, pp. 1515-16. This edition is taken as the standard for the text of the Vulgate in this article.

certain Greek words, Philip Burton divides the Old Latin manuscripts of John into two groups, the second of which provided Jerome's text-type for the Vulgate.³

The most recent list published by the Institut Vetus Latina identifies forty-nine manuscripts which may be considered Old Latin witnesses in the Gospels.⁴ Some of these have a distinctive character throughout, while others only differ from the Vulgate in a few chapters or verses. The latter are usually described as 'mixed texts', resulting from the contamination of Vulgate texts with Old Latin forms (or vice versa). The superficial introduction of variant readings may have been due to a copyist's familiarity with a different version, perhaps mediated through the liturgy or patristic writings. More substantial Old Latin portions are likely to represent 'block mixture', when certain passages were transcribed from a fragmentary older version and gaps were filled in from a manuscript with a different textual affiliation when the other was illegible or lacunose. In his survey mentioned above, Fischer names thirty-two 'mixed texts', nine of which also appear in the current Vetus Latina manuscript list.⁵ One of the others is the subject of this article, a parchment codex now in Würzburg University Library with the classmark M.p.th.f.67.

A full description of this manuscript may be found in the modern library catalogue, and it also features in Bischoff and Hoffman's study of the Würzburg scriptorium and cathedral library.⁶ It consists of the four Gospels in the order Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, breaking off at the end of folio 192v in the middle of John 18:35. The whole manuscript is written in the same hand, described as uncial with some insular features. There are two columns to the page and twenty lines to each column. On the basis of the ornamentation and the unusual division of words between lines, the latter similar to the mixed-text Codex Gatianus (Vetus Latina 30), Bischoff and Hofmann tentatively suggest that it was copied in Brittany. The date is given as the eighth or ninth century, with insular and carolingian corrections from the ninth century; the manuscript was rebound in the second half of the ninth century with ivory covers characteristic of the

³ P. H. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels. A Study of their Texts and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 62-74.

⁴ Roger Gryson (ed.), *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscrits vieux latins. Répertoire descriptif. Mss 1-275*. (Vetus Latina 1/2A). Freiburg: Herder, 1999. The manuscripts are numbered 1-49, and this system will be used in the current article.

⁵ Fischer, 'Das Neue Testament', pp. 37-9. The nine Old Latin codices he mentions are 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 28, 29, 30, 35; Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, ad loc., indicates that witnesses 12, 27, 33, 34, 36, 47 and 48 are also partially Vulgate.

⁶ Hans Thurn, *Die Pergamenthandschriften der ehemaligen Dombibliothek* (Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg, Bd. 3, Hälfte 1), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984, pp. 52-4. This is also available online as digital images at <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/kataloge/HSK0085.htm> (last accessed 18.2.08). Bernhard Bischoff and Josef Hofmann, *Libri sancti Kyliani: die Würzburger Schreibschule und die Dombibliothek im VIII. und IX. Jahrhundert*, Würzburg; F. Schöningh, 1952, especially p. 109. The manuscript is number 1422 in E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores, Part IX: Germany: Maria Laach-Würzburg*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

region of Alemannia (southern Germany).⁷ In his survey of Irish and Breton gospel books, Patrick McGurk draws attention to the fact that this is 'the only uncial book to have survived from the Celtic world'.⁸

Apart from the sequence of the Gospels, the codex displays few characteristics of Vulgate manuscripts. The text is continuous rather than divided into sense lines. Jerome's Letter to Damasus is missing and only Mark is preceded by a prologue. Neither the initial tables of Eusebian canons nor the concordance numbers in the margins of the text are present. There are no lists of *capitula*. Although divisions of text are indicated by capital letters, only six chapter numbers are found in the entire manuscript, at John 3:1 (marked as *vi*), 3:22 (*vii*), 4:1 (*viii*), 4:6 (*viii*), 4:43 (*x*) and 5:1 (*xi*). Two of these, *vii* and *xi*, appear in the body of the text, while the others are added in the left-hand margin. As they occur in one of the portions which is identified below as Old Latin, it is interesting that these numbers correspond to those in Vetus Latina 6 and 8 (Codices Colbertinus and Corbeiensis).

Fischer's description of the manuscript as a 'mixed text' appears to have derived from a brief study by Georg Schepss, concentrating on verses in which additional lines are found in the Old Latin tradition.⁹ Most of these are not present in this witness, with the exception of the insertion *uos autem ... cum introieritis ... utilius* in Matthew 20:28. Schepss only considers five readings in John: *dicitur* in John 5:2; *paraliticorum spectantium* in John 5:3; the omission of John 5:4; the absence of *quidam* from John 5:5; *sequenti autem die* in John 12:12. Fischer's own subsequent pioneering collation by computer of test passages in over four hundred Latin gospel manuscripts dating from the first millennium provides far more evidence.¹⁰ Only the printed apparatus for each Gospel was published, a masterpiece of compression even though its format can be off-putting to the uninitiated. The projected volumes of analysis and evaluation never

⁷ Bischoff & Hofmann, *Libri sancti Kyliani*, pp. 12, 109. The distinctive feature of the word division is the separation of a single letter from the rest of the word; for example, on fol. 156r alone we find *l-ux*, *era-t*, *su-i* and *n-obis*. Folio 1r contains an extract from Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*, itself of textual interest; the Gospels begin on folio 3r (Thurn, *Die Pergamenthandschriften*, p. 53).

⁸ Patrick McGurk, 'The Gospel Book in Celtic Lands before AD850: Contents and Arrangement' in P. Ní Chatháin & M. Richter (eds), *Ireland and Christendom: The Bible and the Missions*, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987, p. 176 (reprinted in P. McGurk, *Gospel Books and Early Latin Manuscripts* (Variorum Collected Studies 606), Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998).

⁹ Georg Schepss, *Die ältesten Evangelienhandschriften der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek*, Würzburg: A. Stuber, 1887, 22-26. Fischer's dependence on Schepss is signalled in *Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Großen*, in *Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (ed. W. Braunsfels et al.), Band 2. *Das geistige Leben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff, Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1965, p. 175 (reprinted in Bonifatius Fischer, *Lateinischer Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter* (AGLB 11), Freiburg: Herder, 1985). Similarly, McGurk's comment that 'its extensive Old Latin readings come as no surprise' ('The Gospel Book', p. 176) is based on Fischer and Schepss.

¹⁰ Bonifatius Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*. (4 vols) (AGLB 13, 15, 17, 18). Freiburg: Herder, 1988-1991.

appeared, which is probably another reason why this masterly achievement remains relatively neglected.¹¹

The siglum given by Fischer to this manuscript is **Bw**, which will be used in the rest of this article. In the three test passages of John for which Bw is extant, Fischer's collation indicates that it contains a number of readings which are otherwise found only in Old Latin witnesses:¹²

- 3:2 *quae tu facis*] omitted 11, Bw
- 3:7 *non mireris*] *nec fueris miratus* 33, Bw
- 3:11 *testamur*] *testimonium perhibemus* 11, Bw¹³
- 3:13 *nisi qui*] *nisi is qui* 8, 11, Bw
- 3:22 *uenit*] *exiit* 3?, 11, Bw; *exiuit* 5
- 3:31 *supra omnes est*] omitted 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 22, 33, Bw
- 7:46 *homo*] *ullus homo* Bw; cf. *ullus hominum* 10
- 7:50 *dicit*] *dixit autem* 10, Bw
- 12:34 *iste*] *hic* 3, 5, 8, 11, Bw
- 12:35 *dixit*] *ait* 2, 3, Bw
- 12:35 *eis*] *illis* 2, 5, Bw
- 12:35 *lucem habetis*] *habetis lucem* Bw; cf. *habetis lumen* 5
- 12:41 *quando uidit*] *quia uidit* 2, Bw
- 12:43 *dilexerunt*] *amauerunt* 2, 3, 11, 13, 14?, Bw
- 12:43 *magis*] *potius* 11, Bw
- 12:48 *iudicabit*] *iudicat* 5, Bw
- 12:48 *in*] omitted 2, 3, 4, 11, Bw
- 13:1 *cum dilexisset*] *cum diligeret* 11, Bw¹⁴
- 13:2 *cena facta*] *cum cena fieret* Bw; cf. *cum fieret cena* 14?, *cum cena fieretur* 5
- 13:2 *cum*] *quando* 14?, Bw
- 13:2 *misisset*] *miserat se* 14, Bw
- 13:3 *ei*] *illi* 2, 3?, 5, 13, Bw
- 13:4 *a cena*] *de cena* 5, 13, 10, Bw
- 13:6 *ei*] *illi* 2, 3?, 4, Bw

There are many more variants which are shared by a handful of other manuscripts in addition to Bw and at least one Old Latin witness. The fact that the list above includes not just changes of tense, omissions and differences in words such as prepositions and pronouns, but also several alternative renderings typical of Old Latin versions (*testimonium perhibere* for *testari*, *ait* for *dixit* and *amare* for *diligere*) suggests that Bw has some affiliation to the Old Latin tradition.

In connection with the preparation of a new edition of the *Vetus Latina Iohannes*, I therefore made a fresh collation of the whole Gospel from digitised microfilm in order

¹¹ See further the review of the apparatus of John by J. K. Elliott, *JTS* 43.2 (1992) 633-5.

¹² The following information has been extracted from Fischer, *Die lateinische Evangelien IV*, and reproduced in an adjusted form, using the *Vetus Latina* numbering system. The initial reading is the text of the Weber-Gryson Vulgate. Fischer's four test passages in John are 2:18-3:31, 7:28-8:16, 12:17-13:6, 20:1-21:4.

¹³ The exact reading of Bw is *testimonium perhibimus*.

¹⁴ The exact reading of Bw is *cum dilegeret*.

to determine the nature of its text. Outside the test passages analysed by Fischer, the readings of Bw can at present only be easily compared with manuscripts reported in critical editions: the Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland edition of the principal Old Latin manuscripts of John and the Weber-Gryson Vulgate.¹⁵ The relationship of Bw to the Vulgate may be plotted according to a list of 306 'distinctive Vulgate readings', which I originally assembled to assess the character of Augustine's citations in his *Tractatus in Iohannis Euangelium*. It consists of 85 readings which, according to Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland, appear only in the Vulgate and none of the Old Latin manuscripts in their edition, and 221 readings which are peculiar to the Vulgate and one Old Latin manuscript.¹⁶ This method only gives a general impression: some of the overlaps between the Vulgate and earlier manuscripts are probably fortuitous, while other readings shared with more than one manuscript could still have been introduced by Jerome. Furthermore, the variants are not equally distributed, nor of similar weight: minor changes in word order or tense are likely to be less important than different renderings and additions or omissions. The table below, however, shows the principal divisions which emerge from the analysis.

	Total 'distinctive Vulgate readings'	Bw agrees with Vulgate	Bw disagrees with Vulgate
John 1:1-5:40	27	6 (22%)	21 (78%)
John 5:41-12:33	139	121 (87%)	18 (13%)
John 12:34-13:10	7	0	7 (100%)
John 13:10-18:35	65	56 (86%)	9 (14%)
Total	238	183 (77%)	55 (23%)

Even though the overall percentage agreement of 77% with these 'distinctive Vulgate readings' would characterise Bw as a Vulgate witness, in two sections of the manuscript the proportions are reversed: John 1:1-5:40, and John 12:34-13:10. Both have considerably fewer points of variation and so are statistically less significant, but the pattern is consistent with the phenomenon of 'block mixture'. Indeed, in these passages Bw does not agree with any reading unique to the Vulgate: all six 'distinctive readings' are also present in one Old Latin manuscript, and three simply involve reversing the position of two words. There is, however, no obvious physical indication of a change of exemplar at the divisions mentioned above, and continuing agreements with Old Latin witnesses against the Vulgate mean that it is difficult to state precisely if and when the copyist changed source when writing this manuscript.

Comparison with the Vulgate alone does not reveal the agreements between Bw and manuscripts which have already been identified as Old Latin. These emerge clearly in

¹⁵ Walter Matzkow, Adolf Jülicher and Kurt Aland (eds), *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinische Überlieferung. IV. Johannes-Evangelium*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1963. The fuller range of electronic transcriptions available on the website <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina> was still in preparation at the time of writing.

¹⁶ The full list of readings may be found in H.A.G. Houghton, 'Augustine's Citations and Text of the Gospel according to John' Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Birmingham, 2006, 224-31. The text of the Vulgate has been conformed to Weber-Gryson, rather than Wordsworth-White (as used by Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland).

the opening verses of the Gospel, despite the fact that this is one of the least diverse passages in the Latin biblical tradition.¹⁷

- 1:3 *per ipsum*] *per illum* [3], 8, Bw
- 1:3 *sine ipso*] *sine illo* 3, 8, 13, Bw
- 1:4 *erat* (1)] *est* 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, Bw
- 1:6 *iohannes*] *iohannis* 2, 4, Bw
- 1:7 *et testimonium*] *ut testimonium* Bw
- 1:7 *crederent per illum*] *per illum credant* Bw
- 1:9 *erat*] *erat enim* 4, 15, Bw
- 1:9 *mundum*] *hunc mundum* 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, Bw
- 1:11 *in*] *in sua* 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, Bw
- 1:11 *receperunt*] *reciperunt* Bw
- 1:12 *autem*] omitted 2, Bw
- 1:12 *receperunt*] *acceperunt* Bw
- 1:13 *ex uoluntate uiri*] *uoluntate uiri* Bw
- 1:14 *habitauit*] *inhabitauit* 3, Bw
- 1:14 *gloriam eius gloriam*] *claritatem* Bw
- 1:15 *perhibet*] *perhibuit* Bw
- 1:15 *de ipso*] *per ipsum* Bw
- 1:15 *uobis*] omitted 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, Bw
- 1:15 *uenturus est*] *uenit* 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, Bw
- 1:15 *quia*] *qui* Bw
- 1:15 *erat*] *fuit* 13, Bw
- 1:16 *et de plenitudine*] *quia de plenitudine* 3, Bw
- 1:17 *gratia*] *gratia autem* 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 22, Bw

There are six 'distinctive Vulgate readings' in these verses, only one of which is found in Bw (*gratiae autem et ueritatis* in John 1:14, shared by Codex Monacensis and the Vulgate). In the other five, Bw agrees with the majority of the Old Latin tradition, comprising six or more manuscripts. More interesting are agreements with one or two manuscripts, although there is no pattern of correspondence here with any one witness. Some of these are readings otherwise known only from the oldest surviving manuscripts, including Codex Palatinus (omission of *autem* from 1:12) and Codex Vercellensis (*inhabitauit* in 1:14 and *quia* in 1:16). Seven of the twenty-three variants (almost one third) are not paralleled in any Old Latin witness. While some may be copying errors (e.g. *ut* for *et*, omission of *ex*, *qui* for *quia*), others are more substantial. *Per illum credant* in John 1:7 combines a word order peculiar to Bw with a tense only paralleled in Codex Vercellensis (*credant*). *Claritatem* in John 1:14 is a rendering of τὴν δόξαν present elsewhere in Latin manuscripts (e.g. John 5:41, 7:18) but not otherwise in this verse. (The omission of the following two words is typical of Bw, which features a large number of skips between identical words.) The importance of unique variants which do not correspond to known Greek texts (e.g. *perhibuit* in 1:15) is debatable; conversely, Bw alone has a distinction which corresponds to παρέλαβον ...

¹⁷ In the following table, the initial reading is the Weber-Gryson Vulgate, while Old Latin manuscripts have been taken from Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland. All Bw's variations from the Vulgate in John 1:1-17 are listed apart from orthographic differences.

ἐλαβον in John 1:11-12 (*reciperunt ... acceperunt*). Whatever its source, there can be no doubt that Bw has an Old Latin text for these verses.

Over the next few chapters, there is a marked resemblance between Bw and Codex Rehdigeranus (Vetus Latina 11), which is only extant from John 1:16.¹⁸ In John 1-5, the majority of non-Vulgate readings in Bw are paralleled by Codex Rehdigeranus, and for eighteen of these the latter offers the only example in Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland: among the more noteworthy are the addition of *dic nobis* in 1:22, the rendering *testimonium perhibemus* in 3:11 and *salus* rather than *saluator* in 4:42.¹⁹ Of course, the two witnesses are by no means identical, and there are numerous occasions in the first five chapters when Bw has a different rendering.²⁰ Nonetheless, the agreements shared by Bw with Codex Rehdigeranus (and other manuscripts) are significant. Most striking is the reference at John 2:3 to the number of guests, where Bw reads *et factum est propter multitudinem turbae uocatorum uinum consummari*. This is only present in Codices Palatinus and Rehdigeranus, which share a slightly different rendering. Codex Rehdigeranus is also one of the Old Latin witnesses which, like Bw and the Vulgate, omit John 5:4. On a smaller scale, Bw repeats the question *quid ergo?* at John 1:21 (as do Vetus Latina 3, 4, 6, 11 and 15), while in 2:9, the addition of *autem* is peculiar to Codices Palatinus, Veronensis, Rehdigeranus and Bw. The additional *dico enim uobis* at the beginning of 3:13 corresponds to Codices Rehdigeranus and Aureus,²¹ while *exiit* in

¹⁸ McGurk's choice of Codex Rehdigeranus as a comparison for the format of Bw ('The Gospel Book', p. 176) appears to be a happy coincidence.

¹⁹ Several of these have already been seen above in Fischer's test passages. The full list in the first five chapters is: John 1:22 (*ergo quis es* and addition of *dic nobis*), 1:25 (omission of *et dixerunt ei*), 1:46 (omission of *ei*), 1:48 (*fici arbore*), 2:12 (*hunc signum*), 3:2 (omission of *quae tu facis*), 3:11 (*testimonium perhibemus*), 3:36 (addition of *enim*), 4:10 (addition of initial *et*), 4:12 (addition of *ipse*), 4:20 (*adorant*), 4:42 (*salus*), 5:10 (*dicebant autem*), 5:14 (addition of initial *et*), 5:18 (word order *interficere iudaei*), 5:22 (*iudicio*), 5:24 (addition of *is*).

²⁰ The following list of renderings does not include compound verbs where the root is the same, nor differences such as word order, tense and the addition or omission of material: John 1:38 (*manes* 11, *habitas* Bw), 1:44 (*incipiebat* 11, *uoluit* Bw), 1:51 (*ad* 11, *supra* Bw), 2:3 (*multam* 11, *multitudine* Bw), 2:10 (*hanc horam* 11, *adhuc* Bw), 2:15 (*funiculis* 11, *sparto* Bw), 2:20 (*aedificabis* 11, *excitabis* Bw), 3:4 (*denuo* 11, *iterato* Bw), 3:7 (*mireris* 11, *fueris miratus* Bw), 3:36 (*non credit* 11, *incredulus est* Bw), 4:1 (*magis* 11, *plures* Bw), 4:5 (*agrum* 11, *praedium* Bw), 4:6 (*puteus* 11, *fons* Bw; *fere* 11, *quasi* Bw), 4:9 (*petis* 11, *poscis* Bw; *communicant* 11, *coiguntur* Bw), 4:10 (*magis* 11, *forsitan* Bw), 4:11 (*hauritorium* 11, *in quo haurias* Bw), 4:32 (*escam* 11, *cibum* Bw), 4:33 (*ad alterutrum* 11, *in semetipsos* Bw), 4:34 (*esca* 11, *cibus* Bw), 4:35 (*inter* 11, *adhuc* Bw), 4:37 (*serit* 11, *seminat* Bw), 4:39 (*quaecumque* 11, *quae* Bw), 4:40 (*biduo* 11, *duos dies* Bw), 4:42 (*propter* 11, *per* Bw; *testimonium* 11, *loquellam* Bw), 4:52 (*autem* 11, *ergo* Bw; *hesterna die* 11, *here* Bw; *dimisit* 11, *reliquid* Bw), 5:3 (*iacebat* 11, *decumbebat* Bw), 5:6 (*iacentem* 11, *recumbentem* Bw; *copiosum* 11, *multum* Bw; *haberet* 11, *fecit* Bw), 5:7 (*infirmus* 11, *languens* Bw), 5:13 (*languidus fuerat* 11, *languerat* Bw), 5:14 (*fiat* 11, *contingat* Bw), 5:17 (*adhuc* 11, *modo* Bw), 5:29 (*prodient* 11, *procedent* Bw; *gesserunt* 11, *fecerunt* Bw; *iniqua* 11, *mala* Bw; *gesserunt* 11, *egerunt* Bw), 5:35 (*lumine* 11, *lucem* Bw), 5:37 (*figiem* 11, *speciem* Bw), 5:38 (*quia* 11, *quoniam* Bw), 5:41 (*honorem* 11, *claritatem* Bw).

²¹ In fact, this phrase is found in thirteen other Latin manuscripts in Fischer's collation, which reveals the limitations of the other published editions (Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien IV*, p. 77); it does not appear to be present in the Greek tradition.

3:22 is only paralleled by Codices Vercellensis, Bezae and Rehdigeranus.²² All witnesses have *expectantium* in 5:3 except Codices Vercellensis and Rehdigeranus, and Bw, with *spectantium*. In 5:10, the reference to the man who was cured is missing from four Old Latin manuscripts (2, 11, 13, 14) and Bw.

Many of the readings which Bw shares with Codex Rehdigeranus are also consistently present in Codex Corbeiensis (Vetus Latina 8), as well as a varying number of other Old Latin witnesses. Among the more distinctive variants found only in these three manuscripts, we may note *de quo dicebam*, *quoniam* and the addition of *uir* in John 1:27, the absence of *autem* in 3:18, the rendering *testimonium perhibet* in 3:32 (cf. 11 and Bw in 3:11), *ipsorum* in 4:38, the addition of *in languore* in 5:6 (Bw actually reads *in longore*), *ille homo* in 5:9, and the additions *aeternam* in 5:24 and *ipsi* in 5:33. Several additions are unique to these manuscripts, Codex Aureus (Vetus Latina 15) and Bw: *proficiscens* in 1:43, *propterea* in 1:50, *uero* in 2:10, *homo* by itself in 3:4 and *dei* in 3:19. Still more are paralleled in other manuscripts: *nisi* in 1:18 (2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 14, Bw), *quidem* in 1:26 (4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, Bw), *fili* in 2:3 (2, 4, 8, 11, Bw), *uocatis ministris* in 2:7 (2, 8, 11, 22, Bw), *et fecerunt sicut dixit eis* rather than *tulerunt* in 2:8 (2, 8, 11, 15, Bw), *enim* in 3:33 (2, 8, 10, 11, Bw), *terram* in 4:3 (2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, Bw), *ergo* in 4:30 (2, 8, 10, 11, Bw), *autem* in 4:42 and 4:46, *dicens* in 5:17 (2, 8, 11, 14, Bw), *enim* (2, 8, 11, Bw) and *patris* (2, 6, 8, 11, 14, Bw) in 5:30 and *ipso* in 5:31 (8, 11, 13, 22, Bw). Bw also includes both well-known additions in 3:6 (sometimes described as minor interpolations), *quia ex carne natum est* (Bw; cf. 2, 4, 8, 11, 14, 22) and *quia deus spiritus est* (3, 8, 15, 22, Bw; cf. 2, 14). Certain readings in Bw are only paralleled by Codex Corbeiensis, especially in passages not extant or omitted by the first hand in Codex Rehdigeranus.²³

More generally, Bw exhibits a number of readings in John 1-5 which are characteristic of the Old Latin tradition. In addition to those already listed, several others are worthy of mention. It is one of the few manuscripts with the well-known variant *hic est electus dei* in 1:34 (2, 8*; cf. 3, 4). In 1:29, Bw has the repeated *ecce* (absent from 2, 10, 13 and the Vulgate), while 1:47 begins *uidens autem*, in contrast to *uidit* in the Vulgate (and 6, 10, 13; cf. 2). Both 2:17 and 2:22 feature the rendering *rememorati* rather than *recordati*. In 3:28, *dixerim* appears in Vetus Latina 6, 10 and the Vulgate, but *dixi* in Bw, along with all other Old Latin witnesses.²⁴ Although Bw initially has *fons* in 4:6, it shifts to *puteus* for the second occurrence of πηγή, while in the following verse it reads *Samaritana* (with 3, 8, 11 and possibly 14). In 4:9 it has *cum sim* twice. Towards the end of John 4, several forms distinguish the majority of Old Latin manuscripts from the

²² Tischendorf records the reading ἀπὸ πλῆθους here in the Greek minuscule 33.

²³ Unique agreements between Bw and 8 in the first five chapters are found in John 1:31 (*non sciebam*, addition of *plebi*), 1:33, (addition of *de caelo*), 3:31 (addition of *autem*), 4:47 (*adueniret*), 5:6 (*facere* rather than *habere*), 5:7 (*languens*), 5:15 (*adnuntiauit*), 5:37 (omission of *de*). Attention is also drawn to those present in 8 and one other manuscript (other than 11), such as *electus dei* (John 1:34; 2, 8, Bw), *erant* (John 1:40; 3, 8, Bw), addition of *autem* (John 1:43; 8, 15, Bw), addition of *qui est* (John 1:45; 8, 22, Bw), *quod audiuit* (John 3:32; 3, 8, Bw), omission of *eum* (John 4:24; 5, 8, Bw), *ille homo* (John 4:50; 8, 15, Bw) and *resurrectione* (John 5:29; 2, 8, Bw).

²⁴ Fischer, *Die lateinische Evangelien IV*, p. 135, shows that this reading distinguishes Old Latin witnesses from other manuscripts.

Vulgate: *ueritatis* not *uerum* in 4:37, *fecit* not *fecerat* in 4:45, *uenit* not *abiit* in 4:47, and, strikingly, *puer* rather than *filius meus* in 4:49. In each case, Bw is found among the Old Latin witnesses. Similar characteristics are evident in the textually-contested John 5:2-3, for which Bw reads:

est au(tem) in hierusolimis natatoria piscina q(uae) dicitur hebreice bedzetha u porticos habens in his decumbebat multitudo languentium c(a)ecorum claudorum aridorum paraliticorum spectantium(m) aq(uae) motu(m).

The presence of *dicitur* and *natatoria* rather than *cognominatur* and *probatica* in 5:2, as well as the absence of *magna* and presence of *paraliticorum* in the next verse, indicates that the omission of 5:4 by Bw should be treated as an Old Latin rather than Vulgate reading.²⁵ *Decumbebat* in 5:3 is an Old Latin rendering of κατέκειτο, paralleled (more or less) by Vetus Latina 3, 4, 5 and 8; *recumbebat* is found in Codex Palatinus, and *iacebat* in the Vulgate and other manuscripts. It is therefore interesting that, where all manuscripts apart from one read *iacentem* for κατακείμενον in 5:6, Bw joins Codex Sarzanensis (Vetus Latina 22) with the rendering *recumbentem*. A similar instance of consistency is found in John 1:48 and 1:50, where Bw reads *sub fici arbore* both times despite having the only occurrence of this in the latter verse.

Having documented extensively the Old Latin affiliation of Bw in John 1-5, we may consider readings peculiar to this manuscript. The majority are errors, usually of omission, or variants in spelling. Others, however, have a stronger claim to be Old Latin readings which have not been preserved in other codices, of which the following are the most significant:²⁶

- 1:7 *crederent per illum*] *per illum credant* Bw
- 1:12 *receperunt*] *acceperunt* Bw
- 1:14 *gloriam*] *claritatem* Bw
- 1:15 *perhibet*] *perhibuit* Bw
- 1:26 *stetit*] *est* Bw
- 1:33 *in aqua*] omitted Bw
- 1:36 *respiciens*] *respexit ... et* Bw
- 1:42 *iohanna*] *ionas* Bw
- 2:2 *uocatus est autem ibi et iesus*] *ubi uocatus est iesus* Bw
- 2:3 *per multam turbam* (only in 2, 11)] *propter multitudinem turbae* Bw
- 2:10 *tunc id*] *ibi* Bw
- 2:15 *funiculis*] *sparto* Bw
- 3:4 *cum senex sit*] *senex cum sit* Bw

²⁵ John 5:4 is omitted by 5, 8, 10, 11 and 13, as well as numerous Greek witnesses. Schepss, *Die ältesten Evangelienhandschriften*, p. 26, suggests that the omission of John 5:4 is due to the fact that the copyist had to turn the page in Bw at the end of John 5:3. Although this is possible, it is an unsatisfactory explanation: there is no other instance of such an omission in this manuscript in John, and the verses do not feature similar words (which have prompted the copyist to skip text elsewhere).

²⁶ The initial text (except where specified) is the Weber-Gryson Vulgate; comparison has been restricted to the manuscripts reported in Matzkow-Jülicher-Aland, and at least some of these readings may be preserved in other witnesses: for example, 33 also reads *fueris miratus* in John 3:7.

- 3:6 *de carne* (VL mss)] *ex carne* Bw
 3:7 *non mireris*] *nec fueris miratus* Bw
 3:13 *est in caelo*] *in caelo est* Bw
 3:24 *nondum*] *non* Bw
 4:6 *autem*] omitted Bw
 4:8 *enim*] omitted Bw
 4:9 *quomodo tu iudaeus cum sis*] *tu iudaeus cum sis quomodo* Bw
 4:9 *cum sim mulier* (VL mss)] *mulier cum sim* Bw
 4:9 *coutuntur*] *coiguntur* Bw
 4:11 *unde ergo habes aquam uiuam*] *unde mihi habes dare aquam uiuam* Bw
 4:23 *patrem*] omitted Bw
 4:31 *interea rogabant eum*] *interea autem interrogabant eum* Bw
 4:33 *ad inuicem*] *in semetipsos* Bw
 4:34 *uoluntatem eius*] *eius uoluntatem* Bw
 4:40 *ad illum*] omitted Bw
 4:50 *filius tuus uiuit*] *uiuit filius tuus* Bw
 5:6 *tempus habet*] *tempus fecit* Bw
 5:7 *alius ante me descendit*] *autem alius descendit* Bw
 5:13 *qui sanus fuerat effectus*] *qui languerat* Bw
 5:34 *haec dico*] *dico haec* Bw
 5:43 *si alius*] *si enim et alius* Bw

In addition to these, Bw has the addition of *dominus* before *Iesus* on three occasions (John 3:3, 3:10, 4:17), a reverential expansion which will be discussed later. Of the readings listed above, *claritatem* in 1:14 has already been identified as an alternative rendering of τὴν δόξαν, while *semetipsos* (4:33) probably derives from the Greek variant ἐν ἑαυτοῖς in Codex Bezae (cf. Vetus Latina 8, 13). In 4:9, *coiguntur* could be either a misreading of *coutuntur*, or a rendering of συγχρᾶσθαι using *cogere* in the sense 'live together'; similarly, *est* in 1:26 may be a misreading of the Old Latin *stat*.²⁷ Both Codices Rehdigeranus and Sarzanensis add *dare mihi* in 4:11, but at the end of the verse. An identical text to Bw's *unde mihi habes dare*, however, is found in two patristic citations: Ambrose, *De Abraham* 1.88 (cf. *De uirginitate* 123) and Augustine, *De diuersis quaestionibus* 64.5. The form of 4:31 in Bw is interesting, because in Codices Rehdigeranus and Corbeiensis *interea rogabant* has been corrected to *interrogabant*. *Tempus facere* for χρόνον ἔχειν in 5:6 is also used in Codex Corbeiensis, although that manuscript has the pluperfect *fecisset*. In 5:13, *languerat* stems from a Greek alternative underlying some other Old Latin witnesses. The most remarkable of these readings is *de sparto* in 2:15. This is clearly a rendering of ἐκ σχοινίου, but it is almost unique: the sole example of this in the Vetus Latina Database is a reference conflated with Matthew 21:12 in Chromatius of Aquileia, *Sermo* 4.1: *flagellum fecit quasi de sparto et eiecit eos omnes et cathedras uendentium euertit*.

The point at which Bw shifts to a Vulgate text-type is not entirely clear. The last agreement with Codices Rehdigeranus and Corbeiensis alone is the addition of *ipsi* in

²⁷ There is no instance of *coiguntur* in the Vetus Latina Database, but in John 1:26 Jerome, *Homilia* 3, reads *medius inter uos est quem uos ignoratis*.

John 5:33, although like *Vetus Latina* 4, 5, 14 and 22 it has *quoniam* rather than *quia* in 5:38. In 5:41, Bw reads *claritatem* with the Vulgate and Codex Colbertinus. It also agrees with *quod est* in 6:1, another 'distinctive Vulgate reading' with the same attestation. In the next verse, however, Bw has *turba multa* with *Vetus Latina* 3, 4 and 5 (cf. 10, 22) rather than the Vulgate *turba magna* (the adjective is omitted by 8 and 11). However, parallels between Old Latin manuscripts and Bw in non-Vulgate readings become much less frequent after this point: the next is *illos* for *eos* in 6:17 (cf. 3 and 5), followed by the word order *dabit uobis* in 6:27, shared with *Vetus Latina* 3, 4, 10, 11, 13 and 14, although this is hardly a major change. In contrast, Bw agrees with the first ten 'distinctive Vulgate readings' over these verses, several of which are major differences in rendering. It continues to deviate from the Vulgate elsewhere, but most of these are errors, usually of omission, or minor variations in word order. Thus *omnes* in 6:10 appears to be a misreading of *homines*, while in the next verse *cum fregisset* instead of *cum gratias egisset* has probably been suggested by the context. The unique verb in 6:21, *uenit* rather than *fuit*, could also be a lapse to the reading expected by the copyist.

Agreements with Old Latin witnesses from John 6 onwards are therefore likely to be coincidence. Nonetheless, there are some groups of correspondences, as in the tenses of verbs in John 6:54 (*habebitis*: most Old Latin manuscripts), 6:55 (*biberit*: 4; *habebit*: 4) and 6:57 (*biberit*: 8, 22), and a couple of conjunctions in 7:4 (*enim* rather than *quippe*) and 7:8 (addition of *autem*: 14) in addition to the unique reading *itaque* for *autem* in 7:3, a rendering of οὐν characteristic of early African translations.²⁸ *Semetipsos* in 7:35, another form peculiar to Bw, corresponds to the rendering noted above at John 4:33. Two agreements with Codex Brixianus (*Vetus Latina* 10), the addition of *ullus* in 7:46 and *autem* in 7:50, are present in these two manuscripts alone out of all those collated by Fischer.²⁹ Perhaps the most interesting reading in the whole Gospel is in John 8:9. Only two manuscripts in Fischer's collation have a phrase corresponding to the Greek variant ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων, one of which is Bw with *usque ad iuniorem*; Augustine is the sole Latin Church Father who cites this addition.³⁰ Another reading only paralleled in patristic sources is *antequam Abraham esset* in John 8:58; the verb, missing from some Greek witnesses, is included in the Vulgate and Codex Brixianus, which both read *fieret*. Jerome's one citation of this verse (*Explanatio in Esaiam* 2.4), however, also has *esset*.³¹

²⁸ See D. C. Parker, 'The Translation of OYN in the Old Latin Gospels' *NTS* 31 (1985) 252-276, especially pp. 255-7. Bw has two other renderings of οὐν which, although paralleled elsewhere, are not present at that point in the Old Latin tradition: *autem* in John 6:61 and *uero* in John 8:5.

²⁹ Fischer, *Die lateinische Evangelien IV*, pp. 224 and 232.

³⁰ The other manuscript is Codex Complutensis I, which reads *usque in ultimis* (Fischer, *Die lateinische Evangelien IV*, p. 270); for Augustine, who also uses the singular, see the commentary on this verse in H.A.G. Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John. Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

³¹ As this verse is not included in Fischer's test passages, it can only provisionally be described as unique. In addition to Jerome (where the reading has been verified in the latest edition, R. Gryson and P.-A. Deproost, *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe* (AGLB 23) Freiburg: Herder, 1993, p. 225), the *Vetus Latina* Database lists *esset* in several councils and translated works.

Around the beginning of John 9, Bw shares several non-Vulgate readings with Codex Palatinus: *iste* rather than *hic* in 9:2, *sput* for *expuit* in 9:4, the omission of *autem* and *quia* in 9:9, *Christus* for *Iesus* in 9:11, and the perfect tense *adduxerunt* in 9:13. Numerous other characteristic features of this manuscript are not present in Bw, but the parallels for these readings (some of which are present in other Old Latin witnesses as well) are notable. A further interesting feature in these verses is the correction of *manifestaretur* in 9:3 by a later hand to *manifestaretur*, the reading of Vetus Latina 5 and 13, rather than the Vulgate *manifestetur*. In 11:11, the Vulgate *dormit* has been corrected to *obdormit*, possibly by the first hand: this is an Old Latin form attested in Codices Vercellensis and Rehdigeranus. Other Old Latin parallels in these chapters involve compound verbs: *cognosco* in 10:15 (as in Vetus Latina 5 and 6), *deambulabat* in 10:23 (11, 14) and *suscitem* in 11:11 (4, 10, 14). In addition, Bw alone has *iniecerent* in 8:59 and *conprehendere* in 10:39. There is another cluster of Old Latin features at the beginning of John 11, with *quae* rather than *quaecumque* in 10:41, the present tense *infirmatur* in 11:6, the addition of *hunc* before *mundum* in 11:27 and the perfect tense *surrexit* in 11:29. Bw also has *quae* instead of *quaecumque* in 11:22, where there is no parallel for this common Old Latin rendering.

In John 12, Bw's affiliation switches back to the Old Latin tradition. There are several hints of this early in the chapter, such as *habebat et* rather than *habens* in 12:6, *sequenti autem die* instead of *in crastinum autem* in 12:12, *uadit* for *abiit* in 12:19 and the present tense *dicunt* in 12:22, but these co-exist with 'distinctive Vulgate readings' such as *egenis* in 12:5 and 12:6, the reported speech *eum fecisse hoc signum* in 12:18 and *eicietur* (*eiectetur* in Bw) rather than *mittetur* in 12:31. Between 12:34 and 13:10, none of the distinctive readings are found in Bw, while many of its variants are paralleled in Old Latin witnesses. Indeed, sixteen readings shared only with known Old Latin witnesses have already been listed above, as much of this section overlaps with Fischer's third test passage. Others, although present in a handful of additional manuscripts, are also characteristic of an Old Latin text, including *crediderunt* for *credebant* in 12:37, the addition of *autem* in 12:41, the imperfects *clamabat et dicebat* in 12:44, *hunc mundum* in 12:46, *ita* for *sic* in 12:50, the word order of 13:2, *surrexit ... et posuit* for *surgit ... et ponit* in 13:4, the addition of *sed* in 13:7, *tibi pedes* rather than *te* and *habebis* for *habes* in 13:8 and the addition of *semel* in 13:10. The second half of John 13:1 in Bw is clearly distinct from the Vulgate:

Bw: cu(m) dilegeret discipulos suos qui erant in hoc mudo³² usq(ue) in fine(m)
dix(it) eos

Vg: cum dilexisset suos qui erant in mundo in finem dilexit eos

Although *diligeret* is only found in Codex Rehdigeranus, six other manuscripts add *discipulos* (including 3, 4, 6, 15), while *hoc mundo* and *usque* appear in the majority of Old Latin witnesses.

³² Corrected to *mundo*, probably by a later hand. The penultimate word, *dix(it)*, has not been corrected.

Unlike the previous Old Latin section, in this passage Bw does not display a consistent similarity with another manuscript, but instead is remarkable for the number of unique readings. The most significant are as follows:

- 12:34 *oportet exaltari*] *exaltari oportet*
- 12:35 *modicum*] *modico tempore* (cf. *modicum tempus* in the Old Latin tradition)
- 12:35 *et qui*] *qui enim*
- 12:37 *eis*] *ipsis*
- 12:38 *impleretur*] *uerus esset*
- 12:39 *propterea*] *ideo*
- 12:39 *iterum dixit*] *praedixit*
- 12:40 *eorum cor*] *cor illorum*
- 12:40 *et intellegant*] *et ne intellegant* (cf. 2, 3, 5, 10)
- 12:41 *eius*] *ipsius* (the preceding *gloriam* has been omitted)
- 12:42 *ut de synagoga non*] *nec extra synagoga*
- 12:47 *iudico*] *iudicabo*
- 12:48 *qui iudicet eum*] *eum qui se iudicet* (cf. 13)
- 12:50 *sicut*] *quemadmodum*
- 13:2 *et*] omitted
- 13:2 *cena facta*] *cum cena fieret* (cf. 5, 14)
- 13:3 *et ad deum*] *et quia ad deum* (cf. 5)
- 13:4 *cum accepisset*] *sumens* (cf. 3, 5, 10, 13)
- 13:6 *dicit*] *ait*
- 13:6 *tu mihi lauas pedes*] *tu lauas pedes meos*
- 13:7 *dicit*] *ait*
- 13:7 *ego*] omitted

Apart from 12:34 and 12:47 (and 13:7, which does not form part of the test passage), Fischer's collation shows that all of these readings are unique to Bw. Several are translational alternatives which are paralleled elsewhere (e.g. *ideo* in John 7:22 and *quemadmodum* in John 3:14, both in Codex Vercellensis), although *uerus esse* is not found as a rendering of πληρωθῆναι, nor *praedicere* for πάλιν λέγειν, elsewhere in the Old Latin Gospels. Only a few readings correspond to an attested Greek variant: the additional negative in 12:40, the future tense in 12:47, and ὅτι in 13:3 (only in Codex Bezae).³³ The Vetus Latina Database, however, gives one or two parallels for some, including the following citation of John 12:39-40 from Augustine, *De dono perseuerantiae* 14.35:

*et ideo non poterant credere, quia iterum dixit Isaias: excaecauit oculos eorum
et indurauit cor illorum, ut non uideant oculis nec intellegant corde, et
conuertantur et sanem illos.*

This is the sole instance of *cor illorum* in the database, and also matches *ideo* (otherwise only found in Jerome *Epistula* 18a.4), as well as featuring a negative form similar to *et ne intellegant*. It is not identical to Bw (initial *et*, *iterum dixit* rather than *praedixit*),

³³ This is based on a comparison with Constantin Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (editio octava maior) Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869.

although it too ends with the Old Latin *illos*.³⁴ Augustine alone also provides parallels for *iudicabo* in 12:47 and *qui se iudicet* in 12:48, in a citation at *De trinitate* 1.12 which has several other Old Latin features including *saluum faciam* in 12:47, like Bw. *Ait illi(s)* rather than *dicit ei(s)* is a particular characteristic of Bw's text-type in this passage, occurring in 12:35, 13:6 and 13:7; the first is present in Codices Palatinus and Vercellensis, the second is found in Ambrose, *De sacramentis* 3.4, and the third appears to be unique to Bw. The omission of *ego* from 13:7 is paralleled by Jerome's translation of Origen's sixth Homily on Isaiah and by Pseudo-Fulgentius, Sermons 23 and 26. These early attestations all confirm the Old Latin nature of these verses.

As before, there is no physical indication of the shift to a Vulgate text-type. In John 13:10, Bw has the addition of *semel*, found only in Vetus Latina 6 and 24 (as well as several Church Fathers), but otherwise corresponds to the Vulgate. In the following verse it includes the distinctive Vulgate reading *qui traderet eum*, as well as *quisnam* rather than *quis*, peculiar to the Vulgate and Vetus Latina 6 and 15. Bw agrees with all five distinctive Vulgate readings in the next seven verses. However, it continues to display similarities with the Old Latin tradition, omitting *et* before *accepit* in 13:11 and before *enim* in 13:13. A more substantial variant is the omission of *si deus clarificatus est in eo* at the beginning of 13:32, but this is also missing from several Vulgate sources and could anyhow be due to the copyist's propensity for skipping similar phrases.

In the remaining five chapters of the manuscript, there are several errors of omission but few non-Vulgate readings which match Old Latin witnesses.³⁵ Some of those for which parallels are found involve verbal forms, such as *cognouistis* both times in John 14:7, *uidebitis* in 14:19, *ardebunt* in 15:6 (only otherwise in Codex Vercellensis), *loquitur* twice in 16:13, *ueniet* in 16:32, and certain others also present in the Vulgate tradition (e.g. *tollit* in 15:2, *perhibet* in 15:26, *crediderunt* in 16:9, *petitis* in 16:26 and *dedit* in 18:14). Characteristic renderings are limited to *parauero* for *praeparauero* in 14:2 (2, 5, 15), *quoniam* for *quia* in 15:18 (2, 4, 14), *nosti* for *scis* in 16:30 (2, 6, 8, 14), *quid* for *quem* in 18:4 (2) and *eis* for *ipsis* in 18:9 (4, 6, 8, 14). Of the readings which appear to be unique to Bw, four are worthy of mention. In 13:26, *tinctum* rather than *intinctum* is also found in Augustine's commentary (*Tractatus in Iohannis Euangelium* 61 and 62), although unlike Augustine Bw has the compound form *intinxisset* later in the verse. The addition of *quae* at the end of 14:10 connects it to the following verse (*ipse facit opera quae non credetis*), but this is likely to be secondary as it does not correspond to any Greek form. In 15:6, Bw alone has the present *mittitur foras*, which is followed by *arefiant* in place of *aruit* (cf. *arefit* in Codex Palatinus and *arefiet* in Codex Brixianus), as well as *ardebunt* (in Codex Vercellensis) as noted above. Finally, the second phrase of 18:3 is recast as *et pontifices et pharisaei miserunt ministros*: the addition of a finite verb and change of subject is not paralleled elsewhere, although a couple of loose patristic references include the participle *missus*.

³⁴ Although it is unusual for Augustine not to correspond to the Vulgate at this point in his career, the length of this citation, extending over four verses, indicates that it is likely to have been taken from a codex. See further Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John*, chapter 9.

³⁵ Omissions of three or more words due to homoeoteleuton are found in John 14:16, 15:22, 16:16, 16:28, 17:3, 17:23 and 18:28.

To sum up this analysis of John, Bw has been shown to preserve an Old Latin form of John 1:1-5:40 and 12:34-13:10 despite the Vulgate order of the Gospels and numerous readings elsewhere characteristic of Jerome's revision. This is supported by the similarity of its text to manuscripts already identified as Old Latin and citations in Church Fathers familiar with older versions. Indeed, the parallels with Codex Rehdigeranus in the first passage may be particularly significant, since, although this manuscript too is usually described as a 'mixed text', in these chapters it is often the middle term in differing configurations of Old Latin witnesses.³⁶ The handful of Old Latin parallels between John 6 and 12, especially the addition of *usque ad iuniorum* in John 8:9, suggests the ongoing influence of earlier versions despite agreements with 'distinctive Vulgate readings'. The presence of another entirely Old Latin section for twenty-seven verses, between John 12:34 and 13:10, is as unexpected as it is remarkable in providing manuscript attestation of several readings otherwise known only from patristic evidence.

As this investigation was prompted by work on the Old Latin versions of John, a full transcription of the Synoptic Gospels has yet to be made. The fact that John does not start on a new page, but at the top of the column following the conclusion of Luke, suggests that they are of similar origin. Although the evidence provided by Schepss is inconclusive, Fischer's collations indicate that the other three Gospels also contain Old Latin material. Two passages stand out in Mark and Luke, in addition to a handful of other Old Latin and unusual readings.³⁷ In Mark 10:30-52, Bw is not a Vulgate witness but corresponds for the most part to Codex Colbertinus. Its Old Latin affiliation is clear in renderings such as *saeculo* for *tempore* (10:30), *pauebant* for *stupebant* (10:32), *occident* for *interficiunt* (10:34), *maiores* for *principes* (10:42), *circa* for *iuxta* (10:46) and *iussit* for *praecepit* (10:49), as well as other non-Vulgate readings. The forms *aliis* for *sed quibus* (10:40) and *hoc audito* rather than *et audientes* (10:41) are only found in Bw and Old Latin manuscripts, as is *uero* in Mark 10:49, 10:50 and 10:52. Similarly, the text of Luke 11:6-28 in Bw also appears to be Old Latin, with variants such as *quantos* for *quotquot* in 11:8, *bonum datum* for *spiritum bonum* in 11:13, *et fit* and *huiusmodi* in 11:26 and the omission of *quippini* from 11:28. Despite parallels for some of these in Codex Corbeiensis, there are several features which are unique to Bw, including *qui autem ex uobis est quem filius suus petit piscem* in Luke 11:11, *omnes turbae obstipuerunt* in 11:14, *inhabitabunt* in 11:26 and the singular *dixit ad eam* in 11:28.

Even more striking is the Old Latin element in Matthew. Bw is clearly an Old Latin witness for at least Matthew 3:4-4:7 in Fischer's first test passage and the whole of the second (Matthew 8:2-9:8). The third, covering Matthew 16:9-17:17, is more difficult to

³⁶ For example, the similarities with Codex Palatinus at the beginning of John 2, and with Codices Usanianus primus and Sarzanensis in John 4, as well as Codex Corbeiensis in all five chapters. Parker observes that Codex Rehdigeranus is the most consistent of Old Latin witnesses in its rendering of οὐν over the whole of John, which may be indicative of a lack of revision ('The Translation of OYN', p. 261).

³⁷ In Mark 8:16-17, Bw uniquely reads *obloquebantur ... mussitatis* for *cogitabant ... cogitatis*. The addition of *Cleopas* in Luke 24:13 and the form *fustibus* for *lignis* in Mark 14:43 and 14:48 are characteristic of Old Latin manuscripts.

classify, featuring Old Latin renderings such as *adrendite* for *caute* in 16:11, *maiestate* for *gloria* in 16:27, *inumbrauit* for *obumbrauit* in 17:5 and *aliquando* for *crebro* in 17:14 alongside forms largely confined to the Vulgate (e.g. the addition of *alii* in 16:14, *oporteret* not *oportet* in 16:21, *uisionem* not *uisum* in 17:9 and *quaecumque* not *quae* in 17:12). The text has been systematically corrected towards the Vulgate in the first test passage, but the reviser clearly gave up at some point before Matthew 8. We may wonder how often the manuscript was subsequently used, given the lack of correction to the omissions and occasional nonsense readings elsewhere. The reverential addition of *dominus* before *Iesus*, already noted in John 3 and 4, occurs in all four Gospels and is particularly common in Matthew.³⁸ The word was probably incorporated from a copy which had been marked up for liturgical use.³⁹ Although this is not restricted to Old Latin sections, it does appear to be more prevalent in these, which may be significant: it is tempting to speculate that an antigraph of Bw had the Gospels in the Old Latin order and was better preserved in Matthew and the beginning of John than the later Gospels. However, a full collation of the rest of the manuscript will be needed to shed light on this, and the absence of obvious indications of a change of source in John may mean that the exemplar used for Bw was already a mixed text.

Beyond the additional work required on Bw itself, this study suggests that further investigation of manuscripts traditionally classified as 'mixed texts' may yield interesting results. The data assembled by Fischer offers an unparalleled set of comparative material, and would repay further analysis.⁴⁰ Another useful diagnostic tool would be the isolation of a series of 'distinctive Vulgate readings' throughout each Gospel, refining those I have used for John, in order to identify 'block mixture'. Despite the continuity between Latin versions of the Gospels, a list of genetically significant variants could provide an indication of the affiliation of each witness, complementing Burton's work on the character of the earlier translations. In the case of John, I have already identified several other manuscripts which may also be of significance for the Old Latin tradition.

³⁸ According to Fischer, *Die lateinische Evangelien I, II, III*, Bw adds *dominus* in Matthew 4:4, 4:7, 4:10, 4:17, 8:3, 8:4, 8:7, 8:10, 8:13, 8:14, 8:18, 8:20, 8:26, 9:2, 9:4, 16:13, 16:15, 16:17, 17:1, 17:2, 17:4, 17:7, 17:16, 17:17, Mark 14:53 and Luke 24:36. Most of these are unique to this manuscript.

³⁹ This may not have been the immediate exemplar of Bw: although the double reading at Luke 24:36, *dum haec autem loquuntur Iesus Stetit dominus Iesus in medio eorum*, could indicate confusion over where to add the title, the first *Iesus* seems to be erroneous, as *Stetit*, with a capital letter, begins a new section.

⁴⁰ It appears that Fischer compiled statistical analyses of manuscript relationships based on his survey, such as those reproduced by P. McGurk 'Des recueils d'interprétations de noms Hébreux' *Scriptorium* 50.1 (1996) p. 121 (reprinted in McGurk, *Gospel Books and Early Latin Manuscripts*). Professor Roger Gryson has confirmed to me that these are still in existence: their publication would be a most welcome addition to the collations themselves.