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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 Vetus 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

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

---


\(^4\) Roger Gryson (ed.), \textit{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, \textit{Altlateinische Handschriften}, ad loc., indicates that witnesses 12, 27, 33, 34, 36, 47 and 48 are also partially Vulgate.

region of Alemannia (southern Germany). 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 (viiii), 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. 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. 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).
appeared, which is probably another reason why this masterly achievement remains relatively neglected.\(^\text{11}\)

The siglum given by Fischer to this manuscript is \textbf{Bw}, which will be used in the rest of this article. In the three test passages of John for which \textit{Bw} is extant, Fischer’s collation indicates that it contains a number of readings which are otherwise found only in Old Latin witnesses:\(^\text{12}\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{3:2 quae tu facis} omitted 11, \textit{Bw}  
  \item \textit{7:7 non miferis} \textit{nec fueris miratus} 33, \textit{Bw}  
  \item \textit{3:11 testamur} \textit{testimonium perhibemus} 11, \textit{Bw}\(^\text{13}\)  
  \item \textit{3:13 nisi qui} \textit{nisi is qui} 8, 11, \textit{Bw}  
  \item \textit{3:22 ueni[\textit{exit} 3?, 11, \textit{Bw}; \textit{exiit} 5}  
  \item \textit{3:31 supra omnes est[ omitted 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 22, 33, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{7:46 homo} \textit{ullus homo} \textit{Bw}; cf. \textit{ullus hominem} 10  
  \item \textit{7:50 dicit} \textit{dixit autem} 10, \textit{Bw}  
  \item \textit{12:34 iste\textit{ hic} 3, 5, 8, 11, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:35 dixit\textit{ ait} 2, 3, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:35 eis\textit{ illis} 2, 5, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:35 lucem habetis\textit{ habetis lucem} \textit{Bw}; cf. \textit{habetis lumen} 5}  
  \item \textit{12:41 quando uidit\textit{ quia uidit} 2, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:43 dilexerunt\textit{ amauerunt} 2, 3, 11, 13, 14?, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:43 magis\textit{ potius} 11, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:48 iudicabit\textit{ iudicat} 5, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{12:48 in[ omitted 2, 3, 4, 11, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{13:1 cum dilexisset\textit{ cum diligeret} 11, \textit{Bw}\(^\text{14}\)}  
  \item \textit{13:2 cena facta\textit{ cum cena fieret} \textit{Bw}; cf. \textit{cum cena fieret} 14?, \textit{cum cena fieretur} 5}  
  \item \textit{13:2 cum[\textit{ quando} 14?, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{13:2 misisset\textit{ miserat se} 14, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{13:3 ei\textit{ illi} 2, 3?, 5, 13, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{13:4 a cena\textit{ de cena} 5, 13, 10, \textit{Bw}}  
  \item \textit{13:6 ei\textit{ illi} 2, 3?, 4, \textit{Bw}}
\end{itemize}

There are many more variants which are shared by a handful of other manuscripts in addition to \textit{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 (\textit{testimonium perhibere for testari, ait for dixit and amare for diligere}) suggests that \textit{Bw} has some affiliation to the Old Latin tradition.

In connection with the preparation of a new edition of the \textit{Vetus Latina Johannes}, I therefore made a fresh collation of the whole Gospel from digitised microfilm in order

\(^{11}\)\textit{See further the review of the apparatus of John by J. K. Elliott, \textit{JTS} 43.2 (1992) 633-5.}  
\(^{13}\)\textit{The exact reading of \textit{Bw} is \textit{testimonium perhibimus.}}  
\(^{14}\)\textit{The exact reading of \textit{Bw} is \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Tractatus in Iohannis Evangeliu}m. 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.\textsuperscript{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 or additions or omissions. The table below, however, shows the principal divisions which emerge from the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total ‘distinctive Vulgate readings’</th>
<th>Bw agrees with Vulgate</th>
<th>Bw disagrees with Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John 1:1-5:40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 5:41-12:33</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121 (87%)</td>
<td>18 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 12:34-13:10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 13:10-18:35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56 (86%)</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{Total}</td>
<td>\textbf{238}</td>
<td>\textbf{183 (77%)}</td>
<td>\textbf{55 (23%)}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


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

\begin{verbatim}
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] recuperant 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 nobis] 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
\end{verbatim}

There are six ‘distinctive Vulgate readings’ in these verses, only one of which is found in Bw (gratiae autem et veritatis 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 are of 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 ...
ërăβov in John 1:11-12 (recipierunt ... 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. 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 salvator in 4:42. 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. 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 vocatorum unum consummari. This is only present in Codices Palatinus, Veronensis, Rehdigeranus and Bw. The additional dico enim nobis at the beginning of 3:13 corresponds to Codices Rehdigeranus and Aureus, while exit 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 arbores), 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 (judicio), 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 of omission of material: John 1:38 (manes 11, habitas Bw), 1:44 (incipiebat 11, voluit Bw), 1:51 (ad 11, supra Bw), 2:3 (multam 11, multituidine 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 quou haurias Bw), 4:32 (escam 11, cibus Bw), 4:33 (ad alterutrum 11, in semetipsum 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 (proper 11, per Bw; testimonium 11, loquellam Bw), 4:52 (autem 11, ergo Bw; hesterna die 11, here Bw; dimisit 11, reliquid Bw), 5:3 (iaebeat 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 Vercelliensis, Bezae and Rehdigeranus. All witnesses have expectantium in 5:3 except Codices Vercelliensis 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 by 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, quontam 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, proptererea 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.

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. 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 άπειρον 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 (adnuntiavit), 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 auditiit (John 3:32; 3, 8, Bw), omission of cum (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: uritatis not uerum in 4:37, fecit not fecerat in 4:45, uenit not abii 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 decumbet multitudo languentium c(a)ecorum claudorum aridorum paraliticorum spectantiu(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. Decumbet in 5:3 is an Old Latin rendering of κατέκειτο, paralleled (more or less) by Vetus Latina 3, 4, 5 and 8; recumbet 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:

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. Schepps, 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.
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 συγχροσθαί using *cogere* in the sense ‘live together’; similarly, *est* in 1:26 may be a misreading of the Old Latin *stat*. In 4:31, *interea rogabant eum* has been corrected to *interrogabant eum*. Tempus facere for γρονθὸν 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 σχινβίν, 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 exuertit.*

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
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 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 ovív characteristic of early African translations. 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. 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 ἓν τὸν ἔσχάτον, one of which is Bw with usque ad iuniorem; Augustine is the sole Latin Church Father who cites this addition. 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.

---

29 Fischer, Die lateinische Evangelien IV, pp. 224 and 232.
30 The other manuscript is Codex Completensis 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, *spuit* 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 *manifesteteretur* 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 *comprehendere* in 10:39. There is another cluster of Old Latin features at the beginning of John 11, with *qua* 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 *qua* 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, *udit* for *abiiit* 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* (*ieiecetur* 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 13:11 in Bw is clearly distinct from the Vulgate:

Bw: *cu(m) dilegeret discipulos suos qui erant in hoc mundo*32 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] praeedit
12:40  eorum cor] cor illorum
12:40  et intellegant] et ne intellegant (cf. 2, 3, 5, 10)
12:41  eius] ipsis (the preceding gloriám 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  sicur] 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 πληροθηναι, 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). 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 perseverantiae 14.35:

et ideo non poterant credere, quia iterum dixit Isaias: excaecauit oculos eorum et induratuit cor illorum, ut non uideant oculis nec intellegant corde, et convuertantur 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 praeedit).

---

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*. 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 *saluam faciam* in 12:47, like Bw. *Ait illis* rather than *dicit ei* 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-Fulgencius, 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 *quismam* 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. 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 *parauro* for *praeparauro* 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, *inctum* 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 *quaes* 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. The handful of Old Latin parallels between John 6 and 12, especially the addition of usque ad iuniorem 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. 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 intericient (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 Usserianus 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 ΟΥ over the whole of John, which may be indicative of a lack of revision (‘The Translation of ΟΥ’, p. 261).

37 In Mark 8:16-17, Bw uniquely reads obloquebantur ... musselsitatis for cogitatant ... cogitatis. The addition of Cleopas in Luke 24:13 and the form justibus for lignis in Mark 14:43 and 14:48 are characteristic of Old Latin manuscripts.
classify, featuring Old Latin renderings such as adiendite for cauete 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 alli in 16:14, oportet not oportet in 16:21, uisionem not uisum in 17:9 and quaeque 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 antegraph 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 loquantur 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.