

## The St Petersburg Insular Gospels: Another Old Latin Witness

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

Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing, University of Birmingham

### *Abstract*

*The St Petersburg Insular Gospels (National Library of Russia F.v.I.8, sometimes known as Codex Fossatensis) were copied in England in the eighth century. This manuscript is well known for its decoration, but there has been no previous investigation of its gospel text apart from the collation of test passages by Bonifatius Fischer. A full transcription of the Gospel according to John, compared with the Vulgate and surviving Old Latin witnesses, shows that the manuscript derives from an Old Latin version which was largely corrected towards the Vulgate. Despite further alterations to the manuscript under consideration, numerous readings remain unchanged which can be traced back to the earliest stratum of Old Latin versions of John. Some are paralleled in patristic citations, while others appear to be unique. This is therefore an important witness to the text of the Old Latin Gospels, and has now been entered in the register of the Vetust Latina-Institut with the number VL 9A.*

In a recent article, I identified a new witness to the Old Latin Gospels on the basis of the exhaustive collation of over four hundred and fifty gospel manuscripts by Bonifatius Fischer.<sup>1</sup> In this manuscript, now identified in the list maintained by the Vetust Latina-Institut as VL 11A, passages with a consistent Old Latin affiliation alternate with Vulgate sections: this pattern of 'block mixture' is present in a number of witnesses which are classified more generally as 'mixed texts'. Another type of 'mixed text' witness is characterized by the continual occurrence of Old Latin readings within a predominantly Vulgate text. Although users familiar with the older versions may sometimes have reintroduced earlier readings into Vulgate manuscripts, the majority of these 'mixed texts' are likely to have been the result of Old Latin witnesses being brought into greater or lesser conformity with the Vulgate before serving as the basis for a new copy. Lawlor describes the Book of Mulling (VL 35) as deriving from 'a single exemplar of the Old Latin text, altered by the hands of successive copyists to its present state'.<sup>2</sup> Stages of such a process can be seen in John 1 in St Gall 60 (VL 47) and Matthew 3-4 in Würzburg Univ. M.p.th.f.67 (VL 11A). Despite the claim that no Vulgate manuscript is without some degree of Old Latin 'contamination',<sup>3</sup> witnesses

---

<sup>1</sup> H.A.G. Houghton, 'A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f.67' *JTS* ns 60.1 (2009) pp. 1-21. The collations are published as: Bonifatius Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*. (4 vols) (AGLB 13, 15, 17, 18). Freiburg: Herder, 1988-91.

<sup>2</sup> H. J. Lawlor, *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*. Edinburgh: Douglas, 1897, p. 69. Lawlor's use of the word 'exemplar' here appears to be broader than its current designation of the immediate manuscript from which a new copy is made.

<sup>3</sup> Thus Jean Gribomont, 'Les plus anciennes traductions latines' in J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (edd.), *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1985, p. 62, and J.H. Petzer, 'The Latin Version of the New Testament' in M.W. Holmes and B.D. Ehrman (edd.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1995, p. 119.

with a higher proportion of readings corresponding to the earlier versions may be of significance for the recovery of the Old Latin tradition. The current official list of *Vetus Latina* manuscripts includes around sixteen such 'mixed text' codices, several of which have features of insular palaeography or Irish connections.<sup>4</sup>

The copy of the four Gospels in insular script currently held in the National Library of Russia, St Petersburg, with the classmark F.v.I.8, is given the siglum *Ec* in Fischer's collations. The four test passages for John provide numerous examples of readings shared primarily with Old Latin manuscripts. In addition, there are ten variants found uniquely in *Ec* among all surviving gospel books from the first millennium. The following list presents the principal variants from Fischer's survey:<sup>5</sup>

- 2:18 *excitabo*] *suscitabo* 4 13 22 33 **Ec** Ji Gk\*f  
2:22 *ergo*] *autem* **Ec** Hfb Pz\*  
2:22 *recordati*] *rememorati* 3 4 8 11 11A 13 14 15 22 33 47 **Ec\*** Jw Fgke  
2:23 *esset*] + *iesus* 3 8 35 **Ecdh** Hz Ba\* Ca\* Yh  
3:8 *spirat*] *aspirat* **Ec\***f Jqoh Hq Zw  
3:15 *ipso*] *eum* 2 3 4 10 13 22 **Ec** Je Hob Br So Zc\*? Pp Ch<sup>2</sup>?w  
3:17 *in mundum*] om. 2 47 **Ec\*** Jj Ur Cp It  
3:18 *non credit*] + *in ipsum* 8 11 **Ec**  
3:19 *iudicium*] + *dei* 8 11 11A 15 **Ec** Jw\*yq Sx Pk Ibzscvym  
3:21 *facit ueritatem*] *bonum facit* **Ec**  
3:22 *uenit*] *exiebat* **Ec**  
3:25 *ergo*] *autem* 4 22 **Ec** Jo Hb Bkodz Gu Ta\* Of\*se<sup>2</sup> Zbwy<sup>2</sup> Pgp Fa<sup>2</sup> Ll  
3:27 *respondit*] *respondens ergo* **Ec**  
3:27 *de caelo*] *desuper* 4 **Ec**  
3:29 *ergo*] *autem* 14 **Ec** Jx Hf Sx Zv Cz  
7:29 *ego*] + *autem* 4 5 6 8 10 14 **Ecf** Hq Be Zvz Pu<sup>2</sup> Ch<sup>2</sup> Kl  
7:30 *eum*] + *iudaei* **Ec**  
7:32 *principes*] + *sacerdotum* 3 5 6 8 10 13 14? **Ec** Ns Ho Sx Ce  
7:32 *ut adprehenderent*] *adprehendere* **Ec**  
7:44 *autem*] *enim* **Ec** Hd  
7:50 *uenit*] *uenerat* 2 6 14? **Ec** Uz Ohse<sup>2</sup> Zy<sup>2</sup> Pg Cet\*y Ry Mc\*? Fm Ibscym  
8:1 *perrexit*] *abiit* 2 5 **Ec**  
8:3 *sedens*] + *iesus* **Ec**

<sup>4</sup> These are VL 7, 9, 10 (Codex Brixianus), 11 (Codex Rehdigeranus), 12 (Codex Claromontanus), 15 (Codex Aureus), 27, 28, 29, 30 (Codex Gatianus), 33, 34, 35 (Book of Mulling), 36, 47, 48: see Roger Gryson (ed.), *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscripts vieux latins. Répertoire descriptif. Mss 1-275*. (Vetus Latina 1/2A). Freiburg: Herder, 1999. The Vulgate portions of VL 11A also feature several isolated Old Latin readings. For more background on the 'mixed text' tradition, see Houghton, 'A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript', and 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, pp. 37-9 (reprinted in Bonifatius Fischer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltex-te* (AGLB 12), Freiburg: Herder, 1986).

<sup>5</sup> The apparatus is reproduced from Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien IV*; the sigla for Old Latin manuscripts have been changed to the standard Vetus Latina numeration, but Fischer's condensed scheme is used for the other witnesses. For an explanation of the sigla, see the introduction to these collations.

8:5 *ergo*] *uero* 11A **Ec** Bb Sb Ta Of\*  
8:7 *eis*] *illis* 2 5 **Ec** Bc Th\*?  
8:9 *autem*] + *hoc uerbum* **Ec**  
8:11 *dixit autem iesus*] *et ait ad illam* **Ec**  
12:17 *a*] *ex* **Ec** Bs\*  
12:19 *ergo*] *autem* 6 8 10 11 14 30 47 **Ec** fdr Jji\*e Hfhrtqiabyz Bc Ge<sup>2</sup>t Te Kw?  
12:44 *clamauit et dixit*] *clamabat dicens* 14 **Ec** (cf. 3)  
12:46 *mundum*] *hunc mundum* 2 3 4 6 8 11 11A 14 35\* 48\* **Ech** Jy Hhodb Sb<sup>2</sup>x Grt\* Dw  
12:46 *omnis qui credit...maneat*] *omnes qui credunt...maneant* **Ec**  
12:47 *iudico*] *iudicabo* 11A **Ec** Jrz\* Sx Ws Ll  
13:1 *in finem*] *usque in finem* 2 3 4 8 10 11 11A 13 35 47 48 **Ec**\*hv Hfordiacbz Beo Suv  
Wd Gk Ok\* Pt\* Mc\*k Lm  
20:1 *sublatum*] *reolutum* 10 **Ec** Jf<sup>6</sup>  
20:9 *oportet*] *oportuit* 48 **Ec** He Ot Pl Cz  
20:12 *in albis*] *in uestis albis* **Ec**  
20:12 *unum ad pedes*] *alium ad pedes* 13 14 **Ec** He  
20:12 *fuerat*] *erat* 3? 5 6 8 22? **Ech** Jw\* Fci<sup>2</sup>  
20:15 *illa*] + *autem* **Ec** Ji Beaox Za\*?r<sup>2</sup> Kc<sup>2</sup>o\* Yf<sup>2</sup> Fm\*  
20:20 *manus et latus*] *manus et pedes et latus* 15 **Ec** Jw\* Gmr Fgk Jf<sup>7</sup>  
20:27 *et adfer*] *et mitte* 3? 4 **Ec** Ia  
20:29 *qui*] *qui me* 30 35 47 48 **Ec** Hfhotieb  
21:1 *postea*] *post haec* 3? 5 10 **Ec** Za\*? Qena

These forty-four variants demonstrate that **Ec** regularly preserves non-Vulgate forms in the Gospel according to John. Many are paralleled in surviving Old Latin witnesses, although there is no consistent pattern of agreement with any one manuscript. The forms of text shared only with VL 4 (Codex Veronensis; John 3:27), VL 2 and 5 (Codices Palatinus and Bezae; John 8:1, cf. 8:7), and VL 14 (Codex Usserianus primus; John 12:44) suggest that these renderings go back to the earliest stratum of Latin translations. Among the witnesses to the Vulgate, there is again no single manuscript similar to **Ec**, although there are certain similarities with those in Irish script (the H-series; John 12:19, 12:46, 13:1 and 20:29) and lectionary books from Milan (the I-series; John 3:19, 7:50). Fischer's collation therefore suggests that **Ec** derives from a distinctive Old Latin ancestor which had been largely corrected towards the Vulgate. The density and significance of these older readings (including additional words and translational alternatives characteristic of the earlier versions) prompted the present investigation of the text of John, in conjunction with work on a new edition of the *Vetus Latina Iohannes*.<sup>8</sup>

The manuscript is a magnificent example of late eighth-century book production. Its calligraphic script has been described as Anglo-Saxon majuscule or Insular half-

<sup>6</sup> The gospel harmony of Codex Fuldensis (Jf) may represent Mark 16:4.

<sup>7</sup> The gospel harmony of Codex Fuldensis (Jf) combines Luke 24:40 and John 20:20.

<sup>8</sup> This project offers a broad range of comparative material in the form of the transcriptions of thirty-one Old Latin manuscripts in the *Vetus Latina Iohannes Electronic Edition* (P.H. Burton, J. Balsarak, H.A.G. Houghton, D.C. Parker (edd.) *Vetus Latina Iohannes. The Verbum Project. The Old Latin Manuscripts of John's Gospel*. Version 1.5 (July 2009), online at <<http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina/>>).

uncial.<sup>9</sup> The pages are fairly large (around 345 x 245 mm) and of well prepared, high quality parchment. There is rich decoration of the canon tables and opening page of each Gospel. Initial capitals are illuminated in a variety of colours; sections are marked by double-height capitals. The biblical text is written in two columns of around 25 lines; each sentence begins with a hanging capital on a new line. (The blank space at the end of a line is sometimes used by the first hand for the completion of the following line, as is seen in other insular manuscripts.<sup>10</sup>) There are 215 folios: the introductory material comprises Jerome's Letter to Damasus (*Nouum opus*), the preface *Plures fuisse* and a Latin version of Eusebius' Letter to Carpianus. The four Gospels are given in the Vulgate order, each preceded by a preface and *capitula*. While the latter correspond to De Bruyne's Type C, as noted by McGurk,<sup>11</sup> the texts of Mark, Luke and John have rubricated divisions following Type B.<sup>12</sup> Ammonian Sections and Eusebian canons are indicated in the margin throughout the latter three Gospels: the Eusebian Apparatus in Matthew includes parallel passages in other gospels as well, but is abandoned completely after Matthew 16. Quotations are marked by varying forms of marginal marks. Surprisingly, the canon tables (foll. 12r-17v) come between the *capitula* for Matthew and the beginning of the Gospel.<sup>13</sup> Among other notable features are the occasional use of Anglo-Saxon minuscule for the final line of a column, numerous erasures (discussed below), and a runic

---

<sup>9</sup> This manuscript is CLA 1605, classified as Anglo-Saxon majuscule with a description in E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores. Part XI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, p. 7. The designation Insular half-uncial is preferred in a detailed forthcoming article by Olga Bleskina, 'Eighth-century Insular Gospels (NLR, Lat. F.v.I.8): Codicological and Palaeographical Aspects.' I am very grateful to the author for a pre-publication copy of this study.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. Trinity College Dublin 60 (Book of Mulling, VL 35), St Gall 51 (VL 48).

<sup>11</sup> Patrick McGurk, *Latin Gospel Books from AD400 to AD800*. (Les Publications du Scriptorium 5.) Paris etc.: Érasme, 1961; the manuscript is number 126 in his list, with fuller details provided by David Wright in the *Addenda* (pp. 122-3). McGurk also records that the *capitula* for the first two Gospels are not complete: Matthew finishes on fol. 11v with summary 84 (of 88), while Mark finishes on fol. 77v with summary 41 (of 46). Luke has all 94 summaries, numbered 1-93 (66 and 67 are combined as a single summary). The John *capitula* include the rubrics *legenda pro defunctis* and *legenda in quadragesima*, which McGurk identifies in other manuscripts. For the divisions and the texts of the *capitula* see [D. de Bruyne], *Sommaires, Divisions et Rubriques de la Bible Latine*. Namur: Godenne, 1914.

<sup>12</sup> In Matthew, the chapters are not marked by rubrics: they are numbered according to Type C as long as the Eusebian apparatus is present. In Luke, the final rubricated division (20) occurs at the modern 22:39 and the second sequence of numbers is not present. The rubrics for John, while close to De Bruyne's Type B divisions, actually occur at the following modern verses: 2 (1:19), 3 (2:1), 4 (3:22), 5 (4:4), 6 (5:1), 7 (6:4), 8 (7:1), 9 (8:21), 10 (10:1), 11 (12:1), 13 (18:1), 14 (18:28). Bleskina, *Eighth-century Insular Gospels*, provides several codicological indications which also distinguish Matthew from the other Gospels.

<sup>13</sup> On other unusual features of the canon tables in this manuscript, some shared with the Lindisfarne Gospels, see Patrick McGurk, 'The Disposition of Numbers in Latin Eusebian Canon Tables' in Roger Gryson (ed.), *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele* (AGLB 24), Freiburg: Herder, 1993, pp. 246-51 (reprinted in P. McGurk, *Gospel Books and Early Latin Manuscripts* (Variorum Collected Studies 606), Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998).

inscription scratched between the columns of the final page of John (fol. 213r).<sup>14</sup> Further information may be found in the modern catalogue.<sup>15</sup> Most of the evidence points to Northumbria as the place of copying.<sup>16</sup>

In the early eighteenth century, the manuscript was held in the monastery of St Maur des Fossés near Paris, hence the older name *Codex Fossatensis* which occurs in Fischer's description.<sup>17</sup> In 1716 it was transferred to St Germain des Prés, and purchased at the end of the century by Peter Dubrovsky, becoming part of the Imperial Public Library in 1805. In 2001, following major conservation work, the manuscript was photographed and released on CD-ROM.<sup>18</sup> Although the colour images are by current standards comparatively low resolution (72 dpi), they remain adequate for textual study: having used them to transcribe the text of John, I was able to compare them against the original in its current unbound state on a visit to St Petersburg in November 2009. The principal benefit of this was to determine where text had been erased, although even this was difficult on numerous pages because of the opaque surface, and it was rarely possible to discern any further information about the original reading. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Natalia

---

<sup>14</sup> The eight runic characters, with four surrounding crosses, are deciphered by A.A. Khlevov in an article on the CD-ROM (see below): the reading is Edelpryþ, an Old English personal name.

<sup>15</sup> Olga A. Dobiaš-Roždestvenskaja and Wsevolod W. Bakhtine, *Les Anciens Manuscrits Latins de la Bibliothèque Publique Saltykov-Ščedrin de Leningrad. VIII<sup>e</sup> - début IX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (trans. X. Grichine with F. Gasparri, W. Vodoff; rev. Guy Lanoë). Paris: CNRS, 1991, pp. 58-61. In addition, a detailed description of the manuscript and its history (also found on the CD-ROM mentioned below) is given in a recent exhibition catalogue: Matti Kilpiö and Leena Kahlas-Tarkka (edd.) *Ex Insula Lux. Manuscripts and Hagiographical Material Connected with Insular England*. Helsinki: University Library, 2001, pp. 41-4.

<sup>16</sup> Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, p. 7, notes the Northumbrian affiliation of the textual and artistic features while observing that the theta-shaped *e* is characteristic of Kent; on the Northumbrian connections of the *Letter to Carpianus*, see Patrick McGurk, 'The Canon Tables in the Book of Lindisfarne and in the Codex Fuldensis of Victor of Capua' *JTS* ns 6.2 (1955) 193-4 (reprinted in P. McGurk, *Gospel Books and Early Latin Manuscripts* (Variorum Collected Studies 606), Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998). A Northumbrian origin for this manuscript is also supported by T.J. Brown and C.D. Verey, "Northumbria and The Book of Kells" *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972) pp. 219-246. The Type-C *capitula*, with the title *capitula lectionum*, are characteristic of manuscripts with Northumbrian links (see Paul Meyvaert, "Bede's *Capitula Lectionum* for the Old and New Testaments" *Revue Bénédictine* 105 (1995) pp. 348-80).

<sup>17</sup> Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien*, p. 16\*. The manuscript had the number 35 in the Maurist library.

<sup>18</sup> *The Insular Gospels of the 8th Century in the Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg*. (Electronic version of Manuscript Lat.F.v.I.8). CD-ROM. National Library of Russia/Spaero Co.. 2001. The CD also includes substantial introductory material on the manuscript (including the lengthy description from *Ex Insula Lux* mentioned above), its relationship to the St Petersburg Bede, the runic inscription and the conservation of the manuscript, as well as a feature comparing the decoration of each of the illuminated capitals.

Elagina of the National Library of Russia for allowing me to consult this and other manuscripts and for offering bibliographical assistance.<sup>19</sup>

The full electronic transcription of the text of John was compared against a Vulgate base text using the COLLATE software.<sup>20</sup> Once nonsense readings, unreadable text and obvious orthographic variants had been discounted, I counted a total of 1096 variants. Just over half of these are additions (215), omissions (217) or variations in word order (126); the majority of the remaining differences are substitution by synonyms (235) or differences in the mood or tense of verbs (168).<sup>21</sup> 863 of the 1096 variants are paralleled in manuscripts already identified as wholly or partly Old Latin.<sup>22</sup> Fischer's collation shows that at least some of the other 233 variants are not unique to this witness (e.g. John 2:22, 3:8, 7:44, 12:17 and 20:15 in the table above). The overall picture confirms the character of the four test passages: non-Vulgate readings are found spread equally throughout the Gospel according to John at the rate of around one per verse.<sup>23</sup>

There are a few indications that the immediate exemplar of Ec had been corrected towards the Vulgate, most notably in the form of doublets. At John 1:21, Ec reads *quid ergo tu helias es tu*. While the Vulgate form is *quid ergo helias es tu*, three Old Latin witnesses place *tu* before *helias* instead (VL 2, 8, 11). A corrector may therefore have deleted the first *tu* from Ec's exemplar and added the second, but the copyist also transcribed the earlier pronoun in error.<sup>24</sup> The beginning of John 5:4 in Ec is *Angelus autem domini secundum tempus lauabat in natatoria piscinae*. Despite the appearance of *natatoria piscina* in several Old Latin witnesses in John 5:2 (VL 3, 4, 5, 8\*, 14; the original form of this verse in Ec is illegible), the doublet is unparalleled in this verse, with Old Latin manuscripts reading either *natatoria* or *piscina(m)*. It may therefore have arisen from a correction supplying the alternative term, which was then incorporated into the text.<sup>25</sup> The clearest example concerns John 13:35, the end of which appears in Ec as: *si dilectionem habueritis ad inuicem ad alterutrum*. Here, the Vulgate *ad inuicem* precedes a form which is not known in any other manuscript in

---

<sup>19</sup> I should also like to thank Ekaterina Krushelnitskaya of the National Library of Russia and Scot McKendrick, Juan Garcés and Gavin Moorhead of the British Library for their assistance during the visit.

<sup>20</sup> P.M.W. Robinson, *Collate: Interactive Collation of Large Textual Traditions*, Version 2. (Computer Program distributed by the Oxford University Centre for Humanities Computing: Oxford, 1994). The standard text used for the Vulgate in this study is R. Weber, R. Gryson et al., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (fifth edition). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

<sup>21</sup> This figure does not include alternations between '-uit' and '-bit', which is characteristic of insular orthography; variation involving 'i' and 'e' was counted, although some of this may be orthographic.

<sup>22</sup> The readings were compared against the *Vetus Latina Iohannes Electronic Edition*.

<sup>23</sup> There is a slightly lower proportion of non-Vulgate readings in John 14, but this does not appear to be significant.

<sup>24</sup> Note, however, that the Book of Mulling (VL 35) provides a parallel for two pronouns, reading: *tu quid ergo helias es tu*.

<sup>25</sup> Compare also the correction *legem circumcisionis* at John 7:22, unique to this manuscript, discussed below.

this verse, although it is paralleled as a rendering of ἀλλήλοι elsewhere in Old Latin witnesses.<sup>26</sup> The obvious explanation is that both the original reading and its intended correction were copied from the exemplar. It is worth observing too that some omissions and instances of unparalleled word order in Ec correspond to points of variation in the Old Latin tradition and may be explained as misreadings of a corrected exemplar.<sup>27</sup>

As noted above, Ec has itself been corrected. The original text has been thoroughly erased, most notably at John 1:27, 3:3, 5:2, 6:4, 7:28, 7:37, 14:16 and 17:12. Corrections are normally written by another insular majuscule hand, which also supplied longer portions of missing text (e.g. John 7:8, 8:24, 13:21, 14:3, 16:16, 17:22-3, 20:27).<sup>28</sup> Partial erasures sometimes offer the possibility of reconstructing the original reading, as at John 12:27 where the spacing and re-used letters of *saluifica me* indicate that the first hand wrote *saluum me fac* (as found in VL 15), and John 16:21 where *parit* appears to be a correction of *parturit* (VL 3, 13). It is usually impossible to read the erased text, although comparison with the Old Latin tradition often suggests a likely original. For example, at John 19:3, the corrector has written the Vulgate *alapas* over an erasure: the only known alternative is *palmas* (VL 2, 3, 4, 6, 8\*, 13, 14, 15, 47, 48). Similarly, at John 12:1, the rubricated first line of the chapter has been erased following *sex*, with *dies* written in black in a gap of around seven characters: the reading *sextum diem* (VL 10, 14) would fit the space perfectly. In John 8:5, the erasure following *tu quid dicis* may have contained *de ea* (VL 6, 8), while the corrections *condemnavit* and *amplius* in John 8:10 and 11 could have replaced *iudicavit* (VL 2) or *lapidavit* (VL 8) and *ex hoc* (VL 5, 6, 10, 14) respectively.<sup>29</sup> One of the most interesting readings is in John 1:13, where only the first three letters of *nati sunt* are definitely original: this suggests that the first-hand reading may have been *nat<us est>*, a form known primarily from VL 4 and Tertullian. On the other hand, some erasures remain without parallel (such as that following *piscina* in John 5:2, the line and a half following John 6:4 and the fifteen or so characters after *patrem* in John 14:16) and the possibility of nonsense readings

---

<sup>26</sup> It is the consistent form in Codex Rehdigeranus (VL 11), lacunose at this point. See also John 4:33 (VL 4, 14, 33); 13:14 (VL 3); 16:17 (VL 4, 10); 19:24 (VL 6, 8, 14).

<sup>27</sup> e.g. the omission of *fragmenta* from John 6:12 (cf. VL 2, 28) or *ille est* from John 13:26 (cf. VL 2). In John 18:10, Old Latin manuscripts with *seruum principis sacerdotum* contrast with the Vulgate *pontificis seruum*: Ec's *seruum pontificis* may represent a correction without a corresponding change in word order (although it is also found in VL 30). It is possible that the unique *sed eum qui permanet* in John 6:26 may be a partial correction of *sed escam quae permanet* (VL 4, 13, 22): cf. the probable first-hand *escam* underlying *cibum* at John 6:50.

<sup>28</sup> Bleskina, *Eighth-century Insular Gospels*, identifies this hand with the 'principal scribe', in her classification, who also copied the prologues. The addition of the prologues to the manuscript after the completion of the gospels suggests that they were copied from a second exemplar, against which the biblical text may then have been compared.

<sup>29</sup> The alternatives suggested in these three verses are the only variants recorded in Fischer's collation; although he marks the illegible first hand reading in 8:10 and 11, he does not note the erasure in 8:5 (which had to be confirmed from the manuscript). At John 7:39, Fischer suggests that Ec may, uniquely, have read *dixit eis*; however, if only *di* has been retained from the first hand, this may be another witness for *dicebat* (VL 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 33 et al.). Fischer agrees with the reconstruction of *ambulabit* in 8:12, and *saluum me fac* in 12:27.

must always be borne in mind. While the corrector usually corrects towards the Vulgate, the alteration sometimes continues to diverge from the modern editorial text. The most substantial is in John 7:22, where after *moses dedit uobis legem* the corrector adds *circumcisionis* rather than correcting *legem* to the Vulgate *circumcisionem* (cf. *natatoria piscinae* in John 5:4). The correction of *eis* to *illis* in John 17:22 is intriguing; the latter is also found in VL 2, 3, 11A, 13 and 33. Although most of the nonsense readings are corrected, the majority of non-Vulgate readings (900 of 1096) are left unchanged.<sup>30</sup>

The Old Latin affiliation of Ec is most clearly shown by the use of synonyms, translational alternatives for the same Greek word indicative of different Old Latin revisions.<sup>31</sup> For example, δόξα is found translated by *gloria*, *claritas* and *honor*: the Vulgate prefers *gloria* in the first half of John but switches to *claritas* in the later chapters. The sole exception in John 1-11 is *claritatem* in John 5:41, where Ec reads *gloriam* (as do VL 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 33, 47<sup>C</sup>). In John 12:16, by contrast, Ec has *clarificatus* (like VL 4, 6, 8, 11, 15) for the Vulgate *glorificatus*. Most significantly, Ec reads *honor* in John 8:50 (with VL 4, 14) and John 9:24 (with VL 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18). A preference is shown no fewer than twenty-two times for *ille* rather than *is*, always shared with two or more witnesses from Group 1, the oldest stratum of the Old Latin versions.<sup>32</sup> Instances of *de* rather than *a* or *ex*, and *ad* rather than *in* fit the same pattern.<sup>33</sup> A selection of less frequently occurring synonyms is shown in the following table, together with the attestation in Old Latin manuscripts:

John	Vulgate	Ec reading	VL parallels
1:33	ille	ipse Ec	2 4 14
1:38	dicit	ait Ec	3
1:48	ficu	arbore fici Ec	2 11 11A 13 (35) 47* 48 (cf. 3 8)
2:11	initium	primum Ec	4 35 (cf. 10 13 27)
2:11	eius	sui Ec	4 11A 14
2:17	recordati uero	et rememorati Ec* <sup>34</sup>	8 11 11A 15 (cf. 3 33)
2:19	excitabo	suscitabo Ec	4 13 33
2:22	recordati	rememorati Ec* <sup>35</sup>	3 4 8 11 11A 13 14 15 22 33 47
3:4	iterato	rursus Ec	29
3:22	uenit	exiebat Ec	(cf. <i>exiit</i> 3 5 11 11A)
3:27	caelo	super Ec	4
3:36	incredulus est	non credit Ec	4 5 8 10 11 13 14 15 (22)
4:10	forsitan	magis Ec	4 11 13 14 22
4:42	propter	per Ec	11A 15
4:47	abiit	uenit Ec	2 3 4 8 11 11A 14 15

<sup>30</sup> The corrector inexplicably alters *rememorati* to *rememoratae* in both John 2:17 and 2:22.

<sup>31</sup> For more information on the concept of *Übersetzungsfarbe* and its use to group manuscripts, see P.H. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels. A Study of their Texts and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

<sup>32</sup> For Group 1, see Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels*, pp. 67-9: it consists of VL 2, 3, 4 (in John 1-11), 5, 13, 14, 22. *Ille* is read at John 4:7, 4:13, 4:16, 4:17, 4:21, 4:26, 5:13, 6:70, 7:12; 7:32, 8:7, 9:20, 10:17, 11:16, 11:40, 15:5, 17:22, 18:21, 18:33, 19:6, 19:27, 21:23 and probably also the erased first hand at John 4:32. There are examples of the opposite (*is* where the Vulgate has *ille*) at John 4:40, 5:14, 6:39, 9:28, 11:23, 13:16.

<sup>33</sup> See John 3:6, 4:45, 4:47, 4:54, 5:24 (twice), 7:17, 18:36, 18:37, 19:17.

<sup>34</sup> Corr. *et rememoratae*

<sup>35</sup> Corr. *rememoratae*

4:50	ibat	abiit Ec	8 10 11 11A 14 15 27 33
5:2	cognominatur	dicitur Ec	2 3 4 5 8 11 11A 13 14 15 33
5:3	iacebat	discumbebat Ec	(5) (cf. <i>decumbebat</i> 3 4 8 11A 33)
5:4 <sup>36</sup>	(motum)	motionem Ec	6 8 14 15 27 29 (47)
5:4	(tenebatur)	detenebatur Ec	(6) 29
5:7	languidus	infirmus Ec	2 3 4 5 10 11 13
5:7	turbata	mota Ec	3 4 5 8 10 13 33
5:20	miremini	admiremini Ec	2 4 11 14
5:24	uerbum	sermonem Ec	2 30
6:2	his qui infirmabantur	infirmos Ec	3 5 10 13 14 22
6:3	subiit	ascendit Ec	2 4 10 13 14 33 47
6:5	cum subleuasset ergo oculos	eleuatis igitur oculis Ec	2 13 14 (cf. 4 10 33)
6:13	superfuerunt	superauerunt Ec	2 3 4 5 10 13 14 22 28
6:55	est cibus	es<ca est> Ec*?	2 3 4 13 14
6:57	uiuens	uiuus Ec	3 4 5 8* 10 13
6:67	abire	discedere Ec	11
7:25	interficere	occidere Ec	3 4 5 6 8 13 14 22
8:1	perrexit	abiit Ec	2 5
8:55	noui	scio Ec	5 6 15
9:6	linuit	inliniuit Ec	11
9:16	scisma	disensio Ec <sup>37</sup>	(3) 4 6 10 13
9:16	in eis	inter eos Ec	4 5 6 10 13 29 (cf. 3)
10:2	ostium	ianuam Ec	3 4 6 8 13 14 22 (27)
10:15	agnosco	noui Ec	3 10 14
10:16	unum ouile	unus grex Ec	(2 3) 4 5 6 8 10 11 15 32
10:20	ipsis	illis Ec	2 3 4 5 14 22
10:27	cognosco	noui Ec	14
11:1	languens	infirmus Ec	3 4 5 6 8 10
11:22	poposceris	petieris Ec	2 <sup>C</sup> 3 4 5 6 8 11 14 15 20 22 30
11:33	plorantem	flentem Ec	2 3 4 14 20 22
11:33	fremuit	infremuit Ec	4 8 11 14 22 27
11:39	ait	dicit Ec	4 5 8
12:27	saluifica	salu<um> me <fac> Ec*	15 (47)
12:47	saluificem	saluum faciam Ec	3 6 11 11A 14 15 30
15:2	plus	plurimum Ec	4 6 8* 10 11
15:13	dilectionem	caritatem Ec	2 3 13 14
15:24	oderunt	odio habuerunt Ec	4 14
16:20	uertetur	conuertetur Ec	3 4 14 30 33 (47)
16:21	parit	par<turit> Ec*?	3 13
16:21	pressurae	tristitiae Ec	5 6
16:24	plenum	impletum Ec	2 4 6 8 10 15
16:27	amat	diligit Ec	2 4 5 10
16:27	amastis	diligitis Ec	4 10
17:4	faciam	perficiam Ec	15
17:11	serua	conserua Ec	8 10 13 14 47
18:29	hunc	istum Ec	15
18:40	clamauerunt	exclamauerunt Ec	2 6 8 13 14 22
19:3	alapas	<palmas> Ec*?	2 3 4 6 8* 13 14 15 (29) 47 48
19:9	ingressus est	introiuit Ec	2 4 6 8 10 13 15 22
19:21	pontifices	principes Ec	(3) 4 10 13
19:24	partiti sunt	diuiserunt sibi Ec	2 3 4 6 8 10 13 14 15
19:28	consummaretur	impleretur Ec	6 10 13 14 16

<sup>36</sup> The base text of John 5:4 has been taken from the apparatus of the Stuttgart Vulgate, as the verse is not included in the editorial text.

<sup>37</sup> Corr. *dissensio*

19:36	os	ossum Ec*	3 4 8 13 16 22 (cf. 6 10?)
19:36	comminuetis	confringetis Ec	(3) 4 6 8 10 15 16 22
20:1	sublatum	reuolutum Ec	10 (22?)
20:12	unum ad pedes	alium ad pedes	13 14
20:23	detenta	retenta Ec	27 29 32 48
20:27	adfer	mitte Ec	3 4
21:1	postea	post haec Ec	2 3 5 14
21:3	prendiderunt	ceperunt Ec	2 3 6 10 14 15 27 47
21:14	cum	postquam Ec	2 3 4 10 14
21:14	surrexisset	resurrexit Ec	3 4 10 14
21:18	cingebas	<prae>cingebas Ec*?	2 (3) 4 6 8* 13 14
21:23	in	inter Ec	13 14 27 29 30 35 47 48

The above readings clearly illustrate that an Old Latin source underlies the text of Ec. While there is no sustained similarity to any single surviving manuscript, the parallels with Group 1 witnesses (especially Codices Palatinus, Vercellensis, Monacensis and Usserianus (VL 2, 3, 13, 14)) demonstrate the antiquity of the source text. Occasional agreements with just one or two Old Latin manuscripts appear to be an accident of preservation rather than evidence of ancestry. Furthermore, despite the piecemeal nature of this evidence which has not been conformed to the Vulgate, a degree of consistency in the translation may still be discerned: in addition to *rememorati* in John 2:17 and 2:22 and *saluum facere* in John 12:27 and 12:47, Ec has *retrorsum* for each instance of τὰ ὀπίσω, consistently renders πρῶτος by *prior*, and in John 3:3-5 has *renasci* throughout.<sup>38</sup> There are also three examples of *seipsum* where the Vulgate reads *semetipsum* (John 7:35, 12:19, 16:13), and a direct object is always provided for the participle *sequens* (John 1:38, 20:6, 21:20).

A similar picture is given by many of the additional words present in Ec but missing from the Vulgate. The inclusion of *hic* before *mundus* is characteristic of the earlier versions, but largely absent from Jerome's revision. This is seen in Ec at John 1:9 (first hand, later erased), 3:19, 6:14, 7:4, 10:36, 11:27, 12:46, 14:22, 15:19, 16:28 and 17:11. Most other additions have widespread Old Latin attestation, such as *nisi* in John 1:18, *dic nobis* in 1:22, *ecce* in 1:29, *terram* in 4:3, *simul* in 6:22 and 19:32, *scripturas* in 7:52, *autem* in 10:12, *nomine* in 11:1 and 11:49, *usque* in 13:1, *quia* in 16:33, *uis ut* in 18:11, *locum* in 19:17, *hebraice* in 20:16 and *congregati* in 20:19, to name but a few. Among those less well attested are *uocatis his ministris* in John 2:7 (VL 8, 11A), *in ipsum* in John 3:18 (VL 8, 11), *dicens* in John 6:7 (VL 2, 4, 28), *et prodigia* in John 6:26 (VL 3, 4, 5, 10, 30, 35), *suam propriam* in John 7:18 (VL 6, 8, 11; cf. *propriis suis* in 8:44), *et dixit* in John 8:19 (VL 2, 4, 5), *ante me* in John 10:8 (VL 5, 30), *enim* in John 10:11 (VL 4, 15), *et ego* in John 13:34 (VL 5, 30, 48), *quam* in John 15:13 (VL 35), *ea* in John 17:8 (VL 4, 6, 13), and *ad pilatum* in John 18:28 (VL 6, 14, 47). Although omissions are a less reliable guide to textual affiliation, a fairly high proportion of these are also paralleled among Old Latin witnesses. For example, *illi qui sanatus fuerat* is missing from John 5:10 in VL 2, 11, 11A, 13 and 14; *soror eius qui mortuus fuerat* is not present in John 11:39 in VL 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 15; *mercennarius autem fugit* is absent from John 10:12 in VL 2 and 5 as well; even *et tunicam* in John 19:23 is not found in a number of manuscripts. Again, while word

<sup>38</sup> *Retrorsum*: John 6:66, 18:6, 20:14; *prior*: John 1:15, 1:30, 5:4, 20:4, 20:8; the Vulgate switches to *primus* after John 1.

order is also an insecure criterion, the majority of non-Vulgate instances in Ec are attested elsewhere, such as *descendentes et ascendentes* in John 1:51 (VL 13) and *relinquo ... do* in John 14:27 (VL 4, 13, 48). It is worth observing that Ec (along with most Old Latin codices) prefers *me misit* where the Vulgate reads *misit me*.<sup>39</sup>

Variation in the form of connectives is characteristic of the Old Latin tradition as well, and may sometimes offer an indication of textual affiliation.<sup>40</sup> Compared with the Vulgate, Ec omits 76 connectives (mostly *et*), adds them 57 times (usually *autem* or *et*, but also *ergo*, *enim*, *uero* and *-que*),<sup>41</sup> and has 41 variant forms. In this last category, there is a preponderance of examples of *autem*, especially in place of *ergo*, but also alternations involving *enim*, *ergo*, *igitur*, *itaque* and *uero*.<sup>42</sup> Some are unique to Ec (indicated by \* in the footnotes), but most are paralleled in at least one Old Latin witness. Other variant readings are also indicative of the manuscript's Old Latin roots. The recastings of *in quibus putatis uos* in John 5:39 (Vulgate *quia uos putatis in ipsis*), and *uerum enim quia* in John 15:19 (Vulgate *quia uero*) are shared with VL 2, 13, 15 and VL 4, 11 respectively. *Parate* rather than *dirigite* in the citation of Isaiah at John 1:23 is also found in VL 6, 8, 10 and 13, while *audit* in place of *habet* in John 14:21 occurs in VL 4, 6 and 15. Only Codex Brixianus (VL 10) offers a parallel for *lapidarent eum* in John 8:59 (Vulgate *iacerent in eum*). While certain changes in pronouns (*tuus* for *eius* in 4:51, *uester* for *noster* in John 8:54 and *uobis* for *nobis* in 11:50) have extensive Old Latin support, *nobis* for *uobis* in John 7:19 is unique to Ec.<sup>43</sup>

There are surprisingly few non-Vulgate forms shared with other mixed texts of Irish or Anglo-Saxon origin, indicating that Ec is relatively independent of this textual tradition despite conforming to the norms of insular orthography.<sup>44</sup> Among the exceptions, we may note *uir* for *uere* at John 1:47 (VL 29, 30, 47\*, 48); *omnes* for

<sup>39</sup> John 4:34, 5:24, 6:40, 7:16, 8:18, 9:4, 12:44, 12:45, 14:24, 15:21; there are counterexamples of *misit me* at 8:16 and 16:5.

<sup>40</sup> See D. C. Parker, 'The Translation of OYN in the Old Latin Gospels' *NTS* 31 (1985) pp. 252-76 (reprinted in D.C. Parker, *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology*. (ANTF 40). Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 2009).

<sup>41</sup> Addition of *ergo* at John 1:22, 3:27\*, 4:9\*, 4:30, 5:10, 6:66, 8:39\*, 9:12, 9:35\*, 10:31, 10:35, 10:37\*, 16:30, 20:18, 21:5\*, 21:11; *enim* at John 3:33, 5:43, 6:45, 6:50\*, 10:11; *uero* at 9:9; *-que* at 6:19\*.

<sup>42</sup> *autem* for *ergo*: John 2:22\*, 3:25, 3:29, 4:1\*, 4:6, 9:25, 12:19, 19:26; *autem* for *at* or *et*: John 4:42, 7:15, 16:5; *autem* for *enim*, *igitur* or *itaque*: John 7:12, 11:31, 18:4; *ergo* for *autem*: John 7:3, 12:2, 19:16; *ergo* for *et*: John 11:55; *ergo* for *itaque*: John 11:17; *enim* for *autem*: John 7:44\*, 13:30\*, 16:13, 18:14; *enim* for *ergo*: John 18:8\*; *et* for *ergo*: John 1:22; *igitur* for *ergo*: John 16:18; *itaque* for *ergo*: John 12:3; *uero* for *ergo*: John 8:5, 11:38\*; *uero* for *autem*: John 11:46.

<sup>43</sup> Tischendorf *ad loc.* indicates minor support for this in Greek, but transcriptional probability for both languages suggests that the variant arose independently.

<sup>44</sup> Such as confusion between *-s-* and *-ss-* (e.g. *misus* John 1:6, *mesiam* 1:41, *accussabant* 8:10) or *-i-* and *-e-* (especially in perfect forms of the verb, e.g. *colligerunt* 6:13), omission of initial *e* from *eicere* (John 9:34-5, 12:31, 12:42), *tonica* for *tunica* (John 19:23, 21:7), abbreviations for *autem* and *enim*. The copyist has a particular tendency to write *qui* in place of *quia*, found in other insular manuscripts (e.g. John 4:1 and 8:45 in VL 47; John 8:34 in VL 11A).

*homines* at John 6:10 (VL 11A, 30); *sermo* in the nominative at John 14:24 (VL 27, 29, 30<sup>C</sup>, 35<sup>C</sup>, 47, 48); the omission of *tu scis* from John 21:17 (VL 30, 35, 47, 48); the additions of *tu* at John 7:3 (VL 30, 48), *acceptam* at John 13:27 (VL 27, 48), *quam* at John 15:13 (VL 35), *uinctum* at John 18:39 (VL 47<sup>C</sup>, 48), and *me* at John 20:29 (VL 30, 35, 47, 48). A number of other readings shared by this group are also attested in the earlier Old Latin stratum, including the construction *de aqua uinum fecit* in John 4:46 (cf. VL 4, 15, 29, 30, 48); *lauabat* in John 5:4 (cf. VL 14, 33, 35, 47), *tui* for *tibi* at John 9:10 (VL 4, 14, 27, 28, 30, 35, 47, 48); *ligatis manibus et pedibus institis* at John 11:44 (cf. VL 2, 14, 27, 30, 35, 47); *discumbentium* in John 21:12 (VL 6, 15, 27, 29, 30, 35, 40); the additions of *multi* in John 3:23 (VL 14, 15, 30, 35, 47), *qui te accusabant* in John 8:10 (VL 11<sup>C</sup>, 14, 28, 29, 30, 35, 47, 48, cf. VL 15), *tuum* in John 18:11 (VL 2, 30, 35, 47, 48), and *aeternam* in John 20:31 (VL 2, 4, 13, 14, 29, 30, 35, 48). It is therefore possible that Ec inherited them independently. One interesting reading only preserved in Ec and Irish witnesses is *adducunt ergo Iesum ad Pilatum in praetorium* in the rubricated text at John 18:28. This is only paralleled by VL 14 and 47.<sup>45</sup> The reading *ad Pilatum* may represent a deliberate attempt to clarify the sequence of the hearings in John 18: many Old Latin manuscripts read *ad Caipham* here, while the Vulgate has *a Caipha* (later added in Ec by a minuscule hand) corresponding to the standard Greek text.

Finally, readings should be considered which are only found in Ec among the Old Latin manuscripts. As noted above, the data from Fischer's test passages indicates that some of these are genuinely unique; others may be paralleled in later manuscripts but have not thus far been considered as Old Latin evidence. In fact, several are also present in the patristic material in the *Vetus Latina Database* and therefore have a claim to be genuine ancient readings.<sup>46</sup> These include *funibus* for *funiculis* in John 2:15 (in Jerome and Hilary),<sup>47</sup> *qui audit sermonem meum* in John 5:24 (in Tertullian and Jerome),<sup>48</sup> *ait ad illam* in John 8:11 (Ambrose),<sup>49</sup> *dabo* for *do* in John 10:28 and *sequeris me postea* in 13:36 (both Augustine),<sup>50</sup> and *sanctificaui* for *sanctifico* in John 17:19 (in the early African *Contra Varimadum*).<sup>51</sup> There are two additions which occur in the *Responsorium Romanum*: *sitiam in aeternam* in John 4:15 and *dicebant inter se* in John 6:14.<sup>52</sup> Others are more weakly supported and may be coincidental, such as *dicens* for the second *et confessus est* in John 1:20, the probable inclusion of *ex aqua et spiritu* in John 3:3, *aspirat* for *spirat* in John 3:8, *habet* for *uidebit* in John 3:36, *quaeritis ... creditis* in John 5:44, *ita etiam* in John 6:66, the passives *lapidari* in

<sup>45</sup> Although VL 6 has *ad Caipham et ad Pilatum*; VL 14 reads *igitur* for *ergo*.

<sup>46</sup> The *Vetus Latina Database*, featuring images of the card index of citations held at the Vetus Latina-Institut in Beuron, is available online at <<http://brepolis.net/>>.

<sup>47</sup> HI Mc 9; HIL Ps 118.3.2; cf. JO III sen 4.8.

<sup>48</sup> TE Pra 21 offers an exact match; the word order is slightly different in HI Ex 6.18, and TE res 37 has the phrase in the plural.

<sup>49</sup> AM ep 68.17; *ait illi* in AM-A Apc 6 is probably too loose, but represents the only other instance of *ait* in this verse (only found in Ec in Fischer's collation).

<sup>50</sup> AU Jo 48.5.10 and AU Ps 103.s3.9.81, AU Ps 140.24.29 respectively.

<sup>51</sup> PS-VIG Var 1.36.

<sup>52</sup> RES-R 2309 and RES-R 3177; the exact reading of the latter is '*intra se dicentes*'.

John 8:5 and *lauetur* in John 13:10, and the omission of the second *daemonium* from John 10:21.<sup>53</sup>

Other readings remain unparalleled, but are likely to be alternative renderings. The most important are:

- 3:21 *facit ueritatem*] *bonum facit* Ec
- 4:31 *interea*] *post haec uero* Ec
- 4:53 *pater*] + *ipsius* Ec (cf. + *eius* VL 2, 10)
- 5:4 *quocumque languore*] *quacumque ... aegritudine* Ec
- 5:13 *qui sanus fuerat effectus*] *qui infirmatus fuerat* Ec
- 6:30 *quod ergo tu facis signum*] *quod signum facies* Ec
- 7:12 *murmur multus de eo erat in turba*] *murmurabat de illo turba* Ec
- 8:41 *dixerunt itaque*] *responderunt* Ec
- 9:22 *conspirauerant*] *consilium fecerunt* Ec
- 10:17 *sumam*] *adsumam* Ec
- 10:20 *quid eum auditis*] *quid uultis eum audire* Ec
- 12:46 *omnis credit ... maneat*] *omnes credunt... maneat* Ec
- 14:22 *factum est*] *facturus es* Ec
- 17:17 *ueritas*] *uerax* Ec
- 18:17 *ancilla ostiaria*] *illa ancilla* Ec

It is not clear whether *cognoscetis* in place of *cogitatis* at John 11:50 is a genuine variant or a scribal error: the same switch is found (again, only in Ec) at John 12:10, where it is more obviously erroneous. Fischer's collation shows that the final infinitive *adprehendere* in John 7:32 (Vulgate *ut adprehenderent*) is unique to Ec; while *manducare* is used in the same way in John 6:52 (Vulgate *ad manducandum*), this literal rendering of the Greek is present in a number of Old Latin manuscripts. The addition of *ecce* before *uenit hora* in John 17:1, also unique to Ec, is probably a reminiscence of John 16:32. Several other additions appear to be explanatory glosses: while some such as *nomine* in John 11:1 and 11:47 or *hebraice* in 20:16 do have Old Latin support, *uestis* in John 20:12 and *numero* in 21:11 remain unique; the singular correction *legem circumcisionis* in John 7:22 may also fall into this category. Some have a harmonistic tendency, as noted above with *manus et pedes et latus* in John 20:20 and *reolutum* in John 20:1 (cf. Mark 16:4). This is also seen in *signa et prodigia* in John 6:26 (cf. John 4:48). The most significant is in John 19:30, reading *cum ergo accepisset Iesus acetum cum felle mixtum*. The addition of *fel* comes from Matthew 27:34, and it is likely that patristic evidence (the Latin version of Origen's sermons, and numerous works by Quodvultdeus) is also a conflation. It is notable that most of these harmonisations occur in the passion narrative (cf. the reading *ad*

<sup>53</sup> For John 1:20, see QU pro 3.2. John 3:3 is often confused with 3:5; while they can usually be distinguished by the main verb (*uidere* and *introire* respectively) and a number of early citations have *uidere* and *ex aqua et spiritu*, this is also the reading of VL 15 in John 3:5; *adspirat* is found in John 3:8 in AM fi ap CO-Lat, AN te 8.1, PS-VIG tri 1.41; *habet* in John 3:36 appears in AU ench 10.6, throughout AU s 294, and in EUGI reg 11.5 and IR 4.37.5 (Augustine and others also read *habebit* with VL 2 and 15); *lapidari* in John 8:5 is probably an orthographic variant for *lapidare*, but a similar passive is found at AU Ps 50.8.24, PS-AU s Mai 8, PS-FU s 9, QU pro 2.43; BEN-A *opuscula* 1 provides the only other example of *non indiget ut lauetur* in John 13:10 (see PL103, col. 1398D; I am grateful to Dr Rosalind MacLachlan for assistance with this reference); AMst q ap 71.2 has a shorter form of John 10:21.

*Pilatum* in 18:28), although it is impossible to determine whether they reflect a deliberate attempt to harmonise the accounts of the different evangelists.

In conclusion, I hope that I have demonstrated the textual importance of a manuscript which has long been admired for its many other qualities. As a result of this study, the manuscript has now been included in the official list of the *Vetus Latina*-Institut, with the number 9A.<sup>54</sup> Even though I have confined my survey to the text of John, a glance at the pages of the Synoptic Gospels, with similar erasures and corrections (not to mention non-Vulgate readings in the rubricated first line of each chapter), and a brief review of the evidence in the other volumes of Fischer's collation suggest that their text has a similar character. I have no doubt that further investigations will continue to demonstrate the ongoing value of Fischer's remarkable achievement and lead to more discoveries.

---

<sup>54</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Roger Gryson, director of the *Vetus Latina*-Institut, for his response to a draft of this article. As the numerical sequence allocated to Gospel manuscripts (1–49) is now full, new witnesses are distinguished by the letter A; VL 9 is the only other Old Latin manuscript currently held in St Petersburg, an eighth-century copy of the Gospel according to Matthew which is also a 'mixed text'. The full transcription of VL 9A will be made available online in an update to the *Vetus Latina Iohannes Electronic Edition*.