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# CHAPTER DIVISIONS, CAPITULA LISTS, AND THE OLD LATIN VERSIONS OF JOHN 


#### Abstract

Introduction* The modern division of the Gospel according to John into twentyone chapters dates back only as far as Stephen Langton around the year 1200, while the current system of verses is largely the work of the printer Stephanus (Robert Étienne) in the sixteenth century. ${ }^{1}$ Biblical manuscripts present a number of different series. In the Greek tradition, the most widespread type is one of eighteen chapters found in the fifthcentury Codex Alexandrinus (Gregory-Aland 02) and numerous subsequent Byzantine manuscripts. These are known as kephalaia, and a list of chapter titles usually precedes the text of the Gospel. ${ }^{2}$ An earlier but very rare alternative is the set of eighty numbered paragraphs in Codex Vaticanus (G-A 03). ${ }^{3}$ Smaller divisions of text are supplied by the Euse-


[^0]bian apparatus, a system of concordance between the four Gospels: each Gospel is divided into sequentially-numbered Ammonian sections (John has 232), which are assigned to one of ten Eusebian canons according to the relationship of the material with the other Gospels. ${ }^{4}$ This appears in Greek biblical manuscripts from the fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus (G-A 01) onwards.

The Latin tradition is much more diverse. In Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine ( $S D R$ ), a collection of material prepared by Donatien De Bruyne in 1914 for the use of scholars working on the Roman edition of the Vulgate, no fewer than fourteen types of chapter divisions are given for John along with an edition of the accompanying titles, or capitula. ${ }^{5}$ This builds on the information provided in Appendix II of Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, and entirely replaces the seven series printed by Wordsworth and White in their Oxford Vulgate. ${ }^{6}$ Nonetheless, $S D R$ was intended only as an aid for transcribers, lacking introduction, explanation of the sigla, and any analysis of the relationships of the different series: De Bruyne himself later acknowledged that «Le texte était provisoire, le sigle donné à chaque sommaire était souvent arbitraire. Tout cela était un commencement d'étude, non une conclusion.» ${ }^{7}$ In the Old Testament it has been superseded as intended by the printed volumes of the Roman Vulgate. For the New Testament, however, the fullest critical account of later Latin tradition is still provided by the Oxford Vulgate and it is only in the Vetus Latina editions that further

[^1]analysis of this material and improved texts of the capitula are to be found. ${ }^{8}$

The present article examines the chapter divisions and capitula in the Gospel according to John with reference to the Old Latin tradition. This consists of early Latin versions which differ from the revision by Jerome later adopted as the Vulgate. Old Latin manuscripts of John have been divided by Burton into three groups: Group 1 provides the most ancient texts; Group 2A represents a later, more consistent form; Group 2B comprises manuscripts closely related to the Vulgate but preserving a substantial proportion of divergent readings. ${ }^{9}$ The first section considers the systems of division found in these codices, demonstrating that two of the principal series of chapters occur in Old Latin witnesses not included in $S D R$, while there is further evidence for a third which is apparently unique to the early versions. The second section investigates each of the types of capitula in turn, clarifying details of their attestation and interrelation and showing how the form of biblical text in several series not only confirms an Old Latin origin but also provides important evidence for early translations of the Gospel.

## 1. Divisions of the Gospel Text in Old Latin Manuscripts

Certain features of the layout of the Gospels are characteristic of the Vulgate. In his dedicatory letter to Pope Damasus, which precedes the biblical text in many Latin gospel books, Jerome states that his revision has the Gospels in the order Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, following the Greek sequence. ${ }^{10}$ This enabled him to add the full Eusebian appa-

[^2]ratus: the Ammonian sections in the margin of the Gospels were written in black with the relevant canon number underneath in red. Jerome's explanation of how to refer to the canon tables in the front of the gospel book in order to identify parallel passages suggests that the practice of including the corresponding Ammonian sections from other Gospels in the margin was a later development. ${ }^{11}$ The list of lections found at the back of many Vulgate gospel books, the Capitulare euangeliorum de circulo anni, uses the Ammonian section numbers to identify the readings. ${ }^{12}$ In a handful of manuscripts, the opening text of each Ammonian section is provided in the initial canon tables. ${ }^{13}$ A few witnesses to the Type I capitula have Ammonian section numbers in place of chapter numbers in the list of titles. ${ }^{14}$

Jerome does not mention other types of biblical chapter division in his preface. Nonetheless, synoptic tables of such systems are provided in the second part of SDR based on a large number of Vulgate manuscripts, along with a few witnesses to the earlier versions. There are fourteen separate columns for John (pp. 521-6), although these mask a considerable degree of overlap. Types I, Pi, In and Cat are broadly similar, with thirty-six sections (the last of which is absent from Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ ). Type B, with fourteen divisions, is the most widely-attested system. Type C ( 45 chapters) is found in Codex Amiatinus and several other well-known Vulgate witnesses, while the remaining five series only appear in one or two manuscripts: Type P ( 21 chapters), Type I ${ }^{\text {for }}$ ( 39 chapters), Type

[^3]Cy ( 68 chapters), Type Ben (49 chapters) and Type Q (27 unnumbered sections). ${ }^{15}$ Further details of the sources for each type are given in the second part of this article: the revised table of divisions in the Appendix includes information for the three columns which are blank throughout (Types $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}}, \mathrm{D}$ and Z ) as well as two sets of capitula which are not included (Types W and Vich). ${ }^{16}$ With the exception of Type $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}}$ (which is identified below as Type A) and the addition of Type Win, this study will continue to use De Bruyne's sigla for each series.

The earliest surviving Latin manuscripts of John have neither Eusebian apparatus nor chapter numbers. Codex Palatinus (VL 2) and Codex Vercellensis (VL 3) indicate sense units by ekthesis, a line projecting into the left margin, at the rate of roughly one for every two modern verses. ${ }^{17}$ The original portion of Codex Bezae (VL 5), the fifth-century Greek-Latin bilingual written in sense lines, also features ekthesis but less frequently: the total for the whole gospel would be slightly fewer than the Ammonian sections, with which there is no correspondence. ${ }^{18}$ However, Codex Veronensis (VL 4), despite having the Gospels in the Old Latin order and being classified as a Group 1 witness in the first half of John, includes both the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canon numbers in silver and gold ink respectively. While it is possible that the numbers were taken from a different source to the exemplar used for the gospel, their presence in this fifth-century Old Latin codex suggests that Eusebius' system may

[^4]also have been adopted in the Latin tradition independently of Jerome. There are 504 instances of ekthesis and 637 gold paragraphus markers in John in Codex Veronensis, but no evidence of division into chapters.

The three other members of Group 1, all copied in the sixth or seventh century, do not have Ammonian sections but do contain systems of chapters. The fragmentary leaves of Codex Sarzanensis (VL 22) reveal two series of numbered sections. First, there are four Greek numerals, $\Gamma$ at $3: 22, \Delta$ at $4: 1, \mathrm{E}$ at $6: 1$ and Z at $7: 1$, which correspond broadly to the fourteen-chapter Types A and B. ${ }^{19}$ In addition, there is an overlapping series of Roman numerals: VI occurs alongside 6:15, and XI to XVIII between 7:2 and 9:1. ${ }^{20}$ This sequence seems to be without parallel, and cannot have extended back to the beginning of the gospel with the same frequency: it is a shame the manuscript is not better preserved to shed more light on this. Codex Monacensis (VL 13) indicates chapter divisions by three rubricated lines plus a decorated capital in the margin, but no numbers. This is the sole witness for Type Q in $S D R$. There are twenty-seven such divisions in the extant part of the manuscript. ${ }^{21}$ Finally, Codex Usserianus primus (VL 14) also rubricates the beginning of each section. There are thirty-three of these lines remaining, but numbers occasionally visible to the left of the rubric indicate that this was a thirty-six chapter sequence very similar to Type I: twenty-six correspond exactly, and six of the seven variants are by no more than a verse. The exception is the placing of Chapter 16: although this occurs in Type I at John 8:1, the story of the adulteress is missing from this manuscript and the rubric is found at 8:12 instead. Nonetheless, as the corresponding title in Type I and related series refers only to this pericope, it seems more likely that Codex Usserianus is an accommodation to an existing scheme rather than an earlier version of this set of divisions.

[^5]Three of the four principal members of Group 2A also have the chapter divisions of the Type I group: Codex Colbertinus (VL 6), Codex Corbeiensis (VL 8) and the mixed-text Old Latin manuscript in Würzburg (VL 11A). ${ }^{22}$ All six marginal numbers in the last of these occur between John 3:1 and 5:1, one of the portions taken from an Old Latin exemplar. Neither VL 11A nor VL 8 have Ammonian sections, but the much later VL 6 has the full Eusebian apparatus including Ammonian sections for the parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels. There are minor differences between the location of the divisions in VL 6, VL 8 and the archetypical version of Type I in $S D R$; some of these match other sequences, but the capitula indicate that they are witnesses to Type I. ${ }^{23}$ The fourth manuscript in Group 2A, Codex Rehdigeranus (VL 11), has the Ammonian sections for John alongside the gospel text and those of the parallel passages in a decorative arcade at the bottom of the page (without any Eusebian canon numbers). Although it has the Gospels in the Vulgate order, this presumably represents a method of applying the Eusebian apparatus to the Latin tradition without the canon tables. There are also six marginal numbers representing longer divisions: 2 (at 2:1); 3 (at 3:22); 5 (at 4:54); 6 (at 6:1); 9 (at 7:1) and 11 (at 13:1). ${ }^{24}$ Four of these correspond to Types A and $\mathrm{B}(2,3,6$ and 11$) ; 5$ is only one verse away from the expected location at $5: 1$, and 9 (VIIII) seems to be an error for 7 (VII), in keeping with comparable mistakes in the Ammonian sections. ${ }^{25}$ This manuscript may therefore be taken as a second Old Latin example of Type A or B, complementing the Greek numerals in VL 22. ${ }^{26}$ The only one of the fragmentary members of Group 2A with sectional divisions is the St Gall fifth-century uncial (VL 16). This does not have the Eusebian apparatus, but Greek chapter numbers have been added in red. The single complete page of John 19 has IOHANNEN IA as the running title, the fourteenth chapter matching the Type A and B divisions; the more extensive numer-

[^6]ation of Matthew and Mark confirms this identification. ${ }^{27}$ It is interesting that, as in VL 22, Greek numerals (and the Greek accusative) are used for this series. ${ }^{28}$

Manuscripts in Group 2B, being close to the Vulgate, usually include the full Eusebian apparatus and the Gospels in their customary sequence. Codex Brixianus (VL 10) is an exception on both counts, having the order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark and only the Ammonian sections in the margin, with the Synoptic parallels indicated in arcades at the foot of each page (like VL 11). The canon tables at the beginning of the manuscript include the opening words of each Ammonian section (and occasional subdivisions): these appear both codicologically and textually to derive from a different source, preserving some Old Latin readings not matched by the gospel text although their character is broadly similar. ${ }^{29}$ Codex Brixianus features ekthesis in 111 lines in John, as well as a series of longer numbered divisions in the first half of the Gospel which are preceded by the letters LEC. Nine of the first ten divisions match the rubrics in Codex Monacensis which constitute Type Q: LEC I appears at John 1:35, corresponding to the second rubric (the first is at John 1:1); the numbers are made up, however, by LEC III at John $2: 12$ where there is no rubric in Codex Monacensis. ${ }^{30}$ The systems diverge from the middle of John 6 : LEC XII at 6:47, LEC XIIII at 7:14, and LEC XVIII at 9:39 have no counterparts in Codex Monacensis, while LEC XVI at 8:20 anticipates the rubric by one verse. From John 10, there are no LEC markings until a unnumbered LEC added by a later hand at 20:19. Even so, the partial similarity of these systems is significant, suggesting that Type $Q$ may not have been peculiar to Codex Monacensis. It is worth noting in passing that both these manuscripts have Arian connections, although they
27. In the fragments of Matthew IH (18) appears next to $18: 1$ and in the running title of the next page, $\mathrm{K}(20)$ next to $20: 1$ and KA (21) alongside 21:1, while in Mark $\zeta$ (6) can be detected in the running title of the page beginning 7:13 and possibly also $\mathrm{Z}(7)$ on the page beginning $8: 32$ (see St Gall 1394, pp. 52, 66, 62, 58, 75 and 79). The size of numbers in the running titles suggests that they were added after the copying of the gospel text, although it is hard to say how much later: the numbers in Mark have faded and it is impossible to detect one in the running title of Mark on p. 85 or its seventh-century replacement page (p. 91).
28. The use of Greek numerals for the capitula in certain witnesses of Cyprian's collection of testimonia and other Latin manuscripts is noted in Parker, Codex Bezae, p. 9. Colmar 38 also identifies the chapter divisions with Greek numerals, preceded by K: see Vezin, «Les divisions du texte», pp. 57-8.
29. See Roger Gryson, «La version gotique des évangiles. Essai de réévaluation» Revue théologique de Louvain 21 (1990) 3-31, p. 23. The text of these titles is included with that of the other Old Latin canon tables in the Vetus Latina Iohannes.
30. As noted above, there is a larger capital at this point in VL 13, although this is one of several which do not seem to relate to the rubricated divisions.
belong to different textual groups. ${ }^{31}$ The designation $L E C$ is presumably an abbreviation for lectio, reminiscent of manuscripts which divide the text of the gospels into paragraphs with the liturgical incipit in illo tempore: the only Old Latin manuscript with this is Codex Sangermanensis secundus (VL 29). This has fifty-three lections marked within the text of John, sometimes inserting introductory phrases into the middle of a verse regardless of the context. ${ }^{32}$

Three other members of Group 2B do not have any of the Eusebian apparatus. The portions of John surviving in Codex Usserianus secundus (VL 28) feature frequent capital letters but no marginal numbers. St Gall 51 (VL 48) is similar, with over six hundred rubricated capital letters. Some extend over two or more lines, with exceptionally large letters or groups of letters at 1:1, 1:6, 10:1, 13:1, 18:1 and 20:1. McGurk identifies several manuscripts of insular origin which share this feature. ${ }^{33}$ It is difficult to specify which (if any) of the other larger capitals are particularly significant: sixteen more occur at the beginning of a line, displacing text below, but this is occasionally the case in the middle of a line as well (e.g. $7: 1,21: 1$ ) and there are also larger capitals which do not affect the following line (e.g. 2:1, 2:12, 3:22). While most are paralleled by sections found elsewhere, there is no obvious correspondence with any single system of division given in SDR. ${ }^{34}$ The only form of division in the tiny sixth-century copy of John found in a reliquary in Chartres (VL 33) is ekthesis, which occurs in 308 lines.

Divisions corresponding to Type I and Types A and B are also present in Group 2B. The former is found in Codex Sangermanensis primus (VL 7, but practically a Vulgate text in John) and Codex Aureus

[^7](VL 15). ${ }^{35}$ Again, there are several slight variations, usually by no more than a verse. St Gall 60 (VL 47) only contains John but has the full Eusebian apparatus including Synoptic parallels as well as fourteen numbered chapters. The latter are an almost exact match for the divisions of Types A and B. ${ }^{36}$ In addition, there is a single fossilised number corresponding to the Type I series copied as part of the biblical text in the middle of John $2: 13$, showing that this series was present in an ancestor. ${ }^{37}$ The newly-identified Old Latin manuscript in St Petersburg, VL 9 A , also has fourteen rubricated lines and numbered divisions in the text of John (notwithstanding the initial list of forty-five capitula). ${ }^{38}$ The first eleven correspond more or less to Types A and B, albeit increased by one because the first chapter is numbered 2. There is no division at $13: 1$ or 15:1; instead Chapter 12 comes at 16:33, Chapter 13 at 18:1 and Chapter 14 in the normal place at 18:28.

Finally, St Gall 48 (VL 27) is not a self-standing Latin witness but a Greek gospel book with an interlinear Latin translation. This has the standard series of Greek kephalaia: the eighteen titles occur both in an initial list and within the gospel text, and the Latin equivalent is provided above.

In conclusion, despite the absence of systematic chapter divisions from several of the oldest Latin gospel books, the two best-attested systems of dividing John, a thirty-six chapter sequence (Type I, cf. Pi, In, Cat, W) and a fourteen-chapter sequence (Type A or B, cf. Vich), are both found in Old Latin manuscripts with the earliest form of text (Burton's Group 1). This is a significant advance on the evidence given in $S D R$ for tracing the development of these divisions. Similarly Type Q, which was previously known only from Codex Monacensis (VL 13), also a member of Group 1, finds further support in the numbered lections of the first half of John in Codex Brixianus (VL 10). Although the other types of division listed in SDR do not appear to be present in manuscripts identi-

[^8]fied as Old Latin, the larger capitals in St Gall 51 (VL 48) indicate that yet more configurations may be found. None of the known Latin systems, however, correspond to the Greek kephalaia or the paragraphs in Codex Vaticanus. ${ }^{39}$ Furthermore, no two witnesses have exactly the same distribution of divisions: this suggests that exact agreement even within the same overall scheme is the exception rather than the rule and could therefore be of genealogical significance. ${ }^{40}$ The presence of chapter numbers, especially incomplete series, may provide an indication of the use of different exemplars (as in the case of VL 11A), or shed other light on the transmission of the text. These systems might also convey information on how the text of the Gospel was approached by exegetes or the way in which gospel books were used. ${ }^{41}$ While the existence of chapter divisions in early Latin biblical manuscripts has long been known, the extent and variety of their attestation in witnesses with an Old Latin text of John is remarkable.

## 2. The text of the capitula lists

Accompanying each set of chapter divisions is a list of chapter titles, or capitula. (The individual titles may be referred to as tituli.) These were part of Latin biblical tradition from at least the middle of the fourth century: Jerome mentions a series of titles for the Gospels attributed to Fortunatianus of Aquileia, and Hilary of Poitiers' commentary on Matthew includes capitula very similar to those preserved in some Gospel manuscripts. ${ }^{42}$ The capitula lists usually precede the text of each Gospel,

[^9]although in some codices they occur in a separate section preceding all four (e.g. VL 7). While the presence of divisions in a gospel manuscript does not offer a secure indication of its chronology or origin, the matching capitula have distinctive textual characteristics, particularly in their quotation of biblical material, which may make it possible to propose a location or date for their original composition. In this section, each of the fourteen sets of capitula printed in $S D R$ (along with a fifteenth mentioned by Berger) is analysed to see whether it is a fresh compilation or dependent on another series, and whether its biblical text derives from an Old Latin or Vulgate source. In addition, full details are given of the manuscripts used by De Bruyne for his edition (which are not always easy to identify), supplemented by information from McGurk's catalogue of Latin gospel books copied before the year $800 .{ }^{43}$ The series are treated in alphabetical order; only the opening and closing capitula are quoted here as a full text of the Old Latin types is now available in the first fascicule of the edition of the Vetus Latina Iohannes.

## Types $A$ and $B$

In the Synoptic Gospels, separate series of capitula are given as Type A and Type B, although they are very closely related: Type B is an abbreviation of Type A. ${ }^{44}$ In John, however, $S D R$ presents a single set with the siglum $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{A}$, on the grounds that many manuscripts with Type A in the Synoptics have the shorter titles typical of Type B in John. In fact, the textual relationship between De Bruyne's Type $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{A}$ and Type $\mathrm{B}^{r}$ is comparable to that of B and A in the Synoptic Gospels; furthermore, this had already been recognised by Berger, who treated the $\mathrm{B}^{r}$ titles as the original form of Type A although the shorter titles for John had clearly been substituted at an early point in at least one branch of the tradition. ${ }^{45}$ In fact, the summary tables in $S D R$ (pp. 411-4) preserve the Type A and Type B distinction found in Berger, apparently ignoring Berger's note that, while at least twenty-four of the otherwise pure Type A wit-

[^10]nesses have Type B in John, there are around forty manuscripts in which the affiliation of John requires verification (see below). In the present study, they will once again be divided into the abbreviated Type B and the longer Type A (formerly Type Br ), taken in this order.

Type B (formerly Type B=A). 14 chapters.
Incipit (I): Pharisaeorum leuitae interrogant Iohannem, Iohannes Iesum uidens agnum dei dicit et Andreas Petro dicit: inuenimus messiam. Explicit (XIIII): Adlocutio Pilati ad Iudaeos de Iesu et de Barabba. Passio Iesu et sepultura et resurrectio eius. ${ }^{46}$

De Bruyne edits the text of the Type B capitula from sixteen manuscripts. ${ }^{47}$ McGurk supplements these with sixteen instances of this series in gospel books copied before the year 800, the earliest of which is the sixth-century Gospels of St Augustine. ${ }^{48}$ These titles occur in two manuscripts with more than one series of capitula: Vienna, lat. 1224, where they immediately precede the Gospel (after Type D at the beginning of the manuscript), and Codex Forojuliensis, where they are followed by Type $\mathrm{I}^{\text {for }}$. The sole example of Type P divisions (Paris, BnF, lat. 10348) has Type B capitula. The titles are preceded by a variety of headings: the majority of manuscripts describe them as capitula, but we also find breues, breuiarium, elenchus and tituli. ${ }^{49}$

[^11]As noted above, VL 16, VL 22 and Colmar 38 use Greek numerals to mark chapter divisions matching this series, although the Old Latin witnesses do not transmit the capitula. VL 11, however, has Type B capitula before Luke and it is possible that Type B titles originally preceded John in the pages now missing. ${ }^{50}$ An Old Latin origin for the series is supported by the biblical text in nine of the fourteen titles, e.g. minorari in Cap. 3 (VL 4, 14; Vulgate minui) and both dedicatio (VL 2, 6, 8, 10, 14, 32, 46; Vulgate encenia) and deambulare (VL 11, 11A, 14; Vulgate ambulare) in Cap. 9. However, all such non-Vulgate readings are shared with the longer capitula of Type A which have an even more marked Old Latin affiliation (see below). The two series are obviously related: much of the wording is identical, including phrases such as de grano frumenti quod in terram mittitur (Cap. 10), de obseruandis mandatis (Cap. 12) and adlocutio Pilati ad Iudaeos de Iesu (Cap. 14). Confirmation of the dependence of B on A may be found in two summary phrases: Cap. 2 in B ends et de aliis multis, abbreviating the mention of the serpent and the light in A, while Cap. 12 in B ends et cetera mandata, which are more fully listed in A. ${ }^{51}$ The material in Type B which does not derive from Type A is minimal: the most striking is the insertion in Cap. 5 of scrutamini scripturas and si crederetis Mosi crederetis forsitan et mihi (John 5:39, 46). Both these quotations correspond to the Vulgate, as does the replacement of initium by principium in Cap. 8 ( $c f$. John 8:25). There is also the addition of Scenophegia in Cap. 7 and Barabbas in Cap. 14. Although references to the woman taken in adultery and the final chapter of John are missing from the editorial text in $S D R$, these are unlikely to be textually significant given that Type B is derived from Type A. ${ }^{52}$

[^12]Type A (formerly Type Br). 14 chapters.
Incipit (I): Pharisaeorum ${ }^{53}$ leuitae interrogant Iohannem. Iohannes Iesum uidens ecce agnus dei dicit de cuius spiritu testificatur. ... ubi etiam ad Nathanahel loquitur.
Explicit (XIIII): Allocutio Pilati ad Iudaeos de Iesu ... et quod post prandium Petro pascendas oues tertio iniungit. ${ }^{54}$

Four manuscripts are listed for Type $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}}$ in $S D R$, yet only Florence, $B M L$, Plutei 25.2 (F) and Vatican, Reginenses lat. 14 (R) are used for the text; Rouen A. 1 also contains the full series, but further investigation of Paris, Arsenal 33 reveals that it switches to Type B from the third title of John onwards. ${ }^{55}$ However, as noted above, Berger lists around forty manuscripts with Type A in the Synoptics which may have this series in John. It was beyond the scope of the present study to investigate all these, but London, British Library, Royal 1.D.III is also a complete example of Type A in John, while Paris, Mazarine 2 is virtually identical to Arsenal $33 .{ }^{56}$ Five of these six witnesses are two-volume Bibles produced in the tenth century or later (the exception being R ). Again, all but one have Type A in the Synoptics, confirming the unity of the series. ${ }^{57}$ The numeration of the titles varies considerably: in the Florence and Rouen manuscripts the capitula are unnumbered and are only distinguished by (respectively) six and fifteen lines with ekthesis; the numeration of Arsenal 33 is inconsistent (perhaps reflecting its composite nature), but Mazarine 2 numbers the titles in sequence. The Vatican manuscript supports the presentation of Type $B^{r}$ in fourteen sections, although the additional division in $S D R$ with 63 hanging lines, broadly
53. In $S D R$, the opening text of Type $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}}$ is given as Pharisaeorum sacerdotes <et> leuitae. However, sacerdotes is only found in F and $\langle\mathrm{et}\rangle$ is an editorial addition (although note Paris, St. Geneviève 10 (olim 5), which begins Type B unusually with pharisaei et leuitae): it seems rather that Types A and B have the same incipit.
54. In some manuscripts with Type A capitula, the fourteenth title starts with the word Passio, and Allocutio begins the final sentence of the thirteenth title. The overlap with Type B and the position of this division in the gospel text, however, support Allocutio as the beginning of the last title.
55. The number of the Rouen manuscript is missing from p. 413 of $S D R$; its inventory number (used in the Index) is 6. In the Oxford Vulgate this series is printed from the editio Thomasii based on Vatican Alex. 14, presumably the same as Vatican Reg. lat. 14.
56. The principal manuscripts awaiting verification are the Bibles of Léon, San Millan and Huesca; Rome, Vallic. B 7 and Vat. lat. 4221; Venice, San Marco 1; Paris, $B n F$, lat. 5, 8, 9, 12, 26, 31, 258, 259, 262, 264, 277 (?), 323, 326, 8849, 9394, 11958, 14232, 14233, 15176, 15470, 16267; Angers 2; Orléans 10; Tours 5; Bern, Burgerbibl. 4 (Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 356).
57. The exception is F , which - contrary to $S D R$ - has Type B in Mark, but A in Matthew, Luke and John.
based on the larger capitals in this witness, seems unwarranted. (It is not supplied for Type A in the Synoptic Gospels.) Notwithstanding differences in De Bruyne's edition (and further manuscript variation), the number and location of the headings in Types A and B seem originally to have been identical. The earliest description of the Type A titles is breuis digestio euangelii cata Iohannem; the Vatican, Rouen and Arsenal manuscripts have capitula, while Mazarine 2 has breuiarium. The Graecism cata serves as an indication of their antiquity.

The precedence of Type A over Type B is demonstrated by the marked Old Latin affiliation displayed in its more extensive biblical quotations. Readings characteristic of the earlier versions include in solitudine ( $3: 14$; VL 4, 14, 47) and lumen in Cap. $2(3: 19 ; c f$. VL $4,13,22,47)$, natatoria in Cap. 5 (5:2; VL 2, 3, 4, 5, 8*, 9A*?, 11, 11A, 14), lumen mundi in Cap. 7 (8:12; VL 14), initium in Cap. 8 (8:25; VL 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 22), accipiendi in Cap. 9 (10:18; VL 11), graeci in Cap. 10 (12:20; VL 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, $8^{*}, 11$, 14,46 ), uinea ( $15: 1$ or 15:4; VL 14), parturiente (cf. 16:21; cf. VL 3, 9A*, 13), tribulatio and saeculo in Cap. 12 (16:33; VL 14, cf. VL 2, 5, 6, 13), honorificare in Cap. 13 (17:1-5; VL 3, 5, 13, 14) and retia and nauis in Cap. 14 (21:6; cf. VL $2,5,10,13,14$ ), in addition to those already discussed for Type B. With such a high proportion of Old Latin forms, it is almost inconceivable that these capitula are a later expansion of Type B rather than the source from which they were abbreviated. The agreements with VL 14 indicate that the Old Latin exemplar had an early form of text (Group 1). For this reason, readings such as inuitatus ad cenam in Cap. 2 (2:2; VL $4,14,47)$ and ascendit in medio die festo in Cap. 7 (7:14; cf. VL 2, 9 A and Type B) have a strong claim to be the original text of the series. Adjustment towards the Vulgate is hardly surprising in these comparatively late witnesses: readings such as frumenti in Cap. 10 (12:24) and dilectione in Cap. 12 (15:13) may have replaced earlier forms.

Direct quotation is comparatively rare in these capitula. Instead, a narrative has been created which makes clear reference to individual verses, although the gospel text is sometimes treated rather loosely. For example, dicunt ei quod Iesus omnes baptizaret in Cap. 3 runs together the two parts of John 3:26; prophetam in patria sua sine honore esse in Cap. 4 is closer to Synoptic parallels such as Matthew 13:57 than propheta in patria sua honorem non habet at John 4:44; mittere is found in Chromatius' references to John 12:24 but biblical codices all have the verb cadere; the sense of Jesus' teaching at John 15:13 is not completely represented by et dicit nihil maius dilectione (Cap. 12); in John 17 Jesus never uses the verb
$\delta 0 \xi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ of the disciples, despite the summary ut honorificentur a patre postulat (Cap. 13). This suggests that the compiler was more interested in the general import of passages than an exact representation of the evangelist's words.

It has long been recognised that certain capitula for Acts and the Hebrew Prophets were composed in Donatist circles. ${ }^{58}$ Although there is nothing distinctively African about the biblical text of this set for John, a number of topics pertinent to the Donatist controversy recur in the relatively limited selection of passages. There is mention of baptism in Cap. 3 and twice in Cap. 4; several references are made to disagreements (Capp. 5 and 7), to treachery and denial (Capp. 7, 11 (twice), 13 (twice, including the term traditio) and 14), and to plots and violence (Capp. $9,10,13)$. Themes such as de tribulatione in saeculo toleranda (Cap. 12) and the Jews' acclamation of Caesar (John 19:15; Cap. 13) could also be connected with a Donatist context. Alternatively, it has been claimed that one of Types A or B represents the summary associated with Fortunatianus. ${ }^{59}$ In either case, the evidence is insufficient to reach a firm conclusion.

Type Ben. 50 chapters.
Incipit (I): De principio uerbi.
Explicit (L): De apparitione eius ${ }^{60}$ ad mare Tiberiadis et Petro dicit: diligis me.

The fifty short titles of Type Ben are only known from four manuscripts, of which three are used for the edition in SDR: Rome, Casanatensis 1101, which has the series in all four Gospels; Monte Cassino 35, containing all but Matthew; the sixth- or seventh-century gospel book in Split Cathedral, the oldest witness, with Type I in the Synoptics but Type Ben in John. One further witness not included in $S D R$ is Rome,

[^13]Angelica 29, from the tenth century. ${ }^{61}$ Each title begins with ubi or de, and in the Split codex they have the heading capitula.

Although most of the locations of division are similar to other series, Type Ben appears to be a fresh compilation: none of the other thirteen types quotes from John 1:16, 5:41, 6:17, 8:22, 9:39 or 13:37. Interestingly, two of these have Old Latin readings: honorem ab hominibus non quaerendum in Cap. 13 (cf. 5:41 and 44 in VL 4, 11, 14, 47) and de ascensione nauiculae in Cap. 14 (cf. 6:17 in VL 4, 10, 13, 14). Furthermore, there are at least six other distinctive non-Vulgate forms: triduo in Cap. 6 (2:19), heremo in Cap. 7 (3:14), ante Abraham ego sum in Cap. 24 (8:58), ianua in Cap. 26 (10:1), copiosum in Cap. 33 (12:25) and proicient in Cap. 40 (16:2). Three of these are not present in surviving Old Latin manuscripts: heremo is found in John 3:14 (and 1:23) in several early authors and is read at $6: 39$ by VL $14,{ }^{62}$ copiosum for $\pi 0 \lambda \dot{\jmath}$ us has parallels at $5: 6$ (VL 11, 14), 15:5 (VL 3, 6, 8, 13) and 15:8 (VL 13) but not 12:25; ${ }^{63}$ proicient in $16: 2$ is comparable to expulerunt (VL 2), eicient (VL 5, 11, 13) and expellent (VL 10), but contrasts with facient in the Vulgate and other manuscripts. ${ }^{64}$ Alongside these should be set forms characteristic of a later stage in the Latin Bible, such as numquid et uos uultis abire (6:67, Cap. 17), de grano frumenti (12:24, Cap. 33) and ubi Iesus crucem baiulat (19:17, Cap. 46). Nonetheless, the Old Latin readings suggest that this series has a preVulgate origin. At one point, De Bruyne considered that the Type Ben gospel capitula might be of Donatist origin, but the evidence adduced is minimal, and Types A and I have stronger claims in John. ${ }^{65}$

[^14]Type C. 45 chapters.
Incipit (I): In principio uerbum deus apud deum per quem facta sunt omnia et Iohannes missus refertur ante eum qui recipientes se facit filios dei per gratiam suam.
Explicit (XLV): Usque tertio dicit Petro amas me, quia ter eum negauerat ... quod crucis morte foret martyrio coronandus.

De Bruyne lists 24 manuscripts with Type C capitula for John, and uses the same five famous codices as the Oxford Vulgate for the text: Amiatinus (A; Florence, Amiat. 1); Hubertianus (H; London, BL, Add. 24142); Vallicellianus (V; Rome, Vallicell. B.6); Lindisfarne (Y; London, BL, Cotton Nero D.IV); London, BL, Harley 2797 (L). The only other pre ninth-century witnesses are London, $B L$, Royal 1.B.VII and the St Petersburg Insular Gospels (VL 9A): in the latter, the discrepancy between the Type C capitula and the Type B divisions was caused by the pages of prefatory material being copied separately and added later. ${ }^{66}$ In VL 9A and Lindisfarne the titles are described as capitula lectionum, a designation which appears to be peculiar to Type C and is found preceding the Synoptic Gospels in Amiatinus. ${ }^{67}$ Other manuscripts have breues (Royal 1.B.VII, although it has capitula lectionum before Luke) or simply capitula (Vallicellianus).

The titles and divisions consist of one or two sentences, often heavily subordinated: ablative absolutes and relative clauses are common, while gerunds and gerundives are a recurring stylistic feature. ${ }^{68}$ The use of inter multa (Capp. 6, 16, 23, 27, 32, cf. 25) and plurima (Capp. 8, 16, 19, 24) indicates that the aim was to summarise the contents of each section. The verbs pronuntiare (Capp. 11, 17, 26, 31), confirmare (Capp. 7, 21,

[^15]43) and significare (Capp. 34, 38, 43, 45) are characteristic of this type; along with other vocabulary such as mystice (Cap. 8, cf. Cap. 5), signum (Cap. 13) and testimonium (Capp. 12, 21, 34), they reveal the compiler's exegetical interest. This is most evident in comments which go beyond the biblical text, such as quo facto cognoscitur quod ubi ipse fuerit inuitatus uinum necesse sit deficere nuptiarum in Cap. 4 and the reference to Peter's death by crucifixion in Cap. 45. ${ }^{69}$

The biblical text normally corresponds to the Vulgate, including distinctive readings such as incredulus in John 3:36 (Cap. 7), si manseritis in sermone meo in 8:31 (Cap. 23), unum ouile in 10:16 (Cap. 26), gentiles in 12:20 (Cap. 31), confidite in 16:33 (Cap. 39) and cum fores essent clausae in 20:19 (Cap. 43). There are a handful of readings with Old Latin parallels, e.g. triduo in 2:19 (Cap. 5; cf. VL 3, 4, 14, 15), quae in deo sunt facta in 3:21 (Cap. 6; cf. VL 9A), de morte ad uitam in 5:24 (Cap. 11; cf. VL 4, 9A, 15), saturauit in a reference to 6:12 (Cap. 13, but $c f .6: 26$ ), and qui sitit in 7:37 (Cap. 19). The most interesting reading is perhaps potestatem habere se dicit ponendi ac resumendi animam suam (Cap. 27): no surviving manuscript has resumendi rather than iterum sumendi in John 10:18, although it is found in patristic citations. Nonetheless, the full integration of Vulgate readings indicates that this series does not have Old Latin roots. ${ }^{70}$ The capitula of Type Win are an expansion based on Type C.

Type Cat. 36 chapters.
Incipit (I): De diuinitate uerbi quod caro factum est, et Iohannes baptista de eo dicit: non sum dignus soluere corrigiam calciamenti eius...
Explicit (XXXVI): Et cum tertio apparuisset eis piscantibus dicit Petro ter: pasce oues meas et cum senueris alius te cinget, et sequere me.

[^16]This set is only found in two manuscripts, Paris, BnF, lat. 6 (tenth century) and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}$ Millan 3 (thirteenth century), both of which are used for the text in SDR. According to the Oxford Vulgate, the series is headed incipit capitulatio, but ends expliciunt capitula. The thirty-six divisions are similar to those of Type I and there is a close but complicated relationship between the titles. Many Old Latin forms are common to both, such as soluere in 1:27 (Cap. 1), natatoriam piscinam in 5:2 (Cap. 11), ire in 6:68 (Cap. 13), ante Abraham ego sum in 8:58 (Cap. 17), occidere in 12:10 (Cap. 22), flores in 12:13 (Cap. 23) and ter me negabis in 13:38 (Cap. 27); they also share the unusual editorial secessit in 4:3 (Cap. 8). Some differences between the series are attested in manuscript variants within Type I, such as the addition of ecce in Cap. 2, labores eorum in Cap. 9 and citius in Cap. 26. The last is an alteration towards the Vulgate, as is mandata mea seruate in Cap. 28 (14:16; cf. also John 4:44 in Cap. 10). These suggest that Type Cat, although longer and with more quotations, is secondary to Type I. There are also errors of sequence, consistent with the expansion of an existing series: the insertion of sicut nouit me pater et ego noui patrem from John 10:15 precedes ego sum pastor bonus (10:10) in Cap. 19; Cap. 31 ends with non tantum pro his rogo from John 17:20, but Cap. 32 (as in Type I) begins with pater sancte serua eos (17:11b).

On the other hand, although some of the extra biblical text is closer to the Vulgate (e.g. scitis in Cap. 16, gentiles in Cap. 23, plorabitis et flebitis in Cap. 30), these quotations also feature a number of characteristic Old Latin forms. The most distinctive are gloriam ab inuicem quaerentes in Cap. 11 (5:44; cf. VL 8), qui non intrat per ianuam (10:1; VL 2, 3, 4, 6, $8,13,14,22,27,35)$ and et ego noui patrem (10:15; VL 3, 9A, 10, 14) in Cap. 19, granum tritici in Cap. 23 (12:24; VL 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14) and omnia quae habet pater in Cap. 30 (16:15; VL 2, 5), alongside a number of omissions or variations in word order. These imply that Type Cat was compiled from an Old Latin source: further evidence for this is supplied by the alteration of John 16:2 in Cap. 30 away from the version in Type I to ueniet hora ut qui interfecerit uos arbitretur se obsequium deo praestare, a form very close to VL 8 and other members of Group 2A. Four readings are not supported in any surviving Old Latin codices, although all have parallels in patristic citations: ueniet hora quando and ipsum accipietis in Cap. 11 (John 5:28 and 5:43), nemo uenit ad me nisi pater meus traxerit eum in Cap. 12 (John 6:44) and uenient Romani et tollent regnum nostrum in Cap. 21 (John 11:48). The last two display alterations characteristic of flattening, suggesting that they may have been quoted from
memory. ${ }^{71}$ This would also explain two major lapses: the interpolation of et quadraginta annos nondum habes from 8:57 into the summary of John 2 in Cap. 5 (cp. quadraginta et sex annis aedificatum est templum hoc in 2:20; 8:57 actually reads quinquaginta), and ego sum lux mundi (John 8:12) in place of ego lux in mundum ueni (John 12:46) in Cap. 24. While the Old Latin readings are of interest, this looseness suggests that caution is necessary in using this series as evidence for earlier texts of the Gospel.

## Type Cy. 68 chapters.

Incipit (II): De Iohanne quia testimonium perhibebat de lumine, nam non erat ipse lumen, et de lumine uero et quia uerbum caro factum est.
Explicit (LXVIII): Ubi apparuit discipulis tertio ad mare et prandit cum illis et dixit Petro: pasce oues meas, et de cruce eius significauit et de Iohanne dixit: sic illum uolo manere donec uenio.

This series has already been studied in detail with a textual commentary by De Bruyne. ${ }^{72}$ The siglum Cy represents his belief that these capitula are roughly contemporary with Cyprian: De Bruyne's preference was to date them a few years before Cyprian, accompanying a revision of the African text of the Gospels represented by Codex Bobiensis (VL 1) prior to Cyprian's quotations and Codex Palatinus (VL 2), although he acknowledged that the reference to the adultera in Cap. 30 might postpone them to the end of the third century. ${ }^{73}$ The capitula for John are preserved in two manuscripts, the ninth-century Vatican, Barberini lat. 637 and the tenth-century Munich, $B S B$ Clm 6212. ${ }^{74}$ The first title is missing from both. The biblical text, with affinities to the citations of both Cyprian and Tertullian, is earlier than that of any surviving Old

[^17]Latin manuscript of John. There is a consistency in the renderings (e.g. magistratus saeculi in Cap. 41 and 50 for $\ddot{\alpha}^{\rho} \chi(\omega \nu$ кó $\sigma \mu \mathrm{ou}$ in John 12:31 and $14: 30$ ) which, along with the close sequential treatment of the text, indicates that the compiler relied on a gospel manuscript. A number of renderings are unique to these capitula, including nata est quaestio in Cap.
 Cap. 28 (7:44), conuincit in Cap. 31 (8:46), schisma in Cap. 33 (10:19; cf. VL 2 in 7:43), constanter in Cap. 34 (10:24; cf. VL 13 in 7:13), quicumque cognosceret in Cap. 36 (11:57), claritatem in Cap. 42 (12:41), excipit in Cap. 45 (13:20), manifeste in Cap. 52 (16:29) and abstulit auriculam puero in Cap. 54 (18:10). Others are only paralleled in early quotations, such as expulit in 2:15 (Cap. 8), edidistis in 6:26 (Cap. 22), inuenit in 14:30 (Cap. 50) and officium deo facere in 16:2 (Cap. 50). As the earliest set of New Testament chapter divisions known to survive in any language, these are of considerable interest and their importance for the biblical text is unparalleled. ${ }^{75}$

Type D. 41 chapters (?).
Incipit (I): In principio erat uerbum et quod in propria uenit.
Explicit (XLI?; XXXIX in M; XLIII in T): ... et cum tertio manifestaret se dominus discipulis suis ait Petro: pasce oues meas et sequere me.

This series is poorly attested: no surviving manuscript has Type D capitula in all four Gospels and there are only three witnesses for John. ${ }^{76}$ In the Cutbercht Gospels (V; Vienna lat. 1224), capitula for Matthew (Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ ) and Mark, Luke and John (Type D) are found in a group at the beginning of the manuscript, with additional sets immediately preceding Luke and John (Types A and B respectively, both entitled elenchus). The second volume of the Montpellier Bible (M; London, BL, Harley 4773) has Type A for Matthew and Type D capitula before each of the other three Gospels. Netzer's detailed investigation of the Trier Gospels (T; Trier, Domschatz 134/61) has demonstrated that although the capitula for Matthew are Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$, the other three Gospels have a conflation of Type I and Type D created by the copyists from the two exemplars used

[^18]for this codex. ${ }^{77}$ (In John, this is evident from the duplication in Cap. 18, De muliere in adulterio depraehensa in moechatione.) The edition of the Type D capitula in $S D R$, conflating V and M with the interpolated text of $T$, is therefore misleading and a revised text is provided in the Vetus Latina Iohannes. The original series, represented by V and M, appears to consist of 41 chapters: in V the titles are unnumbered and not always clearly separated, while the numbering in M is confused in both the capitula list and the divisions in the Gospel. ${ }^{78}$ In T, these have been expanded to 43; passages unique to T are for the most part evidence for the version of Type I present in one of its exemplars. ${ }^{79}$

Even so, the text of V and M appears to be an early revision of the Type I capitula comparable to Type Cat, with extra biblical quotations and a few alterations to the chapter divisions. Some overlaps with Type Cat (e.g. the addition of ubi erat fons Iacob in Cap. 9, facta sunt encaenia in hierusolimis in Cap. 23, si quis mihi ministrat etc. in Cap. 28, pater uenit hora etc. in Cap. 37) suggests that they may be related, although Type D also has material not present in Type Cat or any other series (e.g. John 17:12 and 24 in Cap. 38). It is closer to the Vulgate than either Type I or Type Cat, as shown by readings such as si quis sitit (Cap. 17; John 7:37), antequam Abraham fieret ego sum (Cap. 20; John 8:58), qui non intrat per ostium (Cap. 22; John 10:1), cum autem tanta signa fecisset (Cap. 29; John 12:37), mansiones multae sunt (Cap. 32; John 14:2), confidite ego uici mundum (Cap. 36; John 16:33) in addition to cum lanternis et facibus and misit eum Annas ligatum ad Caipham (Cap. 39; John 18:3 and 24). In the light of this, the few non-Vulgate readings seem of limited significance: manducastis de panibus in Cap. 15 (6:26; VL 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 22), unde ueni aut quo uado in Cap. 19 (8:14; VL 10, 11A, 47, 48), ne

[^19]uos tenebrae conprehendant in Cap. 28 (12:35; VL 3, 11A) and uolo ut ubi ego sum et ipsi sint in Cap. 38 (17:24; VL 30) all occur in the later mixedtext tradition. The forms quid faciemus quia homo iste tanta signa facit in Cap. 25 (11:47), and unus uestrum me tradet in Cap. 31 (13:21) have no parallels in surviving manuscripts or Christian authors: they may be authorial adaptations comparable to the paraphrased form of John 7:3 in Cap. 16 (ut discipuli tui uideant quae facis).

Type I. 36 chapters.
Incipit (I): Iohannes testimonium perhibet de Christo dicens: non sum dignus corrigiam calciamenti eius soluere.
Explicit (XXXVI): Et cum tertio manifestaret se Iesus discipulis, ait Petro dicens ter pasce oues meas et sequere me.

This is the most widespread series of capitula in manuscripts with an Old Latin text of the Gospel, present in VL 8 (ff; Paris, BnF, lat. 17225, Codex Corbeiensis) and VL 6 (Paris, BnF, lat. 254, Codex Colbertinus) from Burton's Group 2A, as well as VL 7 (G; Paris, BnF, lat. 11553, Codex Sangermanensis primus) and VL 15 (A; Stockholm, KB, A.135, Codex Aureus) from Group 2B. It also appears in the Echternach Gospels (E; Paris, BnF, lat. 9389), and manuscripts related to VL 15 including the Maaseyck Gospels (K; Maaseyck, Sint Katerinenkerk s.n.) and the Augsburg Gospels (Augsburg, Univ., Oettingen-Wallenstein'sche Bib. $1.2 .4^{\circ}$.2; formerly Maihingen and Schloss Harburg). In addition, it occurs in an insular group comprising the Book of Armagh (D; Dublin, Trinity College $=$ TCD 52), the Book of Durrow (U; TCD 57) and the Book of Kells (Q; TCD 58). Thirty-two manuscripts with this series are found in $S D R$, although not all feature in the index on pp. 412-4 and only eleven are used for the edition of the text. ${ }^{80}$ McGurk lists twelve codices copied before the year 800 with Type I in John: of these, Paris, BnF, lat. 260 uses Ammonian sections in place of chapter numbers in the capitula, while Poitiers 17 (like VL 6) has only 35 titles. ${ }^{81}$ While most manu-

[^20]scripts describe the list as capitula, both Poitiers 17 and the Echternach Gospels have breuis disputatio, while Codex Aureus has breues. ${ }^{82}$

As expected, Old Latin readings occur throughout the capitula, beginning with corrigiam calciamenti eius soluere in Cap. 1 (1:27; cf. VL 3, 4, $10,13,14,15)$. This does not correspond to the biblical text of the Group 2A manuscripts, suggesting that the series may go back to an earlier stage. On the other hand, there are also readings more characteristic of this group such as lux in hunc mundum in Cap. 24 (12:46; VL 4, 6, 8, 9A, 11, 11A, 46, 48*), quod facis fac celerius in Cap. 26 (13:27; VL 3, 4, $8,10)$ and praecepta mea custodite in Cap. 28 (14:15; VL 6, 8). The value accorded by De Bruyne to VL 8, the earliest surviving witness to the Type I capitula, is not always justified. For example, in Cap. 16 he follows it by printing mulierem in adulterio deprehensam even though the six manuscripts described as $\beta$ (AKCVBN) and VL 6 have mulierem depraehensam in moechatione. In fact, VL 8 is the only Latin gospel manuscript with moechatio in John 8:3, and this unusual rendering is far more likely to be the original form of the capitulum: it is ironic that the alteration to the capitula in VL 8 has resulted in an inconsistency with the subsequent biblical text. ${ }^{83}$ Similarly Cap. 30 in SDR reads ueniet hora ut qui uos occiderit putet se obsequium deo facere. Although this includes a number of Old Latin forms (ueniet as in VL 2, 6, 7, 9A, 10, 11, 13, 14; occiderit as in VL 2, 3, 5, 13, 14; putet as in VL 2, 5), there is no example of obsequium deo facere in Latin manuscripts of John 16:2. The alternative reading officium deo facere has an impeccable Old Latin pedigree in early African Christian writers, including Cyprian, Tyconius, Augustine and his opponent Petilianus, not to forget Type Cy above. ${ }^{84}$

Parallels for several of the Old Latin forms in these capitula are only preserved in Codex Palatinus (VL 2). These include regnum caelorum in Cap. 6 (3:5), sicut scriptum est rather than sicut dixit scriptura in Cap. 15

[^21](7:38), quarta diei rather than quadriduanus in Cap. 21 (11:39) and dilexissetis rather than diligeretis in Cap. 29 (14:28). ${ }^{85}$ Further readings are shared with a handful of other Old Latin manuscripts, such as occidere in Cap. 22 (12:10), ter me negabis in Cap. 29 (13:38) and putet in Cap. 30 (16:2). As VL 2 is the principal witness to an African text of John, these similarities (along with the patristic support) suggest that this series is of African origin. Indeed, the match for the text of Cap. 30 in Petilianus and Tyconius would support a claim that this derives from a Donatist source (compare Types A and Ben above).

One further characteristic of these capitula is their looseness. ${ }^{86}$ For example, the phrase domus orationis est domus patris mei in Cap. 5 is far closer to the sentiment expressed in Matthew 21:13 and parallels than John 2:16. Omnis propheta sine honore est in patria sua in Cap. 10 also draws on the Synoptic phrasing (Matt. 13:57, Mark 6:4) instead of John 4:44. ${ }^{87}$ Cap. 29 reverses the order of verses, quoting John 15:1 before John 14:28. In John 3:5, almost all Latin gospel manuscripts have non potest with the infinitive: non intrabit in Cap. 6 is a flattened form found in numerous Christian authors which also has Synoptic parallels (e.g. Matt. 7:21, 19:23)..$^{88}$ An even more interesting detail is found in Cap. 11, where the colonnade around the Pool of Bethesda in John 5:2 is identified with the porticus Salomonis of John 10:23. This connection is also made by four Church Fathers: Hilary of Poitiers, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine (three times), and Cassiodorus (probably following Augustine). ${ }^{89}$ The surprising conclusion is that the Type I capitula were composed with com-
85. The first and last of these are not adopted in the editorial text given in $S D R$, but their biblical affiliation offers a strong case for their authenticity.
86. For looseness as a feature of Donatist capitula, see Bogaert, «Les particularités éditoriales», pp. 14-15.
87. It is possible too that secessit in Cap. 8 (referring to John $4: 3$ ) draws on Synoptic parallels (e.g. Matt. 4:12, 14:13, 15:21; Mark 3:7; Luke 9:10): this verb is not found in John apart from certain Old Latin manuscripts in John 6:15.
88. Fischer, Die lateinischen Evangelien, p. 53 records one manuscript from the first millennium with intrabit in place of potest introire (Wb; VL 271, a liturgical Liber misticus). Tertullian, Chromatius of Aquileia, Filastrius of Brescia, Jerome, Augustine, the Council of Carthage in 411 and the early African De trinitate (ascribed to Vigilius of Thapsus) are among the early sources for intrabit.
89. HIL Ps 91.5; PAU-N carm 28.307; AU Jo 20.2.3; AU Ps 83.10; AU s 272B.4; CAr Ps 25.12. On this possible identification in Possidius' list of Augustine's sermons, see further David F. Wright, «Piscina Siloa or Piscina Salomonis? (Possidius, Indiculum X 6.57)» Revue des études augustiniennes 25 (1979) 47-60; Wright observes that it is unlikely that Augustine influenced the capitula (p. 55), but the antiquity now demonstrated for this series means that they may have been familiar to Augustine.
paratively little reference to the text of the Gospel and may have drawn on (or subsequently influenced) exegetical tradition. ${ }^{90}$

Type $\mathbf{I}^{\text {for }} .39$ chapters.
Incipit (I): De principio euangelii.
Explicit (XXXVIIII): Ubi tertio se manifestauit discipulis ad mare Tiberiadis et manducauit cum illis.

In Codex Forojuliensis (CLA 285, now divided between Cividale, Prague and Venice), John is preceded first by Type B capitula described as breues and then by this unique series under the heading of capitulationes. ${ }^{91}$ Within the 39 numbered titles, there are 13 more subdivisions identified by ekthesis in SDR. Almost all the numbered titles begin with de or ubi, indicating that this is a unified system. The series has several of similarity with other types, as in the addition of et ementes in Cap. 4 (2:15, cf. Matt. 21:12 and parallels; also Types D, Pi, W) and the use of the non-biblical increpare for Jesus' rebuke of Thomas in Cap. 38 (20:27; also Types Cat and I). A number are shared with Cy alone, such as the beginning of a new chapter at John 11:53 (Cy 36 and $\mathrm{I}^{\text {tor }} 25$ ), the quotation of John 12:36 (abscondit se; $\mathrm{I}^{\text {for }} 28$ and Cy 41) and the term aduocatus in 14:16 (I ${ }^{\text {for }} 31$ and Cy 49); John 14:8 only features in Cy (49), Ben (37) and $\mathrm{I}^{\text {for }}$ (30), while John 15:14 (amicos) is limited to Cy (50), D (34) and $I^{\text {tor }}$ (32). However, there is also much biblical material which is unique to $\mathrm{I}^{\text {lor }}$, including references to John 5:30 (Cap. 12) and 17:15 (Cap. 35) and numerous details (e.g. lucerna in Cap. 12 (5:45), Capharnaum (6:24) and qui de caelo descendi (6:48) in Cap. 14, manducauit cum illis (cf. 21:13) in Cap. 39. Some of these have Old Latin characteristics, including de superioribus sum in Cap. 19 (8:23; VL 3, 5, 8, 13), occidere in Cap. 25 (11:53; VL $2,3,14$ ) and both ubi honorificat patrem (17:1-5; cf. VL $3,5,13,14)$ and conserues a malo (17:15: VL 15, cf. 10, 13) in Cap. 35; of particular interest is plurimi discipuli in Cap. 15 (6:66), only matched by Jerome, Epistula 40.1.3. These indicate that I ${ }^{\text {for }}$ is not dependent on another series for common Old Latin renderings and should therefore be treated as a further independent set of Old Latin capitula. ${ }^{92}$

[^22]Type In. 36 chapters.
Incipit (I): Iohannes testimonium perhibet de ipso et clamat dicens.
Explicit (XXXVI): Postea manifestauit se iterum Iesus ad mare Tiberiadis.

This series is only present in the sixth-century Burchard Gospels (Würzburg, Univ., M.p.th.f. 68) two later copies (Würzburg, Univ., M.p.th.f. 65 and 66). The divisions are identical to Type I as found in Codex Aureus (VL 15), a close relation to the Burchard Gospels in John, but the titles have been replaced by the opening words of each chapter. Their biblical text is typical of an early Vulgate witness with a sprinkling of Old Latin features, such as die tertia in 2:1 (Cap. 2), the omission of eis from 8:21 (Cap. 17), altera die in 12:12 (Cap. 23) and turbatus est in spiritu in 13:21 (Cap. 26): all these are paralleled by the subsequent text of the Gospel. An even more compelling demonstration of this connection is Cap. 11, beginning et ascendit Iesus: the first half of John 5:1 is also omitted by the first hand. However, there remain six minor discrepancies between the capitula and the Gospel, which may be explained as misreadings of the exemplar or subsequent alterations to its text prior to copying. ${ }^{93}$

Type $\boldsymbol{P}^{i} .35$ chapters.
Incipit (I): Ubi Iohannes testimonium perhibet de Christo.
Explicit (XXXV): Ubi dominus resurgens ianuis clausis discipulis apparuit. item post dies octo similiter tertioque ad mare Tiberiadis piscantibus apostolis se praebuit ac Petro dicit pasce oues meas.
$S D R$ lists thirty-two manuscripts with Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ in John, of which five are used for the edition: London, $B L$, Add. 10546 (K); London, $B L$, Harley 2790 (H); Nancy, Cathedral s.n. (N); Bamberg, A.I. 5 (B); Paris, BnF, lat. 13169 (P). The last is VL 29, a mixed-text manuscript which only has capitula before John and no chapter divisions in the text: it introduces the series as capitula parabolarum. The sole pre-ninth-century

[^23]witness in McGurk is the Livinus Gospels (Ghent, St Bavo 13), apparently not used by De Bruyne, which has the heading capitula and lacks the final three titles. The dependence of Type W on this series, however, would push its composition back to before the sixth century. Paris, Arsenal, 1184 divides the final title into four, giving a total of thirtyeight headings.

The chapter divisions and text of the series often overlap with Type I: it appears to represent an intermediate stage between Type I and Type W, abbreviating the Type I capitula, frequently adding the phrase ubi dicit and expanding some of the biblical quotations. Very few of the nonVulgate forms from Type I remain, which suggests that the capitula have been compared with the biblical text. Cap. 13, for example, reads multi discipulorum instead of aliqui de discipulis (6:66). In Cap. 23 ramos palmarum replaces flores palmarum and material is cited from the rest of John 12:13; the same is true of the next title, with tanta signa for multa signa followed by the subsequent part of $12: 37$. Likewise, the form of John 14:15-16 in Cap. 27 matches later versions (cp. Type I Cap. 28). Most of the additional biblical material corresponds to the Vulgate, with a handful of minor exceptions. These include pellit in Cap. 5 (in place of eiecit at 2:15) and saluat in Cap. 9 (the Vulgate reads sanaret at 4:47), both of which may be loose references rather than quotations, and perhibet rather than perhibebit in Cap. 30 (15:26). The most striking is ianuis clausis in the long final capitulum, apparently pertaining to 20:19 (where it is only attested in VL 2, cf. VL 27). However, as this phrase occurs in the Vulgate at 20:26 it is possible that the compiler took it from there (cf. Types D and Vich).

Type Vich. 13 chapters.
Incipit (I): De diuinitate uerbi dei et Iohannis missione ... atque angelos super se descendentes et ascendentes uisuros praedicit.
Explicit (XIII): Iesus flagellatur, spinis coronatur, uestitur purpura, alapis caeditur ... Iohannem in pace quieturum designat.

This series only occurs in two manuscripts, both held in the Town Museum in Vic in Catalonia: the eleventh-century MS 89, and its twelfthcentury copy, MS 119. The divisions are similar to the fourteen chapters of Types A and B, with chapters 11 and 12 combined. Similar opening lines for Capp. 2, 3, 6 and 11 might suggest that one of these was taken as a model, but this lengthy series seems to be a new composition for an existing set of divisions, citing verses not present in any other set of
capitula (e.g. 1:51, 5:16, 7:6, 7:40-1, 10:39 etc.). The biblical text is for the most part consistent with the Vulgate, including characteristic readings such as probatica piscina in John 5:2 (Cap. 5), ostium in 10:7 (Cap. 9), gentibus in 12:20 (Cap. 10) and alapam in 18:22 and 19:3 (Capp. 12, 13). Differences such as saluificet in Cap. 2 (cf. 3:17), uero in Cap. 3 (cf. 3:30), iuxta puteum in Cap. 4 (4:6) and comederint in Cap. 6 (6:26) may be ascribed to the heavy redactional activity of the compiler, although crucem portat (cf. 19:17; VL 10, 13,14) and ianuis clausis (20:19; cf. Types D and $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ above) find some support elsewhere.

Type W. 35 chapters.
Incipit (I): Testimonium Iohannis de Christo. Explicit (XXXV): Resurrectio domini.

Type W is peculiar to the sixth-century Kilian Gospels (Würzburg, Univ., M.p.th.q. 1a), occurring with the heading breues before Mark, Luke and John (the beginning of Matthew is not extant). It appears to be dependent on Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ : the scope of every capitulum for John is an exact match and five titles are identical (Capp. 8, 11, 16, 18 and 34). On the other hand, the biblical text is accommodated to the Vulgate three times (eicit in Cap. 5, addition of autem in Capp. 24 and 30), while direct quotations replace the summaries of Type $\mathrm{P}^{i}$ in Capp. 23, 28 and 31. This shows that the adaptation of an existing series could be combined with the introduction of new material.

Type Win. 42 (unnumbered) chapters.
Incipit: Ubi in principio uerbum esse et apud deum esse et deus esse. euangelizante Iohanne memoratur ... omnes in se credentes facit filios dei fieri per gratiam suam.
Explicit: Ubi dominus Petro pascendas oues aeque tertio commendans. ... et de conclusione euangelistae quod uerum sit testimonium eius.

This is the only set of titles for John listed by Berger which is not included in $S D R .{ }^{94}$ It is found in a single manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian L., Auct. E. inf. 2, the second part of a two-volume Bible copied in Winchester in the twelfth century. Although the capitula before Matthew correspond to Type $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$, those for the other three Gospels all seem to be expanded versions of earlier series. The source for John is clearly Type C although the division of titles (marked by large capital letters) is not
94. Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 355, Type I. 13.
identical. In addition to distinctive phrases such as excitandi mysterium corporis sui proponit (Cap. 5), mulieri Samaritanae plurima mystice loquitur (Cap. 8), pharisaeos de proprio testimonio reluctantes arguit (Cap. 21), hora clarificationis suae praedicit (Cap. 30) and prolixa et multimoda oratione commendat (Cap. 38), there is considerable verbal overlap throughout. That this is secondary to Type C is indicated by the replacement of pronouns, the omission of Cap. 12 and substitution by Vulgate forms, as in sub condicione qua amplius non peccaret (Cap. 20; Type C reads ulterius). The additional biblical material (e.g. the extracts from John 19 in the Passion narrative) also corresponds to the Vulgate.

Type Z. 40 chapters.
Incipit (I): De incarnatione uerbi et testimonio Iohannis.
Explicit (XL): Ubi dominus interrogat Petrum si diligat eum et ubi dixit ei sequere me.

This series is known only from one twelfth-century gospel book with glosses, Oxford, Bodleian L., Laud lat. 25. The nature of the capitula in this manuscript is more complicated than is apparent from $S D R$. On fol. 11v there are partial and disordered lists of titles quoting verses from each Gospel. These are followed by two complete sets of capitula for Matthew and John, apparently in the same hand, which are the sole instances of Type Z. ${ }^{95}$ All the titles begin with ubi or de and usually quote biblical material from the beginning of each chapter. The gospel text matches the Vulgate, with probatica piscina in 5:2 (Cap. 12), ostium in 10:1 (Cap. 22), gentiles in 12:20 (Cap. 28) and palmites in 15:5 (Cap. 32): even super puteum in 4:6 (Cap. 10), the single possible exception, has some currency in Vulgate manuscripts. As there is no match with any other series of divisions for John, it seems best to describe this series as a one-off based on the Vulgate. ${ }^{96}$

## Conclusion

This survey has demonstrated that a surprising number of series of capitula were composed with reference to pre-Vulgate versions of John

[^24]and continued to be transmitted in manuscripts with Jerome's revised text of the Gospel. The most ancient is the remarkable African Type Cy, dated by De Bruyne to the middle of the third century. As observed above, this is the earliest known series of gospel chapters in any language. Type I is likely to be the next oldest set: the early readings such as moechatione in John 8:3 and officium deo facere in 16:2 along with similarities to the text of Codex Palatinus suggest that it was composed in Africa in the fourth century. It is possible that its compilation was undertaken in conjunction with the revision of the gospel text underlying Group 2A, although witnesses to the latter are generally closer to the Vulgate. Numerous revisions and reworkings are evident both in the variations within Type I and the headings of other thirty-six (and thirtyfive) chapter series. Of these, Type Cat and the original version of Type D incorporate additional material from an Old Latin version of the text, while Type $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{i}}$ comes from the early period of the Vulgate and Type W is an abbreviation of Type $\mathrm{P}^{i}$ not later than the sixth century.

The other major Old Latin series is that of the fourteen-chapter Type $\mathbf{A}$ (formerly known as $\mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{r}}$ ). Its correspondence with the early form of text found in VL 14 (matching VL 4 and VL 47 in the early chapters of John) again points to a fourth-century origin. It was suggested above that the choice of topics in these capitula might indicate a Donatist origin, matching the series identified for other biblical books. Type I, however, with its more marked African characteristics, has an equally strong contention to be a product of a Donatist milieu. Type B (formerly known as $\mathbf{B}=\mathbf{A}$ ) is a shorter form of Type A, abbreviated at a fairly early stage but preserving the form of the biblical quotations. In addition, it appears that Type Ben and Type $\mathbf{I}^{\text {for }}$ (the latter only found in Codex Forojuliensis) are independent compilations with some Old Latin characteristics.

The remaining series are of Vulgate origin. Type In, peculiar to the Burchard Gospels, was produced in the fifth or early sixth century: it replaces Type I with the opening words of each chapter, possibly taken from the exemplar used for the subsequent text of John. Type G, the capitula with the distinctive heading capitula lectionum found in Codex Amiatinus and several insular manuscripts, is a new series based on a Vulgate text; Type Win is a later expansion of these. Type Vich and Type $\mathbf{Z}$ are very rare and are not attested before the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively: their similarity to earlier series of divisions suggests that they were composed to supply or replace lists of headings for a text of the Gospel which already had numbered divisions.

As well as providing important evidence for the history of the Latin versions of the text of John, these series of capitula are also significant for studying the production of gospel codices and the use and interpretation of the Bible. The fact that the most archaic capitula (Type Cy) are only preserved in two Vulgate manuscripts from the ninth and tenth centuries, with all witnesses to Type A of a similar date, demonstrates the eclectic nature of the prefatory material in gospel books. The transmission of these ancient forms and, indeed, the difference between most series and the subsequent text of the Gospel suggests that this discrepancy was not often noted, and one may wonder how frequently the capitula (or, indeed, the chapter numbers) were used as a system of reference: it is also not unusual for the numeration of the titles to bear no relationship to the divisions alongside the following text of the Gospel. The number of different series produced between the fourth and sixth centuries is remarkable: perhaps it reflects a growing emphasis on the form of the scriptural text along with the fixing of the canon. It is noteworthy that this activity is confined to the Latin tradition, and there is no overlap with Greek systems. ${ }^{97}$ It is also interesting to speculate on the extent to which textual features of the capitula, such as the conflations in Type I, may have influenced the form in which Christian authors quoted or expounded the gospel. ${ }^{98}$

De Bruyne remarks that the creation of each new set of capitula represented a new edition of the biblical text, while Berger asserts that the study of the summaries is indispensable for the history of the biblical text. ${ }^{99}$ I hope that this survey building on their valuable work will lead to this evidence being given renewed attention and that the new edition of the Vetus Latina Iohannes will provide a sound basis for fresh research on the Latin versions of John.

University of Birmingham,<br>Institute for Textual Scholarship<br>and Electronic Editing<br>(H.A.G.Houghton@bham.ac.uk)

[^25]
## APPENDIX

## TABLE OF DIVISIONS in CAPITULA SERIES AND OLD LATIN MANUSCRIPTS

This table is based on that in Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine (pp. 521-6) and the transcriptions of Old Latin manuscripts in the Vetus Latina Iohannes Electronic Edition. Several alterations have been made to the earlier table, including the correction of misprints and the comparison of divisions with the titles of each series in order to arrive at an archetype for each. It should be remembered that the signalling of divisions in gospel manuscripts often fails to correspond exactly to the archetypical divisions, especially in the more widely-attested series.

## KEY

$\mathrm{R}=$ rubrication (no number present)
C = double-height capital (no number present)
$\mathrm{CC}=$ outsize capital (no number present)
() $=$ division indicated in manuscript (e.g. capitals, rubrication) but no number visible
italic font $=$ division reconstructed from title
$\mathrm{x}=$ superscript letter indicates manuscript with variant placing of division

```
\(\triangle=\) verse absent from manuscript
\(\square=\) manuscript no longer extant
```



[^26] 2 Not present in SDR: reconstructed from capitula titles (Types Vich and W) or supplied from manuscripts (Types D and Z).

3 Type $\mathrm{P}^{i}$ divisions have been revised based on the extent of the capitula titles as well as divisions in Harley 2790 (H) and Arsenal 1184 (A). 4 The first capitulum in Type I appears to quote John 1:15, which may have led to confusion over the placing of this division (compare VL 6, 7, 15). 6 The division at $2: 13$ is missing from Harley $4773(\mathrm{M})$; division 6 occurs at $3: 1$ and all subsequent divisions are decreased by one.


| N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  | － |  |  | $\cup$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cup$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ |  |  | $\because$ |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  | $\triangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |
| ＊ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ब゙ } \\ & \text { In } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ |  |  | $\cong$ |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\triangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  |
| － |  | （1） |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | 圧 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\square}$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\because$ |  | $\Xi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\triangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| A |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ก |  |  |  |  |  | $=$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  | 12 |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{7}$ |  |  |  |  | $\sigma$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ぶ |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{m}{9}$ |  |  |  |  | $\simeq$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\simeq$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\approx$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{ }{-}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\sim}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 120 |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{-}$ |  |  |  |  |  | กิ | ล |  |  |  | N |  |  |
| A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ํ |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 苐 |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{ }{-}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | － |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  |  |  |  | ล |  |  |
| U |  |  |  | 든 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  | ก | त |  |  | ลิ |  |  | \％ |  | त |  |  | － | － |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { gin } \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\stackrel{1}{\square}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ |  |  | ล | จ |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  | त |  |  | $\stackrel{\text {－}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ |  |
| A |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | ลิ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | จ |  |  |
| ั゙ |  | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\because$ | $\approx$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |
| $\ddot{\square}$ |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\varphi$ | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  |
| \＆ |  |  | $\because$ |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |
| H |  |  | $\because$ |  | $\Xi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{ }{-}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | ล |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{10}{\square}$ |  |  |
| $\left.\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\oplus$ |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | 。 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| － |  | ค |  |  |  |  | $\vec{\sim}$ |  | － |  | \％ |  | $\stackrel{\text { A }}{ }$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ |  | 骨 | 言 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | $\bar{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 앙 |  | $\because$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \frac{0}{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{n}{\hat{0}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} 0 \\ \\ \hline \end{aligned}$ | \％ | \％ | － | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { 令 }}{\text { N }}$ | － | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{Z} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\stackrel{10}{2}$ | $1$ | 号 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \vec{ٌ} \\ \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{\mathrm{O} \\ \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\mathfrak{B}$ | $1$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | $\frac{9}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{y}{\dot{b}} \underset{\ddot{\circ}}{\underset{\sim}{\circ}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ | N |  | $\begin{aligned} & -\frac{9}{2} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \dot{\infty} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{9} \\ & \dot{\infty}, \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \underset{\infty}{2} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hat{6} \\ \stackrel{\hat{0}}{\dot{\theta}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\%}{\circ}$ | 令 |

[^27]

[^28]11 As capitulum 22 in D quotes 10:1, the division at 10:11 in Harley 4773 (M) is erroneous. m SDR division 10 in B is located at 1:1, but the division of the capilula suggests it should be at 11:55 (matching Type A and the majority of manuscripts

| N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { 즐 }}{\text { ® }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cup$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | \％ | $\%$ |  |  |  |  |
| स | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\widetilde{\sim}}{\stackrel{\sim}{1}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{\circ}$ | 冎 |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{4}{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\text { A }}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{9}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{8}{i}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bar{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ | 会 |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 合 |  |  | ล1 | 冎 |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ai }}{ }$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\%$ |  |  |  |  |
| － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ～ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ก |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\overline{7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ब゙ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ๆ |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  | $\simeq$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  | $\bar{\sim}$ |  |  | ค० |  | $\%$ |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{\circ}$ |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |
| ～ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | त |  |  |  |
| 竒 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\bar{\square}$ |  |  |  | － |  |  |  | $\%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{4}{6}$ |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |
| ט |  |  | 18 |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |  |  | $\propto$ | $\because$ |  |  | \％ | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { g } \\ \text { © } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\stackrel{1}{8}$ |  |  |  |  | $\propto$ |  |  | \％ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{9}$ |  |  |  |  |
| － | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\vec{\sim}$ |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  | $\propto$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |
| บัّ | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | क | \％ |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |
| 3 | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  | 人 |  | $\approx$ | $\therefore$ |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 二ै |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |
| $\ddot{a}_{1}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  | \％ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | क |  |  | \％ | $\frac{\square}{\circ}$ |  |  |  | 2 |
| g | त |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{i}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | क |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |
| H | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{i}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bar{\square}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{0}$ |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 黑 |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |
| － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ص |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ～ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  | $=$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\geqslant$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{2}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| － |  | $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{4}$ |  |  | 앙 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | is |  |  | 앙 |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |  | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \dot{\vec{E}} \\ \overrightarrow{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | 豊 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \\ & \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 号 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\dddot{~}}}$ | $\stackrel{10}{\square-1}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \underset{y}{\underset{~}{\underset{~}{2}}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \underset{\sim}{\beth} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\overrightarrow{0}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\ddot{\circ}}$ | $\stackrel{y}{\underset{\sim}{\ddot{2}}}$ | $1$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\underset{\ddot{\theta}}{ }$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \\ \stackrel{\ominus}{0} \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \because & \ddots \\ \ddot{\theta} & \ddots \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\theta} \\ & \underset{\theta}{\theta} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \stackrel{1}{\wedge} \\ \stackrel{\ddots}{\bullet} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\underset{\sim}{n}} \\ \underset{\sim}{0} \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{8}{\circ} \\ \stackrel{\ominus}{\bullet} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\triangle}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\ddot{~}}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}}$ | $\stackrel{\ddots}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\triangle}} \mid$ |  | － | $\because$ | $\stackrel{O}{\ddot{\ddot{O}}}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \ddot{\ddot{O}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\ddot{O}}$ |

14 Division 28 for $\mathrm{P}^{i}$ is missing from Arsenal 1184 （A），and the remaining four numbered divisions are one short of the expected numeral． 15 In SDR division 29 in Cat is located at 15：11，but the capilulum quotes 15：1 and 4.

16 In SDR division 38 in C is duplicated at 15：26．
17 In $S D R$ division 14 in B is located at 18：1，but the division of the capitula suggests that it comes later（18：28 in the majority of manuscripts）．
18 In $S D R$ division 33 in $P^{i}$ is located at 18：1（as in Harley 2790），but the capitulum refers to $18: 13$（where Arsenal 1184 has another capital letter）．

| ล |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 包 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| $\stackrel{20}{7}$ |  |  |  |  | $\bar{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |
| $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 雨 |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ |  |  |  |  | व |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\wedge$ |  |  |  |  | त |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{18}{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 圂 | 园 |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{9}$ |  |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| － |  |  | $=$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nิ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ |  |  | $\approx$ |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\approx$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 嵼 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{6}$ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  | 雨 |  |  |
| ט |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ |  | $\stackrel{\%}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | 18 |
| 砸 | $\bigcirc$ |  | F | 12 | 9 |  | $\stackrel{1}{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{¢}$ |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 䃃 |  |  |
| － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{7}^{8}$ |  | \％${ }_{4}^{4}$ |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uّ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{7}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\%$ |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ：88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \＆ |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{18}{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |
| － |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\%$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 志 |  |  |  | 宕 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 鱼 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { 志 }}$ |  |  |
| 気 |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\infty$ |  |  | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | \＃ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ |  | 9 |  | 的 | $\because$ |  | 8 |  | 8 |  |  | \％ |  | \％ |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | 18 | 8 |  | \％ |  |  | $\otimes$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | － | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \mathscr{\circ} \\ \stackrel{0}{\ddot{0}} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | 号 | 管 | 近 |  | － | 扁 | 会宫 |  | ¢ | 范 |  | \|r |  | Hicicio | cic |  | － | 戓 |  |

19 A division in $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ at $18: 13$ is supported by the capitulum and Arsenal 1184；see the note above on $18: 1$ ．
20 The Trier Gospels are lacunose from 19：9 to $21: 20$ ；divisions $40-43$ have been reconstructed from the capitula．
2 The capilula in Rouen A． 1 suppose a fifteenth division at this point，not present in the other witnesses or Type B．
22 There are no divisions between $18: 2$ and 19：42 in Harley $4773(\mathrm{M})$ ；they resume at $20: 1$ with the expected numeral 40 ．


[^0]:    * At the time of writing, the author was a Research Fellow on the Vetus Latina Iohannes Project, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. He would like to thank Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Patrick McGurk for comments on earlier drafts of this article, and Jeffrey J. Kloha for verifying readings in Vatican, Reg. lat. 14.
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    18. There are 164 projecting lines in the extant part of John in Latin. Ammonian section numbers were added alongside the Greek text of Codex Bezae by Hand L, probably in the late sixth century: for further details, comparative figures and a more detailed study of the layout see D.C. Parker, Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 31-4, 42.
[^5]:    19. Type B is an abbreviation of Type A, and the archetypical divisions appear to be identical (although their location fluctuates in the manuscripts). In the table in $S D R$, Type B has the fifth division at $5: 1$ (not extant in VL 22) and the sixth division at $6: 3$; it is possible that there was confusion between the Greek numerals E (5) and $S(6)$. Alternatively, could it be that the division at $6: 15$ with Roman numeral VI actually represents $S$ and the division at $5: 1$ was omitted?
    20. Godu, the more recent editor of the manuscript, transcribes the numbers from 16 onwards as XG, XGI etc. using the older G ligature for VI (cf. B. Bischoff, Latin Palaeography [trans. Ó Cróinín and Ganz], Cambridge: CUP, 1990, p. 176).
    21. There are also four occasions when a larger capital is found without rubrication (John 1:41, 2:12, 4:51, 6:11), but as these are not decorated, they do not seem to be part of the scheme of division and are not taken as such by De Bruyne. Several inaccuracies in the table in $S D R$ have been corrected in the Appendix below.
[^6]:    22. For this, see H.A.G. Houghton, «A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f. 67» JTS ns 60.1 (2009) 1-21.
    23. The full list of divisions is supplied in the Appendix; both manuscripts are lacking Chapter 36.
    24. Some appear to be combined with rubricated lines, although it was not always possible to identify these with confidence from the monochrome microfilm used for this study; there do not appear to be rubrics accompanying chapters 5 and 9 , while there may be rubricated lines elsewhere not related to the numbered divisions.
    25. For example, XCII and XCIIII for XVII and XVIIII at 1:41 and 2:12; LI for XLI at 5:24; LXXVII erroneously at 8:14 (between LXXXVI and LXXXVII); CXXXVIII for CXXXVII at 15:16.
    26. Type B is supported by its affiliation in the Synoptic Gospels: see further the section below on Type B capitula.
[^7]:    31. For VL 13, see Roger Gryson, «Les citations scripturaires des œuvres attribuées à l'évèque arien Maximinus» Revue bénédictine 88 (1978) 45-80; for VL 10, which is believed to originate from a Latin-Gothic bilingual, see F.C. Burkitt, «The Vulgate Gospels and the Codex Brixianus» JTS 1 (1900) 129-34 and Gryson, «La version gotique des évangiles».
    32. Although VL 29 has the Type $\mathrm{P}^{i}$ titles for John, the corresponding divisions do not appear in the text of the Gospel. A particularly good example of the liturgical arrangement is Florence, BML, Plutei 25.2, which has 39 unnumbered paragraphs in the extant part of John: all except three are paralleled in VL 29, but there is no match with any of the series in $S D R$. Note too the use of capitula lectionum for the chapter titles in Type C (see below).
    33. McGurk, Latin Gospel Books, pp. 117-9. Two of these manuscripts also have an outsize capital at John 2:1.
    34. Thirty double-height (or larger) capitals are indicated in the table in the Appendix, although this selection is necessarily arbitrary.
[^8]:    35. These are presented in the Appendix. There is a group of manuscripts closely related to Codex Aureus in John which also have Type I capitula and divisions (see Type I and Type In below).
    36. Note that this is based on the divisions as given in the present Appendix rather than $S D R$, which is erroneous at a number of points in Type B. VL 47 also has 358 double-height rubricated capitals at the beginning of sentences, some of which correspond to Ammonian sections.
    37. The only Type I witness beginning Chapter 5 with et ascendit is VL 14, another Insular manuscript; see the Appendix.
    38. See H.A.G. Houghton, «The St Petersburg Insular Gospels: Another Old Latin Witness» JTS ns 61.1 (2010) 110-27 (especially p. 114) and the section on Type C below.
[^9]:    39. Berger's attempts to connect Type I or Type A/B in Latin Gospels with the Vaticanus paragraphs are misleading (Histoire de la Vulgate, pp. 311-2): similarities are scarcely surprising given the narrative shape of the text, but the high proportion of Vaticanus divisions without a Latin counterpart tells against their use as a source.
    40. Variations in Ammonian section numbers are similar indicators: see Patrick McGurk, «The Disposition of Numbers in Latin Eusebian Canon Tables» in R. Gryson (ed.), Philologia Sacra I. Altes und Neues Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1993, pp. 242-58 (reprinted in P. MaGurk, Gospel Books and Early Latin Manuscripts Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), and Vladislav Popovıć, «Du nouveau sur les Évangiles de Split» Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France 1990 (1992) 275-93, pp. 290-1.
    41. For patristic use of the term capitulum, see Petitmengin, «Capitula païens et chrétiens»; for Augustine in particular, H.A.G. Houghton, Augustine's Text of John. Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts. Oxford: OUP, 2008, pp. 40-1.
    42. Fortunatianus, natione afer, Aquileiensis episcopus, imperante Constantio in euangelia titulis ordinatis breui sermone et rustico scripsit commentarios. (Jerome, De uiris illustribus 97, ed. E. Richardson, TU XIV.Ia, Leipzig, 1896); see further Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, pp. 308-9.
[^10]:    43. The capitula of John are presented in the following order in SDR: Types D, I, W, Cat, $\mathrm{I}^{\text {for }}$, $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{i}}$ on pp. 264-9; Types $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{A}$, In, $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}}, \mathrm{Cy}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{Z}$, Vich, Ben on pp. 302-11; in addition, the tables of affiliation on pp. 411-4 are often useful. MaGurk, Latin Gospel Books, pp. 113-17 includes nine of the fourteen series of capitula.
    44. Popović, «Du nouveau sur les Évangiles de Split», p. 285, states that A stands for Antiquus and B for Breuiatus and that they are probably of Roman origin.
    45. See the table in Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 356; the introduction of the shorter version for John may derive from a single Vulgate manuscript which used a different exemplar for this Gospel but proved to be influential in the subsequent transmission of the text.
[^11]:    46. Like Type A, many manuscripts with Type B capitula begin the fourteenth title with Passio, and have adlocutio ... Barabba as the final sentence of the thirteenth title. The placing of the fourteenth division alongside 18:28 in the gospel text, however, supports De Bruyne's disposition of the titles.
    47. These are Codex Cavensis (C; Cava, Badia 1); Toletanus (T; Madrid, BN, Vitr. 13-1/Tol. 2.1); Complutensis 2 (t; Madrid, Bibl. Univ. 32); Autun 3 (A); Paris, BnF, lat. 256 (D); Paris, BnF, lat. 17226 (N); Ingolstadiensis (I; Munich, Univ. 2 ${ }^{\circ}$ 29); Forojuliensis (J; Cividale, Mus. arch. etc.); Oxford, Bodl., Auct. D.ii. 14 (O); Cambridge, Corpus Christi 286 (X; Gospels of St Augustine); Theodulfianus ( $\Theta$; Paris, $B n F$, lat. 9380); Vatican, Vat. lat. 5645 (R?); Vatican, Vat. lat. 43 (V); Vatican, Palat. lat. 46 (P); Ivrea, Bibl. cap. 99 (Y); Turin F.vi.I (Z). The manuscript with siglum $R$ is not identified on p. 270, although a comparison with its text in the final capitulum as reported by McGurk and a handwritten note in De Bruyne's own copy observed by P.-M. Bogaert indicate that it is Vatican lat. 5645. Note also that Vatican Pal. 46 and Pal. 48 seem to have been swapped on pp. 411-2.
    48. Seven of these are used by De Bruyne: witnesses A, D, N, J, O, X, R in the preceding note. The others are Abbeville 4; Autun 4; Cambridge, Univ., Kk.I.24; Colmar 38; London, BL, Add. 5463 (mistyped as 5436 on p. 117); London, BL, Harley 2788; Paris, Arsenal 599; Trier, Stadtbib. 22; Vienna, lat. 1224 (second series).
    49. Breues: J (first series), $\Theta$, A (but expliciunt capitola), D, Autun 4; breuiarium: Harley 2788, Vatican lat. 5465; elenchus C, T, N, Vienna 1224 (second series); tituli: O has no heading, but ends expliciunt tituli. On the introduction of the term breuiarium by Sedulius Scottus, see Petitmengin, «Capitula païens et chrétiens»,
[^12]:    p. 496; Meyvaert suggests that breues may be an indication of Insular origin (Paul Meyvaert, «Bede’s Capitula Lectionum for the Old and New Testaments» Revue bénédictine 105 (1995) 348-80, p. 350).
    50. See McGurk, Latin Gospel Books, pp. 94 and 114, who also notes that it has Type I capitula before Mark.
    51. Compare the phrase et ceteris mandatis in Type B in Matthew Cap. 4 and Mark Cap. 12 (and et mandatis in Luke Cap. 5), where Type A provides more details; similarly et reliqua at the end of Luke Cap. 20.
    52. In the text printed in the Vetus Latina Iohannes, Type B includes de muliere adultera, supported by the majority of manuscripts. For the omission of the last chapter, compare the relationship between Types A and B in Luke. It should also be noted that $S D R$ lacks the phrase et duobus piscibus from Cap. 6 through a typographical error.

[^13]:    58. See Bogaert, «Les particularités éditoriales», pp. 9-10: the first set of capitula for Acts in the Oxford Vulgate (beginning De passione et resurrectione domini) feature references to rebaptism, while Donatist summaries for the prophets are identified in H.J. Chapman, «The Codex Amiatinus and Cassiodorus», Revue bénédictine 39 (1927) 12-32; De Bruyne's suggestions for other potential Donatist series are mentioned under Type Ben below.
    59. Thus Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 312, who asserts Fortunatianus’ authorship of Type B based on the form used by Hilary of Poitiers. Yet it is not clear from Jerome's text whether the tituli ordinati were composed by Fortunatianus himself (or, indeed, whether they refer to the Gospels or the commentaries); furthermore, does the abbreviated form constitute a separate work?
    60. Eius is duplicated in $S D R$.
[^14]:    61. See further Popović, «Les Évangiles de Split» and, especially, «Du nouveau sur les Évangiles de Split», p. 290, which includes Angelica 29 in this group. According to Popović, the siglum Ben stands for Beneventanus and the switch to this type in John represents the more prestigious of the two codices used for the Split Gospels («Du nouveau», pp. 283-5).
    62. See H.A.G. Houghton, Augustine's Text of John, Oxford: OUP, 2008, p. 209; eremo occurs in 3:14 in two early gospel books, Cambridge, UL, Kk.I. 24 (with Type B capitula) and Würzburg, Univ., M.p.th.q. 1a (with Type W capitula).
    63. There are no manuscripts with this reading in Bonifatius Fischer, Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert. IV. Varianten zu Johannes (AGLB 18). Freiburg: Herder, 1991. Nonetheless, it is suggested by three patristic references to John 12:24: AU Ps 19.5.6, MAXn s 3 and PS-HI bre 40. (Abbreviations of patristic works are given according to the Vetus Latina system: see Roger Gryson, Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut moyen âge. (Vetus Latina $1 / 1$ ). 2 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 2007).
    64. Compare also proicere in a similar context in VL 14 at 9:22.
    65. See Bogaert, «Les particularités éditoriales», pp. 11-16. The only item of characteristic African vocabulary identified in John is arguere in Type Ben (Cap. 42), also present in Type C (Capp. 21 and 29). Apart from insinuat in Type Vich (Cap. 13), none of the other words in this list appears in any of the capitula of John.
[^15]:    Despite accepting an African origin for this set, Popović («Du nouveau», p. 290) also observes features typical of Rome and Campania.
    66. See further Houghton, «The St Petersburg Insular Gospels», p. 114. The other seventeen manuscripts are: Douai 16; Florence, Laurent. 26.1 (given as 25.1 on p. 599); Liège, 1; London, BL, Add. 17738; London, BL, Harley 2788 and 2804; Namur, Seminary; Paris, BnF, lat. 111, 265, 271 and 15177; Metz 1151; Reims 2; Rome, Vallicell. A. 2 and D 8; Rome, St Peter D 153; Rouen 2. Although SDR lists Utrecht (Univ. 32) as a witness to Type C in all four Gospels, McGurk, Latin Gospel Books, pp. 77 and 114, confirms that the capitula only survive for Matthew.
    67. The heading of the titles for John has been erased in Amiatinus and Hubertianus; the titles for Luke in Amiatinus are introduced as indicia siue capitula lectionum. On the adoption of the terminology capitula lectionum in Wearmouth-Jarrow at the time of Bede, see M.M. Gorman, «Source Marks and Chapter Divisions in Bede’s Commentary on Luke» Revue bénédictine 112 (2002) 246-75 (p. 267); for Bede's own use of it, see Meyvaert, «Bede’s Capitula Lectionum», pp. 348-51.
    68. On the high frequency of ablative absolutes in the capitula for the Octateuch in Codex Amiatinus, see De Bruyne, «Cassiodore et l’Amiatinus», p. 264.

[^16]:    69. The comment in Cap. 4 is very similar to the Mozarabic and Spanish prologues to John (ubi dominus inuitatur deficere nuptiarum uinum debeat|uinum deficiat nuptiarum). At the end of Cap. 3 (relating to Nathaniel) Codex Hubertianus includes a line from Jerome's De uiris illustribus (et confectus senio sexagesimo et octauo anno post passionem domini mortuus iuxta eadem urbe sepultus est): this, however, seems to have been incorporated erroneously into the capitula as in its original context it refers to the evangelist John.
    70. H.J. Chapman, Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908, p. 284, suggests that the capitula in Codex Amiatinus were composed by Eugippius based on earlier divisions. While Chapman's reconstruction of events is questionable, as there is no trace of earlier divisions matching Type C, there is nothing in Eugippius' citations of John to contradict this; indeed, uia, ueritas et uita in Cap. 35 matches his non-standard quotation of John 14:6 at EUGI reg 29.93 against the form of this verse in Codex Amiatinus.
[^17]:    71. For flattening, see H.A.G. Houghton, «'Flattening’ in Latin Biblical Citations» in J. Baun, A. Cameron, M. Edwards and M. Vinzent (edd.) Studia Patristica vol. XLV, Leuven: Peeters, 2010, pp. 271-6.
    72. De Bruyne, «Quelques documents nouveaux»; for John see pp. 316-24. Comparison of the text in $S D R$ with the extant manuscripts has brought to light a few minor omissions, corrected in the text provided in the Vetus Latina Iohannes.
    73. De Bruyne, "Quelques documents nouveaux», p. 442.
    74. The Munich manuscript was only discovered by De Bruyne after the publication of the first installment of «Quelques documents nouveaux»; both are used in $S D R$. According to McGurk, its exemplar was a sixth-century manuscript from Ravenna and it has an unusual set of canon tables ("The Disposition of Numbers», note on p. 245). In addition, there are two further partial witnesses to the headings of the Cy series, Florence, BML, Edili 125 for Matthew and Paris, BnF, lat. 277 for Mark, while some of the Cy divisions are found in Matthew in London, BL, Harley 1775 (see V. Popović, «Sur l'origine de l'évangéliaire latin de la British Library, Harley 1775» Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres 134.3 (1990) 709-735, p. 728).
[^18]:    75. For an example of their application to the study of the Greek tradition, see C.-B. Amphoux, «Les premières versions latines de Luc 5 et leur contribution à l’histoire du texte» in R. Gryson (ed.), Philologia Sacra I. Altes und Neues Testament. Freiburg: Herder (1993) pp. 193-211, especially pp. 200-8.
    76. De Bruyne, «Quelques documents nouveaux», p. 433 identifies the Type D capitula for Matthew as a fourth-century African series, but this does not appear to apply to the other Gospels.
[^19]:    77. Nancy Netzer, Cultural Interplay in the Eighth Century: The Trier Gospels and the Making of a Scriptorium at Echternach. Cambridge: CUP, 1994, especially pp. 18-21 and 162-71. SDR (p. 413) and McGurk, Latin Gospel Books (p. 114) record the Matthew capitula as absent and describe the capitula as Type I in Mark and Type D in Luke and John; in fact, the prefatory material for Matthew is misplaced, and is currently bound in the middle of John, on folios 143 r to 147 v . The lists for Matthew, Luke and and John have the heading breues, but Mark has capitulare. Netzer also observes (p. 21) that the additional series at the beginning of the Cutbercht Gospels may therefore come from the same scriptorium as the Trier Gospels.
    78. The titles are numbered from 1 to 39 , with 27 and 28 conflated and the numeral 27 then repeated; the divisions accompanying the text of John are given as 1-37 and 40-1.
    79. There are a few places where material unique to T is not found in the Type I tradition (Capp. 1, 4, 12, 17, 18, 32, 41); these are biblical quotations which may have been added by the copyists. T is another witness to moechatione in Type I Cap. 16 and putet se officium deo facere in Type I Cap. 30 (see below).
[^20]:    80. In addition to the eight manuscripts given letters above, De Bruyne uses the following for the text: Vatican lat. 7223 (H), Paris, BnF, lat. 11957 (C) and Montpellier, Bibl. de la ville 3 (M). See also Popović, «Du nouveau sur les Evangiles de Split», pp. 289-91; the designation I seems to have been used to suggest an Italian origin.
    81. McGurk, Latin Gospel Books, pp. 114 and 117; the reference to the final «Cap. 126 » may be an error for Cap. 226, the Ammonian section matching the last title. (For other manuscripts with this feature, see note 14 above.)
[^21]:    82. Wordsworth and White (p. 493) claim that the Book of Durrow has breuis interpretatio secundum Iohannem, but no title is visible in the facsimile. The Echternach Gospels also have the archaic kata Iohannem (found in some witnesses to Type A).
    83. The rare word moechatio is first attested in PS-CY sng and does not appear to be found in quotations of John 8.
    84. Manuscripts with officium deo facere in Cap. 30 generally also read moechatione in Cap. 16 (e.g. VL 15, Bodley 155, the Trier Gospels and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}$ Petersburg, NLR, Q.v.I.26). The patristic references are AU ep 185.20, AU Fau 22.70, AU Gau (seven times), CY ep 58, CY Fo 11, CY te 3.16, LUC Ath 1.19, PETI ap AU Do (three times), TY Apc 3.1; the only instance of obsequium facere is BEA Apc 5.12.7, which may represent a partial updating of Tyconius.
[^22]:    90. It is conceivable that the Synoptic parallels may derive from a list of Ammonian sections with titles similar to those found in VL 10, 39, 40 and 46: in Canons comprising two or more Gospels, the Matthaean (or Synoptic) text is usually quoted, although this does not explain all the inaccuracies.
    91. For other uses of this term, see Petitmengin, «Capitula païens et chrétiens», p. 495 and Type Cat.
    92. Old Latin forms shared with other series include natatoria in 5:2 (Cap. 10, cf. Types A, B, Cat, I), ianua in 10:1-7 (Cap. 22, cf. Types A, B, Ben, Cat), dedicatione
[^23]:    in 10:22 (Cap. 23, cf. Types A, B), flores in 12:13 (Cap. 26, cf. Types Cat, D, I), Graeci in 12:20 (Cap. 27; cf. Types A, B, Cy), tritici in 12:24 (Cap. 27, cf. Types Cat, Cy), uinea in 15:1 (Cap. 32, cf. Types A, B) and amat in 16:27 (Cap. 34, cf. Type C).
    93. These are as follows: in Hierosolymis in Cap. 11 but Hierosolymam (first hand; corrector Hierosolymis) in 5:1; uidens in Cap. 2 but uidet in 1:29; consequentes in Cap. 3 but eos sequentes at 1:38; colligerunt autem in Cap. 22 but colligerunt ergo in 11:47 (where there is no VL parallel for autem); diligitis and seruaretis in Cap. 28 but diligeritis (first hand; corrector diligitis) and seruate at 14:15 (where, again, seruaretis is not found in Old Latin manuscripts).

[^24]:    95. A collation with the text in $S D R$ provides the following emendations: Cap. 9, discipulorum corr., added above Iesu; Cap. 12, ierosolamis $]$ ierosolimis; Cap. 28, iesum] iesu; Cap. 31, <seruabil> (word supplied from trimmed margin); Cap. 40, ei corr., added above line.
    96. The divisions are present in the Gospel (see Appendix), but were added variously in red after the copying of the glosses and subsequently overwritten with modern chapter numbers in a similar red.
[^25]:    97. On the sets of Latin capitula for Hebrews and the Song of Songs which are related to Greek series, see Bogaert, «Les particularités éditoriales», p. 8.
    98. See also P. Petitmengin, «Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine» in J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (edd.) Le monde latin antique et la Bible (Bible de tous les temps 2), 89-128, especially pp. 102-3.
    99. De Bruyne, «Quelques documents nouveaux», p. 295; cf. De Bruyne, «Cassiodore et l'Amiatinus», p. 263; Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, p. 315.
[^26]:    1 Formerly known as Type $\mathrm{B}^{r}$; the divisions are not included in SDR and are based principally on Vatican Reg. lat. 14 (R) and Rouen A. 1 (O).

[^27]:    8 Between John 8 and 11，the divisions given in $S D R$ for Ior（20 at 8：12， 21 at 8：31， 22 at 9：1，23 at 10：1，24 at 10：22）do not correspond to the capitula：the table has been adjusted to match these 9 The division at 8：22 in Type B（which is not a logical break）seems to be an error in SDR：all manuscripts investigated place it at $8: 21$ ．

[^28]:    10 In SDR division 19 in Cat is located at 10:7, but the capitulum quotes $10: 1$.

