

# The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin witness in Matthew

Houghton, H.A.G.

*License:*

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Houghton, HAG 2019, The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin witness in Matthew. in G Allen (ed.), *The Future of New Testament Textual Scholarship From H. C. Hoskier to the Editio Critica Maior and Beyond*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, vol. 417, Mohr Siebeck, pp. 247-264.

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

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Checked for eligibility: 25/02/2019

Houghton, H. A. G. (2019) The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin witness in Matthew. In G. V. Allen (Ed. ), *The future of New Testament textual scholarship* (pp. 247-264). Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

For non commercial use only.

**General rights**

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

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

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

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

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

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

# The Future of New Testament Textual Scholarship

From H. C. Hoskier to the Editio Critica Maior  
and Beyond

Edited by  
Garrick V. Allen

Mohr Siebeck

Author's e-offprint with publisher's permission

GARRICK V. ALLEN, born 1988; 2015 PhD; Lecturer in New Testament Studies at Dublin City University, Republic of Ireland.  
orcid.org/0000-0003-4428-1775

ISBN 978-3-16-156662-2 / 978-3-16-156663-9  
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156663-9

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476  
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohrsiebeck.com](http://www.mohrsiebeck.com)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Author's e-offprint with publisher's permission

## Table of Contents

|              |    |
|--------------|----|
| Preface..... | IX |
|--------------|----|

### Intellectual History of Textual Scholarship

*Garrick V. Allen*

The Patient Collator and the Philology of the Beyond:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| H. C. Hoskier and the New Testament ..... | 3 |
|---|---|

*Juan Hernández Jr.*

Hoskier's Contribution to the Apocalypse's Textual History:

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Collations, Polyglots, Groupings..... | 39 |
|---------------------------------------|----|

*Martin Karrer*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Herman Charles Hoskier and the Textual Criticism of Revelation..... | 51 |
|---|----|

*Jan Krans*

|                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Hoskier in the Spiritual World ..... | 69 |
|--------------------------------------|----|

*Jennifer Wright Knust*

On Textual Nostalgia: Herman C. Hoskier's Collation of Evangelium 604

|   |    |
|---|----|
| (London, British Library Egerton 2610; GA 700) Revisited..... | 79 |
|---|----|

*Peter J. Gurry*

'A Book Worth Publishing': The Making of Westcott and Hort's

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Greek New Testament (1881) ..... | 103 |
|----------------------------------|-----|

### The Status Quaestionis and Future of Textual Scholarship

*Stanley E. Porter*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| The Domains of Textual Criticism and the Future of Textual Scholarship.... | 131 |
|--|-----|

Table of Contents

*Gregory Peter Fewster*

Finding Your Place: Developing Cross-reference Systems  
in Late Antique Biblical Codices ..... 155

*Christina M. Kreinecker*

Papyrology, Papyrological Commentary, and the Future  
of New Testament Textual Scholarship ..... 181

*Jacob W. Peterson*

Patterns of Correction as Paratext: A New Approach with Papyrus 46  
as a Test Case..... 201

*Dirk Jongkind*

Redactional Elements in the Text of Codex B ..... 231

*H. A. G. Houghton*

The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin  
Witness in Matthew..... 247

*Curt Niccum*

Hoskier and His (Per)Version of the Ethiopic..... 265

*Thomas J. Kraus*

Ostraca and Talismans: The Story of Two Former Text-Critical  
Categories and What to do with Them Today..... 283

*An-Ting Yi*

The Critical Apparatus of Stephanus' Greek New Testament of 1550:  
Early Printed Editions and Textual Scholarship..... 305

*Tommy Wasserman*

Methods of Evaluating Textual Relationships: From Bengel  
to the CBGM and Beyond..... 333

*J. K. Elliott*

Thoroughgoing Eclectic Textual Criticism: Manuscripts and Variants  
of Revelation..... 363

*Jill Unkel*

Speaking in Tongues: Collecting the Chester Beatty Biblical Manuscripts... 379

*Table of Contents*

Editing the New Testament in a Digital Age

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>D. C. Parker</i><br>The Future of the Critical Edition .....  | 395 |
| <i>Catherine Smith</i><br>Old Wine, New Wineskins: Digital Tools for Editing the New Testament....   | 407 |
| <i>Klaus Wachtel</i><br>The Development of the Coherence-Based Genealogical<br>Method (CBGM), its Place in Textual Scholarship, and Digital Editing..... | 435 |
| <i>Annette Hüffmeier</i><br>Apparatus Construction: Philological Methodology<br>and Technical Realization.....   | 447 |
| Contributors .....   | 461 |
| Bibliography .....   | 463 |
| Ancient Sources Index.....   | 503 |
| Modern Author Index .....  | 513 |
| Subject Index .....  | 521 |

# The Garland of Howth (*Vetus Latina* 28): A Neglected Old Latin Witness in Matthew

*H. A. G. Houghton\**

Research on the textual tradition of the Latin New Testament has been slower to integrate digital approaches than comparable investigations of the Greek evidence. Bonifatius Fischer's computer collation of substantial test passages in over four hundred and fifty Latin gospel manuscripts from the first millennium was a notable but isolated early achievement.<sup>1</sup> It was only two decades later that this was used to identify new witnesses to the Old Latin textual tradition and the tables of overall statistical agreement were published.<sup>2</sup> The *Verbum Project*, running at the University of Birmingham between 2002 and 2005, made full-text electronic transcriptions of manuscript witnesses to the Old Latin version of the Gospel according to John.<sup>3</sup> Even so, these were not integrated into a single, automated workflow for producing the *Vetus Latina* edition of John. Other recent projects to produce volumes in this series have made only limited use of software tools.<sup>4</sup>

---

\* The present study uses material prepared for the Irish Latin Gospel Books Transcription Project ([www.insulargospels.net](http://www.insulargospels.net)), and is offered in gratitude to Professor Martin McNamara. The author would also like to thank Dr Garrick Allen for the invitation to deliver this paper at the conference *Herman Hoskier and the Future of Textual Scholarship on the Bible* held in Dublin in August 2017.

<sup>1</sup> Bonifatius Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, AGLB 13, 15, 17, 18 (Freiburg: Herder, 1988–1991).

<sup>2</sup> H. A. G. Houghton, "A Newly Identified Old Latin Gospel Manuscript: Würzburg Universitätsbibliothek M.p.th.f.67," *JTS* 60 (2009): 1–21; Houghton, "The St Petersburg Insular Gospels: Another Old Latin Witness," *JTS* 61 (2010): 110–27; J.-C. Haelewyck, "Un nouveau témoin vieux latin de Marc. Le ms. Durham, Cathedral Library A.II.10 + C.III.13 + C.III.20," *RBen* 123 (2013): 5–12; Bonifatius Fischer†, "Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert. Zwei Untersuchungen zum Text," *ZNW* 101 (2010): 119–44.

<sup>3</sup> For the separate electronic edition produced by this project, see <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina> [accessed 23 March 2018].

<sup>4</sup> Transcriptions produced at the University of Mainz towards a *Vetus Latina* edition of the Acts of the Apostles were made directly into an Excel spreadsheet, released online in PDF form (<http://nttf.klassphil.uni-mainz.de/179.php>). There does not appear to be any electronic data underlying the *Vetus Latina* edition of Mark (J.-C. Haelewyck, ed., *Vetus Latina*).

Author's e-offprint with publisher's permission

The present chapter combines the use of unpublished data from Fischer's collations with a full-text electronic transcription of the Gospel according to Matthew made from new, high-resolution digital images and a computer-generated apparatus of variants from the standard text of the Stuttgart Vulgate in order to investigate the textual affiliation of a ninth-century gospel book copied in Ireland. In so doing, it represents a born-digital approach to the examination of Latin manuscripts of the New Testament, offering a paradigm for further work in this area. At the same time, given that the most recent study of this witness was produced by H. C. Hoskier, it allows for reflection on developments in the study of witnesses to the New Testament over the last century.

### History of Research on the Manuscript

In 1919, Hoskier published a *New and Complete Edition of the Irish Latin Gospel Codex Usse[r]ianus] 2 or r<sub>2</sub>, otherwise known as 'The Garland of Howth' in Trinity College Library, Dublin*.<sup>5</sup> Hoskier's edition of the surviving portions of this manuscript followed two works produced by Irish scholars in the preceding decades. The first was T. K. Abbott's collation of this manuscript included as an appendix to his edition of *Codex Usse[r]ianus Primus*, the Old Latin gospel book known as r<sup>1</sup> or VL 14.<sup>6</sup> On the basis of his collation, Abbott identified the text of the Garland of Howth as Old Latin in Matthew, Vulgate in Mark, John and much of Luke, and a mixture of these traditions in Luke 2 and the latter part of the same gospel.<sup>7</sup> A few years later, H. J. Lawlor refined Abbott's conclusion by observing that the Old Latin section in Matthew only began in chapter 16: although Lawlor's principal concern was to illustrate the phenomenon known as "block mixture," when parts of the same manuscript are copied from different exemplars,

---

*Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 17. Evangelium Secundum Marcum.* [Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder, 2013–].

<sup>5</sup> Although this is the description given on an initial page at the beginning of the volume, the title page itself has a slightly different formulation: H. C. Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usse[r]ianus 2. R<sub>2</sub>. ('Garland of Howth')*. *With Critical Notes to Supplement and Correct the Collation of the Late T.K. Abbott* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1919). It may be noted that, despite the characterisation of the volume as appearing in a series on "Old Latin Texts," it is a one-off with no connection to the Oxford series of the same name.

<sup>6</sup> T. K. Abbott, *Evangeliorum Versio Antehieronymiana ex Codex Usse[r]iano (Dublinensi), Adiecta Collatione Codex Usse[r]iani Alterius* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1884). The appendix is on pp. 819–63: Abbott takes Codex Amiatinus as the base for his collation and uses symbols to mark agreements with Codex Usse[r]ianus primus and the Book of Kells.

<sup>7</sup> Abbott, *Evangeliorum Versio Antehieronymiana*, xiv–xv. Abbott's edition was used to cite this manuscript in the Oxford Vulgate. J. Wordsworth and H. J. White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine. I. Evangelia.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889–1898).

he published a full transcription of this portion as an appendix in his *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*.<sup>8</sup>

Hoskier's edition is what I have described elsewhere as a "textual facsimile."<sup>9</sup> The transcription matches the layout of the manuscript, but is mostly printed with normal type: special characters are used to render the insular *g* and symbols for *autem* and *enim*, certain capital letters including *a* and *n*, and the *et* digraph, in order to reproduce the appearance of the text as closely as possible. Although this is typographically impressive and assists with reading some damaged parts of the manuscript, the preservation of all the abbreviations makes this a difficult work for the non-specialist to use. At the end of the volume, Hoskier prints a supplement to Abbott's collation of the manuscript in which some of the spelling conventions and abbreviations are explained. In fact, in his introduction, Hoskier describes the quality of Abbott's work as "deplorable," noting "one thousand errors of omission and commission" and a failure to report "over two thousand varieties of spelling."<sup>10</sup> Hoskier's own transcription is generally very accurate, although it too can still be improved in a few places.<sup>11</sup> In his brief introduction, however, he contents himself with listing just a dozen or so readings from each gospel which "seem to be of more than passing interest," especially those which support his theory of the origin of the Latin version in a bilingual manuscript.<sup>12</sup> There is no discussion of the position of the Garland of Howth within Latin textual tradition or an examination of its block mixture.

The Garland of Howth was included in the inaugural register of Old Latin manuscripts issued by the Vetus Latina Institute in 1949, and assigned the number 28.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, unlike similar manuscripts on either side, it was not excerpted onto the index cards which subsequently formed the basis of the *Vetus Latina Database*.<sup>14</sup> It was also not included in any volumes of the *Itala* edition

<sup>8</sup> H. J. Lawlor, *Chapters on the Book of Mulling* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1897), Appendix A, "The Old Latin Portions of 'The Garland of Howth,'" is on pp. 186–201.

<sup>9</sup> H. A. G. Houghton, "The Electronic Scriptorium: Markup for New Testament Manuscripts," in *Digital Humanities in Biblical, Early Jewish and Early Christian Studies*, ed. C. Clivaz, A. Gregory, and D. Hamidović (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 31–60 (esp. 32, 43, 52).

<sup>10</sup> Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2*, iii; the emphasis is original.

<sup>11</sup> For example, he fails to spot the opening words of Matt 1:18 on the first surviving page of the codex.

<sup>12</sup> Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2*, vi–x (quotation from vi); the verses he identifies as "polyglot-places" are Matt 20:30 and 26:3.

<sup>13</sup> Bonifatius Fischer, *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Handschriften und Kirchenschriftsteller*, Vetus Latina 1/1 (Herder: Freiburg, 1949). It is also included in Patrick McGurk, *Latin Gospel Books From A.D. 400 to A.D. 800* (Paris: Érasme, 1961) as number 85; in his brief description, McGurk observes the text of Matt 1:18 on fol. 1r missed by Hoskier.

<sup>14</sup> VL 27 was excerpted from Rettig's 1836 facsimile, while VL 30 was taken from Heer's edition of 1910. For the *Vetus Latina Database*, see H. A. G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 116.

of Old Latin gospel manuscripts.<sup>15</sup> The first examination of its biblical text since Hoskier was as part of Fischer's computer collations published in the late 1980s. The table of overall agreements, published posthumously, indicated that the overall agreement of the Garland of Howth with the editorial text of the Stuttgart Vulgate was 78.9%.<sup>16</sup> This places it among the twenty witnesses which differ most from this standard form. However, a breakdown of its affiliation in each passage and details of its closest relatives can be presented from the raw data files kindly provided to me by the publishers. The range of figures is given in Figure 1, which gives the number and extent of the passages, agreements with the Stuttgart Vulgate as both an actual number and a percentage, and the rank of dissimilarity from the Vulgate among all manuscripts in the sample.

The most striking figures are those for the Gospel according Matthew: in passage 14, a selection from Matthew 26 and 27, the Garland of Howth exhibits the greatest difference from the Vulgate of all Latin gospel manuscripts copied in the first millennium, with an agreement of just 56.5%.<sup>17</sup> Admittedly, the competition is reduced by Codex Bobiensis (VL 1) and Codex Palatinus (VL 2) not being extant here, but this represents a greater dissimilarity than well-known Old Latin witnesses such as Codex Vercellensis (VL 3), Codex Veronensis (VL 4) and Codex Bezae (VL 5). In passage 13, where there is a 64.1% agreement with the Vulgate, it comes in fourth place overall, behind Codex Palatinus, Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus (VL 12). In the passages from Mark and Luke the overall agreement is higher, consistent with texts displaying a mixture of Old Latin and Vulgate readings. In John the percentage drops again, although the manuscript is only extant for ten verses of passage 42 which may be too small a sample to be significant.

In terms of identifying relatives, the evidence from Fischer's raw data is inconclusive. The highest level of overall agreement with another manuscript in the collation is just 83.5%: this is with Codex Perusinus (P in the Oxford Vulgate), which is only extant in Luke.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> For Matthew, these are Adolf Jülicher, ed., *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinische Überlieferung. I. Matthäus-Evangelium* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938); Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow, Kurt Aland, eds., *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinische Überlieferung. I. Matthäus-Evangelium*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972). The indication in Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, 225, that this manuscript is included in the *Itala* is erroneous.

<sup>16</sup> Fischer†, "Die lateinischen Evangelien," 136.

<sup>17</sup> This figure was verified from a tally of the relevant section of the collation in Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien I*. Interestingly, in the portion from Matthew 26 the agreement is roughly 68% but in the portion from Matthew 27 this drops to 52%, although this may say more about the Vulgate text of this passage than VL 28.

<sup>18</sup> For more on this manuscript, see Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, 274.

| Passage                            | Agreements | %    | Rank              |
|------------------------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| 11 (Matt 2:19–4:17)                | -          | -    | -                 |
| 12 (Matt 8:2–9:8)                  | -          | -    | -                 |
| 13 (Matt 16:9–17:17)               | 173/270    | 64.1 | 4                 |
| 14 (Matt 26:39–58, 27:29–46)       | 144/255    | 56.5 | 1                 |
| 21 (Mark 2:12–3:21)                | 314/366    | 85.8 | 18                |
| 22 (Mark 7:32–8:35)                | 282/332    | 84.9 | 20                |
| 23 (Mark 10:17–52)                 | 282/340    | 82.9 | 21                |
| 24 (Mark 14:22–62)                 | 264/334    | 79.0 | 21                |
| 31 (Luke 6:17–49)                  | 210/245    | 85.7 | 19                |
| 32 (Luke 8:12–43)                  | 306/359    | 85.2 | 16                |
| 33 (Luke 10:40–11:32)              | 277/342    | 81.0 | 18                |
| 34 (Luke 23:35–44, 24:8–13, 24–49) | -          | -    | -                 |
| 41 (John 2:18–3:31)                | -          | -    | -                 |
| 42 (John 7:28–8:16)                | 57/84      | 67.9 | [7] <sup>19</sup> |
| 43 (John 12:17–13:6)               | -          | -    | -                 |
| 44 (John 20:1–21:4)                | -          | -    | -                 |
| Total                              | 2309/2927  | 78.9 | 19                |

*Fig. 1.* Vulgate agreement and ranking of VL 28 from Fischer's collations

All Old Latin witnesses appear among the lowest fifty relatives, showing less agreement with this text than more than 400 Vulgate manuscripts do: Codex Usserianus Primus, which Abbott notes shares a number of readings with the Garland of Howth, comes in 433<sup>rd</sup> place with an overall agreement of just 62.5% (1410 of 2255 variation units), slightly above Codex Veronensis and Codex Claromontanus. Codex Bezae and Codex Vercellensis are even lower, with agreements of 52.4% (1504/2869) and 51.2% (1365/2667) respectively. The only instances of a more marked agreement between the Garland of Howth and Old Latin witnesses are in the passages from Matthew, as shown in Figure 2.

The agreement with Codex Usserianus Primus, the closest witness in both these passages, is still relatively low but exceeds the Vulgate agreement by 12.4% in passage 13 and 8.5% in passage 14. The correspondence with other Old Latin witnesses, particularly in passage 13, seems to confirm an Old Latin affiliation for the Garland of Howth in at least part of Matthew. Nevertheless, more extensive investigation is needed in order to determine the significance of these percentages.

<sup>19</sup> The overall ranking tables exclude any witness which is extant in fewer than 100 variation units; this is the rank which would correspond to this percentage in this variation unit.

| Manuscript                     | Passage 13      | Passage 14      |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| VL 14: Codex Usserianus Primus | 76.5% (101/132) | 65.0% (147/226) |
| VL 8: Codex Corbeiensis        | 73.0% (197/270) | 58.4% (149/255) |
| VL 6: Codex Colbertinus        | 72.2% (192/266) | 62.8% (164/261) |
| VL 4: Codex Veronensis         | 71.9% (194/270) | 59.8% (156/261) |
| VL 11: Codex Rehdigeranus      | 66.7% (180/270) | 58.4% (149/255) |
| VL 16: Fragmenta Sangallensia  | 66.2% (49/74)   | -               |
| VL 13: Codex Monacensis        | 63.6% (171/269) | 59.9% (157/262) |
| VL 12: Codex Claromontanus     | -               | 61.2% (161/263) |

Fig. 2. Old Latin manuscripts agreeing most with VL 28 in Fischer's collation of Matthew

Since Fischer's collation, the Garland of Howth has been included in the *Vetus Latina* edition of John.<sup>20</sup> It is assigned by the editors to Group 2B, indicating that its affiliation is with the Vulgate even though a few non-standard readings are shared with other Irish witnesses. However, the decision was taken to exclude it from the *Vetus Latina* edition of Mark due to the Vulgate nature of its text, based on a comparison of Hoskier's edition with the Oxford Vulgate.<sup>21</sup> As part of the Early Irish Manuscripts Project at Trinity College Dublin, new high-resolution digital images of the Garland of Howth were made freely available on the Library's website in 2016.<sup>22</sup> Conservation undertaken in conjunction with these images means that certain portions illegible to Hoskier can now be read more clearly. A fresh electronic transcription of Matthew, based on these images, was prepared by the Irish Latin Gospel Books Transcription Project in 2017, which forms the basis of the present study.<sup>23</sup>

### Description of the Manuscript

The Garland of Howth is a manuscript of the Latin Gospels in the standard Vulgate order copied in Ireland around the year 800. It is written in insular minuscule script, in a single column with normally 26 lines per page. The page size is 24.3

<sup>20</sup> P. H. Burton, H. A. G. Houghton, R. F. MacLachlan and D. C. Parker, eds., *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 19. Evangelium Secundum Iohannem* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder, 2011–).

<sup>21</sup> See Haelewyck, *Evangelium Secundum Marcum*, 7.

<sup>22</sup> See <http://www.tcd.ie/library/early-irish-mss/launch-of-the-digital-garland-of-howth/> (blog post, 9 February 2016). The Digital Collections of Trinity College Dublin are accessed through <http://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/home/> and a PDF of the Garden of Howth downloaded from <http://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/content/1647/pdf/1647.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> This transcription, by Alan Taylor Farnes, is available at <http://epa.pers.bham.ac.uk/3023>; for more on the project, see Martin McNamara, "Irish Gospel Texts Publication Project," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 38 (2015): 85–98.

by 17.5cm, with a text block of around 20 by 15cm.<sup>24</sup> 86 folios remain, containing portions from all four Gospels.<sup>25</sup> A number of these parchment leaves have suffered damage such as tears, holes, and loss of margins as well as discoloration in certain places. There are two illuminated pages, *Christi autem* (Matt 1:18, 1r) and the opening page of Mark (22r). The text is divided into sense units by enlarged letters and there is minimal use of punctuation marks. Words are separated by blank space; prepositions are often attached to the following word, and there are occasional instances of unusual word-division across lines (e.g. *g-entibus* in Matt 24:14, *f-actum* in Matt 27:57). There is extensive use of abbreviation in addition to the standard *nomina sacra*: the insular symbols for *autem*, *enim* and *eius* are employed, as well as ÷ for *est*. Two different abbreviations are used for *quae*.<sup>26</sup> A penultimate vowel is sometimes written underneath the following consonant at the end of a line, but the completion of a line in blank space above or below is rare.<sup>27</sup> Although the insular *g* is used throughout, Hoskier notes that the insular *s* is uncommon, and only appears from Mark 7:18 onwards.<sup>28</sup> At least four copyists worked on the manuscript.<sup>29</sup> Corrections are few in number, and there are no marginalia.

The orthography of the manuscript presents a variety of interesting features. Typical insular spellings are present throughout, such as the interchange between long *i* and *e*, the simplification of double consonants, and erroneous duplications (e.g. *nissi* for *nisi*, *dixise* for *dixisse*, *sufocare* for *suffocare*, *occulos* for *oculos*). There is also interchange between *o* and *u* (e.g. *monus* for *munus*, *diabulus* for *diabolus*), *y* and *i*, and *ie* for *ei* (especially in *icere*). *H* is sometimes added in initial position (e.g. *hira* for *ira*), or reinforced by *c* (e.g. *adprechendere* for *adprehendere*, *chipocritae* for *hypocritae*). There is confusion between *b* and *v*, or *b* and *p*, as well as final *t* and *d*; *s* and *z* are sometimes exchanged, with *sizania* for *zizania* and even *sabulo* for *zabulo* (originally *diabolo*: e.g. Matt 25:41). Often, but not always, *ae* is simplified to *e*, although it is occasionally written as a

---

<sup>24</sup> Figures from McGurk, *Latin Gospel Books*, 79. The manuscript is also included in E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores II. Great Britain and Ireland*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), no. 72.

<sup>25</sup> The current contents are: Matt 1:18–2:7; 4:24–5:29; 13:7–14:1; 16:13–18:31; 19:26–26:18; 26:45–27:58; Mark 1:1–3:23; 4:19–5:36; 6:36–16:20; Luke 1:13–2:15; 3:8–6:39; 7:11–11:54; 12:45–14:18; 15:25–16:15; 17:7–19:10; 19:38–22:35; 22:59–23:14; John 5:12–6:25; 8:7–10:3.

<sup>26</sup> These consist of *q* with a superline (e.g. Matt 13:17) and *q* followed by a triangle of dots (e.g. Matt 13:16, 44); see further Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2*, iv–v.

<sup>27</sup> One exception is found at the bottom of 54r (Luke 6:5).

<sup>28</sup> Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2*, 59.

<sup>29</sup> Hoskier notes that 26v is in a different hand and only contains 24 lines, while other scribes were responsible for folios 59–64, part of 74r, and 82–86 (*The Text Of Codex Usse-rianus 2*, ad loc.). In fact, there are at least three hands on 59r and fewer lines per page on the following folios.

digraph (*æ*) or *e-caudata* (*ę*). The treatment of certain vowels, however, appears to be unique to the Garland of Howth: the third-person plural perfect *-erunt* is frequently written as *-iarunt*, and *-iabant* is sometimes found in place of *-ebant* (e.g. Matt 27:47); participles in *-ens* often gain an extra *i*, such as *diciens* and *uidiens*; long *e* is sometimes supplemented by *a*, with *profeata* commonly for *propheta*, *secreato* for *secreto*, *habeabant* for *habebant* and *pleana* for *plena*. In the other gospels, Hoskier notes the duplication of long vowels such as *doo* for *do* or *paraa* for *para* as well as the aspiration of *t* to *th*.<sup>30</sup> A further unusual feature, for an insular manuscript at any rate, is interference in both directions between *qu* and *c*, with forms such as *nesquitis* for *nescitis*, *relincimus* for *relinquimus*, and *accibus* for *a quibus*.<sup>31</sup>

Although the non-standard spellings are sufficiently widespread to form a coherent system, there are also frequent scribal errors. Several lines are absent through homoioteleuton, and there are also examples of dittography.<sup>32</sup> The omission of single words or short phrases is particularly common, sometimes resulting in a nonsense reading. The latter is also true of changes in number or case due to scribal inattentiveness; alternations between participles and finite verbs are also common and not always grammatical in context.<sup>33</sup> There are a number of occasions on which a mistake may have arisen from the incorrect expansion of an abbreviation in the exemplar, including *quicumque* for *quodcumque* on four occasions, *quasi* for *quia sic*, *quod fecit* for *profecit* and *uestros* for *nostros*.<sup>34</sup> The miswriting of *honone* for *honore* in Matt 13:57 suggests that the exemplar was written in insular script. This is confirmed by the incorporation of a gloss in Matt 27:5, where in place of *argenteis* the copyist writes *arcadgabuthc*, a garbled form of an Irish translation of *argentum acceptum*.<sup>35</sup> A Latin gloss is incorporated in the following verse (*hic est locu<lu>m*, Matt 27:6) and other doublets could have arisen this way, although they are a common feature of insular

---

<sup>30</sup> Luke 4:6; 10:18; 14:3, 5; 17:8; 19:8; Mark 6:56: see Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2*, v. Double vowels, especially *ii*, are indicated by the insular addition of faint strokes above the letters.

<sup>31</sup> Matt 17:24; 19:27; and 25:13. This alternation is more common in manuscripts of Italian origin; it appears in VL 7 which derives from a Roman pandect (see Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, 87).

<sup>32</sup> Homoioteleuton: Matt 5:19; 17:16; 18:12–13; 19:28; 20:26–27; 21:44; 24:26; 25:5, 22–23 (possibly also 22:16); dittography: Matt 20:25; 22:30; 26:62; 27:30–31.

<sup>33</sup> e.g. *accediens...dicens* in Matt 18:21, *sedentes...audientes...et clamauerunt* in Matt 20:30 and *errantes nescientes* in Matt 22:29.

<sup>34</sup> Matt 16:19; 18:18; 26:54; 27:24, 26 respectively; in the last two cases, the abbreviations for *quod* and *pro* are very similar, while the similarity between *n* and *u* means that abbreviated first- and second-person plural pronominal adjectives are easily confused.

<sup>35</sup> See Abbott, *Evangeliorum versio antehieronymiana*, xvii where the correct form of the Irish is given as *airgid gabtha*.

tradition.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, errors such as *maiestate fratris* for *maiestate patris* in Matt 16:27, *nouisime censum* for *nomisma census* in Matt 22:19 and *de operibus fidelis* in place of *de xpo cuius filius* in Matt 22:42 simply represent poor copying.<sup>37</sup> Few of these errors have been corrected, and the consequence is that readings peculiar to this manuscript must be carefully weighed before being considered as genuine biblical forms which are no longer attested elsewhere.

## The Text of Matthew

Six portions of the Gospel according to Matthew are preserved in the Garland of Howth: three shorter passages from the first half of the Gospel on one or two folios each (Matt 1:18–2:7; 4:24–5:29; 13:7–14:1) and the majority of the latter half with a couple of interruptions on the remaining seventeen folios (Matt 16:13–18:31; 19:26–26:18; 26:45–27:58). It is surprising that the back of the page on which the text breaks off mid-verse is blank, suggesting that the conclusion of the gospel may never have been copied. In order to examine the textual affiliation of this witness, the electronic transcription was collated against the editorial text of the Stuttgart Vulgate.<sup>38</sup> This produced a total of 1790 variants, which were compared with the Old Latin codices reported in the *Itala* and divided into three categories: purely orthographic variants; agreements with surviving Old Latin manuscripts; readings peculiar to VL 28 (i.e. without parallel in the *Itala*).<sup>39</sup> The latter were subdivided into probable errors (e.g. omissions, nonsense readings) and possible alternative readings no longer preserved in direct tradition. The overall distribution is shown in Figure 3.

The effect of the unusual orthography of the Garland of Howth on its agreement with the Vulgate (or, indeed, other witnesses) is immediately obvious: 29% of the variants are simply orthographic. When these are combined with the high proportion of unparalleled readings which are likely to represent copying errors (18%), they account for almost half of the differences from the Vulgate.

---

<sup>36</sup> E.g. *sciscitabatur interrogabat* at Matt 2:4, where *ab eis* is also repeated, or *accessiarunt erigebant* at Matt 17:23. Abbott, *Evangeliorum versio antehieronymiana*, xvii notes further doublets in Luke as well as the incorporation of a further Latin marginal gloss in Luke 23:12.

<sup>37</sup> These are also selected as “examples of carelessness or foolishness” by Abbott, who provides similar instances from the other gospels (*Evangeliorum versio antehieronymiana*, xvi).

<sup>38</sup> R. Weber, R. Gryson et al., eds., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007). The collation interface used was developed by Dr C. J. Smith of the University of Birmingham.

<sup>39</sup> As with any analysis of this sort, the exact number of variants is dependent on the definition of the extent of each unit and there are some instances of overlap between classification. The figures given in the following tables should therefore not be taken as absolute, but should allow a margin of error in order to take into account the ambiguity of the data.

Nevertheless, a substantial Old Latin element is clearly present, along with a group of other non-Vulgate readings which may include significant early forms.

| Type of variant                             | Number | Proportion |
|---|--------|------------|
| Orthographic                                | 524    | 29%        |
| Old Latin parallel                          | 798    | 45%        |
| Unparalleled reading (probable error)       | 325    | 18%        |
| Unparalleled reading (possible alternative) | 143    | 8%         |
| Total                                       | 1790   | 100%       |

Fig. 3. Classification of variants in VL 28

Breaking down these figures according to the surviving portions of text gives a more detailed picture of the textual affiliation. Figure 4 provides both the numbers for each type of variant and the frequency per hundred words, using the same variant categories as Figure 3:

|     | 1:18–2:7  |             | 4:24–5:29 |             | 13:7–14:1  |             | 16:13–18:31 |             | 19:26–26:18 |             | 26:45–27:58 |             |
|-----|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|     | No        | Freq        | No        | Freq        | No         | Freq        | No          | Freq        | No          | Freq        | No          | Freq        |
| (1) | 15        | 6.1         | 41        | 8.6         | 44         | 5.1         | 67          | 5.3         | 266         | 6.4         | 91          | 6.6         |
| (2) | 8         | 3.3         | 9         | 1.9         | 38         | 4.4         | 141         | 11.1        | 455         | 11.0        | 147         | 10.7        |
| (3) | 4         | 1.6         | 11        | 2.3         | 38         | 4.4         | 65          | 5.1         | 143         | 3.4         | 64          | 4.6         |
| (4) | 4         | 1.6         | 2         | 0.4         | 4          | 0.5         | 14          | 1.1         | 91          | 2.2         | 28          | 2.0         |
| (5) | <b>31</b> | <b>12.6</b> | <b>63</b> | <b>13.2</b> | <b>124</b> | <b>14.4</b> | <b>287</b>  | <b>22.5</b> | <b>955</b>  | <b>23.0</b> | <b>330</b>  | <b>24.0</b> |

Fig. 4. Distribution of non-Vulgate readings in VL 28 by passage and frequency per hundred words. (1) = Orthographic; (2) = Old Latin parallel; (3) = Probable error; (4) = Possible alternative; (5) = Total.

There is a clear division of the gospel into two. In the first three portions, the frequency of variant readings is between 12.6 and 14.4 per hundred words, whereas from chapter 16 onwards this almost doubles. The proportion of orthographic variations is largely unchanged. Instead, the difference is largely due to a marked increase in variants paralleled in surviving Old Latin manuscripts, which occur at a consistent rate of around 11 per hundred words. In addition, readings characteristic of the Vulgate are almost entirely absent from the fourth portion.<sup>40</sup> This confirms Lawlor's identification of block mixture in the

<sup>40</sup> These are readings only attested in the *Itala* by the Vulgate and manuscripts known to be partly Vulgate in their affiliation (e.g. VL 6, 7, 11, 15). There are 52 such readings in Matt 16:13–18:31, and the Garland of Howth differs from the Vulgate in 49 of them. The exceptions are the omission of *propitius (esto) tibi* in 16:22, *obumbravit* rather than *inumbrauit* in 17:5, and the omission of *illuc* from 17:19. The omissions are not compelling

manuscript, with the Old Latin portion beginning at some point in the gap between Matt 14:1 and 16:13. The consistency of the figures for the whole of the latter part of the gospel also bears out the impression given in Fischer's test-passages from the beginning and end of this section.

There are few variant readings with Old Latin parallels in the first three sections which are particularly notable. Nine involve an alternative rendering (*quoniam* for *quia* at 5:7 and 5:28; *magnificans* for *glorificans* at 5:16; *eat* for *mittatur* at 5:29; *autem* for *ergo* at 13:18; *malus* for *malignus* at 13:19; *eis* for *illis* at 13:24; *absconsa* for *abscondita* in 13:35; *maligni* for *nequam* in 13:38). There are several expansions, which are matched by some of the variants in the Garland of Howth not found in other surviving Old Latin gospels.<sup>41</sup> Most of the other parallels involve minor changes and may be coincidental. Certain non-Vulgate forms correspond to Greek variants: the singular *sine parabula[m]* in 13:34; the additions of *dicit eis* and *domine* in 13:51; *Iohannes* rather than *Ioseph* in 13:55. Even though the first of these is not paralleled in direct Old Latin tradition, it has a strong claim to represent an Old Latin form. The most striking errors in this portion of text are the consistent substitution of the numeral *XL* in place of *LX* (Matt 13:8, 13:23), and *temporibus* in place of *messoribus* in 13:30 (prompted by *tempore* a few words previously).

In order to classify the Old Latin element in the latter half of Matthew, readings allocated to this category were systematically compared with five Old Latin manuscripts.<sup>42</sup> The figures for this agreement are shown in Figure 5:

|            | VL 4    | VL 5    | VL 9    | VL 12   | VL 14   |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Agreements | 331/724 | 261/726 | 243/741 | 404/634 | 365/521 |
| Percentage | 45.7%   | 36.0%   | 32.8%   | 63.7%   | 70.1%   |

Fig. 5. Overlap of Old Latin readings in VL 28 with other manuscripts

The overlap with VL 12 and VL 14 is noticeably higher than with the other three manuscripts. This is also demonstrated by no fewer than thirty-four readings shared with these two manuscripts alone of all those reported in the *Itala*. These often involve different renderings, such as *pugnas* for *proelias* (24:6),

---

evidence for the influence of a Vulgate text, given many similar examples of the same types of variation in the manuscript, which leaves *obumbrauit* as the only distinctive Vulgate form.

<sup>41</sup> Expansions paralleled in Old Latin manuscripts: *homo iustus* (1:19), *essaia[m] profetam* (1:22), *una pars* (5:29), *parabulam tritici et sizaniorum* (13:36), *ares audiendi* (13:43), *genere piscium* (13:47), *filius ioseph* (13:55), *et ideo* (13:58); expansions peculiar to VL 28: *mariam coiugem* (1:24), *regis iudae* (2:1), *non occides non mechaberis* (5:21). (Readings are given according to the orthography of VL 28, with abbreviations expanded.)

<sup>42</sup> VL 12 and VL 14 were chosen on the basis of their clear parallels with VL 28; the other witnesses were intended to give a broader representation of Old Latin tradition (VL 2 and VL 3 were considered too fragmentary). As the whole text was available for comparison, it was not deemed necessary to re-evaluate the test passages reproduced in Figure 2.

*lamentabunt se* for *plangent* (24:30), *senserunt* for *cognouerunt* (24:39), and *suscipistis* for *collexistis* (25:35).<sup>43</sup> In addition, there are twenty-four readings which the Garland of Howth shares with VL 14 alone (including *adprehendiens* for *tenens* in 18:28, *angulis uentorum* for *uentis* in 24:31, *uxores ducebant* for *et nuptum tradentes* in 24:38, and *duxerunt* for *suscipientes* in 27:27), and twenty-two readings peculiar to the Garland of Howth and VL 12 (including *dico uobis simile* for *adsimilatum* in 18:23, *maximum* for *magnum* in 22:36, *uero* for *autem* in 23:8 and *narrabitur* for *dicetur* in 26:13). Some of the latter may also have been present in VL 14 where it is now lacunose, such as the distinctive reading *fi(n)cta simulatione* for *hypocrisi* in 23:28. The significance of the readings shared with VL 14 is underlined by Fischer's collation, which shows that *et exhiberet* in 26:53 and *apud uos eram* in 26:55 occur only in these two witnesses among all Latin manuscripts surviving from the first millennium; similarly, *spoliauerunt* for *exuerunt* in 27:31 is peculiar to VL 12 and VL 28 of the entire collation, although VL 13 reads *dispoliauerunt*. Readings uniquely shared with other surviving Old Latin manuscripts are fewer in number: two each with VL 6, VL 10 and VL 15; three with VL 7; four each with VL 3 and VL 4; seven with VL 2; eight each with VL 8, VL 9 and VL 13; thirteen with VL 5.<sup>44</sup> The various permutations of agreement with two or more surviving Old Latin witnesses are typical of the piecemeal attestation of readings in the pre-Vulgate tradition.

The thoroughgoing Old Latin character of the Garland of Howth in the latter part of Matthew is also demonstrated by the consistency of its renderings and the presence of interpolations. For example, it always has *coloni* for *γεωργοί* (Vulgate *agricolae*; 21:33–41), *sapientes* for *φρόνιμοι* (Vulgate *prudentes*; 25:2–4), and *puer* or *infans* for *παιδίον* (Vulgate *paruulus*; 18:2–5). *Quoniam* is found several times for *ὅτι* where the Vulgate has *quia* (18:10; 23:10, 27; 24:33, 34), the demonstrative *hic* is added before *mundus* (16:26, 18:7) and *in* is present before place names (16:21; 17:23; 20:17).<sup>45</sup> Other consistent non-Vulgate forms include *accipere* for *δέχασθαι* (twice in 18:5) and *suscipere* for *συνάγειν* (25:35, 38, 43); *εὐθέως* is normally rendered by *confestim* (20:34; 21:2, 3; 26:49) or

<sup>43</sup> Fischer's collation shows that only six manuscripts have *abscedit* rather than *amputauit* in 26:51 (a harmonisation to John 18:10): in addition to VL 12, 14, 28, these are the Rushworth Gospels (Hr), Bodmin Gospels (Hx), and New York Public Library 115 (Bl), all of insular origin. Similarly, *ad turbas* rather than *turbis* in 26:55 is just found in five of these six manuscripts (not the Rushworth Gospels) and three other insular witnesses (VL 30, VL 35, and London, BL Royal 1 A XVIII).

<sup>44</sup> The comparative dataset for these is much smaller, as it is taken from the *Itala* rather than Fischer's collation. Many similarities may be coincidental, such as the three omissions shared with VL 13 or the four shared omissions with VL 5 alone. The most compelling of the peculiar readings are *uobis* for *illis* in 18:19 (VL 2), *datum* for *paratum* in 20:23 (VL 3), *sumpserunt* for *acceperunt* in 25:4 (VL 7), and *alius* for *unus* in 24:40 (VL 8).

<sup>45</sup> For other instances of *quoniam*, see 5:7; 16:28; 23:39; *hic mundus* is also found at 13:38, while at 24:21 *saeculum* is found in place of *mundus*.

*continuo* (25:15; 26:74; 27:48), while *adprehendere* is twice found for κρατῆσαι (18:28; 22:6) and *deludere* renders ἐμπαίζειν on three occasions (20:19; 27:29, 41).<sup>46</sup> The Garland of Howth has the interpolations present in several Old Latin witnesses at Matt 20:28; 23:14; 24:31 and 27:35, and also places 17:12b after 17:13. The only one of the common interpolations which is not present is at Matt 24:41; although comparable omissions elsewhere due to homoioteleuton might prompt the suggestion that this is a copying error, this is the only one of the five interpolations missing from VL 14, so its absence from VL 28 may well reflect its textual tradition. In addition, VL 28 has a long interpolation at the end of Matt 27:49 based on John 19:34: *alius autem accepta lanciam pupungit latus eius et exiit aqua et sanguis*. Although this is not paralleled by any of the manuscripts reported in the *Itala*, it is also found in VL 30 and a number of Greek majuscule manuscripts, which demonstrates its antiquity.<sup>47</sup>

Among the Old Latin readings already known from other manuscripts, the additional support of the Garland of Howth is worth observing in several places. In Matt 17:15 (17:14 in the Vulgate), it has *torquetur* rather than *patitur* for πάσχει, a reading found in just five manuscripts from the first millennium, as well as *aliquando* (from ἔντοτε rather than πολλάκις).<sup>48</sup> In keeping with other Old Latin witnesses, it reads *ignem* rather than *supplicium* in 25:46 (a harmonisation to 25:41), has *duodecim milia* in 26:53, and includes *unicum* in 21:37, *in eum quicquam* in 26:60, *audierunt* in 26:61, *in faciem eius* in 27:30 and *et postquam crucifixus est* at the beginning of 27:45, none of which have any Greek support. The additions of *tunicam purpureum* in 26:60 and *uenientem obuiam sibi* in 27:32 are only found in Greek in Codex Bezae. VL 12 is the sole other instance of *aduersus eum* for ἐπ' αὐτόν in 22:34, while in 24:42 VL 28 shares with VL 14 the conflation of both Greek readings, as *qua die uel hora*. VL 28 also reads *stateres* not *argenteos* in 26:15, begins 26:60 with *et non inuenerunt*, has *filius dei uiui* in 26:63, and *Pharisaeis* rather than *senioribus* in 27:41, all of which correspond to Greek alternatives. It is interesting that, while both VL 3 and VL 28 have the singular noun *princeps sacerdotum* in 27:6, which is probably a misreading, only VL 28 has the singular verb *dixit*.<sup>49</sup> Another unusual

---

<sup>46</sup> In contrast, *tenere* for κρατῆσαι occurs at 21:46; 26:4, 48 and 57, but on all four occasions the Old Latin tradition is invariant; the sole occurrence of *statim* in VL 28 is at 24:29, where it is the majority Old Latin reading; similarly, *inluserunt* is only found in VL 28 at 27:31.

<sup>47</sup> For more on interpolations in the Latin tradition of Matthew, see Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, 158–60, which notes that 24:31 and 27:49 are among the five typical of insular manuscripts; the Garland of Howth is not extant for the others in Matt 8:24; 10:29 or 14:35.

<sup>48</sup> The witnesses to *torquetur* reported in Fischer's collation are VL 12, 14, 28, 35 and the Rushworth Gospels.

<sup>49</sup> VL 28 also uniquely has *princeps sacerdotum* with a singular participle at 21:15; other Old Latin manuscripts have the same variation in 27:20.

reading is *non uenistis ad me* in 25:43, shared with VL 8 and VL 9, where other Old Latin codices have *non uisitastis me*.

Given the Old Latin affiliation of the Garland of Howth in the latter half of Matthew, some of the variants in this section which are not paralleled by manuscripts reported in the *Itala* may preserve pre-Vulgate readings. The collation gives a total of no fewer than 133 possible alternatives. The most likely are those which match renderings found elsewhere in Old Latin tradition or correspond to known Greek variants, while minor substitutions or changes in word order are less compelling. The interpolation at Matt 27:49 has already been mentioned above; another substantial variant reading with Greek support is found at Matt 21:29–30, where VL 28 reverses the order of the sons, with the first agreeing to go but then failing, as found in Codex Vaticanus, Family 13 and other Greek manuscripts. The following readings are also not transmitted in other Old Latin codices but find some correspondence in Greek tradition:

|       |   |       |  |
|-------|---|-------|--|
| 16:21 | quia ] quod                                       | 23:25 | inmunditia ] iniquitate                                      |
| 18:3  | paruuli ] infantem ( <i>pro</i> infantes)         | 23:32 | implete ] adinpletis   |
| 18:10 | pusillis ] + qui in me credunt                    | 23:39 | uobis ] + quoniam  |
| 18:15 | si ] quod si                                      | 24:3  | secreto ] in saecriato ( <i>i.e.</i> in secreto)             |
| 18:17 | si autem et ecclesiam non ] si uero nec aeclisiam | 24:18 | tunicam suam ] tonicas suas                                  |
| 19:28 | regeneratione ] generatione ista                  | 24:22 | fieret salua ] saluasset                                     |
| 20:7  | in ] ad   | 24:31 | eius ] suos  |
| 20:9  | ergo ] autem                                      | 25:10 | dum autem irent ] euntes                                     |
| 20:15 | quod uolo facere ] + in eis ( <i>pro</i> in meis) | 25:12 | ait ] dicit  |
| 20:19 | flagellandum ] ad flagillandum                    | 25:39 | aut ] uel  |
| 20:21 | ait illi dic ] at illa dixit ei                   | 25:43 | nudus...infirmus ] nudus fui...infirmus fui                  |
| 20:28 | eminentioribus ] maioribus                        | 25:46 | aeternam ] perpetuam   |
| 20:28 | utilius ] gloria                                  | 26:5  | dicebant autem ] et dicebant                                 |
| 20:30 | audierunt ] audientes                             | 26:9  | multo ] pretio magna ( <i>pro</i> pretio-magno)              |
| 21:14 | sanauit ] sanabat                                 | 26:57 | ubi ] in quo   |
| 21:19 | illi ] ad eam                                     | 26:65 | egemus ] opus uobis  |
| 21:35 | ceciderrunt ] coederunt                           | 27:28 | exuentes eum ] cum spoliassent eum uestiarunt                |
| 22:6  | adfectos ] adflctos                               | 27:29 | plectentes coronam de spinis ] coronam de spinis texerunt et |
| 22:18 | cognita ] cognoscens                              | 27:35 | sortem mittentes ] miserunt sortes                           |
| 23:8  | uester ] + Christus                               | 27:40 | destruit ] distruas  |
| 23:19 | an ] uel  | 27:42 | ei ] in eum  |
| 23:20 | ergo ] enim                                       | 27:46 | et circa ] circa uero  |
| 23:20 | in eo ] per eum                                   |       |  |
| 23:21 | eo ] eum  |       |  |
| 23:22 | super eum ] in ipso                               |       |  |

In the interpolation at 20:28, the Garland of Howth is the only witness to have *in locis maioribus* for εἰς τοῦς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, while in reading *gloria* at the end of this addition it corresponds to the parallel passage at Luke 14:10 (δόξα rather than χρήσιμον). At Matt 23:25, *iniquitate* represents the Greek ἀδικία rather

than ἀκρασίας or ἀκαθαρσίας. Although *euntes* corresponds to the Greek participle at 25:10, in context this is not grammatical and could be a scribal error for *euntibus*. Hoskier sets much store by *audientes* in 20:30 (ἀκούσαντες), but this participle may also be erroneous since it creates an anacoluthon with *et clamauerunt* in the next phrase.<sup>50</sup> While both *pretio* and *multo* are found in Old Latin manuscripts for πολλοῦ in 26:9, *pretio magno* is peculiar to VL 28. There is a cluster of unique readings in Matt 27:28–29: *cum spoliassent* to translate ἐκδύσαντες is also found in this manuscript and VL 12 two verses later, while *uestiarunt* may be a doublet (cf. *uestientes* for ἐνδύσαντες in VL 5); *texerunt* as a rendering of πλέξαντες is found in Old Latin manuscripts at John 19:2 but Fischer's collation shows that the Garland of Howth is the sole witness to this form in Matthew.<sup>51</sup>

Most if not all of the readings in the Garland of Howth which are not paralleled in manuscripts reported in the *Itala* and do not have Greek support are secondary developments. Many of these are expansions, including <h>*amum in mari* in 17:26, the addition of *in saeculo isto* after *accipiet* in 19:29, *Essaiam profeatam* in 21:4, *resurrectione mortuorum* in 22:30 (possibly harmonised to the next verse, where *mortuorum* is missing from VL 28), *uocari ab hominibus* in 23:8, *uenire ad me* in 24:48, *emere oleum* in 25:10, *tradetur principibus sacerdotum* in 26:2 and *seniores populi* in 27:20. The pronouns *ipsi* and *hii* in 25:44 and 25:46 are replaced by *iniusti*, while at 26:14 *duodecim* is substituted by *discipulis suis*. While a number of Old Latin witnesses have the erroneous *ad dextris...ad sinistris* in 27:38, in VL 28 this is corrected to *ad dexteram...ad sinistram*.<sup>52</sup> Even *sanguine iusti* in 27:4 appears to be a simplification of the unusual original construction *sanguine iustum* (αἷμα ἁθῶνον). A handful of odd readings deserve a brief mention. *Ideo* rather than *et ego* at the beginning of 16:18 has no Greek support, and may be a misreading: *quomodo* for *quod* in 22:31, and *in eo* for *in dono* in 23:18 are similar. The command *defer ecclesiae* in 18:17 is comparable to *referes ecclesiae* in VL 12, even though *dic* in other witnesses matches εἰπέ/εἶπον in Greek.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, *occident se* hardly corresponds to μῆσουσιν ἀλλήλους in 24:10, yet VL 14 has *occident inuicem* here: this could derive from a misreading of *odient inuicem* (VL 2, 12), or it may somehow reflect the poorly-attested Greek variant παραδώσουσιν εἰς θάνατον.<sup>54</sup> In *oportuit ergo uenundari*

<sup>50</sup> Hoskier, *The Text of Codex Usserianus* 2, viii–ix; compare also the introduction of the participle *deludentes* in VL 28 for ἐνέπαιξαν in 27:29.

<sup>51</sup> There is, in fact a doublet in VL 30 (*et plectentes...texerunt*), while VL 262 has *intexentes*.

<sup>52</sup> On this variation, see P. H. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 39.

<sup>53</sup> Augustine *Serm.* 295.2 and Caesarius of Arles *Serm.* 28.3 have *refer ad ecclesiam* (cf. Jerome *Ep.* 125.19.6).

<sup>54</sup> This is found in GA 043, and supported by both quotations from Arnobius in the *Vetus Latina Database*.

*pecuniam meam* in 25:27, *uenundari* may be a corruption of *te ut dares*, as found in Augustine (*Serm.* 137.15; cf. *te dare* in VL 9, 12 and 14), or come from a doublet such as *mittere uel dare* in VL 30.<sup>55</sup> At 27:48, VL 28 uniquely reads *surgiens* rather than *currens* (δραμών), which is difficult to explain other than a simple misreading.

## Conclusion

This investigation has confirmed the importance of the Garland of Howth for the Latin text of Matthew, as recognised by Hoskier and his predecessors. In the latter half of the gospel, it preserves a text with a consistent Old Latin affiliation. This displays marked similarities to VL 14 (Codex Usserianus primus) and VL 12 (Codex Claromontanus), manuscripts which are often characterised as sharing a “Gallo-Irish” text which probably had its origins in fourth-century Italy.<sup>56</sup> The overlap of the extant portions of these codices in the latter part of Matthew facilitates their comparison: in addition to readings shared with one or both of these witnesses, the Garland of Howth also displays parallels with other Old Latin manuscripts. What is more, it preserves a number of readings not present in the principal Old Latin manuscripts but corresponding to Greek forms, most notably the ordering of Matt 21:29–30 and the interpolation in Matt 27:49. These may go back to an early strand of Latin biblical tradition. Other non-Vulgate forms appear largely to be secondary, featuring several expansions and grammatical adjustments. The manuscript is also characterised by a relatively high proportion of copying errors and very unusual orthography, especially for long vowels, which is worthy of a study in its own right.

The use of electronic tools and digital data have made a distinctive contribution to the present study. The high-resolution online images were indispensable in the preparation of the transcription. Not only did they represent a significant improvement on earlier photographic prints from microfilm, but they enabled careful examination and re-examination of the manuscript without the restrictions of library opening hours: travel to Dublin was only required for the presentation of the results! The release of the complete proofread transcription online, through a centrally-maintained university repository, allows subsequent researchers to use the same electronic data for different forms of comparison.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Compare the copying errors in Matt 16:27; 22:19 and 22:42 noted above.

<sup>56</sup> VL 12 was copied in Italy in the fifth century; an early Italian origin has also been suggested for VL 14 by D. N. Dumville, *A Palaeographer's Review: the Insular System of Scripts in the Middle Ages I* (Osaka: Kansai University Press, 1999), 35–40.

<sup>57</sup> Open access to this data is also ensured by the licensing of the file under a Creative Commons Attribution license, meaning that it may be freely re-used with acknowledgement to the original creators.

For example, it is intended that it will in due course be redeployed in a synopsis or collation of manuscripts on the website of the Irish Latin Gospel Books Transcription Project. Similarly, the presence online of the full transcription means that the peculiar spellings of the manuscript may be discovered by historical linguists through search engines. The flexibility of this digital data is thus in contrast to Hoskier's transcription and the printed collations which preceded it. In addition, the automatic generation of a list of differences spanning the whole text of Matthew removes the potential at this stage for the errors so criticised by Hoskier, although some may have been subsequently introduced when the readings were evaluated and the collation was edited. The principal departure from the digital medium was in the identification of parallels for the non-Vulgate readings. Once other Latin gospel texts are transcribed in their entirety, it should become possible to improve this stage of the process. As it is, the availability of such transcriptions looks set only to increase gradually through the creation of electronic resources in conjunction with studies such as the present chapter. Nevertheless, it is hoped that, now it has entered the digital realm, the Garland of Howth will no longer be neglected as a witness to the Old Latin gospel text.