

**THE VULGATE TEXT OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES:  
ITS LANGUAGE, ORIGIN AND RELATIONSHIP WITH THE VETUS LATINA**

by ANNA PERSIG

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing

School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion

College of Arts and Law

University of Birmingham

November 2020

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## ABSTRACT

The Latin Vulgate represents the final stage of the process of the translation of the Bible which began in the late second century with the texts known as the *Vetus Latina*. This study examines the language of the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles from the lexical, morphological and syntactical points of view and through a qualitative and quantitative analysis. It investigates their relationship with the Greek text and the presence of non-standard and late Latin features. The comparative examination of Greek and Latin texts casts light on the techniques employed by the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* translators. Diachronic and synchronic descriptions of the language highlight the linguistic peculiarities of these texts and their relationship with contemporary and earlier writings. The statistical examination of the lexicon, participial renderings and word order presents an overview of the variation in each epistle between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina*. The Vulgate, which has traditionally been considered a more refined text than the *Vetus Latina* is shown here to be equally, and often more, influenced by the Greek language and ‘vulgar’ usages.

The differing linguistic character of the individual Epistles and the varying degrees of agreement between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* reveal that the Vulgate Catholic Epistles do not form a unitary corpus: 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John and Jude appear to be more conservative and accomplished than James, 2 Peter and 3 John. This variation may be due to their gradual inclusion in the western canon, which could explain their separate origins and different processes of revision. On the other hand, the close relationship between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* in all the letters demonstrates that the Latin versions known today derive from a common archetype.

*Ai mei genitori*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research has only been possible thanks to the generous funding and training offered by the Midlands4Cities Doctoral Training Partnership and the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which believed and invested in this project. I am greatly indebted to Prof Hugh Houghton who supervised the thesis with competence, precision, patience and admirable commitment. I would like to thank him for all the opportunities I was given and for what I learned from him in the past three years. Dr Philip Burton made a number of acute observations derived from his deep knowledge of the subject of study. Prof Thomas O'Loughlin assisted with his theological expertise and wide erudition. Prof Giovanbattista Galdi was kind to provide feedback on a partial draft of the thesis. I am grateful for the time spent at the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing and the support of its members and fellow PhD candidates. I enjoyed sharing the office with Emanuele Scieri and Jacopo Marcon, with whom I had daily stimulating discussions and distractions. Mrs Pamela Ditchburn has been a wise advisor in academic and non-academic matters, encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies in the United Kingdom and assisted me with the application process. At the University of Birmingham, I was lucky to meet Eugenia Lancellotta, who became a precious friend and delighted me with our endless conversations on psychology and anthropology. Paolo Tamburlini has been such a supportive partner, bore with a long-distance relationship and countless hours of study together. My parents supported me throughout my education and stirred my interest in literature and culture: grateful for their love, care and abnegation, I dedicate this work to them.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. The Catholic Epistles: from the Greek Text to the Latin Translations      | 1  |
| 2. The Problem of Canonicity of the Catholic Epistles in the West            | 5  |
| 3. The Direct and Indirect Tradition of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles        | 7  |
| a. The Manuscript Tradition  | 7  |
| b. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Jerome                               | 11 |
| c. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Augustine                            | 14 |
| d. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Pelagius, His Circle and Adversaries | 16 |
| 4. Prefaces and Order of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles                       | 19 |
| 5. The Question of the Authorship  | 23 |
| 6. Stylistic Differences and Principles of Revision                          | 28 |
| 7. ‘Christian Latin’   | 30 |
| 8. ‘Late’, ‘Vulgar’ and ‘Colloquial’ Latin                                   | 34 |
| 9. <i>Status Quaestionis</i> and Aims of the Research                        | 38 |
| 10. Methodology  | 41 |

### CHAPTER TWO: THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

|                                 |    |
|---------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction                 | 47 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon                | 57 |
| a. Loan-words                   | 57 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds | 59 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b.1 Periphrases  | 59  |
| b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words                               | 61  |
| b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds                                  | 63  |
| b.4 Etymologising Renderings                                   | 65  |
| 3. Latin Language  | 68  |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words                                  | 68  |
| b. Postclassical and Late Latin Formations                     | 73  |
| c. Rare Words  | 77  |
| d. Revivals of Archaic Words                                   | 79  |
| 4. Morphology  | 80  |
| 5. Syntax  | 83  |
| a. Graecisms   | 83  |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 83  |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 85  |
| b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax                             | 88  |
| 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek | 91  |
| a. Number  | 91  |
| b. Comparatives and Superlatives                               | 93  |
| 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina    | 94  |
| a. Rendering of Greek Articles                                 | 94  |
| b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions                | 96  |
| c. Unfocused Renderings  | 103 |
| 8. Variations  | 104 |
| a. Absence of Variations                                       | 105 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b. Variations in the Vetus Latina                              | 108 |
| c. Variations in the Vulgate                                   | 109 |
| d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina              | 110 |
| 9. Participial Renderings                                      | 111 |
| a. Articular Participles                                       | 111 |
| b. Participles   | 113 |
| 10. Statistics   | 116 |
| a. Lexicon   | 118 |
| b. Participles   | 119 |
| c. Word Order  | 120 |
| 11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 121 |
| 12. Conclusions  | 125 |

### **CHAPTER THREE: THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER**

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Introduction                  | 133 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon                 | 141 |
| a. Loan-words                    | 141 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds  | 145 |
| b.1 Periphrases                  | 145 |
| b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words | 147 |
| b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds    | 150 |
| b.4 Etymologising Renderings     | 153 |
| 3. Latin Language                | 157 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words    | 157 |



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words | 162 |
| 4. Morphology  | 165 |
| 5. Syntax  | 167 |
| a. Graecisms   | 167 |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 167 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 168 |
| b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax   | 173 |
| 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek                 | 174 |
| a. Number  | 174 |
| b. Comparatives and Superlatives   | 176 |
| 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina                    | 178 |
| a. Rendering of Greek Articles   | 178 |
| b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions                                | 182 |
| c. Unfocused Renderings  | 184 |
| 8. Variations  | 186 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 186 |
| b. Variations in the Vetus Latina  | 188 |
| c. Variations in the Vulgate   | 189 |
| d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina                              | 189 |
| 9. Participial Renderings  | 190 |
| a. Articular Participles   | 190 |
| b. Participles   | 191 |
| 10. Statistics   | 192 |
| a. Lexicon   | 193 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b. Participles   | 194 |
| c. Word Order  | 194 |
| 11. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 196 |
| 12. Conclusions  | 199 |

## **CHAPTER FOUR: THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Introduction  | 203 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon   | 208 |
| a. Loan-words  | 208 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds  | 209 |
| b.1 Periphrases  | 209 |
| b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words   | 210 |
| b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds  | 212 |
| c. Etymologising Renderings  | 214 |
| 3. Latin Language  | 217 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words  | 217 |
| b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words | 222 |
| 4. Morphology  | 223 |
| 5. Syntax  | 224 |
| a. Graecisms   | 224 |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 224 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 225 |
| b. Postclassical Constructions   | 229 |
| 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek                 | 229 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| a. Number  | 229 |
| b. Comparatives and Superlatives                                   | 230 |
| 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina        | 232 |
| a. Rendering of Greek Articles                                     | 232 |
| b. Focused Renderings and Constructions                            | 233 |
| c. Unfocused Renderings  | 234 |
| 8. Variations  | 239 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 239 |
| b. Variations in the Vetus Latina                                  | 241 |
| c. Variations in the Vulgate                                       | 241 |
| d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina                  | 242 |
| 9. Participial Renderings  | 243 |
| a. Articular Participles   | 243 |
| b. Participles   | 243 |
| 10. Statistics   | 244 |
| a. Lexicon   | 245 |
| b. Participles   | 246 |
| c. Word Order  | 246 |
| 11. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek text | 247 |
| 12. Conclusions  | 249 |
| <br><b>CHAPTER FIVE: THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN</b>                 |     |
| 1. Introduction  | 254 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon   | 262 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| a. Loan-words  | 262 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds  | 266 |
| b.1 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words   | 267 |
| b.2 Alpha Privative Compounds  | 268 |
| b.3 Etymologising Renderings   | 268 |
| 3. Latin Language  | 270 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words  | 270 |
| b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words | 273 |
| 4. Morphology  | 274 |
| 5. Syntax  | 276 |
| a. Graecisms   | 276 |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 276 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 284 |
| b. Postclassical Constructions   | 286 |
| 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek                 | 287 |
| a. Number  | 287 |
| b. Comparatives and Superlatives   | 287 |
| 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina                    | 289 |
| a. Rendering of Greek Articles   | 289 |
| b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions                                | 292 |
| c. Unfocused Renderings  | 294 |
| 8. Variations  | 296 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 296 |
| b. Variations in the Vetus Latina  | 303 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| c. Variations in the Vulgate                                   | 304 |
| d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina              | 304 |
| 9. Participial Renderings                                      | 305 |
| a. Articular Participles                                       | 305 |
| b. Participles   | 306 |
| 10. Statistics   | 307 |
| a. Lexicon   | 307 |
| b. Participles   | 308 |
| c. Word Order  | 308 |
| 11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 310 |
| 12. Conclusions  | 314 |

## **CHAPTER SIX: THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction   | 319 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon  | 321 |
| a. Loan-words   | 321 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds   | 322 |
| 3. Latin language   | 322 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words   | 322 |
| 4. Syntax   | 323 |
| a. Graecisms  | 323 |
| a.1 Reported Speech   | 323 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions   | 324 |
| 5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with the Greek Text | 326 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| a. Number  | 326 |
| b. Comparatives and Superlatives                                   | 326 |
| 6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina        | 326 |
| a. Rendering of Greek Articles                                     | 326 |
| b. Verbal Constructions  | 326 |
| 7. Variations  | 327 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 327 |
| b. Variations in the Vulgate                                       | 328 |
| 8. Participial Renderings  | 328 |
| a. Articular Participles   | 328 |
| b. Participles   | 329 |
| 9. Statistics  | 330 |
| a. Lexicon   | 330 |
| b. Participles   | 330 |
| c. Word Order  | 331 |
| 10. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 332 |
| 11. Conclusions  | 332 |

## **CHAPTER SEVEN: THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN**

|                                 |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Introduction                 | 335 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon                | 337 |
| a. Loan-words                   | 337 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds | 337 |
| b.1 Periphrases                 | 338 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words                                   | 339 |
| b.3 Etymologising Renderings                                       | 339 |
| 3. Latin Language  | 340 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words                                      | 340 |
| 4. Syntax  | 341 |
| a. Graecisms   | 341 |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 341 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 342 |
| 5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek     | 344 |
| a. Comparatives and Superlatives                                   | 344 |
| 6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina        | 345 |
| a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions                    | 345 |
| b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate   | 345 |
| 7. Variations  | 346 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 346 |
| b. Variations in the Vulgate                                       | 346 |
| 8. Participial Renderings  | 347 |
| a. Articular Participles   | 347 |
| b. Participles   | 348 |
| 9. Statistics  | 349 |
| a. Lexicon   | 349 |
| b. Participles   | 349 |
| c. Word Order  | 350 |
| 10. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 351 |

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| 11. Conclusions | 351 |
|-----------------|-----|

## **CHAPTER EIGHT: THE EPISTLE OF JUDE**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Introduction  | 354 |
| 2. Greek Lexicon   | 359 |
| a. Loan-words  | 359 |
| b. Rendering of Greek Compounds                                  | 360 |
| b.1 Alpha Privative Compounds                                    | 360 |
| b.2 Etymologising Renderings                                     | 361 |
| 3. Latin Language  | 363 |
| a. Abstract and Derived Words                                    | 363 |
| 4. Morphology  | 366 |
| 5. Syntax  | 368 |
| a. Graecisms   | 368 |
| a.1 Reported Speech  | 368 |
| a.2 Greek Constructions  | 368 |
| 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek   | 370 |
| a. Comparatives and Superlatives                                 | 370 |
| 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina      | 370 |
| a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions                  | 370 |
| b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate | 373 |
| 8. Variations  | 374 |
| a. Absence of Variations   | 374 |
| b. Variations in the Vulgate                                     | 375 |



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| c. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina              | 375 |
| 9. Participial Renderings                                      | 375 |
| a. Articular Participles                                       | 375 |
| b. Participles   | 377 |
| 10. Statistics   | 378 |
| a. Lexicon   | 378 |
| b. Participles   | 379 |
| c. Word Order  | 379 |
| 11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text | 380 |
| 12. Conclusions  | 381 |
| <b>CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSIONS</b>                               | 386 |
| <b>APPENDIX</b>  | 406 |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>  | 407 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 1. The affiliation of the citations of Jerome from the Catholic Epistles | 13  |
| Table 2. Rendering of articular participles in James                           | 111 |
| Table 3. Rendering of non-articular participles in James                       | 113 |
| Table 4. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in James          | 117 |
| Table 5. Lexical renderings in James   | 119 |
| Table 6. Participial renderings in James                                       | 119 |
| Table 7. Word order in James   | 120 |
| Table 8. Rendering of articular participles in 1 Peter                         | 190 |
| Table 9. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 Peter                     | 191 |
| Table 10. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 1 Peter       | 192 |
| Table 11. Lexical renderings in 1 Peter  | 193 |
| Table 12. Participial renderings in 1 Peter                                    | 194 |
| Table 13. Word order in 1 Peter  | 195 |
| Table 14. Rendering of articular participles in 2 Peter                        | 243 |
| Table 15. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 Peter                    | 243 |
| Table 16. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 2 Peter       | 244 |
| Table 17. Lexical renderings in 2 Peter  | 245 |
| Table 18. Participial renderings in 2 Peter                                    | 246 |
| Table 19. Word order in 2 Peter  | 247 |
| Table 20. Use of conjunctions in the reported speech in 1 John                 | 282 |
| Table 21. Use of conjunctions in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles                 | 282 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 22. Rendering of articular participles in 1 John            | 305 |
| Table 23. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 John        | 306 |
| Table 24. Lexical renderings in 1 John                            | 307 |
| Table 25. Participial renderings in 1 John                        | 308 |
| Table 26. Word order in 1 John                                    | 309 |
| Table 27. Rendering of articular participles in 2 John            | 328 |
| Table 28. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 John        | 329 |
| Table 29. Lexical renderings in 2 John                            | 330 |
| Table 30. Participial renderings in 2 John                        | 331 |
| Table 31. Word order in 2 John                                    | 331 |
| Table 32. Rendering of articular participles in 3 John            | 347 |
| Table 33. Rendering of non-articular participles in 3 John        | 348 |
| Table 34. Lexical renderings in 3 John                            | 349 |
| Table 35. Participial renderings in 3 John                        | 350 |
| Table 36. Word order in 3 John                                    | 350 |
| Table 37. Rendering of articular participles in Jude              | 376 |
| Table 38. Rendering of non-articular participles in Jude          | 377 |
| Table 39. Lexical renderings in Jude                              | 378 |
| Table 40. Participial renderings in Jude                          | 379 |
| Table 41. Word order in Jude                                      | 379 |
| Table 42. Comparison between 2 Peter and Jude                     | 384 |
| Table 43. Word order in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles             | 393 |
| Table 44. Lexicon in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles                | 394 |
| Table 45. Participial renderings in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles | 395 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| <i>ap</i>   | <i>apud</i>   |
| <i>cf</i>   | <i>confer</i>   |
| CSEL        | <i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>                     |
| ECM         | <i>Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio critica maior</i>                  |
| GA          | Gregory – Aland numbering system of the Greek New Testament manuscripts |
| LLT–A       | Library of Latin Texts – Series A                                       |
| LLT–B       | Library of Latin Texts – Series B                                       |
| NA28        | <i>Nestle – Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> [28th edition]           |
| ms, mss     | manuscript, manuscripts   |
| ns          | new series  |
| P           | Papyrus   |
| TLL         | <i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>  |
| Var         | Variant   |
| vol., vols. | volume, volumes   |
| VL          | Vetus Latina  |
| V, Vg       | Vulgate   |

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. The Catholic Epistles: from the Greek Text to the Latin Translations

The corpus of the Catholic Epistles is made up of seven letters: James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John and Jude. The denomination ‘Catholic’ (ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί), first used by Origen in the third century, alludes to the general audience to whom the letters are addressed.<sup>1</sup> In the West the Epistles were called *canonicae*, which means universally accepted.<sup>2</sup> The authorship and dating of these texts are doubtful: although the writers of the Epistles are presented as James, ‘the Lord’s brother’, the apostles Peter, John and Jude, the brother of James, these are likely to be pseudonyms.<sup>3</sup> The pseudepigraphic letters might have been written after their death: James was probably composed between 80 and 120, 1 Peter during the persecution

---

<sup>1</sup> Lockett (2012: 3). Schlosser (2004: 9–10) affirms that the adjective ‘Catholic’ used by Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4,14,1 and 5,18,5) when explaining the content of Clement of Alexandria’s *Hypotyposes* and reporting Apollonius’ accusation against Themison reflects Eusebius’ terminology and not the actual expressions employed by Clement and Apollonius at the end of the second century.

<sup>2</sup> The Epistles are referred as *canonicae* in the preface *Non ita ordo est*, Augustine, Junilius and Cassiodorus whereas Jerome is the only western writer who calls them *catholicae* (Nienhuis, 2007: 84).

<sup>3</sup> Lockett (2012: 10–3, 42–5, 77–9, 80–2).

of either Nero (54–68), Domitian (81–96) or Trajan (98–117) while the period of composition of the others is undefined.<sup>4</sup> From the fourth century the Catholic Epistles were combined in manuscripts with the Acts of the Apostles to form the so-called *Praxapostolos*, which, however, may also include either Revelation or the Pauline Epistles.<sup>5</sup> The Epistles of John form with the Gospel of John and Revelation the Johannine corpus. The ideological and linguistic features shared by these writings do not necessarily point to a single origin and authorship, considering that the Johannine style could have been easily imitated.<sup>6</sup> It has been argued that in the second century the Johannine corpus may have been perceived as a conceptual and perhaps physical unity attributed to a single writer, but from the third century the authenticity of Revelation and 2–3 John was questioned and the Epistles of John were assembled in manuscripts with the other Catholic Epistles.<sup>7</sup> However, Greek manuscripts containing the Epistles of John without the other Catholic Epistles are not preserved and the hypothesis of the circulation of the Johannine corpus in manuscripts derives from the reconstruction of the lacunose Codex Bezae and the fragmentary manuscript 0232 while intertextuality, which was used in antiquity for the whole

---

<sup>4</sup> Lockett (2012: 11, 52), Mason and Martin (2014: 11–26).

<sup>5</sup> Parker (2008: 283–6). For instance, P74 (P.Bodmer XVII) hands down the Acts and the Catholic Epistles (Houghton, 2018: 6).

<sup>6</sup> Lieu (2008: 1–4, 17–19), Hill (2004: 1–2).

<sup>7</sup> Hill (2004: 449–64) affirms that the acknowledgment of the Johannine corpus is demonstrated by the intertextual use of these writings for the sake of interpretation in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, the Muratorian Fragment and by the possible codicological unity of the works of John, as Codex Bezae, GA 0232 and the anonymous writing *Contra Noetum* might suggest.

Bible, is not a strong argument in support of this hypothesis.<sup>8</sup> Lieu and De Boer conclude that ‘there is little if any explicit evidence that they [the Gospel and three Epistles of John] ever circulated together as did the Pauline corpus’.<sup>9</sup> The development of the canonical New Testament was a gradual process, as may be seen in manuscripts such as the fourth-century pandects, although Trobisch has argued that details such as the order and titles of the books, cross-references and so on (including the Johannine material) point to the assembly of a ‘canonical edition’ at an earlier stage than is normally thought to have been the case.<sup>10</sup> A greater uniformity in the transmission of the New Testament books would have been expected as a consequence of the existence of an early ‘canonical edition’.<sup>11</sup> From the second up to the mid-third century, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John and Jude appear to be the only Epistles known and cited by Irenaeus (with the exception of Jude), Tertullian (with the exception of 2 John) and Clement of

---

<sup>8</sup> Hill (2004: 454–6). Parker (2008: 285) suggests that the lacuna of Codex Bezae may have contained Revelation and the Johannine Epistles, placed between the Gospels and Acts.

<sup>9</sup> Lieu and De Boer (2018: 1).

<sup>10</sup> Trobisch (2000), followed by Schlosser (2004: 17). Trobisch bases his argument on the study of the *nomina sacra*, the order and titles of the New Testament books, the cross-references between the books and the codicological evidence. The cross-references between 2 Peter and Jude and the attribution to John of the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine Epistles and Revelation are among the arguments adduced by Trobisch to demonstrate the internal coherence of the ‘canonical edition’.

<sup>11</sup> This is one of the points raised by Parker (2002: 301–3) as counter-evidence against Trobisch’s hypothesis.

Alexandria.<sup>12</sup> 1 Peter, 1 John and Jude are acknowledged as scripture at an early date, when they are quoted in the ‘Apostolic Fathers’.<sup>13</sup> Origen is aware of all the seven Epistles although he has doubts about the authenticity of 2 Peter, 1 and 2 John.<sup>14</sup> The formation of a unitary collection dates back to the late third century and the acceptance of the Catholic corpus in the eastern canon is attested by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Historia ecclesiastica* 2,23,25; 3,25,3), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses* 4,36), the Synod of Laodicea (Canon 60), Athanasius of Alexandria (Epistle 53,9), Gregory of Nazianzus (*Carmina* 1,12,5 ss.), Amphilochius of Iconium (*Epistula iambica ad Seleucum* 310–5) and the Third Synod of Carthage (Canon 24).<sup>15</sup> Jerome explicitly mentions the seven Catholic Epistles in Epistle 53,9 of the year 394, and Augustine names them in *De doctrina christiana* 2,8,13 dated to 396–7.<sup>16</sup> However, the earliest attestations of the Latin Catholic Epistles precede that date: these appeared in Northern Africa at the end of the second century, as the citations of Tertullian witness, and slightly later in Europe: the citations of Novatian date back to the third century. The number of the Latin versions exponentially

---

<sup>12</sup> Nienhuis (2007: 44, 47), Gamble (1985: 48): ‘For the remaining Catholic Epistles – James, 3 John and 2 Peter – there is simply no evidence for their use in the second century. They came into consideration as authoritative documents only later, and then with difficulty.’

<sup>13</sup> McDonald (2007: 941–3).

<sup>14</sup> Nienhuis (2007: 62).

<sup>15</sup> Lockett (2012: 4), Metzger (1987: 201–14), Schlosser (2004: 4–5).

<sup>16</sup> *Iacobus, Petrus, Iohannes, Iudas septem epistulas ediderunt* (Epistle 53,9). *Petri duabus, tribus Iohannis, una Iudae et una Iacobi* (*De doctrina christiana* 2,8,13).



increased from the fourth century onwards.<sup>17</sup> The collective term *Vetus Latina* (Old Latin in English) groups together the numerous Latin versions of African and European origin, produced from the second to the fifth century and transmitted by the direct and indirect tradition, in contrast with the Vulgate, the revision of the Gospels accomplished by Jerome between 382–4 and by one or more anonymous revisers in the other New Testament books between the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century.<sup>18</sup>

## 2. The Problem of Canonicity of the Catholic Epistles in the West

Not all the seven Catholic Epistles were either known or considered to be authentic in the West between the late second and third century. Tertullian cites 1 Peter, 1 John and knows Jude while Cyprian quotes only 1 Peter and 1 John. Frisius affirms that ‘the books of 2 and 3 John are universally seen as unused and unknown in early third century North Africa’ and demonstrates that Tertullian ‘is aware of Jude, but does not appear familiar with the text. He does not display any knowledge of 2 Peter or James, although it is unclear if this is because he

---

<sup>17</sup> The Latin translations of the works of the Apostolic Fathers are considered to be among the earliest European versions. However, the timeframe in which they were produced remains unknown: the scholarly debates on the possible dating of 1 Clement will be presented in the chapter on James (p. 47).

<sup>18</sup> The term ‘version’, which is sometimes equivalent to ‘translation’ and ‘text type’ in New Testament textual criticism, is used here in a broader sense than the other nomenclatures to refer to a form of text which may be transmitted by the direct and indirect tradition and be either a direct translation from Greek or a revision of a preceding translation.

has rejected these works or simply has never come into contact with them.’<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, Novatian quotes James, 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John. The authenticity of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John and Jude was widely disputed in antiquity: the Muratorian fragment mentions Jude and two letters of John.<sup>20</sup> The Mommsen or Cheltenham canon, dated after the middle of the fourth century, includes three Epistles of John and two Epistles of Peter, both followed by the indication *una sola*, which appears to point out that only 1 John and 1 Peter are authentic.<sup>21</sup> 2 John is cited as early as the Protocol of the Synod of Carthage (CY sent) of the year 256. Jerome observes differences in language and style between 1 and 2 Peter in Epistle 120,11 from the years 406–7 as well as in *De viris illustribus* from 393.<sup>22</sup> In the fourth century, Hilary of Poitiers (*De trinitate* 1,18,3; 4,8,28) quotes James and considers 2 Peter to be authentic, while Ambrosiaster cites all the Epistles except Jude in his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and attributes 2 Peter and 2 John to the apostles.<sup>23</sup> 1 and 2 John and Jude are quoted by Lucifer of Cagliari. We can conclude that in the West the seven Catholic Epistles formed a fixed corpus only at the end

---

<sup>19</sup> Frisius (2011: 1, 17).

<sup>20</sup> Lieu (2008: 26–8), Metzger (1987: 197, 307). However, the text of the Muratorian fragment is corrupt in this passage. On the hypothesis that the Muratorian fragment is a fourth-century forgery see Guignard (2015) and Rothschild (2018).

<sup>21</sup> Metzger (1987: 231–2). Nienhuis (2007: 81) dates the Cheltenham canon to the latter third of the fourth century and McDonald (2007: 945) to the year 360.

<sup>22</sup> *Denique et duae epistulae, quae feruntur Petri, stilo inter se et caractere discrepant structuraque verborum; ex quo intellegimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus*. For the passage from *De viris illustribus* see footnote 70 (p. 22).

<sup>23</sup> Nienhuis (2007: 82).

of the fourth century, when the circulation of the seven letters is acknowledged by Jerome in Epistle 53,9.<sup>24</sup>

### 3. The Direct and Indirect Tradition of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The study of the textual tradition is a primary approach to illuminate the origin and set a precise timeframe for the production of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles. A brief description of the principal manuscripts transmitting the Vulgate and of the earliest attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in the quotations of the Church Fathers is helpful to contextualise them and lay the basis for the study of their language.<sup>25</sup>

#### a. The Manuscript Tradition

At a certain point in the textual tradition, the Vulgate New Testament, which comprises Jerome's revision of the Gospels on one hand and the Acts, the Epistles and Revelation in their revised form on the other, was assembled as a unitary corpus in manuscripts. In earliest times biblical writings circulated in separate groups (for instance the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles), as the surviving copies and Augustine's evidence (*Contra Felicem* 1,3; Epistle 29, 4–

---

<sup>24</sup> See footnote 16 (p. 4).

<sup>25</sup> A full list of the manuscripts transmitting the Vulgate and Old Latin Catholic Epistles is present in Thiele's introduction to the *Vetus Latina* edition (1969: 11–50). The principal manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina* will be described in the introductory sections of the following chapters.

5) attest.<sup>26</sup> Pandects, i.e. manuscripts containing the entire Old and New Testament, were produced in the West from the fifth century.<sup>27</sup> The oldest surviving Latin pandect of the Old and New Testament is the Palimpsest of León (León, Archivo Catedralicio, 15), written in the seventh century, which contains the Vulgate Pauline Epistles, but Acts and the Catholic Epistles in the Old Latin version.<sup>28</sup> The earliest complete manuscript of the Vulgate New Testament is Codex Fuldensis (Fulda, Landesbibliothek Bonifatianus, 1) copied in the sixth century and containing a harmony of the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles plus the Epistle to the Laodiceans, the Catholic Epistles, Acts and Revelation corrected by Victor of Capua in the years 546–7. The name of Jerome precedes the harmony of the Gospels and not the whole New Testament.<sup>29</sup> Another important source for the textual history of the Vulgate is Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Amiatino, 1), copied in Northumbria at the beginning of the eighth century. It shares with Cassiodorus' *codex grandior* a large format and is a pandect of the Latin Bible with a text derived from various sources.<sup>30</sup> Two subscriptions contained in the Bible of Saint Germain des Prés (VL 7: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11553) copied around 810, which are attributed by Bogaert to 'the booksellers responsible for the first

---

<sup>26</sup> Petitmengin (1985: 94–5). The manuscripts transmitting only the Gospels represent the majority of the surviving evidence: a significant exemplar is Codex Sangallensis (St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 1395), the earliest manuscript with the Vulgate Gospels from the first half of the fifth century (Houghton, 2016: 48).

<sup>27</sup> Houghton (2016: 13–4).

<sup>28</sup> Thiele (1969: 16–7), Houghton (2016: 63).

<sup>29</sup> Bogaert (2013: 525).

<sup>30</sup> Thiele (1969: 20–1), Houghton (2019: 77–8).

distribution' of the Vulgate, are the first explicit manuscript witnesses that claim Jerome as the reviser of the Old and New Testament.<sup>31</sup> The subscription at the end of Esther attests that the editor collected the manuscripts of Jerome's translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew in order to produce a pandect (*fecique pandectem*) while the subscription at the end of Hebrews contains the attribution of the whole New Testament to Jerome.<sup>32</sup> This manuscript is a copy of a fifth century pandect and conveys a mixed text, mainly Vulgate, apart from Matthew, which is Old Latin, and some Old Latin elements in the other Gospels and James.<sup>33</sup> According to Bogaert, the combination of the Gospels with the other writings not revised by Jerome was promoted by booksellers in the first half of the fifth century for commercial reasons.<sup>34</sup> Bogaert bases his argument on the subscriptions of VL 7, the early use of the complete New Testament by Victor of Capua and Cassiodorus, who implicitly states that his small pandect contains the Old and New Testament in the Vulgate version.<sup>35</sup> It must be noted that the copies of fifth-century pandects, such as Fuldensis, Amiatinus and Sangermanensis, are composite and therefore their affiliation is not thoroughly Vulgate: the quality of the text changes according

---

<sup>31</sup> Bogaert (2013: 521), Sparks (1940: 522).

<sup>32</sup> Bogaert (2013: 521–2) translates the subscriptions into English whereas Houghton (2016: 88) reports the Latin text of the second subscription.

<sup>33</sup> Thiele (1969: 23), Houghton (2016: 213–4).

<sup>34</sup> Bogaert (2013: 519): 'With the aim of offering a complete New Testament under Jerome's authority, booksellers very early attached the Gospels to a revised translation of the missing sections. Taken as one, this then became the New Testament 'Vulgate', and according to affirmations of Jerome (more programmatic than real), was circulated under his authority.'

<sup>35</sup> Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1,12,2. See Bogaert (2013: 519), Houghton (2016: 58).

to the biblical books, which were contained in different manuscripts used to assemble the pandects.<sup>36</sup>

The Old Latin was gradually superseded by the Vulgate: the increasing diffusion of the latter, mainly in mixed-text manuscripts and mixed-text versions of individual books, is witnessed by Isidore and the number of surviving manuscripts of the Vulgate overcame that of the *Vetus Latina* in the sixth century.<sup>37</sup> In the year 604 Pope Gregory allowed the use of the Vulgate in the liturgy alongside the *Vetus Latina*.<sup>38</sup> The mixture of the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate within a single book of the Bible or the alternation of Old Latin and Vulgate books in the Bible were long-lasting phenomena up to the Carolingian age, at the end of which the standard format of the Bible had become the pandect. Under the influence of Charlemagne's admonition to prepare correct copies of the Bible, Alcuin, abbot of Tours, and Theodulf, abbot of Fleury and bishop of Orléans, attended to their editions of the Vulgate and supervised the copying of accurate and refined manuscripts in their scriptoria.<sup>39</sup> To strengthen the idea of a unitary revision and in order to associate it with the name of Jerome, Epistle 53 of Jerome to Paulinus of Nola was placed at the beginning of the Bible, a practice probably initiated by Alcuin.<sup>40</sup> The authorship of Jerome was considered a guarantee of accuracy and reliability, since he was held in high regard for his linguistic skills, as a good command of Hebrew, Greek

---

<sup>36</sup> Fischer (1985: 33).

<sup>37</sup> Houghton (2016: 60–8), Elliott (1992: 221), Petitmengin (1985: 97).

<sup>38</sup> Elliott (1992: 221).

<sup>39</sup> Bogaert (2012: 80), Houghton (2016: 81–6).

<sup>40</sup> Bogaert (2012: 84).

and Latin, and perhaps Syriac and Aramaic, was exceptional at Jerome's time.<sup>41</sup> The Vulgate acquired an indisputable and official recognition with the Council of Trent: the *vetus et vulgata editio* became the authoritative version of the Bible, to be preferred to any other Latin versions because of its established use through the centuries.<sup>42</sup> From the sixteenth century the term *Vulgata*, which originally referred to the Greek Koiné, the Septuagint and the *Vetus Latina*, was used, first as an adjective and then as a freestanding noun, to refer to Jerome's revision.<sup>43</sup> The epithet was applied to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, the revision initiated by Pope Sixtus V, accomplished for Pope Clement VIII in the year 1592 and in use until 1979, and was firmly associated with Jerome's version.<sup>44</sup>

#### b. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Jerome

The attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in the indirect tradition give a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the revision. Jerome attests readings and renderings of the Vulgate in writings dated to the end of the fourth century.<sup>45</sup> The most striking examples are the citations contained in the second book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, of the year 393, such as the participial renderings in agreement with the Vulgate at James 1:12–15, 17, the lexical similarities at 2 Peter 2:17–18 and 1 John 2:2–6; 3:9; 4:13, 15; 5:16, 18. However, these are not the earliest

---

<sup>41</sup> Rebenich (1993: 56).

<sup>42</sup> Sutcliffe (1948a: 37–8), Vosté (1946: 313).

<sup>43</sup> Bogaert (2012: 69), Bogaert (2013: 510–1). A list of the earliest attestations of the term *Vulgata* in the modern sense is present in Sutcliffe (1948b: 349–52).

<sup>44</sup> Sutcliffe (1948b: 351).

<sup>45</sup> Thiele (1965: 157–8), Fischer (1972: 74).

citations of Jerome with readings and renderings consistent with the Vulgate: lexical and syntactical similarities can be observed in the quotations of James 1:15 and 1 Peter 1:11 in Jerome's translation of Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto*, made in the year 387. The lexical renderings in common with the Vulgate in Jerome's four Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, written in the year 386, may be either accidental similarities or later adjustments towards the Vulgate.<sup>46</sup> These isolated instances, which mainly concern the vocabulary, are not sufficient to demonstrate the use of the Vulgate by Jerome at such an early stage of the textual tradition. Nonetheless, verses 5–7 of Jude are cited according to the Vulgate in Epistle 46, also dated to 386, two years after the revision of the Gospels: this is the earliest attestation of a Vulgate text of the Catholic Epistles within the corpus of Jerome's quotations. This citation is extremely informative about the origin of the Vulgate because not only does it contain rare lexical features but also renderings of participles and word order in common with the Vulgate as well as the translation of the same Greek variants. Therefore, the revision of Jude seems to precede that of the other Epistles, which are all cited from 393 onwards, in *Adversus Iovinianum*, as said above, and in further contemporary writings. Verse 3:2 of James in Epistle 50, dated to the year 394, contains readings and renderings characteristic of the Vulgate. The extensive citations of 1 Peter 5:2–4 in Epistle 52, composed in the year 397, plus the Vulgate readings and renderings at 1 Peter 3:15 (*Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum*) and 5:13 (*De viris illustribus*), show that the revision of 1 Peter predates the year 397. A similar timeframe can be suggested for the Vulgate version of 1 John: readings and renderings characteristic of the

---

<sup>46</sup> Houghton (2014a: 17–8; 2017: 90) observes the introduction of Vulgate readings and Old Latin variants in Jerome's Commentary on Galatians in which not only the lemmata but also the exegesis was adjusted, although not consistently, according to the Vulgate.



Vulgate are attested in *Commentariorum in Abacuc prophetam* (verses 2:20, 27) and *De viris illustribus* (1:1), both of the year 393. In addition, the lexical renderings of 2 John 1 and 3 John 1 agree with the citations of these passages in *De viris illustribus* and the latter with Epistle 146 of 398.

These observations are not sufficient to lead to the conclusion that Jerome revised the Vulgate Epistles: Jerome's quotations of the Catholic Epistles with features in agreement with the Vulgate are the exceptions rather than the rule, as it is possible to see in the table below, which illustrates the distribution of the citations in each category:

| EPISTLES | CITATIONS WITH READINGS DISTINCTIVE OF V | AGAINST V | NOT SIGNIFICANT (V= VL) | TOTAL NUMBER OF CITATIONS | PERCENTAGE OF CITATIONS WITH READINGS DISTINCTIVE OF V |
|----------|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| JAMES    | 32                                       | 40        | 28                      | 100                       | 44%  |
| 1 PETER  | 68                                       | 185       | 89                      | 342                       | 27%  |
| 2 PETER  | 13                                       | 38        | 12                      | 64                        | 25%  |
| 1 JOHN   | 80                                       | 90        | 59                      | 229                       | 47%  |
| 2 JOHN   | 1  | 7         | 0                       | 8                         | 12%  |
| 3 JOHN   | 3  | 4         | 1                       | 8                         | 43%  |
| JUDE     | 9  | 10        | 7                       | 26                        | 47%  |
| TOTAL    | 206                                      | 374       | 196                     | 777                       | 35%  |

Table 1: The affiliation of the citations of Jerome from the Catholic Epistles<sup>47</sup>

The quotations with readings and renderings of the Vulgate represent 35% of the total number. The majority of these citations are not entirely Vulgate but contain isolated features distinctive

---

<sup>47</sup> The abbreviation VL is used to refer to the *Vetus Latina* and V to the *Vulgate*. The citations that are not significant are subtracted from the total number of citations in order to calculate the percentage.

of the Vulgate together with Old Latin and unique readings. Inconsistencies in the affiliation of the biblical text can be noticed within the citations and between different quotations of the same verse, even in contemporary writings. On one hand, Jerome's citations do not correspond to a precise *Vetus Latina* text type as reconstructed by Thiele; on the other, they are characterised by numerous readings and renderings unique to Jerome. The biblical text of Jerome in 2 Peter is so peculiar that Thiele groups the citations from the first book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, *Explanationum in Esaiam* and Epistle 140 in the specific text type X, which represents the biblical text of Jerome and Paulinus of Aquileia.<sup>48</sup> However, it cannot be excluded that the citations of Jerome, although apparently unique, represent an Old Latin text no longer preserved elsewhere. Although readings of the Vulgate occur in the quotations of Jude of the year 386 and in the other letters of 393, the biblical text of later writings, such as *Explanationum in Esaiam*, *Commentariorum in Zachariam prophetam*, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos*, *In Hieremiam prophetam*, does not follow the Vulgate consistently. The data gathered from Jerome's citations demonstrate that Jerome is unlikely to be the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles because his biblical text rarely matches the Vulgate.<sup>49</sup>

### c. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Augustine

The biblical text of Augustine in the Catholic Epistles is variable: not only does it change according to the Epistles but also swings between text types within each epistle: the citations

---

<sup>48</sup> Thiele (1969: 77).

<sup>49</sup> However, it has been noted that Jerome does not cite the Vulgate version of Matthew, which was revised by him, in his Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. See Lagrange (1918: 254), Chapman (1933: 123), Souter (1941: 12–18).

are used by Thiele to reconstruct the African text type C, the European text type T and are indicated by the siglum A when the text is unique to Augustine.<sup>50</sup> Only in James do most of the quotations agree with the Vulgate.<sup>51</sup> Readings distinctive of the Vulgate in the Catholic Epistles can be found in Augustine's outputs spread out across a wide timespan, from the writings dated from 400 (*De natura boni; Contra Cresconium; De consensu evangelistarum; In Iohannis evangelium tractatus; Contra litteras Petiliani*) up to the late ones from the decade 420–30 (*De correptione et gratia; De gratia et libero arbitrio; Contra Iulianum; Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem; Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum; De dono perseverantiae; De VIII Dulcitii quaestionibus*). James 1:14 and 2:14 quoted in *De continentia* were once taken as early attestations of the Vulgate, but this is no longer the case following the redating of the writing from 395 to the second decade of the fifth century.<sup>52</sup> The Vulgate Gospels began to be cited by Augustine in the same period as James, from the year 403, when the Vulgate is mentioned in Epistle 71,6 to Jerome, and in the same works, *De consensu evangelistarum* and *In Iohannis*

---

<sup>50</sup> The classification of Augustine's biblical text in each letter will be described in the chapters dealing with the linguistic analysis of the Epistles.

<sup>51</sup> Houghton (2008b: 84): 'Augustine does not seem ever to have been familiar with the versions of the Epistles, Acts, or Revelation which became part of the Vulgate.' In Acts, Augustine agrees with the Vulgate when the readings are also supported by the Old Latin text types D and I (Petzer, 1991: 43–5). However, these instances do not demonstrate the dependence of Augustine on the Vulgate in that the readings identified by Petzer are not distinctive of the Vulgate.

<sup>52</sup> Bonnardière (1959) proposes the period 416–18 and Gryson 418–20 (2007: 210).

*evangelium tractatus*.<sup>53</sup> The affiliation of Augustine's biblical text in his lost commentary on James cannot be ascertained.<sup>54</sup> The similarity between Augustine's citations of James and the Vulgate across his entire corpus might be explained only by suppositions: a. the dependence of Augustine on the Vulgate, if the latter had been accomplished by the beginning of the fifth century, or on a common Old Latin version; b. later adjustment of the biblical text towards the Vulgate in the manuscript tradition; c. Augustine's involvement in the revision of James, although this hypothesis seems to be unlikely.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand, Augustine did not know the revision of the other Catholic Epistles and cited them according to the *Vetus Latina* and a version unique to him among surviving texts.

d. The Citations of the Church Fathers: Pelagius, His Circle and Adversaries

It has been acknowledged that Pelagius and his followers John Cassian, Caelestius, Eucherius of Lyons, Julian of Eclanum, Rufinus the Syrian, the authors of the Caspari corpus and the Pseudo-Pelagian and Pseudo-Hieronymian literature are among the earliest patristic sources who cite the Vulgate.<sup>56</sup> The biblical text of these writers has been also transmitted by

---

<sup>53</sup> Houghton (2008a: 456–60). Although Augustine's citations from the Gospels agree with the Vulgate from 403 onwards the *Vetus Latina* was not completely abandoned.

<sup>54</sup> Augustine, *Retractationes* 2,58; Possidius, *Indiculum operum S. Augustini* 10,3,10; Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1,8,5.

<sup>55</sup> Augustine affirms in the years 426–7: *ipsam epistulam ... non diligenter ex graeco habebamus interpretatam* (*Retractationes* 2,58). On the hypothesis, now outdated, that Augustine is the reviser of some biblical books, see De Bruyne (1931).

<sup>56</sup> Fischer (1972: 74), Frede (1975–82: 155), Thiele (1956–69: 64, 72, 77, 85, 96).

their opponents, such as Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine and the anonymous author of the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos sive Caelestianos haereticos*. Nonetheless, most of their citations derive from the period 420–50 and are therefore later than those of Jerome and Augustine. Although a detailed study of the biblical text of Pelagius' followers and opponents is urgently required, only the earliest witnesses, which are valuable to assess the questions of the dating and authorship of the Vulgate, can be discussed in this context.<sup>57</sup>

Pseudo-Jerome's Epistle 41 written in the year 384 cites James 1:12 and 5:1–5 according to the Vulgate. The latter verses contain a stylistic modification unique to the Vulgate, the rendering of the verb ἐσπαταλήσατε with *in luxuriis* to avoid the juxtaposition of two neighbouring verbs as found in Greek and the Vetus Latina, and the translation of the expression σιτόβρωτα γέγονεν with the periphrasis *a tineis comesta sunt* against the verb *tiniaverunt* of the Old Latin text types S and F.<sup>58</sup> In 1 Peter, the citations with a text close to the Vulgate are quoted in fifth-century writings: the biblical text of Caelestius at 1:14–16 cited by Augustine in *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* of the year 414 completely agrees with the Vulgate while the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistle 148, written between 413–4, features readings of the Vulgate at 3:1–6. The *Hypomnesticon*, dated to the beginning of the fifth century, is affiliated to the Vulgate in James 1:13–15, 17; 3:14; 4:1; 1 Peter 2:24–25; 5:10–11; 2 Peter 2:1–3 and 1 John 2:1, 15–17; 3:8; 4:8–10; 5:20, despite the presence of a few Old Latin elements in

---

<sup>57</sup> The attribution of the Vulgate Epistles to Rufinus the Syrian and the character of the citations in the *Liber de fide* will be considered in section 5 (pp. 23–8).

<sup>58</sup> However, the biblical text of Pseudo-Jerome's Epistles may have been altered by the copyists or the modern editors: a new critical edition is wanted in order to replace the only available at the moment in *Patrologia Latina*.

the quotations. The citations of the Caspari Corpus, dated between 408 and 416, are mainly Vulgate in 2 Peter 1:4–5, 8; 3:10–12, 15–16 but affiliated to the *Vetus Latina* in 1 Peter and 1 John, in which they agree with the African text type K. Pseudo-Augustine's *De vita christiana*, written before 413, has 2 Peter 2:20–22 and 3:9 according to the Vulgate. The only citations of 1 John that have a pure Vulgate text are 1 John 2:16–17 of Julian of Eclanum in Augustine's *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem* (428–30). The quotations of Caelestius, which correspond to the Vulgate in 1 Peter, are close to the Old Latin text type T in 1 John while elements of text type K are present in Pelagius, the Caspari corpus and the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistles 13 and 148. The biblical text of 2 and 3 John is not cited by the followers and opponents of Pelagius except a general allusion of Pelagius to the latter in the *Expositiones*. None of the citations of Jude feature a pure Vulgate text: those that contain readings and renderings of the Vulgate are Jude 6 in Cassian's *Conlationes Patrum* (420–6) and Jude 4 in the *Hypomnesticon*.

Overall, the affiliation of the biblical text of the followers and opponents of Pelagius is inconsistent and changes according to the epistles. The most stable texts are those of the *Hypomnesticon*, which has features of the Vulgate in all the Epistles cited, and Pseudo-Prosper's works *De vocatione omnium gentium* of the year 450 and *Epistula ad Demetriadem de vera humilitate*, written around 440. Although Pseudo-Prosper is not an early source, these writings contain citations that are mostly Vulgate with a minority of Old Latin renderings. The development of the biblical text from the mixed form of the early citations towards the Vulgate in the late ones has not been identified: the affiliation is also changeable in the late writings of Cassian, Eucherius and Prosper, dated between 420 and 450. Prosper is close to the *Vetus Latina* text types C and S while Eucherius features lexical renderings of the Vulgate and Cassian

a mixture of Vulgate, Vetus Latina and unique readings.<sup>59</sup> Considering that the majority of the Pelagian and anti-Pelagian witnesses are not consistent and mix the Vulgate with the Vetus Latina, their biblical text may have either relied on a Latin version which was an intermediate stage between the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate or have undergone contamination. The quotations of 1 Peter, 2 Peter and 1 John according to the Vulgate are later than those of Jerome and do not represent the earliest attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles, with the exception of the citations of James in the Epistle 41 of the year 384. This case is puzzling: either the Vulgate version of James might be contemporary to the revision of the Gospels or be an Old Latin version which was incorporated in the manuscript tradition of the Vulgate in the absence of a revised version of the letter. It can be concluded that the biblical text of the followers of Pelagius in the first half of the fifth century is very close to the Vulgate, although not identical.

#### 4. Prefaces and Order of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The study of the manuscript tradition makes clear that the name of Jerome was conventionally extended from the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament in antiquity. The authorship of Jerome was reinforced by the addition of prologues and prefatory epistles. The preface to the Catholic Epistles, *Non ita ordo est* (PROL cath [S 809]), is a pseudepigraphic letter from Jerome to Eustochium which imitates the beginning of Jerome's prologue to the Minor Prophets (*non idem ordo est*).<sup>60</sup> *Non ita ordo est* is dated to the second half of the fifth century and the earliest Vulgate manuscript attesting the preface is Codex Fuldensis, copied in

---

<sup>59</sup> Yevadian (2017: 203) confirms that the biblical text of Cassian does not completely depend on the Vulgate but has Old Latin influences and is based on Greek texts.

<sup>60</sup> Berger (1904: 11).

the mid-sixth century.<sup>61</sup> The preface, which was not written by the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles, remains anonymous but Priscillian, Peregrinus and Vincent of Lérins have been proposed as possible authors.<sup>62</sup> The topoi of the inaccuracy of the previous translations and concern about the criticism of the Vulgate by Jerome's contemporaries echo the themes of the *Novum opus*, Jerome's prologue to the Vulgate Gospels. The writer of *Non ita ordo est* proposes a correction to the order of the letters by changing the position of the Epistles of Peter, which were placed at the beginning in the former Latin versions.<sup>63</sup> The author of the preface informs us that the Vulgate order – James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude – follows the convention of Greek manuscripts.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Houghton (2016: 178), Gryson (2007: 721).

<sup>62</sup> See Ayuso Marazuela (1948: 66–7) who also refers to Künstle and Bludau. Chapman (1908: 262–7) believes that Pseudo-Jerome is dependent on a prologue of Priscillian.

<sup>63</sup> The Petrine letters open the Catholic corpus in the catalogue of Codex Claromontanus, Filaster, Augustine, Rufinus, the Acts of the Councils of Hippo and Carthage (Neinhuis, 2007: 84).

<sup>64</sup> This order is present in Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus. The 'Eastern' (James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude) and 'Western' (1 Peter, 2 Peter, James, 1, 2 and 3 John and Jude) arrangements of the Epistles do not group them according to length, as it occurs in the Pauline corpus, but to the author (Lockett, 2012: 133). Despite the predominance of the 'Eastern' order of the letters, the 'Western' order of the New Testament books (Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles, Revelation) prevailed over the 'Eastern' (Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Revelation) (Nienhuis, 2007: 87).



The preface also discusses 1 John 5:7–8, the verses known as the Johannine Comma. The writer blames the Latin translators for the omission of the last part of 5:8, which contains the mention of the Trinity (*pater et filius et spiritus sanctus* in the Old Latin text types K, T and *pater verbum et spiritus* in C).<sup>65</sup> In contrast with *Non ita ordo est*, the most authoritative early manuscripts of the Vulgate, such as Fuldensis (F), Amiatinus (A) and Sangermanensis (G), do not feature the Johannine Comma, which is included only in late manuscripts of the Vulgate.<sup>66</sup> Although the allegorical interpretation of 5:8 is first present in Cyprian, the Comma probably originated in Spain given its attestation in the Spanish direct and indirect tradition such as in Priscillian, Peregrinus, the León Palimpsest (VL 67) and the Freising Fragments (VL 64).<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> The Johannine Comma is absent in the Greek manuscripts and possibly attested for the first time by Cyprian in the third century (Thiele, 1959: 68–70). However, it is not included in the contemporary African writing *De rebaptismate*, in the works of Hilary, Lucifer of Cagliari, Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, Quodvultdeus (Ayuso Marazuela, 1948: 72; Houghton, 2016: 178–9). Thiele (1959) does not exclude a Greek origin of the Comma on the basis of the dependence of the early Latin translations on a disappeared ‘western’ form of Greek text.

<sup>66</sup> Ayuso Marazuela (1947a, 1947b).

<sup>67</sup> Ayuso Marazuela (1948: 72–4) hypothesises that the Comma was introduced in the fifth century by Peregrinus in his edition as a marginal gloss, was later incorporated in the main text by Isidore under the influence of the Spanish tradition, the mention of the Comma in *Non ita ordo est* and its theological significance and passed through Isidore to the Theodulf Bibles.

The passages on James, Peter and Jude from Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, dated to the year 393, are employed as prefaces in some manuscripts.<sup>68</sup> The biographical note on James shows that Jerome is aware that the letter of James is one of the seven Catholic Epistles and gradually gained authority despite the debates on its authorship.<sup>69</sup> 2 Peter is deemed to be spurious by Jerome because the style differs from that of 1 Peter.<sup>70</sup> Jerome states that, although Jude contains citations from the apocryphal book of Enoch and is therefore considered to be inauthentic, it must be accepted because of its antiquity and diffusion.<sup>71</sup> Excerpts from the biographies of the apostles and summaries of the Epistles of Peter and John in Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum* and *Proemia* are also included in manuscripts as prefaces. The *argumenta* to the Epistles (PROL Jac, 1 Pt, 2 Pt, 1 Jo, 2 Jo, 3 Jo, Jud) are brief summaries of their content dated before 700.<sup>72</sup> Some manuscripts also have anonymous prefaces that address the questions

---

<sup>68</sup> The system of sigla and classification of manuscripts employed by De Bruyne (1920) does not match those of the modern Old Latin and Vulgate editions. Therefore, it is difficult to identify the manuscripts which he cites in his collection for the prefaces.

<sup>69</sup> *Iacobus ... unam tantum scripsit epistulam, quae de septem catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quondam sub nomine eius edita adseritur, licet paulatim tempore protendente obtinuerit auctoritatem.*

<sup>70</sup> *Scripsit duas epistolas, quae catholicae nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam.*

<sup>71</sup> *Iudas frater iacobi unam parvam quae de septem catholicis epistulam reliquit. Et quia de libro enoch qui apocryphus est 'in ea' adsumpsit testimonium, a plerisque reicitur, 'tamen auctoritate uetustatis iam et usu meruit' inter sanctas scripturas computari.*

<sup>72</sup> De Bruyne (1920: 256–7), Gryson (2007: 729–30, 737).

of the order of the Epistles and canonicity: prologues 8 (PROL cath 8) and 9 (PROL cath 9) in De Bruyne's edition,<sup>73</sup> the former of Irish origin and the latter dependent on Jerome's *De viris illustribus*,<sup>74</sup> warrant the position of James in front *propter dignitatem* and because of the *prerogatiua apostolici ordini*, while prologue 11 notes the inauthenticity of 2 and 3 John.<sup>75</sup> The Catholic Epistles have four series of *capitula*: A of Donatist origin; C attested from the twelfth century; Tur, the capitula of Bede; Sp derived from the Spanish edition of the seventh century.<sup>76</sup>

#### 5. The Question of the Authorship<sup>77</sup>

The evidence derived from the manuscript tradition, the citations of the Church Fathers and the prefaces attached to the corpus suggests that Jerome was not the reviser of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles although his authorship was proposed from as early as the mid-fifth century, when *Non ita ordo est* was composed and the archetype of the Bible of Saint Germain des Prés (VL 7) was copied.<sup>78</sup> Jerome's own statements about the extent of the revision are inconsistent:

---

<sup>73</sup> De Bruyne (1920: 259–60).

<sup>74</sup> Gryson (2007: 721).

<sup>75</sup> *Reliquae autem duae ... Iohannis presbyteri adseruntur ... et nonnulli putant duas memorias eiusdem Iohannis esse.*

<sup>76</sup> De Bruyne (1914: 382–90, 417), Houghton (2016: 178).

<sup>77</sup> The question of the authorship of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels is discussed in my forthcoming article 'The Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels' in Houghton H.A.G. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>78</sup> See pp. 8–9.

Jerome affirms three times that he revised the whole New Testament (*De viris illustribus* 135; Epistle 71,5; Epistle 112,20) while he mentions only the Gospels twice (*Novum opus* prologue; Epistle 27,1), to which Augustine's witness of Epistle 71,6 to Jerome must be added. However, both the *Novum opus* and Epistle 27 are contemporary with the revision of the Gospels, but it is improbable that Jerome had completed the revision of the whole Vulgate New Testament by the year 384. These assertions are therefore not reliable in assessing the role played by Jerome in the revision of the Vulgate.<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, Jerome might have exaggerated his merits when mentioning his work on the New Testament in the three later remarks from *De viris illustribus*, Epistles 71 and 112, given that the absence of specific references to the Acts, the Epistles and Revelation seems to be suspicious. Therefore, no certain conclusions can be drawn from Jerome's affirmations.

In the sixteenth century, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples questioned the attribution of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to Jerome without gaining acceptance among his contemporaries.<sup>80</sup> This hypothesis was reconsidered four centuries later, between 1915–1920, when the studies of De Bruyne (1915), Vaccari (1915) and Cavallera (1920) came out. The main argument of these scholars against Jerome's authorship is the disagreement between the biblical text of the Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and the Vulgate. De Bruyne proposed Pelagius as the possible reviser of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles but his theory was not based on solid foundations given the uncertain reconstruction of the biblical text of Pelagius' Expositions of

---

<sup>79</sup> Chapman (1933: 33).

<sup>80</sup> Vaccari (1915: 160–2).

Thirteen Epistles of Paul.<sup>81</sup> Nonetheless, the attribution to Pelagius opened the way for the identification of a member of his circle, Rufinus the Syrian, as the reviser of the Vulgate Epistles by Fischer, Frede and Thiele.<sup>82</sup>

The figure of Rufinus the Syrian and the origin, dating and language of composition of the *Liber de fide*, the treatise attributed to him in the colophon of the only surviving manuscript (St Petersburg Q.v. I.6), are surrounded by uncertainties. The idea that the author of the *Liber de fide* corresponds to the reviser of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels is based on two arguments: his biography and the identity between the biblical citations and the text of the Vulgate. The biography of Rufinus the Syrian is a modern reconstruction compiled on the basis of the allusions of Augustine (*De gratia Christi* 2,3,3), Marius Mercator (*Liber subnotationum in verba Iuliani, praefatio* 2) and Jerome (Epistle 81,2; *Contra Rufinum* 3,24), who, however, may refer to different persons having the name Rufinus.<sup>83</sup> These writers appear to witness that Rufinus the Syrian arrived in Rome under Pope Anastasius between 399 and 402 (*Liber subnotationum in verba Iuliani, praefatio* 2) and was hosted by Pammachius (*De gratia Christi* 2,3,3). Rufinus seems to have been a monk at Jerome's monastery in Bethlehem sent by Jerome to Milan via Rome to defend an unknown Claudius (*Contra Rufinum* 3,24).

---

<sup>81</sup> De Bruyne (1915: 371). The scholarly debates on the character of Pelagius' biblical text of Paul, which are not relevant to the Catholic Epistles, are summarised in Stelzer (2018: 1–21) and in my forthcoming contribution to the *Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*.

<sup>82</sup> Fischer (1972: 74), Frede (1966–71: 42), Thiele (1969: 100–1).

<sup>83</sup> An opposite stance is taken by Dunphy (2009), who proposes Rufinus of Aquileia as the author of the *Liber de fide*.

Jerome also asked Rufinus the Syrian to greet Rufinus of Aquileia when he would have passed through Aquileia (Epistle 81,2).

The dating of the *Primum quaeritur*, the prologue to the Vulgate Pauline Epistles, might also shed light on the authorship of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels. Fischer and Frede, in order to support the attribution of the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to Rufinus the Syrian, who was in Rome between 399 and 402, dated the *Primum quaeritur* between 393–410 on the basis of its possible dependence on *De viris illustribus*.<sup>84</sup> However, Jerome might have remembered the *Primum quaeritur* when he enumerates in *De viris illustribus* 5 the reasons why the Epistle to the Hebrews is not considered to be authentic.<sup>85</sup> Considering that readings and renderings of the Vulgate are attested in the citations of the Catholic Epistles contained in Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, as demonstrated above, it cannot be ruled out that Jerome knew at that time both the Vulgate Catholic Epistles and the *Primum quaeritur*, which must have been composed before 393 if Jerome cited it in *De viris illustribus*.

---

<sup>84</sup> Fischer (1972: 73–4), Frede (1975–82: 99–100).

<sup>85</sup> The problem of the canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews is raised in both the *Primum quaeritur* and *De viris illustribus* 5 in the same terms although with different conclusions: Jerome considers Hebrews to be inauthentic while the writer of the *Primum quaeritur* accepts the letter in the canon. The authorship of Hebrews was questioned for the following motivations, which are mentioned in both the writings: a. stylistic and linguistic differences with the other letters; b. the absence of Paul's signature; c. the order of the letters. The question of the authorship of the *Primum quaeritur* was addressed by De Bruyne (1915), Plinval (1966), Frede (1966–71: 42), (1975–82: 99–100), (1983–91: 303–4), Scherbenske (2013: 185–98).

The conclusion that the biblical text of the *Liber de fide* agrees with the Vulgate is refuted by Dunphy, who observes that Miller, the editor of the *Liber de fide*, compares the citations with the Clementine Vulgate and not with the Stuttgart Vulgate, the modern edition of the fourth-century text.<sup>86</sup> In addition, the citations of the *Liber de fide* that at first glance correspond to the Vulgate also agree with the *Vetus Latina*: only the presence of distinctive readings and renderings of the Vulgate which are not attested in any Old Latin texts would demonstrate the dependence of the *Liber de fide* on the Vulgate.<sup>87</sup> Such cases are very rare, constituting precisely 5 out of 72 citations, all of which belong to the Pauline Epistles.<sup>88</sup> The *Liber de fide* contains only three quotations from the Catholic Epistles: James 3:9 (XXIII), 1 Peter 3:19–21 (XXXIX), 2 Peter 2:4 (XX). James 3:9 and 2 Peter 2:4 are characterised by unique readings not attested elsewhere in the Latin tradition (*secundum similitudinem; qui peccaverunt*) while 1 Peter 3:19–21 is close to both the Old Latin text type T and the Vulgate. The remaining citations from the Pauline Epistles feature Old Latin elements in 42 citations out of 72: the biblical text of the *Liber de fide* appears to be related to that of Ambrosiaster (34

---

<sup>86</sup> Miller (1964: 14–5), Dunphy (2012: 227).

<sup>87</sup> A complete analysis of the citations from the Pauline and Catholic Epistles in the *Liber de fide* is carried out in my forthcoming article ‘The Affiliation of the Quotations from the New Testament Epistles in the *Liber de Fide*’ in Houghton, H.A.G and Montoro, P. (eds.) *At One Remove: The Text of the New Testament in Early Translations and Quotations. Papers from the Eleventh Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Piscataway: Gorgias.

<sup>88</sup> 1 Corinthians 12:12–13 (in chapter XIII); 2 Timothy 4:6 (XXXIII); 2 Corinthians 12:9–10 (XXXV); 2 Corinthians 4:16–18 (XXXV); 2 Corinthians 5:4 (LI).

readings out of 50) and other sources grouped in the *Vetus Latina* edition of the Pauline Epistles under text types I and J, which transmit a form of text circulating in Northern Italy in the middle of the fourth century.<sup>89</sup> The Old Latin affiliation of the quotations of the *Liber de fide*, the attestation of the Vulgate in Jerome's citations of the Catholic Epistles in early writings and the possible dating of the *Primum quaeritur* preceding 393 because of the dependence of Jerome's *De viris illustribus* on the prologue, reject the hypothesis that Rufinus the Syrian revised the Vulgate Epistles when he was in Rome between 399 and 402. The search for the reviser(s) of the Vulgate Epistles remains open.

## 6. Stylistic Differences and Principles of Revision

When assessing Jerome's involvement in the revision of the New Testament, attention has been drawn to the consistency of the revision as a criterion to determine the authorship of these texts. The Vulgate text of Matthew contains more corrections than the other Gospels, which follow Matthew in the order of the Vulgate.<sup>90</sup> On this basis, it was suggested that Jerome could have revised the whole New Testament, making fewer adjustments in the Acts, Epistles and Revelation.<sup>91</sup> However, the lack of interest of Jerome is rather an argument in favour of the

---

<sup>89</sup> The presence of features of text types I and J in the citations of the *Liber de fide* from 1 Corinthians is noticed by Fröhlich (1995–8: 221–2).

<sup>90</sup> Houghton (2016: 34). Metzger (1977: 359) suggests that the descending number of interventions is ascribed to Jerome's loss of interest in the revision of the New Testament and his commitment to the translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew.

<sup>91</sup> Sparks (1940: 524), Elliott (1992: 221): 'On the other hand, Jerome's own evidence is that he did in fact revise the whole of the New Testament and it is perhaps most reasonable to



opposite conclusion, that he refrained from the revision of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels. The presence of stylistic differences between the Vulgate Gospels and the other books would be a decisive proof against Jerome's authorship. Divergences in style and criteria of revision have been noted in general terms: Fischer and Thiele affirm that Jerome and the reviser of the other books of the New Testament follow different principles of revision, without specifying which these are.<sup>92</sup> This judgement, which seems to be more an impression than the product of a rigorous examination, has been endorsed without any further explanations.<sup>93</sup> On the other hand, Chapman deems the Vulgate to be a unitary text, revised by Jerome with care and attention, according to the same principles.<sup>94</sup> Only a thorough analysis of the language and the style of the Vulgate can ratify or refute these contradictory opinions.

---

conclude that his reforming zeal diminished as he worked through it, hence the evident lack of revision in the later books of the Vulgate New Testament.'

<sup>92</sup> Fischer (1972: 21): 'Die Art der Revision des Hieronymus, die in den Evangelien die Vulgata bildet, unterscheidet sich von der Revision, die in den andern Büchern des Neuen Testaments sich als Vulgata durchgesetzt hat, so sehr und so grundlegend, daß eine Identität der beiden Revisoren ausgeschlossen ist.' Thiele (1965: 178): 'Als Schöpfer der Vulgata der Katholischen Briefe kommt Hieronymus freilich nicht in Betracht. Die außerordentlich sorgsame, teilweise auch übertriebene Art und Weise, in der die Vulgata der Katholischen Briefe den altlateinischen Text an die griechische Vorlage angleicht, steht in schroffem Gegensatz zu der Praxis, die Hieronymus in der Revision der altlateinischen Evangelien und im Gallicanum handhabt.'

<sup>93</sup> Birdsall (1970: 374), Rebenich (1993: 51), Petzer (1995: 123), Tkacz (1996: 59).

<sup>94</sup> Chapman (1933: 283–4).

## 7. 'Christian Latin'

The language of the biblical versions differs in many aspects from that of other contemporary texts of Christian and non-Christian origin: striking features of these translations are the influence of Greek on the lexicon and syntax and the presence of non-standard forms.<sup>95</sup> From the third decade of the twentieth century the language of the Latin Bible was classified in the broad category of 'Christian Latin', the uniqueness of which was propounded by the Nijmegen School. Following an approach close to modern sociolinguistics, Schrijnen hypothesises that a gradual linguistic change occurred within the Christian communities: the new religion prompted the development of a Christian *Sondersprache* to express concepts previously unknown through the coinage of direct and indirect 'Christianisms'. The label 'Christian Latin' groups together texts with both literary and popular elements and sometimes overlaps with other technical languages.<sup>96</sup> Schrijnen's theory was developed by Mohrmann,

---

<sup>95</sup> The definition of 'non-standard' can be inferred by the following definition of 'standard' given by Clackson (2010: 11): 'Standard languages are typically the languages employed by sovereign powers as the medium of administration, religion, law, science, education and prestige discourse and display. Standard languages show little or no variation, and their status in a society means that speakers usually associate the standard with the 'correct' form of the language. The standard is the variety taught in schools and codified in grammars, and consequently other varieties, including regional and social dialects, are seen as deviations from the standard.'

<sup>96</sup> Schrijnen (1932: 43): 'Die Sprache aber wird im Schoosse der Familie gewonnen und gepflegt und wächst beim Individuum mit vielen anderen Gemeinschaftsfunktionen allmählich

who maintains that the ‘vulgar’ features of the biblical translations reflect the poor education of early Christians belonging to the lower social classes. According to Mohrmann, the ‘vulgarisms’ gradually lost their popular character and were preserved because of their diffusion and the emotional attachment of the believers to them.<sup>97</sup> Although the Latin of the biblical translations often differs from the literary language, it is too simplistic to label it as ‘Vulgar Latin’: Burton demonstrates that the translators of the Old Latin Gospels were not uneducated, but were capable of avoiding postclassical forms, using technical terms and accurate expressions to render the Greek text.<sup>98</sup> Early Christians belonged to different social levels and not to a homogeneous group of uneducated and poor people.<sup>99</sup>

Mohrmann also claims that some ‘popular’ words, which were in use in early Latin and unattested in the classical period, were deliberately re-introduced in Christian Latin because they did not have a classical connotation.<sup>100</sup> The choice of archaic words, especially from the comic lexicon, might have been intentional when the archaisms represented a good match for the Greek counterparts or educated writers employed them as literary revivals to show off their knowledge. Nonetheless, their presence can be justified by further reconstructions: these words

---

heran, jedoch nur im kollektiven Verband. Die altchristliche Gemeinschaft hatte ihre Sondersprache; diese war in den Ländern lateinischer Zunge das altchristliche Latein.’

<sup>97</sup> Mohrmann (1948: 93–4).

<sup>98</sup> Burton (2000: 111–2, 170). For the definition of ‘Vulgar Latin’ see section 8 (pp. 34–8).

<sup>99</sup> Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 286): ‘The image of the early Christians as united through persecution and divine favour, and their protestations of humility are better seen as rhetorical stances, which can be explained as part of their theological message.’

<sup>100</sup> Mohrmann (1948: 95).

may have been unconsciously remembered from the reading of Plautus and Terence, have been re-coined or re-borrowed to match the Greek text or represent cases of submerged Latin: words used throughout the history of Latin but not employed in classical literature because of their low connotation and used again in writings written in a colloquial register.<sup>101</sup>

Coleman considers the hypothesis of the *Sondersprache* to be valid only as far as the lexicon is concerned, whereas he affirms that it is not correct to talk about Christian Latin without making a distinction between various typologies of Christian writings, such as biblical translations, exegetical works, hymns and administrative documents.<sup>102</sup> Nowadays, the assumption that ‘the early Christians became almost a secret society, evolving a species of Latin which was largely incomprehensible to outsiders’<sup>103</sup> seems to be very unlikely: the language of Christians, although characterised by lexical peculiarities, was not unintelligible to the non-Christians. Burton acknowledges the formation of Christian technical vocabulary through the processes of lexical borrowing, calquing and semantic extension but also the coexistence of

---

<sup>101</sup> Pezzini (2016).

<sup>102</sup> Coleman (1987: 52): ‘In fact the language of the Church was made up of several distinct registers – the vulgarized Latin of Bible and Psalter, the plain but unvulgarized style of ecclesiastical administration, the more sophisticated idiom of expository and hortatory literature and finally the products of high literary culture – the hymns and collects of the Liturgy and Offices. The only linguistic feature that unites these registers is the specialized Christian vocabulary, which is in turn the only feature that distinguishes them individually from the corresponding genres of pagan and secular Latin writing.’

<sup>103</sup> Palmer (1954: 183).

classical forms.<sup>104</sup> Burton also proposes a re-evaluation of the theory of the *Sondersprache*, although interpreted in a mitigated sense.<sup>105</sup> Following the examination of a corpus of Christian writings dated between the late fourth and late fifth century, Burton observes that the frequency of certain words, attested in classical literature, increases in Christian writings although they do not present a clear semantic shift. Their use is part of a ‘rhetorical strategy which looks both outward towards potential pagan readers, and inward towards other Christians, implicitly assuring the former that the new religion is indeed compatible with a classical education, while reinforcing a sense of group solidarity among the latter’.<sup>106</sup> However, some of the seven words examined by Burton underwent at least a partial shift of meaning (*habitus, infans, postulo*), were used in preferred contexts (*dignor, intueor*) or were successful in the Romance languages (*desiderium*). These factors may have encouraged their unconscious use in Christian literature together with the influence of the Bible, in which most of the words are attested, as Burton notes.<sup>107</sup>

The advent of Christianity caused deep social and ideological changes, which affected the mindset and consequently the language of Latin speakers.<sup>108</sup> However, there are not enough

---

<sup>104</sup> Burton (2011: 500).

<sup>105</sup> Burton (2008: 169): ‘It may be argued that we are dealing not with a sort of Christian vernacular, as proposed by Schrijnen and Mohrmann, but rather a frankly literary mode of expression, which might have very little to do with the speech of ordinary Christians.’

<sup>106</sup> Burton (2008: 170).

<sup>107</sup> Burton (2008: 170).

<sup>108</sup> Braun (1985: 131): ‘S’il est vrai que, phénomène social, le langage est avant tout un système de signes destinés à communiquer des idées et notions, et si, à ce titre, toute transformation de

elements to posit the formation of a *Sondersprache* parallel to mainstream Latin. The coinage of a new technical vocabulary either through direct borrowing and imitation of Greek (loan-words, calques, etymologising renderings) or the adaptation of pre-existing Latin vocabulary (semantic extensions) was the outcome of a gradual linguistic development that exclusively concerned the lexicon. The existence of ‘Christian Latin’ is refuted by the absence of phonetic, morphological and syntactical features exclusive of the language of Christians. What distinguishes Christian writings from the preceding literary production is the different ideological and cultural background at their base and not the language that conveys them.<sup>109</sup>

#### 8. ‘Late’, ‘Vulgar’ and ‘Colloquial’ Latin

Given that ‘Christian Latin’ is unsatisfactory as a description of the language of the Latin versions of the New Testament, the temporal designation ‘Late Latin’ and the sociological descriptions ‘Vulgar’ and ‘Colloquial Latin’, referring to the register in which these texts were written, are employed to define their linguistic character.<sup>110</sup> The phrase ‘Late Latin’, referring

---

l’idéologie de la société doit inévitablement retentir sur lui, personne ne devra s’étonner que la «transculturation» au moins partielle, nécessitée par le passage du monde romain à une religion orientale comme le christianisme, ait eu des conséquences saisissables au niveau de la langue, avant qu’à son tour l’usage de cette langue renouvelée ne modèle la mentalité de l’Occident latin, roman, et même germanique et slave.’

<sup>109</sup> Fredouille (1996: 23): ‘Si les allusions ou les références, explicites ou implicites, à l’Écriture leur confèrent souvent une originalité propre, celle-ci n’autorise à parler d’un “latin chrétien” ou d’un “latin des chrétiens” que dans cette acception stricte et limitée.’

<sup>110</sup> See the discussion on Late and Vulgar Latin in Burton (2000: 151–5).

to the status of the Latin language between the second and seventh century, was coined by the Swedish school of Löfstedt, Norberg and Svennung to indicate a linguistic phase of Latin characterised by three factors: the influence of Christianity, of the Greek language and of ‘Vulgar’ Latin.<sup>111</sup> The terminology is, however, problematic: Adams points out how inaccurate it is to define as ‘late’ syntactical phenomena which become conventional and better attested at a later time but appear, albeit sporadically, in earlier Latin.<sup>112</sup> Nonetheless, some common phonological, lexical, morphological and syntactical trends characterising the Latin language from the fourth century onwards have been identified and feature in the biblical versions.<sup>113</sup> Although the periodisation of Latin is an artificial division which might obscure the continuity of the language, the terms early (ca. 240 – ca. 120), classical (ca. 120 BC – ca. AD 14), postclassical (ca. 14 – ca. 200) and late Latin (ca. 200 – ca. 600) will be employed in the following chapters not as fixed categories but as flexible chronological indications in order to point out the continuity of some linguistic phenomena and set the writings cited in a historical dimension.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Löfstedt (1959: 14–5).

<sup>112</sup> Adams (2011: 257–63).

<sup>113</sup> A brief description of the linguistic developments in late Latin can be found in Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 272–84), Adams (2011: 257–83).

<sup>114</sup> The dates represent the following historical and literary moments: 240 BC corresponds to the literary debut of Livius Andronicus, 120 BC to that of Lucilius, 14 AD is the year of Augustus’ death and 200 marks the acme of the literary production of Tertullian. The late Latin period is followed by the period of transition (around 600 – 900) to the Romance languages, which is not included in the present study.

The designation ‘Vulgar Latin’, which points to the ungrammatical and spoken language, is defined by Herman as ‘the set of all those innovations and trends that turned up in the usage, particularly but not exclusively spoken, of the Latin-speaking population who were little or not at all influenced by school education and by literary models’.<sup>115</sup> This notion sometimes overlaps with, but is in no way equivalent to, ‘Late Latin’: several non-standard usages were current in the informal language, which does not necessarily correspond to the popular language, and became established with time, thus being perceived as ‘late’.<sup>116</sup> Väänänen proposes to replace the term with the more specific (but equally vague) ‘Popular Latin’, ‘Familiar Latin’, ‘Everyday Latin’ but retains ‘Vulgar Latin’ as a well-established nomenclature.<sup>117</sup> According to Herman, the vulgar elements are a general characteristic of Christian literature due to the influence of the biblical translations, the limited education of most Christians and the necessity of educated writers to write and speak in a plain language in order to be understood by their audience.<sup>118</sup> Nowadays ‘Vulgar Latin’ is still a successful term despite its ambiguity: it is employed by Adamik in his periodisation of Latin instead of ‘Late Latin’ to refer to the period between 250 and 600 ‘when the so-called ‘vulgar’ variety of Latin with its fundamental changes in the subsystems of the language came to influence and

---

<sup>115</sup> Herman (2000: 7).

<sup>116</sup> Adams (2011: 265).

<sup>117</sup> Väänänen (1981: 3–6).

<sup>118</sup> Herman (2000: 24) affirms that ‘it is fair to say that the linguistic characteristics of Christian texts as a whole, including those written in a literary style, are closer to those of speech than are those of contemporary texts of other kinds.’



predominate in more and more forms of communication and all registers of Latin.’<sup>119</sup> On the other hand, Löfstedt affirms that ‘there is not, and cannot be, any document in pure, unadulterated Vulgar Latin’ because of the direct or indirect influence of the literary language.<sup>120</sup> The Latin translations of the New Testament cannot be defined as ‘vulgar’ but are composite texts in which both literary and colloquial registers coexist.<sup>121</sup>

The designation ‘Colloquial Latin’ is also ambiguous: the adjective, antithetical to ‘literary’, refers to the spoken language, which, however, is not a fixed entity but varies according to the background and education of the speakers. Dickey’s definition of ‘Colloquial Latin’ is ‘the words and usages that Latin speakers ... employed freely in conversation but avoided in their formal literary productions’.<sup>122</sup> This definition can be applied to the biblical translations in as much as these are considered to be a technical genre without literary intentions, such as inscriptions, tablets, papyrus letters, ostraca etc. Although some of the Old Latin translations were made out of necessity and correspond word for word to the Greek text, others were more literary versions produced by learned writers, of whom Jerome is the best-known example, and are unlikely to be entirely haphazard. The inconsistent character of these versions is well summarised by Adams:<sup>123</sup> ‘There is a quirky mixture in the version of the popular and the old-fashioned, reflecting the fact that translating in writing is an artificial act for which the translator does a certain amount of groping about for the *vox propria*, which may

---

<sup>119</sup> Adamik (2011: 648).

<sup>120</sup> Löfstedt (1959: 15).

<sup>121</sup> Burton (2000: 152–3), Dickey (2010a: 4).

<sup>122</sup> Dickey (2010b: 65).

<sup>123</sup> Adams (2016: 444).

take him beyond everyday usage'. 'Colloquial' and 'literary' elements will be identified as we come across them in the following chapters and a judgment on the overall character of the texts will be suspended for now.

#### 9. *Status Quaestionis* and Aims of the Research

The scholarly contributions to the study of the language of the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles are limited to two monographs by Thiele on the vocabulary of 1 John (1958) and on the textual tradition of 1 Peter (1965), which are contemporary with publication of the *Vetus Latina* edition (1956–69) and intended as preparatory to its consultation by readers. The work on 1 Peter arranges the sources at the base of the critical edition in chronological order and according to the text types, discusses their relationship with the Greek text and the criteria on which the text types have been established. The final section of this monograph is dedicated to the analysis of a selection of nineteen Greek words and their Latin renderings apparently arbitrarily chosen from the Epistle and analysed with a synchronic approach limited to the other attestations of these terms in the Bible and Christian literature. The principal flaw of this study is that Thiele does not distinguish between variations internal to Latin or due to the presence of Greek variants.<sup>124</sup> The analysis of the lexicon of 1–3 John is restricted to 121 Greek words: a

---

<sup>124</sup> For instance, Thiele (1965: 110) identifies twelve passages in which the text of the Vulgate matches the Greek text of 1 Peter in contrast with the *Vetus Latina*. Nonetheless, four differences are not internal to the Latin language but are translations of different Greek variants (1:1: omission of *et* in the Vulgate while text type S renders the variant *καί*; 2:1: presence of *omnes* in the Vulgate translating *πάσας*, which is omitted in the *Vetus Latina*; 3:22: *in caelum* rendering *οὐρανόν* in the Vulgate against *in caelos* in text type A corresponding to the variant

collation of the Latin texts is first presented, followed by the examination of the African and European renderings and the description of the lexical peculiarities of each text type.<sup>125</sup> The Vulgate Catholic Epistles were also studied by von Harnack at the beginning of the twentieth century (1916) with the aim of reconstructing the Greek text at the base of the Vulgate: von Harnack translated the Oxford critical edition of the Vulgate into Greek and compared the resulting text with the extant Greek manuscripts. Modern philology has cast doubt on the value and reliability of such an exercise but the short chapters that analyse the Latin language of the Epistles are still valuable: von Harnack notes substantial linguistic differences between the Vulgate versions of the Epistles pointing to their separate origin.<sup>126</sup> The monograph of Burton on the Old Latin Gospels (2000), to which this thesis is much indebted, marks a turning point in the study of the language of the *Vetus Latina* and prompted renewed interest in this subject.

---

οὐρανοῦς; 5:2: *dei* in the Vulgate translating θεοῦ instead of *christi* in text type T matching Χριστοῦ). Thiele does not make a distinction between these cases and the remaining eight instances, representing renderings of lexicon, participles and word order which do not undergo the influence of the underlying Greek text.

<sup>125</sup> In the present research 1117 words from 1–3 John were collected and analysed against the 121 words of Thiele.

<sup>126</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 2) believes that: ‘es ist a priori nicht nur möglich, sondern auch wahrscheinlich, daß die Überlieferung des Textes der einzelnen katholischen Briefe in der Vulgata verschieden ist und daher einen verschiedenen Wert hat. Ist es doch mehr als unwahrscheinlich, daß diese Briefe alle in derselben Zeit, geschweige von demselben Verfasser, ins Lateinische übertragen worden sind, und die verschiedenen Übersetzungsprinzipien gefolgt sein.’

Apart from the cursory mentions of stylistic divergences between the Vulgate New Testament books, a linguistic analysis of the Vulgate and Old Latin New Testament outside the Gospels has not yet been carried out.<sup>127</sup> The present thesis aims to be the first complete study of the lexicon, morphology and syntax of the Old Latin and Vulgate Catholic Epistles with two principal foci: their relationship to the Greek text and the description of their Latin language.<sup>128</sup> It will be observed to what extent the Latin versions are dependent on Greek in lexicon (loan-words, calques, rendering of Greek compounds, etymologising renderings) and syntax (subordinate clauses modelled on Greek, Greek verbal constructions) and whether these texts are word-for-word or free translations as far as lexicon, verbal and nominal number, rendering of comparatives and superlatives, rendering of Greek articles with demonstratives, participles and word order are concerned. The study of the Latin language will mainly focus on the late Latin features of these texts: nominal, adjectival and verbal formations, metaplasms, postclassical verbal constructions and the presence of revivals of archaic words.

It will be demonstrated that the linguistic data can be used to determine whether the Catholic Epistles had a single origin or not: if they share the same principles of revision, such

---

<sup>127</sup> Burton (2012: 195): ‘Lastly, the language and translation technique of the Old Latin versions still call for attention. The work of Burton has tried to move the standard description beyond the terms “literal” and “vulgar”, which were until recently thought to be an adequate characterization of it. Nonetheless, more study is needed, not least to reflect developments in the field of Latin linguistics that have seen fresh attention focused on both Greek-to-Latin translations and the creation of technical vocabularies.’

<sup>128</sup> Phonology was not taken into consideration because the orthography might reflect that of the later copyists who produced the manuscripts transmitting the texts.

as a similar relationship with Greek and common tendencies in the rendering of the original text into Latin, they were probably revised by a single reviser, otherwise by multiple revisers. The comparison between the language of the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate will enable us to show the differences between them and check whether the Vulgate can be defined as a more correct and stylistically refined revision of the *Vetus Latina* or retains the ‘vulgar’ elements which are considered to be characteristic of the Old Latin versions. The Old Latin sources of the Vulgate will also be examined in each letter in order to identify the closest Old Latin text type and establish whether the Latin versions of each Epistle might have had a common archetype.

## 10. Methodology

This section gives an overview of the critical editions consulted, the methods and criteria followed to reach the goals presented above. The Vulgate as reconstructed in the fifth edition of the Stuttgart Vulgate (2007) is compared with Thiele’s critical edition of the *Vetus Latina* (1956–69) and the Greek text of Nestle–Aland 28 (2012). In order to give a full account of the variants of the Greek text, the *Editio Critica Maior* (abbreviated as ECM) of the Catholic Epistles (2013) is consulted when necessary, in particular in the passages in which the Latin renderings may be explained by the attestation of Greek variant readings. The *Vetus Latina* Pauline Epistles edited by Frede (1962–4, 1966–71, 1975–82, 1983–91) and Revelation by Gryson (2000–3) are also employed while Brepols *Vetus Latina* Database is used for the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels, together with the *Vetus Latina* edition of John by Burton, Houghton, MacLachlan and Parker (2011–13) and Jülicher, Matzkow and Aland’s edition (1963–76). The *Vetus Latina* material for the unedited Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians) is taken from Houghton, Kreinecker, MacLachlan and Smith (2019).

Because the Old Latin versions are transmitted by numerous direct and indirect sources, which frequently disagree from each other, Thiele groups the Old Latin texts that show similarities into ‘text types’, which are indicated by sigla and displayed in the schema of the critical edition in comparison with the Greek text and the Vulgate. The text types are not artificial texts but ‘are the readings of real witness[es], not synthetic reconstructions; these witness[es] may be either continuous-text manuscripts or readings found in specific early Christian writers, chosen on the basis that they best represent the text type in question’.<sup>129</sup> The term ‘text type’ was first applied to the Greek New Testament and then to the Latin versions: the Latin text types are revisions of an original *Vorlage* which underwent changes in vocabulary and in the relationship with the Greek text.<sup>130</sup> The result of this reconstruction ‘is the consistent line that runs through the whole of the NT from the African to the European text, culminating in the Vg.’<sup>131</sup> The concept of text types has been subject to criticism given that their constitution and the linearity of their tradition are sometimes questionable: the biblical text transmitted by manuscripts and Church Fathers may be associated with more than one text type according to the books and even within each book of the New Testament while the citations often feature unique readings which were not preserved by the rest of the surviving Latin tradition and

---

<sup>129</sup> Burton (2012: 172).

<sup>130</sup> Petzer (1995: 118–9). Blümer (2020: 454) proposes a change in terminology, from ‘text types’ to *Textformen* or *Textfassungen*: the latter nomenclature would not imply a unitary origin of these versions as the expression ‘text types’ does. On the classification of Greek manuscripts into the ‘Alexandrian’, ‘Western’, ‘Byzantine’ and ‘Neutral’ text types see Parker (2012: 81–3).

<sup>131</sup> Petzer (1995: 124).

cannot, therefore, be classified.<sup>132</sup> However, when used with caution, the text types are useful to get an overview of the Old Latin tradition and assist with statistical examinations.<sup>133</sup> In a study that focuses on language, it would be too lengthy to report all the Old Latin sources that support each reading and rendering and this practice might compromise the overall clarity and comprehension of the main arguments. Therefore, it was decided to accept the division into text types with a critical eye and with the following limitations:

- a. The critical apparatus of the *Vetus Latina* edition has always been consulted in order to ascertain what direct and indirect witnesses support each reading.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Burton (2012: 184–6). The method of the *Übersetzungsfarbe* and the phylogenetic approach have been recently adopted in order to determine the relationship between manuscripts (Burton, 2012: 186–90). A new presentation of the textual tradition according to groups of manuscripts is experimented in the *Vetus Latina* edition of John (2011–13) but the division into text types is retained in the *Vetus Latina* edition of Mark (2013–18), in which the text types represent manuscripts rather than quotations and are accompanied by the texts of Codex Bezae, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, and in the forthcoming edition of Acts.

<sup>133</sup> Fischer (1972: 17): ‘Es handelt sich eben um Abstraktionen, die nie alle konkreten Einzelheiten decken können, die aber andererseits absolut notwendig sind, um die geschichtlichen Vorgänge einigermaßen zu beschreiben und zu verstehen.’

<sup>134</sup> The critical apparatus of the edition of James differs from those of the other epistles: it is a negative apparatus in which the sources supporting the readings of the Vulgate are not included. In the chapter on James, the witness apparatus, which contains the full citations of the Church Fathers, was consulted in order to add the missing information. On the other hand, the rest of

b. When there is no correspondence between the sources in the apparatus and those listed under the text type by Thiele, which are also given at the beginning of each chapter, this is explicitly indicated: the sources follow the siglum of the text type in bold.

c. When the Vulgate, which is the main object of study, agrees with other witnesses, these are always mentioned after the siglum **V** between parentheses in order to distinguish between readings unique to the Vulgate or with an Old Latin substratum.<sup>135</sup>

d. When analysing in detail linguistic features that are of particular interest, all the Old Latin sources supporting these readings and renderings are reported. The witness apparatus is consulted when it is necessary to know the context in which a reading originated.

A combined approach of quantitative and qualitative analysis of the linguistic data is taken: a comprehensive selection of lexical, syntactical and morphological forms is presented and fully described in each chapter following a diachronic and synchronic approach and the relationship between the Old Latin text types and the Vulgate in lexicon, participial renderings

---

the corpus has a positive apparatus which includes the witnesses in agreement with the main text.

<sup>135</sup> The Old Latin indirect sources that are deemed by Thiele (1958: 12) to be dependent on the Vulgate are A-SS Bar, Goar, Rad; AN cath; AU spe; PS-AU s. The reliance on the Vulgate is also possible for medieval sources and witnesses that cannot be dated with certainty: BEA El; BED; BON; COL; COL-C; EUGE-T; PS-EUTn; FRU; GERM; GR-M; PS-GR-M; PS-HI Mc; PS-HIL-A; ILD; IS; PS-IS; JUL-P; JUL-T; JUS-U; KA C, A, Tur; LEA; LUCU; M-A; M-M; MAU; PIR; S-Mo.



and word order is presented using statistical data shown in tables. The double goal of the research is to trace the history and development of the lexicon, morphology and syntax of the Catholic Epistles throughout the Latin language and to look at the attestation and distribution of the linguistic phenomena in the other books of the Bible and in Christian literature. The study of the lexicon is facilitated by numerous lexicographical resources among which the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (abbreviated as TLL), the Library of Latin Texts (LLT-A and LLT-B) and the Database of Latin Dictionaries must be particularly remembered.<sup>136</sup>

The linguistic data at the base of the quantitative analysis are collected from the *Vetus Latina* edition and organised into three spreadsheets for each Epistle: lexicon, participial renderings and word order.<sup>137</sup> The spreadsheets are arranged as follows: each text type and the Vulgate occupy a column while the rows contain the Greek text and the respective Latin renderings. The aim of the statistical examination is to define the variations internal to Latin for each Greek unit, i.e. word, participle and sequence of words. The readings that differ because of the presence of Greek variants are excluded from the final count because they do not inform us of the relationship between the Latin versions. The readings of the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* which are not supported by the Greek manuscript tradition are listed in the final sections of each chapter: in some cases, these unattested variants might be worthy of

---

<sup>136</sup> The numerous references to the TLL are omitted in the following chapters to make the text clear and easy to read although the TLL was consulted for all the Latin words cited in the thesis. The dictionaries included in the Database of Latin Dictionaries, such as Forcellini (1940), Blaise (1954–67), Souter (1949), Lewis and Short (1933), Gaffiot (1934), are cited without reference to the pages, which are not given in the database.

<sup>137</sup> The spreadsheets are available at <http://edata.bham.ac.uk/604>. See the appendix at p. 406.

consideration when reconstructing the Greek original text. The collection of vocabulary complies with the following criteria: nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs are included in the spreadsheets while coordinating conjunctions, particles (such as μέν, δέ, ἄν), negative particles, prepositions, pronouns, personal names are omitted. The subordinating conjunctions that show a wide range of variations in Latin are analysed, for instance ὅτι and ὡς, whereas those with straightforward Latin correspondences (ἵνα, εἰ consistently rendered by *ut* and *si*) are not included. The auxiliary verb εἰμί is excluded from the count because it is always rendered by *esse*; in contrast, ἔχω, which presents rare cases of variations, is included. Old Latin words which are editorial conjectures to fill textual lacunae are not taken into consideration. Changes in mood, tense, person, number, voice of verbs, case, number, person of nouns and case, number, person, gender, degree of adjectives are not considered to be differences between text types if the lexeme is the same. The number of cases in which each text type agrees with the Vulgate is indicated in the tables attached to the final sections of the chapters, which display the proportion between the number of the cases of agreement with the Vulgate and the total number of attestations of each text type plus the final percentage of agreement: the more attestations a text type has the more reliable is the reconstruction of its relationship with the Vulgate. The tables showing the relationship between the Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* in word order also indicate how many times the text types and the Vulgate follow the sequence of the Greek text or differ from it. The application of these principles aims to illustrate the relationship between the Old Latin versions and the Vulgate as objectively as possible in order to trace the origin, tradition and linguistic characters of these texts.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> According to Petzer's future directions for New Testament scholarship (1995: 126): 'One of the most important points to clarify is the origin of the Vg in the parts outside the Gospels'.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

#### 1. Introduction

Early citations of the Epistle of James are attested in the Latin version of 1 Clement, translated from Greek at an unknown point between the second and fourth century:<sup>1</sup> the form of text of verses 2:23 and 2:25 is close to the Old Latin text type F while at 4:6 1 Clement stands on its own:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The dating of the Latin version of 1 Clement is uncertain: Morin (1894: 11–12) notes that the translation has the features of a pre-Vulgate text with Graecisms and barbarisms and suggests that from a chronological point of view it follows immediately the Greek version: *Itaque his omnibus perpensis, minime temeritatis insimulandum eum fore existimo, qui Clementis epistulam, ubi primum edita est, parvo intervallo interiecto, ex graeco conversam ac Latina voce expressam esse praeiudicaverit*. On the other hand, Wölfflin (1896: 97) affirms that the Latin version of 1 Clement is contemporary with Tertullian because of the presence of lexicon in common. Ehrman (2003: 30) and Holmes (2007: 39) propose a wider timeframe (either the second or the third century) whereas Gryson (2007: 398) dates the Latin 1 Clement to the fourth century.

<sup>2</sup> See the description of the Old Latin text types at pp. 50–2.

2:23 (10,1; 17,2):<sup>3</sup> φίλος: *amicus* (CLE-R= F, V)<sup>4</sup>

2:23 (10, 6): ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην: *et credidit Abraham deo, et aestimatum est illi ad iusticiam* (CLE-R), *credidit Abraham domino et estimatum est ei ad iustitiam* (F), *credidit Abraham deo et reputatum est illi ad iustitiam* (V)

2:25 (12, 1–7): Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη ... τοὺς ἀγγέλους: *Raab ... fornicaria ... exploratores* (CLE-R=F), *Raab meretrix ... nuntios* (V)

4:6 (30,2): θεὸς γὰρ φησὶν ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν: *quia deus superbis contrarius est, nam humilibus dat gratiam* (CLE-R), *deus superbis resistit humilibus autem dat gratiam* (S, V), *deus superbis resistit humilis autem dat gratiam* (F)

---

<sup>3</sup> The references to the chapters follow the division of Holmes (2007). The Latin text of 1 Clement is taken from Morin (1894).

<sup>4</sup> The Vetus Latina abbreviation system is employed to refer to text types, manuscripts, names and writings of the Church Fathers. A complete list of the abbreviations is available in Brepols Vetus Latina Database and in the *Vetus Latina Register and Repertorium* edited by Gryson (1999, 2004, 2007). The list of the symbols and abbreviations employed in the critical apparatus is given at the beginning of the Vetus Latina edition of the Epistle of James. The following abbreviations are frequently cited below: *cf* (*confer*: used to refer to readings close but not identical to those of the main text), Var (variant readings in patristic sources), the fraction (it indicates the number of citations in agreement with the main text out of the total number of citations of a given writer), curly brackets (doublets), > (source for), < (dependent on), <sup>txt</sup> (reading in the text), <sup>com</sup> (reading in the commentary), <sup>ed</sup> (edition). The biblical text of the Vetus Latina complies with the spelling and punctuation of Thiele's edition (1956–69).

Thiele does not include 1 Clement in the witness apparatus and ignores the citation of 2:25. On the other hand, the quotation of 4:1, highlighted by Thiele, is not identified in the edition of Holmes and Ehrman (2003).<sup>5</sup> The following lexical renderings of 1 Clement are in agreement with text type F against the Vulgate: *aestimatum est* (2:23), *fornicaria ... exploratores* (2:25). On the other hand, the renderings *deo* and *illi* at 2:23 agree with the Vulgate while the rendering *contrarius est* at 4:6 differs from *resistit*, the translation of text types F, S and the Vulgate. According to Thiele, the allusions to James present in the Shepherd of Hermas (1:5, 6–8, 21, 27; 2:7; 3:17, 18; 4:7, 12) and the passages cited by Tertullian (1:13; 2:1; 2:23; 4:10; 5:16–17) are too general to be evaluated as proper citations of the Epistle.<sup>6</sup> Frisius does not identify any quotations or allusions to James in Tertullian's works.<sup>7</sup> Augustine is the earliest African source of James because neither Cyprian nor the Pseudo-Cyprianic writings cite the letter. Lucifer of Cagliari does not quote James either. Thiele states that Novatian's citations of 1:17 and 2:23 are rather free and Lactantius' allusions at 1:15, 27 and 2:15, 19 partly agree with the *Vetus Latina* and partly with the Vulgate.<sup>8</sup> Numerous sources from the end of the fourth century quote

---

<sup>5</sup> Thiele (1969: 58).

<sup>6</sup> Thiele (1969: 58). The latter citation of Tertullian, which is mentioned by Thiele in the introduction, is not included in the witness apparatus as well as the citations of the Shepherd of Hermas.

<sup>7</sup> Frisius (2011: 10–3).

<sup>8</sup> Thiele does not quote Novatian's citations in the apparatus and lists only Lactantius' citation of 1:15. A few renderings of Lactantius from verses 5:20, 1:27, 2:15, 2:19 in common with the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate are mentioned in the introduction (1969: 58) without reference to the writings and passages from which they are taken.

James: Ambrosiaster cites 5:20 with distinctive readings of the Vulgate (*converti fecerit, salvabit animam eius a morte, peccatorum*), three verses (1:17, 2:23, 4:7), of which only the former is cited by Thiele in the apparatus, are quoted by Hilary of Poitiers and several by Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, Pelagius, just to name some well-known witnesses. The late reception and debated authorship of the Epistle is witnessed by Jerome in *De viris illustribus*, written in the year 393.<sup>9</sup> The order of the Catholic Epistles was changed in the Vulgate and James became the first letter of the corpus.<sup>10</sup> Augustine's commentary on James is unfortunately lost: the existence of the *Expositio epistulae Iacobi* is witnessed by Augustine (*Retractationes* 2,58), Possidius (*Indiculum operum S. Augustini* 10,3,10) and Cassiodorus (*Institutiones* 1,8,5).<sup>11</sup>

Three text types, which group the Old Latin witnesses presenting similarities, are reconstructed by Thiele:

S:

- VL 67: Palimpsest of León. *Palimpsestus Legionensis*. León, Archivio Catedralicio, 15. The manuscript in Spanish half-uncial script was written in the seventh century in Toledo and palimpsested in the tenth century when it was overwritten with Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*. It contains the Pauline Epistles

---

<sup>9</sup> See p. 22.

<sup>10</sup> Houghton (2016: 41).

<sup>11</sup> Thiele (1969: 51).

according to the Vulgate and Old Latin versions of Acts and Catholic Epistles.<sup>12</sup> The manuscript is used to reconstruct 4:4–15 and 5:17–20.

- Priscillian (PRIS) quotes 2:5, 19; 3:6; 4:1, 4; 5:1–3.
- Pseudo-Augustine *Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum* (PS-AU spe) cites 1:19–20, 26–27; 2:13–17, 26; 3:1–4, 7–8, 13; 4:1, 7–8, 10–12; 5:1–3, 5.
- Pseudo-Ambrose *De fide* (PS-AM fi) contains citations of 1:13, 14, 18; 4:1.<sup>13</sup>
- Bachiarius (BACH) cites 3:6; 5:13.
- Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC) quotes 2:26.
- Isidore of Seville (IS) cites 1:6.

F:

- VL 66: *Corbey St James*. St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Q. v. I. 39. It was copied in Corbie around 830 and contains Novatian's *De cibis iudaicis*, a Latin translation of the Epistle of Barnabas and an Old Latin version of James produced in Rome at the beginning of the fifth century.<sup>14</sup>
- Pope Innocentius I (IN) cites 5:14–15.
- Chromatius of Aquileia (CHRO) quotes 1:12, 15.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Thiele (1969: 16–7), Houghton (2016: 240).

<sup>13</sup> Thiele (1969: 58). The citations, however, are not included in the apparatus.

<sup>14</sup> Thiele (1969: 16). Houghton (2016: 239–40).

<sup>15</sup> Chromatius and VL 66 share the peculiar expression *adquirat mortem* at 1:15.

- Jerome cites 1:12, 18, 23; 2:10; 3:2; 4:13, 14.<sup>16</sup>
- Rufinus has the rendering *voce* at 5:14 in agreement with VL 66 and IN.
- Readings of text type F are also present in Cassiodorus and in the Vulgate manuscripts F and I.

T:

- Isolated readings in Spanish, Gallic and Irish manuscripts of the Vulgate as well as in Codex Fuldensis (F), in St Gall Stiftsbibliothek 907 (S) and in the Vulgate text of Pope Martin I (MART I).
- In the indirect tradition T is transmitted by Augustine (AU), Quodvultdeus (QU), Fulgentius (FU), Cassiodorus (CAn), Rufinus (RUF), Jerome (HI), Salvian of Marseille (SALV) and KA Sp.

A: the biblical text of Augustine when it is unique (*momenti* at 1:17; *inaestimabilis* at 3:17; *sustinentiam* at 5:11 and *invicem* at 5:16).

G: Gallic readings present in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B. 168 sup. (VL 52); Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, lat. 2. (VL 53); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 11553 (G) at 1:5, 6, 15, 18, 23, 25; 2:16; 3:4, 5, 7, 16; 4:2, 3, 8; 5:5, 7, 8, 10.

Text type S is based on Spanish (VL 67 and Priscillian) and Italian sources (Bacharius, of Spanish origin but active in Rome): Thiele affirms that the text type was known in Italy

---

<sup>16</sup> Thiele (1969: 61) affirms that Jerome agrees with text type F at 4:8 although Jerome's citation of this verse in Is 15 (534A) features readings of text type T and the Vulgate. Thiele also points out similarities between Jerome and text type F at 2:22, a verse which is not cited by Jerome.



considering its influence on text type F, Cassiodorus and Jerome: either S was one of the sources of the Vulgate or the latter entered the tradition of PS-AU and VL 67.<sup>17</sup> Text type S can be tracked down in the Irish and English tradition of the Vulgate, especially in D (VL 61). According to Thiele, S represents a form of text more ancient than F and V, translated from a *Vorlage* belonging to the Greek ‘Western’ text and with numerous glosses and parallel readings later incorporated in the main text.<sup>18</sup> Thiele reconstructs text type F in the entire letter on the basis of VL 66. It would be more appropriate to refer directly to VL 66 instead of using the siglum F, which should represent a group of sources according to the definition of text type. The only verses in which text type F ought to be reconstructed are those in which VL 66 can be compared with the indirect tradition (1:12, 15, 18; 3:2; 5:14–15). The differences between VL 66 and the citations of the Church Fathers are noteworthy and lead Sanday to the conclusion that the text of VL 66 is a further development of the text type whereas Thiele believes that the indirect sources are contaminated with other texts current at that time and for this reason differ from VL 66.<sup>19</sup> According to Thiele, F is dependent on T and S and based on a Greek text with readings witnessed by Codex Vaticanus.<sup>20</sup> A few unique readings of Augustine, marked by the siglum A, are considered by Thiele to be corrections introduced by Augustine according to De Bruyne’s hypothesis that Augustine undertook a revision of the Bible.<sup>21</sup> This assumption is untenable in James in which only five unique lexical renderings, which are not improvements

---

<sup>17</sup> Thiele (1969: 59).

<sup>18</sup> Thiele (1969: 59–60).

<sup>19</sup> Sanday (1885: 239), Thiele (1969: 62).

<sup>20</sup> Thiele (1969: 62).

<sup>21</sup> Thiele (1969: 65), De Bruyne (1931).

but alternative renderings, are attested and the majority of the citations of Augustine are used to reconstruct text type T and the Vulgate. In James, only single readings of text type T are preserved although the tradition of this text type is not marginal: T is connected with both S and F and the tradition of the Vulgate. Thiele hypothesises that Old Latin readings of text type T entered the tradition of the Vulgate in James making it difficult to distinguish between T and the Vulgate in this epistle.<sup>22</sup> Thiele's conclusions on the relationship between text types will be reviewed at the end of this chapter in light of new statistical examinations.

The earliest attestations of the Vulgate in the indirect tradition are the citations of 1:12 and 5:1–5 in Pseudo-Jerome Epistle 41 of the year 384, which is attributed to Pelagius.<sup>23</sup> Two out of three citations of 1:12 cite the biblical text consistently:

1:12 in Epistle 41,2 (282C):

ὑπομένει πειρασμόν: *suffert temptationem* (V)] *permanet in tentationibus* (PS-HI), *sustinuerit temptationem* (F)

ὅτι: *quia* (V)] *quoniam* (PS-HI= S)

δόκιμος γενόμενος: *cum probatus fuerit* (PS-HI= V)] *probatus factus* (F)

τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν: *diligentibus se* (PS-HI= V)] *eis qui eum diligunt* (F)

addition of *deus* (PS-HI= V)

ἐπηγγεῖλατο: *repromisit* (PS-HI= V)] *promisit* (S)

The citation differs from the Vulgate in the renderings *permanet in tentationibus* and *quoniam* but agrees on the participial renderings *cum probatus fuerit* and *diligentibus se*, on the addition

---

<sup>22</sup> Thiele (1969: 61).

<sup>23</sup> Gryson (2007: 551).

of *deus* and the lexical rendering *repromisit*. Verses 5:1–3, 5 attest significant readings and renderings of the Vulgate:

5:1–3, 5 in Epistle 41,6 (284A):

omission of *vestris* (PS-HI= V)] *vestras* (S), *vestris* (T)

addition of *vobis* (PS-HI= V)

ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις: *quae advenient* (PS-HI= V)] *quae superveniunt* (S), *advenientibus* (T)

σέσηπεν: *putrefactae sunt* (PS-HI= V)] *putruerunt* (S), *putrierunt* (T)

καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σητόβρωτα γέγονεν: *et vestimenta vestra a tineis comesta sunt* (PS-HI= V)]

*et tiniaverunt vestes vestrae* (S), *res vestre tiniaverunt* (F)

ἐτρουφήσατε: *epulati estis* (PS-HI= V)] *deliciati estis* (S), *fruiti estis* (F)

ἐσπαταλήσατε ἐθρέψατε: *in luxuriis enutristis* (V, *nutristis* in PS-HI)] *luxoriati estis creastis*

(S), *abusi estis cibastis* (F)

This citation is a valuable witness because it contains complex expressions: both the Vulgate and Pseudo-Jerome resort to the periphrasis *a tineis comesta sunt* to translate σητόβρωτα γέγονεν while the Old Latin versions employ the rare verb *tiniaverunt*. In addition, the Vulgate and Pseudo-Jerome considerably change the text by translating the verb ἐσπαταλήσατε with *in luxuriis* against the *Vetus Latina*.

Jerome attests the Vulgate in 32 citations out of 100.<sup>24</sup> The second book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, written in the year 393, is the principal witness to the Vulgate text of James among Jerome's writings: a number of peculiar lexical and syntactical renderings are present in the citations of 1:12–15, 23–24; 2:19; 4:17. Despite this being the only source identified by Thiele

---

<sup>24</sup> See pp. 11–4.

as attesting the Vulgate, verse 1:15 in the translation of Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* of the year 387 contains lexical and syntactical similarities with the Vulgate and may represent the earliest attestation of the Vulgate version of James in Jerome's writings.<sup>25</sup> Verse 3:2 is cited according to the Vulgate in Epistle 50, of the year 394, and in the later *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* in which, however, the lexicon of the citations is often inconsistent. Further readings and renderings in agreement with the Vulgate in Jerome's citations are isolated instances.

The Vulgate version of James is increasingly attested at the beginning of the fifth century: the biblical text of Augustine features numerous readings and renderings distinctive of the Vulgate in citations contained in writings written between 400–30.<sup>26</sup> The followers and opponents of Pelagius cite the Vulgate in writings dated between 420 and 450:<sup>27</sup> Cassian agrees with the Vulgate at verses 1:12 and 5:14–15 quoted in *Conlationes Patrum*; Prosper cites verse 1:17 according to the Vulgate in *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem* and *Epistula ad Rufinum*; verses 3:14–17 mostly agree with the Vulgate in the citations of Prosper's *Epistula ad Rufinum* and 1:17–18 in the Pseudo-Prosper *Epistula ad Demetriadem* are affiliated to the Vulgate. The Pseudo-Augustine *Hypomnesticon* is close to the Vulgate at 1:14–15 and, to a lesser extent, at 1:13, 17; 3:14; 4:1. Isolated similarities with the Vulgate are present in the citations of Eucherius (1:13), Julian of Eclanum (2:10), Pelagius (1:2, 4; 3:2; 4:15), Caspari corpus (1:22; 2:10, 14; 4:4), Pseudo-Jerome Epistles 13 (3:2) and 3 (5:11).

---

<sup>25</sup> Thiele (1969: 65).

<sup>26</sup> See pp. 14–6.

<sup>27</sup> See pp. 16–9.

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The loan-words of James are either Greek and Hebrew words connected with Christianity or non-religious terms which become specialised words frequently employed in Christian literature. The following verbs are included in the latter category: *blasphemare* (2:7 F, V); *moechari* (2:11 F, V), previously attested in poetry (Catullus 94,1; Horace, *Saturae* 1,2,49; Martial 6,91,2) but predominantly in Christian writings; *zelare* (4:2 F, V, G); *thesaurizare* (5:3 F, V), ‘to treasure up’, which renders θησαυρίζω, first introduced into Latin in the biblical translations; *psallere* (5:13 V; AN cath; AU spe; PS-HIL-A; cf MUT; NIC), alternatively rendered by the periphrasis *psalmum dicere* (F), which becomes a specialised Christian verb with the meaning ‘to sing the psalms’. The Greek nouns in James are the following: *daemonium* (S) or *demonium* (F) and *daemon* (V; ALD; AN; AR; AU; BEA; CAE; CAr; CE; CHRY; FAU-R; FU; HI; PS-HIL-A; [IS]; KA; PEL; PRIS; QU; RUF; SALV; VER) at 2:19;<sup>28</sup> *zelus* (3:14 F, V); *diabolus* (4:7 S, V) or *zabolus* (F); *propheta* (5:10 F, V); *presbyter* (5:14 F, V); *ecclesia* (1:1 T; 5:14 V). At 3:6 the Hebrew loan-word *gehenna* is attested in text type F and the Vulgate while S, reconstructed on the basis of the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*, has *genitura*, meaning ‘birth, generation’. This mistaken translation arose from the confusion

---

<sup>28</sup> The adjectives *diabolicus* (V) and *demoneticus* (F) are attested at 3:15 to render δαιμονιώδης.

See p. 77.

between the similar Greek terms γενέσεως and γεέννης and because of the influence of the preceding *geniturae* rendering γενέσεως:

3:6: καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης  
*et inflammatur rotam geniturae et inflammatur a genitura* (PS-AU spe)

The form *daemon* at 2:19, which is the only attestation in the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels, is less common than *daemonium*, largely attested in the Vulgate Gospels, Pauline Epistles (1 Corinthians 10:20; 1 Timothy 4:1), Acts and Revelation. Valgiglio observes that the Vulgate does not match the diminutive δαμόνια and employs a classical word in opposition to the *Vetus Latina*.<sup>29</sup> The latter assumption is unconvincing: the term *daemon* is postclassical and mostly attested in Christian writers.<sup>30</sup> The terms *daemon* and *daemonium* are often interchanged and the use of *daemon* does not demonstrate that the Vulgate is less literal than the *Vetus Latina*.

In three cases, the Vulgate has Latin words instead of the Greek loan-words: at 1:27: *orphanus* (S, F) – *pupillus* (V; POS), at 2:2: *synagoga* (F) – *conventus* (T, V), at 3:17: *hypocrisis* – *simulatio* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-HIL-A; PROS). These are the only occurrences of *conventus* rendering συναγωγή and *pupillus* translating ὀρφανός in the Vulgate New Testament. However, *pupillus* is used very frequently in conjunction with *vidua* in the Vulgate Old Testament while *orphanus* is common in the *Vetus Latina* and never attested in the Vulgate. At 3:17 text type F features the loan-word *hypocrisis*, attested from Tertullian onwards, while the Vulgate has the corresponding Latin word, *simulatio*.

---

<sup>29</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 146).

<sup>30</sup> TLL 5.1.4.33.

## b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

The Epistle of James features a number of Greek compounds which are either rendered in Latin by periphrases or by calques and matching words. The Greek compounds are grouped into four sections according to the typology of the Latin renderings.

### b.1 Periphrases

In the following instances, the Latin versions render the Greek compounds with separate words which match the components of the original forms:

1:6: ἀνεμιζομένω: *quae / qui a vento fertur* (S / F), *quae a vento movetur* (V; PS-HIL-A)

1:8: δίψυχος: *duplici corde* (F; CAn<sup>com</sup>; BED), *duplex animo* (V; AU spe; CAr; PS-HI; PS-HIL-A; PS-IGN; PHY; RUF; SALO)

4:8: δίψυχοι: *duplices animo* (S, V), *duplices corde* (F)

3:2: χαλιναγωγῆσαι: *frenare* (S), *infrenare* (F; PS-AU spe Var), *refrenare* (HI; PS-AU spe Var; cf KA), *freno circumducere* (V; PS-AM), *circumducere freno* (A), *frenum circumducere* (Σ<sup>C</sup>τ<sup>56</sup> 65; AN)<sup>31</sup>

2:1: ἐν προσωπολημψίαις: *accep(ta)tione personarum* (F), *personarum acceptione* (V; AU; PS-HIL-A; KA C)

2:9: προσωπολημπτεῖτε: *personas accipitis* (F, V), *personam accepistis* (T)

2:2: χρυσοδακτύλιος: *anulos aureos in digitos habens* (F), *anulum aureum* (T), *aureum anulum habens* (V; HES; PS-HIL-A), *habens anulum aureum* (Ω<sup>O</sup>; cf AU 1/2)

---

<sup>31</sup> Cfr. 1:26: χαλιναγωγῶν: *refrenans* (S, V), *infrenans* (F).

4:12: νομοθέτης: *legum dator* (S), *legum positor* (F), *legislator* (V; PS-AU bar; BEA; CAR; PS-HIL-A)<sup>32</sup>

5:10: κακοπαθίας: *malis passionibus* (F), *laboris* (V; AN cath; PS-HIL-A), *exitus mali* (G)<sup>33</sup>

5:11: πολύσπλαγγχος: *visceraliter ... misercors* (F), *misericors* (V; PS-HIL-A)<sup>34</sup>

5:17: ὁμοιοπαθής: *similis ... passibilis* (S, V; AN cath; BED; GEL; PS-HIL-A), *similis* (F)

At 1:8 and 4:8 the rendering of the Vulgate (and text type S at 4:8), *duplex animo*, matches the etymology of the Greek compound δίψυχος better than *duplex corde* (F). At 3:2 the Vulgate translates the verb χαλιναγωγέω, ‘to guide with bit and bridle’, with the periphrasis *freno circumducere* while the rendering of text types S, F and Jerome are less specific although suitable for the context: *frenare*, *infrenare*, *refrenare* mean ‘to bridle’ and lack the idea of ‘leading’ present in the Greek compound and in the rendering of the Vulgate. On the other hand, at 1:26 the Greek verb is rendered by *infrenare* in text type F and *refrenare* in text type S and the Vulgate. The compound χρυσοδακτύλιος at 2:2, ‘with a ring of gold’, is translated in different ways in text type F and the Vulgate: not only does F employ the plural but also adds the unnecessary information *in digitos* whereas the Vulgate and text type T have the singular form. At 5:17 text type S and the Vulgate render the adjective ὁμοιοπαθής with the two adjectives *similis ... passibilis* corresponding to the components of the Greek word while F omits the second adjective. *Passibilis*, ‘capable of suffering’, is a widespread Christian term never used in pagan literature. At 5:10 text types F and G split the compound κακοπαθία and

---

<sup>32</sup> See p. 72.

<sup>33</sup> Cfr. 5:13: κακοπαθεῖ: *male patitur* (S).

<sup>34</sup> See p. 99.



render the two parts of which it is composed. However, the rendering of F, *malis passionibus*, matches the structure but not the meaning of the Greek word, ‘laborious toil, perseverance’, expressed by the rendering of the Vulgate, *laboris*, which is also singular as the Greek compound. The expression *personarum acceptio*, attested at 2:1, is frequently used in the Bible (for instance in the Vulgate at Romans 2:11; Ephesians 6:9; Colossians 3:25; 1 Peter 1:17) to render the Greek προσωποληψία: ‘respect of persons’. *Acceptatio* is a correction of VL 66 and a rare form instead of *acceptio*, also attested in Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 5 *extr.* and *Adversus Marcionem* 5,9) and in Fulgentius of Ruspe (Epistle 18,4,8).

## b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words

A calque is ‘a type of borrowing, where the morphemic constituents of the borrowed word or phrase are translated item by item into equivalent morphemes in the new language’.<sup>35</sup> The matching words have the same features of calques but differ from them because they are not new formations.<sup>36</sup>

3:8: θανατηφόρου: *mortali* (S), *mortifera* (F), *mortifero* (V)

3:9: εὐλογοῦμεν: *benedicimus* (F, V)

3:10: εὐλογία: *benedictio* (F, V)

4:8: ἀγνίσατε (ἀγιάσατε variant): *sanctificate* (S, F), *purificate* (V; AN cath; BEA; FU; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>35</sup> Crystal (2008: 64).

<sup>36</sup> The same distinction is made by Burton (2000: 129–30).

5:8: μακροθυμήσατε: *pacientes estote* (F), *patientes estote* (V), *longanimi* (G)<sup>37</sup>

5:10: μακροθυμίας: *pacientia* (F), *patientiae* (V), *longanimitatis* (G)

5:11: μακαρίζομεν: *beatos dicimus* (F), *beatificamus* (V), *beatificabimus* (T)

The matching word *mortifer*, attested from the classical period, is employed in text type F and the Vulgate to match θανατηφόρος whereas the rendering of text type S, *mortalis*, does not correspond formally to the Greek term. The feminine *mortifera* in text type F refers *ad sensum* to the preceding noun *lingua*. *Benedicere*, ‘to praise’ in classical Latin, acquires the specialised meaning ‘to bless’.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, the noun *benedictio*, ‘blessing’, is a Christian formation modelled on the Greek noun εὐλογία. The verb *beatificare*, attested in text type T and the Vulgate at 5:11, is a calque of μακαρίζω whereas text type F has the periphrasis *beatos dicere*.<sup>39</sup> *Beatificare* is a hapax in the Vulgate New Testament: at Luke 1:48, μακαρίζω is rendered by *beatum dicere* in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina with the exception of VL 10, which is the only source for *beatificare*. Similar examples of calques composed by nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbal stems plus the suffix *-ficare* are coined in early and classical Latin mainly on the basis of nouns while they are formed by the stems of nouns and adjectives in late Latin.<sup>40</sup> The factitive verbs composed by adjectival roots and the often delexicalised suffix *-fic-*, which

---

<sup>37</sup> Cfr. 5:7: μακροθυμήσατε ... μακροθυμῶν: *pacientes estote ... patiens* (F), *patientes estote ... patienter ferens* (V), *aequo animo ... aequo animo* (G).

<sup>38</sup> Burton (2000: 131–2).

<sup>39</sup> According to Mohrmann (1961: 60) the calque was coined in the biblical translations and was in use in Christian literature under the influence of the Bible.

<sup>40</sup> Marini (2014: 138) summarises their chronological distribution in a table.

matches -ιζ- and -αζ-, become typical of the Christian discourse.<sup>41</sup> At 4:8 text types S and F render the variant ἀγιάσατε with the Christian calque *sanctificate* while ἀγνίσατε is translated by the Vulgate with *purificate*, which is not a Christian coinage. At 5:8 and 5:10 μακροθυμέω and μακροθυμία are rendered by *patientes esse* and *patientia* in text type F and the Vulgate, which match the meaning but not the structure of the Greek compound. The calques of text type G, *longanimi* and *longanimitatis*, match both semantically and formally the Greek words.<sup>42</sup> *Longanimi* is also a metaplasm of declension instead of *longanimes*, which is also attested in Cassian (*Conlationes patrum* 16,27,6; 18,13,2).<sup>43</sup> In other cases, the Latin versions employ compounds although they are not present in the Greek text. The Latin compounds in *-loquus* are usually calques of the Greek adjectives ending in -λογος. Surprisingly, this is not the case in James. At 3:1 the expression μή πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε is rendered by *nolite multiloqui esse* in text type S whereas *nolite multi magistri esse* (T, F) and *nolite plures magistri fieri* (V) are the translations of the other Old Latin text types and the Vulgate. At 3:5 text type S translates ἡ γλῶσσα ... μέγαρα ἀύχεϊ with *lingua ... est magniloqua*. On the other hand, F, T and the Vulgate have the renderings *lingua ... magna gloria[n]tur*, *lingua ... magna exaltat*, *lingua ... magna exultat*.

### b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds

The Greek words introduced by the alpha used as a privative and negative prefix are rendered by the Vulgate and Vetus Latina as follows:

---

<sup>41</sup> See pp. 149–50. Marini (2014: 141), Burton (2000: 134–5).

<sup>42</sup> Cfr. 2 Peter 3:15 (pp. 210–11).

<sup>43</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.), Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

1:8: ἀκατάστατος: *inconstans* (F, V)

3:8: ἀκατάστατον (ἀκατάσχετον variant): *nec retinere* (S), *inconstans* (F), *inquietum* (V; AU; EUS-G; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

3:16: ἀκαταστασία: *inconstans* (F), *inconstantia* (V; AU; CAr; PS-HIL-A; PEL II.; PROS)<sup>44</sup>

1:13: ἀπείραστός ἐστιν: *temptator non est* (F; cf CAr), *intemptator ... est* (V; AU; PS-AU hyp; CHRO; EUCH; HI; PS-HIL-A; PET-C; PS-VIG)

1:27a: ἀμίαντος: *incontaminata* (S), *inmaculata* (F, V)

1:27b: ἄσπιλον: *inmaculatum* (S, V), *sine macula* (F)

2:13: ἀνέλεος: *sine misericordia* (S, V), *non miserebitur* (F)

3:17a: ἀδιάκριτος: *sine diiudicatione inreprehensibilis* (F), *diiudicans* (T), *inaestimabilis* (A), *non iudicans* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-HIL-A), *non diiudicans* (AU spe; PROS)

3:17b: ἀνυπόκριτος: *sine hypocrisi* (F), *sine simulatione* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-HIL-A; PROS)

The alpha privative compounds are rendered by a. *sine* plus a noun (1:27 F; 2:13 S, V; 3:17a F; 3:17b F, V); b. *non* and a verb (1:13 F; 2:13 F; 3:8 S) or an adjective (3:17a V); c. the prefix *in-* (1:8 F, V; 1:13 V; 1:27a S, F, V; 1:27b S, V; 3:8 F, V; 3:16 F, V; 3:17 A). At 1:13 the rendering of the Vulgate, *intemptator*, is a calque of ἀπείραστος not attested elsewhere in the Latin language. On the other hand, text type F employs the positive noun *temptator* and the negation before the copula. The adjective ἀκατάστατος and noun ἀκαταστασία, ‘unstable, instability’, are rendered by *inconstans* in text type F (1:8; 3:8, 16) whereas the Vulgate has *inconstans* (1:8), *inconstantia* (3:16) and once *inquietus* (3:8). On the other hand, at 3:8 text type S renders the variant ἀκατάσχετον, ‘uncontrollable’, with *nec retinere*. At 1:27 the Vulgate

---

<sup>44</sup> See p. 100.

renders both ἀμίαντος, ‘undefiled’, and ἄσπιλος, ‘stainless’, with *inmaculatus* despite the different Greek roots. Text type S varies the translations (*incontaminatus* and *inmaculatus*) and text type F the type of rendering (*inmaculatus* and *sine macula*). At 3:17 the adjective ἀδιάκριτος, ‘impartial’,<sup>45</sup> is translated in a variety of ways in the Latin versions: the Vulgate features *non iudicans* while text type F attests the periphrasis *sine diiudicatione inreprehensibilis*, ‘unblameable without judging’, which is a free translation of the Greek compound. The rendering in Augustine’s biblical text is *inaestimabilis*: the adjective is usually employed in the passive sense, ‘that cannot be estimated or judged’ and this is the only attestation of the adjective with an active meaning. The rendering of text type T, *iudicans*, omits the negation. On the whole, the rendering of the Vulgate is the closest to the Greek text. In the same verse, the adjective ἀνυπόκριτος means ‘without dissimulation’: both the expressions *sine hypocrisi*, employed by text type F, and *sine simulatione*, the rendering of the Vulgate, match the meaning and structure of the Greek compound.

#### b.4 Etymologising Renderings

The term ‘etymologising rendering’ is employed by Burton to refer to calques and words that match the structure and etymology of the corresponding Greek terms: this practice often leads to meaningless translations which aim to correspond closely to the original text.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, the prefixes and preverbs of the Latin renderings as well as the verbs and nouns employed do not always match the Greek ones. This section presents a selected number of instances in which the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate differ.

---

<sup>45</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 16).

<sup>46</sup> Burton (2000: 195–6).

1:2: περιπέσητε: *incurritis* (F), *incideritis* (V; PS-AM; cf AN s Cas; AR; AU; PS-BAS; cf BED; CAr; EP-SC; PS-GR-M; PS-HIL-A; LI-D; LUCU; PEL; PEL: PS-HI; cf RUF; SED-S)

1:11: ἐξέπεσεν: *cadit* (F), *decidit* (V; BON; BRAU; JO-N)

1:12: ἐπηγγείλατο: *promisit* (S, F; D; CHRO; EP-L; HES; RUS Var), *repromisit* (V; PS-AM; AN Casp; AU spe; PS-BAS; CAn; EP-SC; EUS-G; GEL; HI; PS-HIL-A; PEL: PS-HI; RUS)

2:5: ἐπηγγείλατο: *expromisit* (F), *repromisit* (S, V)<sup>47</sup>

1:21a: ἀποθέμενοι: *exponentes* (F), *abicientes* (V; AN cath; AU spe; CAr; PS-HIL-A)

1:21b: ἔμφυτον: *genitum* (F), *insitum* (V; AN cath; AU spe; PS-HIL-A)

1:22: παραλογιζόμενοι: *aliter consiliantes* (F), *fallentes* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-HIL-A; PEL)

1:24: ἀπελήλυθεν: *recessit* (F; cf HI), *abiit* (V; AU; CAr)

1:25: παρακύψας: *respexit* (F), *prespexerit* (T), *prospexerit* (G), *perspexerit* (V; AU; CAr; PS-HIL-A)<sup>48</sup>

3:10: ἐξέρχεται: *exit* (F), *procedit* (V; AN cath; AU spe)

4:5: κατώκισεν: *habitat* (S, F; BEA; BED; PS-HIL-A), *inhabitat* (V; FG 53 32 CΣΛΧΔΘ QP<sup>2</sup>Ω<sup>C</sup>)

5:1: ἐπερχομένας: *superveniunt* (S), *advenientibus* (F), *advenient* (V), *adveniunt* (T)

At 1:2 the verb περιπέσητε is rendered by *incurritis* in text type F and *incideritis* in the Vulgate: although both the verbs mean ‘to bump into’, the compound of *cado* used by the Vulgate and further sources better corresponds to the compound of πίπτω. The prefix *in-*, employed by both

---

<sup>47</sup> The Vulgate text in the Vetus Latina edition has *promisit* but the Stuttgart Vulgate (2007) *repromisit*.

<sup>48</sup> Cfr. 1 Peter 1:12: παρακύψαι: *prospicere* (T, V).

the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina, does not match περί. At 1:11 the Vulgate renders ἐξέπεσεν with the matching verb *decidit* while text type F attests *cadit* without the preposition and at 4:5 translates κατόκισεν with the compound *inhabitat* instead of the simple form *habitat* (S, F).<sup>49</sup> Similarly, at 1:12 text types S and F render ἐπηγγείλατο with *promisit* and the Vulgate with *repromisit*, ‘to promise in return’, also attested at 2:5. The rendering of text type F at 2:5, *expromittere*, ‘to promise to pay’, does not match the meaning and the preverb of the Greek verb. Valgiglio states that the prepositions of the Vulgate do not exactly correspond to the Greek ones but were employed to match the structure of the Greek verbs: in *deperiit* and *repromisit* the prepositions *per* and *pro* were not perceived anymore, and new ones, *de-* and *re-*, were added to reinforce the correspondence with the Greek text.<sup>50</sup> At 1:21a text type F matches the etymology of the Greek verb translating ἀποθέμενοι with *exponentes* although the preverb and meaning of the rendering of the Vulgate, *abicientes*, are more appropriate. At 1:21b the etymology of the adjective ἔμφυτον is preserved in the rendering of the Vulgate, *insitum*, and not in that of text type F, *genitum*.<sup>51</sup> Another etymologising rendering of the Vulgate is *abiit* translating ἀπελήλυθεν at 1:24 while text type F has *recessit*. On the other hand, the rendering of F at 3:10, *exit*, matches ἐξέρχεται more than the rendering of the Vulgate, *procedit*. At 5:10 ἐπέρχομαι is rendered by the matching verb *supervenire* in text type S while F, T and the Vulgate have *advenire*. At 1:22, παραλογιζόμενοι, ‘to cheat’, is rendered by *aliter consiliantes* in text type F and *fallentes* in the Vulgate. Both the translations do not exactly correspond to

---

<sup>49</sup> Cfr. 2 Peter 3:13 (p. 214) in which the Vulgate employs the simple verb against the Vetus Latina.

<sup>50</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 72).

<sup>51</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 73).

the structure of the Greek participle but the *Vetus Latina* uses the adverb *aliter* to render παρά whereas the *Vulgate* does not translate the preverb. Differences in the use of prepositions among the Latin translations are also attested at 1:25.

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

All the abstract and derived terms present in James are listed below and the most interesting ones are described in detail:

*-io*: *dispersio* (1:1 F, V), *temptatio* (1:2 S, F, V; 1:12 F, V), *probatio* (1:3 F, V), *exaltatio* (1:9 V), *exultatio* (1:9 T; 4:16 V), *datio* (1:17 F), *permutatio* (1:17 F), *transmutatio* (1:17 V), *commutatio* (1:17 T), *immutatio* (1:17 cfNO; AU Pet, ci, s 26), *demutatio* (1:17 HIL; cfPRU), *aversio* (1:17 HI), *obumbratio* (1:17 F, V), *conditio* (1:18 F), *oblivio* (1:25 F), *religio* (1:26, 27 F, V), *tribulatio* (1:27 F, V), *acceptio* (2:1 V), *accep(ta)tio* (2:1 F), *cogitatio* (2:4 F, V), *benedictio* (3:10 F, V), *maledictio* (3:10 F, V), *conversatio* (3:13 S, F, V), *operatio* (3:13 V), *contentio* (3:14 S, F, V; 3:16 F, V), *regio* (5:4 V), *occisio* (5:5 S, F, V), *oratio* (5:15 F, V; 5:16 S; 5:17 S, F, V), *petitio* (5:16 F), *deprecatio* (5:16 V)

*-tas*: *tempestas* (1:6 V), *dignitas* (1:11 F), *humilitas* (1:10 F, V), *nativitas* (1:23 V; 3:6 F, V), *libertas* (1:25 F, V; 2:12 V), *sanctitas* (1:27 S), *liberalitas* (2:12 F), *volumptas* (3:4 F), *universitas* (3:6 V), *iniquitas* (3:6 S, F, V), *voluptas* (4:1 F), *voluntas* (4:1 S), *civitas* (4:13 S, F, V), *veritas* (1:18 F, V; 3:14 F, V; 5:19 S, F, V)

*-antia / -entia*: *sufferentia* (1:3 F; 1:4 F; 5:11 F, V), *patientia* (1:3 V; 1:4 V), *sapientia* (1:5 F, V; 3:13 F, V; 3:15 F, V; 3:17 F, V), *concupiscentia* (1:14 F, V; 1:15 S, V; 4:1 V; 4:3 V),



*conscientia* (1:14 T), *differentia* (1:17 HI), *abundantia* (1:21 F, V), *clementia* (1:21 F; 3:13 F),  
*potentia* (2:6 V), *prudentia* (3:13 S), *sustinentia* (5:11 A)

*-ura*: *creatura* (1:18 V), *scriptura* (1:8 S, F, V; 2:23 F, V; 4:5 S, F, V), *genitura* (3:6a S; 3:6b  
S)

*-do*: *altitudo* (1:9 F), *vicissitudo* (1:17 V), *mansuetudo* (1:21 V; 3:13 S, V), *similitudo* (3:9 F,  
V), *dulcedo* (3:12 T), *libido* (4:3 F), *multitudo* (5:20 F, V)

*-or*: *intemptator* (1:13 V), *temptator* (1:13 F), *auditor* (1:22, 23 F, V; 1:25 V), *factor* (1:22, 23,  
25 F, V), *transgressor* (2:9 S, F, V; 2:11 F, V), *explorator* (2:25 F), *fornicator* (4:4 F), *peccator*  
(4:8 F, V; 5:20 F, V), *factor* (4:11 S, F, V), *legislator* (4:12 V), *dator* (4:12 S), *positor* (4:12 F),  
*miserator* (5:11 V)

*-mentum*: *alimentum* (2:16 F), *vestimentum* (5:2 V), *experimentum* (5:10 F), *iuramentum* (5:12  
F, V)

*-bilis*: *inreprehensibilis* (3:17 F), *inaestimabilis* (3:17 A), *suadibilis* (3:17 V), *passibilis* (5:17 S,  
V)

Some of the derived nouns of James acquire new meanings in Christian literature. *Datio*, ‘the act of giving, allotting, distributing’, renders δόσις in text type F at 1:17. The noun is used with the meaning ‘gift’ only in juridical writings, laws and in the Bible, for instance in the Vulgate Old Testament (Sirach 11:7; 38:2; 42:3; 1 Esdras 2:7) while *datum*, the rendering of the Vulgate in this verse, is attested in the Vulgate version of Sirach and in the Vulgate New Testament at Luke 11:13 and Philippians 4:17 to translate δόμα. The use of *dulcedo* with the meaning ‘sweet taste’, at 3:12 (T), is quite rare and mainly postclassical while the meaning

‘pleasantness’ is widely attested in classical Latin.<sup>52</sup> The Vulgate and text type F have the literal translation *dulcem ... aquam* (γλυκύ ... ὕδωρ). The Greek noun δέησις is rendered by *oratio* (S), *petitio* (F) and *deprecatio* (V) at 5:16. *Petitio* acquires the Christian meaning ‘a request offered to God, a prayer’ in addition to the classical meaning ‘attack’, ‘petition’ and ‘application, candidacy’. *Deprecatio*, ‘prayer for pardon’, is attested throughout Latin literature as well as *oratio*, which undergoes a shift from the pagan meaning ‘speech, oration, discourse’ to the Christian ‘prayer’. *Civitas*, used at 4:13 with the meaning ‘city, town’ instead of ‘citizenship’ is also a case of semantic extension.<sup>53</sup> *Universitas* is present at 3:6 in the Vulgate with the meaning ‘the whole, the whole world’ and accompanied by the objective genitive *iniquitatis*, which completes the meaning of the preceding abstract noun. *Universitas* is a hapax in the Vulgate New Testament: κόσμος is commonly rendered by *mundus* (S) and *saeculum* (F).

Several abstract nouns listed above are Christian technical terms such as *exaltatio*, translating ὑψωσις, ‘glorification’, attested from Tertullian and five times in the Vulgate Old Testament while the postclassical *exultatio* (T; CΣ<sup>TCA\*</sup> Λ<sup>L\*</sup> Xτ 54\* Δ<sup>LMB\*</sup> 53? 32 GIL; AU spe Var), meaning ‘joy, exultation’, might have been confused by the copyist with *exaltatio* at 1:9. At 4:16 *exultatio* renders καύχησις, ‘boasting’, in the Vulgate: the Greek noun is also frequent in the Pauline Epistles and rendered by *gloriatio* (Romans 3:27; 2 Corinthians 7:4, 14) and *gloria* (Romans 15:17; 1 Corinthians 15:31; 2 Corinthians 1:12; 8:24; 11:10, 17; 1 Thessalonians 2:19) in the Vulgate. *Dispersio* can be considered to be a Christian term with the exception of two doubtful attestations in Cicero (*Philippicae* 3,30 and 4,9) and is also employed

---

<sup>52</sup> See p. 221.

<sup>53</sup> See also this rendering at 2 Peter 2:6 (p. 218) and Jude 7 (p. 364).

at 1 Peter 1:1 by text type S and the Vulgate to render διασπορᾶ. At 1:18 text type F employs *conditio* to render κτίσμα whereas the Vulgate has *creatura*: the rendering of text type F is a Christian term attested from the Vetus Latina onwards. *Operatio*, ‘action’, renders ἔργον only at James 3:13 (V) instead of the widespread translations *opus* (S, F) and *opera* (T) but it is employed several times in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to translate other Greek words, such as ἐνέργημα (1 Corinthians 12:6, 10), ἐνέργεια (Ephesians 1:19; 3:7; 4:16; Philippians 3:21; Colossians 1:29; 2:12; 2 Thessalonians 2:9, 11) and ἐργασία (Ephesians 4:19). Among the numerous postclassical meanings of *conversatio*, that of ‘moral habit, behaviour’ is attested in Christian writings and in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina at James 3:13 to render the corresponding ἀναστροφῆ.<sup>54</sup> This abstract term is present several times in the Catholic Epistles with a wide range of meanings. The word παραλλαγή, ‘variation’, is translated into Latin by a number of abstract nouns: *permutatio* (F), *commutatio* (T), *transmutatio* (V), *immutatio* (NO? AU Pet, ci, s 26), *demutatio* (HIL; cf PRU?), *differentia* (HI Jov) and *transformatio* (PS-AU s 247 Var). *Permutatio*, *commutatio*, *immutatio* and *differentia* are attested in the classical period; *demutatio* is rare and mainly attested in Christian Latin while *transmutatio* and *transformatio* are postclassical words. At the same verse, *obumbratio* (F, V), ‘obscuring’, is an etymologising rendering of ἀποσκίασμα, a word only attested in Christian writings. *Nativitas*, translating γένεσις at 1:23 and 3:6, is a Christian formation in opposition to the classical *ortus*. The nouns

---

<sup>54</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.) lists the meanings of *conversatio*: ‘action de se retourner, de retourner’; ‘transformation, conversion’; ‘genre de vie, manière de vivre, cité’; ‘conduite, moeurs, vie’; ‘vie monastique’; ‘relations, familiarité, intimité’; ‘commerce, conversation’; ‘relations sexuelles’.

*aversio, tribulatio, sufferentia, sustinentia* and adjectives *passibilis* and *inreprehensibilis* are also Christian coinages.

Among the *nomina agentis* attested in James *intemptator* at 1:13 (V) is noteworthy.<sup>55</sup> At 4:12 the term νομοθέτης is rendered by the corresponding Latin word *legislator* in the Vulgate. The Vetus Latina text types feature the unusual renderings *legum dator* (S) and *legum positor* (F), the latter denoting an attempt to render the etymology of the Greek term. *Dator* is usually employed with the meanings ‘founder’ and ‘donor’, often with reference to God. *Positor* is used twice by Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 9,449; *Fasti* 2,63) as a synonym of *conditor*, ‘builder’. *Dator* and *positor* are not associated with *legum* in other passages: in the Vetus Latina of James they acquire a new meaning thanks to this collocation.

The derived nouns *iuramentum* and *vestmentum* are attested in the Vulgate at 5:12 and 5:2: the former is a postclassical term also present in text type F and the latter is attested from the classical period onwards. *Iuramentum* is also present at Hebrews 6:16 in text type J and the Vulgate. The Vetus Latina text types S and T translate ἱμάτια as *vestes* and *res vestrae*. On the other hand, Burton notices a prevalence of *vestmentum* rather than *vestis* in the Old Latin Gospels.<sup>56</sup> In the Epistles ἱμάτιον is attested only three times: it is rendered by *vestmentum* in Hebrews 1:11 (text types D, J, A, V) and at 1 Peter 3:3 in text types S, T and the Vulgate whereas K and C have *vestis*. At James 2:2 ἐσθής is repeated twice and rendered as *vestis* in text type F in both the instances and as *vestis* and *habitus* in the Vulgate.

---

<sup>55</sup> See p. 64.

<sup>56</sup> Burton (2000: 100).

## b. Postclassical and Late Latin Formations

This section deals with the words of James not attested in classical literature as far as it is possible to know from the surviving evidence: some of them occur in non-Christian literature but the majority are exclusively employed in the Latin Bible and Christian writings. These terms are grouped according to their grammatical category.

The adverb *desursum*, ‘from above’, rendering ἀνωθεν, is employed for the first time in the Vetus Latina and then in the Vulgate text of James (1:17 F, V; 3:17 F, V; 3:17 V) while the Greek adverb is translated by alternative renderings in seven passages of the Gospels, in Acts 26:5 (*ab initio*), Galatians 4:9 (*denuo*) and in several cases in the Vulgate Old Testament.

The verb *inproperare*, attested at 1:5 in text type F and the Vulgate, is first present in Petronius (38,11) and later in Christian writings and in the biblical versions, for instance at 1 Peter 4:14 (K) and in the Vulgate at Matthew 27:44 and Romans 15:3. *Iustificare* (2:21 F, V; 2:24 F, T, V), ‘to forgive’, is a Christian formation first attested in Tertullian. The verb *cooperari* is used only by Christian writers and attested in the Vulgate and text type G (Σ<sup>A</sup>\* 53 GMΩ<sup>0</sup>) at 2:22, in which it renders συνεργέω, while text type F features *communicare*. The rendering of the Vulgate matches the structure of the Greek verb: this translation is also attested in the Vulgate New Testament at Mark 16:20, Romans 8:28 and 1 Corinthians 16:16. Another verb that formally corresponds to Greek and is only attested in Christian literature is *exhonorare*, ‘to dishonour’, at 2:6, rendering ἀτιμάζω in the Vulgate and text type T. On the other hand, text type F has the classical verb *frustrare*, ‘to deceive’, which does not suit the meaning of the Greek verb. *Exhonorare* is also attested three times in the Vulgate version of Sirach at 10:16, 23, 32. *Germinare* (5:18 S, F) first appeared in Seneca (*Hercules furens* 698) and in several passages of Columella and of Pliny’s *Naturalis historia*. It has several attestations in Christian writings and in the Latin Bible, two of which feature in the Vulgate New Testament

at Mark 4:27 and Hebrews 12:15. At 5:5 the Greek verb τρυφάω, ‘to live softly, luxuriously’, is rendered in text type S by the term *deliciare*, exclusively attested in Christian writings. In the same verse, the verb *iucundari* in text type G is used from the Vetus Latina onwards and mainly in Christian literature. Other verbs expressing emotions are attested at 5:13: κακοπαθέω, ‘to be in distress’, is rendered by *male pati* (S), *anxiare* (F), *adfligere* (T) and *tristari* (V). *Anxiare* is the only attestation of the active voice of this verb together with that in Pseudo-Augustine (*Sermo* 223,2) while the deponent is more common in Christian literature, for instance in the Vulgate at 2 Esdras 6:37. The verb *tristari* is also rare: according to Lewis and Short it is present in Seneca (*De providentia* 2,3) and then in a few Christian sources.<sup>57</sup> At 5:14 the Vulgate features *infirmari* rendering ἀσθενέω: the active voice is current in classical Latin whereas the deponent is frequent in Christian Latin, for instance at John 4:46, 11:2, 3, 6.<sup>58</sup> The verb *humiliare* is a Christian formation: it is employed in the passive voice with active and reflexive meaning at 4:10 (S, V) to render the passive aorist imperative ταπεινώθητε whereas text type T has the active form *humiliate* followed by the reflexive pronoun *vos*. *Humiliate vos* is also attested in text type S to translate the passive aorist imperative ὑποτάγητε at 4:7.<sup>59</sup> The reflexive construction is employed to put emphasis on the subject of the action in contrast with other objects of the sentence and to underline the fact that the action affects the subject.<sup>60</sup> The verb *minare*, ‘to drive’, is employed by the Vulgate at 3:4 to render the corresponding Greek verb ἐλαύνω: the rendering of the Vulgate seems to be more appropriate to the context than that of

---

<sup>57</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.), Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

<sup>58</sup> Burton (2000: 182).

<sup>59</sup> Cfr. 1 Peter 5:6 (pp. 166–7).

<sup>60</sup> Stolz and Schmalz (1928: 546).

text types S and F, *ferre*, which is generic. The active voice is postclassical and less common than the deponent *minari*, which has the different meaning, ‘to threaten’, and is used several times in the Vulgate Old Testament and once in the Vulgate Acts at 18:16. At 2:6 the verb καταδυναστεύω, ‘to oppress’, is rendered by F with *potentari*, which is first attested in the Vetus Latina, for instance in the New Testament at Mark 10:42 (VL 1), Matthew 20:25 (VL 27), Romans 4:20 (VL 77), 2 Corinthians 12:10 (VL 77), 13:3 (VL 77). The Vulgate features the alternative rendering *per potentiam opprimere*. At 4:8 the Vulgate and text type T use the verb *adpropiare* to translate ἐγγίζω, which is also attested in James at 5:8 (F) and in the Vulgate at Romans 13:12: Burton notes that this verb is either a Christian calque or a vulgar form widespread in the Vetus Latina.<sup>61</sup> The Vulgate and text type F attest the postclassical verb *manducare* instead of *comedere* (S) at 5:3. On the other hand, at 5:9 both F and the Vulgate have *ianua* to translate θύρα and not *porta*, which will be predominant in the Romance languages.<sup>62</sup>

The word *fornicaria* (2:25 F), translating πόρνη, is employed in Christian literature and frequently in the Vetus Latina while the Vulgate shows a preference for *meretrix* (1 Corinthians 6:15; Hebrews 11:31; Revelation 17:1, 15; 19:2) with the exception of Revelation 17:16 in which *fornicaria* is used not to repeat *meretrix*, present in the neighbouring passage. Similarly, text type F has *fornicator* at 4:4 translating μοιχαλῖς instead of *adulter*. *Fornicator* is frequently attested in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles to translate πόρνος (1 Corinthians 5:11; Ephesians 5:5; Hebrews 12:16; 13:4). The Latin renderings of πετεινῶν and ἐναλίωv at 3:7 need consideration:

---

<sup>61</sup> Burton (2000: 161).

<sup>62</sup> The same tendency is noticeable in the Gospels (Burton, 2000: 167).

3:7: πετεινῶν: *avium* (S), *volatiliium* (F), *volucrum* (V; AN cath)

3:7: ἐναλίωv: *belvarum maritimarum* (S), *natantium* (F), *piscium* (T; τ<sup>56.70</sup> 54\*?), *ceterorum* (V; AN cath), *ceterorumque* (A)

In the first case, text type F and the Vulgate have substantival adjectives as the Greek text: *volatile* started being used in late Latin while *volucris* is a classical and poetic term and the most frequent rendering of πετεινός in the Vulgate New Testament. In the second instance, the periphrasis of text type S corresponds to the meaning of the Greek adjective, ‘sea creature’, whereas *natantium* refers to the ability to swim and *piscium* to precise animals. The rendering of the Vulgate, *ceterorum*, either is a translation of the possible variant ἄλλων, which, however, is not attested in the ECM, or a scribal mistake for *cetorum*, usually employed with reference to big fishes and whales. *Cetus* is attested in Plautine comedy, in Virgil (*Aeneid* 5,822) and in postclassical authors such as Pliny the Elder, Vitruvius, Columella but becomes very common in the Christian period.

At 3:11, 12 text type F twice uses the postclassical adjective *salmacidus*, ‘having a sour and salt taste’, to translate both πικρόν, ‘bitter’, and ἀλυκόν, ‘salty’: the renderings of the Vulgate, *amaram aquam* and *salsa*, correspond to the different meanings of the Greek terms. The postclassical adjective *temporivus* is employed by the Vulgate at 5:7 to render πρόμιος: the same term in association with *serotinum* is also used in the Vulgate version of Deuteronomy 11:14. The Vetus Latina has *matutinum* (F) and *temporaneum* (T), another late Latin term instead of the classical *tempestivus*. The adjective *superstitiosus* is employed at 1:26 in text type S to render θρησκός, ‘religious’, while the Vulgate and text type F feature *religiosus*: *superstitiosus* is attested in early and classical Latin with the meanings ‘superstitious’ and ‘prophetic’. In late Latin it retains the negative connotation and acquires the new meaning



‘over-scrupulous’ (Vulgate Acts 17:22; Jerome, Epistle 52,12).<sup>63</sup> James 1:26 seems to be the only passage in which the adjective is not used in the pejorative sense.

### c. Rare Words

James is a precious source for the study of the lexicon in that it contains a number of rare words, often otherwise unattested in Latin literature. The translations of δαμονιώδης at 3:15 are noteworthy: text type F has *demonetica*, the Vulgate *diabolica* and manuscript D features *zabulitica*. The formation of F is a hapax while the majority of the sources for this verse (V; AN cath; AU; CAr; FU; GR-M; HES; PS-HIL-A; PROS) have *diabolica*, a well attested Christian loan-word from the Greek διαβολικός but a hapax in the Vulgate New Testament.<sup>64</sup> The alternative forms with assibilation *zabulus / zabolus* and *zabulicus / zabolicus* were in use from the fourth century but neither *zabuliticus* or *diabuliticus* are attested in other Latin sources: it is uncertain whether this term is a mistake for *zabulicus* or a hapax. The Latin translations of the verb κατακαυχάομαι, ‘to exult over’, need special attention: at 2:13 text types F, T and the Vulgate resort to the rare renderings *supergloriari* (F), *superexaltare* (T) and *superexultare* (V; FGI<sup>Θ</sup>H\*M\*τ; AU; Car; BEN-N) which match the verb but not the preverb of the Greek term. A probable confusion in the manuscript tradition between *superexultare* and *superexaltare*, which differ in a single letter, should not be disregarded. Valgiglio underlines that the preposition *super* is used either to reinforce the meaning of the verb or to indicate the movement downwards expressed in Greek by κατά.<sup>65</sup> The accusative *iudicium* following

---

<sup>63</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>64</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 147).

<sup>65</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 214).

*supergloriari* in text type F is dependent on the preposition and not on the verb, which usually governs the ablative. On the other hand, text type S features the verb *praeferre* which does not stress the idea of superiority expressed by the Greek verb and the other Latin renderings. At 3:14 the Vulgate varies the translation of κατακυχάομαι and employs *gloriari*, which is also the rendering present at Romans 11:18, whereas F (VL 66) has *alapari*. This rare verb of uncertain origin is a revival of an archaic word attested in Plautus (*Truculentus* 928) and later in the fifth-century poem of Commodianus (*Carmen apologeticum* 457). Another very rare verb is attested in the Vetus Latina text types S (PRIS; PS-AU spe) and F (VL 66) at 5:2: *tiniaverunt* translating σητόβρωτα γέγονεν, ‘to be infested by moths’. This is a formation derived from the noun *tinea* and attested only once beside this passage in the present tense *tineant* in the Vulgate version of Baruch 6:71. In James, the Vulgate uses the periphrasis *a tineis comesta sunt* (V; AU spe; BEA; CAE; FU; PS-HIL-A; PEL: PS-HI; PIR; SALV). At 5:3 both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina (text types S, F) feature the verb *aeruginare* derived from the noun *aerugo*, ‘rust’, and attested only in the Vulgate version of Sirach 12:10 and in Venantius Fortunatus (*Praefatio carminum* 5,6). At 3:17 the adjective *suadibilis* (V; AN Wil; AU; PS-HIL-A; PROS), ‘that may be persuaded’, translating εὐπειθής, is a hapax in the Vulgate and attested from the fourth century. It is also used in Augustine (*De civitate dei* 18,51) in an active sense, with the meaning ‘persuasive’.<sup>66</sup> The adjective *satullus* used by text type F at 2:16 to render χορτάζεσθε (*satiemini* in S and *saturamini* in V) is attested once outside this passage in Varro (*De re rustica* 2,2,25), in which it refers to lambs.

---

<sup>66</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.), Souter (1949: ad loc.).

#### d. Revivals of Archaic Words

Several words not in use in the classical period reappear in the Latin versions of James.<sup>67</sup> The expression ἐν τῇ ποιήσει at 1:25 is translated by *in operibus* (F), *in facto* (V; AU; CAR; PS-HIL-A), *in factu* (T; τ<sup>70</sup>Δ<sup>LB\*</sup>). The term *factus*, *-us*, to be distinguished from *factum*, *-i*, is rarely employed in this sense: it is used in Cato (*De agricultura* 67,1) and in a fragment preserved by Columella (*Res rustica* 11,1,4), then in Pliny (*Naturalis historia* 15,23) to refer to pressed oil. The meaning ‘act, effect’ arose in late Latin (Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Mythologiae* 2,5 p. 45; Paulinus of Nola, Epistle 31,2; Verecundus, *Commentarii super cantica ecclesiastica* 6,28). Either confusion in the manuscript tradition between *factu* and *facto* or a metaplasm of declension are possible explanations of this form. The noun *inmunditia*, attested in the Vulgate at 1:21 (V; AN cath; AU spe; CAR; PS-HIL-A; KA C) and in numerous Christian writings, is present once in Plautus (*Stichus* 747), three times in Columella (*Res rustica* 1,6,11; 12,3,8; 12,52,21) and in an uncertain passage of Fronto (p. 207,14 N.).<sup>68</sup> The adjective *disciplinosus* (F) at 3:13 instead of *sciens* (S) and *disciplinatus* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-HIL-A), rendering ἐπιστήμων, is attested in fragment 14 of Cato’s *De re militari* and in fragment 42 from an uncertain book of Cato. The term reappears in the fourth century in Nonius Marcellus (*De compendiosa doctrina* p. 463) and in the *Tractatus Ariani cuiusdam in euangelium secundum*

---

<sup>67</sup> It is also possible that further attestations of these terms have been lost. Therefore, it is important to consider such instances on a case-by-case basis and be aware that the analysis is based on the evidence that we have, which might be misleading due to its incompleteness.

<sup>68</sup> Pezzini (2016: 43). Cfr. 2 Peter 2:10 (p. 223).

*Lucam*.<sup>69</sup> On the other hand, the rendering of the Vulgate, *disciplinatus*, is employed by Christian authors from Tertullian onwards. At 4:2 the Vulgate translates πολεμεῖτε with *belligerare* (V; PS-HIL-A). This verb is attested in Plautus (*Captivi* 24; *Persa* 26; *Truculentus* 628) and Ennius (*Annales* 195 Vahl). It is scarcely used in the classical period and becomes very frequent in Christian literature. The Vetus Latina has the classical *pugnatis* (F).

#### 4. Morphology

The Latin versions of James attest metaplasms and analogical verbal forms. An ambiguous case is the translation of κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν as *iudices cogitationum malorum* in text type F at 2:4: either the masculine adjective *malorum* demonstrates that *cogitatio* underwent a metaplasm of gender under the influence of the Greek masculine noun διαλογισμός or is an objective genitive referred to the preceding noun with the meaning ‘judges of thoughts of evil things’.<sup>70</sup> On the other hand, the regular feminine is attested in text type T and the Vulgate in the rendering *iudices cogitationum iniquarum*. The perfect forms of the verb *putrescere* start being used in the Vetus Latina: at 5:2 text types S and F translate σέσηπεν with *putruerunt* and *putrierunt* respectively. The perfect passive indicative *vocitum est* at 2:6, attested in text type F, is a parallel form instead of *vocatum* (*invocatum* in the Vulgate) also

---

<sup>69</sup> Similarly, *obliviosus* (1:25 V) is attested in Plautus (*Miles* 890) as well as in many Christian writings. However, it cannot be considered to be a revival of an archaic word because it is also used by Cicero (*De inventione* 1,35; *Cato maior de senectute* 36) and by Horace (*Carmina* 2,7,21).

<sup>70</sup> I am grateful to Dr Burton for this suggestion.

identified by Souter in the biblical text of Cyprian and in CIL 2.4514.I.31.<sup>71</sup> Conversely, the analogical perfect *domata* (32 251 65 ADL<sup>2</sup>M; AN; PS-HIL-A; BED cath) instead of *domita* (F, V) is attested at 3:7.<sup>72</sup> At 1:10 *παρελεύσεται* is rendered as *transibit* in the Vulgate, *transiit* or *transivit* in T and *transiet* in F: the latter is an analogical future form equivalent to *transibit* while the reading of T can be either an orthographical variation for *transibit* considering that the confusion between *b* and *v* is quite common in manuscripts or the perfect may have been used to stress the perfective aspect of the action. The analogical superlative *parvissimus*, at 3:4 in PS-AU spe, is attested in the classical period in Varro and Lucretius and in a few later instances in technical and Christian writings.<sup>73</sup> The presence of the metaplasm of declension *longanimi* at 5:8 in text type G was highlighted above.<sup>74</sup>

The change of the voice of verbs is a common phenomenon in late Latin: the cases of the verbs *anxiare*, *tristari*, *infirmari*, *humiliari*, *minare* were described above.<sup>75</sup> *Lucrificare* is used as a deponent at 4:13 in text type S in which *lucrificari* means ‘to make a profit’.<sup>76</sup> At 5:4 the participle τῶν θερισάντων is rendered by *qui messi sunt* in text type F: the verb *metere*, ‘to reap’, is used here as a deponent: the other attestation of this metaplasm of voice is in Irenaeus

---

<sup>71</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>72</sup> Vineis (1974: 140–1) affirms that the supine formed on the basis of the a- stem verbs is attested for the first time in Petronius.

<sup>73</sup> See p. 94.

<sup>74</sup> See p. 63.

<sup>75</sup> See pp. 74–5.

<sup>76</sup> See 1 Peter 3:1 (pp. 162–3).

4,25,3. At 2:16 the verbs *calefacere*, *satiare* and *saturare* are used in the passive form but with active meaning:

2:16: θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε: *calefacimini et satiemini* (S), *saturabimini* (T), *calefaciamini* (G), *calefacimini et saturamini* (V)

These ‘deponents’ match the middle voice of the Greek verbs which have a reflexive nuance. In addition, we would expect *calefitis* and not *calefacimini*: the analogical passive conjugated according to the stem of *facio* and not of *fiō* is rare and attested only in Vitruvius 5,10,1 (*calfaciantur*), 4,7,4 (*concalefaciuntur*) and Oribasius, *Synopsis ad Eustathium* 6,14 (*calefaciuntur*).<sup>77</sup>

Two heteroclite forms with alternative gender of a noun and declension of an adjective can be noticed in James. At 3:3 the heteroclite plural *frenos* is attested in text type F and the Vulgate instead of *frena* in text type S: the neutral form is poetic while the masculine is frequent in prose. The heteroclite dative *humilis* is attested in text type F at 4:6 in contrast with *humilibus* of text type S and the Vulgate.

---

<sup>77</sup> Vineis (1974: 143–4).

## 5. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

It is well known that *verba sentiendi et declarandi* are usually followed in the Latin Bible by completive clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia* and *quoniam* translating ὅτι plus the indicative.<sup>78</sup> The following instances are attested in James:

1:3: γινώσκοντες ὅτι ... κατεργάζεται: *scientes quod ... operatur* (F, V)

1:7: μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμψεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου: *nec speret se homo ille quoniam accipiet aliquid a domino* (F), *non ergo aestimet homo ille quod accipiat aliquid a domino* (V)

1:13: λεγέτω ὅτι ... πειράζομαι: *dicat quoniam ... temptatur / temptor* (S, F / V)

2:19: πιστεύεις ὅτι ... ἐστίν: *credis quia ... est* (S, F), *credis quoniam ... est* (V)

2:20: γινῶναι ... ὅτι ... ἐστίν: *scire ... quoniam ... est* (F, V), *scire ... quia* (C)

2:22: βλέπεις ὅτι ... συνήργει: *vides quoniam ... communicat / cooperabatur* (F / V)

2:24: ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ... δικαιούται: *videtis quoniam ... iustificatur* (F, V)

3:1: εἰδότες ὅτι ... λημψόμεθα (λήψεσθε variant): *scientes quoniam ... accipiemus / sumitis* (F / V)

4:4: οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ... ἐστίν: *nescitis quoniam ... est* (F), *nescitis quia ... est* (V)

---

<sup>78</sup> Plater and White (1926: 119–21), García De La Fuente (1994: 64, 75, 238–9, 309), García De La Fuente (1981), Burton (2000: 189–90).

4:5: ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει: *aut put<atis quia ina>nis dic<i>t scribtura (S), aut putatis quoniam dicit scriptura (F, T), aut putatis quia inaniter scriptura dicat (V)*

5:20: γινώσκετε ὅτι ... σώσει: *<scire> debet quia ... salvat (S), scire debet quoniam ... salvabit (V)*

It is possible to notice that *quoniam* is the most frequent conjunction in the Vulgate.<sup>79</sup> The translation of the ὅτι clause at 1:7 is significant: *sperare* and *aestimare* govern a completive clause in accordance with the Greek construction although these verbs are usually followed by the accusative and infinitive: ὅτι is rendered by *quoniam* and the future in text type F and *quod* plus the present subjunctive in the Vulgate. The use of the reflexive pronoun *se* after *sperare* is noteworthy: in the apparatus, Thiele suggests that *sperare se* is used instead of the passive.<sup>80</sup> The reflexive pronoun in the accusative or dative case following verbs of movement, of status and *verba sentiendi et declarandi* originated in popular Latin according to Löfstedt.<sup>81</sup> The construction of *nescire* with *quia*, present at 4:4, is typical of the biblical versions.<sup>82</sup> At 4:5 the present subjunctive is attested in the Vulgate (V; BEA; PS-HIL-A) instead of the present indicative. The Vulgate has the subjunctive and the Vetus Latina the indicative in the direct speech at 2:14 (τί τὸ ὄφελος: *quid prode est S, quit prodest F, quid proderit V*), in the indirect speech at 1:24 (ὅποῖος ἦν: *qualis erat F, qualis fuerit V*) and in the adverbial clause expressing a cause at 4:3 (διότι ... αἰτεῖσθε: *propter hoc ... petitis F, eo hoc ... petatis V*).

---

<sup>79</sup> See p. 282.

<sup>80</sup> Thiele (1969: 10): ‘von jenem Me[n]schen soll man nicht meinen bzw. hoffen’.

<sup>81</sup> Löfstedt (1911: 140–3).

<sup>82</sup> García De La Fuente (1994: 57).



## a.2 Greek Constructions

The Latin versions feature a wide variety of verbal constructions modelled on Greek. The accusative with adverbial function, typical of the Greek language and here with the meaning ‘on many occasions’, is retained in the *Vetus Latina* while the Graecism is not attested in the *Vulgate*, which has *in* plus the ablative:

3:2: πολλὰ γὰρ πταίομεν ἅπαντες

*multa enim omnes delinquimus* (S)

*multa autem erramus omnes* (F)

*multa peccamus omnes* (HI ep 57, Jov)

*in multis enim offendimus omnes* (V; AN cath; AU; CO-Mil; EP-SC; FAC; FEnd; GR-M; HI ep 50, Pel; PS-HIL-A; LEO; LUCU; ORO; RUF; S-L; SALO)

At 3:7 the *Vetus Latina* keeps the number of the verbs as in Greek:

3:7: πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν, ἔρπετῶν τε καὶ ἐναλίων δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται

*omnis enim natura bestiarum et avium et serpentium et beluarum domatur et subiecta est* (S)

*omnis autem natura bestiarum sive volatiliū reptantium et natantium domatur et domita est* (F)

*omnis enim natura bestiarum et volucrum et serpentium etiam ceterorum domantur et domita sunt* (V)

*domitantur* (T)

In text types S and F the singular subject is connected with a singular third-person verb while the *Vulgate* and text type T have a *concordatio ad sensum* in which the verbs become plural under the influence of the plural genitives. In many instances the Latin verbs govern the same

case as the Greek ones: at 2:13 the verb *misereri* is followed by the dative, as in Greek, instead of the genitive of the person:

2:13: ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι: *non miserebitur ei qui non fecit* (F)

The construction of *miserere* with the dative appears in Seneca the Elder (*Controversiae* 1,2,3), Quintilian (*Declamationes* 272 p. 115,15), Pseudo-Quintilian (*Declamationes excerpta monacensia* p. 1116,37) and becomes widespread in Christian literature, in particular in the Vetus Latina, while the genitive is frequent in non-Christian literature. The use of the dative arose under the influence of the construction of *parcere*, *indulgere* and *ignoscere* or possibly because of confusion between the genitive and dative in a- stem nouns.<sup>83</sup> At 1:25 the genitive follows *audire* in text type F instead of the accusative:

1:25: ἀκροατῆς ἐπιλησιμονῆς: *audiens oblivionis* (F)

*Benedicere* governs the accusative at 3:9 in text types F, C and the Vulgate:

3:9: εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα: *benedicimus dominum et patrem* (F, V), *deum* (C), *domino* (T; CΣΛL<sup>L</sup> τ<sup>56</sup>; PS-RUF), *patri* (T; CΣΛτ<sup>56.70</sup>; PS-RUF)

The accusative matches the Greek case while text type T has the dative.<sup>84</sup> At 2:7 it is possible to notice another Greek accusative:

---

<sup>83</sup> Vineis (1974: 154–5).

<sup>84</sup> Mohrmann (1965: 53, 65) affirms that *benedicere* with the accusative becomes a verbal construction typical of Christian writings in contrast with *benedicere* plus the dative.

2:7: βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα: *blasphemant in bono nomine* (F), *blasphemant bonum nomen* (V; AN cath; AU; SALV), *nomen bonum* (T; τ 251 D; AU spe Var; PS-HIL-A)

The Greek accusative following *blasphemare* is widespread in Latin and sometimes replaced by *in* and accusative. *In* plus the ablative is not attested elsewhere but probably arose in text type F because of the frequent confusion in late Latin between accusative and ablative following *in*. Another Greek construction can be observed at 3:7:

3:7: δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ  
*domita est nature autem humane* (F; HI; PS-AU spe)  
*domita sunt a natura humana* (V; cf PS-HIL-A)

The dative, instead of *a* and the ablative, is governed by the passive verb in text type F, as it occurs in Greek. The construction of *orare* with *super* instead of *pro* is modelled on Greek:

5:14: προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτόν  
*orent super ipsum / eum* (F / V)

*Super* is attested only in three further instances (2 Paralipomena 32:20 VL 109; Gregory of Tours, *De miraculis Thomae apostoli* p. 100,2; *Vita Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis* 2,4). On the other hand, *orare* governs *pro* at 5:16 (F, V). The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina differ in the rendering of 2:23:

2:23: ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην  
*estimatum est ei ad iustitiam* (F)  
*reputatum est illi ad iustitiam* (V; AU s; cf CHRY; FU; HES; cf PS-HIL-A; ILD; IR; cf RUF)

The construction of the Vulgate with *reputare* plus the dative of the person to whom something is charged is postclassical and a suitable translation of the Greek expression. On the other hand, *aestimare* means ‘to value’ and is usually followed by the genitive and ablative of quality and price: in this verse text type F makes a word-for-word translation of the Greek verse, which is meaningless in Latin.

#### b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax

The first attestation of the verb *retractare* with the meaning ‘to blame’ is in Gellius (14,3,4).<sup>85</sup> In the instance below the verb is followed by *de* and the ablative instead of the accusative employed in the classical period:

4:11: μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων ... ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ... καταλαλεῖ νόμου

*retractare de alterutro ... qui retractat de fratre ... retractat de lege* (F; ΛΣ<sup>0</sup>Θ<sup>H\*</sup>?; AU spe; AU)

This construction is also attested at 1 Peter 2:12 (καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν: *retractant de vobis* K). In late Latin the preposition *de* replaces the genitive, which is present in Greek.<sup>86</sup> A further instance of this usage is present at 5:10:

5:10: ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε ἀδελφοί τῆς κακοπαθίας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας

*accipite experimentum fratres de malis passionibus et de patientia* (F)

*exemplum accipite fratres laboris et patientiae* (V; AN cath; CAr; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>85</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>86</sup> Adams (2011: 267–8).

In text type F *experimentum*, which means ‘example’ in this verse, is followed by *de* and the ablative while the Greek text and the Vulgate have the regular genitives. Two different temporal subordinates are employed at 1:2:

1:2: ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις

*quando in varias temptationes incurritis* (F; AU s Mai; CAr cpl<sup>com</sup>)

*cum in temptationibus variis incideritis* (V)

Text type F has *quando*, ‘when’, plus the indicative: this construction is first attested in Plautus and often avoided in classical and postclassical prose.<sup>87</sup> On the other hand, the Vulgate has *cum* and subjunctive (V; PS-AM; AR; AU; PS-BAS; BED; CAr; EP-SC; PS-GR-M; PS-HIL-A; LI-D; LUCU; PEL; PEL:PS-HI; RUF; SED-S). At 5:20, ὁ ἐπιστρέψας, ‘who converted [someone]’, is rendered by *qui converti fecerit* in the Vulgate: the use of the verb *facere* plus the infinitive with a causative function becomes widespread in late and medieval Latin.<sup>88</sup> *Facere* plus infinitive is also attested in early and classical Latin with the meaning ‘to portray, show’ and often in poetry for metrical reasons.<sup>89</sup> The causative construction is frequently attested in Romance languages but while the Latin construction is biclausal (*facere* plus accusative and infinitive) the Romance one is monoclausal (*facere* and the infinitive become a single verbal form that governs the accusative).<sup>90</sup> *Facere* plus infinitive is also attested at Ephesians 2:6 in the Vulgate and at Mark 9:18 in VL 1 as well as in other passages from the

---

<sup>87</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 607).

<sup>88</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 325), Hoffmann (2008: 170–1).

<sup>89</sup> Vincent (2016: 299–301).

<sup>90</sup> Vincent (2016: 312).

Old and New Testament listed by Vincent.<sup>91</sup> The *Vetus Latina* translates the Greek participle as *qui revocaverit* (S, F).

The Greek negative imperative is mostly rendered by *nolite* and infinitive in both the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* (1:16: μή πλανᾶσθε: *nolite errare* S, V; 2:1: μή ... ἔχετε: *nolite ... habere* F, V; 3:1: μή ... γίνεσθε: *nolite ... esse* S, F, *nolite ... fieri* V; 3:14: μή κατακαυχᾶσθε: *nolite gloriari* V; 4:11: μή καταλαλεῖτε: *nolite detrahere* S, V, *nolite retractare* F; 5:9: μή στενάζετε: *nolite ingemescere* F, V; 5:12: μή ὀμνύετε: *nolite iurare* F, V). The classical construction of *nolite* with the infinitive is the most frequent in the Gospels too in contrast with *ne* and subjunctive, which appears in early Latin, becomes rare in the classical period and re-emerges in late Latin.<sup>92</sup> At James 1:7 *ne, nec, non* plus the subjunctive are employed (μή γὰρ οἰέσθω: *ne enim existimet* S, T; *nec speret se* F; *non ergo aestimet* V).

The expressions of time are rendered by different cases in the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* at 5:17:

5:17: καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐνιαυτοὺς τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ

*et non pluit super terram annis <tribus> et mensibus sex* (S)

*et non pluit in terra annis tribus et mensibus sex* (F)

*et non pluit annos tres et menses sex* (V; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

In the funeral inscriptions of imperial age, the ablative is employed more frequently than the accusative to indicate duration: according to Suárez Martínez, the ablative is preferred because

---

<sup>91</sup> Vincent (2016: 296). However, James 5:20 is not included in the list.

<sup>92</sup> Harrison (1986: 258–62).

it is a marked case expressing circumstantiality in opposition to the unmarked accusative.<sup>93</sup> James 5:17 makes reference to a timeframe of three years and a half: text types S and F render the expression of time with the postclassical ablative while the Vulgate has the accusative according to Greek.

## 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

### a. Number

In this section it will be observed whether the Vulgate keeps the number of Greek nouns and participles or not in order to investigate its relationship with the Greek text. The variations in number due to the presence of Greek variants reported in the ECM are not taken into consideration. In the following instance, the Vulgate and text type F differ in number and in the lexical rendering:

1:11: ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται

*locuples in actu suo marcescit* (F)

*dives in itineribus suis marcescet* (V; AU; BON)

The term πορεία means either ‘journey’ or ‘purpose, pursuit, undertaking’: the latter is the most suitable meaning for this passage.<sup>94</sup> The rendering of text type F does not match the number of the Greek noun: the rendering *actus* refers to the activity or to the conduct of the wealthy man who is the subject of the sentence. On the other hand, the rendering of the Vulgate matches the number of the Greek expression but has a vague meaning: *in itineribus suis* might be intended

---

<sup>93</sup> Suárez Martínez (1994).

<sup>94</sup> The English Standard Version translates the term with ‘pursuits’.

as ‘in their ways’. Other renderings of the Vulgate corresponding to the number of Greek nouns and participles are listed below:

1:21: ῥυπαρίαν: *sordes* (F), *inmunditias* (CAr), *inmunditiam* (V; AN cath; AU spe; PS-HIL-A)

1:25: ἔργου: *operum* (F), *operis* (V; AU Ps, spe; CAr Ps; PS-HIL-A; FU)

1:25: ἐν τῇ ποιήσει: *in operibus* (F), *in factu* (T), *operatione* (CAr), *in facto* (V)

3:4: τοῦ εὐθύνοντος: *eorum qui eas gubernant* (F), *dirigentis* (S, V)

3:14: ἐριθείαν: *contentionem* (S, F), *contentiones* (V; AN cath; AU; CAr; GR-M; PS-HIL-A; PROS)

4:16: ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις: *in superbia* (F; cf AU s; CAr), *in superbiis* (V; AN cath; AU spe; BEA; PS-HIL-A)

4:17a: εἰδότι: *scientibus* (F), *scienti* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-AU; BEA; GR-M; HI; PS-HIL-A; IS; RUF)

4:17b: ποιοῦντι: *facientibus* (F), *facienti* (V; AU; PS-AU; BEA; GR-M; HI; PS-HIL-A; IS; RUF)

4:17c: αὐτοῖς: *illis* (F), *illi* (V; AU; PS-AU; BEA; GR-M; PS-HIL-A; RUF)

5:4a: μισθός: *mercedes* (F), *merces* (V; AN cath; AU spe; BEA; FU; PS-HIL-A)

5:4b: βοαί: *voces* (F), *clamor* (V; AU spe; BEA; FU)

5:10: κακοπαθίας: *malis passionibus* (F), *laboris* (V; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

5:20: ἁμαρτιῶν: *peccati* (F), *peccatorum* (V; AMst; AU spe; BEA; [BON]; CAE)

The Vulgate matches the number of the Greek words against text type F in eleven instances out of thirteen. On the other hand, at 3:14 the Vulgate renders ἐριθείαν with the plural *contentiones* against the Vetus Latina text types S and F, which have the singular *contentionem*. In addition, at 5:4b βοαί is rendered by *voces* in text type F and *clamor* in the Vulgate. On the whole, the



Vulgate tends to keep the number as in Greek in contrast with text type F. At 1:27 text type S employs *in angustia* to render ἐν τῇ θλίψει although the term is usually attested in the plural form. The singular becomes frequent in the biblical versions: according to the TLL, it has 47 attestations in the singular and 17 in the plural in the Vulgate.<sup>95</sup> In the Vulgate New Testament the singular is present three times (Romans 2:9; 8:35; 2 Corinthians 2:4).

#### b. Comparatives and Superlatives

The following list contains the comparatives and superlatives attested in James and their Latin translations. The comparison between the Greek text and the Latin versions aims to assess whether the Latin renderings have the same degree as the original adjectives.

1:16: ἀγαπητοί: *dilecti* (S; 66 τ<sup>56.70</sup> 65; HI; PROS), *dilectissimi* (V; AU spe)

1:17: ἀγαθή: *bona* (F; AMst; cf BRAU; cf CAE; cf CO-Araus; cf HI; KA b; cf MART; cf RUF Rm; cf RUR; cf VEN), *optimum* (V; AN cath, Wil; AU; PS-AU; Brev. Goth.; CAr; Claudius Taurin.; COL-C; CY-T; EP-SC; FEnd; FU; GEL; PS-GR-M; PS-HIL; JO-N; KA C; LEO; LUCU; PRAE; PROS; [PROS]; SALV; SED-S; PS-VIC; VIG-P)

2:5: ἀγαπητοί: *dilecti* (S; 66 Λ 65 Ω<sup>D</sup> 59; PS-HIL-A), *dilectissimi* (V; AU ep 167, spe; SALV)

3:1: πολλοί: *multi* (F, T; 53; AU Jo; cf CAr<sup>com</sup>; PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup>), *plures* (V; AN cath; AU re pr, pr, s 23, spe; CAr; FAC; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

3:4: ἐλαχίστου: *parvissimo* (S), *parvulo* (F), *modico* (V; PS-AM)

4:6: μείζονα: *magis* (S), *maiorem* (F, V)

5:3: ἐσχάταις: *novissimis* (F, V)

---

<sup>95</sup> TLL 2.0.59.35.

The Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* disagree in five instances out of seven. The Vulgate employs superlatives to render positive adjectives at 1:16, 17; 2:5; 5:3. The use of superlatives for positive adjectives denoting affection is common in the biblical translations and Christian literature generally speaking.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, the Greek superlative at 3:4 is rendered by the positive adjective *modico* in the Vulgate, by the diminutive *parvulo* in text type F and the superlative *parvissimus* in PS-AU spe, which is an analogical form equivalent to *minimus*, also attested in Varro (*Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta* 375), Lucretius (1,615, 621 and 3,199), Festus (p. 330), *Scholia in Horatium* (*Carmina* 2,15,14), Pseudo-Asconius (*In divinationem in Q. Caecilium* p. 203,3), Vegetius (*Epitoma rei militaris* 1,8; *Digesta artis mulomedicinae* 4 *praef.*2), Rufinus (*Historia monachorum* 223), Vindicianus (*Gynaecia* 445 *recensio* C), Orosius (*Historiae adversum paganos* 2,18,4). The Vulgate uses the comparative *plures* at 3:1 while text type F has the positive form *multi* according to Greek.

## 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the *Vetus Latina*

### a. Rendering of Greek Articles

The Latin versions often feature demonstrative adjectives when the Greek text has articles. In the following cases, the Vulgate disagrees with the *Vetus Latina*:

1:27: ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου: *a mundo* (S), *a seculo* (F), *ab hoc saeculo* (V; AU spe; CO-Tol; PS-HIL-A), *huius saeculi* (AU)

2:3: ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιον: *illo sub scamello* (F), *sub scabello* (V)

---

<sup>96</sup> Burton (2000: 177–8), Plater and White (1926: 67–8). See p. 288.

2:5: τῷ κόσμῳ (τοῦ κόσμου τούτου in GA 61, 180Z, 326\*, 398, 1837, 2523, 2544Z, 2674, L2087): *seculi* (F), *in hoc mundo* (V; AN cath; AU ep 167, spe; EP-L; SALV)

4:4a: τοῦ κόσμου (+ τουτού in GA 01, 442, 1501, 1735, 2344, 2523, L596, L1441): *mundi* (S; FIR Var; AU s 125; AN Casp; EP-SC; KA), *saeculi* (F, T; Ω<sup>C</sup>; cf DAM?; PEL Casp; KA C), *huius mundi* (V; AN cath; AU s 162; s Mai, spe; CAE; CAr Rm; FIR, FU; PS-HIL-A; PEL Rm; PEL: PS-AU vit), *saeculi huius* (PEL Casp)

4:4b: τοῦ κόσμου: *seculi* (F), *seculi huius* (V; FAGIL 251 53 32 CΣ<sup>TCOA2</sup>ΛXτ 54 Δ 262 Θ 65 MQΦΡΩ 59; AU spe; PEL Casp, Rm Var; RUF; AU Jo 79, s Wil Var; CAE; GR-M; IS; BED cath 6 mss; BEA; PS-AU s Mai), *huius saeculi* (U; AU spe Var; FIR; PEL Rm Var, PEL: PS-AU; AU Jo 101; BED cath 2 mss; PS-AU s), *huius mundi* (51 D; PEL: PS-AM; HI; AU s 171, Jul; PS-HI; FU), *huic saeculi* (PEL Rm)

At 1:27, 4:4a and 4:4b the Vulgate renders ὁ κόσμος with *hoc saeculum* / *hic mundus* which are, especially in the latter passage, supported by several manuscripts and Church Fathers. The formula *hic mundus*, corresponding to οὗτος κόσμος, is frequently employed in the Bible to refer to the earthly world. According to Abel, the demonstrative in this formula does not render the Greek article, which normally corresponds to *ille* in Latin, but is a Latin formation.<sup>97</sup> Nonetheless, it can be observed in the examples above that the demonstrative sometimes accompanies *mundus* and sometimes is omitted: it is worth analysing these usages in James and in the other epistles although the demonstrative is not the translation of the Greek article. The Vulgate features the demonstrative in all the four instances of this formula in James. At 2:5 the translation of the Vulgate with the demonstrative is unlikely to be the rendering of the variant

---

<sup>97</sup> Abel (1971: 194–8). See also Vineis (1974: 164–5) on this phenomenon.

τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, which is in the genitive case. The variant reading τουτού might have been translated by the Vulgate at 4:4a but in Greek the demonstrative follows the noun while in the rendering of the Vulgate it precedes *mundi*. At 2:3 text type F seems to render the Greek article with the demonstrative, which is not present in the Vulgate. In this case, *ille* does not comply with the classical norms and has the function of a definite article.<sup>98</sup> However, considering that the demonstrative is included in a direct speech, it might have a marked deictic function and not be an empty word as the article should be. On the other hand, the position of *illo*, detached from the noun and preceding the preposition, is unusual: the demonstrative precedes the noun to which it refers when it corresponds to the Greek article.<sup>99</sup> Therefore, it is highly probable that *illo* does not render the Greek article but has been used adverbially to translate ἐκεῖ, which precedes ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιον in NA28 and ECM whereas the Vetus Latina edition prints ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθου ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιον.

#### b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions

The terms ‘focused’ and ‘unfocused’ are used here and in the following paragraph in the same sense as that employed by Burton: the rendering is focused if the context in which it occurs is taken into consideration by the translator and if it matches the meaning of the corresponding Greek word.<sup>100</sup> Some examples of focused renderings are described here with particular attention to the cases in which the Vulgate has focused renderings in contrast with the Vetus Latina.

---

<sup>98</sup> Abel (1971: 120).

<sup>99</sup> Abel (1971: 176).

<sup>100</sup> Burton (2000: 192–3).

1:8: ἀνὴρ: *homo* (F), *vir* (V; AN cath; AU spe; CAn; CAr; PS-HI; PS-HIL-A; PHY; PRIM; RUF; SALO)

1:23: ἀνδρὶ: *homini* (F), *viro* (V; AU; CAr Ps; HI)

2:2: ἀνὴρ: *homo* (F), *vir* (V; AU; HES)

1:14: δελεαζόμενος: *eliditur* (F), *inlectus* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-AU hyp; cfFU; GEL; HES; HI)

1:15: ἀποκύει: *adquirat* (F; 66; LAC; CHRO; cfREG), *generabit* (G), *generat* (V; ATH; AU; PS-AU hyp; CAr; GEL; HES; HI; PS-HI; PS-HIL-A; QU; RUF)

2:4: οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐγένεσθε κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν: *diiudicati estis inter vos facti estis iudices cogitationum malorum* (F), *iudicastis* (T; CΣ<sup>TC20A</sup>; AU; AN; M-M), *nonne iudicatis apud vosmetipsos et facti estis iudices cogitationum iniquarum* (V; HES; PS-HIL-A)

2:12: διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι: *a lege liberalitatis iudicium sperantes* (F), *per legem libertatis incipientes iudicari* (V; AU)

3:14: μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε: *quit alapamini mentientes* (F), *nolite gloriari et mendaces esse* (V; AN cath; AU; PS-AU hyp; CAr Rm; GR-M; PS-HIL-A; cfPROS)

3:16: ἀκαταστασία: *inconstans* (F), *inconstantia* (V; AU; CAr; PS-HIL-A; PEL II.; PROS)

4:14: ἀτμίς: *favor* (S), *momentum* (F), *vapor* (V; AN cath; AU; BEA; CAE; GR-M; cfHI; PS-HIL-A; PIR)

5:4a: τῶν ἀμησάντων τὰς χώρας ὑμῶν: *qui araverunt in agris vestris* (F), *qui messuerunt regiones vestras* (V; AU spe; FU)

5:4b: ὁ ἀπεστερημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν κράζει:<sup>101</sup> *quod abnegastis clamabunt* (F), *qui fraudati sunt clamant* (T), *quae fraudata est* (ΦΡΣ<sup>A2</sup>Ω<sup>O</sup> 54 59; FU), *qui fraudatus est a vobis clamat* (V; BEA)

5:11: πολὺσπαλλγγνός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων: *visceraliter dominus misericors est* (F), *misericors est dominus et miserator* (V; AN cath; cf AU ep 188; PS-HIL-A; cf PEL: PS-HI; cf QU)

5:12a: μὴ ὀμνύετε, μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὄρκον: *nolite iurare neque per celum neque per terram nec alterutrum iuramentum* (F), *nolite iurare neque per caelum neque per terram neque aliud quodcumque iuramentum* (V; AU s 180, spe; FEol; cf PS-HIL-A)

5:12b: ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν: *sit autem apud vos* (F), *sit autem vestrum* (V; FGI\*? 251 53 32 XΔΘ 65 Q\*U; AU spe; M-Bo 35)

5:20: ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ: *de via* (S), *de erroris via* (F), *ab errore viae suae* (V; AN cath; cf AU s; AU spe; BACH; BEA; [BON]; CAE; [CAE])

At 1:8, 23; 2:2 the lexical rendering of the Vulgate, *vir*, matches ἀνὴρ better than *homo*, attested in text type F, which usually corresponds to ἄνθρωπος. However, ἀνὴρ is rendered by *vir* at 1:12 F, V; 1:20 S, F, V; 3:2 S, F, V. At 1:14 *inlectus* reflects the meaning of δελεαζόμενος, ‘enticed’, while the verb of text type F, *elidere*, ‘to remove, force out’, does not contain the element of attraction expressed by δελεάζω but suggests diversion. The verb ἀποκυέω, ‘to give

---

<sup>101</sup> NA28 and ECM print ὁ ἀπεστερημένος, which is identified in the Vetus Latina edition as a variant reading: the text of Thiele’s edition has ὁ ἀφυστερημένος. The Latin tradition translates the former.

birth’, is rendered by the corresponding *generare* in text type G and the Vulgate at 1:15 whereas the translation of text type F, *acquirere*, ‘to acquire’, is unfocused. At 4:14 ἀτμίς, ‘moist vapour, steam’, is rendered by the corresponding word *vapor* in the Vulgate: the Old Latin translations *favor* and *momentum*, attested in VL 67 and VL 66 respectively, either derive from variants not preserved elsewhere or are unfocused renderings of the Greek noun. The lexical rendering of the Vulgate at 5:4a, *metere*, is the Latin equivalent of ἀμάω, ‘to reap’, whereas the rendering of text type F, *arare*, means ‘to plough’.<sup>102</sup> The verb is also followed by the accusative according to Greek in the Vulgate and by *in* and the ablative in text type F. At 5:11 the compound πολυσπλαγγνός, ‘of great mercy’, is almost a synonym of οἰκτίμων, ‘merciful’. Text type F renders the former adjective, which is composed by πολύ and σπλάγγνον, the latter meaning ‘inward parts’, with the intensifier *visceraliter*, ‘dans les entrailles, au plus intime’, ‘pitifully’, a rare adverb which matches the meaning of the Greek compound, twice attested elsewhere, in Arnobius (*Commentarii in psalmos* 102 p. 472 D) and Praedestinatus (3,29 p. 669 A).<sup>103</sup> On the other hand, the Vulgate translates the Greek text word for word: the Greek adjectives are rendered by the corresponding Latin terms *misericors* and *miserator* although the former does not match the etymology of the Greek compound. The *nomen agentis miserator* is a Christian coinage often used together with *misericors* although this is the only attestation in the Vulgate New Testament.<sup>104</sup> At 5:12a ἄλλον τινὰ ὄρκον is rendered by *alterutrum iuramentum* in text type F and *aliud quodcumque iuramentum* in the Vulgate. *Alteruter*, ‘one or the other’ or ‘both’,

---

<sup>102</sup> Valgiglio (1985: 76–7).

<sup>103</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.), Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>104</sup> TLL 8.1114.31.

refers to the preceding *neque per caelum neque per terram* and does not match ἄλλον τινά, which means ‘any other’ and is translated by the Vulgate with *aliud quodcumque*.

At 3:14 the Vulgate renders the Greek imperatives with coordinated infinitives preceded by *nolite* against text type F, which modifies the sentence translating the second verb with the present participle *mentientes*. Free-standing present participles instead of finite verbs are widespread in Christian literature. According to Hofmann and Szantyr, independent participles replacing finite verbs can be found in three occurrences: a. in main clauses; b. in relative and completive clauses because of the similar subordinate function of participles and relative clauses; c. coordinated with a finite verb.<sup>105</sup> A case similar to c. is attested at James 3:14. The use of free-standing participles spread in the Latin Bible because of the influence of biblical Greek, in which participial constructions are numerous, and the tendency to prefer parataxis to subordination. According to Arias Abellán, three factors contributed to the diffusion of this participial use: a. pleonastic expressions such as *dicens ait*; b. periphrases with present participles plus *esse*, which was then omitted; d. the nominative absolute.<sup>106</sup> At 3:16 ἀκαταστασία is translated by the corresponding Latin noun *inconstantia* in the Vulgate and by the present participle *inconstans* in text type F: the present participle does not correspond to the Greek text. The participle ὁ ἀπεστερημένος, ‘victim of fraud’, is rendered differently in the Vulgate and in the Vetus Latina at 5:4b: the Vulgate renders the sentence word for word by employing a relative clause with a third-person singular verb, *qui fraudatus est*, which matches the number of the Greek participle. In addition, the Vulgate is the only text that translates ἀφ’ ὑμῶν. On the other hand, text type T uses the plural in both the relative clause and the main

---

<sup>105</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 389–90).

<sup>106</sup> Arias Abellán (1999: 203).



clause. The reading *quae fraudata est* in some manuscripts and Fulgentius refers to the preceding subject *merces*. The freest rendering is that of text type F which changes the subject of the relative clause, the voice and meaning of the verb (from ‘to defraud’ to ‘to deny’) as well as the number of the main verb: it seems that the translator mistook  $\acute{o}$  for the relative pronoun  $\acute{o}$  and referred, under the influence of the context, the main verb in the future tense to a plural third-person subject not expressed, ‘the victims of the fraud’, with the meaning ‘they will cry out for what you refused’.

The translation of the Vulgate at 2:12 is closer to Greek than that of text type F as far as the lexicon and word order are concerned: *sperare* in text type F does not closely correspond to  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , which is translated by the Vulgate with *incipere*. Galdi demonstrates that from the third century AD *incipere* undergoes a desemanticisation and loses its inchoative function: in the biblical translations it is employed as a loan-shift equivalent to  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  because both the verbs share the meaning ‘to be about to’.<sup>107</sup> However, *incipere* plus the infinitive does not replace the simple future: this construction is also employed with past tenses and participles, as at James 2:12, and rarely in the present indicative with reference to the future. Galdi concludes that this is a form of ‘translationese’ typical of Christian written language.<sup>108</sup> He also observes that *incipere* is used only three times in the Vulgate Gospels, in which Jerome prefers *-urus esse* to render  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , and 12 times in the other books of the New Testament. According to Galdi, ‘This discrepancy may result from the fact that, due to the centrality of the message of the Gospels, Jerome paid special attention to their translation and tended to avoid forms that

---

<sup>107</sup> Galdi (2016: 258–63).

<sup>108</sup> Galdi (2016: 264).

could have been unclear or ambiguous to the reader'.<sup>109</sup> Given that Jerome is not the reviser of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels, the divergence may be rather due to different principles of revision between the Gospels and the other books. On the other hand, the *Vetus Latina* has the highest number of attestations of the construction, 25 in the Gospels and 28 in the rest of the New Testament. Another instance of *incipere* plus the infinitive in the Catholic Epistles is attested in the Vulgate text of 2 Peter 1:12: μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν: *incipiam vos semper commone*re. At 2:12 the verb κρίνεσθαι is replaced by the noun *iudicium* in text type F and ἐλευθερία, 'freedom', is rendered by *liberalitas*, 'generosity', probably confused with *libertas*. The preposition *per* in the Vulgate matches διὰ in contrast with *a*, the rendering of text type F. Further instances in which the Vulgate matches the Greek prepositions are attested at 1:21 (ἐν πραΰτητι: *per clementiam* F, *in mansuetudine* V; AU spe, *in mansuetudinem* PS-HIL-A, *sub mansuetudine* CAr), 5:12c (ὑπὸ κρίσιν: *in iudicium* T; 66; M-Bo 35; PS-HIL-A, *sub iudicio* V; AU spe; FEol), 2:18 (ἐκ τῶν ἔργων: *de operibus* F, *ex operibus* V; CAN; CAr; FAU-R; AU; KA; RUF; SALV), 3:13 (ἐκ: *de* S, F, *ex* V; AU na, spe; PS-HIL-A).

At 2:4 James warns against social discriminations within the Christian communities. Text type F employs the perfect passive indicative and renders the Greek verse as a positive sentence (*diiudicati estis inter vos*). This is the only attestation in Latin in which the verb *diiudicare*, 'to distinguish', is employed as a deponent, that is in the passive voice on the model of the Greek διεκρίθητε with the active meaning 'you have made distinctions among yourselves'. On the other hand, the Vulgate translates the sentence as a rhetorical question using the present active indicative (and the perfect active in text type T) with the meaning 'judge,

---

<sup>109</sup> Galdi (2016: 259).

discriminate’ (*nonne iudicatis apud vosmetipsos*). The Vulgate has a word-for-word translation in contrast with the Vetus Latina at 5:12b and 5:20 in which the expression ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ, ‘from wandering from his path’, is rendered by *de via* (67), *de erroris via* (66), *ab errore viae suae* (V). The Vulgate refers the preposition ἐκ to the following noun πλάνης and the demonstrative pronoun to the genitive ὁδοῦ. Text types F and S render the verse by referring the preposition ἐκ to ὁδοῦ with the meanings ‘from the path’ and ‘from the path of error’ respectively.

The Vulgate tends to keep the tenses of the Greek verbs when translating them into Latin: at 1:11 the verbs in the aorist tense (ἀνέτειλεν, ἐξήρανε, ἐξέπεσεν, ἀπόλετο) are rendered by the perfect indicative in the Vulgate (*exortus est, arefecit, decedit, deperit*) and future and present indicative in text type F (*oriatur, siccat, cadit, perit*). In the same verse, the future μαρανθήσεται is rendered by the corresponding tense in the Vulgate, *marcescet*, and the present, *marcescit*, in text types S and F although confusion between *e* and *i* is common in the manuscript tradition. Other cases of correspondence in the verbal tenses between the Greek text and the Vulgate against the Vetus Latina are present at 1:12 (ὑπομένει: *sustinuerit* F, *suffert* V), 2:2 (εἰσέλθῃ: *intret* F, *introierit* V), 2:3 (εἴπητε: *dicatis* S, F, *dixeritis* V), 2:6 (ἡτιμάσατε: *frustratis* F, *exhonoratis* T, *exhonorastis* V), 4:2 (ἔχετε: *habebitis* S, F, *habetis* V), 5:20 (σώσει: *salvat* S, F, *salvabit* V).

### c. Unfocused Renderings

In a few cases the renderings of the Vulgate do not match the meaning of the Greek text:

1:11: ἐν ταῖς πορείαις: *in actu* (F), *in itineribus* (V)<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> See p. 91.

3:7: ἐναλίωv: *belvarum maritimarum* (S), *natantium* (F), *piscium* (T; τ<sup>56.70</sup> 54\*?), *ceterorum* (V; AN cath), *ceterorumque* (A)<sup>111</sup>

5:5: ἐτρυφήσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε: *et vos deliciati estis super terram et luxoriati estis* (S), *fruiti estis super terram et abusi estis* (F), *epulati estis super terram et in luxuriis enutristis* (V; AU spe; BEA; FU; cf PS-HIL-A; PEL: PS-HI)

At 5:5 the verb τρυφάω, ‘to live softly, luxuriously’, is rendered by text types S and F with *deliciare* and *frui*, which mean ‘to entice’ and ‘to enjoy’ respectively, while the rendering of the Vulgate, *epulari*, ‘to banquet’, does not closely correspond to the meaning of the Greek verb. In the Vulgate *epulari* renders εὐφραίνω, ‘to enjoy oneself’, at Luke 12:19; 15:23, 29, 32; 16:19 and ἐορτάζω, ‘to celebrate a festival’, at 1 Corinthians 5:8. The Vulgate also avoids the asyndeton by replacing the translation of the verb ἐσπαταλήσατε with the expression *in luxuriis*. The verbal tenses of the Vulgate do not correspond to the Greek ones at 1:23 (ἔοικεν: *est similis* F, *comparabitur* V), 2:4 (διεκρίθητε: *diiudicati estis* F, *iudicastis* T, *iudicatis* V), 5:1 (ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις: *quae superveniunt* S, *advenientibus* F, *adveniunt* T, *quae advenient* V). The preposition ἐκ is rendered by *de* at 3:11 in the Vulgate and *ex* in text type F. The Vulgate does not match the degree of Greek adjectives, notably at 1:17 (ἀγαθή: *optimum*) and 3:1 (πολλοί: *plures*).

## 8. Variations

The aim of this section is to identify the cases in which the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate use synonyms to avoid lexical repetitions in order to assess whether they agree or not and their

---

<sup>111</sup> See p. 76.

relationship with the Greek text. Only the variations in neighbouring verses are taken into consideration.

a. Absence of Variations

1:3–4: ὑπομονήν ... ἡ ὑπομονή: *sufferentiam ... sufferentia* (F), *patientiam ... patientia* (V)

1:4: τέλειον ... τέλειοι: *consummatum ... consummati* (F), *perfectum ... perfecti* (V)

1:5–6: αἰτείτω ... αἰτείτω: *petat ... petat* (S, F), *postulet ... postulet* (V)

1:6: διακρινόμενος ... ὁ διακρινόμενος: *dubitans ... dubitat* (S, F), *haesitans ... haesitat* (V)

1:10: ὁ πλούσιος ... ὁ πλούσιος: *locuples ... locuples* (F), *dives ... dives* (V)

1:10–11: ἄνθος ... τὸ ἄνθος: *flos ... flos* (F, V)

1:10–11: χόρτου ... τὸν χόρτον: *feni ... fenum* (F), *faeni ... faenum* (V)

1:13–14: πειραζόμενος ... πειράζομαι ... πειράζει ... πειράζεται: *temptatur ... temptatur ... temptat ... temptatur* (F); *temptatur ... temptor ... temptat ... temptatur* (V)

1:14–15: ἐπιθυμία ... ἡ ἐπιθυμία: *concupiscentia ... concupiscentia* (F, V)

1:15: ἀμαρτίαν ... ἡ ἀμαρτία: *peccatum ... peccatum* (F, V)

1:19: βραδύς ... βραδύς: *tardus ... piger* (S), *tardus ... tardus* (F, V)<sup>112</sup>

1:19–20: ὀργήν ... ὀργή: *iracundia ... iracundia* (S), *iracundiam ... iracundia* (F); *iram ... ira* (V)

1:21–22: λόγον ... λόγου: *verbum ... verbi* (F, V)

1:22, 23, 25: ποιηταί ... ποιητής ... ποιητής: *factores ... factor ... factor* (F, V)

1:26: θρησκός ... θρησκεία: *superstitiosum ... religio* (S), *religiosum ... religio* (F, V)<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Variation in text type S.

<sup>113</sup> Variation in text type S.

- 1:26–27: ἡ θρησκεία ... θρησκεία: *religio ... sanctitas* (S), *religio ... religio* (F, V)<sup>114</sup>
- 2:2–3: πτωχός ... τῷ πτωχῷ: *pauper ... pauperi* (F, V)
- 2:9, 11: παραβάται ... παραβάτης: *transgressores ... transgressor* (F, V)
- 2:11: μοιχεύσης ... μοιχεύεις: *moechaberis ... moechaberis* (F, V)
- 2:11: φονεύσης ... φονεύεις: *occides ... occideris* (F), *occides ... occides* (V)
- 2:13: ἡ κρίσις ... κρίσεως: *iudicium ... iudicio* (S), *iuditium ... iuditium* (F), *iudicium ... iudicio* (V)
- 2:13: ἔλεος ... ἔλεος: *misericiordiam ... misericordia* (S, F, V)
- 2:17–26: ἡ πίστις ... πίστιν ... τὴν πίστιν ... ἡ πίστις ... ἡ πίστις ... ἡ πίστις ... πίστεως ... ἡ πίστις: *fides ... fidem ... fidem ... fides ... fides ... fide ... fides* (F, V)
- 2:18: τῶν ἔργων ... ἐκ τῶν ἔργων: *operibus ... de / ex operibus* (F / V)
- 2:20–21: τῶν ἔργων ... ἐξ ἔργων: *operibus ... ex operibus* (F, V)
- 2:20, 22: ἡ πίστις ... ἡ πίστις: *fides ... fides* (F, V)
- 2:22: τοῖς ἔργοις ... ἐκ τῶν ἔργων: *operibus ... ex operibus* (F, V)
- 2:20, 24, 25: ἐδικαιώθη ... δικαιούται ... ἐδικαιώθη: *iustificatus est ... iustificatur ... iustificata est* (F, V)
- 2:24–25: ἐξ ἔργων ... ἐξ ἔργων: *ex operibus ... ex operibus* (F, V)
- 3:2: πταίομεν ... πταίει: *delinquimus ... delinquit* (S), *erramus ... e<r>rat* (F), *offendimus ... offendit* (V)
- 3:4–5: ἐλαχίστου ... μικρόν: *parvulo ... parvulum* (F), *modico ... modicum* (V)
- 3:5–6: ἡ γλῶσσα ... ἡ γλῶσσα ... ἡ γλῶσσα: *lingua ... lingua ... linguam / lingua* (S / F, V)
- 3:5–6: πῦρ ... πῦρ: *ignis ... ignis* (S, F, V)

---

<sup>114</sup> Variation in text type S.

- 3:7: φύσις ... τῆ φύσει: *natura ... naturae / natura* (S, F / V)
- 3:7: δαμάζεται ... δεδάμασται ... δαμάσαι: *domatur ... subiecta est ... domare* (S), *domatur ... domita est ... domare* (F), *domantur ... domita sunt ... domare* (V)<sup>115</sup>
- 3:13: σοφός ... σοφίας: *prudens ... prudentia* (S), *sapiens ... sapientiae* (F, V)
- 3:14–16: ζῆλον ... ζῆλος: *zelum ... zelus* (F, V)
- 3:14–16: ἐριθείαν ... ἐριθεία: *contentionem ... contentio* (F), *contentiones ... contentio* (V)
- 3:17–18: καρπῶν ... καρπός: *fructum ... fructus* (F), *fructibus ... fructus* (V)
- 3:18: ἐν εἰρήνῃ ... εἰρήνην: *in pace ... pacem* (F, V)
- 4:1–2: πόλεμοι ... πολεμεῖτε: *pugne ... pugnat* (F), *bella ... belligeratis* (V)
- 4:1–2: μάχαι ... μάχεσθε: *rixae ... rixatis* (F), *lites ... litigatis* (V)
- 4:4: ἔχθρα ... ἐχθρός: *inimica ... inimicus* (F, V)
- 4:6: ἀντιτάσσεται ... ἀντίστητε: *resistit ... resistite* (S, F, V)
- 4:11: καταλαλεῖτε ... ὁ καταλαλῶν ... κατάλαλεῖ: *detrahere ... vituperat ... vituperat* (S), *retractare ... retractat ... retractat* (F), *detrahere ... detrahit ... detrahit* (V)<sup>116</sup>
- 4:16: καυχᾶσθε ... καύχησις: *gloriamini ... gloria* (F), *exultatis ... exultatio* (V)
- 5:3: κατίωται ... ὁ ἰός: *eruginavit ... erugo* (S, F, V)
- 5:14–15: προσευξάσθωσαν ... ἡ εὐχή: *orent ... oratio* (F, V)
- 5:15–16: ἀμαρτίας ... τὰς ἀμαρτίας: *peccata ... peccata* (F), *peccatis ... peccata* (V)
- 5:17: βρέξαι ... ἔβρεξεν: *plueret ... pluit* (S, F, V)

---

<sup>115</sup> Variation in text type S.

<sup>116</sup> Variation in text type S.

5:19–20: ἐπιστρέψῃ ... ὁ ἐπιστρέψας: *revocaverit ... revocaverit* (S, F), *converterit ... converti fecerit* (V)

b. Variations in the Vetus Latina

1:23–24: κατανοοῦντι ... κατενόησεν: *respicienti ... aspexit* (F), *consideranti ... consideravit* (V)

1:27: ἀμίαντος ... ἄσπιλον: *incontaminata ... inmaculatum* (S), *inmaculata ... sine macula* (F), *inmaculata ... inmaculatum* (V)<sup>117</sup>

2:5–6: πλουσίους ... οἱ πλούσιοι: *locupletes ... divites* (F), *divites ... divites* (V)

3:3–4: μετάγομεν ... μετάγεται: *circumducamus ... circumducuntur* (S), *convertimus ... reguntur* (F), *circumferimus ... circumferuntur* (V)<sup>118</sup>

3:6: φλογίζουσα ... φλογιζομένη: *inflammat ... inflammatur* (S), *inflammat ... incenditur* (F), *inflammat ... inflammata* (V)<sup>119</sup>

4:1–2: ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ... ἐπιθυμεῖτε: *de voluntatibus / ex voluptatibus ... concupiscitis* (S / F), *ex concupiscentiis ... concupiscitis* (V)

4:1, 3: ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ... ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς: *ex voluptatibus ... in libidines* (F), *ex concupiscentiis ... in concupiscentiis* (V)

5:1–2: οἱ πλούσιοι ... ὁ πλοῦτος: *divites ... divitiis* (S), *locupletes ... divitię* (F), *divites ... divitiae* (V)<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Variation in text type S.

<sup>118</sup> Variation in text type F.

<sup>119</sup> Variation in text type F.

<sup>120</sup> Variation in text type F.



5:4: κράζει ... αἱ βοαί: *clamabunt ... voces* (F), *clamat ... clamor* (V)

5:17: ἔδωκεν ... ἐβλάστησεν: *dedit ... germi<navit>* (S), *dedit ... germinavit* (F), *dedit ... dedit* (V)

### c. Variations in the Vulgate

1:25: ἔργου ... ἐν τῇ ποιήσει: *operum ... in operibus* (F), *operis ... in facto* (V)

2:2–3: ἐσθῆτι ... ἐσθῆτι ... τὴν ἐσθῆτα: *veste ... veste ... veste* (F), *veste ... habitu ... veste* (V)

2:8–9: ὡς ... ὡς: *tamquam ... tamquam* (F), *sicut ... quasi* (V)

2:20: κενέ ... ἀργή: *vacue ... vacua* (F), *inanis ... otiosa* (V)

2:26: νεκρόν ... νεκρά: *mortuum ... mortua* (S, F), *emortuum ... mortua* (V)

3:2–3: ὅλον ... ὅλον: *totum ... totum* (S, F), *totum ... omne* (V)

4:2–3: αἰτεῖσθαι ... αἰτεῖτε ... αἰτεῖσθε: *petitis ... petitis ... petitis* (F), *postulastis ... petistis* (T), *postulatis ... petitis ... petatis* (V)<sup>121</sup>

4:4: τοῦ κόσμου ... τοῦ κόσμου: *seculi ... seculi* (F), *mundi ... saeculi* (V)

4:8: ἐγγίσατε ... ἐγγίσει: *proximate ... proximabit* (S), *accedite ... accedit* (F), *adpropiate*<sup>122</sup> ... *adpropinquabit* (V)

5:7–8: μακροθυμήσατε ... μακροθυμῶν ... μακροθυμήσατε: *patientes ... patiens ... patientes estote* (F), *aequo animo ... aequo animo ... longanimi* (G), *patientes ... patienter ferens ... patientes* (V)<sup>123</sup>

5:16: ἀλλήλοις ... ἀλλήλων: *alterutrum ... alterutro* (F), *alterutrum ... invicem* (V)

---

<sup>121</sup> Variation in text type T.

<sup>122</sup> *Adpropinquate* is also attested in the manuscript tradition of the Vulgate.

<sup>123</sup> Variation in text type G.

d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina

1:15, 18: ἀποκύει ... ἀπεκύησεν: *adquirat ... peperit* (F), *generat ... genuit* (V)

2:2–3: λαμπρᾷ ... λαμπράν: *splendida ... candida* (F), *candida ... praeclara* (V)

In the majority of the cases the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina do not introduce variations when a Greek word is repeated in neighbouring passages. In addition, at 1:25 (F); 1:27 (V); 2:20 (F); 4:1–2 (V); 4:6 (S, F, V); 5:3 (S, F, V); 5:4 (V); 5:17 (V) the text types translate different Greek terms with the same etymologically connected word or words. The Vulgate varies the lexical renderings in eleven instances, text type F in nine and text type S in six instances. In most of the cases, the Vulgate features repetitions as well as the Vetus Latina: the reviser did not improve the text from a stylistic point of view but employed fixed patterns when translating Greek, associating Greek and Latin words and keeping these relationships even when there was the possibility to vary the Latin renderings to produce a more elegant text.

## 9. Participial Renderings<sup>124</sup>

### a. Articular Participles

The table below shows the types of renderings of Greek articular participles and their distribution in each text type and in the Vulgate:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | ADJECTIVE |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|
| F          | 23              | 4                  | 0         |
| S          | 10              | 1                  | 0         |
| V          | 20              | 5                  | 1         |

Table 2. Rendering of articular participles in James

The most frequent construction to render Greek articular participles is the relative clause in both the Vulgate and Vetus Latina. The present participle is also employed as alternative rendering of Greek present active participles in direct cases (substantival: 5:15 F; attributive: 2:23 F, V) and indirect cases (substantival: 1:12 V; 2:5 F, V; 3:4 S, V; 3:18 V; attributive: 5:1 F). Once, at 5:15, the Vulgate employs an adjective, *infirmum*, to translate τὸν κάμνοντα while text type F has the present participle *laborantem*. The articular participles are either substantival (in the majority of the cases) or attributive (at 1:5; 1:21; 2:7; 2:23; 3:6; 3:9; 4:1; 4:12; 5:1; 5:4), i.e. participles that have the function of adjectives and are referred to nouns which usually

---

<sup>124</sup> The participial renderings of the Vulgate and Vetus Latina Catholic Epistles are described in detail in my forthcoming article ‘Die Übersetzung Griechischer Partizipien in den Katholischen Briefen der Vetus Latina und der Vulgata’ in Hoffmann, Roland (ed.) *Lingua Vulgata. Eine linguistische Einführung in das Studium der lateinischen Bibel*. Hamburg: Buske.

precede them. In the following instance the demonstrative pronoun which works as antecedent of the relative pronoun is omitted in text type F:

2:3: ἐπιβλέψητε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν φοροῦντα τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν λαμπράν

*respiciatis autem qui vestitus est veste candida* (F)

*et intendatis in eum qui indutus est veste praeclara* (V)

Similarly, at 3:18, the ellipsis of the demonstrative pronoun *eis* in text type F makes the sentence unclear:

3:18: καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην

*fructus autem iustitię in pace seminatur qui faciunt pacem* (F)

At 5:4 text type F renders the substantival participle with the relative clause not preceded by the demonstrative pronoun in the genitive case:

5:4: αἱ βοαὶ τῶν θερισάντων

*voces qui messi sunt* (F)

The ellipsis of the demonstrative pronoun is either a stylistic feature of VL 66 or a copyist's omission. Once the accusative demonstrative pronoun is unexpressed in both the Vulgate and text type F:

5:11: ἰδοὺ μακαρίζομεν τοὺς ὑπομείναντας

*ecce beatos dicimus qui sustinuerunt* (F)

*ecce beatificamus qui sustinuerunt* (V)

On the other hand, the demonstrative pronoun is often omitted in the rendering of attributive participles because it can be easily implied, for instance at 4:1.

## b. Participles

The following table illustrates the renderings of non-articular participles in the Old Latin text types and in the Vulgate:

|   | PRES. P. | PF. P. | RELATIVE<br>CLAUSE | FINITE<br>VERB | <i>CUM</i> +<br>SUBJUNCTIVE | ADVERB | ADJECTIVE |
|---|----------|--------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------|
| F | 16       | 5      | 4                  | 10             | 2                           | 0      | 2         |
| S | 4        | 1      | 3                  | 6              | 0                           | 0      | 1         |
| V | 19       | 5      | 3                  | 5              | 6                           | 1      | 1         |

Table 3. Rendering of non-articular participles in James

The Vulgate shows a prevalence of present participles to render present and active aorist participles and a high number of instances of *cum* and subjunctive to translate adverbial participles in comparison with the Vetus Latina text types. The perfect participles translate the present middle passive and aorist passive participles. The Vetus Latina often renders the Greek present and aorist participles with finite verbs (1:14 F; 1:15 S, F; 3:4a F; 3:4b S, F; 3:6a S, F), and coordinates them with the main verb or with another finite verb translating a participle. Finite verbs are often employed to render non-articular participles coordinated with preceding articular participles which are translated by relative clauses (1:5 F, V; 1:6 S, F, V; 1:25 V; 2:15 S, T, F, V; 3:6b S, F, V; 4:11 S, F; 4:14 V). The relative clauses are often used to render attributive participles and participles not preceded by the articles but coordinated with articular participles. At 1:18 the Vulgate renders the participle βουληθείς with the adverb *voluntarie* instead of the present participle *volens* of text type F. At 4:14 the Vulgate employs a finite verb:

4:14: ἡ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη ἔπειτα καὶ ἀφανιζομένη

*qui ante paululum apparet et postea non apparet* (S)

*per modica visibilis deinde et exterminata* (F)

*ad modicum parens deinceps exterminatur* (V; FGIL 251 53 32? Δ 65 QU; AU spe)

The latter participle is rendered by a finite verb coordinated by asyndeton with the former participle while in text type S the finite verb is coordinated with the preceding relative clause.

The following participial rendering of the Vulgate is focused:

3:4: τὰ πλοῖα, τηλικαῦτα ὄντα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν ἐλαυνόμενα, μετὰγεται ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου πηδαλίου

*naves quae tam immensae sunt sub ventis duris feruntur et circumducuntur a parvissimo gubernaculo* (S)

*naves tam magnae sunt et a ventis tam validis feruntur reguntur autem parvulo gubernaculo* (F)

*naves cum magnae sint et a ventis validis minentur circumferuntur a modico gubernaculo* (V; PS-AM; PS-HIL-A)

The two participles referred to τὰ πλοῖα have a concessive nuance rendered by *cum* and subjunctive in the Vulgate. On the other hand, text type S translates the first participle with a relative clause and the second one as a finite verb coordinated with the main verb *circumducuntur*. In text type F the Greek participles are expressed by two main verbs, the latter linked to *reguntur* through asyndeton: these, in contrast with the Greek text, are at the same level as the main clause. In both the renderings of the Vetus Latina the concessive meaning of the Greek, preserved in the Vulgate, is missing. At 1:12 the rendering of text type F appears to be not as fluent as that of the Vulgate:

1:12: ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς  
*quoniam probatus factus accipiet coronam vite* (F)

*quia cum probatus fuerit accipiet coronam vitae* (V; PS-AM; AN Casp; AU spe; PS-BAS; CAn; CAr Rm; EP-L; EP-SC; EUS-G; GEL; HES; HI; PS-HIL-A; PEL: PS-HI; PRIM)

*dum probatus fuerit* (T; Xτ<sup>68.56</sup>)

Δόκιμος γενόμενος is rendered by *probatus factus* in text type F (in VL 66 while CHRO has *beatus factus*) with the juxtaposition of two perfect participles, the former rendering the adjective and the latter the aorist participle. On the other hand, the Vulgate has *cum probatus fuerit*: the *cum* and subjunctive clearly expresses the anteriority of the action of the Greek participle. The reading of text type T, *dum probatus fuerit*, is also suitable for the context expressing a condition that needs to be fulfilled to cause a consequence.

The Vulgate version of James attests the analytical use of present participles followed by the verb *esse* instead of the finite verb. This construction, widely attested in biblical Greek, is comparable to that of the Greek periphrastic middle-passive perfect and supported by the use of similar periphrases in Hebrew.<sup>125</sup> According to Plater and White this construction is irregular in Latin in that only the participles which become adjectives can be used in this manner.<sup>126</sup> Arias Abellán affirms that these periphrases were in use throughout the history of Latin, in comedy, rarely in the classical age and abundantly in Christian Latin, and have a durative and emphatic function.<sup>127</sup> In James the following instances are attested:

1:17: πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δῶρημα τέλειον ἄνωθεν ἐστὶν καταβαῖνον

---

<sup>125</sup> Blass, Debrunner and Funk (1961: 179).

<sup>126</sup> Plater and White (1926: 109–10).

<sup>127</sup> Arias Abellán (1999: 201). She also identifies two examples taken from the Vulgate text of Luke 1:21 and 19:47.

*omnis datio bona et omne donum perfectum desursum descendit* (F)

*omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est descendens* (V; AN Mt, Reg; AU bo, corr, ep 140, 188, 189, 214, gr, pat, pers 44, Pet, cf Ps 142, s 159, s 284, spe, tri; PS-AU hyp, s Cai; BON II.; CAE; CAn; CAr Ps; cf Claudius Taurin.; CO-Araus; COL-C; EP-SC; FEnd; FU; cf GEL; PS-GR-M Rg; HI; cf PS-HIL-A; JO-N; LEO; MART; PROS Coll, Ruf, voc; [PROS]; RUF Rm; SED-S; VIG-P)

3:15: οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη σοφία ἄνθεν κατερχομένη

*non est sapientia que descendit desursum* (F)

*non est ista sapientia desursum descendens* (V; AN cath; AU; FU; GR-M; PROS)

4:14: ἀτμίς γάρ ἐστε ἢ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη

*erit enim sicut favor qui ante paululum apparet* (S)

*momentum enim est per modica visibilis* (F)

*vapor est ad modicum parens* (V; AU Fau, Ps, s 124, 320, s Den, spe; BEA; CAE; GR-M; cf HI; PIR)

These forms are attested only in the Vulgate and seem to be word-for-word renderings of the Greek sentences. A further instance of analytical construction is present in the Vulgate at 1 Peter 2:25.<sup>128</sup>

## 10. Statistics

The relationship between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina text types in James is investigated by Sanday and Thiele. Thiele supports the idea of a close relationship between text

---

<sup>128</sup> See p. 191.



types S, F and the Vulgate and proposes the following table which takes into consideration only the verses in which all the text types (S, F and V) are attested.<sup>129</sup>

| TEXT TYPE | F   | S  |
|-----------|-----|----|
| S         | 69  |    |
| V         | 127 | 66 |

Table 4. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in James

Thiele examines 346 variants: the Vulgate agrees with text type F on 127 occasions and with text type S in 66 instances whereas the three text types differ from each other in 84 cases. Both Sanday and Thiele highlight the special position of text type S as the earliest form of text of James: they think respectively that VL 66 contains elements derived from AU spe and the Vulgate or from text types S and T.<sup>130</sup> According to Thiele, the Vulgate may have influenced the sources of S considering the similarities between them (66 cases).<sup>131</sup> Thiele also observes that T is closely related to S and F and when S and F differ from the Vulgate, T is closer to the *Vetus Latina*. When T=S and T=F the readings in common originated in T.<sup>132</sup> On the basis of these observations, Thiele concludes that the tradition is unitary and because of the diffusion of T, its readings are present in S, F and in the variants of the Vulgate while the value of F is minor, being a revision made at the end of the fourth century in Italy according to Greek and

---

<sup>129</sup> Thiele (1969: 59).

<sup>130</sup> Sanday (1885: 257), Thiele (1969: 66). However, when briefly describing the text types at the beginning of VL 26/1, Thiele writes that F is based on S and V.

<sup>131</sup> Thiele (1969: 59).

<sup>132</sup> Thiele (1969: 60).

based on T and V.<sup>133</sup> The *Vorlage* of the original translation of James may be reconstructed when S and T agree, the latter originated from text types K and C.<sup>134</sup> The following tables, which are based on a larger amount of evidence than Thiele's examination, aim to give more specific and accurate results through a distinction between the relationship among text types in lexicon, participles and word order and to define the character of the Vulgate, described by Thiele as a conservative revision according to Greek and contaminated with T.<sup>135</sup>

#### a. Lexicon

The table below contains the number of instances in which the Vulgate agrees with each *Vetus Latina* text type and the unique renderings of the Vulgate (at the bottom) out of the total number of lexical renderings attested by each text type. The Vulgate is considered to be a text type according to Thiele's convention. It is therefore listed in the tables under the heading 'text types' but separated graphically from the *Vetus Latina* text types. The instances in which the renderings of the Vulgate and of the *Vetus Latina* differ because of their dependence on Greek variant readings and the cases in which the renderings of either the Vulgate or the *Vetus Latina* are not attested are excluded from the count. The final column contains the percentages of agreement between each text type and the Vulgate and the percentage representing the unique renderings of the Vulgate.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Thiele (1969: 66–7).

<sup>134</sup> Thiele (1969: 66). Thiele's justification for this statement is unclear given that K and C cannot be reconstructed in James.

<sup>135</sup> Thiele (1969: 66).

<sup>136</sup> These criteria are applied to the quantitative analysis of the lexicon in all the chapters.

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| F          | 617/884 | 70%        |
| S          | 255/375 | 68%        |
| T          | 59/105  | 56%        |
| G          | 7/22    | 32%        |
| C          | 0/4     | 0%         |
| A          | 0/7     | 0%         |
| V (unique) | 225/896 | 25%        |

Table 5. Lexical renderings in James

The table above indicates that in one quarter of the sample of words collected in the spreadsheet the Vulgate disagrees with the *Vetus Latina* text types (25%). Both text types F and S have almost the same quantitative relationship with the Vulgate with 70% and 68% of similarities respectively although F is better attested than S. Only isolated readings of text type T are preserved, which seem to be well connected to the Vulgate (56%) while the number of renderings in common with text type G is inferior (32%) and the Vulgate never agrees with text types C and A, which, however, are poorly attested.

#### b. Participles

The relationship between the Vulgate and the Old Latin text types in the rendering of participles is exemplified by the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| F          | 45/67   | 67%        |
| S          | 19/27   | 70%        |
| T          | 3/9     | 33%        |
| G          | 1/2     | 50%        |
| V (unique) | 18/67   | 27%        |

Table 6. Participial renderings in James

In the majority of the cases taken into account the Vulgate agrees with text type F (67%) although it also features a good number of own renderings (27%). Text type S seems to be rather close to the Vulgate when it is attested (70%) but in 18 cases out of 19 in which it agrees with the Vulgate, it also agrees with F. Text types F, S and the Vulgate appear to be closely related in the participial renderings and the results of the analysis of participles match those of the lexicon. The number of attestations of T and G is too low to assess their relationship with the Vulgate.

### c. Word Order

The following table describes the agreement in word order between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* on one hand and their relationship with the Greek text on the other. The instances taken into consideration represent variations internal to Latin and not influenced by Greek variants: following a comparison with the ECM those variations in word order which are translations of Greek variants were excluded from the count.

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| F          | 11/28   | 39%        | 14/28: 50%         | 14/28: 50%             |
| S          | 4/16    | 25%        | 11/16: 69%         | 5/16: 31 %             |
| T          | 0/2     | 0%         | 0/2: 0%            | 2/2: 100%              |
| V (unique) | 13/28   | 46%        | 21/28: 75%         | 7/28: 25%              |

Table 7. Word order in James

The Vulgate appears to have a distinctive character as far as word order is concerned: in the majority of the instances it differs from the *Vetus Latina* (46%). It agrees with text type F in 39% of the cases and, to a lesser degree, with text type S (25%) while it disagrees with text type T in the only two instances of T attested in James. The Vulgate differs remarkably from the *Vetus Latina* in the relationship with the Greek text: the Vulgate shows an overall tendency to

match the word order of Greek with 21 cases of literal renderings out of 28 (75%) and only 7 cases of renderings not corresponding to Greek (25%). On the other hand, the *Vetus Latina* text types have a higher number of renderings that are not word-for-word translations of the Greek text (50%, in F, 69% in S, 100% in T) than the Vulgate. The Vulgate agrees with the *Vetus Latina* when the latter matches the Greek word order, in 10 cases out of 11 in which the Vulgate and F agree and in all the four instances that the Vulgate and S have in common.

#### 11. The Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* as Sources for the Greek Text

The Latin versions sometimes preserve variant readings which are not attested in the Greek tradition: some of them might be scribal mistakes but others ought to be taken into consideration for the reconstruction of the Greek text.<sup>137</sup> The most significant cases of variants otherwise unattested in Greek are reported below:<sup>138</sup>

1:1: ἡμῶν: *nostrī* (V; AN cath; AU Rm in; PS-HIL-A)

1:5: ἀπλῶς: *simpliciter* (F), *abundanter* (G), *affluenter* (V; PS-AM; AN Reg; AU; CAr Ps; EP-L; FU; PS-HIL-A; LEO; QU; S-Mo; SED-S)

2:14: ἡ πίστις: *fides sola* (S, F; τ; PEL; PS-AU spe; CAE s 209), *fides* (V; AU; CAE; CAr; FAU-R; FU; PS-HIL-A)

2:18: πίστιν ... ἔργα: *operam ... fidem* (F)

2:19: πιστεύουσιν: *faciunt* (S)

---

<sup>137</sup> All the readings listed in this section and in the equivalent sections in the following chapters were checked in the ECM.

<sup>138</sup> Some of these cases are identified by von Harnack (1916: 112–7), who also adds minor instances of addition and omission of particles which are not included in the list.

3:13: ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας: *in mansuetudine et prudentia* (S)

3:17: ἄνωθεν: *dei* (F), *desursum* (V)

4:14: ἀτμῖς: *favor* (S), *momentum* (F), *vapor* (V)

5:4: τῶν θερισάντων: *qui messi sunt* (F), *ipsorum* (V; FADGIL 251 53 32 Σ<sup>A</sup> Θ 65 MQ; AU spe; BED cath 7 mss), *eorum* (ΛX 54 ΔΟΥΦΡΩ<sup>DOC</sup> 59; FU; BED cath 1 ms), *eius* (T; CΣ<sup>TCO</sup>τ), *ipsius* (Ω<sup>W</sup>)

5:7: ἐπ' αὐτῷ: *in ipso* (F), omission (V)

5:15: κὰν ἁμαρτίας ἧ̃ πεποικώς: *et si peccata fecit* (F), *et si in peccatis sit* (V; AN cath; AU spe; CAE; CAn; cf EUS-G; HES; cf RUF)

5:17: τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: *ut non plueret super terram et non pluit* (V)

The addition of *nostri* in the Vulgate and other versions (K: B. A<sup>mss</sup>.A) at 1:1 is caused by the recurrent iunctura *dominus noster* in the Bible. At 1:5 the adverb ἀπλῶς means 'simply': the rendering of text type F, *simpliciter*, matches the Greek meaning in contrast with the renderings of text type G and the Vulgate, *abundanter* and *affluenter*, which seem to render πλουσίως (also in other versions: A, G: G-D; SI: DMSiS). Text types S and F add *sola* at 2:14, which is omitted in the Vulgate. The variant μόνη is only attested in GA 1893. The Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* seems to render the variant ἐν πραΰτητι καὶ σοφία at 3:13, which is also attested in other versions (K:S. A). At 3:17 text type F is the only one that renders the possible variant θεοῦ with *dei*. The renderings *favor* and *momentum* at 4:14 do not correspond to ἀτμῖς and might be variants otherwise unattested. The demonstrative pronouns instead of the rendering of the participle at 5:4 are well attested in the Latin versions but not present in any Greek manuscripts: the origin of these readings is not clear and they are worth a mention in the ECM. The omission of the translation of ἐπ' αὐτῷ at 5:7 is attested only in the Vulgate. The Vulgate seems to

translate the otherwise unattested variant ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἧ̃ at 5:15.<sup>139</sup> The translation of the Vulgate is not reported in the ECM: it must have been considered by the editors to be a free Latin translation of κὰν ἀμαρτίας ἧ̃ πεποηκώς. At 5:17 *super terram* follows *plueret* in the Vulgate in contrast with the Greek text, text types S and F in which follows *pluit*: the only manuscript that attests this word order is GA 629. Von Harnack also identifies the presence of *quidem* in the Vulgate at 3:5 and 4:13 translating μέν: the particle might have been omitted by copyists because preceding μέλος and following ποιήσομεν.<sup>140</sup> Conversely, the error could have originated in the Latin translation. Other mistakes internal to the Latin tradition are *faciunt* in Priscillian at 2:19 where the Greek text, text type F and the Vulgate have πιστεύουσιν and *credunt*: the rendering is influenced by the preceding ποιεῖς. The text of VL 66 is the only one that transposes *operam* and *fidem* at 2:18: this mistake probably derives from the following word order *de operibus fidem*.

The Vulgate supports minor variant readings attested in the Greek tradition often in contrast with the Vetus Latina:

2:3: + τῶν ποδῶν (in GA 02f, 33): *pedum* (V; AU ep 167; HES; PS-HIL-A), omission in F

2:5: τῷ κόσμῳ (ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ in GA 322, 323): *mundi* (S), *seculi* (F), *in hoc mundo* (V; AN cath; AU; CAr; FU; SALV)

2:8: τὴν γραφήν (τὰς γραφάς in GA 322, 323) *scripturam* (S, F), *scripturas* (V; AU; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>139</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 115).

<sup>140</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 114).

3:11: τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν (ὔδωρ in GA 629, 1850, 2718, S: PH<sup>mss</sup>): *dulce[m] et salmacidum* (F), *dulcem et amaram aquam* (V; PS-HIL-A)

4:11: νόμον κρίνεις (κρίνεις νόμον in GA 94, 629, 1799f): *legem iudicas* (S), *iudicas legem* (F, V)

5:18: ἐβλάστησεν (ἔδωκεν in GA 2523, K: S<sup>mss</sup>, S:P): *germinavit* (S, F), *dedit* (V; PS-HIL-A)

Most of these instances show the influence of the context in which they are inserted. The addition of *aquam* at 3:11 is due to the presence of γλυκὺ ... ὔδωρ in the following verse. The translation *dedit* at 5:18 probably arose under the influence of the preceding ἔδωκεν. The word order *iudicas legem* at 4:11 is attested in Greek manuscripts although it may derive from the preceding *iudicat legem* rendering κρίνει νόμον. Similarly, the word order *ostendam tibi* in the Vulgate at 2:18 is influenced by the preceding *ostende mihi* rendering δεῖξόν μοι.

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina follow different Greek texts in the instances below:

1:13: πειράζομαι (πειράζεται in GA 467, 1718, 1751, 1848, 2412, L921): *temptatur* (F, S), *temptor* (V; AU gr, pec; HI)

2:16: δῶτε (δῶ in GA 61, 378, 621, 630, 808, 2544): *det* (S), *dederit* (F), *dederitis* (V; PS-AU spe; CAE; GR-M; M-M; VAL)

3:1: ληψόμεθα (λήψεσθε in GA 436, 1067, 1390, 2541, L884): *accipietis* (S), *accipiemus* (F), *sumitis* (V)

4:15: ζήσομεν (ζήσωμεν attested in several Greek manuscripts): *vivemus* (F), *vixerimus* (V; AU spe; BEA; CAr; HI; PEL)

At 1:13 and 2:16 the Vetus Latina translate variant readings attested in Greek while at 3:1 and 4:15 the Vulgate renders Greek variants in opposition to the Vetus Latina.



## 12. Conclusions

In this chapter a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the readings and renderings of the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina texts of James was carried out in order to describe their linguistic character and the relationship between the Vulgate and the previous Latin versions with reference to the Greek source. As far as the relationship with Greek is concerned, both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina have numerous lexical and syntactical Graecisms. The Vulgate attests several loan-words connected with Christianity (*blasphemare, moechari, zelare, thesaurizare, psallere, daemon, diabolus, zelus, propheta, ecclesia*) but three times translates Greek terms with the equivalent Latin words (*pupillus, conventus, simulatio* against *orphanus, synagoga, hypocrisis* in the Vetus Latina). The Greek verbal and nominal compounds and composite words with prepositions or alpha privatives are rendered by the Vulgate with terms that match the etymology and structure of the Greek expressions: for instance, at 1:13, the Vulgate coins the neologism *intemptator* to render ἀπειραστός and at 5:11 uses the calque *beatificare* to translate μακαρίζω while text type F has the periphrasis *beatum dicere*. Not only does the Vulgate feature terms that formally correspond to Greek but also focused renderings that take into consideration the semantics of the Greek words: at 5:10 κακοπαθίας, ‘toil’, is rendered by F with the meaningless expression *malis passionibus* and by the Vulgate with the appropriate *laboris*. Greek constructions, such as the reported speech introduced by *quod, quia* and *quoniam*, and verbs governing the same case as in Greek, such as *benedicere* and *blasphemare* plus the accusative, are frequent in the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate.

The Latin versions of James attest several abstract and derived words: many of them are Christian formations while others are pre-existing words which undergo semantic extensions, such as *datio, dulcedo, petitio, oratio, civitas*. Postclassical terms and constructions are usual in the Latin translations of the Bible, such as the postclassical and etymologising rendering

*cooperari* in the Vulgate at 2:22, the use of *de* and the ablative instead of the genitive in text type F at 4:11 and 5:10, the causative use of *facere* with the infinitive in the Vulgate at 5:20, which will continue in the Romance languages, as well as the reflexive usage of personal pronouns in the Vetus Latina at 1:7 and 4:7, 10. A very frequent phenomenon attested in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina is the change of the voice of verbs (*anxiare, minare*) and the coinage of new deponents, especially with verbs expressing emotions (*tristari, infirmari, humiliari, lucrificari*). A few analogical forms, mostly attested in the Vetus Latina, were identified: for instance, *parvissimus* (3:4 S), *longanimi* (5:8 G), *calefacimini* (2:16 S, F, V). Revivals of archaic words are present in both the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate (for instance *disciplinosus* at 3:13 in text type F and *inmunditia* at 1:21 in the Vulgate) while rare terms are more frequent in the Vetus Latina than in the Vulgate, which has only the uncommon words *aeruginare* (5:3) and *suadibilis* (3:17). Text type F has the scarcely attested verbs *alapari* (3:14) and *tineare* (5:2) and adjectives *demoneticus* (3:15) and *satullus* (2:16).

The relationship with the Greek text is investigated in the paragraphs about number, the rendering of comparatives and superlatives and lexical variations. The Vulgate tends to keep the number of Greek nouns, adjectives, participles in contrast with the Vetus Latina while the degree of the Greek adjectives is not matched by the renderings of the Vulgate, which often employ comparatives and superlatives when the Greek text has a positive adjective. Neither the Vulgate nor the Vetus Latina often introduce variations to avoid repetitions in neighbouring verses: the number of variations in the Vulgate is higher than in the Vetus Latina but still not significant. Demonstrative pronouns are employed by the Vulgate to render the formula *ὁ κόσμος* in opposition to the Vetus Latina text types. The Vulgate often features focused renderings which correspond formally and semantically to the Greek text: it keeps the prepositions, moods and tenses of Greek verbs, renders the Greek participles with the

corresponding Latin forms and attests lexical renderings suitable for the context. On the other hand, the Vulgate has three unfocused renderings: translation of ἐν ταῖς πορείαις with *in itineribus* at 1:11, of ἐναλίωv with *ceterorum* at 3:7 (either a scribal mistake for *cetorum* or a variant reading) and of ἐτρυφήσατε with *epulati estis* at 5:5. The similarity between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina in the rendering of participles is due to the fact that Greek participles are translated into Latin using standard patterns: articular participles are rendered by relative clauses and present participles while non-articular participles are mostly translated by present participles. However, a different tendency in the rendering of participles can be noticed: the Vulgate often employs *cum* and subjunctive whereas text types S and F show a preference for finite verbs and paratactic constructions. In three instances (1:17; 3:15; 4:14) the Vulgate attests analytical constructions with present participles plus *esse*, which are word-for-word translations of the Greek text. On balance, the Vulgate text of James is characterised by close adherence to Greek with renderings that correspond to the structure and meaning of the Greek text without significant stylistic improvements. The Latin versions are also useful sources to reconstruct the Greek text: in a few instances they preserve variant readings otherwise unattested in the Greek tradition which should be evaluated attentively.

The results of the statistical examination ought to be compared with those from the preceding studies of the Latin versions of James in order to review and update the findings. Sanday supports the idea of the affiliation of the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* with the African text and hypothesises the presence of a pre-Vulgate substratum in this witness in order to explain the points of contact between the Vulgate and PS-AU spe.<sup>141</sup> Sanday affirms that the similarities between PS-AU spe and the Vulgate are not quantitative but qualitative in that they

---

<sup>141</sup> Sanday (1885: 247).

are restricted to isolated readings attested in a few verses, of which the most convincing case is 3:4 (*ubi impetus dirigentis voluerit*). Sanday's theory on the relationship between PS-AU spe and the Vulgate is called into question by the observation presented above that the Vulgate and text type S, to which PS-AU spe belongs, differ remarkably in word order (only 25% of common renderings) and, although they have 68% of similarities in the lexicon, S and the Vulgate are not closer to each other than F and the Vulgate (70%). By comparing PS-AU spe and VL 66, Sanday seeks to demonstrate a connection between them but does not identify which text influenced the other.<sup>142</sup> On the other hand, he notices a close relationship between VL 66 and the Vulgate: according to Sanday, they differ 11 times out of 63 and agree 23 times out of 26 on word order. Nonetheless, he is aware of the different character of the texts in the lexicon and explains the divergences by the hypothesis of the influence of local variations and the diversification of Latin throughout the empire.<sup>143</sup> Sanday also stresses the link between the Vulgate and the Old Latin versions in James: 'What inferences are we to draw from all this as to the character of the Vulgate text in the Epistle? (I) Extremely little is due to Jerome himself. There is hardly a word that cannot be proved to have been in use before his time: in many cases where the evidence is slenderest as to the use of the word elsewhere the quotations in St. Augustine and Ambrosiaster prove that it was already found in this Epistle'.<sup>144</sup> However, the methodology followed by Sanday is inadequate: he searches for attestations of the lexicon of the Vulgate text of James in the other books of the Old and New Testament in the tradition of the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina*: the Vulgate uses words also attested elsewhere in the Latin

---

<sup>142</sup> Sanday (1885: 248).

<sup>143</sup> Sanday (1885: 260).

<sup>144</sup> Sanday (1885: 252).

Bible, as we would expect, but this observation is not a demonstration of the dependence of the Vulgate on the *Vetus Latina* in James. In addition, the attestations of words of the Vulgate in Augustine's writings is not a proof in favour of the Old Latin character of these readings, as Augustine mostly cites the Vulgate in James and Ambrosiaster cites only one verse in a version close to the Vulgate. Finally, the fact that PS-AU spe and VL 66 are compared by Sanday to the text of *Codex Amiatinus* leads to conclusions that need reconsideration and a new comparison with the Stuttgart Vulgate.

Wordsworth, who published an article about VL 66 and its relation to the other Latin versions and Greek in the same year and volume as Sanday, draws opposite conclusions from the comparison between VL 66 and *Codex Amiatinus*. He observes that VL 66 and the Vulgate agree on common renderings and constructions but disagree on the complex ones, stating that 'it is hardly an exaggeration to say that there is no single important noun or verb in which the Corbey MS. agrees with the Vulgate'.<sup>145</sup> Not only does Wordsworth deny that VL 66 and the Vulgate have a similar character but also affirms that neither VL 66 nor its source are contaminated with the Vulgate.<sup>146</sup> According to Wordsworth, the Vulgate and VL 66 are also distinct from PS-AU spe despite a few features in common.<sup>147</sup>

Thiele finds his examination of James on Sanday's premise: he supports the hypothesis of the twofold tradition of the *Vetus Latina* with text type S on one hand and F and the Vulgate on the other and gives a prominent role to T as the text type that connects S, F and the Vulgate. However, the extent of text type T is difficult to ascertain: T and the Vulgate have

---

<sup>145</sup> Wordsworth (1885: 127).

<sup>146</sup> Wordsworth (1885: 127, 130).

<sup>147</sup> Wordsworth (1885: 133).

similarities in the lexicon but, because of the sporadic remains of T, is not possible to check whether the Vulgate and T agree on syntactical renderings and word order, which are more determinant than the lexicon in proving a relationship between text types. In addition, the witnesses to T have been highly contaminated with the Vulgate so that it is often difficult to distinguish one from the other.<sup>148</sup> Thiele emphasises the importance of T more on the basis of the analogy with the other Catholic Epistles, in which T is well attested and deemed to be the model of the Vulgate, than on evidence. On the other hand, it is not clear on what basis Thiele states that F and S are contaminated with the Vulgate: they could also convey an Old Latin substratum in common with the Vulgate.<sup>149</sup>

The quantitative examination of the Latin versions of James carried out in this chapter leads to the conclusion that text types S and F are in agreement with the Vulgate in around 70% of the lexical and participial renderings while the relationship with text type T in the lexicon

---

<sup>148</sup> Thiele (1969: 61): ‘Im Vergleich zu den übrigen Katholischen Briefen besteht aber auch ein erheblicher Unterschied. Dort trennt sich der nach Art und Bezeugung wesentlich gleiche T-Text durchweg von der Vulgata, während er in Jac nur in verstreuten Einzellesarten hervortritt. Dieser Befund läßt zwei Erklärungen zu. Eine Möglichkeit wäre, daß die Vulgata den Text T sehr schnell bis auf wenige Reste verdrängte, während sich T in den anderen Briefen besser behaupten konnte; man kann auch sagen, daß der erste der Katholischen Briefe viel stärker nach der Vulgata korrigiert wurde, während der Eifer bei den folgenden Briefen rasch nachließ ... Daher möchte ich diese Erklärung der ersten Möglichkeit vorziehen. T ist dann ein altlateinischer Text, von dem so viele Bestandteile in der Vulgata übernommen sind, daß er nur noch in Einzellesarten faßbar wird.’

<sup>149</sup> Thiele (1969: 59).

(56% of similarities) is not as close as that with S and F. This percentage is not sufficiently high to state that text type T is the source of the Vulgate, as Thiele does, and the limited attestation of the text type does not permit us to reach certain conclusions as far as the rendering of participles and word order are concerned. On the other hand, the Vulgate has a high percentage of unique lexical and participial renderings (25% and 27%) in comparison with the other letters and a distinctly independent character in word order (46% of unique renderings) that point to a separate development of the revision from the Old Latin tradition. Despite the presence of an Old Latin substratum, the Vulgate often differs from the preceding versions and agrees with S and F when the text types follow the sequence of the words of the Greek text: the reproduction of the Greek word order seems to be the priority of the reviser. Wordsworth also notices the peculiar character of the Vulgate in James, which differs from the other books of the New Testament ‘in method of translation’.<sup>150</sup> Von Harnack reaches the similar conclusion that ‘Der Jakobusbrief steht hiernach innerhalb der Vulgata (epp. cath.) ganz für sich, und dieses Ergebnis kann ja nach der Geschichte des Briefes im Abendland auch nicht befremden’.<sup>151</sup> According to von Harnack the Vulgate text of James is an improved version of the text contained in *Codex Bobienseis* (VL 53).<sup>152</sup> However, the latter is deemed by Thiele to be affiliated to the Vulgate in James.<sup>153</sup> Wordsworth and von Harnack’s hypothesis that the

---

<sup>150</sup> Wordsworth (1885: 129).

<sup>151</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 116).

<sup>152</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 123).

<sup>153</sup> Thiele (1969: 13).

Vulgate version of James has a different character, and probably origin, from the other epistles will be ascertained by comparing James with the rest of the Vulgate Catholic corpus.



## CHAPTER THREE

### THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

#### 1. Introduction

Four citations of 1 Clement can be considered to be early attestations of 1 Peter in Latin:

2:9 (36,2): εἰς ... τὸ φῶς: *in ... lumen* (C, T, V), *in luce* (CLE-R)

2:12 (50,3): ἐπισκοπῆς: *visitationis* (T, V), *episcopatu* (CLE-R)<sup>1</sup>

4:8 (49,5): ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν: *caritas cooperit multitudinem peccatorum* (CLE-R= A, T), *caritas cooperuit multitudinem peccatorum* (S), *caritas operit multitudinem peccatorum* (V)

5:5 (30,2): θεὸς γὰρ φησὶν ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν: *quia deus superbis resistit humilibus autem dat gratiam* (S, T, V), *quia deus superbis contrarius est, nam humilibus dat gratiam* (CLE-R)

The first and second instances represent isolated words which differ in 1 Clement from the renderings of the other Latin versions. Verse 5:5 in 1 Clement is also characterised by a peculiar lexical rendering (*contrarius est*) while 4:8 agrees with text types A and T. The citations of 1 Peter in the Latin translation of Polycarp are included in the witness apparatus at 1:8 (1,3); 1:21 (2,1); 3:9 (2,2); 2:11 (5,3); 2:22 (8,1); 2:24 (8,1); 4:7 (7,2); 5:5 (10,2).<sup>2</sup> The references of the Shepherd of Hermas, Novatian (verses 1:3; 3:22), Pseudo-Cyprian Epistle 8 (5:9), Lactantius

---

<sup>1</sup> This citation is not identified by Thiele (1969: 67).

<sup>2</sup> The only missing citation is 2:21 (8,2).

(1:25; 5:8) are uncertain according to Thiele.<sup>3</sup> Novatian's citation of 3:22 contained in *De trinitate* 20 (73,10) transmits the rendering *subditis* instead of *subiectis* (A, T, V) translating ὑποταγέντων. The citation of Optatus at 1:16 in *Contra Donatistas* 2,20 (55,24) is significant because it supports the reading of the Vulgate *eritis* against the Old Latin *estote* to render the Greek future form ἔσεσθε while the rendering *obstruet* (καλύπτει) at 4:8 differs from those of the other Latin versions. The readings and renderings in Tertullian's citations attested in *Scorpiace* are often unique and not numerous enough to be grouped in an independent text type according to Thiele.<sup>4</sup> Tertullian differs from the *Vetus Latina* in the following instances:<sup>5</sup>

2:20 in sco 12,2 (1092): ποῖον: *quae* (C, A, S, T, V), *quanta* (TE)

2:20: εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε: *si peccantes punimini et suffertis* (C, A, T), *si peccantes cruciemini sufferatis* (S), *si peccantes et colaphizati suffertis* (V), *si [non] ut delinquentes puniamini <...> sustinetis* (TE)

2:21 in sco 12,2 (1092): ἐπακολουθήσητε: *sequamini* (K, C, A, T, V), *adsequamini* (TE)

4:8 in sco 6,11 (1080): ἀγάπη: *caritas* (A, S, T, V), *dilectio* (TE)

---

<sup>3</sup> Thiele (1969: 67). The citations of the Shepherd of Hermas, Novatian (1:3), Lactantius (5:8), Pseudo-Cyprian (5:9) are not included in the apparatus of the *Vetus Latina* edition and the reference to the critical editions of these works is not given by Thiele in the introduction.

<sup>4</sup> Thiele (1969: 67). The unique position of Tertullian's biblical text is highlighted by Thiele (1965: 34): 'Er entfernt sich so sehr von allem, was sonst in der lateinischen Bibel üblich ist, daß die Folgerung jedenfalls unabweisbar ist, er habe auf die Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltex-te keinen Einfluß ausgeübt.'

<sup>5</sup> A detailed examination of Tertullian's quotations can be found in Haupt (2019: 287–9).

4:8: καλύπτει: *cooperit* (A, T), *tegit* (C), *cooperuit* (S), *operit* (TE= V)

4:12 ff. in sco 12,3 (1092): ἀγαπητοί μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῶν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν γινομένη ὡς ξένου ὑμῶν συμβαίνοντος: *carissimi nolite mirari ardorem accidentem vobis qui ad temptationem vestram fit nec excidatis tamquam novum vobis contingat* (K), *carissimi fratres nolite expavescere in fervore qui ad temptationem vobis fit nolite pavere tamquam novi vobis aliquid contingat* (T), *carissimi nolite peregrinari in fervore qui ad temptationem vobis fit quasi novi aliquid vobis contingat* (V), *dilecti ne epavescatis ustionem quae agitur in vobis in temptationem quasi novum accidat vobis* (TE)

4:13: ἀλλὰ καθὼ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν: *sed quotienscumque communicatis Christi passionibus* (K), *sed ut communicantes Christi passionibus* (T), *sed communicantes Christi passionibus* (V), *etenim secundum quod communicatis passionibus Christi* (TE)

4:14: εἰ ὀνεδίξεσθε ... ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται: *si inproperatur ... quia maiestatis et virtutis domini nomen in vobis requiescit* (K), *exprobramini ... quoniam quod est honoris et virtutis dei et qui est eius spiritus super vos requiescit* (T), *exprobramini ... quoniam gloriae dei spiritus in vobis requiescit* (V), *si dedecoramini ... quod gloria et dei spiritus requiescit in vobis* (TE)

4:15: μὴ γάρ τις ... ὡς ... ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος: *nec quisquam ... tamquam ... curas alienas agens* (K), *nemo autem ... quasi ... curas alienas agens* (A), *nemo autem ... quasi ... alienorum adpetitor* (V), *dum ne quis ... ut ... alieni speculator* (TE)

4:16: τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ: *deum in isto nomine* (A, T, V), *dominum* (K), *dominum in hoc nomine* (TE)

The quotation of 2:21 mostly agrees with text type K with the exception of the lexical rendering *adsequamini* whereas unique lexical renderings are present at 4:8 (*dilectio* and *operit*, the latter also attested in the Vulgate) and 2:20 (*quanta, ut delinquentes, sustinetis*). The longest

quotation of 4:12–16 is characterised by a number of unique lexical and syntactical renderings as well as word order: the biblical text of Tertullian does not depend on other Latin versions.<sup>6</sup> The fourth-century witnesses of Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Chromatius of Aquileia and Ambrosiaster cannot be assigned to any existing text type.<sup>7</sup> The text types reconstructed in the *Vetus Latina* edition of 1 Peter are the following:<sup>8</sup>

K:

- Cyprian (CY): the biblical text is quoted in Epistle 70 and *De dominica oratione* (1:16); *De zelo et livore* (2:1; 2:21; 5:8); Epistle 13 (2:11–12); *De mortalitate* (2:11); *Ad Quirinum* (2:11–12, 21–23; 3:3–4, 18; 4:6, 15–16); *De bono patientiae* (2:21–23; 3:9); Epistles 11, 63, 73 (2:24); *De habitu virginum* (3:3–4); Epistles 69 and 74 (3:20–21); Epistle 58 (4:12–14); *Ad Fortunatum* (4:12–14; 5:8); Epistle 12 (5:9).
- Pseudo-Cyprian (PS-CY): citations from the Epistle of Firmilian of Caesarea ([CY] ep 75); *Ad Novatianum* (1:18–19); the anti-Cyprian writing *De rebaptismate* (1:18, 19); *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* (1:24–25; 4:18); *De duodecim abusivis* (2:10); *De aleatoribus* (5:8).
- Pontius in *Vita Cypriani* (PON) cites 2:11 and 3:13.
- Zeno of Verona (ZE) quotes verse 2:11.
- the Pseudo-Jerome Epistle 5 (PS-HI ep 5) quotes 4:12.

---

<sup>6</sup> Frisius (2011: 35–7).

<sup>7</sup> Thiele (1969: 67–8).

<sup>8</sup> The descriptions of the manuscripts are taken from Houghton (2016) and Thiele (1965).

C:

- Augustine is a source for text type C when his biblical text is supported by other sources.
- Pseudo-Cyprian in *De singularitate clericorum* (PS-CY sng) cites 1:19; 2:12, 15.
- Gelasius in *Dicta adversus Pelagianam haeresim* (GEL Pel) quotes 2:11.
- the Pseudo-Hilarius *Epistula seu libellus apologeticus* (PS-HIL ap) witnesses 3:21.
- VL 271: *Liber mysticus*. Toledo, Biblioteca del Cabildo, 35–6. A lectionary written in visigothic minuscule and copied in Toledo around 1000. It is a source for 1 Peter 1:16–2:6.
- τ<sup>68</sup>: Toledo, Cabildo, 35–8. It transmits verse 1:12.
- Readings in the capitula of the Spanish manuscripts of the Vulgate CΣ (KA Sp).
- Donatists: *Liber genealogus* (AN gen); Tyconius (TY).

A: the biblical text of Augustine when it is unique, for instance at 1:3–5, 7–9; 2:1–3; 3:1–7; 4:1–3.

S:

- VL 67: Palimpsest of León (67).<sup>9</sup> It transmits 1 Peter 1:1–7, 22–2:9; 3:1–14.
- Priscillian (PRIS) cites 1:13–14, 18–19, 22–25; 2:5–8, 11; 3:15; 4:3, 10; 5:4, 8–9.
- the Pseudo-Augustine *Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum* (PS-AU spe) quotes 1 Peter at 1:13–16, 22; 2:13–20; 3:1–9, 15–16; 4:8–9; 5:1–7.
- VL 271 is a witness to the S text of verse 1:17.

---

<sup>9</sup> See the description of the manuscript at pp. 50–1.

- VL 53: Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, lat. 2. It was copied in Italy in the sixth century and written in half-uncial script. It transmits 1 Peter 1:1–18; 2:4–10.
- the Pseudo-Ambrose *De fide* (PS-AM fi) cites 2:9.
- Bachiarius (BACH) has a mixture of text types S and T at 3:15.

T:

- VL 32: *Lectionarium Guelferbytanus*. Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Weißenburg 76. It was copied in France in uncial script in the first half of the sixth century and was later palimpsested in the seventh or eighth century with Julianus Pomerius' *De vita contemplativa*. It transmits 1 Peter 2:18–25; 3:8–18; 4:7–9, 18.
- VL 55: The Fleury Palimpsest. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 6400 G, foll. 113–30. It was copied in uncial script in the fifth century, probably in Italy, and was palimpsested in the seventh or eighth century with the Vulgate text of Numbers and Deuteronomy. It features 1 Peter from 4:17 to the end.
- VL 64: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6436/21 (from Clm 6220 and Clm 6277). It transmits the text of the Pauline Epistles in the textual form employed by Augustine. The Pauline Epistles were copied in the second half of the sixth century in Africa while the Catholic Epistles in the first half of the seventh century: both are written in uncial script. The manuscript transmits 1 Peter 1:8–9; 2:20–3:7.<sup>10</sup>
- VL 65: Codex Harleianus. London, British Library, Harley 1772. It is written in Caroline minuscule and was copied in France in the second half of the ninth century. It contains 1 Peter 2:9–4:15.

---

<sup>10</sup> Thiele (1965: 92).

- Readings in the tradition of the Vulgate, in particular in the Spanish manuscripts CΣ and in the insular manuscripts DF<sup>2</sup>A.
- Fulgentius of Ruspe (FU) cites 1:3–9, 11–12, 18–19; 2:5, 7–8, 11–12, 16–18, 21–3:6, 9, 11–12, 15, 20–4:1, 8–13, 17–18; 5:5, 8–9, 14.
- Facundus of Hermiane (FAC) quotes 1:10–11; 2:17; 3:15; 4:8.
- Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC) transmits 1:1–2, 4, 6, 9–12, 15–18, 23–25; 2:1, 4–5, 7–11, 13, 16–18, 21–23.
- Readings in Cassiodorus' *Complexiones* (CAr cpl).
- Lucifer (LUC) transmits a text mixed with S at 2:23; 5:8–9.
- Hilary, Ambrose, Rufinus of Aquileia, Jerome and Augustine's Epistle 164 are partial witnesses of this text type.
- Variants in the Vulgate text of Pope Martin I (MART I.).

Text type K is based on Cyprian and the Pseudo-Cyprianic writings and is characterised by precise linguistic features: a tendency to vary the lexicon, the presence of free renderings of the Greek underlying text and additions.<sup>11</sup> Text type C represents a middle stage from a chronological point of view between the African text type K and the European text types S, T, V: it is reconstructed on the basis of the citations of Pseudo-Hilarius, the Donatists, the Pseudo-Cyprian *De singularitate clericorum* and Gelasius. The citations of Augustine are the source for the composition of three text types: his biblical text is one of the main witnesses of text type C in the cases in which it agrees with other direct and indirect evidence. Augustine's biblical text is also close to text type T, but when it is unique to him it is listed under the siglum A.

---

<sup>11</sup> Thiele (1969: 68).

Thiele states that when Augustine's biblical text is not supported by other sources, it is characterised by improvements: these are usually isolated readings and renderings and therefore do not demonstrate that a consistent revision of the biblical text was undertaken by Augustine.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, it is significant that Augustine's citations here differ from the Vulgate, in contrast to the situation in James.<sup>13</sup> The main sources of text type S are VL 67 and the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*: the character of this text type in 1 Peter is consistent with that in James. Text type S is closely connected with text type T and the Vulgate, of which it may have been the source.<sup>14</sup> Text type T is mainly transmitted by the Old Latin manuscript tradition (VL 32 55 64 65) as well as by Spanish and insular manuscripts of the Vulgate (CΣ and DF<sup>2</sup>A) and by the citations of the circle of Cassiodorus: Facundus, Fulgentius and Epiphanius Scholasticus. Some of the additions of text types K, C, S are retained in T: this demonstrates continuity in the Old Latin tradition.<sup>15</sup> The earliest citations of the Vulgate are those of Jerome in Epistle 52 and in *Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum*, both of the year 397, followed by the fifth-century quotations of Caelestius, preserved in Augustine's *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (AU perf),

---

<sup>12</sup> Thiele (1969: 69).

<sup>13</sup> Thiele (1965: 53) also notes that the lexicon of the biblical text of Augustine in 1 Peter differs from that of his citations from the Pauline Epistles, saying that: 'die Augustintexte des 1 Pt einen ganz anderen Charakter haben als die Texte, denen Augustin in den Paulusbriefen folgt. Dort wird Genauigkeit angestrebt; hier bleiben kleinere und größere Freiheiten, ja ausgesprochene Fehler unangefochten.'

<sup>14</sup> Thiele (1969: 70).

<sup>15</sup> Thiele (1969: 71).



the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistles 148 and 13, the Pseudo-Prosper writings *Epistula ad Demetriadem* and *De vocatione* and the Pseudo-Augustine *Hypomnesticon*.

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

Most of the loan-words of 1 Peter are Christian terms of Greek origin: *angelus* (1:12 T, V; 3:22 A, T, V); *apostolus* (1:1 S, V; 1:12 C); *baptisma* (3:21 K, C, T, V); *blasphemare* (4:4 T, V; 4:14 K, T); *christianus* (4:16 K, A, T, V); *diabolus* (5:8 K, A, S, T, V); *episcopus* (2:25 V; PAC; cf KA; PS-HIL-A; BED cath 1 ms) while text type T has the Latin rendering *visitator*; *evangelizare* (1:12 C, T, V; 1:25 S, V; 4:6 A, T, V) whereas the Latin rendering *praedicare* is employed by text type K; *evangelium* (4:17 A, T, V); *idolum* (4:3 A, T, V); *presbyter* (5:1 HI ep, Tt; CA<sup>r</sup>com; cf PS-IGN);<sup>16</sup> *propheta* (1:10 C, T, V); *prophetare* (1:10 T, V) whereas other Latin versions have *praedicare* (C), *praenuntiare* (AU, IS), *annuntiare* (AM); *scandalum* (2:8 A, S, V). The Hebrew word *amen* is attested three times (4:11 T, V; 5:11 T, V; 5:14 T).

Some of the loan-words contained in 1 Peter are not closely connected with Christianity and represent interesting linguistic cases. The noun *petra* is employed at 2:8 (A, S, V) to render the corresponding Greek word: the loan-word is frequent in the Vulgate Gospels and also attested outside the Gospels at Romans 9:33, 1 Corinthians 10:4, Revelation 6:15.<sup>17</sup> This Greek noun entered the Latin language at an early stage, with attestations in Plautus and Ennius. The case of *dolus* (2:1 A, S, V; 2:22 K, C, V; 3:10 S, T, V) is ambiguous: it is not clear whether the Greek and Latin words have a common Indo-European root, hypothesis supported by the

---

<sup>16</sup> Jerome has also *conpresbyter* at 5:1 to render συμπρεσβύτερος.

<sup>17</sup> Burton (2000: 162).

presence of *dolom*, *dolud* in Oscan and *tal* in Old Norse, or the Latin term is a loan-word derived either directly from Greek or from Oscan through Greek.<sup>18</sup>

The verb *colaphizare*, ‘to strike with the fist, beat, cuff’,<sup>19</sup> is attested at 2:20 in the Vulgate (V; AU spe Var; PS-AU Fu Var; PS-HIL-A)<sup>20</sup> whereas Tertullian and text types C, T have *punire*, rendering the Greek variant κολάζω, AU Pet features the expression *poenas pati* and text type S the verb *cruciare*. This loan-word is present only once in the Vulgate outside this passage, at 2 Corinthians 12:7, while κολαφίζειν is rendered three times in the Vulgate New Testament with the expression *colaphis caedere* at Matthew 26:67, Mark 14:65, 1 Corinthians 4:11. The Vetus Latina features the Greek term at Matthew 26:67 (VL 27) and 1 Corinthians 4:11 (VL 61 75 76 77 78; *AMst<sup>ed</sup>*; *PEL<sup>B</sup>*).<sup>21</sup> The earliest attestation of *colaphizare* is in Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* 5,12; *De pudicitia* 13) and the loan-word is present only in Christian writers: the borrowing of verbs ending in -ίζω is a frequent phenomenon in Christian writings.<sup>22</sup>

The loan-word *clerus* is used with the meaning ‘lot, inheritance’ at 5:3 (T, V), instead of the Christian meaning ‘the clergy’: according to Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich ‘the κληροί seem to denote the ‘flock’ as a whole, i.e., the various parts of the congregation which have been

---

<sup>18</sup> Buck (1949: 1171), Ernout and Meillet (2001: 182).

<sup>19</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 441).

<sup>20</sup> The alternative readings *colofizati fueritis* (D), *colaphizantes* (M; PS-AU Fu), *colafizanti* (Σ<sup>T\*</sup>) are also attested.

<sup>21</sup> The sigla in italics represent different orthographic forms. See Houghton, Kreinecker, MacLachlan and Smith (2019: xxxi).

<sup>22</sup> Burton (2011: 489).

assigned as ‘portions’ to the individual presbyters or shepherds’.<sup>23</sup> The attestations of this meaning are rare and included in three legal texts (*Epistula imperatoris Hadriani ad Quietum* Corp. III 355<sup>B</sup>; *Epistula proconsulis ad procuratorem* Corp. III 355<sup>C</sup>; *Epistula procuratoris ad proconsulem* Corp. III 355<sup>D</sup>), in the Old Latin version of Jeremiah 12:13, cited twice by Jerome (*Commentarii in Ieremiam prophetam imperfecti* and Epistle 51,1), and in the Vulgate version of Psalm 67:14.<sup>24</sup> Excluding these cases, the loan-word *clerus* becomes in Latin a specialised term to indicate the clergy.

The adjective *discolus* (2:18 S, V; AU spe; PS-AU spe; BED cath; Remigius Autiss.)<sup>25</sup> is a loan-word from the Greek δύσκολος, ‘troublesome’, while text type T has the Latin adjective *difficilis*. The similar rendering *discolatis* in D and PS-HIL-A<sup>txt</sup> is accompanied by an etymological explanation in PS-HIL-A (231a,5): *i.e. qui colere (colori Edit.) difficiles sunt*.<sup>26</sup> This peculiar loan-word is identified by Thiele who extends the research to the Latin renderings of σκολιός, which means ‘crooked, unjust, unrighteous’<sup>27</sup> and is the underlying Greek term of 1 Peter 2:18.<sup>28</sup> A further attestation of *discolus* is present at Mark 10:24 (VL 1) to render the

---

<sup>23</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 436). Bergren (2019: 18) has the translation ‘underling’.

<sup>24</sup> The word *terminos* is chosen in the fifth edition of the Stuttgart Vulgate instead of *cleros*, present in the fourth edition.

<sup>25</sup> A further case is present in the Vetus Latina Database in CAn Hib 24,2.

<sup>26</sup> *Discolatis* is also attested in CAn Hib 37,33 according to the Vetus Latina Database.

<sup>27</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>28</sup> Thiele (1965: 97). According to Bergren (2019: 20) *discolus* derives from σκολιός and not from δύσκολος, which is unattested in the Greek text of 1 Peter 2:18. On the other hand, von

adjective *δυσκόλον* (*discolum*) while the other Latin versions feature *difficile*. The adverb *δυσκόλως* at Mark 10:23 is translated by *difficile* (*dedifficulter* in VL 1) in both the Vulgate and the direct and indirect tradition of the Vetus Latina. It is noteworthy that in Mark the Greek adverb and adjective do not refer to people, unlike 1 Peter 2:18 in which the adjective refers to the masters, but are part of exclamations (*πῶς δυσκόλως, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν*) that highlight the difficulty for the wealthy to enter the kingdom of God. At Matthew 19:23 and Luke 18:24 the adverb *δυσκόλως* is rendered by *difficile* in the Vulgate and in the majority of the Old Latin witnesses: the context is the same as that of the passages in Mark.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, the adjective *σκολιός* is used in three further New Testament passages and rendered by the adjectives *pravus* (Luke 3:5; Acts 2:40 VL 5 50 51 54 56 57; Arator tit 4; AU op 13, 37; PS-AU Do; BED Prv 1; LEO; LUC; Philippians 2:15 D, I, V), *tortuosus* (Philippians 2:15 A; Luke 3:5 VL 2; AU cf, s Gue; IR; QU) and *perversus* (Acts 2:40 HI ep 51, Joan).

In conclusion, the Vulgate does not avoid Greek terms; on the contrary, the revision features loan-words even when the Vetus Latina has the Latin equivalent nouns. A significant case is the employment of *episcopus* in the Vulgate at 2:25 instead of *visitor*, a synonym of the former according to Augustine (*Sermones ad populum* 162C). The earliest attestation of *visitor* is contained in Apuleius (*Apologia* 98), in which the *nomen agentis* is referred to an attendant at the gladiatorial games, and the only attestation of this word in the Vulgate is at 2 Maccabees 3:39 with the differing meaning ‘protector’. The loan-word *episcopus* is always

---

Harnack (1916: 78) notes that the translator ‘ersetzt damit ein griechisches Wort durch ein anderes (*δύσκολος*) dessen Gebrauch im Lateinischen m. W. sonst unbekannt ist.’

<sup>29</sup> The only alternative renderings are *impossibile* (AU Ps 51,14,27; HI Mt 3) at Matthew 19:23 and *difficiliter* (VL 2) at Luke 18:24.

preferred in the Vulgate New Testament to the Latin equivalent (Acts 20:28; Philippians 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7).<sup>30</sup>

## b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

Greek compounds can be divided into groups according to their structure, whether they are formed on the basis of the juxtaposition of two words (b.1, b.2, b.4) or are alpha privative compounds (b.3), and to the typology of the Latin translations, which can be either periphrastic expressions (b.1) or calques, matching words and etymologising renderings which correspond to the lexical components of the Greek words (b.2 and b.4).

### b.1 Periphrases

In the following instances the Latin versions paraphrase the Greek compounds:

1:18: πατροπαραδότου: *a parentibus vestris tradita* (A), *paternae traditionis* (S, T, V)

1:22: φιλαδελφίαν: *caritate(m) fraternitatis* (S), *fraternitatis amore* (V; PS-HIL-A)

2:2: ἀρτιγέννητα: *modo nati* (C), *modo geniti* (S, V)

2:6: ἀκρογωνιαῖον: *angularem* (C), *summum angularem* (S, V)

3:8: φιλάδελφοι: *fraternitatis amatores* (S, V), *fraternitatem amantes* (T)

4:3: εἰδωλολατρίαις: *idolorum servitutibus* (A, T), *idolorum cultibus* (V; PS-HIL-A)

4:15: ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος: *curas alienas agens* (K, A), *alienorum adpetitor* (T, V; 64 65; PS-HIL-A), *adpetitor alienorum* (D), *aliena adpetens* (AM-A Apc 1), *aliena concupiscentes* (PS-IGN Mag 9,5), *alieni speculator* (TE)

---

<sup>30</sup> Burton (2011: 491) looks into the case of *episcopus* and its Latin renderings.

5:2: αἰσχροκερδῶς: *turpi lucro* (T), *turpis lucri gratia* (V; HI ep 52; PAS-D; CO-Brac; CO-Tol 10,7; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

5:4: ἀρχιποίμενος: *princeps pastorum* (S, T, V), *pastorum pastor* (RUF Lv, Nm), *primus omnium pastorum* (GR-M ep 5), *primus pastor* (GR-M ep 5 Var; past; cf Ev; Jb 21; cf 16; Ez 1,7; cf 1,6 > BEA Apc; cf BED h 2; Paulinus Aquil.), *pastor primus* (GR-M ep 11 1/2), *summus pastor* (GR-M Jb 19)

The Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina three times (1:22; 4:3; 5:2). The term φιλαδελφία is rendered three times in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles by *caritas fraternitatis* (Romans 12:10, 1 Thessalonians 4:9, Hebrews 13:1) while *amor fraternitatis* is attested at 1 Peter 1:22 and 2 Peter 1:7. The related expression *amator fraternitatis*, attested in the Vulgate and text type S at 3:8, is rare: it is employed by Augustine (spe 44 264,13), in the Latin translation of Polycarpus (10,1,125), twice in Ambrosiaster's Commentary on Romans (12,10) and once in the Commentary on 1 Timothy (6,12). On the other hand, the similar adjective φιλόξενος is rendered by *hospitalis* at 4:9 (T, V),<sup>31</sup> which does not reflect the structure of the Greek compound. The term εἰδωλολατρία is rendered in Latin by the loan-word *idolum* plus *servitus* (A, T) and *cultus* (V; PS-HIL-A), translating λατρεία, 'service'. The principal meaning of *servitus* is 'slavery' but also 'service' in the Christian context. The compound ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, 'meddler', is a hapax in the Greek New Testament as well as the Latin translation *alienorum adpetitor*, present in the Vulgate and text type T.<sup>32</sup> The term *adpetitor*, 'one that strives or longs for something', usually followed by the genitive, is a fourth-century

---

<sup>31</sup> The expression *hospitalitatem ... exhibete* is employed in text type S.

<sup>32</sup> *Aliorum adpetitor* in Ω<sup>w</sup> and *adpetitor alienorum* in D.

formation mainly attested in Christian writers, especially Jerome and Augustine, and sporadically in historians, such as Ammianus Marcellinus (25,4,18; 31,14,5; 29,2,2) and in the *Historia Augusta* (40,10). At 2:6 the components of the adjective ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ‘placed at the extreme corner’, are matched by the rendering of text type S and the Vulgate, *summum angularem*, while the simple adjective *angularem* of text type C does not translate ἄκρος. On the other hand, at 2:2, ἀρτιγέννητος, ‘just born’, is matched by the renderings of both the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina*. The *Vetus Latina* text types and the Vulgate agree on the rendering of the compound ἀρχιποίμενος at 5:4, which is a hapax in the New Testament, as *princeps pastorum*. The rendering of Rufinus, *pastorum pastor*, does not match the Greek word. Both the renderings at 1:18 are suitable for the Greek term.

## b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words

The compounds are rendered by new formations and pre-existing words that match the structure of the Greek terms. Examples (and counterexamples) of calques and matching words are presented below:

2:12: κακοποιῶν: *malignis* (K), *malefacientibus* (C), *malefactoribus* (T, V)

2:14: κακοποιῶν: *malorum* (C, A, S, T), *malefactorum* (V; 65; EP-SC<sup>txt</sup>), *malefactoribus* (BED cath 1 ms)

3:16: κακοποιῶν (variant): *malefactoribus* (T)

4:15: κακοποιός: *maleficus* (K; DIL 54\* ΔΜΦ<sup>B\*</sup>?U\*; TE; CY; PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup> 1/3?), *maledicus* (A, T, V; 65 FCΣΛΧτΘΥ 251 AGRQSF<sup>TB2GV</sup>PU<sup>2</sup>Ω 54<sup>2</sup>; AU spe; CY Var; AU; QU; GR-M; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt</sup> cf<sup>com</sup> 2/3; BED cath)<sup>33</sup>

3:17: κακοποιοῦντας: *malefacientes* (A, T, V)

2:14: ἀγαθοποιῶν: *bonorum* (C, A, S, T, V)

2:15, 20: ἀγαθοποιοῦντας: *benefacientes* (C, S, T, V)

3:6: ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι: *benefacientes* (C, S, T, V)

3:17: ἀγαθοποιοῦντας: *benefacientes* (S, T, V)

4:19: ἀγαθοποιίαις (variant): *benefactis* (T, V)

1:3: εὐλογητός: *benedictus* (A, S, T, V)

3:9a: εὐλογοῦντες: *benedicentes* (S, T, V)

3:9b: εὐλογία: *benedictionem* (S, T, V)

3:8: ὁμόφρονες: *unianimes* (S, T, V)

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina mostly agree on the employment of formations which match the components of the Greek words. The compound κακοποιός is rendered differently at 2:12, 14 and 4:15: the Vulgate features *malefactor* twice, at 2:12, 14, and *maledicus* at 4:15, the former also attested in text type T at 3:16 and the latter, which does not exactly match κακοποιός, in text types A and T at 4:15. *Malefactor* is a revival of an archaic word attested once in Plautus (*Bacchides* 395) and later in a few biblical passages and Christian texts, for

---

<sup>33</sup> *Maleficus* is the reading attributed to the Vulgate in the Vetus Latina edition but *maledicus* is printed in the Stuttgart Vulgate. The latter is supported by the most important manuscripts of the Vulgate.



instance at 2 Timothy 2:9 (VL 75) and in the Vulgate version of John 18:30.<sup>34</sup> The substantivised participle *malefaciens* (2:12 C), *malefactor* (2:12 T, V; 2:14 V; 3:16 T) and *maleficus* (4:15 K) match the Greek compound κακοποιός whereas the adjectives *malus* (2:14 C), *malignus* (2:12 K) and *maledicus* (4:15 V, A, T) do not reflect formally the Greek term, the latter being probably a scribal mistake considering that the possible underlying word κακολογός is not attested in the ECM. The participles from the verb ἀγαθοποιέω are rendered in four instances by *benefacere* (2:15, 20 C, V; 3:6 C, S, T, V; 3:17 S, T, V) and once by the simple adjective *bonus* (2:14 C, A, S, T, V). *Benedicere* and *benedictio* are used three times (1:3 A, S, T, V; 3:9a S, T, V; 3:9b S, T, V) to match εὐλογέω and εὐλογία.<sup>35</sup>

A particular type of calque is represented by the renderings of verbs ending in -άζω and -ίζω, such as δοξάζω, ἀγνίζω, ἀγιάζω:<sup>36</sup>

1:8: δεδοξασμένη: *honorato* (A), *honorificata* (T), *glorificata* (V; 53; BED h)

2:12: δοξάσωσιν: *magnificent* (K, T), *glorificent* (C, V; PS-CY; LUCU; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

4:11: δοξάζηται: *glorificetur* (T), *honorificetur* (V; 65; [PROS]; PS-HIL-A; BED h)

4:14: δοξάζεται: *honoratur* (K), *honorificatur* (T)

4:16: δοξαζέτω: *glorificet* (A, T, V)

1:22: ἡγνικότες: *sanctificate* (C), *castificate* (S), *castificantes* (V)

3:15: ἀγιάσατε: *sanctificate* (T, V)

---

<sup>34</sup> Pezzini (2016: 43).

<sup>35</sup> See James 3:9, 10 (pp. 61–2).

<sup>36</sup> See pp. 62–3.

The translators establish a correspondence between the Greek suffixes *-αζω*, *-ιζω* and the Latin *-ficare*. In 1 Peter *δοξάζω* is rendered by *glorificare*, *honorificare* and *magnificare*, *ἀγνίζω* by *sanctificare* and *castificare* and *ἀγιάζω* by *sanctificare*. *Honorificare* and *magnificare* are not calques but pre-existing words which undergo semantic extension: the latter, which usually renders *μεγαλύνω*, does not match *δοξάζω* in that it does not keep the relationship *δόξα* – *δοξάζω*, retained by *honor* – *honorificare* and *gloria* – *glorificare*.<sup>37</sup> The Vulgate features *glorificare*, which appears to be the closest rendering to *δοξάζω*, in three instances (1:8; 2:12; 4:16) out of four. In addition, the verbs *mortificare*, ‘to put to death’, and *vivificare*, ‘to make alive’, attested at 3:18 (A, T, V) and rendering *θανατόω* and *ζωοποιέω* are Christian coinages.<sup>38</sup> The former is present in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles (Romans 7:4; 8:13, 36; 2 Corinthians 6:9; Colossians 3:5) and the latter in several passages of the Vulgate Gospels, Acts and Pauline Epistles.

### b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds:

The compounds with alpha privative are rendered in the following ways:

1:4: ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον: *inmortalem et intaminatam florentem* (A), *incorruptibilem et incontaminabilem et inmarcescibilem* (S, T), *incorruptibilem et incontaminatam et inmarcescibilem* (V; AN cath; FU; GR-M; cf GI)

1:8: ἀνεκλαλήτω: *inenarrabili* (C, T, V), *ineffabili* (HI; AU Pel 1/2)

---

<sup>37</sup> Burton (2000: 134–5).

<sup>38</sup> Burton (2000: 135).

1:17: ἀπροσωπολήμπτως: *sine discriptione personarum* (S), *sine discrimine personarum* (T), *sine acceptione personarum* (V; AN glo; COL)<sup>39</sup>

1:19: ἀμόμου καὶ ἀσπίλου: *incontaminati et immaculati* (S, V), *immaculati et incontaminati* (T)

1:22: ἀνυπόκριτον: *inaffectum* (C), *simplicem* (S), *simplices* (T), *simplici* (V; CAr; PS-HIL-A)

1:23: ἀφθάρτου: *immortali* (A), *incorrupto* (S), *incorruptibili* (V; PRIS; RUF Var; HI Za; EP-SC<sup>txt.com</sup> 3/6; GI; IS; PS-HIL-A)

2:2: ἄδολον: *innocens* (C), *sine dolo* (S, V)

2:15: ἀφρόνων: *stultorum* (C), *insipientium* (T), *inprudentium* (V; PS-HIL-A)

4:3: ἀθεμίτοις: *inlicitis* (T, V)

4:18: ἀσεβής: *impius* (A, T, V)

5:4: ἀμαράντιον: *inmarcescibilem* (S, T, V)

The alpha privative is rendered either by the prefix *in-* (1:4; 1:8; 1:19; 1:22 C; 1:23; 2:2 C; 2:15 T, V; 4:3; 4:18; 5:4) or by *sine* plus a noun (1:17; 2:2 S, V). The negation is not kept in Latin at 1:4 (A), 1:22 (S, T, V) and 2:15 (C). The renderings of text type A at 1:4 and 1:23 differ from those of the other Latin versions: *immortalis*, regularly employed to render ἀθάνατος, is not as suitable as *incorruptibilis* to translate ἄφθαρτος in which the root of the verb *corrumpere* corresponds to that of φθείρω, ‘to corrupt’. *Incorruptibilis*, ‘unperishable’,<sup>40</sup> is a Christian coinage first attested in the Vetus Latina (1 Corinthians 9:25 54\*; CY te Var; 1 Timothy 1:17 VL 64 77; HI Is tr, Za; PS-RUF fi; AU Ad, bo, ep, Fau 13, Fel, Ps 109, s 277; cf THr 1 Tm

---

<sup>39</sup> The word order *personarum acceptione* is attested in 53 ΛΘ<sup>HA</sup>Σ<sup>A2</sup>MSUΩ<sup>D</sup>; KA; cf EP-SC<sup>com</sup>?; COL Var; cf 2 Par 19,7; Rm 2,11; Eph 6,9; Col 3,25.

<sup>40</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

1,17<sup>com</sup>; CE; BED; QU), in the Vulgate version of Romans 1:23 and twice in pagan writers (Claudius Donatus, *Aeneid* 5,344 and Oribasius, *Synopsis ad Eustathium* 4,27 cod. Aa). The adjective *inlicitus*, attested at 4:3 in text types T and V, appears in the postclassical period. At 1:4 *florentem* (A) does not preserve the structure of ἀμάραντον as *inmarcescibilem* does: this postclassical adjective, mainly used by Christian writers with the meaning ‘unfading’, is formed on the basis of the verb *marcesco*, which corresponds to the Greek μαράνω: ‘to wither’. The first attestation of the adjective is in Tertullian (*De corona* 15,13) with reference to a flower. The same term occurs at 5:4 to render ἀμαράντινος in S, T, V, ‘composed of amaranth’, a flower that does not wither. The adjective *insipiens* is the most common rendering of ἄφρων in the Vulgate Epistles (Romans 2:20; 1 Corinthians 15:36; 2 Corinthians 11:16, 19; 12:6, 11) whereas *inprudens*, the rendering of the Vulgate at 2:15, is employed outside this passage only at Ephesians 5:17 (D, I, V). The expression *acceptio personarum*, meaning ‘respect of persons’, is recurrent in the Vulgate Epistles to render προσωποληψία (Ephesians 6:9 X, D, I, V; Colossians 3:25 D, I, V; James 2:1 F, V) and occurs at 1:17 preceded by *sine* in the Vulgate instead of the Old Latin renderings *discriptio personarum* (S) and *discrimen personarum* (T). The translation of ἀνυπόκριτον, ‘unfeigned’, with the adjective *simplex* (S, T, V), which does not render the alpha privative of the Greek term, disagrees with the renderings of James 3:17, which feature *sine* plus a noun (*sine hypocrisi* F, *sine simulatione* V). In the Vulgate Pauline Epistles the adjective is translated by the expression *non ficta* (2 Corinthians 6:6; 1 Timothy 1:5; 2 Timothy 1:5) and *sine simulatione* (Romans 12:9), the latter being the same rendering of James 3:17. The Old Latin manuscript tradition of 2 Corinthians 6:6 and Romans 12:9 agree with the Vulgate and alternative renderings are rarely attested in patristic sources: *sine dolo* (PS- IGN Php pr), *non simulata* (HYM ant 50, 29-30 at Romans 12:9 and AMst 2 Cor 6,6), *sincera* (FU inc 10 and AU Ps 134,2,14 at 2 Corinthians 6:6), *non ficta* (AU ep 33,6 at Romans

12:9), *simplices* (Max h 37). The rendering of VL 271, *inaffectum*, is a hapax not attested elsewhere.

#### b.4 Etymologising Renderings

The etymologising renderings are verbal and nominal calques and matching words in which a system of correspondences between the original word and the translation is established by using equivalent prepositions and roots with the same meaning in Greek and Latin. A selected number of examples (and counterexamples) of Latin words that match the Greek counterparts are cited below:

1:2: πρόγνωσιν: *praescientiam* (S, V), *providentiam* (PS-VIG Var)

1:3: ἀναγεννήσας: *regeneravit* (A, S, T, V)

1:3: ἀναστάσεως: *resurrectionem* (A, S, T, V)<sup>41</sup>

1:7: ἀποκαλύψει: *revelatione* (S, V), *revelationem* (T)<sup>42</sup>

1:12: ἀπεκαλύφθη: *revelatum est* (T, V)<sup>43</sup>

1:10: ἐξεζήτησαν: *exquisierunt* (A, T, V)

1:11: προμαρτυρόμενον: *qui praenuntiavit* (T), *praenuntiaverunt* (C), *praenuntians* (V)

1:14: συσχηματιζόμενοι: *conmiscentes* (S), *configurantes* (T), *configurati* (V; 53; Caelestius), *conformati* (HI Za), *conformemini* (HI Jov)

1:20: προεγνωσμένου: *precognitus* (T), *praecogniti* (V; 271; PROS; CLE-A<sup>txt</sup>; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt</sup>)

1:22: ἀναγεγεννημένοι: *renati* (S, V)

---

<sup>41</sup> Cfr. 3:21: ἀναστάσεως: *resurrectione* (C) *resurrectionem* (T, V).

<sup>42</sup> Cfr. 4:13: ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει: *in revelatione* (K, T, V).

<sup>43</sup> Cfr. 5:1: ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι: *revelari* (T), *revelanda est* (V).

- 1:24a: ἐξηράνθη: *aruit* (S), *exaruit* (V)
- 1:24b: ἐξέπεσεν: *decidit* (S, V)
- 2:5: ἐποικοδομῆσθε (variant): *superaedificamini* (V; 53; HI Jr, Za; cf AU Ps 81; PS-AU s Fra; cf PAU-N; LEO; PS-AM man; GR-M; PS-GR-M; ILD; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED h; [EUCH])
- 2:19, 3:16: συνείδησιν: *conscientiam* (S, T, V)
- 3:21: συνειδήσεως: *conscientiae* (C, T, V)
- 2:23: ἀντελοιδόρει: *remaledicebat* (C)<sup>44</sup>
- 3:3a: περιθέσεως: *circumpositio* (S, T), *circumdatio* (V; PEL; PS-HIL-A)
- 3:3b: ἐνδύσεως: *habitus* (S), *habitu* (T), *indumenti* (V; PEL: PS-HI)<sup>45</sup>
- 3:7a: συνοικοῦντες: *concordes* (A), *conmorantes* (S), *cohabitantes* (T, V)
- 3:7b: συγκληρονόμοις: *coheredibus* (A, T, V), *coheredi* (S)
- 3:8: συμπαθεῖς: *conpatientes* (S, T, V)
- 3:11: ἐκκλινάτω: *declinet* (S, T, V)
- 3:21: ἀπόθεσις: *depositio* (C, T, V)<sup>46</sup>
- 4:14: ἀναπαύεται: *requiescit* (K, T, V)
- 5:1: συμπρεσβύτερος: *consenior* (T, V; 55 64; HI Gal; CO-Brac; FEol; CAr; GR-M; PS-HIL-A), *similiter maior natu* (S), *conpresbyter* (HI ep, Tt)

---

<sup>44</sup> The simple verb *maledicere* is employed by text type K and the Vulgate to translate the variant ἐλοιδόρει.

<sup>45</sup> See pp. 160–1.

<sup>46</sup> Cfr. 2:1: ἀποθέμενοι: *deposita* (A), *deponentes* (S, V).

5:13: συνελεκτή: *electa* (T), *cumelecta* (V; F\*IRCΣ<sup>TCO</sup>Δ<sup>LM</sup>Φ<sup>BV</sup>; HI ill Var, Mc), *conelecta* (AΦ<sup>TGP\*</sup>?Λ<sup>L2</sup>, W-W; BED cath<sup>txt</sup> 1 ms), *coelecta* (Σ<sup>A</sup>Λ<sup>LX</sup> 54\*.<sup>3</sup> Θ 65 LΩ<sup>D2</sup>; HI ill, Mc Var; BED cath<sup>txt</sup> 6 mss), *collecta* (Λ<sup>H</sup>Δ<sup>BP2</sup>Ω<sup>C</sup> 54<sup>2</sup>; HI ill Var, Mc Var; cf BED cath<sup>com</sup> 93,67B)

The list above shows that the Latin translators endeavoured to find adequate Latin correspondences for the Greek words. In most of the cases the Latin versions employ pre-existing words that match the structure of the Greek terms: the verb *exarescere*, ‘to dry up’, attested in classical literature, is employed only by the Vulgate at 1:24a in order to match the aorist ἐξηράνθη. However, this is an apparent case of etymologising rendering: the Latin preposition *ex* does not correspond to the Greek ἐξ / ἐκ in that the verb ξηραίνω is not preceded by the preposition but by the augment of the aorist. New words are also coined in order to establish a correspondence with the Greek words, for instance the hapax *cumelecta*, present in the Vulgate at 5:13, and the readings *conpresbyter*, attested in Jerome’s citations, and *consenior* at 5:1 (T, V). The latter is a hapax of the Vulgate and text type T which preserves in Latin the preposition and the comparative of the Greek term συμπρεσβύτερος while text type S (PS-AU spe) employs the periphrasis *similiter maior natu*. In some occurrences, the translators resort to rare words to match the Greek terms, such as the verb *configurare* (1:14 T, V), ‘to form from or after something, to fashion accordingly’,<sup>47</sup> first attested in the first century AD in Columella (4,20,1), later in Christian writers such as Tertullian and Lactantius and in the biblical translations, in the Vetus Latina at Romans 2:12 (79; FOR)<sup>48</sup> and in the Vulgate at Philippians 3:10 (V; 78 61; HI Gal; PEL > CAr; PS-IS; cf SED-S; cf AM) and 3:21 (V; 78 87; CY te Var,

---

<sup>47</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>48</sup> The Vulgate has *conformare*.

mort Var; PEL Phil<sup>txt.</sup> cf<sup>com</sup> 1/2 > CAr Phil; PS-AM man; FU ep; CAr cpl; GR-M > TA; BED).<sup>49</sup> *Configurare* and *conformare* (HI) are appropriate renderings of συσχηματίζω because of the semantic equivalence between the words σχῆμα and *figura / forma* on which the verbs are formed. On the other hand, the rendering of text type S, *conmiscentes*, keeps the correspondence with the Greek verb only in the rendering of the preverb. Other examples of postclassical etymologising renderings are *remaledicere* (2:23 C), which is attested once in a non-Christian context (Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum: divus Vespasianus* 9) and *revelare* (1:12 T, V; 5:1 T, V), a postclassical term never used before the Augustan age while the noun *revelatio* (1:7 S, T, V; 4:13 K, T, V) appears for the first time in Christian writings. *Praesentia* (1:2 S, V), which matches πρόγνωσις, is not employed by the writers preceding Tertullian. Another postclassical formation only attested in Christian writers is *superaedificare* (2:5 V), ‘to build above’, which has numerous attestations in the Vulgate Epistles.<sup>50</sup> The noun *circumpositio* (3:3 S, T), which perfectly matches the Greek counterpart, has two attestations outside this passage: in an Old Latin citation of Augustine (*Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* 4,30) of Numbers 16:38–39 and in the anonymous translation of Origen (*Commentariorum in Matthaeum* 18,31). The lexical rendering of the Vulgate, *circumdatio*, is also a late Latin formation exclusively attested in Christian writings and not of common use, which does not retain the equivalence between τίθημι and *ponere*. In a few instances the Greek prepositions are not matched by the Latin ones: ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις are rendered by *revelare* and *revelatio* at 1:7; 1:12; 4:13; 5:1; ἐκπίπτω is translated by *decidere* at 1:24b and ἐκκλίνω by *declinare* at 3:11; ἀποτίθημι and

---

<sup>49</sup> In the passages of Philipians, the Greek text features συμμορφίζω and σύμμορφον.

<sup>50</sup> Cfr. Jude 20 (pp. 362–3).



ἀπόθεσις are rendered by *deponere* and *depositio*. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina agree on such renderings and on the majority of the instances listed above, except 3:3b and 5:13.

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

*-io*: *dispersio* (1:1 S, V), *sanctificatio* (1:2 S, V), *adsparsio* (1:2 S), *aspersio* (1:2 V), *resurrectio* (1:3 A, S, T, V; 3:21 C, T, V), *temptatio* (1:6 S, T, V; 4:12 K, T, V), *tribulatio* (1:6 C), *probatio* (1:7 S, T), *revelatio* (1:7 S, T, V; 1:13 S, T, V; 4:12 K, T, V), *passio* (1:11 T, V; 4:13 K, T, V; 5:1 S, T, V; 5:9 T, V), *obauditio* (1:14 S, T), *conversatio* (1:15 S, T, V; 1:18 S, T, V; 2:12 K, C, T, V; 3:1 A, S, T, V; 3:2 A, S, T, V; 3:16 S, T, V; 5:3 S), *discriptio* (1:17 S), *acceptio* (1:17 V), *traditio* (1:18 S, T, V), *constitutio* (1:20a T; 1:20b T, V; 2:13 A), *simulatio* (2:1 S, V), *adulatio* (2:1 A), *detractio* (2:1 A, S, V), *offensio* (2:8 A, S, V), *adoptio* (2:9 C), *adquisitio* (T, V), *visitatio* (2:12 T, V; 5:6 S, T, V), *ordinatio* (2:13 T), *incrispatio* (3:3 C), *implicatio* (3:3 T), *circumpositio* (3:3 S, T), *circumdatio* (3:3 V), *perturbatio* (3:6 S, T, V), *oratio* (3:7 C, S, T, V; 4:7 T, V), *confessio* (3:15 S), *satisfactio* (3:15 V), *responsio* (3:15 T), *ratio* (3:15 T, V; 4:5 T, V; 5:4 C, T), *depositio* (3:21 C, T, V), *interrogatio* (3:21 C, T, V), *cogitatio* (4:1 A, V), *comissatio* (A, T), *comisatio* (V), *potatio* (4:3 A, T, V), *confusio* (4:4 T, V), *dilectio* (4:8 C), *murmuratio* (4:9 S, T, V), *incoatio* (4:17 C), *declaratio* (5:1 S), *compulsio* (5:2 T), *repraehensio* (5:2 S), *dominatio* (5:2 S)

*-tas*: *hereditas* (1:4 A, S, T, V; 3:9 S, T, V), *veritas* (1:5 A; 1:22 T), *caritas* (1:22a V; 1:22b S; 4:8a A, S, T, V; 4:8b A, S, T, V; 5:14 T), *fraternitas* (1:22 S, V; 2:17 S, T, V; 3:8 S, T, V; 5:9 T, V), *voluptas* (2:11 C; 4:3 A), *voluntas* (2:15 C, S, T, V; 3:17 T, V; 4:2 A, T, V; 4:3 A, T, V; 4:19 T, V), *libertas* (2:16 C, A, S, T, V), *perpetuitas* (3:4 A; 5:14 T), *incorruptibilitas* (3:4 T,

V), *bonitas* (3:13 S, T), *potestas* (3:22 A, T, V; 4:11 T; 5:11 T), *ebrietas* (4:3 A, T), *hospitalitas* (4:9 S), *claritas* (4:13 K), *maiestas* (4:14 K), *humilitas* (5:5 S, T, V)

-*antia* / -*entia*: *praescientia* (1:2 S, V), *oboedientia* (1:2 V; 1:14 V; 1:22 V), *ignorantia* (2:15 C, S, T, V), *conscientia* (2:19 S, T, V; 3:16 S, T, V; 3:21 C, T, V), *scientia* (3:7 S, T, V; 4:1 T), *patientia* (3:20 C, T, V), *concupiscentia* (4:3 T)

-*ura*: *scriptura* (2:6 S, V), *creatura* (2:13 V), *capillatura* (3:3 V)

-*do*: *multitudo* (1:3 A; 4:8 A, S, T, V), *consuetudo* (1:18 C), *libido* (4:3 A, T), *sollicitudo* (5:7 S, T, V)

-*mentum*: *testamentum* (1:9 A), *velamentum* (2:16 C, A, S), *ornamentum* (3:3 K, S), *indumentum* (3:3 V), *vestimentum* (3:3 S, T, V)

-*or*: *malefactor* (2:12 T, V; 2:14 V; 3:16 T), *pastor* (2:25 T, V), *visitor* (2:25 T), *amator* (3:8 S, V; 3:13 A), *sector* (3:13 S), *sectator* (3:13 T), *aemulator* (3:13 V), *procurator* (4:10 S), *dispensator* (4:10 T, V), *adpetitor* (4:15 T, V), *peccator* (4:18 A, V), *creator* (4:19 T, V), *communicator* (5:1 V)

-*bilis*: *incompactibilis* (1:3 S, T, V; 1:23 V), *incontaminabilis* (1:4 S, V), *inmarcescibilis* (1:4 S, T, V; 5:4 S, T, V), *inenarrabilis* (1:8 C, T, V), *ineffabilis* (1:8 HI, AU Pel 1/2), *compactibilis* (1:18 C, S, T, V; 1:23 S, V), *rationabilis* (2:2 C, S), *acceptabilis* (2:5 S, T, V), *admirabilis* (2:9 C, T, V)

Many of the words ending in *-io* appear in Christian Latin: *dispersio* is first attested in Tertullian, *sanctificatio* is a calque of the Christian term ἁγιασμός while *resurrectio*, *revelatio*, *passio* define precise Christian concepts. *Conversatio* is not used before the Augustan age and

has a wide range of meanings, such as ‘familiarity’, ‘training’, ‘intercourse’, ‘behaviour’: the latter is often employed in the biblical context, for instance at 1:15, 18 and 3:1, 2, 16. The noun *incrispatio*, ‘curling’, is a late Latin formation attested only in Augustine (*De bono coniugali* 14 206,9; Epistle 147,51 328,1 = *ap* PRIM 5 930C; Epistle 112,22) and in Pseudo-Hilarius (*Epistula seu libellus apologeticus* 11 84,22). The verb *incrispare*, from which the noun is supposed to derive, is handed down only twice, as a mistake in Tertullian’s *De idololatria* 8 p. 37,8 and in the later work of Marcellus, *De medicamentis*. On the other hand, *implicatio*, ‘entanglement’, is attested from Cicero onwards while the equivalent noun *implicatus* is a hapax attested only in this verse in VL 67, in the citations of Ambrose (*Exhortatio virginitatis* 64 355C) and in the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* 81 (581,8). The lexical rendering of the Vulgate at 3:3, *capillatura*, is also a postclassical word, first attested in Pliny (*Naturales Quaestiones* 37,190) and then in Christian writers. *Murmuratio* (4:9 S, T, V), ‘a murmuring, crying’, is present in the writings of Seneca and Pliny. It is also attested in the Vulgate version of Philippians 2:14 whereas the Greek term γογγυσμός is translated by *murmur* in the Vulgate text of John 7:12 and Acts 6:1. *Incoatio*, ‘beginning’, at 4:17 (C), is attested only in this verse and once in Augustine (*Quaestionum in heptateuchum* 129).<sup>51</sup> *Compulsio*, ‘an urging constraint’,<sup>52</sup> is present in text type T at 5:2: the term has juridical origin with first attestation in Ulpian (*Fragmenta in digestis* 36,1,15,6) but is also employed by Christian writers. *Adquisitio*, (2:9 T, V), ‘acquisition’, is present in Frontinus, in juridical sources and in several passages of the Pauline Epistles (Ephesians 1:14 V; 1 Thessalonians 5:9 D, I, V; 2 Thessalonians 2:14 I, V; Hebrews 10:39 I, J, A, V).

---

<sup>51</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.). The term is not listed in the TLL.

<sup>52</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

Some of the abstract nouns in *-io* underwent a process of semantic extension, for example *oratio*.<sup>53</sup> The nouns *depositio* and *interrogatio* at 3:21 acquire peculiar meanings: the former, which is typical of juridical and rhetorical vocabulary, means in this passage ‘parting from the body’<sup>54</sup> while the meaning of the latter, which is ‘inquiry, interrogation’ in the classical age, is uncertain in this verse: according to Blaise it means ‘engagement’ while the definition of the TLL is an interrogation *obtinendi causa*. The term *probatio* (1:7 S, T) is used in the classical age to refer to the concepts of ‘examination’ and ‘assent’: the meaning ‘proof, demonstration’ was added in the postclassical period. *Detractio* (2:1 A, S, V) means ‘withdrawal’ in the classical period but has also specialised medical, rhetorical and Christian meanings: the latter, attested in 1 Peter and 2 Corinthians 12:20, is ‘slander’. The *Vetus Latina* and the *Vulgate* feature the noun *visitatio*, ‘apparition’, at 2:12 and in an addition to 5:6. This is a postclassical formation attested in *Vitruvius* 9,4 and used in Christian literature with the meaning ‘visitation’. The frequent use in the Bible of nouns ending in *-io* and *-tas* in the plural form, usually with a negative connotation, is noted by Burton: instances of this phenomenon are attested at 2:1 (*simulationes, detractioes*).<sup>55</sup>

The nouns ending in *-tas* usually belong to the classical vocabulary. However, *incompactibilitas* (3:4 T, V), ‘incompactibility’, is a late Latin formation derived from the adjective *incompactibilis*: the noun is attested in Christian literature from Tertullian onwards. Words ending in *-do* and *-mentum* are not very frequent in 1 Peter. *Indumentum* is a postclassical formation employed by the *Vulgate* at 3:3 instead of *habitus* (S, T): this is the only

---

<sup>53</sup> See p. 70.

<sup>54</sup> Cfr. 2 Peter 2:14 (p. 214).

<sup>55</sup> Burton (2011: 493).

attestation of the term in the Vulgate New Testament and corresponds to the Greek underlying term ἐνδύσις although there is no etymological connection between *induo* and ἐνδύω.<sup>56</sup> On the other hand, the *nomina agentis* in *-or* are often employed in the letter. The noun *sector* (S), coined from *sequi* and attested at 3:13 in VL 67, has in this context the same meaning as *sectator*, ‘follower’. The latter is attested from the classical period with the meanings ‘attendant, adherent’, often referred to clients and followers of philosophical doctrines but is interpreted in the moral sense of ‘pursuer of the good’ in this passage and Titus 2:14 (I, V). However, *sector* usually means ‘cutter’, ‘bidder’, ‘seller’ and is used in geometry to refer to the sector of a circle. The word *dispensator*, abundantly attested in classical literature with the meanings ‘manager, treasurer’ acquires in Christian Latin the meaning ‘distributor of good things’, for instance ‘distributor of God’s grace’ at 4:10. *Communicator*, ‘partner, one who makes another share in something’,<sup>57</sup> is a Christian term formed on the basis of the verb *communicare* and attested once at 5:1 in the Vulgate (V; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt</sup>; BED cath 6 mss). Further attestations are present in Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 22), Ambrosiaster (on Romans 12,13) and in the Vetus Latina (1 Timothy 6:18 in the Pseudo-Hilarius *Epistula seu libellus apologeticus* 9 and Ambrosiaster; Hebrews 13:16 in Augustine’s *De civitate Dei* 10,5 p. 409). However, text types S and T employ *socius* in this passage, in which the correspondence between κοινωνόω – *communicare* and κοινωνός – *communicator* is lacking.

Adjectives ending in *-bilis* are frequent in 1 Peter and most of them are postclassical coinages. *Acceptabilis*, rendering εὐπρόσδεκτος, ‘acceptable, worthy of acceptance’, is a late Latin formation first employed by Tertullian. It often refers to the words *hostia*, *victima*, *oblatio*

---

<sup>56</sup> Ernout and Meillet (2001: 207).

<sup>57</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

with collocation with the dative *deo* and *domino*: at Romans 15:31 *acceptabilis* features in a number of Old Latin witnesses (61 (75\*) 75<sup>C</sup> 76 77 (78) 86 PEL<sup>B</sup> PEL Var) while the Vulgate has *accepta*. The perfect participle *acceptus* is also employed in the Vulgate at Romans 15:16 (*acceptabilis* only in Augustine), 2 Corinthians 8:12 (*acceptabilis* in 64 and AMst) and Philippians 4:18 (also in text types K, D, I). On the other hand, at 2 Corinthians 6:2 *acceptabilis* is used in the Vulgate and in the majority of the Old Latin sources of this verse. In conclusion, the adjective is employed in the Vulgate only in two passages, 1 Peter 2:5 and 2 Corinthians 6:2, in which it refers to nouns; in the other cases, when the copula is present, the Vulgate features the participle.<sup>58</sup> *Inenarrabilis* is a postclassical formation, attested in Quintilian, Seneca, Pliny while *rationabilis* (2:2 C, S), first attested in Columella 9,9, becomes very common from the fourth century onwards and is present in the Vulgate at Romans 12:1.

#### b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words

Further instances of postclassical terms that are not included in the categories above are attested in 1 Peter. The verb *lucrificare*, derived from *lucrum* and *facere*, is present in the passive form *lucrificentur* at 3:1 in several Old Latin sources listed under text type T (64 65 262 D; PEL:PS-HI, cf 1 Cor<sup>com</sup>; FU; BED cath; M-M 345A). The earliest attestation of this verb is in Seneca (Epistle 37,2), followed by its use in Christian writers such as Tertullian (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 24 1,6), the Vetus Latina (1 Corinthians 9:19 77, AU spe Var; 9:21 61, AU spe Var; 9:22 78, 88) and in a citation of Augustine (*De catechizandis rudibus* 10,15).<sup>59</sup> *Lucrificare* is also used in the passive form *lucrificemur* at James 4:13 in text type S

---

<sup>58</sup> An exception is Philippians 4:18 in which the participle is not followed by the copula.

<sup>59</sup> This reference is identified by Souter (1949: ad loc.).

(VL 67) with the active meaning ‘to make profit’.<sup>60</sup> On the other hand, the alternative form *lucrifacere* appears for the first time in Plautus, later in Cicero and writers of the postclassical period and becomes widespread in the fourth and fifth century with frequent usage by Jerome, Augustine and in the Vulgate (Acts 27:21; 1 Corinthians 9:19, 20, 22; Philippians 3:8).<sup>61</sup> The passive form of *lucrifacere*, *lucrifio*, attested at 3:1 in text types A, S and the Vulgate, as well as the passive of *lucrificare*, present in text type T, are rarely employed: in this passage they are used in order to retain the passive voice of the Greek verb κερδηθήσονται, meaning ‘to be gained, to be won’. The verb *degluttire*, contained in an addition to verse 3:22 in text types C and T, is postclassical and rare. The literal meaning, ‘to swallow down’, is attested in Fronto (p. 182,7 N), then in Tertullian and other Christian writers as well as in the Vulgate Old Testament (Numbers 16:30, 34; Proverbs 1:12; Jonah 2:1). In 1 Peter the verb, referring to Christ, acquires the figurative meaning ‘to abolish, destroy’ followed by the word *mortem* (T) and the expression *a morte* (C). The Greek verb ονειδίζω is translated by *inproperare* at 4:14 (K) in Cyprian’s Epistle 58,2 (658,6) while the Vulgate and text type T have *exprobrare*. In this passage the verb is used in the third person *inproperatur* with the dative in the impersonal function. The earliest occurrence of this rendering is in Petronius (38,11) followed by several instances in the Vetus Latina, especially in the Old Testament, and Christian writers. The Vulgate has *inproperare* in the New Testament in three instances (Matthew 27:44; Romans 15:3; James 1:5).<sup>62</sup> *Reprobare*, attested at 2:4 (A, S, V) and 2:7 (A, S, V), ‘to disapprove’, is also a postclassical verb. *Rugire*, ‘to roar’, is employed by the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina (K,

---

<sup>60</sup> See p. 81.

<sup>61</sup> This form is not listed in the TLL, the figures for *lucrifacere* derive from the LLT.

<sup>62</sup> See p. 73.

A, S, T) at 5:8 and earlier in a fragment of Suetonius (p. 248,2 Reifferscheid) and Ammianus (27,3,1).<sup>63</sup> In the same verse the verb *transvorare* (S, T), ‘to swallow down’, is a postclassical and rare word attested in Apuleius (*Apologia* 93) and in Christian writers. The derived noun *obauditio* (also spelled *oboeditio*) at 1:14 (S, T) appears for the first time in the Vetus Latina: the spelling *oboeditio* is attested in the Vulgate in three verses of Romans (5:19; 6:16; 16:26) although *oboedientia* is more frequent in the Pauline and Catholic Epistles (for instance 1 Peter 1:2, 14, 22) while *obauditio* is never attested in the Vulgate Old and New Testament. Both *oboeditio* and *obauditio* are rarer than *oboedientia* while the verbs *oboedire* and *obaudire* are widely attested. The Vulgate employs the verb *subdere* at 2:18 and 3:1: the form *obaudire* is never present in the Vulgate New Testament and *oboedire* is used instead, for instance at 3:6. The noun *incolatus, -us*, ‘a residing, a dwelling’,<sup>64</sup> is a postclassical term derived from *incola* and attested in Tertullian for the first time. The word is used only in juridical and Christian contexts: at 1:17 it means ‘journey, dwelling in a strange place’. Another biblical passage in which the term is attested is Acts 13:17 in the anonymous *Computatio anni 452* (AN comp 31). The adjective *intaminatus* (1:4 A) is present once in Horace (*Carmina* 3,2,18) and later in a few passages of Christian writers. The only revival of archaic word attested in 1 Peter is *malefactor*.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> The reference to Suetonius is present in Forcellini (1940: ad loc.) and Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.) but not in Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.), Gaffiot (1934: ad loc.), Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>64</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>65</sup> See pp. 148–9.



#### 4. Morphology

At 3:3 the participle *absconsus* (S; 67 65; PS-AU spe) instead of *absconditus* (C, T, V) is indicated by Souter (1949: ad loc.) as a colloquial and unliterary form. *Absconsus* derives from an analogical process in postclassical Latin ‘attuatosi mediante un rapporto del tipo OFFENDO : OFFENDI : OFFENSUM = ABSCONDO : ABSCONDI (attestato da Seneca in poi) : ABSCONSUM’.<sup>66</sup> The ancient grammarians (Caper, *Libelli de orthographia et de verbis dubiis* VII 94,16; Servius, *Georgica* 1,135; *Differentiae ex libro Svetonii* p. 307,12 Roth; Diomedes, *Ars grammatica* I 375,25; *Differentiae* serm. p. 28,1 Beck) witness that *absconsus* is current in late Latin but is not the normative form because the participle of the simple verb *condere* is *conditus* and not *consus*. The alternative form appears first in Pseudo-Quintilian (*Declamationes* 17,15) and then in Tertullian.

The Latin versions of 1 Peter attest a few cases of metaplasms of gender and declension.

At 3:4 the Vulgate refers the neutral relative pronoun to the masculine noun *spiritus*:

3:4: πνεύματος ὃ: *spiritus qui* (A, S, T), *spiritus quod* (V; PEL:PS-HI; [HI] Var; PS-AU spe)

The neuter *quod* matches the gender of πνεῦμα, which is neuter in Greek. On the other hand, the Old Latin text types employ the masculine pronoun. Text type T refers the neuter relative pronoun *quod* to the preceding noun *spiritus* in an addition to verse 4:14, which is not translated by the Vulgate. The form *vaso* at 3:5 (S; 67; cf AM; PS-AU spe) and 3:7 (S, T, V; 67; AM; AU vid Var; PS-AU spe; ORI Var; AN; PS-HIL-A; BED cath 2 mss), derived from *vasum* belonging to nouns in o- stem and not from the most common *vas* in consonant stem, is a revival of an archaic form attested in early Latin, such as in Cato (*ap* Gellius 13,23,1), Fabius Pictor

---

<sup>66</sup> Vineis (1974: 136).

(*ap* Nonius 544,26), Plautus (*Truculentus* 1,1,33).<sup>67</sup> The form *vasi* is the reading of text type A (A; Σ<sup>0</sup>; AU spe Var; AM Var; AU; ORI?; BED cath 3 mss) and *vasu* is present in 65 and manuscript S. The ablative *vaso* is also attested at Luke 8:16 in the Old Latin manuscripts 5 8 10 11 13 14 15 30 35; AU spe 27; PS-BED Lc 8,16 while the Vulgate has *vase*.<sup>68</sup> Burton affirms that the substitution of imparisyllabic words was a process typical of the popular language of the time.<sup>69</sup> It is noteworthy that the Vulgate at 1 Peter 3:7 features the form in o- stem. The plural form *firmes* (S; LUC; PRIS) at 5:9 represents a metaplasm of declension: the adjective is declined according to the nouns with stems in consonant or -i and not to those in -a and -o stems, to which it usually belongs. Souter highlights the presence of the metaplasm in Ambrosiaster (Commentary on Galatians 4:14; on Colossians 1:11–13) while the mainstream form *firmi* is attested at 5:9 in HI Ez h; PS-AU; EP-L. At 4:1 the verb *armare*, followed by the ablative designating the weapon, is conjugated in the passive imperative form *armamini* (A, T, V), which, however, has an active and reflexive meaning, in order to correspond to the Greek middle voice ὀπλίσασθε. At 5:6 the passive imperative ταπεινώθητε is rendered by *humiliate vos* (S, T) and *humiliamini* (V; RUF Jos; HI Is 6; 13; Mi; cf PS-ANAST I.; BON I.; ORI Mt;

---

<sup>67</sup> Vineis (1974: 43) states that ‘se, come pare, queste testimonianze [of the form *vasum*] vanno intese come spie della continuità della vita sotterranea di quest’uso, ci troveremmo di fronte al tipico fatto che, sorto in età arcaica sotto la spinta livellatrice della lingua parlata, e in seguito rifiutato dal purismo elegante e normativo della tradizione, riaffiora in epoca tarda in un testo che sceglie deliberatamente moduli espressivi attinti all’uso quotidiano.’

<sup>68</sup> Vineis (1974: 43): ‘La Vulgata restaura VAS, in ottemperanza al criterio di una veste linguistica più corretta’.

<sup>69</sup> Burton (2011: 487).

AN Wil; M-R; cf S-Mo 510; LUCU 9; 18 tit; 18<sup>txt</sup>; cf PS-AU s 1/2). On one hand, the Vetus Latina uses the active verb plus the personal pronoun in the reflexive function, on the other the Vulgate has the passive verb with active and reflexive meaning in agreement with the Greek text. The deponent usage of *humiliare* is attested in Christian writings from Tertullian and often in the biblical versions, for example at James 4:10 in the Vulgate and text type S.<sup>70</sup>

## 5. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

The use of *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* plus the indicative modelled on Greek is attested in a few cases in 1 Peter to render ὅτι clauses. This construction is employed with *verba sentiendi et declarandi*:

1:12: ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι ... διηκόνουν: *revelatum est quia ... ministrabant* (T, V)

1:18: εἰδόντες ὅτι ... ἐλυτρώθητε: *scientes quod ... redempti estis* (S, T, V)

2:3: ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστός: *gustastis quoniam ... suavis est* (C), *gustastis quoniam ... dulcis est* (S), *gustastis quoniam dulcis* (V), *quia* (T)

5:8: γρηγορήσατε (ὅτι variant) ... περιπατεῖ: *vigilate quia ... circuit* (K, A, T, V)

At 2:3 the construction of the verb *gustare* plus *quoniam* and *quia* is clearly a calque of the Greek clause because it is not used outside this passage. The verb *vigilare* governs a *quia* clause at 5:8: the completive clause is not introduced by *ut* or *ne* as usual but matches the Greek conjunction ὅτι. On the other hand, the construction of the reported speech with the infinitive

---

<sup>70</sup> See p. 74.

and the accusative following *verba sentiendi et declarandi* is attested when it is also present in Greek at 5:9 (εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων ... ἐπιτελεῖσθαι: *scientes easdem passiones ... fieri* T, *scientes eadem passionum ... fieri* V) and 5:12 (ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ: *contestans haec esse vere gratiam dei* T, *contestans hanc esse veram gratiam dei* V).

#### a.2 Greek Constructions

In several instances the Latin versions match the constructions of the Greek text. The verb *παύω* governs either the simple genitive or the genitive preceded by a preposition:

4:1: πέπαιται ἀμαρτίας (ἀμαρτίαις, ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας variants)

*desivit peccare* (A)

*desiit a peccatis* (T, V)

The expression *desiit a peccatis* (T, V) is either a word-for-word translation of the Greek variant ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας, in which, however, the noun is singular in contrast with the plural in Latin, or of the dative ἀμαρτίαις whereas *desinere* is regularly followed by the infinitive in text type A. The attestation of *a* and the ablative following *desinere* is limited to Christian writers. Verbs indicating the act of dressing in a literal and metaphorical sense are often followed by the Greek accusative in the biblical translations:<sup>71</sup>

1:13: ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας: *succincti lumbos* (S, T, V)

---

<sup>71</sup> Plater and White (1926: 34–5).

5:5: τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε: *quietem et humilitatem animi induite* (S), *quietem et humilitatem induite* (T)<sup>72</sup>

*Succingere* governs the accusative in the Vulgate text of John 21:7 and Ephesians 6:14 (I, V). However, at James 2:3 *induere* is followed by the ablative in text type F and the Vulgate. The verb *obsecrare* usually governs a completive clause preceded by *ut, ne, ut ne* and subjunctive. However, at 2:11 it is followed by the infinitive in imitation of the Greek construction:

2:11: παρακαλῶ ... ἀπέχεσθαι: *obsecro ... abstinere vos* (T, V)

This Graecism is first attested in the *argumentum* of Plautus' *Aulularia* 1,11 and much later in historians (Hegesippus 4,7 p. 252 and Ammianus Marcellinus 17,12,16) and in biblical translations: Acts 26:3 (VL 50), Romans 12:1 (Ambrose, *De incarnationis* 2,10 and Tertullian, *De resurrectione carnis* 47 p. 98,6), 2 Corinthians 5:20 (61 64 75 76 77 89; AMst; PEL<sup>AB</sup>), Hebrews 13:22 (MUT<sup>com</sup>). In these instances, the Vulgate has *ut* plus the subjunctive. A Greek construction is attested in text type T:

3:13: καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς

*et quis nocere vobis* (A)

*et quis vos nocebit* (T)

*et quis est qui vobis noceat* (V)

*Nocere* is followed by the dative *vobis* in text type A and the Vulgate while text type T features the accusative *vos* as in Greek. *Nocere* governs the Greek accusative in the Vulgate at Luke 4:35 and Acts 18:10 and in other late Latin writers such as Chiron, Vegetius, Caelius

---

<sup>72</sup> The Vulgate renders the variant ἐγκολπώσασθε with *insinuate*.

Aurelianus.<sup>73</sup> *Sperare* is followed by *in* and the accusative according to Greek instead of the simple accusative:

3:5: αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεόν

*quae in dominum sperabant* (C)

*quae in deum sperabant* (S, T)

*sperantes in deum* (V)

*Sperare* plus *in* and the accusative is also present at 1:13 (S, T, V) to render ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην. The construction of *poscere* with the double accusative (*poscenti vos* T, V) is in use in classical Latin and corresponds to the Greek text (τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς) at 3:15 better than *a* and the ablative present in text type S (*poscenti a vobis*). At 4:6 (A, T, V) the verb *evangelizare* is followed by the dative as it occurs in the Greek underlying text:

4:6: νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη

*mortuis evangelizatum est* (A, T, V)

In addition, *evangelizare* might govern the accusative:

1:12: τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς

*qui vos evangelizaverunt* (T)

*qui evangelizaverunt vos* (V)

Not only does *evangelizare* govern the dative and the accusative but also *in* plus the ablative and the accusative:

---

<sup>73</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 33), Plater and White (1926: 36).

1:25: τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς: *quod in vobis evangelizatum est* (S), *quod evangelizatum est in vos* (V; G 100 ΧΔτSUΦP\*Y<sup>2</sup>Ω<sup>O(gloss)</sup>; EP-SC)

This construction is rare and modelled on Greek: according to Augustine (*Enarrationes in Psalmos* 104,1,19), the analogous expression *evangelizate in gentibus* is a word-for-word translation from Greek. Another instance of this construction is present in Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians 2 (PL 26 513,47): *evangelizantur in populo*. The adjective κρυπτός is followed in Greek by the genitive at 3:4:

3:4: κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας

*cultus cordis* (K)

*absconsus cordis* (S)

*absconditus cordis* (C, T, V)

The Latin renderings govern the same case although this collocation is unusual in Latin. In Christian writings and the Latin translations of the Bible the verb *communicare*, 'to participate in', is followed by the dative without preposition according to the Greek construction although the verb is normally followed by *cum*, *apud*, *inter* plus ablative and accusative. This use is attested at 4:13:

4:13: κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν

*communicatis Christi passionibus* (K)

*communicantes Christi passionibus* (T, V)

Other instances of *communicare* plus the dative are attested in the Vulgate at Romans 12:13; Galatians 6:6; Ephesians 5:11; Philippians 4:14; 1 Timothy 5:22; Hebrews 2:14; 2 John 11. The Vulgate governs the dative in the following instance:

2:24: τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν (συνζήσωμεν variant)

*cum iustitia vivamus* (C)

*iustitiae viveremus* (V; PEL; HI; PS-AU hyp; LEO; PS-AU s 118; CO-Hisp; PS-HIL-A)

The dative of the Vulgate indicating a purpose is a calque of the Greek corresponding case whereas text type C translates the variant συνζήσωμεν. *Credere* governs the dative according to Greek at 3:1 (A, S, T, V), 4:17 (A, T, V) and at 2:8 (T) while in the latter instance the Vulgate has the accusative. The infinitive of purpose is attested once in the Vulgate at 2:5:

2:5: ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας

*offerentes spirituales hostias* (S, T)

*offerre spirituales hostias* (V; HI Ez 9, Is 15; KA Tur)

At 4:3 the infinitive of text type A has a completive function as in Greek:

4:3: ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατεργάσθαι

*sufficit enim vobis praeteritum tempus voluntate<m> hominum perfecisse* (A)

*sufficit enim praeteritum tempus ad voluntatem hominum consummatum* (T)

*sufficit enim praeteritum tempus ad voluntatem gentium consummandam* (V; AU ep 164 Var; IS)

The Vulgate employs *ad* and the gerundive instead of the infinitive and text type T *ad* and the perfect participle. In the following instance the number of the verb in the Vulgate is in agreement with Greek:

4:18: ὁ δὲ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται

*peccator et impius ubi parebunt* (A, T)



*impius et peccator ubi parebit* (V; 32? GIYCΣΛ<sup>L\*H</sup>XτΔΘ 65\* U\*Ω<sup>D</sup>; FU inc Var; EP-SC<sup>txt</sup>; BEA; {PS-AM; PEL; CAE; EP-L; GR-M Jb 13 Var; [COL]})

At 4:18 the Vulgate keeps the singular verb of the Greek text by referring the adjectives to a single subject while the Vetus Latina considers the adjectives to be two distinct subjects linked to the verb in the plural form.

#### b. Verbal Constructions and Syntax

The verb *facere* is followed by the infinitive at 2:15 (C, V) in the expression *obmutescere faciatis* translating the verb φημοῦν. The causative construction of *facere* plus the infinitive, also attested at James 5:20,<sup>74</sup> Ephesians 2:6 (V) and Mark 9:18 (VL 1), becomes successful in the Romance languages.<sup>75</sup> An extensive use of *feri* can be noticed at 4:18 in which the expression *salvus fit* (A, T) replaces the synthetic passive *salvatur*, present in the Vulgate and rendering the Greek corresponding verb σώζεται.<sup>76</sup> At 3:20 διεσώθησαν is rendered by *salvae factae sunt* in K, T, V and *salvatae sunt* in C. The periphrastic forms *salvos faciet* (K, C) and *salvos facit* (T, V) are also attested at 3:21 to render σώζει. At 1:6 εἰ δέον is translated by *si fieri potest* in text type T (67; FU; EP-SC) while the Vulgate has *oportet*. The construction *fieri posse* instead of the simple *posse* is present in direct speech, exclamations and emotive-

---

<sup>74</sup> See p. 89.

<sup>75</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 325).

<sup>76</sup> Mohrmann (1965: 83) maintains that ‘la traduction σώζειν — *salvare* semble avoir été plus « normale » pour les traducteurs populaires, qui étaient attachés à un littéralisme rigoureux, que la tournure *salvum facere*.’

subjective expressions from Cicero and becomes more frequent in late Latin, particularly in Tertullian and Lactantius.<sup>77</sup>

The negative imperative is attested once at 4:12 and rendered by *nolite* plus the infinitive (μη ξενίξεσθε: *nolite mirari* K, *nolite expavescere* T, *nolite peregrinari* V). In the same verse, the Old Latin text types K and T coordinate the preceding *nolite* plus infinitive to another exhortative expression without correspondence in Greek: text type K makes a variation by employing the subjunctive preceded by the negation (*nec excidatis*) whereas T repeats *nolite* and the infinitive (*nolite pavere*).

## 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

### a. Number

This section investigates whether the Latin versions keep the number of the Greek nouns, adjectives and pronouns or make variations. The cases in which the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina differ because of the translation of Greek variants are not taken into consideration.

1:12: εἰς ἄ: *in quo* (C), *in quem* (T), *in quae* (V; GP; IR 2; 4; AM ep 29, Is<sup>com</sup>, sa; cf HI Ps h?; EP-SC<sup>com</sup>; PS-THs)

2:19: λύπας: *iniuriam* (S), *in tristitiae* (65), *tristitiam* (XΔ<sup>B2</sup> 251 DGLRMQΩ<sup>C</sup>; AU spe Var; PS-HIL-A), *tristitias* (T, V)

2:24: μώλωπι: *vulnere* (C), *cicatricibus* (A), *livore* (V; 65; PS-AU hyp; FU; CO-Hisp; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt.com</sup> 2/3 G<sup>gloss</sup>; AM sp; ANT-M; M-Bo 187; PS-HIL-A)

3:1: γυναικῶν: *mulieris* (A), *uxorum* (T), *mulierum* (S, V)

---

<sup>77</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 422).

3:3: ἱματίων: *vestis* (K), *veste* (C), *vestimentorum* (S, T, V)

3:7: συγκληρονόμοις: *coheredi* (S), *coheredibus* (A, T, V)

3:21: ῥύπου: *sordium* (C, T, V)

4:3a: οἰνοφλογίαις: *ebrietas* (A, T), *vinolentiis* (V; IS; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt</sup>)

4:3b: πότοις: *rotatione* (A), *rotationibus* (T, V)

4:4: ἐν ᾧ: *in quibus* (T), *in quo* (V; 91 95; AU; AN; PS-HIL-A)

The disagreement on the number of the relative pronoun at 1:12 is due to a different interpretation of the verse in the *Vetus Latina*, in which the relative is referred to the previous word *spiritus*, as Thiele observes in the apparatus. The Vulgate renders the plural neuter pronoun of the Greek text. *Tristitia* is used only in the singular up to the third century AD when Cyprian (*ad Quirinum* 3,32; *De habitu virginum* 22) begins to employ the plural with the meaning ‘distresses’,<sup>78</sup> which is present in VL 32 and the Vulgate at 2:19 and matches the Greek plural noun λύπας. The Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* attest the genitive plural *sordium* instead of the singular of the Greek text at 3:21: the Latin adjective is mainly used in the plural. The lexical rendering of the Vulgate at 4:3, *vinolentia*, matches the Greek term in both the equivalence between οἶνος and *vinum* and the employment of the plural. *Vinolentia* is seldom attested in the plural form, for instance in Salvianus (*De gubernatione dei* 4,9,40) and in passages related to this verse, such as AU spe 44 and BED.<sup>79</sup> In the same verse, text type A

---

<sup>78</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>79</sup> The two passages from Bede (*In primam partem Samuhelis libri IV et nomina locorum* 2,14 and *In epistulas septem catholicas* 2,4) are listed in the LLT-A and not in the apparatus of the *Vetus Latina* edition.

features the singular *potatione* while the Vulgate and text type T have the plural as in Greek. The singular form *coheredi* at 3:7 is referred to the previous singular expression *vaso muliebri* while text types A, T, V have the plural form according to Greek. At 4:4 the relative pronoun has the same number in the Vulgate as in Greek. Text type A disagrees with Greek four times (2:24; 3:1; 4:3a; 4:3b;) while the Vulgate matches the Greek text in all the instances listed above, although mostly in agreement with the Vetus Latina (except 4:3a and 4:4).

#### b. Comparatives and Superlatives

The attestations of comparatives and superlatives in the Latin versions, either in agreement or in contrast with the degree of the Greek adjectives, are examined below:

1:5: ἐσχάτω: *novissimo* (A, S, V)

1:20: ἐσχάτου (ἐσχάτων variant): *novissimis* (T, V)

1:7: πολυτιμότερον: *multo praetiosior* (S, T), *multo praetiosius* (V)

1:11: μετὰ ταῦτα: *post haec* (T), *posteriores* (V; [JUL-E]; AN; PS-HIL-A)

1:14: πρότερον: *prioribus* (S, T, V)

1:19: τιμίω: *pretiosissimo* (K), *pretioso* (T), *praetioso* (S, V)

1:22: ἐκτενωδς: *perseveranter* (S), *attentius* (V; PS-HIL-A)

2:11: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (C, T, V)

4:12: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (K, T, V)

2:18: τοῖς σκολοῖς: *difficilioribus* (T), *discolis* (S, V)

3:3: ἔξωθεν: *exterior* (K), *a foris* (A), *extrinsecus* (S, T, V)

3:7: ἀσθενεστέρω: *infirriori* (A, S, T, V)

3:17: κρεῖττον: *melius* (S, T, V)

5:1: πρεσβυτέρους: *seniores* (S, T, V)

5:1: συμπρεσβύτερος: *similiter maior natu* (S), *consenior* (T, V)

5:5a: νεώτεροι: *iuniores* (S, T), *adulescentes* (V; 55; CAr; PS-HIL-A; KA Tur)

5:5b: πρεσβυτέροις: *senioribus* (S, T, V)

5:6: κραταιάν: *potente* (S), *potentissima* (T), *potenti* (V; RUF Jos Var; HI; PS-ANAST I.; PS-AU spe Var; M-R; LUCU 9; 18; BED h)

The Latin versions have a tendency to employ comparatives and superlatives to intensify the meaning of the adjectives even though the Greek text has the positive form, for example in the renderings of ἔσχατος at 1:5, 20 and ἀγαπητός at 2:11 and 4:12: in the latter case the superlative emphasises the affection towards the addressees.<sup>80</sup> The Vulgate features comparatives at 1:11 (*posteriores*) and 1:22 (*attentius*) to render the temporal expression μετὰ ταῦτα, translated by the matching expression *post haec* in text type T, and the adverb ἐκτενῶς, rendered in text type S by *perseveranter*. At 5:5a the rendering of the Vulgate, *adulescentes*, does not match the comparative νεώτεροι rendered by the comparative *iuniores* in text types S and T. At 1:7 the adverb *multo* is employed in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina to render the Greek πολυ- and intensify the following comparative. In two instances (1:19 and 3:3) text type K renders a positive adjective and an adverb with a superlative and comparative. Text type T does not match the degree of the Greek adjective when renders κραταιάν with the superlative *potentissima* at 5:6 and τοῖς σκολιοῖς with *difficilioribus* at 2:18 while text type S and the Vulgate have the positive adjective and a noun respectively.

---

<sup>80</sup> See pp. 94, 288.

## 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Rendering of Greek Articles

One of the most evident divergences between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina in 1 Peter concerns the use of demonstratives to match Greek articles:

1:14: ταῖς ... ἐπιθυμίαις: *illis ... desideriiis* (S, T; 64; CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>X<sup>mgτ</sup>ΔΘP<sup>2</sup>; PS-AU spe; GI), *desideriis* (V; 53; PRIS; HI; Caelestius; PS-HIL-A)

2:7: ἡ τιμή: *hic honor* (S; 67; PRIS), *honor* (V; 53; HI; FU; CAr; EP-SC; AN; PS-HIL-A)

2:9: εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς: *in illud admirabile lumen suum* (C, T; 65; CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup> 54\* Θ<sup>AM</sup>; AU; MAR-M<sup>4com</sup>; GI; Martin I.), *in admirabile lumen suum* (V; 53; CHRO; AU pec Var; PS-AU s Cai; PAU-N?; MAR-M<sup>txt</sup>; PROS; PS-MAX; CAr; PS-THs; LUCU; ILD; M-R; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED h; PS-FEL II.)

3:1: τῷ λόγῳ: *huic verbo* (S; XΔ; PS-AU spe), *verbo* (A, T, V)

3:4a: ὁ κρυπτός ... ἄνθρωπος: *ille absconditus ... homo* (A, T; 64; CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>X<sup>mgτ</sup>71; AM ep 38,1, exh<sup>txt</sup>; AU conj, ep, s; PHI; FU), *ille absconsus ... homo* (S; 67 65; PS-AU spe), *qui absconditus ... homo* (V; PEL: [HI]; PS-HIL-A)

3:4b: ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ: *in illa perpetuitate* (A; AU conj), *incorruptus* (S), *in incorruptibilitate* (T, V)

5:4: τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον: *illam floridam et inmarcescibilem gloriae coronam* (S, T; 55 64?; CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup> 91 94 95 τ<sup>68</sup> 54\*; PS-AU spe; EP-L; FEol)

5:6: ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα: *sub potente dextera* (S), *sub illa potentissima manu* (T; 55 64? CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>Xτ 54\*; CAE = PS-AU s Cas), *sub potenti manu* (V; RUF Jos Var; HI; PS-ANAST I.; M-R; LUCU 9; 18; BED h)

5:9: τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων: *has easdem passiones* (LUC),<sup>81</sup> *easdem passiones* (T), *eadem passionum* (V)

The demonstratives have been employed intentionally to match Greek articles in translations of high literary value from the classical period, for instance in Cicero, but the imitation of Greek is only one of the factors that may have prompted the development of demonstratives into articles.<sup>82</sup> According to Abel, the correspondence between Greek articles and Latin demonstratives in the Latin Bible is not intentional and Greek did not influence the emergence of articles in the Romance languages, which developed in a process internal to Latin.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> The juxtaposition of two demonstratives is attested 27 times plus a noun and 29 times without a following noun in classical and postclassical texts (Abel, 1971: 193–4). The presence of two juxtaposed demonstratives can be observed five times in the Bible, with a further instance at 1 Peter 2:14 (*in hoc ipsum* in PS-AU spe). At 5:9 (LUC) the former demonstrative, *has*, corresponds to the Greek article.

<sup>82</sup> Adams (2013: 484). According to Adams (2013: 522–4) demonstratives can be regarded as articles only when they lose their classical functions (anaphoric, deictic, associative, emphatic) and undergo a process of weakening which makes them semantically empty words. The other factors that may have played a role in the development of demonstratives into articles are the use of a sequence of demonstratives following the same noun, the employment of a demonstrative to mark a contrast between two nouns and the classical structure personal name + demonstrative + apposition.

<sup>83</sup> Abel (1971: 23): ‘Il est absolument impossible que cet emploi soit le résultat d’un effort conscient visant à traduire l’article défini grec. On peut affirmer pour la quasi-totalité des

Nonetheless, the fact that the demonstratives in the Latin texts occupy the same position as the Greek articles should not be underestimated: an intention to highlight the correspondence between Greek articles and Latin demonstratives is highly plausible in light of the tendency of the Latin versions to match the Greek source word for word. In such instances, the Latin demonstratives are rarely empty words, unlike the articles in the Romance languages, and cannot therefore be considered to be proper articles. However, the presence or absence of the demonstratives in place of Greek articles is regarded here as a linguistic and stylistic feature of the Latin versions. In 1 Peter, Greek articles are matched by the demonstratives *hic* and *ille*, three and five times respectively, with attestations in several Old Latin text types, not only in the manuscript tradition but also in citations of Augustine and Ambrose. The predominance of *ille* is not surprising given that it ‘is the main source of the Romance article’.<sup>84</sup> *Ille* has a general anaphoric function at 1:14 in which ‘pour un lecteur chrétien, l’emploi de ILLE avec la valeur de «*notissimus*» se justifie parfaitement.’<sup>85</sup> In the instances at 2:9, 3:4a, 5:4, 5:6 *ille* might stress the Christian meaning of the terms and context.<sup>86</sup> On the other hand, the demonstrative is not anaphoric at 3:4b and accompanies a term, *perpetuitas*, which neither expresses a peculiar

---

passages examines que l’article défini grec n’a pas exercé d’influence directe sur l’emploi du démonstratif latin.’

<sup>84</sup> Adams (2013: 482).

<sup>85</sup> Abel (1971 : 116).

<sup>86</sup> Abel (1971 : 116) affirms that ‘l’emploi de ILLE à la place d’un article défini grec sert à mettre en relief la signification chrétienne d’un terme de la langue commune, fonction du démonstratif assez proche de la fonction anaphorique générale.’



Christian concept nor is mentioned in the preceding verses.<sup>87</sup> Similarly, there is no mention of *desideriis* in the verses preceding 1:14 but perhaps the presence of the adjective *prioribus* indicates an implicit anaphoric use of the demonstrative. In these cases, *ille* has the function of a definite article and ‘Il ne peut s’expliquer que par un fréquent emploi explétif de ILLE dans la langue parlée, qui se serait étendu ... à la langue écrite’.<sup>88</sup> The association of *hoc* with *verbum* is observed by Abel in Genesis in the passages in which the demonstrative οὗτος is present in Greek: this formula may have influenced the instance at 3:1.<sup>89</sup> Abel states that *hic* accompanies *sermo* and *verbum* with anaphoric function in five Old Latin instances taken from Genesis (34:19) and the Gospels (Mark 5:36 VL 15, 5, 10, 17, 13, 8; 9:10 VL 4; 9:32 VL 10; Matthew 15:12 VL 3, 15, 6, 13, 10, 9, 8, 2) but the passage at 1 Peter 3:1 represents an uncertain case, perhaps derived from the misunderstanding of Greek text.<sup>90</sup> On the other hand, according to Abel, the use of *hic* at 2:7 and 5:9 is anaphoric in that it recalls an idea already expressed.<sup>91</sup> This observation applies to 5:9 in which the verse refers, in an associative way, to the temptation of the devil outlined in the previous verse but is not applicable to 2:7 in which the honour given to the believers is not mentioned before. The Vulgate never attests demonstratives matching

---

<sup>87</sup> Abel (1971: 120).

<sup>88</sup> Abel (1971: 118).

<sup>89</sup> Abel (1971: 41).

<sup>90</sup> Abel (1971: 58, 62): ‘Toutes les autres versions (A, T, V) emploient *verbo* seul, c’est-à-dire qu’elles utilisent *verbum* avec sa signification chrétienne habituelle, tandis que la Version S relie *verbum* par la valeur anaphorique de HIC au contexte et abandonne ainsi le jeu de mots de l’original.’

<sup>91</sup> Abel (1971: 59).

Greek articles and is therefore more correct than the *Vetus Latina* in terms of standard Latin usage.

#### b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions

In the following cases the lexical renderings of the Vulgate are more suitable renderings of the Greek terms and are appropriate for the context. The Vulgate often matches the Greek text word for word:

1:2: πληθυνθείη: *adimpleatur* (A, S, T), *multiplicetur* (V; 53; RUF; HI; FAU-R; CAE; Martin I. > PS-FEL II.; PS-HIL-A; SED-S)

1:20: Χριστοῦ ... προεγνωσμένου ... φανερωθέντος: *Christi Iesu ... praecognitus ... manifestatus* (T), *Christi ... precogniti ... manifestati* (V; PROS; CLE-A; PS-HIL-A)

2:5: αὐτοί: *vos* (C, S, T), *ipsi* (V; HI Ez, Za, Jr; LEO; PS-AM man; KA Sp; CAr?; ILD; PS-HIL-A)<sup>92</sup>

2:10: οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες: *quorum aliquando non misertus est nunc autem miseretur* (C), *qui non consecuti misericordiam nunc autem misericordiam consecuti* (V; cf PEL?, JUL-E; PROS voc 1,11; cf CAr Rm?; EP-SC<sup>com</sup>3/5; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

2:24: τῷ μώλωπι: *vulnere* (C), *cicatricibus* (A), *livore* (V; 65; PS-AU hyp; FU; CO-Hisp; PS-HIL-A<sup>txt.com</sup> 2/3; {HI; PS-AU s 156; ORA})

3:10: ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν: *qui enim vult vitam diligere et cupit videre* (S, T), *qui enim vult vitam diligere et videre* (V; CLE-A; LUCU; PS-HIL-A)

4:3: τῶν ἐθνῶν: *hominum* (A, T), *gentium* (V; AU s; CAr)

---

<sup>92</sup> A similar instance is attested at 1:15: αὐτοί: *vos* (S, T), *ipsi* (V; HI; Caelestius). Thiele reports the presence of the variant ὑμεῖς which is not indicated in the ECM.

5:9: εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων: *scientes easdem passiones* (T), *scientes eadem passionum* (V; F\*LY 251 τ<sup>56</sup> 262 65\* Φ<sup>B\*</sup>; AU spe)

5:12: ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν: *contestans haec vere gratiam* (T), *contestans hanc esse veram gratiam* (V; PS-HIL-A)

The meaning of the verb πληθύνω, ‘to increase, multiply’, corresponds to the rendering of the Vulgate *multiplicare* and not to that of the Vetus Latina, *adimplere*, which means ‘to fulfil’. At 4:3 the Vulgate employs the specific term *gentes*, which acquires through a semantic extension the meaning ‘the heathens, the Gentiles’ in Christian Latin. The rendering of text types A and T, *homines*, is unfocused. Another case in which the Vulgate features a term that matches the Greek text better than those of the Vetus Latina is attested at 2:24: μώλωψ, ‘bruise, weal’, is rendered by *livor*, which makes reference to the bluish colour of the bruise, instead of the generic *vulnus* (C) and the imprecise *cicatrix* (A). At 2:5 αὐτοί is rendered by the corresponding demonstrative pronoun *ipsi* in the Vulgate and by the personal pronoun *vos* in the Vetus Latina, which has no correspondence in Greek.

In the remaining instances the Vulgate matches the Greek text word for word while the Vetus Latina has free renderings. At 2:10 it is possible to notice a shift of subject in text type C from that of the previous clause, *qui*, to the implied subject ‘God’. The Vulgate follows the Greek text retaining the former subject (*qui non consecuti misericordiam*). At 1:19 the Vulgate refers the participles *praecogniti* and *manifestati* to the preceding noun *Christi*, as it occurs in Greek, while text type T, which inserts a long addition between *Christi* and *precognitus*, changes the case of the participle into nominative. The examples at 5:9 and 5:12 are also word-for-word translations of the Greek text: in the former the neuter demonstrative pronoun is followed by the partitive genitive in the Vulgate and in Greek against the Vetus Latina while in the latter the demonstrative pronoun *hanc* and adjective *veram* refer to *gratiam* according to

Greek. On the other hand, text type T freely employs the plural neuter *haec*, followed by the explanatory infinitive and the adverb *vere*, which does not correspond to Greek. The addition of *cupit* at 3:10, which is not attested in Greek, is present in the Vetus Latina and not in the Vulgate.

### c. Unfocused Renderings

The renderings of the Vulgate do not precisely correspond to the meaning of the Greek text in the instances below:

2:23: παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικάίως: *tradebat autem se iudicanti iniuste* (K; CY; cf AU Ps Var; MAXn; FU Var), *commendabat autem se iudici iudicanti iuste* (C), *sed commendabat illi qui iuste iudicat* (A), *tradebat autem iudicanti se iniuste* (V; cf AM?; PEL; PAU-N; LEO; QU Var; PS-AU s 118; cf PS-FU; JO-N; CLE-A; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur?)

4:4: ξενίζονται (θαυμάζουσιν variant) μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν: *stupescunt concurrere* (A), *obstupescunt non consurgere vos* (T), *peregrinantur non concurrentibus vobis* (V; GILY 251 Λ 54\*? Δ<sup>L(peregrinantibus)</sup>ΒΘΣΑ<sup>3</sup>Υ\* Ω<sup>D\*</sup>?)

4:7: νήψατε: *sobrii* (T), *vigilate* (V; KA; GR-M; LUCU; AN; PS-HIL-A<sup>ext</sup>; BON; {PRU; cf RUS, CO; PS-GR-M})

4:12: μὴ ξενίξεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῶν πυρώσει: *nolite mirari ardorem accidentem vobis* (K), *nolite expavescere in fervore* (T), *nolite peregrinari in fervore* (V; AU spe Var; HI; PS-HIL-A; BED cath)

4:19: παρατιθέσθωσαν: *commendent* (T), *commendant* (V; Σ<sup>A\*</sup>?; AU spe Var; cf AU, PAT?, CAr; PS-HI; PS-HIL-A)

The misunderstanding of the sense of verse 2:23, which refers to Christ who entrusts himself to God, the good judge, is noticeable in the Vulgate, text type K and in the Georgian tradition

which seem to render the unattested variant ἀδίκως. Perhaps the mistake was due to confusion with 2:19 in which ἀδίκως, rendered as *iniuste* (S, T, V), is attested at the end of the verse as it occurs at 2:23. Otherwise, *iniuste* at 2:23 makes sense if it is interpreted under the influence of 2:19: those who suffer should surrender themselves to the unjust judge, as Christ did.<sup>93</sup> A minority of witnesses feature *iuste* (C, A; 32 64 65\*; CY pat Var?; AU; MAXn; QU; FU; EP-SC; ANT-M?; ORA?). At 4:4, 12 the rendering of the Vulgate, *peregrinari*, meaning ‘to travel abroad, wander about’ and translating ξενίζομαι, ‘to be surprised’, has to be interpreted in the metaphorical sense ‘trouver étrange, se trouver dépaysé’.<sup>94</sup> It must be noted that at 4:4 text type T and A have *obstupescere / stupescere* followed by accusative and infinitive. There are instances in which these verbs are followed by conjunctions such as *quod, quemadmodum, quomodo*<sup>95</sup> but the passage in 1 Peter is the only one that features the infinitive clause.<sup>96</sup> The presence of the infinitive may be due to analogy with the construction of *stupere* plus accusative and infinitive, attested in Vergil (Eclogues 6.37; Aeneid 12.707).<sup>97</sup> The verb νήφω, meaning ‘to be sober’, is matched by the adjective *sobrius* of text type T whereas the rendering of the Vulgate, *vigilare*, means ‘to be and keep awake’. On the other hand, the Vulgate renders νήφω with *sobrius* at 1:13 and 5:8 and in the latter instance *vigilare* translates γρηγορέω in text types

---

<sup>93</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 90).

<sup>94</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

<sup>95</sup> These are present in late Latin writings apart from Ovid, *Tristia* 1,11,8.

<sup>96</sup> The closest case is attested in Quintilian (*Declamationes minores* 352 p. 383,20) in which the verb is followed by the accusative and the infinitive *esse* is implied: *milites ... confecto proelio ad gratulationem redeuntes portas clusas obstupuisse*.

<sup>97</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 358).

K, A, T and the Vulgate. At 4:19 the Greek imperative is rendered by the exhortative subjunctive in text type T and the present indicative in the Vulgate.

## 8. Variations

The repetition of identical words or terms having the same root attested in neighbouring passages is examined below in order to cast light on the style of the Latin versions.<sup>98</sup>

### a. Absence of Variations

1:7: τὸ δοκίμιον ... δοκιμαζόμενος: *probatio ... probatur* (S, T), *probatum ... probato* (V)

1:9–10: σωτηρίαν ... σωτηρίας: *salutem ... salute* (A, T, V)

1:10: προφηῆται ... προφητεύσαντες: *prophetae ... prophetaverunt* (T, V)

1:10–11: ἐξηρεύνησαν ... ἐρευνῶντες: *scrutati sunt ... scrutantes* (T, V)

1:15–16: ἅγιοι ... ἅγιοι ... ἅγιος: *sancti ... sancti ... sanctus* (S, T, V)

1:15, 17, 18: ἀναστροφῆ ... ἀναστράφητε ... ἀναστροφῆς: *conversatione ... conversamini ... conversationem* (S, T, V)

1:21: πιστούς ... τὴν πίστιν: *fideles ... fides* (V)

1:24: χόρτος ... χόρτου ... χόρτος: *faenum ... faeni ... faenum* (S, V)

1:24: ἄνθος ... τὸ ἄνθος: *flos ... flos* (S, V)

1:25: τὸ ῥῆμα ... τὸ ῥῆμα: *verbum ... verbum* (S, V)

2:1–2: δόλον ... ἄδολον: *dolum ... sine dolo* (S, V)

2:4–5: λίθον ζῶντα ... λίθοι ζῶντες: *lapidem vivum ... lapides vivi* (S, V)

---

<sup>98</sup> Further examples of variations of non-neighbouring words are given by von Harnack (1916: 77).

- 2:5: πνευματικός ... πνευματικός: *spiritalem / spiritali / spiritalis ... spiritales* (S / T / V)
- 2:6–7: ὁ πιστεύων ... τοῖς πιστεύουσιν: *qui crediderit ... credentes* (S, V)
- 2:7–8: λίθος ... λίθος: *lapis / lapidem ... lapis* (A / V, S)
- 2:8: προσκόμματος ... προσκόπτουσιν: *offensionis ... offendunt* (S, V)
- 2:10: λαός ... λαός: *populus ... populus* (C, V)
- 2:10: ἠλεημένοι ... ἐλεηθέντες: *misertus est ... miseretur* (C), *consecuti misericordiam ... misericordiam consecuti* (V)
- 2:12: καλήν ... ἐκ τῶν καλῶν: *bonam ... bona* (K), *bona ... de bonis* (C), *bonam ... ex bonis* (T, V)
- 2:16–18: δοῦλοι ... οἰκέται: *servi ... servi* (S, T, V)
- 2:17–18: φοβεῖσθε ... φόβω: *timete ... timore* (S, T, V)
- 2:19–20: χάρις ... χάρις: *gratia ... gratia* (S, T, V)
- 2:20–21: πάσχοντες ... ἔπαθεν: *patimini ... passus est* (C), *patientes ... passus est* (V)
- 2:24: τὰς ἀμαρτίας ... ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις: *peccata ... peccatis* (C, V)
- 3:1: τῷ λόγῳ ... λόγῳ: *verbo ... loquella* (A), *verbo ... verbo* (S, T, V)<sup>99</sup>
- 3:1: γυναῖκες ... τῶν γυναικῶν: *mulieres ... mulieris* (A), *mulieres ... mulierum* (S), *mulieres ... uxorum* (T), *mulieres ... mulierum* (V)<sup>100</sup>
- 3:1–2: ἀναστροφῆς ... ἀναστροφήν: *conversationem ... conversationem* (A, S, T, V)
- 3:9: εὐλογοῦντες ... εὐλογίαν: *benedicentes ... benedictionem* (S, T, V)
- 3:10–11: ἀπὸ κακοῦ ... ἀπὸ κακοῦ: *a malo ... a malo* (S, T, V)
- 3:12: κυρίου ... κυρίου: *domini ... domini* (S, T, V)

---

<sup>99</sup> Variation in text type A.

<sup>100</sup> Variation in text type T.

- 3:16: ἀγαθὴν ... τὴν ἀγαθὴν: *bonam ... bonam* (S, T, V)
- 3:17: θέλοι τὸ θέλημα: *velit voluntas* (T, V), *velit spiritus* (S)<sup>101</sup>
- 3:20–21: διεσώθησαν ... σώξει: *salvae factae sunt ... salvos faciet / facit* (K / T, V), *salvatae sunt ... salvos faciet* (C)
- 4:1: παθόντος ... ὁ παθών: *passo ... passus est* (T, V), *passo ... mortuus est* (A)<sup>102</sup>
- 4:2–3: χρόνον ... χρόνος: *tempus / temporis ... tempus* (A, T / V)
- 4:2–3: θελήματι ... τὸ βούλημα: *voluntate / voluntati ... voluntatem* (A, V / T)
- 4:5–6: νεκρούς ... νεκροῖς: *mortuos ... mortuis* (T, V)
- 4:8: ἀγάπην ... ἀγάπη: *caritatem ... caritas* (A, S, T, V)
- 4:10: χάρισμα ... χάριτος: *gratiam ... gratiae* (T, V)
- 4:11: θεοῦ ... θεός ... θεός: *dei ... deus ... deus* (T, V)
- 4:13: χαίρετε ... χαρῆτε: *gaudete ... gaudentes / gaudeatis* (K / T, V)
- 5:5–6: τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ... ταπεινοῖς ... ταπεινώθητε: *humilitatem ... humilibus ... humiliare / humiliamini* (S, T / V)

#### b. Variations in the Vetus Latina

- 2:12–14: κακοποιῶν ... κακοποιῶν: *malefacientibus ... malorum* (C), *malefactoribus ... malorum* (T), *malefactoribus ... malefactorum* (V)
- 3:14: τὸν φόβον ... φοβηθῆτε: *metum ... timueritis* (T), *timorem ... timueritis* (V)
- 4:3–4: ἐν ἀσελγείαις ... τῆς ἀσωτίας: *in libidinibus ... luxuriae* (T), *in luxuriis ... luxuriae* (V)

---

<sup>101</sup> Variation in text type S.

<sup>102</sup> Variation in text type A.



4:13–14: τῆς δόξης ... τῆς δόξης: *gloriae ... honoris* (T), *claritatis ... maiestatis* (K), *gloriae ... gloriae* (V)

4:14–15: δοξάζεται ... δοξάζεται: *honorificatur ... glorificet* (T)<sup>103</sup>

c. Variations in the Vulgate

4:10–11: διακονοῦντες ... διακονεῖ: *ministrantes ... ministrat* (T), *ministrantes ... ministrat* (V)

4:11: δοξάζεται ... ἡ δόξα: *glorificetur ... gloria* (T), *honorificetur ... gloria* (V)

d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina

2:17: τιμήσατε ... τιμᾶτε: *honorate ... honorificate* (S, T, V), *honorate ... reveremini* (A)

2:20: ὑπομενεῖτε ... ὑπομενεῖτε: *suffertis ... sustinetis* (C, V), *sufferatis ... sustineatis* (S)

As it is possible to see from the list above, the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina usually agree on repeating the same lexical renderings in neighbouring passages. In some cases the variations were not possible because of the absence of alternative renderings in Latin but in other instances variations could have been made. At 4:2–3 the term *voluntas* is employed twice despite the variation in the Greek text (θελήματι ... βούλημα). At 2:18 *servi* (S, T, V) renders both δοῦλοι and οἰκέται. *Gratia* is present twice at 4:10 in text type T and the Vulgate while in Greek there is a slight change (χάρισμα ... χάριτος). The Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina in a few passages: in the repetition of *malefactor* at 2:12–14 while text types C and T vary the rendering; in the use of *luxuria* at 4:3 to render the different Greek terms ἀσέλγεια and ἀσωτία while T employs *libido* and *luxuria*; in the repetition of *gloria* at 4:13–14 against the variations of text

---

<sup>103</sup> The Vulgate does not translate this part of the verse.

types K and T. At 3:14 the Vulgate translates the expression φόβον φοβεῖν with *timorem timere* employing words with the same root while the Vetus Latina has *metum timere*. The Vulgate and text type T retain the alliteration and the use of words etymologically connected at 3:17: θέλοι τὸ θέλημα is rendered by *velit voluntas*. On the other hand, at 4:11 the Vulgate has *honorificare* and *gloria* instead of *glorificare* and *gloria* of text type T and at 4:10–11 alternates the verbs *administare* and *ministrare*. In addition to the aforementioned cases, text type T varies the renderings at 4:14–15 (*honorificare ... glorificare*) and 3:1 (*mulier ... uxor*). Other instances of variation in the Vetus Latina are attested at 4:1 (A) and 3:20–21 (C). On the whole, the Vulgate repeats the same Latin rendering more often than the Vetus Latina and makes variations only four times (4:10–11; 4:11; 2:17; 2:20).

## 9. Participial Renderings

### a. Articular Participles

The table shows the renderings of Greek articular participles in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina versions of 1 Peter:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | FINITE VERB | ADJECTIVE | NOUN |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------|------|
| T          | 16              | 2                  | 1           | 1         | 0    |
| S          | 10              | 4                  | 0           | 1         | 0    |
| A          | 6               | 2                  | 1           | 1         | 0    |
| C          | 3               | 2                  | 0           | 0         | 0    |
| K          | 0               | 1                  | 0           | 0         | 0    |
| V          | 21              | 5                  | 0           | 1         | 1    |

## 8. Rendering of articular participles in 1 Peter

The articular participles in 1 Peter are mostly rendered by the relative clause and, in a smaller number of cases, by the present participle. It is noteworthy that the articular participle at 3:13

is transformed in a direct clause in the Vetus Latina text types A and T while S and the Vulgate have a relative clause:

καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς

*et quis nocere vobis potest* (A)

*et quis est qui noceat* (S)

*et quis vos nocebit* (T)

*et quis est qui vobis noceat* (V)

#### b. Participles

The type and distribution of the renderings of non-articular participles are illustrated by the table below:

| TEXT TYPES | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | PERFECT PARTICIPLE | RELATIVE CLAUSE | FINITE VERB | CUM AND SUBJUNCTIVE | ADJECTIVE |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------|
| T          | 36                 | 13                 | 6               | 3           | 1                   | 0         |
| S          | 20                 | 9                  | 1               | 6           | 0                   | 1         |
| A          | 12                 | 6                  | 1               | 2           | 1                   | 1         |
| C          | 11                 | 4                  | 0               | 8           | 2                   | 1         |
| K          | 5                  | 0                  | 1               | 1           | 2                   | 0         |
| V          | 46                 | 26                 | 3               | 1           | 3                   | 2         |

Table 9. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 Peter

The use of present and perfect participles is very frequent in 1 Peter whereas the relative clause is employed to render attributive participles and *cum* plus subjunctive to translate adverbial participles. Greek participles are often transformed into finite verbs in the Vetus Latina while the Vulgate retains the participial forms at 1:22; 2:4, 10, 18, 20; 3:1; 5:3. The Vulgate employs once the analytical construction which appears to be a word-for-word translation of the Greek text:

2:25: ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι

*qui sicut oves errabatis* (T)

*tamquam pecora errantia* (A)

*eratis enim sicut oves errantes* (V; PS-AU hyp<sup>txt</sup>; PS-HIL-A)

The genitive absolutes are rendered by *cum* and subjunctive (3:20 C, T, V; 5:4 S, T, V), the ablative absolute (3:22 A, T, V; 4:1 A, T, V; 4:4 V)<sup>104</sup> and a finite verb (4:12 K, T, V).

## 10. Statistics

The relationship between the text types is illustrated by Thiele with a statistical summary that shows their relationship:<sup>105</sup>

| TEXT TYPES | T  | S  |
|------------|----|----|
| S          | 83 |    |
| V          | 76 | 35 |

Table 10. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 1 Peter

The Vulgate is remarkably closer to T (76 instances) than to S (35 instances) and S and T agree against the Vulgate on 83 occasions; each text type is unique 36 times. Nonetheless, it is not clear what types of renderings are selected by Thiele and the total number of instances taken into consideration: a more detailed analysis, which makes a distinction between renderings of lexicon, participles and word order, is undertaken below.

---

<sup>104</sup> In the latter instance, the Old Latin text types T and A have infinitives governed by the previous verbs *obstupescere* and *stupescere*.

<sup>105</sup> Thiele (1965: 87).

a. Lexicon

The number of instances in which the Vulgate agrees with each *Vetus Latina* text type and the percentage of agreement are summarised in the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 75/114  | 66%        |
| C          | 143/215 | 67%        |
| A          | 205/283 | 72%        |
| S          | 383/472 | 81%        |
| T          | 634/737 | 86%        |
| V (unique) | 99/855  | 12%        |

Table 11. Lexical renderings in 1 Peter

The table confirms the close relationship between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* in 1 Peter underlined by Thiele:<sup>106</sup> the high number of cases of agreement between the Vulgate on one hand and the Old Latin text types on the other demonstrates the common origin of these texts. Not only does the Vulgate agree in a number of instances with the European text types S and T (81% and 86% of cases) but also has several lexical renderings in common with the biblical text of Augustine (72%) and the African text types K and C (66% and 67% respectively), which are less attested. The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in a very limited number of cases (12%). These results are at odds with those of James in which the Vulgate is frequently independent of the Old Latin versions (25%) and not as close to text types S and T (68% and 56% of similarities respectively) as in 1 Peter. The fact that the sources at the base of the African

---

<sup>106</sup> Thiele (1969: 72): ‘In der Regel hat V den gleichen Wortschatz, der in S und T belegt ist, soweit nicht der Rückgriff auf die griechische Vorlage Veranlassung zu einer neuen Übersetzung gibt.’

text types K and C are preserved in 1 Peter gives also the chance to make a comparison, which is not possible for James, between these versions and the Vulgate.

#### b. Participles

The table shows the number of cases of agreement between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina text types and the resulting percentages:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 9/10    | 90%        |
| C          | 20/31   | 65%        |
| A          | 23/34   | 68%        |
| S          | 43/53   | 81%        |
| T          | 67/81   | 83%        |
| V (unique) | 15/109  | 14%        |

Table 12. Participial renderings in 1 Peter

The percentages of agreement in the participial renderings confirm the results of the statistical analysis of the lexicon. The Vulgate is rarely alone (14% of the cases), although more frequently than in the lexical renderings, and often agrees with text types K, S and T with 90%, 81% and 83% of participial renderings in common respectively (although the number of participles of K is relatively low). A good number of similarities between the Vulgate on one hand and text types A and C on the other (68% and 65%) are also evident.

#### c. Word Order

The table illustrates the agreement between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina on word order and their relationship with the Greek text:

| TEXT TYPES | V     | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|-------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| K          | 2/6   | 33%        | 2/6: 33%           | 4/6: 67%               |
| C          | 4/11  | 36%        | 4/11: 17%          | 7/11: 64%              |
| A          | 6/12  | 50%        | 7/12: 58%          | 5/12: 42%              |
| S          | 6/15  | 40%        | 5/15: 33%          | 9/15: 60%              |
| T          | 11/29 | 38%        | 10/29: 34%         | 19/29: 66%             |
| V (unique) | 10/31 | 32%        | 30/31: 97%         | 1/31: 3%               |

Table 13. Word order in 1 Peter

The statistical examination of word order draws unexpected conclusions on the relationship between text types and their degree of literariness. The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in word order more often than in the renderings of lexicon and participles, precisely in 32% of the cases taken into account. The closest Old Latin text type to the Vulgate is A (50%), followed by S (40%), T (38%), C (36%) and K (33%). The number of cases of agreement with the *Vetus Latina* halves compared to those of the lexicon and participial renderings. The renderings of the Vulgate match the word order of the Greek text in 97% of the cases with only one exception.<sup>107</sup> On the contrary, in the Old Latin text types K, C, S and T the number of renderings not matching the Greek order outnumbers those that follow the Greek word order. Text type A is the only one that has a slight majority of word-for-word renderings (58%). Text type T, which is the closest to the Vulgate in lexicon and participial renderings, differs from the Greek word order in 66% of the cases and is therefore distant from the Vulgate. As far as word order is concerned, text types S and T are not closely related to the Vulgate.

---

<sup>107</sup> A further case of non-literal rendering is *in isto nomine* (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ) at 4:16, which was not included in the table above because all the text types (A, T, V) agree on this rendering.

## 11. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina can be also consulted to reconstruct the Greek text of 1 Peter to a certain extent. Some of the cases of unique readings of the Vulgate identified by von Harnack can no longer be supported in light of the changes brought to the base text of the Vulgate and the completion of the Vetus Latina edition but the following instances are still worth consideration:<sup>108</sup>

1:5: ἐν δυνάμει: *in veritate* (A), *in virtute* (S, V)

1:8: πιστεύοντες: *quem cum videritis* (C; Y 251<sup>A</sup> AS; AU; cf QU Jud; CAr; BED), *credentes* (T, V)

1:22: τῆς ἀληθείας: *fidei* (S; 271 67?; PRIS 1; 4; 5; 7; PS-VIG; PS-AU spe; GI cf Rm 1,5; 16,26), *caritatis* (V; PS-AU spe Var; PS-HIL-A), *veritati* (T)

2:23: δικαίως (ἀδίκως in G:A1B): *iniuste* (K, V; CY; cf AM?; PEL; AU Ps Var; PAU-N; MAXn Var; LEO; QU Var; PS-AU s 118; FU Var; cf PS-FU; JO-N; CLE-A; PS-HIL-A; cf Tur?), *iuste* (C)

3:1: ἀπειθοῦσιν: *non credunt* (A, S, T, V)

3:13: ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς (ὑμᾶς κακῶσων in GA 629): *vos nocebit* (T), *qui vobis noceat* (V), *nocere vobis* (A)

3:14: εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε: *et si quid patimini* (T, V; 32 65; cf KA Sp; GR-M > [PEL II.]; LUCU; PS-HIL-A; cf CAr?), *et si patimini* (S)

3:16: οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες: *videntes* (S; PS-AU spe; cf PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup>; BED cath<sup>com</sup>; cf CAr), *infamantes* (T), *qui calumniantur* (V)

---

<sup>108</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 79–91).



3:17: τὸ θέλημα: *spiritus* (A; AU Fau), *voluntas* (T, V)

3:22: + καταβάλλων τὸν θάνατον ἵνα ζωῆς αἰωνίου κληρονόμοι γενώμεθα (in GA 629): *qui deglutit a morte ut vitae heres esset* (C), *deglutiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficeremur* (T)

4:14: πνεῦμα: *nomen* (K; CY), *spiritus* (T, V)

4:16: ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ (τούτῳ ὀνόματι in GA 629): *in isto nomine* (A, T, V)

5:3: + (καὶ) ἐκ ψυχῆς: *et ex animo* (V; F\*GI<sup>1</sup>Θ<sup>A</sup>Y 251<sup>A</sup> SQΦ<sup>TBG</sup> PΣ<sup>A2</sup>; AU spe Var; HI > A-SS; CO-Brac; PS-HIL-A; BED cath), *ex animo* (CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>ΛXτ 54 ΔΘ<sup>M</sup> 65 251 AF<sup>2D</sup> I\*LRMUΦ<sup>V</sup>Ω, W-W; AU spe; HI Var; VIG-P; CO-Brac; PS-HIL-A; BED cath)

5:14: εἰρήνη (χάρις in GA 629): *gratia* (V; cf CAr), *pax* (T)

The reading *in veritate* at 1:5 in the biblical text of Augustine is a probable scribal mistake for *in virtute* (S, V) given that the variant reading ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is not attested in the ECM. At 1:8 the underlying Greek text of text type C seems to be ἰδόντες: this variant, however, is not attested elsewhere. The reading might have been influenced by the preceding participle ὀρῶντες. At 1:22 text type S and the Vulgate have *fides* and *caritas*, corresponding to πίστις and ἀγάπη, which are not attested in the ECM: the readings, however, do not match ἀλήθεια. The reading *iniuste* at 2:23 in text type K and the Vulgate, which is also attested in the Georgian tradition, seems to be in contrast with the meaning of the verse.<sup>109</sup> The hypothesis of confusion between ἀπιστεῖν and ἀπειθεῖν at 3:1 made by von Harnack is not plausible in that the translation *non credere* (A, S, T, V) is also suitable for the latter verb.<sup>110</sup> The word order of the Vulgate and

---

<sup>109</sup> See pp. 184–5.

<sup>110</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 81–2).

text type T at 3:13 and 4:16 is unattested in Greek (except the bilingual manuscript GA 629): considering that the Vulgate mostly matches the sequence of the Greek words, these differences in word order might derive from unattested Greek variant readings. The Vulgate and text type T are the only witnesses that add *quid* at 3:14: von Harnack proposes to restore  $\tau\iota$  before  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$  which might have been overlooked because it is followed by the letter  $\pi$ .<sup>111</sup> On the other hand, *quid* could have arisen from dittography. At 3:16 the verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ , ‘to insult’, is rendered by *videre* in text type S: this reading is unique. At 3:17 the biblical text of Augustine features the reading *spiritus*, corresponding to  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ , which is not attested in Greek. The long addition at 3:22 in text types C and T is also attested in GA 629 and some manuscripts of the Vulgate.<sup>112</sup> The biblical text of Cyprian has *nomen* instead of *spiritus* at 4:14: this is probably due to the presence of *in nomine* in the same verse. The additions *et ex animo* and *ex animo* at 5:3 imply the underlying text ( $\kappa\alpha\iota$ )  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$   $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$  but the variant is not registered in any sources according to the ECM. At 5:14 the Vulgate has *gratia*, also attested in GA 629, instead of *pax* ( $\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\eta$ ). In the same verse the Vulgate has *sancto* ( $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega$ ), in agreement with several Greek manuscripts, the Armenian tradition and the Peshitta, instead of *caritatis* ( $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\varsigma$ ).

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina also follow Greek variant readings which have a low number of attestations. A selection of cases is presented below:

1:8:  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  (in GA 1798, L596\*, 442, 621, 629, L596C, IrLat): *creditus* (C, T, V)

2:4: +  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  (in GA 1505, 1881; A, G, SI:M): *et* (A, S)

2:9:  $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$   $\phi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$  ( $\phi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$   $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$  in GA 1067, G): *lumen suum* (C, T, V)

---

<sup>111</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 80–1).

<sup>112</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 83–6).

2:23: ἐλοιδοῦρει (variant in GA 01\*): *maledixit* (K), *maledicebat* (V)

4:15: omission of ὡς (in GA 915, 1881): (K, A, T, V)

5:7: + πάντων (in GA 2805): *omnibus* (S; 54\*?; AU 1/3?; PS-AU spe)

## 12. Conclusions

The idea that the Vulgate version of 1 Peter is a conservative revision is propounded by von Harnack who affirms that the main activity of the reviser of 1 Peter is the correction of scribal mistakes.<sup>113</sup> However, the language of the Vulgate is characterised by precise lexical and syntactical features, often in opposition to those of the *Vetus Latina*. The Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* attest several loan-words with Christian (*amen, angelus, apostolus, baptisma, blasphemare, christianus, diabolus, episcopus, evangelizare, evangelium, idolum, presbyter, conpresbyter, propheta, prophetare, scandalum*) and non-Christian (*petra, dolus, discolus, clerus* with the rare meaning ‘lot, inheritance’) connotations. In two instances in which the Vulgate employs loan-words (*colaphizare* at 2:20 and *episcopus* at 2:25) the Old Latin versions feature the corresponding Latin terms. On the other hand, in James the Vulgate attests the Latin renderings in contrast with the loan-words of the *Vetus Latina*. The Greek compounds are rendered by periphrastic expressions, calques and matching words. The Greek verbs in -αζω and -ιζω are translated by new formations and pre-existing verbs ending in *-ficare* (*glorificare, honorificare, magnificare, castificare, sanctificare*). The alpha privative compounds are rendered in the majority of the cases by the negative prefix *-in*, by *sine* plus a noun or positive adjectives, attested only in text types C and A, which represent free translations of the alpha

---

<sup>113</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 93) says that ‘es ist recht wahrscheinlich, daß er sich fast ausschließlich auf die Reinigung des altlateinischen Textes von Schreibfehlern bzw. Härten beschränkt hat.’

privative compounds. The Latin versions also resort to etymologising renderings: some of them are pre-existing words that match the structure of the Greek terms but others are rare words and Christian coinages, such as the Vulgate rendering *cumelecta* at 5:13. Neologisms are created because of the lack of Christian vocabulary in Latin, for instance *sanctificatio*, and terms already in use acquire in late Latin specialised meanings in a process of semantic extension, for example *visitatio*, which has the Christian meaning ‘visitation’ at 2:12 and 5:6. The abstract nouns in *-io* are frequent in 1 Peter and often postclassical (*dispersio*, *incrispatio*, *incoatio*) while those ending in *-tas* are mostly classical. The *nomina agentis* in *-or* and the adjectives ending in *-bilis* are often late formations such as *communicator* and *adpetitor* on one hand and *acceptabilis* and *incompactibilis* on the other. Only one revival of archaic word, *malefactor* (2:12, 14; 3:16), is present in 1 Peter. Metaplasms of gender (*spiritus quod* at 3:4 V and 4:14 T) and declension (*vaso* at 3:5 S and 3:7 S, T, V; *firmes* at 5:9 S) are attested in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. The verbs *humiliare* (5:6) and *armare* (4:1) are employed in the passive form with active and reflexive meaning. The analogical participle *absconsus* is attested at 3:3 in text type S.

The syntax of the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina is clearly influenced by the Greek text: an infinitive of purpose is attested at 2:5 in the Vulgate in contrast with the Vetus Latina and four instances of reported speech introduced by ὅτι are rendered by *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* and the indicative (the constructions *gustare quoniam* at 2:3 and *vigilare quia* at 5:8 are calques of the corresponding Greek clauses). The Greek verbal constructions are numerous: *obsecrare* plus the infinitive at 2:11 (T, V); *nocere* with the accusative at 3:13 (T); verbs of dressing with the accusative (1:13 S, T, V; 5:5 S, T); *communicare* with the dative at 4:13; *evangelizare* followed by the dative at 4:6 (A, T, V), the accusative at 1:12 (T, V) and *in* and the accusative or the ablative at 1:25 (S, V); *sperare* with *in* and the accusative at 3:5 (C, S, T, V).

What characterises the Vulgate version of 1 Peter is the close relationship with the Greek text: Greek participles are rendered by the Latin equivalents while the *Vetus Latina* employs finite verbs, the number of the Greek verb is retained at 4:18 in the Vulgate as well as the number of nouns, adjectives, pronouns and verbs in further instances. The Vulgate features once the analytical construction of the Greek text (*eratis ... errantes* at 2:25). Comparatives and superlatives are frequent in 1 Peter and sometimes employed when they are not present in Greek (*posteriores* at 1:11 and *attentius* at 1:22 in the Vulgate). Corrections and stylistic improvements, such as fluent and free renderings of the Greek text, are uncommon in the Vulgate. The Vulgate often uses more precise terminology than the *Vetus Latina*, for instance *multiplicetur* at 1:2, *livore* at 2:24, *gentium* at 4:3 (but counterexamples are also present such as *iniuste* at 2:23, *peregrinari* at 4:4, 12 and *vigilare* at 4:7), and always avoids the rendering of Greek articles with demonstratives, which are present nine times in the *Vetus Latina*. On the other hand, the demonstratives match Greek articles in the Vulgate text of James. The Vulgate introduces variations to eliminate repetitions in neighbouring passages only four times while a higher number of variations is counted in the *Vetus Latina*. The same word is repeated even though there are different underlying Greek words (4:2–3; 2:18; 4:10).

The statistical analysis shows that the lexical and participial renderings of the Vulgate are rarely unique (12% and 14%) and agree in more than 80% of the cases with text types T (86%, 83%) and S (81%, 81%). These data do not support the statistical results of Thiele who identifies a wide gap between the cases of agreement between T and V on one hand (76 instances) and S and V on the other (35 instances).<sup>114</sup> A good number of similarities with text types A, K and C can be also noticed: A is the closest text type to the Vulgate in word order

---

<sup>114</sup> Thiele (1965: 87).

(50%) and K in the renderings of participles (90%) although these text types are not largely attested. The high number of similarities between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* seems to demonstrate that the Latin versions of 1 Peter derive from a common archetype, as Thiele maintains.<sup>115</sup> The Vulgate often differs from the *Vetus Latina* in word order: the word order of text types K, C, S, T is not literal with Greek in the majority of the cases while the Vulgate follows the order of the Greek text in 97% of the instances and is unique in 32% of the cases. The relationship between the Vulgate and the Old Latin text types in 1 Peter has to be compared with the results of James. Text type S is well attested in both the Epistles, in which it has also a consistent character: it is remarkably closer to the Vulgate in 1 Peter (lexicon: 81%; participles: 81%; word order: 40%) than in James (lexicon: 68%; participles: 70%; word order: 25%). Text type T, which is reconstructed in both the letters but is attested to a lesser extent in James, has a higher number of renderings in common with the Vulgate in 1 Peter (lexicon: 86%; participles: 83%; word order: 38%) than in James (lexicon: 56%; participles: 33%; word order: 0%). The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* more often in James than in 1 Peter (25%; 27%; 46% of unique renderings in James versus 12%; 14%; 32% in 1 Peter) and the word order is less literal in James than in 1 Peter (75% versus 97%). These data seem to support the hypothesis of a different origin for the Vulgate Catholic Epistles but have to be compared with the results derived from the linguistic analysis of the remaining Epistles before reaching certain conclusions.

---

<sup>115</sup> Thiele (1969: 71).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

#### 1. Introduction

2 Peter is not extensively cited in early sources: very general allusions to the content of verses 2:5 (7,6) and 3:9 (7,5) are present in the Latin translation of 1 Clement and the reference to verses 2:10, 15 in the Shepherd of Hermas is uncertain.<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Optatus, Lucifer of Cagliari do not cite the Epistle.<sup>2</sup> The biblical text of Augustine is mostly in agreement with text type T while it is listed under the siglum C when supported by African witnesses. Novatian makes an allusion to verse 3:12 and Chromatius quotes 3:9 and 2:20 according to Thiele, who, however, does not report Chromatius' biblical text in the witness apparatus.<sup>3</sup> Hilary of Poitiers (1:4; 2:21–22; 3:10) and Ambrosiaster (1:4, 20; 2:1, 4, 10, 17, 20) cite the letter in the fourth century. The texts of the manuscripts and Church Fathers are grouped into the following text types by Thiele:

C:

- Pseudo-Cyprian in *De singularitate clericorum* (PS-CY sng 28 204,24–25) cites 2:13–14.
- Pseudo-Hilarius, *Epistula seu libellus apologeticus* (PS-HIL ap), quotes 1:21.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thiele (1969: 73). Only the allusion of 1 Clement to 3:9 is included in the witness apparatus.

<sup>2</sup> Frisius (2011: 13–5) demonstrates that Tertullian does not cite or make reference to 2 Peter.

<sup>3</sup> Thiele (1969: 73).

- Pseudo-Augustine in *Epistula ad catholicos de secta Donatistarum* (PS-AU Do 38 282,13) cites 1:8.
- Isolated readings in Augustine (AU), Quodvultdeus (QU), Pseudo-Vigilius, *Contra Varimadum* (PS-VIG Var), Primasius (PRIM), KA Sp.

M: Ambrose quotes verses 1:10–11 in *De fide ad Gratianum Augustum* (AM fi 3,93 608B–C).

The biblical text of Ambrose agrees with the citation of Pseudo-Vigilius, *Contra Varimadum* 3,82 (429C) on the following renderings: *πταίσητε*: *errabitis* (*offenditis* in T and *peccabitis* in V) and *βασιλείαν*: *imperium* (*regnum* in T, V).

S:

- the Pseudo-Augustine *Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum* (PS-AU spe) cites 1:2–9; 2:11–15, 21–22; 3:9–12.
- Priscillian (PRIS) cites 1:20; 2:3, 5, 10.
- Bachiarius (BACH) quotes 1:20 in *De fide* 6 (1034A).
- Pseudo-Prosper, *Epistula ad Demetriadem* ([PROS] Dem 16 175B), is a source of text type S at 1:2–4.
- Isolated readings in Jerome (2:13, 21, 22), Gelasius (2:13), Cassiodorus (1:3; 2:22; 3:10), Pope Martin I. (1:3–4), KA A (1:4; 2:13), the Vulgate manuscripts CΣ (1:1; 2:4, 7, 20).
- The Vulgate manuscripts AF<sup>2</sup>D and S and the Spanish tradition of the Vulgate (X and Δ).



T:<sup>4</sup>

- VL 32: *Lectionarium Guelferbytanus*. Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Weißenburg 76. It transmits 2 Peter 1:13–21.
- VL 55: The Fleury Palimpsest. Paris. Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 6400 G, foll. 113–30. The manuscript ends at 2:7.
- VL 64: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6436/21 (from Clm 6220 and Clm 6277). It transmits 2 Peter 1:1–4.
- Isolated readings in the Vulgate manuscripts CΣ.
- Augustine (AU).
- Quodvultdeus (QU) quotes 1:18–19, 21; 2:1, 4, 16, 21–22; 3:7–8, 12–13.
- Fulgentius of Ruspe (FU) cites 1:4, 21; 2:19; 3:9, 18.
- Facundus of Hermiane (FAC) cites 3:15–17.
- Primasius (PRIM) cites 1:19; 2:19.
- Isolated readings in Verecundus (3:7, 10), in Gallic (Salvian of Marseilles at 2:6, 20–22) and Italian writers: Rufinus of Aquileia (2:16, 19; 3:15), Pelagius, Julian of Eclanum, Pope Leo I, Pope Martin I, Cassiodorus, Epiphanius Scholasticus (2:11; 3:5–6)

A: the biblical text of Augustine when it is unique: verses 2:8, 12, 17–18; 3:4, 11, 14–15, 18.

X:

- Jerome's biblical text from the first book of *Adversus Iovinianum* (1:4; 2:9–10, 12–14; 20–21; 3:3), *Explanationum in Esaiam libri* (3:5–7), Epistle 140 (3:8–9).

---

<sup>4</sup> The manuscripts transmitting text type T are described in the chapter on 1 Peter (p. 138).

- Paulinus of Aquileia (3:15–16).

The reconstruction of text type C, which represents an African form of text later than Tertullian and Cyprian, is limited to a few verses, in particular 2:14–15, which contain a few unique renderings (*moechationibus, capientes, infirmas*) and some in common with both the Vulgate and the Old Latin tradition (*luxuriantes, incessabilis, delictum*). The citations of Ambrose at 1:10–11 are different enough from the other text types to motivate Thiele to create text type M, the text circulating in Milan in the fourth century, which features isolated similarities with the citations of Pseudo-Vigilius in *Contra Varimadum*. Nonetheless, the extent of the biblical text of Ambrose is limited to two verses and the creation of a text type to represent it is therefore unnecessary. The biblical text of Augustine is considered to be a source of text types C and T when it agrees with the principal witnesses of these types while it forms an independent text type, A, when it is unique. The main sources of text type S are the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and Priscillian whereas in VL 67, used to reconstruct S in James and 1 Peter, 2 Peter is not extant. The character of text type S in 2 Peter is peculiar: the translation is free, the word order of Greek is often modified and the meaning of the Greek text is sometimes misunderstood (for instance at 3:11). Text type T is based on a number of witnesses although the manuscript tradition preserves only a small portion of the letter. Therefore, T is mostly founded on the basis of the citations of Augustine, Quodvultdeus, Fulgentius of Ruspe and Facundus of Hermiane. The manuscripts of the Vulgate transmit readings of both text types S and T. According to Thiele, the divergence between Jerome's biblical text and the other Latin versions made necessary the composition of an additional text type, X, reconstructed only in 2

Peter and also representing the biblical text of Paulinus of Aquileia at 3:15–16.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, the foundation of text type X appears to be unjustified: it is unclear why the citations of Jerome and Paulinus of Aquileia should be grouped together considering that the quotations of the latter are limited to two verses not even quoted by Jerome. Therefore, the biblical texts of the two writers cannot be compared because they do not share renderings. The citations contained in the first book of *Adversus Iovinianum* are characterised by a unique form of text but the biblical text of the *Explanationum in Esaiam libri* has distinctive readings of the Vulgate and probably conveys a mixed form of text: the reader of the *Vetus Latina* edition may wonder why text type X is based on the latter and not on the other writings of Jerome featuring citations with a unique biblical text. The earliest attestations of the Vulgate date back to the last decade of the fourth century: distinctive readings and renderings are present in Jerome's citations, especially in the second book of *Adversus Iovinianum*, of the year 393, and in *Explanationum in Esaiam libri*, dated between 408–9. The Vulgate is attested at the beginning of the fifth century, despite the presence of unique and Old Latin readings, in the quotations of the Pseudo-Augustine *Hypomnesticon* (2:1–3) and *De vita christiana* (2:20–22; 3:9), the Caspari Corpus (1:4–5, 8; 3:10–12, 15–16) and Pelagius' *Epistula ad Demetriadem* (2:19; 3:11–12). Two short citations of Eucherius (2:17, 22) have the same lexicon as the Vulgate. A mixture of the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* is present in Cassian, Prosper (1:19) and Pelagius' *Expositiones*. The Vulgate version of 2 Peter must have been in circulation from the end of the fourth century in light of the earliest attestations in the citations of the Church Fathers.

---

<sup>5</sup> Thiele (1969: 78).

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The loan-words in 2 Peter are mainly Christian terms derived from Greek: *angelus* (2:4 T, V; 2:11 S, T, V); *apostolus* (1:1 T, V; 3:2 V); *blasphemare* (2:2 V; 2:10 S, V; 2:12 V, X); *propheta* (2:16 T, V; 3:2 T, V); *prophetia* (1:20 S, T, V; 1:21 T, V); *pseudopropheta* (2:1 T, V). *Pseudopropheta* enters the Latin language with the Vetus Latina and Tertullian: this loan-word is frequently attested in the Vulgate too (Matthew 24:11, 24; Mark 13:22; Acts 13:6; 1 John 4:1; Revelation 16:13; 19:20). *Prophetia* was first borrowed by Christian writers while *propheta* is used not only in religious texts but also in postclassical literature with the meaning ‘foreteller’ (Festus p. 254,9; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 7,13,9; Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate* 1,3; *De mundo* 146,13; *Metamorphoses* 2, 28–9). The only Hebrew word in the Epistle is *amen* (3:18 V). Two loan-words not connected with Christianity are attested in 2 Peter: *epistula* (3:1 V; 3:16 T, V, X), which was introduced in Latin with Plautus, and *cataclismus* (2:5 S; PRIS tr 3 46,12), which corresponds to κατακλυσμός and means ‘deluge’.<sup>6</sup> The earliest attestations of the latter go back to the first century and are present in Varro (*De re rustica* 3,1,3) and Hyginus (*Astronomica* 2,29; *Fabulae* 153 p. 26). The loan-word is often employed by Christian writers to refer to the narrative of the flood in Genesis, for example at Matthew 24:38 (VL 2) and 24:39 (VL 2 3 9; APR Apc; HI Apc 4,2; VICn Apc 4,2). In both the instances of Matthew the Vulgate features *diluvium*: the same rendering is employed at 2 Peter 2:5 in the Vulgate and text type T and at Luke 17:27 in the Vulgate and the Old Latin sources that transmit the verse. The term is also used in the medical context (Caelius Aurelianus, *Tardae vel*

---

<sup>6</sup> The alternative spellings *cataclysmos* and *cataclysmus* are also frequent.

*chronicae passionis* 1,1,42; 1,1,46). The verb βλασφημέω is once rendered by the Latin verb *exsecrari* (1:12 S) instead of the loan-word *blasphemare* (V, X) and βλάσφημον is translated by *exsecrabile* at 2:11 (S, T, V) and not by the loan-word *blasphemum*.

## b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

### b.1 Periphrases

The Latin versions employ periphrastic expressions to render the Greek compounds in the following instances:

1:7a: φιλαδελφίαν: *amicam fraternitatem* (S), *amorem fraternitatis* (T, V)

1:7b: φιλαδελφία: *affectione fraternitatis* (S), *amore ... fraternitatis* (T, V)

1:17: εὐδόκησα: *bene sensi* (T), *conplacui* (V; Σ<sup>A3</sup>; GR-M; JUL-T; BED h)

2:1: ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι: *magistri mendaces* (T, V), *pseudodoctores* (VINC 25), *pseudomagistri* (VINC 27)

3:9: μακροθυμεῖ: *expectat* (S), *patienter fert* (T), *patienter agit* (V; τ<sup>56</sup>; PEL > CAr; LEO; FAU-R<sup>txt</sup>; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur?)

3:16: δυσνοητά: *difficilia intellectu* (T, V), *difficilia ad intelligendum* (X)

The translation of φιλαδελφία at 1:7a, b with *amor fraternitatis* in text type T and the Vulgate agrees with the rendering of the Vulgate at 1 Peter 1:22. On the other hand, text type S varies the renderings. At 1:17 the rendering *bene sentire* of text type T (32 55? CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>; AU Jo) matches the Greek verb εὐδοκέω: the same translation also occurs at Matthew 5:25 (HI ep 127,3), 12:18 (VL 1), 17:5 (VL 1); Luke 12:32 (VL 2); 1 Corinthians 10:5 (AMst; IR) and in Irenaeus 1,7,4; 3,6,4; 4,27,4; 4,38,3. The rendering of the Vulgate, *complacere*, which does not match the structure of the Greek verb, is a revival of an archaic word first attested in Plautus

(*Amphitruo* 106), Terence (*Hautontimorumenos* 773) and reappeared later in Columella, Gellius, Apuleius and Christian writers.<sup>7</sup> Text type T and the Vulgate agree on the periphrastic rendering *magistri mendaces* at 2:1 while calques of the Greek compound are present in the citations of Vincent of Lérins. The periphrases *patienter ferre* (T) and *patienter agere* (V) correspond to the meaning of the verb μακροθυμέω, ‘to bear patiently’. This verb is attested twice at James 5:7 and translated by the differing renderings *patientes esse* (F, V), *pati* (F), *aequo animo* (G) and *patienter ferre* (V).<sup>8</sup>

## b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words

The compounds of 2 Peter are rendered a few times by pre-existing Latin words which match the components of the Greek terms and by calques, i.e. new Christian formations coined for the sake of transparency.

1:1: ισότιμον: *coaequalem* (T, V)

1:19: φωσφόρος: *lucifer* (T, V)

3:15: μακροθυμίαν: *patientiam* (A), *longanimitatem* (V; PS-HIL-A), *longanimitate* (251 SΣ<sup>A\*</sup> ΧτΔΘ<sup>A</sup>)

---

<sup>7</sup> Pezzini (2016: 43).

<sup>8</sup> The verb μακροθυμέω is present three times in the Pauline Epistles: 1 Corinthians 13:4 (*patiens esse* V; *magnanima esse* AMst<sup>ed</sup>; CY te); 1 Thessalonians 5:14 (*patientia* X; *aequo animo esse* D; *patientes esse* I, V); Hebrews 6:15 (*longanimiter ferens* J, V; *per patientiam* D; *longanimis* A). In the Gospels the translation of the Vulgate is *patientiam habere* (Matthew 18:26, 29; Luke 18:7).

The adjective *coaequalis*, ‘equal’, does not match formally ἰσότημον, ‘of the same kind’:<sup>9</sup> it is a postclassical formation first attested in Petronius 136 and Columella 8,14,8 with the meaning ‘of equal age’. The adjective is substantivised in the Vulgate at Matthew 11:16 and means ‘comrade’. On the other hand, *lucifer* (1:19 T, V) is first present in Accius (*Tragoediarum fragmenta* 331), Pomponius (*Fabularum Atellanarum fragmenta* 74) and is common in poetry but also attested in classical and post-classical prose to refer to Gods and the stars. *Longanimitas* is a calque not attested outside Christian writings and frequent in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles (Romans 2:4;<sup>10</sup> 2 Corinthians 6:6;<sup>11</sup> Galatians 5:22;<sup>12</sup> Colossians 1:11 D, I, V; 2 Timothy 3:10 D, I, V). Μακροθυμία is rendered by the classical word *patientia* in further two instances in the Catholic Epistles (James 5:10 F, V; 1 Peter 3:20 C, T, V) as well as in the Vulgate and Old Latin text of Romans 9:22; Ephesians 4:2 (K, I, V);<sup>13</sup> Colossians 3:12 (V);<sup>14</sup> 1 Timothy 1:16 (D, V);<sup>15</sup> 2 Timothy 4:2 (D, V);<sup>16</sup> Hebrews 6:12 (D, J, A, V).

---

<sup>9</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 382).

<sup>10</sup> *Patientia* is attested in AMst<sup>ed</sup>; RUF<sup>ed</sup>; CY te.

<sup>11</sup> *Magnanimitas* in 75 76; AMst.<sup>ed</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Patientia longanimitas* {54} 251 PEL<sup>B</sup>; AU spe (Var); *longanimitas patientia* 58; *patientia* 61 75 76 88<sup>alt</sup> 89; THr; CY te (Var); *patientia mansuetudo* 77; *magnanimitas* CY te.<sup>ed</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Magnanimitas* in text type D.

<sup>14</sup> *Modestiam* and *longanimitas* in text types D and I.

<sup>15</sup> *Magnanimitas* in text type I and *longanimitas* in A.

<sup>16</sup> *Magnanimitas* in text type I and *longanimitas* in A.

### b.3 Alpha Privative Compounds

The adjectives with the alpha privative are numerous in 2 Peter and rendered as follows:

- 1:8: ἀκάρπους: *sine fructibus* (S), *sine fructu* (T, V), *infructuosos* (RUS)
- 2:5: ἀσεβῶν: *imprios* (S), *inpios* (T), *impiorum* (V)
- 2:7: ἀθέσμων: *nefandorum* (V)
- 2:8: ἀνόμοις: *iniquis* (A, V)
- 2:9: ἀδίκους: *iniquos* (V, X)
- 2:12: ἄλογα: *muta* (A), *irrationabilia* (V, X)<sup>17</sup>
- 2:13: ἀδικίας: *iniustitiae* (S, V), *iniquitatis* (X)
- 2:15: ἀδικίας: *iniustitiae* (T), *iniquitatis* (V; AU; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:14a: ἀκαταπαύστους: *incessabilibus* (C), *incessabiles* (S, V), *indesinentis* (T), *insatiabili* (X)
- 2:14b: ἀστηρίκτους: *infirmas* (C), *stabilitos* (S), *instabiles* (V), *instabilis* (65\*; AU spe Var)
- 2:16: ἄφωνον: *sine voce* (A), *mutum* (T, V)
- 2:17: ἄνυδροι: *sicci* (T), *sine aqua* (V; HI; [EUCH]; PS-HIL-A)
- 3:14: ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμόμητοι: *inviolati et immaculati* (A), *inmaculati et inviolati* (V)<sup>18</sup>
- 3:16a: ἀμαθεῖς: *indocti* (T, V)
- 3:16b: ἀστήρικτοι: *instabiles* (T, V), *pravi* (X)

---

<sup>17</sup> Cfr. Jude 10: *muta* (T, V), p. 360.

<sup>18</sup> Cfr. James 1:27 (p. 64); 1 Peter 1:19 (p. 151).



3:17: ἀθέσμων: *infaustorum* (T), *insipientium* (V; JUL-T; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur)<sup>19</sup>

The alpha privative is mainly translated by adjectives introduced by the prefix *in-* (1:8 RUS; 2:5 S, T, V; 2:8 A, V; 2:9 V, X; 2:12 V, X; 2:13 S, V, X; 2:15 T, V; 2:14a C, S, T, V, X; 2:14b C, V; 3:14 A, V; 3:16a T, V; 3:16b T, V; 3:17 T, V), once by *ne-* (2:7 V), twice by *sine* plus a noun (1:8 S, T, V; 2:17 V). In four instances the alpha privative is not rendered in Latin (2:12 A; 2:16 T, V; 2:17 T; 3:16 X). The Vulgate is not consistent in the rendering of ἀδικία (*iniustitita* at 2:13 and *iniquitas* at 2:15) and ἄθεσμος (*nefandus* at 2:7 and *insipiens* at 3:17). Both the renderings *insipiens* and *infaustus* at 3:17 do not match the meaning of ἄθεσμος, ‘lawless’.<sup>20</sup> At 2:12 the adjective *irrationabilis* is a postclassical formation first attested in Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* 10,7,11), Apuleius (*De Platone et eius dogmate* 1,6; 2,16) and widespread in Christian writers. Both the adjectives *incessabilis* (2:14a C, S, V) and *indesineus* (2:14a T) are Christian coinages. At 2:14b text type S has the positive participle *stabilitos* instead of the negative form perhaps because it is preceded by the rare verb *refigurare*, ‘to form again’, which modifies the meaning of the sentence.<sup>21</sup> The use of this verb in PS-AU spe cannot be explained by the presence of Greek variants.

---

<sup>19</sup> The noun *insipientia*, attested in Plautus, Cicero and later in Gellius and Christian writings, is employed in the Vulgate as rendering of παραφρονία at 2 Peter 2:16. This term also renders ἄνοια (Luke 6:11; 2 Timothy 3:9) and ἀφοσύνη (2 Corinthians 11:1, 17, 21) in the Vulgate.

<sup>20</sup> No variants are attested in the ECM.

<sup>21</sup> Another attestation of the verb is present at Wisdom 19:6.

### c. Etymologising Renderings

The following list contains examples and counterexamples of renderings that match formally the Greek words: the majority of them predate the biblical translations but a minority of cases are calques formed in late Latin.

1:5a: παρεισενέγκαντες: *subinferentes* (S, T, V)

1:5b: ἐπιχορηγήσατε: *subminis<trate>* (T), *ministrare* (V; HI; RUS; GR-M > BEA; PS-HIL-A; BED h)

1:11: ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται: *subministrabitur* (T), *ministrabitur* (M, V)

1:14: ἀπόθεσις: *depositio* (T, V)<sup>22</sup>

2:1: ἐπάγοντες: *super<inducens>* (T), *superducentes* (V; PS-AU hyp; PS-HIL-A)

2:5: ἐπάξας: *inducens* (S, T, V)

2:8: ἐγκατοικῶν: *inhabitans* (A; PS-AU Do<sup>txt</sup>), *habitans* (V; cf PEL; PS-AU Do<sup>com</sup>; GR-M > BEA; PS-HIL-A)

2:13: συνευωχούμενοι: *adventi* (S), *coepulantes* (A), *luxuriantes* (C, V)

2:15: καταλείποντες: *abrelicti* (S), *derelinquentes* (V; Martin I.; AN)

2:16: ὑποζύγιον: *subiugale* (T, V)

2:18: ἀποφεύγοντας: *qui ... effugerunt* (T), *qui ... effugiunt* (V)

2:20a: ἀποφυγόντες: *refugientes* (T, V), *fugientes* (X)

2:20b: ἐμπλακέντες: *inplexi* (T), *inplici* (V; Σ<sup>A\*.3</sup>; AU spe Var; AU ep; SALV; CAE; PS-HIL-A)

3:5: συνεστῶσα: *constituta* (T), *consistens* (V), *subsistit* (X)

---

<sup>22</sup> Cfr. 1 Peter 3:21 (p. 160).

3:6: ἀπόλετο: *deperit* (T), *perit* (V, X)

3:10: παρελεύσονται: *transcurrent* (S, T), *transient* (V; Ω<sup>0</sup>; GR-M Ez 1,6 Var)

3:13: κατοικεῖ: *inhabitat* (T), *habitat* (V; AU op Var, cf Jul im 2<sup>com</sup>?, s<sup>com</sup>?; CAr; IS; PS-HIL-A)

3:17a: προγινώσκοντες: *praescientes* (T, V)

3:17b: ἐκπέσητε: *decidatis* (T), *excidatis* (V; cf PS-AM; JUL-T; PS-HIL-A)

The Latin versions have often renderings that match the structure of the Greek terms although the Latin and Greek preverbs do not correspond in several instances (1:5a S, T, V; 1:5b T; 1:11 T; 1:14 T, V; 2:5 S, T, V; 2:15 S, V; 2:18 T, V; 2:20a T, V; 3:5 X; 3:6 T; 3:10 S, T, V; 3:13 T; 3:17b T) and the verbal roots at 3:17a do not match either. In addition, in some of the cases listed above the Vulgate does not feature etymologising renderings (1:5b; 1:11; 2:8; 2:13; 3:6; 3:13) in opposition to the Vetus Latina: this tendency of the Vulgate is in contrast to what was observed in James and 1 Peter. At 1:5b, 11 text type T employs the verb *subministrare*, which implies the unattested variant ὑποχορηγέω instead of ἐπιχορηγέω, while the Vulgate has the simple verb *ministrare*. At 2:13 the verb συνευωχέομαι, ‘to feast sumptuously with’, is rendered by the calque *coepulari* in text type A (AU op 46 91,19; 46 91,26), which has only two attestations outside this passage (Ambrose, Epistle 19,15; the anonymous translation of Origen, *Commentariorum in Matthaeum* 18,79).<sup>23</sup> The renderings of the Vulgate and text type C and S do not match the structure and the exact meaning of the Greek term: the verb *luxuriare* (C, V) means ‘to indulge to excess’ and *adtere* (S) ‘to direct the attention’. Συνευωχέομαι is also

---

<sup>23</sup> Petraglio (1975: 169) underlines the presence of the noun *coepulonus* in Plautus (*Persa* 100).

rendered by *copulari* (T; AU; EP-SC)<sup>24</sup> and *convivari* (V) at Jude 12.<sup>25</sup> The verb *copulari*, ‘to couple’, having a sexual connotation, is not suitable for the context of Jude 12 in which the expression ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις (‘at feasts’) and the verb ποιμαίνω ‘to feed’ are attested. Petraglio thinks that the reading *coepulari* is a scribal mistake for *copulari*, which arose under the influence of the rendering *luxuriare* at 2 Peter 2:13 and ‘esprime l’atto con il quale gli eretici, in modo sfrontato, si uniscono ai ‘buoni’, o rispettivamente come un verbo che evoca il disordine morale e sessuale nel quale le stesse persone vivono’.<sup>26</sup> On the contrary, *copulari* in Jude is presumably a scribal mistake for *coepulari*, which matches better the meaning of the passage and is also attested in Augustine at 2 Peter 2:13.<sup>27</sup> *Superducere* (2:1 V) is a postclassical verb used by Quintilian (*Declamationes minores* 373,1; 381,1) and Calpurnius Flaccus (*Declamationum excerpta* 35,30) in collocation with *novercam*: ‘to impose a stepmother on your son(s)’. The verb acquires the meanings ‘to draw over, add, bring upon’ from Tertullian onwards and is used at 2:1 in the sense ‘to bring swift destruction upon themselves’.<sup>28</sup> On the

---

<sup>24</sup> Variant *coepulantur*.

<sup>25</sup> See pp. 370–1. Petraglio (1975: 170): ‘Evidentemente, però, non tutti i composti di *cum-* che caratterizzano il latino dei cristiani potevano essere accettati in una ‘buona’ traduzione della Bibbia. Così il revisore a cui dobbiamo la Vg. di Giuda, invece del verbo *coepulor*, usa *convivo* o *convivor*.’

<sup>26</sup> Petraglio (1975: 169, 171).

<sup>27</sup> Petraglio (1975: 169): ‘Inoltre qualche autore comprende il verbo greco συνευωχεῖσθαι di Giuda 12 come un termine del banchetto, posto che la ‘lectio’ *coepulantur* non sia semplicemente un errore da attribuire a un copista.’

<sup>28</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 280).

other hand, the Greek underlying verb ἐπάγω is rendered by *inducere* at 2:5 in text types S, T and the Vulgate. At 2:15 the verb *derelinquere* corresponds to καταλείπω, ‘to depart from’, while the rare verb *abrelinquere*, ‘to leave behind’, is present only in the Vetus Latina of 2 Maccabees 10:13 and Tertullian (*Adversus Iudaeos* 1). At 2:16, the adjective and noun *subiugalis*, ‘beast of burden’, is a fourth-century calque of the Greek term ὑποζύγιον, present in Prudentius (*Peristephanon* 10,333), Gregory the Great (*Regula pastoralis* 3,13), Sedulius (*Paschale opus* 4), Jerome and the Vulgate version of Matthew 21:5.<sup>29</sup>

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

*-io*: *recognitio* (1:2 S, T; 1:3 T; 1:8 S), *cognitio* (1:2 V; 1:3 V; 1:8 V; 2:20 V; 3:18 V), *agnitio* (1:3 S; 2:20 T; 2:21 V), *evasio* (1:4 S), *corruptio* (1:4 T, V; 2:12 V, X; 2:19 V), *affectio* (1:7 S), *oblivio* (1:9 S, T, V), *purgatio* (1:9 T, V), *contagio* (1:9 S), *vocatio* (1:10 M, T, V), *collectio* (1:10 M), *electio* (1:10 V), *commemoratio* (1:13 T), *commonitio* (1:13 V; 3:1 V), *depositio* (1:14 T, V), *interpretaetio* (1:20 S, T, V), *perditio* (2:1a T, V; 2:1b V; 2:3 S, T, V; 3:7 T, V; 3:16 V), *eversio* (2:6 T, V), *conversatio* (2:7 T, V; 3:11 T, V), *factio* (2:8 C), *temptatio* (2:9 S, V) / *tentatio* (2:9 X), *convolutatio* (2:10 T), *pollutio* (2:10 X), *dominatio* (2:10 T, V, X), *captio* (2:12 V), *coinquinatio* (2:13 V; 2:20 T, V, X), *moechatio* (2:14 C), *maledictio* (2:14 V), *increpatio* (2:16 T), *correptio* (2:16 V), *notio* (2:21 S), *volutatio* (2:21 S), *inlusio* (3:3 T), *deceptio* (3:3 V), *promissio* (3:4 V), *ratio* (3:7 X), *corroboratio* (3:17 T)

---

<sup>29</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.), Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

*-tas*: *cupiditas* (1:4 S, T), *pietas* (1:3 S, T, V; 1:6a S, T, V; 1:6b S, T, V; 1:7 S, T, V; 2:10 S; 3:11 T, V), *fraternitas* (1:7a S, T, V; 1:7b S, T, V), *caritas* (1:7 S, T, V), *caecitas* (1:9 S), *vanitas* (1:9 S; 2:18 T, V), *veritas* (1:12 V; 2:2 T, V; 2:15 S; 2:21 S, T), *potestas* (1:17 A), *maiestas* (1:17 T; 2:10 S), *voluntas* (1:21 T, V; 2:10 S), *civitas* (2:6 T, V), *captivitas* (2:12 A), *iniquitas* (2:13 X; 2:15 V), *voluptas* (2:13a V; 2:13b S), *malignitas* (2:13 S), *libertas* (2:19 T, V), *tarditas* (3:9 S, T), *impietas* (3:11 S), *longanimitas* (3:15 V), *firmitas* (3:17 V), *aeternitas* (3:18 A, V)

*-or*: *salvator* (1:1 V; 1:11 V; 2:20 V, X; 3:2 V; 3:18 A, V), *conservator* (1:11 M; 2:20 T), *speculator* (1:16 T, V), *dominator* (2:1 T), *inlusor / illusor* (3:3 V / X)

*-do*: *sollicitudo* (1:5 T), *magnitudo* (1:16 T, V), *libido* (2:2 T; 2:12 X; 2:14 X), *fortitudo* (2:11 S, T, V), *dulcedo* (2:13 S)

*-entia*: *concupiscentia* (1:4 X; 2:10 V; 2:18 A; 3:4 T, V), *scientia* (1:6 S, T, V; 2:20 X), *abstinentia* (1:6a S, V; 1:6b S, V), *continentia* (1:6a T; 1:6b T), *patientia* (1:6a S, T, V; 1:6b S, T, V; 3:15 A), *praesentia* (1:16 T, V; 3:4 A; 3:12 S, T), *dementia* (2:16 T), *insipientia* (2:16 V), *poenitentia* (3:9 S, T, V), *sapientia* (3:15 T, V, X)

*-ura*: *scriptura* (1:20 S, T, V; 3:16 T, V, X), *creatura* (3:4 T, V)

*-mentum*: *elementum* (3:10 S, T, V; 3:12 S, T, V)

*-bilis*: *irrationabilis* (2:12 V, X), *incessabilis* (2:14 C, S, V), *insatiabilis* (2:14 X), *instabilis* (2:14 V; 3:16 T, V), *exsecrabilis* (2:11 S, T, V; 3:11 S)

The derived nouns in *-io* are the most frequent in 2 Peter: some of them are terms already in use in the classical period while others are postclassical formations and revivals of archaic

words. The noun ἐπίγνωσις is rendered by *recognitio* in the Vetus Latina and *cognitio* in the Vulgate at 1:1, 2, 8. The latter rendering, ‘a becoming acquainted with, acquiring knowledge’,<sup>30</sup> corresponds to the meaning of the Greek noun better than *recognitio*, which means ‘reviewing, investigation, examination’.<sup>31</sup> The preverb *re-* in *recognitio* and *recognoscere*, from which the noun derives, intensifies the meaning of the simple forms through the idea of the repetition of the action with a shift from the meaning ‘examine again’ to ‘examine thoroughly’.<sup>32</sup> *Commonitio* (1:13 V; 3:1 V) is a postclassical formation first attested in Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* 4,4,9) and in several Christian writers while the verb *commonere*, from which it is formed, is attested in Plautus. The attestations of *coinquatio* (2:13 V; 2:20 T, V, X) are limited to Christian literature: the word is present four times in the Vulgate Old Testament (Ezra 6:21, 9:11; Judith 9:2; 2 Maccabees 5:27) while the only instances in the New Testament are contained in 2 Peter and render two different Greek words, σπύλος and μίασμα. *Moechatio* (2:14 C), ‘adultery’, is a loan-word corresponding to the Greek μοιχαλῖς, which was incorporated in Latin and given the derivational morph *-io*.<sup>33</sup> The verb *moechari*, from which *moechatio* derives, is attested in several verses in the Vulgate Gospels, Epistles (Romans 2:22; James 2:11), Revelation (2:22) and is more common than the noun, which is employed in a few passages: in the *versio vulgata* of the Shepherd of Hermas (4,1,5; 4,1,9), at John 8:3, 4 (VL 8),

---

<sup>30</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>31</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>32</sup> Schrickx (2015: 276): ‘Eine beliebig intensivierende Wirkung von *re-* ist schwer nachzuweisen. Bei *recognosco* (‘prüfen’) könnte die Idee der Wiederholung (‘wieder durchsehen’) sich zu einer intensivierenden Bedeutung entwickelt haben.’

<sup>33</sup> Burton (2000: 142).

in the *Doctrina apostolorum* 5,1, Augustine (*Ad Pollentium de adulterinis coniugiis* 1,9,9 p. 356,13) and Pseudo-Cyprian (*De singularitate clericorum* 7 p. 181,2). At 2:15 *correptio* and *increpatio* render ἔλεγχις, ‘rebuke’: the former is a postclassical coinage meaning ‘seizing’ (Gellius 20,10,8) and ‘shortening’ with reference to letters and syllables (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 7,9,13) which acquires the meaning ‘reproof’ from Tertullian onwards while the latter is attested from the Vetus Latina and Tertullian. The term *evasio* (1:4 S), derived from *evadere*, is a rare formation attested in this passage, in the Vulgate version of Judith 13:20 and in the Latin translation of Origen (*Commentariorum in Matthaeum* 18,100 p. 1751<sup>A</sup>). *Perditio*, ‘ruin’, is also a Christian coinage attested from the Vetus Latina and Tertullian. The term *convolutatio* (2:10 T; CA<sup>rxt</sup>), ‘wallowing in filth’,<sup>34</sup> translates μασμός and is a hapax derived from the verb *convolutari*, which is attested only twice in Seneca (*Naturales quaestiones* 7,9,2 and Epistle 114,25): this is the only passage in which the noun is present. The rendering of text type X, *pollutio*, ‘defilement’, is attested from the fourth century, especially in Christian writers and Palladius (9,10). *Corroboratio* (3:17 T), ‘strengthening’, is a rare term with four attestations in Christian (Cyprian, *De opere et eleemosynis* 16; Pseudo-Ambrose, *De paenitentia* 3) and medical writings (Chiron 14; 31). The noun *purgatio* (1:9 T, V) is a case of semantic extension: it is in use from Cato onwards with the meaning ‘cleansing’ but in Christian Latin the term refers to purification from guilt. *Captio* (2:12 V) is attested from Plautus with the meaning ‘craft, fraud’ but acquires the meaning ‘capture, hunting’ in Christian literature.<sup>35</sup> A further instance of this term in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina is present at Romans 11:9 (VL 51 54 58 67 75 76 77 78 88 89 135; AMst; RUF; PEL). Most of the nouns ending in *-tas* and *-do* are

---

<sup>34</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>35</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).



classical words. The prevalence of *sollicitudo* (1:5 T) over *cura* in the Old Latin Gospels is noted by Burton: the latter is the rendering of the Vulgate at 1:5.<sup>36</sup> *Dulcedo* (2:13 S) is an unusual rendering of ἡδονή,<sup>37</sup> which is normally translated by *voluptas* (Luke 8:14 V; Titus 3:3 D, I, V; James 4:1 F; 2 Peter 2:13 V), *libido* (James 4:3 F), *luxuria* (Luke 8:14 VL 3; 2 Peter 2:13 X) or *concupiscentia* (James 4:1, 3 V). *Dulcedo* is employed at James 3:12 (T) with the different meaning ‘sweet taste’ to render γλυκύ.

The Greek noun σωτήρ is rendered differently at 1:11 by *salvator* (V), *salutaris* (T), *conservator* (M).<sup>38</sup> The latter *nomen agentis* means ‘keeper’ in classical literature and is used in inscriptions as an epithet of emperors from Tiberius onwards and of pagan gods. In a few passages in Christian writers, it is used to identify Christ as ‘saviour’ (Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* 2,65; Lactantius, *De ira dei* 5,5; Ambrose, *De Abraham* 1,3,17; Zeno 2,14,4; Augustine, *Sermones* ed. Mai 132,2). This term is probably avoided in the biblical translations because of its association with paganism. *Salutaris* is also employed as an epithet of Jupiter (Cicero, *De finibus* 3,20,66) and then of Christ and God.<sup>39</sup> The Christian formations *salvator* and *salutaris* are both attested in Lactantius: the former replaces the latter in the fourth century and is characteristic of the Vulgate.<sup>40</sup> *Illusor* (3:3 V, X) is a postclassical noun derived from the verb *illudere*, only attested in a limited number of Christian writings from Tertullian onwards

---

<sup>36</sup> Burton (2000: 97).

<sup>37</sup> The only attestation outside this passage is at Luke 8:14 in VL 35.

<sup>38</sup> At 2:20 σωτήρ is rendered by *conservator* (T; AU op; SALV) and *salvator* (V, X).

<sup>39</sup> Cfr. the Vulgate text of Luke 1:47; 1 Timothy 2:3 (D, V); Titus 2:10 (V). A full account of the use of *conservator*, *salutaris* and *salvator* can be found in Mohrmann (1965: 135–9).

<sup>40</sup> Mohrmann (1965: 53, 83).

(*Apologeticum* 46,7; *Adversus Marcionem* 4,35 p. 540,20), especially in Jerome and Augustine. The same term is employed in the Vulgate at Jude 18 and Proverbs 3:32, 34; 9:12; 13:1; Isaiah 28:14; 29:20; Hosea 7:5.

#### b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words

Further postclassical and late formations are contained in 2 Peter. The verb *subinferre* (1:5 S, T, V), ‘to add’, is used once in the first century in Rutilius Lupus (*Schema dianoeas et lexeos* 1,1) and later from the fourth century onwards. *Subinducere* (2:1 T) is a Christian coinage appeared in the fourth century in Jerome (Commentary on Ephesians 3,6,13), Augustine (*Contra Faustum* 16,8; *Contra litteras Petiliani* 2,62,140) and Pseudo-Cyprian (*De singularitate clericorum* 19).<sup>41</sup> *Praedurare* (2:10 S) is postclassical with attestations from Columella and Pliny. *Apostatare* (2:21 S), meaning ‘to rebel’ and translating ὑποστρέψαι, is formed on the basis of the loan-word *apostata*: the verb is attested only in a few Christian writings (Sirach 10:14; 19:2; Cyprian, Epistle 57,3; Commodianus, *Instructiones per litteras versuum primas* 2,9; Ambrosiaster, Romans 12:16, 1 Corinthians 7:11; Augustine, *De civitate dei* 15,23, *De musica* 6,16,54, *De genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 8,10,23, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 147,17, *Sermones* 169,18; *Collectio Avellana* p. 456,21; *Canones* p. 751 Migne). At 2:15 text type S has two rare postclassical verbs: *abrelinquere* and *exerrare*, the latter first attested in Statius (*Thebais* 6,444).<sup>42</sup> *Creatura* (3:4 T, V), ‘act of creating’, is a Christian formation widespread in biblical translations.<sup>43</sup> *Delictum* is the rendering of ἁμαρτία at 1:9 (S,

---

<sup>41</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

<sup>42</sup> See p. 217.

<sup>43</sup> See James 1:18 (V), p. 71 and 1 Peter 2:13 (V), p. 158.

T, V) and 2:14 (C, S, T, V) and is regarded by Thiele as one of the proofs that the text types draw back to a common origin.<sup>44</sup> The term appears in Plautus with the meaning ‘fault’ and acquires the specialised meaning ‘sin’ in Christian literature and the biblical translations. On the other hand, the word ἀμαρτία is rendered seven times in James and six times in 1 Peter by *peccatum*. The revivals of archaic words *complacere*,<sup>45</sup> *retrudere* and *immunditia* are attested in 2 Peter. *Retrudere* (2:4 T), ‘to thrust back’, is present in Plautus (*Epidicus* 2,2,64) in the Codex Theodosianus (1,5,1), in Jerome (*Adversus Iovinianum* 2,31), Sulpicius Severus (*Vita sancti Martini Turonensis* 4,6) and in the Vulgate version of Genesis 41:10.<sup>46</sup> *Inmunditia* (2:10 V), ‘impurity’, is first present in Plautus (*Stichus* 744), then in Columella and becomes widespread in the fourth and fifth century.<sup>47</sup> The loan-word is also attested in the Vulgate at James 1:21.<sup>48</sup>

#### 4. Morphology

The Latin versions of 2 Peter feature a few analogical verbal and nominal forms. The future form *peribunt* is present in the Vulgate (V; GEL; PS-HIL-A) at 2:12 while text type S (PS-AU spe) has *perient*. On the other hand, the future form *transient* is present in the Vulgate at 3:10 (V; Ω<sup>0</sup>; GR-M Ez 1,6 Var) while the form *transibunt* is supported by several sources (SU; PEL; JUL-E; VER Var; EP-SC; GR-M > BEA; PS-AU s Mai?; PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup>). According

---

<sup>44</sup> Thiele (1969: 78).

<sup>45</sup> See pp. 209–10.

<sup>46</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.), Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.).

<sup>47</sup> Pezzini (2016: 43).

<sup>48</sup> See p. 79.

to Vineis (1974: 128–9) ‘assistiamo qui ad un fenomeno di analogia con il comportamento ‘regolare’ dei future dei verbi di pertinenza della IV coniugazione (il tipo AUDIO e simili); la perdita coscienza di EXEO, PEREO, TRANSEO etc. come composti di EO – favorita, nel caso specifico, dall’ormai probabile pronuncia EXIO, PERIO, TRANSIO etc., conseguenza di un fatto fonetico assai bene documentato per quest’età – avrà certo contribuito all’affermarsi del processo.’<sup>49</sup> The nominative singular *sues* is attested only at 2:22 (S; PS-AU spe) while text type T and the Vulgate have *sus*. The alternative nominative *suis* is present in Prudentius (*Adversus Symmachum* 2,813).

## 5. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

The following instances of reported speech are present in 2 Peter:

1:14: εἰδὼς ὅτι ... ἐστίν: *certus quod ... erit / est* (T / V)

1:20: τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ... οὐ γίνεται: *hoc primum intellegentes quod ... indiget / non fit* (T / V)

3:3: γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται: *scientes quia venient* (T), *scientes quod venient* (V), *scientes venient* (X)

3:5: λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι ... ἦσαν: *latet enim illos hoc volentes quia ... erant* (T), *latet enim eos hoc volentes quod ... erant* (V), *latet eos hoc volentes quoniam ... erant* (X)

---

<sup>49</sup> Vineis (1974: 128–9).

3:8: ἐν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς ... ὅτι: *hoc unum vero non lateat vos ... quia* (T, A), *unum vero hoc non lateat vos ... quia* (V), *unum hoc ne vos praetereat ... quia* (X)

The adjective *certus* and the verbs *intelligere* and *scire* are followed by clauses introduced by *quod* and *quia* and the indicative, as it occurs in Greek, at 1:14, 1:20 and 3:3. In the latter instance, the conjunction is omitted in text type X. The verb *latere* is also constructed with *quod*, *quoniam* and *quia* according to the Greek usage at 3:5 and 3:8: in these cases, as well as at 1:20, the reported speech is not directly dependent on the verb but epexegetic of the pronoun *hoc*.

## a.2 Greek Constructions

The replication of Greek syntax is a common phenomenon in the Latin translations of the Bible. At 1:3 a neuter plural nominative is coordinated with a singular verb in the Vulgate:

1:3: ὡς τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης (δεδωρημένος, δεδωρημένα variants)

*qui nunc omnia nobis divina virtute sua quae ad vitam et pietatem pertinent donavit* (S)

*sicut omnia nobis divinae virtutis eius ad vitam et pietatem donatae* (T)

*quomodo omnia nobis divinae virtutis suae quae ad vitam et pietatem donata est* (V; cf BED)

Text type S renders the variant δεδωρημένος, text type T δεδωρημένης and the Vulgate δεδωρημένα. In the latter, the neuter plural subject *omnia* is referred to the third-person singular verb *donata est* according to the Greek use. However, the reading *donata sunt* is supported by mixed manuscripts of the Vulgate (CΣ<sup>TCA20</sup> 54\* ΛΔΘΦ<sup>T2</sup>Ω<sup>O2WC</sup>; CA<sup>r</sup><sup>com?</sup>; IS; BED cath<sup>txt.com</sup> 93,69A.70A; M-M 355C). At 1:10 *satagere* is regularly constructed with *ut* and the infinitive

in the Vulgate and probably in text type T.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, the verb is followed by the Greek infinitive in text type M:

1:10: σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι (ἵνα ποιῆσθε, ποιεῖσθε, ἵνα ποιήσῃσθε variants)

*satis agite certam vocationem et collectionem facere* (M)

*satis agite <ut> ... confirmatam vestram vocationem e<t electionem> faciatis* (T)

*satagite ut ... certam vestram vocationem et electionem faciatis* (V)

The Greek construction is also present at 3:14 in text type A and the Vulgate:

3:14: σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμόμητοι αὐτῷ εὐρεθῆναι

*satis agite inviolati et immaculati apud eum repperiri* (A)

*satis agite immaculati et inviolate ei inveniri* (V)

Commodianus (*Carmen apologeticum* 604) features another instance of *satagere* plus the infinitive.<sup>51</sup> The verb is also attested at Luke 10:40 with the preposition *circa* and the accusative.<sup>52</sup> The following constructions of *dare operam* are attested at 1:15:

1:15: σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς

*dabo autem operam ut frequenter habere possitis* (T)

*dabo autem operam et frequenter habere vos* (V; Σ<sup>A2</sup> 54<sup>2</sup>; cf AN)

---

<sup>50</sup> The word is reconstructed by the editor.

<sup>51</sup> Forcellini (1940: ad loc.).

<sup>52</sup> Burton (2000: 106–7).

The construction with the infinitive is rare (Terence, *Hecyra* 553; Lucretius 6, 1076; Augustine, *De civitate dei* 5,19) and present at Luke 12:58 in the Vulgate and Old Latin sources (*da opera liberari*: VL 4 5 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 27 30; AM Lc, Tb; AU s 109; BED; GR-M; M-M). At 2:10 the construction of the verb *metuere* is noteworthy:

2:10: δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες

*maiestatem quia ignorant non metuunt blasphemare* (S)

*sectas non metuunt blasphemantes* (V; AU spe)

*Metuere* usually governs either *ne* and the subjunctive or the infinitive: the latter construction occurs in text type S and is used in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and then from Livy.<sup>53</sup> In the Vulgate, *metuere* is followed by the participle *blasphemantes* as in Greek: the supplementary participle dependent on a verb of emotion is rare in the New Testament with an instance at Acts 16:34 (ἡγαλλιάσατο πανοικεῖ πεπιστευκῶς τῷ θεῷ: *laetatus est cum omni domo sua credens deo* V).<sup>54</sup> However, the participle *blasphemantes* may also refer to the subject of the clause and not be governed by the main verb.<sup>55</sup> The Vulgate has another Greek construction at 2:14:

2:14: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας

*oculos habentes plenos moecharionibus et incessabilibus delictis* (C)

*oculos habentes adulteros et incessabiles delictis* (S)

*oculos habentes plenos adulterii et indesinentis delicti* (T)

---

<sup>53</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 347).

<sup>54</sup> The same construction with different vocabulary is attested in the Old Latin manuscripts VL 75 50 51 and LUC par 27.

<sup>55</sup> Blass, Debrunner and Funk (1961: 214).

*oculos habentes plenos adulterio et incessabiles delicti* (V; FLR<sup>2</sup>D 262 ΘΦ<sup>B</sup>M\*; AU spe)  
*qui habent oculos plenos adulterio et insatiabili libidine* (X)

The Vulgate and text type S have the adjective *incessabiles*, referring to the eyes, followed by the genitive in the former, as it occurs in Greek, and by the ablative of respect in the latter. Both the ablatives in text types C and X and the genitives in text type T are governed by *plenos*. At 2:18 *illicere* (T) and *pellicere* (V) are followed by *in* and the ablative instead of the accusative to match the Greek text (δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις). The verb βραδύνω plus the genitive means ‘to hold back from something’.<sup>56</sup>

3:9: οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας<sup>57</sup>

*non tardat dominus sui promissi* (S)

*non tardat dominus promissum suum* (T)

*non tardat dominus promissi* (V)

*non moratur dominus in promisso* (X)

The Greek construction is employed in text type S and the Vulgate while T has the regular accusative. Text type S features the genitive absolute at 3:11 whereas text type T has the ablative absolute and the Vulgate *cum* and subjunctive:

3:11: τούτων οὕτως πάντων λυομένων

*eorum omnium pereuntium* (S; PS-AU spe)

---

<sup>56</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 146).

<sup>57</sup> Variants according to the ECM: τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ἐπαγγελίας, τῆς παραγγελίας.



*his ergo omnibus pereuntibus* (T)

*cum haec igitur omnia dissolvenda sint* (V)

On the other hand, the infinitive expressing purpose at 3:2 is rendered by final clauses in both text type T and the Vulgate: μνησθῆναι: *ut reminiscamini* (T), *ut memores sitis* (V).

#### b. Postclassical Constructions

At 1:20 the verb *indigere* is followed by the accusative in text type S and the ablative in text type T: the construction with the accusative of a noun is attested only in the Vetus Latina (Luke 15:14 VL 2; Romans 3:23 AMst Rom 3,19; EP-L 49; James 1:5 AU ep 177,5) and Tertullian.<sup>58</sup> The construction of *negotari* plus *de* and the ablative (2:3: *de vobis negotiabuntur* V) is not common and limited to Christian writings: other attestations are contained in Eusebius Gallicanus (Homilies 62,3), Chromatius (*Sermones* 4,3), Hesychius (*Commentarius in leviticum* 25,14 p. 116<sup>D</sup>, 25,35 p. 128<sup>A</sup>), Rusticus (*Synodicon* 4 p. 18,25).

### 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

#### a. Number

The number of Greek nouns is either changed or retained in the following instances:

2:4: σιροῖς: *carceribus* (T)

2:10: κυριότητος: *pietatem* (S), *dominationem* (T, V), *dominationes* (X)

2:13: τρυφήν: *deliciis* (S), *delicias* (V, X)

2:17a: λαίλαπος: *turbine* (A), *turbinibus* (V; HI; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>58</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 83).

2:17b: τοῦ σκότους: *tenebrarum* (2:17 T, V)

3:2: ἐντολῆς: *praeceptorum* (V; cf AN; PS-HIL-A)

3:11: εὐσεβεῖαι: *impietatibus* (S), *pietatibus* (T, V)

*Carcer* is usually employed in the singular form with the meaning ‘prison’ while the plural means ‘the barrier or starting-place in the race-course’.<sup>59</sup> Nonetheless, the plural form, meaning ‘prison’, is frequent in Christian literature and attested at 2:4 in text type T. *Tenebrae* at 2:17b and *deliciae* at 2:13 are *pluralia tantum* and for this reason do not match the Greek number. At 2:17a and 3:2 the Vulgate is not literal with Greek. In the former case the Vulgate has the plural form, also present in the Syriac tradition according to Thiele, instead of the singular of text type A and the Greek text. The plural *praeceptorum* at 3:2 does not match the singular ἐντολῆς and is also attested in the Armenian tradition according to Thiele’s apparatus. The plural of *pietas*, attested at 3:11 (T, V) is rare: further instances not connected with this passage are included in Augustine (*Sermones ad populum* 299E) and Cassiodorus (*Institutiones* 1,16,2).<sup>60</sup>

#### b. Comparatives and Superlatives

Several instances of comparatives and superlatives are present in 2 Peter:

1:4: τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα: *honorifica et maxima* (S), *<maxima> et praetiosa* (T), *maxima et praetiosa* (V; 55; PEL; IS; AN?; BED cath<sup>xt</sup>), *grandia ... et pretiosa* (X)

1:9: τῶν πάλαι: *priorum* (S, T), *veterum* (V; AU spe 45; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>59</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

<sup>60</sup> Cfr. LLT-A. Additional instances are attested in later writings from the eighth century onwards.

- 1:11: πλουσίως: *abundantius* (M), *abundanter* (T, V)
- 1:19: βεβαιότερον: *certiorem* (T), *firmiorem* (V; PROS Ps 131; HES; GR-M; AN 2/3; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur)
- 2:1: ταχινήν: *celerrimum* (T), *celerem* (V; PS-AU hyp; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:10: μάλιστα: *magis magisque* (S), *maxime* (T), *magis* (V; AN), *praecipue* (X)
- 2:11: μείζονες: *maiores* (S, T, V)
- 2:20a: ἔσχατα: *novissima* (T, X), *posteriora* (V; PEL; AU; CAE; AN; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:20b: χείρονα: *peiora* (T, X), *deteriora* (V; cf AMst; PEL; AU; cf GEL; CAE s 32<sup>txt.com</sup> Var; 175; 237 Var; AN<sup>com</sup>; PS-HIL-A; {PAC; cf EUS-G<sup>com</sup>})
- 2:20c: πρώτων: *prioribus* (T, V, X)
- 2:21: κρείττον: *melius* (S, T, V, X)
- 3:1: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (V; PS-HIL-A)
- 3:3: ἐσχάτων (ἐσχάτου variant): *novissimo* (T), *novissimis* (V, X)
- 3:5: ἔκπαλαι: *olim* (T), *prius* (V; IS; AN<sup>txt</sup>; PS-HIL-A), *ab initio* (X)
- 3:6: τότε: *tunc* (T, V), *prior* (X)
- 3:8: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (X)
- 3:14: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (A, V)
- 3:15: ἀγαπητός: *dilectissimus* (T), *carissimus* (V; PEL; GR-M; AN Wil; PS-HIL-A), *dilectus* (X)
- 3:17: ἀγαπητοί: *amantissimi* (T)

The Vulgate features adjectives with the same degree as the Greek text against the Vetus Latina at 1:9, 11; 2:1. On the other hand, the Vulgate always renders ἀγαπητός with *carissimus* (3:1, 8, 14, 15), the superlatives μάλιστα and ἔσχατα with the comparatives *magis* (2:10) and *posteriora* (2:20a), the superlative πρώτων with the comparative *prioribus* (2:20c T, V, X) and

the adverb ἔκπαλαι with *prius* (3:5). Text type X does not match the degree of Greek adjectives and adverbs at 1:4; 2:10; 2:20c; 3:6.

## 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Rendering of Greek Articles

The Greek article is matched by demonstratives in the Vulgate version of 2 Peter against the Vetus Latina:

2:22: τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας; *res vulgaris* (S), *res veri proverbii* (T), *illud veri proverbii* (V; PEL; HI; cf AV; CAE s 32; 53; 237; cf CAR; GR-M; BED cath 6 mss)

3:6: ὁ τότε κόσμος; *qui tunc erat mundus* (T), *ille tunc mundus* (V; cf IS), *prior mundus* (X)

At 2:22 *ille* has a general anaphoric function: it does not refer to a proverb already mentioned but to a well-known proverb. According to Abel, the demonstrative at 3:6 might either have the same function as at 2:22 or be a calque of the Greek text.<sup>61</sup> This is the only case in which *mundus* is preceded by *ille* instead of the widespread formula *hic mundus*.<sup>62</sup> It is noteworthy that both the instances of 2 Peter in which the demonstratives correspond to Greek articles belong to the Vulgate whereas the opposite tendency is noticeable in 1 Peter.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Abel (1971: 117).

<sup>62</sup> See pp. 94–6.

<sup>63</sup> See pp. 178–82.

## b. Focused Renderings and Constructions

In the following cases the Vulgate is closer to Greek than the *Vetus Latina* and employs renderings that match the original text:

1:8: οὐκ ἄρκους οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν: *ut non vacui nec sine fructibus inveniamini* (S; PS-AU spe), *non vac<ui nec> sine fructu constituemini* (T; 55), *non vacuos nec sine fructu vos constituent* (V; PEL; PS-HIL-A)

1:13: σκηνώματι: *corpore* (T; 32 55 C<sup>txt</sup>Σ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>; PAT), *tabernaculo* (V; AN; PS-HIL-A)

1:16: ἐγνωρίσαμεν: *notam facimus* (T; 32 FRYCΣX 54\* Δ<sup>B2</sup>; QU; JUL-T; BED cath 1 ms), *notam fecimus* (V; 55; PS-HIL-A)<sup>64</sup>

2:2: δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται: *per quos vias veritatis <blasfema>ve<runt>* (T; 55), *per quos via veritatis blasphemabitur* (V; PS-AU hyp; AN cath; BED cath)

2:5: κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ (κατὰ variant) ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας: *cataclismum mundo super impios inducens* (S), *custo<divit> diluvium super inpios inducens* (T), *diluvium mundo impiorum inducens* (V; PS-HIL-A)

2:6: ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς: *exemplum ponens in pie acturis* (T), *exemplum eorum qui in pie acturi sunt ponens* (V; PS-HIL-A)

2:14: καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες κατάρας τέκνα: *cor exercitatum cupidi et maledicti filii* (S; PS-AU spe), *cor exercitatum avaritiae habentes maledictionis filii* (V; Δ<sup>L</sup>)

2:15: καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν: *abrelictī qui a via veritatis exerraverunt* (S; PS-AU spe), *derelinquentes rectam viam erraverunt* (V; Martin I.; AN; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>64</sup> No variant reading attested in the ECM.

2:19: αὐτοῖς: *aliis* (T; CΣ<sup>TCO</sup>; M-M), *illis* (V; AU; PS-HIL-A; BED Act)<sup>65</sup>

The Vulgate retains the same subjects as in Greek at 1:8 and 2:2 while the Vetus Latina changes them into the second plural person and the third plural person respectively. At 1:16 the Greek aorist is rendered by the Latin perfect tense in the Vulgate and VL 55 and the present tense in T: however, the verbal forms differ only in one letter which might have been confused in the process of copying. Verses 2:5, 6, 14, 15 in the Vulgate are word-for-word translations of the Greek text: the genitive *impiorum* at 2:5 is kept in the Vulgate while text types S and T have *super impios*. The word order and translation of the participle in the Vulgate at 2:6 correspond to Greek. At 2:14 πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες is rendered by the matching expression *avaritiae habentes* instead of *cupidi* of text type S and at 2:15 εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν is translated by the Vulgate with *rectam viam* against text type S, which has the unfocused rendering *a via veritatis*. At 1:13 and 2:19 the Vulgate features focused words in comparison with text types T and C to render the Greek corresponding terms. The term σκῆνωμα means ‘tent, tabernacle’ and metaphorically ‘human body’: the Vulgate uses the corresponding Latin word *tabernaculum* and text type T *corpus*, employed under the influence of the context and of 1:14 in which σκηνώματος is rendered by *tabernaculi* in the Vulgate while text type T translates the variant reading σώματος with *corporis*.

### c. Unfocused Renderings

The Vulgate often employs renderings and constructions that do not match semantically the Greek text.

---

<sup>65</sup> No variant reading attested in the ECM.

- 1:2: πληθυνθείη: *adimpleatur* (S, V), *multiplicetur* (T)
- 1:5: καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο (αὐτοὶ variant): *sed et vos* (S, T), *vos autem* (V)
- 1:9: μωπάζων: *vanitatem ... accipiet* (S; PS-AU spe), *manu temptans* (V; AN; PS-HIL-A)
- 1:15: ἐκάστοτε: *frequenter* (T, V)<sup>66</sup>
- 1:16: σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις: *commenticias fabulas* (T; 32 55 C<sup>txt</sup>Σ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>X 91 94 95 54\* Θ<sup>A(txt)</sup>),  
*doctas fabulas* (V; PS-HIL-A; BED cath 5 mss)
- 1:17: φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ: *voce delata ei* (T), *voce delapsa ad eum* (V; GR-M; BED h)
- 1:21: φερόμενοι: *acti* (T; 32 55?; AU ci, Cre, ep; PS-AU hyp; QU; FU; PS-FU; CAr Ps 28; 77),  
*inspirati* (V; PS-FAU > PS-AU s; PS-AU te; AN te; CAr Ps praef, cf cpl 2 Pt?; cf AN cath; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:4a: ζόφου: *caliginis inferi* (T; 55 Θ; AU; QU), *inferni* (V; FU tri; GR-M; PS-GR-M; AN; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:4b: ταρταρώσας: *retrudens* (T; 55 Θ; AU Ps; Jo; Nm<sup>txt</sup>; ench; ci 11<sup>txt</sup>; 15 > Claudius Taurin.; QU; PS-VIG), *detractos in tartarum* (V; FU tri<sup>txt</sup>; GR-M; PS-GR-M; AN; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:8: ἐβασάνιζεν: *cruciabat* (A), *cruciabant* (V; Σ<sup>A1</sup>; GR-M > BEA; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:10: δόξας: *maiestatem* (S; CΣ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>XΛ; PRIS; M-M), *sectas* (V; 91 95; PS-HIL-A)
- 2:13: συνευωχούμενοι: *luxuriantes* (C, V), *adtenti* (S), *coepulantes* (A)<sup>67</sup>
- 2:15: τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βεώρ (τοῦ Βόσορ variant): *Balaam filii Beor* (T; Σ<sup>TCA\*O</sup>X 91 94 95; AU; M-M), *Balaam ex Bosor* (V; Σ<sup>A3</sup> Δ<sup>B</sup>et bosor)<sup>68</sup>
- 2:17: τετήρηται: *reservata est* (A), *reservatur* (V; HI; PS-HIL-A)

---

<sup>66</sup> The Greek adverb means ‘each time’ and not ‘frequently’.

<sup>67</sup> See pp. 215–6.

<sup>68</sup> Cfr. *de Bosor* (Martin I.), *ex Beor* (Θ<sup>(txt)</sup>Σ<sup>A2</sup>), *fili ex Bosor* (54\*), *fili Beor ex Bosor* (262).

2:21: ἐπιγνοῦσιν: *post notionem* (S), *cognoscentibus* (T), *post agnitionem* (V; PEL; HI Jov Var; GR-M; PS-HIL-A; BED 91,178D), *post notitiam* (X)<sup>69</sup>

3:2: τῶν προειρημένων: *praedictorum* (T), *eorum quae praedixi* (V)

3:4: ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας: *promissum praesentiae* (A), *promissio aut adventus* (V; PS-HIL-A)

3:17: ἀθέσμων: *infaustorum* (T), *insipientium* (V; JUL-T; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur)<sup>70</sup>

The majority of the cases in which the Vulgate does not correspond to the Greek text are unfocused lexical renderings. At 1:2 the verb πληθύνω, ‘to increase, multiply’, is rendered by *adimplere*, ‘to fulfil’, in the Vulgate and text type S while T has *multiplicare*, which is the matching rendering of the Greek verb. On the other hand, at 1 Peter 1:2 the Vulgate has *multiplicare* and at Jude 2 *adimplere*. Both the renderings of the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina at 1:9 do not match the meaning of the Greek text. The verb μωπάζω, ‘to be short-sighted’, is rendered by the expression *manu temptare* in the Vulgate which is a metaphorical description of blindness while text type S has the noun *vanitas*, ‘emptiness’, which does not correspond to the Greek verb. At 1:16 σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις, ‘devised myths’,<sup>71</sup> is rendered by *commenticias fabulas* (T) and *doctas fabulas* (V). The latter translation is less transparent than that of text type T in which *commenticius* means ‘fabricated, false’. *Doctus*, ‘skilled, learned’, is mostly

---

<sup>69</sup> Text type T is the only one that renders the Greek participle with the corresponding Latin form. Other instances of participles rendered by nouns are present at 3:10 (S, T, V) and 3:12 (S, T, V).

<sup>70</sup> See p. 213.

<sup>71</sup> This is the translation in the English Standard Version.



used with a positive connotation while the meaning ‘cunning’ is attested in comedy either with reference to humans or in the expression *doctus dolus* (Plautus, *Bacchides* 1095, *Miles gloriosus* 147, 248, *Persa* 480, *Pseudolus* 485; Terence, *Eunuchus* 4,7,21), which recalls the use of the Vulgate at 1:16. The genitive absolute φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ at 1:17 is rendered by *voce delata ei* (T) according to Greek and *voce delapsa ad eum* (V): *deferre*, ‘to bring down’, matches φέρω better than *delabi*, ‘to slip down, fall’, and text type T attests the dative as in Greek. The term ζόφου at 2:4, ‘darkness’, is rendered by *caliginis inferi* in text type T and *inferni* in the Vulgate, which is suitable for the sense of the verse but is not the corresponding rendering of the Greek noun.<sup>72</sup>

At 2:10 δόξας means ‘glorious angelic beings’ according to Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich and is rendered by ‘the glorious ones’ in the English Standard Version.<sup>73</sup> The term used by the Vulgate, *sectas*, has several meanings (‘mode of life, party, doctrine, philosophical school, religious sect’)<sup>74</sup> but none of them reflect the meaning of the Greek term.<sup>75</sup> The translation of the Vulgate is not easy to understand: von Harnack offers the hypothesis that the reviser confused δόξαι with δόγματα, ‘principles’, which might better correspond to *sectas*.<sup>76</sup> The

---

<sup>72</sup> However, the same Greek noun is rendered by *caligo* at 2:17 (T, V).

<sup>73</sup> Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 203).

<sup>74</sup> At 2:1 *sectas* translates αἰρέσεις, which means ‘destructive opinions’ according to Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 23).

<sup>75</sup> There are no Greek variants in the ECM.

<sup>76</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 102).

meaning of *secta* in this passage may be ‘class, guild’<sup>77</sup> with reference to the ‘ranks’ of the angels: in fact, δόξα means ‘angelic order’ in *Acta Ioannis* II p. 158,9. This is a possible explanation given that the angels are the subject of the following verse (*ubi angeli fortitudine et virtute cum sint maiores non portant adversum se execrabile iudicium*).<sup>78</sup> The rendering of text type S, *maiestatem*, ‘greatness’, is closer to Greek, despite the singular form and the abstract meaning: the similar phrasing at Jude 8 referring to the angels, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, is rendered likewise by *maiestatem vero blasphemant* (T), *maiestates autem blasphemant* (V; FRYSXΦ), *dignitates* (PRIS) and *glorias* (HI ap).

At 2:13 *luxuriantes* (C, V) does not match the meaning and structure of the Greek participle συνευωχούμενοι, which is translated more appropriately in Augustine by *coepulantes*. The rendering *inspirati* at 1:21 is suitable for the verse and more refined than the translation of text type T, *acti*, although the former is a metaphorical rendering of the Greek participle φερόμενοι. In three cases the Vulgate alters the order and function of the constituents of the sentence. At 2:4 the participle ταρταρώσας is translated by *retrudens* in text type T, which retains the Greek subject θεός (*deus*), whereas the Vulgate refers the participle *detractos in tartarum* to the object of the clause. At 2:8 the Vulgate makes the subject of the sentence plural (*qui ... cruciabant*) while text type A has the singular form as in Greek and at 3:4 the nouns *promissio* and *adventus* are coordinated by *aut* in the Vulgate, a structure not present in Greek. At 3:2 the perfect middle-passive participle τῶν προειρημένων is rendered by a relative clause that has the active verb *praedixi*: the Greek participle refers to the words predicted by the

---

<sup>77</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.) affirm that this meaning is rare and attested once in Florus (*Epitoma de Tito Livio* 1,112,18).

<sup>78</sup> Lampe (1961: 381).

prophets and therefore the first-person verb is not suitable. The translation of text type T, *praedictorum*, is a correct rendering of the Greek participle. At 2:15 the use of the preposition *ex* in the Vulgate for the patronym instead of the genitive of text type T, matching the Greek genitive, is not common in Latin: *ex* is usually followed by an indication of place and never by a personal noun. The perfect indicative τετήρηται is rendered by the present tense in the Vulgate and the perfect in text type A. In verses 1:5; 1:15; 2:21 the renderings of both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina are not literal with Greek.

## 8. Variations

The presence or absence of lexical variations in neighbouring verses are illustrated below:

### a. Absence of Variations

1:2–3, 8: ἐν ἐπιγνώσει ... διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως ... ἐπίγνωσιν: *in recognitionem ... per agnitionem ... recognitione* (S), *in recognitione ... per recognitionem ... <recognitio>nem* (T), *in cognitione ... per cognitionem ... cognitionem* (V)<sup>79</sup>

1:3: δυνάμεως ... ἀρετῆ: *virtute ... virtute* (S), *virtutis ... virtute* (T), *virtutis ... virtute* (V)

1:3–4: δεδωρημένης (δεδωρημένος, δεδωρημένα variants) ... δεδώρηται: *donavit ... donantur* (S), *donatae ... donate sunt* (T), *donate est ... donavit* (V)

1:5: τὴν ἀρετὴν ... ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ: *virtutem ... in virtute* (S, T, V)

1:5–6: τὴν γνῶσιν ... ἐν τῇ γνώσει: *scientiam ... in scientia* (S, T, V)

---

<sup>79</sup> Variation in text type S.

- 1:6: τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ... ἐν τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ: *abstinentiam ... in abstinentia* (S, V), *continentiam ... in continentia* (T)
- 1:6: τὴν ὑπομονήν ... ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ: *patientiam ... in patientia* (S, T, V)
- 1:6–7: τὴν εὐσέβειαν ... ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ: *pietatem ... in pietate* (S, T, V)
- 1:7: τὴν φιλαδελφίαν ... ἐν τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ: *amicam fraternitatem ... in affectione fraternitatis* (S), *amorem fraternitatis ... in amore fraternitatis* (T, V)<sup>80</sup>
- 1:10: ποιεῖσθαι (ποι(εῖ)σθε variant) ... ποιοῦντες: *facere ... facientes* (M), *faciatis ... facientes* (T, V)
- 1:12–13: ὑπομνησκείν ... ἐν ὑπομνήσει: *commemorare ... in commemoratione* (T), *commonere ... in commonitione* (V)
- 1:13–14: τοῦ σκηνώματι ... τοῦ σκηνώματος (σώματος variant): *corpore ... corporis* (T), *tabernaculo ... tabernaculi* (V)
- 1:19: λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ... διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος: *lucernae ... lucenti ... lucescat et lucifer* (T), *lucernae ... lucenti ... inlucescat et lucifer* (V)
- 1:20–21: προφητεία ... προφητεία: *prophetiae ... prophetia* (T), *prophetia ... prophetia* (V)
- 2:3–4: τὸ κρίμα ... εἰς κρίσιν: *iudicium ... in iudicio* (T), *iudicium ... in iudicium* (V)
- 2:5: κόσμου ... κόσμῳ: *mundo ... mundo* (V)
- 2:8–9: ἐβασάνιζεν ... κολαζομένους: *cruciabant ... cruciandos* (V)
- 3:5, 8: λανθάνει ... λανθανέτω: *latet ... lateat* (T, V)
- 3:12–13: προσδοκῶντας ... προσδοκῶμεν: *expectantes ... expectamus* (T, V)

---

<sup>80</sup> Variation in text type S.

b. Variations in the Vetus Latina

1:17: δόξαν ... δόξης: *gloriam ... maiestate* (T), *gloriam ... gloria* (V)

2:1, 3: ἀπωλείας ... ἀπόλειαν ... ἡ ἀπόλεια: *perditionis ... interitum ... perditio* (T), *perditionis ... perditionem ... perditio* (V)

2:4–5: ἐφείσατο ... ἐφείσατο: *pepercit ... indulisit* (T), *pepercit ... pepercit* (V)

2:10, 12: βλασφημοῦντες ... βλασφημοῦντες: *blasphemare ... exsecrantur* (S), *blasphemantes ... blasphemantes* (V)

2:13: τρυφήν ... ἐντρυφῶντες: *deliciis ... in summis voluptatibus* (S), *delicias ... deliciis affluentes* (V)

2:16, 18: φθεγξάμενον ... φθεγγόμενοι: *respondens ... loquentes* (T), *loquens ... loquentes* (V)

2:19–20: ἥττηται ... ἥττωνται: *devictus est ... superantur* (T), *superatus est ... superantur* (V)

3:5–6: ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος ... ὕδατι: *de aqua et per aquam ... aqua* (T, V), *de aqua et per aquam ... diluvio* (X)<sup>81</sup>

c. Variations in the Vulgate

1:17: ἐνεχθείσης ... ἐνεχθεῖσαν: *delata ... delatam* (T), *delapsa ... allatam* (V)

2:13, 15: ἀδικίας ... ἀδικίας: *iniustitiae ... iniustitiae* (T), *iniustitiae ... iniquitatis* (V)

3:3: ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται: *inlusione inludentes* (T), *in deceptione inlusores* (V), *illusores seducentes* (X)<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Absence of variation in T and V.

<sup>82</sup> Variation in text type X.

d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina

2:12: φθοράν ... ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ: *perniciem ... in periculo* (S), *in perniciem ... in corruptione* (V), *libidinem ... in corruptione ...* (X)

2:18, 20: ἀποφεύγοντας (ἀποφυγόντας variant) ... ἀποφυγόντες: *effugerunt ... refugientes* (T), *effugiunt ... refugientes* (V)

2:20–21: ἐν ἐπιγνώσει ... ἐπιγνοῦσιν: *in agnitionem ... cognoscentibus* (T), *in cognitione ... post agnitionem* (V), *per scientiam ... post notitiam* (X)

3:10–11: λυθήσεται ... λυομένων: *solvuntur ... pereuntium* (S), *resolventur ... pereuntibus* (T), *solventur ... dissolvenda sint* (V)

In a number of cases the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina do not vary the renderings of neighbouring words, even when different terms are employed in Greek, at 1:3; 2:3–4, 8–9. In eight cases the Vetus Latina makes variations against the Vulgate (1:17; 2:1, 3; 2:4–5; 2:10, 12; 2:13; 2:16; 2:19–20; 2:6–7), which varies the renderings in three cases in which the Vetus Latina employs the same word (1:17; 2:13, 15; 3:3 together with text type X). Both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina vary the lexical renderings four times (2:12; 2:18, 20; 2:20–21; 3:11). Although the Vulgate tends to repeat the lexical renderings overall, it is significant that in seven instances it introduces variations: in 1 Peter, which is twice as long as 2 Peter, the Vulgate varies the lexicon only four times whereas the other long epistle, James, features the highest number of variations in the Vulgate with thirteen instances.

## 9. Participial Renderings

### a. Articular Participles

The table shows the type and number of renderings of Greek participles preceded by the article in 2 Peter:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | PERFECT PARTICIPLE | ADJECTIVE |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| T          | 5               | 0                  | 4                  | 1         |
| X          | 1               | 0                  | 1                  | 0         |
| S          | 1               | 1                  | 1                  | 0         |
| V          | 8               | 0                  | 1                  | 1         |

Table 14. Rendering of articular participles in 2 Peter

The relative clause renders articular participles in most of the cases. The participles in the passive voice are often rendered by perfect participles while in James and 1 Peter only the relative clause is employed.

### b. Participles

A wide variety of renderings of non-articular participles are attested in 2 Peter, as shown below:

|   | PRES. PART. | PF. PART. | REL. CLAUSE | FINITE VERB | CUM + SUBJ. | ADJ. | NOUN | FUT. PART. | GERUNDIVE |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|------------|-----------|
| T | 28          | 14        | 0           | 2           | 5           | 2    | 2    | 1          | 2         |
| X | 5           | 1         | 2           | 5           | 0           | 0    | 1    | 0          | 1         |
| S | 11          | 5         | 0           | 6           | 1           | 1    | 5    | 0          | 1         |
| A | 6           | 2         | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0    | 0    | 0          | 0         |
| C | 4           | 0         | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0    | 0    | 0          | 0         |
| M | 1           | 0         | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0    | 0    | 0          | 0         |
| V | 42          | 17        | 2           | 2           | 5           | 2    | 3    | 0          | 1         |

Table 15. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 Peter

The present participle is the most frequent rendering of non-articular participles in 2 Peter: the present tense is used not only to render the corresponding Greek present participles but also the aorist active and perfect active participles. On the other hand, the Latin perfect participles also render participles in the active voice, for instance at 2:15 (S), 2:4 (V) and 3:5 (T). *Cum* and subjunctive is employed as replacement for the lacking present participle of *esse* (1:8 T, V; 1:18 T, V; 2:11 S, T, V; 2:19 T, V). The gerundive with final and future meaning renders attributive participles three times (2:4 T, S; 2:9 V, X; 3:7 T). Finite verbs correspond to Greek participles in text types S (1:3; 1:8; 1:8; 1:9; 2:10) and X (2:10; 2:12; 2:13; 2:14; 3:5). The Vulgate features finite verbs twice: at 2:1, in order to avoid the juxtaposition of two neighbouring participles, and at 2:10, to coordinate the finite verb with the preceding relative clause rendering an articular participle. Relative clauses, adjectives, nouns are fewer common renderings of participles in 2 Peter.

## 10. Statistics

Thiele describes the relationship between text type S on one hand and T and the Vulgate on the other by presenting the following data:<sup>83</sup>

| TEXT TYPES | T  | V  | S UNIQUE WHEN T AND V AGREE | S UNIQUE WHEN T AND V DIFFER |
|------------|----|----|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| S          | 25 | 14 | 56                          | 25                           |

Table 16. Relationship between text types according to Thiele in 2 Peter

The data collected by Thiele show that text type S is unique in 81 instances (56 in which T and V agree plus 25 in which T and V differ) while agrees with T against the Vulgate in 25 cases

---

<sup>83</sup> Thiele (1969: 75).



and with the Vulgate against T only in 14 instances. On the other hand, the following statistical examination aims to investigate the relationship between the Vulgate and each text type reconstructed in 2 Peter and to demonstrate that the Vulgate and text type S actually agree in more than 14 instances.

a. Lexicon

The table shows the number of occurrences in which the lexical renderings of the Vulgate are either unique or agree with the Old Latin text types out of the total number of attestations of each text type.

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| C          | 10/16   | 63%        |
| A          | 41/60   | 68%        |
| M          | 12/18   | 67%        |
| S          | 119/197 | 60%        |
| T          | 342/467 | 73%        |
| X          | 86/147  | 58%        |
| V (unique) | 123/563 | 22%        |

Table 17. Lexical renderings in 2 Peter

The lexicon of text type T is the closest to that of the Vulgate with 73% of cases of agreement against 86% in 1 Peter and 56% in James. Text types S and X have a good number of lexical renderings in common with the Vulgate (60% and 58%) although text type S is remarkably closer to the Vulgate in 1 Peter (81%). The African text type C, the biblical text of Augustine (A) and Ambrose (M) are less attested but well connected with the Vulgate (63%, 68%, 67% of instances in common). The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in 22% of the renderings analysed, a percentage close to that of James (25%) and almost twice as much as in 1 Peter (12%). The kinship between the text types is more evident in 1 Peter but the percentages of 2

Peter also suggest a common origin of these texts although the Vulgate text of 2 Peter is more independent of the *Vetus Latina* than in 1 Peter.

#### b. Participles

The number of similarities between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* in the renderings of participles are illustrated by the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| C          | 3/4     | 75%        |
| A          | 6/8     | 75%        |
| M          | 1/1     | 100%       |
| S          | 17/33   | 52%        |
| T          | 43/67   | 64%        |
| X          | 12/18   | 67%        |
| V (unique) | 18/84   | 21%        |

Table 18. Participial renderings in 2 Peter

The percentages representing the relationship between the text types in the renderings of participles confirm the tendency of the analysis of the lexicon. The Vulgate stands on its own in 21% of the cases, a percentage close to that of the lexicon, and is quite close to the European text types: X has the highest number of participial renderings in common with the Vulgate (67%) but does not clearly outdistance text types T and S (64% and 52%). Text types C, A and M do not feature a sufficient number of participial renderings to draw safe conclusions on their relationship with the Vulgate.

#### c. Word Order

The agreement between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* and the relationship with the Greek word order is presented in the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | V     | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|-------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| C          | 1/1   | 100%       | 1/1: 100%          | 0/1: 0%                |
| A          | 2/3   | 67%        | 2/3: 67%           | 1/3: 33%               |
| S          | 1/6   | 17%        | 1/6: 17%           | 5/6: 83%               |
| T          | 6/19  | 35%        | 7/17: 41%          | 10/17: 59%             |
| X          | 2/6   | 33%        | 1/6: 17%           | 5/6: 83%               |
| V (unique) | 12/22 | 55%        | 21/22: 95%         | 1/22: 5%               |

Table 19. Word order in 2 Peter

The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in 55% of the instances taken into account and appears to follow the sequence of the words of the Greek text in 95% of the cases with only one divergence from the Greek word order out of 22 instances. The number of similarities between the Vulgate and the European text types T, X and S is rather low (35%, 33%, 17%) and the word order in these texts in most cases does not correspond to the Greek one (in 83% of the cases in S and X and in 59% of the cases in T). Text types C and A are poorly attested as far as the word order is concerned and, therefore, confident conclusions on their relationship with the Vulgate cannot be drawn. However, as observed in 1 Peter, text type A is closer to Greek and the Vulgate than the other text types. The word order according to Greek appears to be a distinctive character of the Vulgate in 2 Peter.

#### 11. The Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* as Sources for the Greek Text

The readings of the Vulgate which differ from the Greek tradition are identified by von Harnack.<sup>84</sup> These instances (and a few more) can now be reviewed in light of the ECM:

---

<sup>84</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 103).

- 1:8: καθίστησιν: *inveniamini* (S; PS-AU spe), *constituemini* (T; 55), *vos constituent* (V)<sup>85</sup>
- 1:10: μᾶλλον ἀδελφοί (ἀδελφοί μᾶλλον in GA 629): *fratres magis* (V; PS-HIL-A), *magis fratres* (T)
- 2:10: κυριότητος: *pietatem* (S; PRIS), *dominationem* (T, V), *dominationes* (X)
- 2:14: δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους: *refigurantes spiritus stabilitos* (S; PS-AU spe), *capientes animas infirmas* (C), *inlicientes* (T), *pellicentes animas instabiles* (V), *decipiunt animas* (X)
- 3:1: ἀγαπητοί δευτέραν ὑμῖν (ὑμῖν ἀγαπητοί δευτέραν in GA 629C): *vobis carissimi secundam* (V; PS-HIL-A)
- 3:2: ἐντολῆς: *praeceptorum* (V; cf AN; PS-HIL-A)
- 3:4a: καὶ λέγοντες: *dicentes* (V), *et dicentes* (A)
- 3:4b: ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας: *promissio aut adventus* (V; cf CAR?; PS-HIL-A; cf KA Tur), *promissum praesentiae* (A)
- 3:11: ὑπάρχειν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις: *edere exsecrabilibus escis et impietatibus* (S; PS-AU spe), *esse vos in sanctis conversationibus* (A, V)

The word order of the Vulgate *fratres magis* at 1:10 and *vobis carissimi secundam* at 3:1 is attested in GA 629, which, however, is a bilingual manuscript: the Latin text may have influenced the Greek one. At 2:10 text type S features *pietatem* which translates the unattested underlying noun εὐσεβειαν. The rendering of 2:14 in Pseudo-Augustine does not correspond to the meaning of the Greek text and does not derive from attested Greek variants. The translation of text type S at 3:11, unattested elsewhere, is a misunderstanding of the Greek text. The only readings unique to the Vulgate are *praeceptorum* at 3:2 while the Greek has the singular

---

<sup>85</sup> See p. 233.

ἐντολῆς, the omission of καί before λέγοντες (*dicentes* V) and the possible variant καὶ παρουσία (*aut adventus* V) instead of τῆς παρουσίας, both at 3:4. The repetitions of *in* at 2:12 (εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν: *in captionem et in perniciem* V) and 3:18 (ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει: *in gratia et in cognitione* V) in coordinated indications of places might be a stylistic feature and do not point to a different underlying text. The following instances identified by von Harnack appear to be supported by Greek manuscripts:

2:20: omission of δέ in GA 0142, 206T, 429, 522, 630, 1175, 2200 and the Vulgate

3:9: omission of ὡς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται in GA 044, 048, 629 and the Vulgate

3:17: ἀγαπητοί (ἀδελφοί in GA 629,1838): *fratres* (V; JUL-T; PS-HIL-A)

## 12. Conclusions

This chapter described the linguistic features of the Latin versions of 2 Peter. Each text type is characterised by its own lexical and syntactical peculiarities but a summary of the character of the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate is possible at this point as well as a comparison with the other Catholic Epistles. As far as the lexicon is concerned, the loan-words are mostly Christian terms derived from Greek (*angelus, apostolus, blasphemare, propheta, prophetia, pseudopropheta*) with the exception of the secular *epistula* and *cataclismus*: at 2:5 the Vulgate has the Latin word *diluvium* instead of *cataclismus* (text type S) and the loan-word *blasphemare* instead of *exsecrari* (1:12 S), despite the use of *exsecrabilis* in place of *blasphemus* at 2:11 (S, T, V). The Greek compounds are mainly rendered by periphrases and three times by matching words, of which only the rendering of the Vulgate, *longanimitas* at 3:15, is a proper calque. On the other hand, the Vulgate avoids the employment of etymologising renderings on six occasions and has simple verbs instead of verbal forms matching their Greek counterparts. Some of the etymologising renderings are postclassical words, such as the fourth-century

coinage *subiugalis* (2:16 T, V) and the rare *coepulari* (2:13 A). The alpha privative compounds are rendered by the prefixes *in-* and *ne-*, *sine* plus a noun and four times by adjectives that do not match the structure of the Greek words (once in the Vulgate at 2:16).

The nouns in *-io* are usually postclassical deverbal formations which are less attested than the verbs from which they derive, for instance *commonitio* (1:13 V; 3:1 V) and *moechatio* (2:14 C). Some of the words in 2 Peter underwent a process of semantic extension, for example *purgatio* (1:9 S, T, V), *captio* (2:12 V) and *delictum* (2:14 C, S, T, V). The noun *conservator* (1:11 M; 2:20 T), once in use as an epithet of emperors and pagan gods, refers in the Vetus Latina to Christ but, because of its secular association, is later replaced by *salutaris* and *salvator*. Nouns ending in *-tas* and *-do* are normally attested from the classical period while some of the adjectives in *-bilis* are postclassical formations (*irrationabilis* at 2:12 V, X; *incessabilis* at 2:14 C, S, V). Three revivals of archaic words are present in the Latin versions and two of them are exclusively attested in the Vulgate (*complacere* at 1:17 V, *retrudere* at 2:4 T and *immunditia* at 2:10 V). The morphology of 2 Peter is quite regular: the alternative future forms of the compounds of *ire* are employed once in the Vetus Latina (2:12 S) and in the Vulgate (3:10) as well as the rare nominative *sues* (2:22 S) instead of *sus*.

Greek constructions are very frequent in 2 Peter, especially in the Vulgate: the reported speech and epexegetic clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia* and *quoniam* (1:14 T, V; 1:20 T, V; 3:3 T, V; 3:5 T, V, X; 3:8 T, A, V, X), the neuter nominative plural in co-ordination with a singular verb (1:3 V), *satagere* followed by the infinitive (1:10 M; 3:14 A, V), *dare operam* plus the infinitive (1:15 V), *metuere* constructed with the supplementary participle (2:10 V), *incessabiles* (2:14 V) and *tardare* (3:9 V, S) with the genitive. Two postclassical constructions are present: *indigere* governing the accusative (1:20 S) and *negotari* plus *de* and the ablative (2:3 V).

The relationship between the Vulgate and the Greek text appears to be inconsistent: on one hand, the order of the constituents of the Greek text is usually retained with resulting word-for-word translations (2:5, 6, 14, 15), on the other, the lexical renderings of the Vulgate do not always preserve the focus of the meaning of the Greek terms (for instance, *doctas fabulas* to render σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις at 1:16 and *sectas* for δόξας at 2:10). Once, at 3:2, the translation of the middle passive participle with the active verb *praedixi* implies the misunderstanding of the Greek sentence by the reviser of the Vulgate. On the other hand, the Vulgate version of 1 Peter is characterised by lexical renderings appropriate for the Greek text. In 2 Peter the Vulgate is not literal with the number of the Greek nouns at 2:17 and 3:2 while in 1 Peter the number agrees with Greek most of the time. The Vulgate tends to repeat neighbouring words, as does the Vetus Latina, but varies the lexical renderings in seven cases: in 1 Peter, despite the different length of the epistles, only four variations are present while James has the highest number of variations. James, 1 Peter and 2 Peter also differ from each other in the rendering of Greek words (μακροθυμέω, μακροθυμία, ἡδονή, ἁμαρτία, πληθύνω, ὅτι), in the prevalence of etymologising renderings in 1 Peter and James, which are often absent in 2 Peter, and in the translation of Greek articles, which are rendered by demonstratives in 2 Peter against 1 Peter. The Vulgate text of 1 Peter features metaplasms while these are absent from 2 Peter and James. The renderings of participles in 2 Peter include the use of gerundives instead of perfect participles and the employment of perfect participles instead of relative clauses to render Greek articular participles in the middle and passive voice. An aorist active participle is translated by a perfect participle in the Vulgate at 2:4: this rendering is not attested in the other letters. On the other hand, the use of the emphatic superlatives and comparatives instead of the positive adjectives is a common feature of the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles.

The statistical analysis demonstrates that the Vulgate is close to text type T in the lexicon (73%) and slightly distant from text types S and X (60% and 58%): a base of common vocabulary is undisputable but the relationship between the Vulgate and the European text types is not as close as in 1 Peter, in which the former agrees with T and S in 86% and 81% of the instances respectively. In James the percentage of similarities with T in lexicon is lower than in 2 Peter (56%). The Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina in 22% of the cases against the 12% of 1 Peter and 25% of James. Despite the differences with the other epistles, the hypothesis that the text types of 2 Peter have a common *Vorlage* is plausible as far as the lexicon is concerned.<sup>86</sup> In the renderings of participles, the Vulgate agrees with X (67%), T (64%) and S (52%) and is unique in 21% of the cases. The relationship between the Vulgate and the European text types is closer in James (70% of similarities with S) and 1 Peter (83% of the instances in common with T and 81% with S). The word order of the Vulgate is unique in 55% of the cases, the highest percentage in comparison with James (46%) and 1 Peter (32%), and mostly matches that of the Greek text (95%) whereas the similarities with T, X and S (35%, 33%, 17%) are not numerous. The word order of the Greek text is often matched in the Vulgate version of 1 Peter with 97% cases of agreement whereas in James the Vulgate agrees with Greek in 75% of the instances.

The linguistic analysis of the Epistle establishes the distinctiveness of 2 Peter. The unique character of the Vulgate text is maintained by von Harnack who affirms that ‘Der Übersetzer war mit dem des I. Petrusbriefes schwerlich identisch’.<sup>87</sup> Thiele also acknowledges the difference between the Vulgate version of 2 Peter and that of the other Epistles and observes

---

<sup>86</sup> Thiele (1969: 78).

<sup>87</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 94).



that in 2 Peter text type T renders the Greek text more precisely than the Vulgate.<sup>88</sup> Nonetheless, according to Thiele these assumptions are not sufficient to hypothesise the activity of different revisers.<sup>89</sup> However, the qualitative analysis of the Epistle shows differences between 2 Peter on one hand and James and 1 Peter on the other in the principles of revision with reference to the relationship with the Greek text, the lexical and participial renderings and translation of Greek articles. The statistical examination of the lexicon of 2 Peter supports the hypothesis of the derivation of the Old Latin text types from a single translation, which later divided into textual branches having their own features. Although the Vulgate is quite close to T in the lexicon, it has an independent character in participial renderings and word order with low percentages of agreement with the *Vetus Latina* in comparison with James and 1 Peter. These data together with the analysis of the linguistic features of the Epistle indicate that the Vulgate version of 2 Peter occupies a unique position in the Catholic corpus.

---

<sup>88</sup> Thiele (1969: 76).

<sup>89</sup> Thiele (1969: 76): ‘Ohne Frage gibt T an manchen Stellen den griechischen Text genauer wieder als die *Vulgata*, aber es gibt keine Anhaltspunkte, für die *Vulgata* von 2 Pt einen anderen Schöpfer anzunehmen als in den anderen Katholischen Briefen.’

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN

#### 1. Introduction

The biblical text of 1 John cited in the Latin versions of the ‘Apostolic Fathers’ cannot be reconstructed: 1 Clement does not cite the letter and the citations of the Shepherd of Hermas (2:27; 3:22; 5:15) are not literal.<sup>1</sup> Tertullian is the earliest Old Latin witness of 1 John (1:1–3, 5–10; 2:1–2, 6, 16, 18–20, 22; 3:2–10, 15–16, 20, 23; 4:1–3, 12, 15, 17–18; 5:1, 3, 5–10, 12, 16–18, 21) and his biblical text occupies a unique position in the textual history of the letter, with features partly in agreement with the African type K and partly with the European type T and the Vulgate.<sup>2</sup> The biblical text of Tertullian is not assigned to any text type in 1 John because, according to Thiele, ‘Tertullian ist weithin von der lateinischen Bibelübersetzung unabhängig und hat ihre Geschichte nicht beeinflußt’.<sup>3</sup> Some of the renderings of Tertullian’s biblical text are defined by Thiele as ‘African’, such as *delictum* (1:10, 7–9; 2:2; 3:4, 8, 9; 5:16, 17) and *delinquere* (1:10; 3:6, 9; 5:16, 18) instead of *peccatum* and *peccare*; *sermo* (1:1, 10) instead of *verbum*; *lumen* (1:5, 7) instead of *lux*; *dilectio* (4:17, 18) instead of *caritas*.<sup>4</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Thiele (1969: 80).

<sup>2</sup> Thiele (1969: 79).

<sup>3</sup> Thiele (1958: 35). An analysis of Tertullian’s citations of verses 1:1, 3:3, 4:18 is presented in Haupt (2019: 290–2).

<sup>4</sup> Bergren (1991: 177–207), Thiele (1958: 26–34).

instances listed below are unique to Tertullian's biblical text of 1 John and sometimes supported by a minority of Old Latin witnesses:

1:1: ἐθεασάμεθα: *inspeximus* (T), *perspeximus* (V), *vidimus* (TE= HI Am Var)

1:3, 6, 7: κοινωνία: *societas* (T, V), *communio* (TE)

1:6, 8, 10: εἶπωμεν: *dixerimus* (T, V), *dicamus* (TE)

1:6, 7; 2:6: περιπατέω: *ambulare* (T, V), *incedere* (TE)

1:7: καθαρίζει: *purgat* (T), *mundat* (V), *emundat* (TE= FLYSΦΩ<sup>owc</sup> 54<sup>2</sup>; AU spe Var; LEO; CAr<sup>com</sup> 1/2; BED cath Var, cf Act; BEA Var; [EUCH])

1:8: οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν (ἐν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔστιν variant): *in nobis non est* (K, T, V), *non est in nobis* (TE)

1:9: ἀδικίας: *iniquitate* (T, V), *iniustitia* (TE= AMst)

2:2: ἱλασμός: *deprecatio* (K), *exoratio* (T), *propitiatio* (V), *placatio* (TE= HIL Ps 64)

3:3: ταύτην: *hanc* (T, V), *istam* (TE)

3:8: ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: *ab initio* (T, V), *origine* (R), *a primordio* (TE)

4:18: βάλλει: *mittit* (T, V), *abicit* (TE sco)

4:18: κόλασιν: *poenam* (T, V), *supplicamentum* (TE fu)

5:5: ὁ πιστεύων: *qui credit* (T, V), *qui non putarent* (TE)

5:10: μεμαρτύρηκεν: *testificatus est* (T, V), *testatus est* (TE= AMst q 97,14?; PS-VIG Var)

5:12: ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει: *qui non habet filium dei vitam non habet* (T, V), *qui filium non habet, nec vitam habet* (TE)

5:18: ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: *qui natus est ex deo* (T, V), *qui ex deo natus sit* (TE)

These cases represent unique lexical renderings and word order attested in Tertullian's biblical text of 1 John, although there may be parallels in his citations from other New Testament books.

Turning to the next oldest Latin source, Novatian cites verses 1:5; 3:2; 4:8, 12, 15: the biblical text appears to be close to text type T and the Vulgate (renderings *lux* at 1:5, *caritas* at 4:8, *confessus fuerit* at 4:15 and the word order *vidit umquam* at 4:12).<sup>5</sup> In the *Vetus Latina* edition of 1 John, Thiele reconstructs the following seven text types:

K:

- Cyprian (CY) quotes 1 John in *De opere et eleemosynis* (1:8–9; 3:17); *De dominica oratione* (1:8–9; 2:1–2, 15–17; 3:15); Epistle 10 (4:4); Epistle 11 (2:1–2); Epistle 55 (2:1–2); Epistle 28 (2:3–4); Epistle 58 (2:6); Epistle 59 (2:19); Epistle 69 (2:18–19); Epistle 70 (2:18–19); Epistle 73 (2:23; 4:3; 5:7–8); *De habitu virginum* (2:6, 15–17); *De bono patientiae* (2:6); *Ad Quirinum* (2:6, 9, 15–17, 19; 3:10, 15, 17, 21–22; 4:2–3, 16, 20); *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* (2:9, 11, 19; 4:16; 5:7–8); *De zelo et livore* (2:9, 11; 3:15); *De mortalitate* (2:15–17); *Sententiae* (2:18–19); *Ad Fortunatum* (2:23; 4:4).
- Pseudo-Cyprian (PS-CY) cites 1 John in *Ad Novatianum* (2:11, 18); *Ad Vigilium* (1:7; 2:1–2); *De montibus Sina et Sion* (5:19); *De rebaptismate* (4:7–8; 5:6–8); *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* (2:16–17; 5:7–8); *De aleatoribus* (3:5, 8).
- Pontius (PON) quotes 2:16 in *Vita Cypriani*.
- Zeno of Verona (ZE) cites 2:15–17; 4:16, 20; 5:4.

---

<sup>5</sup> Thiele (1969: 80) highlights the avoidance of the renderings *lumen* (1:5) and *dilectio* (4:8), which are characteristic of text type K, but does not specify whether Novatian is employed as source for text type T and the Vulgate.

- Pseudo-Ambrose in *Sermones 3 ex codice Sessoriano 55* (PS-AM s Se 3) quotes 2:15–16.

C:

- Pseudo Cyprian cites 4:4 in *De singularitate clericorum* (PS-CY sng).
- Donatists: Tyconius (TY) quotes 2:2–4, 9; 3:14; 4:1–3, 17–18, 20; 5:21; *Liber genealogus* (AN gen) 2:18–19; *Gesta conlationis Carthaginensis* (DO) 2:15; 4:5; Petilianus (PETI) 2:19; 4:1.
- Optatus (OPT) cites 1:8; 2:18–19.
- Pseudo-Hilarius, *Epistula seu libellus apologeticus* (PS-HIL ap), quotes 2:6; 4:8, 16.
- Hilary of Poitiers (HIL) cites 2:2, 18, 23; 4:8; 5:1, 16, 20.
- Readings in Ambrose (AM), Chromatius (CHRO), Augustine (AU).

S:

- Priscillian (PRIS) cites 1:6; 2:12, 16–17, 20, 22–23; 4:2–3; 5:7–8, 19.
- Pseudo-Priscillian (PS-PRIS) quotes 1:1–2; 2:1–2, 23; 4:12, 20.
- Bacharius (BACH) cites 5:16.
- Pseudo-Augustine, *Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum* (PS-AU spe), cites 1:2–3, 8–9; 2:9–10, 23; 3:7–10, 16–18; 4:1, 9, 17–18; 5:1, 6–8, 10, 12, 20–21.
- Readings in the Spanish tradition of the Vulgate.

R: the biblical text of Lucifer of Cagliari when it is unique.

M: the biblical text of Ambrose when it is unique.

A: the biblical text of Augustine when it is unique.

T:

- Direct tradition: VL 32, 55, 64, 65 (only verses 1:1–3:15), 67.<sup>6</sup>
- Readings in the Spanish manuscripts of the Vulgate (CΣ), in the Irish manuscript D and in the St Gall manuscript S.
- Indirect tradition: Fulgentius (FU), Ferrandus (FEnd), Facundus (FAC), Cassiodorus (CAr), Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC), Pseudo-Ambrose *Ad virginem devotam* (PS-AM vg), Salvian (SALV), *Vita S. Heliae* (A-SS Helia), Orosius (ORO), Augustine (AU), readings in Ambrose (AM) and Chromatius (CHRO).

The main sources of text type K are the numerous citations of Cyprian spread out across his literary production and those in Pseudo-Cyprianic writings. The Pseudo-Cyprian *De rebaptismate* differs from Cyprian's citations at 5:7–8 because of the omission of the *Comma Iohanneum*. The witnesses of text type K are characterised by a peculiar lexicon in opposition to the European types, such as *delictum*, *delinquere* (translating ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτάνειν), *dilectio* (ἀγάπη), *ambitio* (ἀλαζονεία), *cognoscere* (γινώσκειν), *factum* (ἔργον), *deprecatio*, *placatio* (ἰλασμός), *iste* (οὗτος), *decipere* (πλανᾶν), *lumen* (φῶς).<sup>7</sup> Text type C represents an intermediate stage of development between the African and European versions, with elements in common but also differences with text type K: not only does text type C feature African renderings attested in Cyprian (*dilectio*, *ambitio*, *cognoscere*, *concupiscentia* which renders ἐπιθυμία, *iste*, *decipere*) but also European renderings: *lux* (2:9: φῶς), *societas* (1:3: κοινωνία),

---

<sup>6</sup> The manuscripts are described in the chapters on James (pp. 50–1) and 1 Peter (p. 138).

<sup>7</sup> Thiele (1958: 26–36). However, the renderings *peccatum*, *peccare*, *caritas*, *lux* are also attested in Cyprian.

*permanere* (2:19; 3:14: μένειν).<sup>8</sup> The main witnesses of type C are the citations of the Pseudo-Cyprian *De singularitate clericorum*, the Donatists, Pseudo-Hilarius, Hilary and readings attested in Ambrose, Chromatius and Augustine. The latter features a biblical text close to that of Optatus and Tyconius in writings preceding the year 400 and in *In epistolam Iohannis ad Parthos tractatus* (AU 1 Jo) of the year 407: for instance, ἀγάπη is rendered first by *dilectio* and then by *caritas*; αὐτός by *ille* then *ipse*; καθώς by *quomodo* then *sicut*; πλανᾶν by *decipere* then *seducere*; τέλειος by *consummatus* then *perfectus*.<sup>9</sup> In later works, Augustine cites a form of text close to text type T.<sup>10</sup> The biblical text of Augustine not supported by further sources, indicated by the siglum A, does not represent a thorough revision of the previous translations and is not in agreement with the Vulgate.<sup>11</sup> Thiele notes the tendency of text type A to render the Greek text more precisely than text type T, to avoid lexical variations and to introduce rare improvements to the Latin language.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, two out of three cases of improvement identified by Thiele (*suadere* with the dative instead of the accusative at 3:19 and the accusative following the verb *credere* at 4:16) are also present in text type T and most of the renderings which, according to Thiele, precisely render the Greek text are also attested in the Vulgate (*adnuntiare* rendering ἀπαγγέλλω at 1:2; *rogare* rendering ἐρωτᾶν at 5:16a; ἵνα μή rendered by *ut non* and κόσμος by *mundus*) with only three features distinctive of Augustine (the rendering of ὅτι with *quod* and *quia* instead of *quasi* in text type T and the Vulgate at 2:21 and *qui*

---

<sup>8</sup> Thiele (1958: 36).

<sup>9</sup> Thiele (1958: 39–40).

<sup>10</sup> Thiele (1958: 40; 1969: 81).

<sup>11</sup> Thiele (1969: 81).

<sup>12</sup> Thiele (1958: 40–1).

*crediderit in filium* translating ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν instead of *qui credit in filio* in T and the Vulgate at 5:10).<sup>13</sup> Therefore, these instances are not sufficient to state that the biblical text of Augustine in 1 John is a revision of text type T according to Greek.<sup>14</sup> Lucifer of Cagliari cites one-third of 1 John in an early form of text, which is a precursor of text type T and the Vulgate.<sup>15</sup> The similarities between Lucifer's biblical text and the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*, which are characteristic of 2 John and Jude, are rare in 1 John.<sup>16</sup> The vocabulary of Lucifer attests the following unique renderings in this epistle: *amare* (ἀγαπάω), *origo* (3:8, 11: ἀρχή), *opera* (3:8: ἔργον), *expiator* (4:10: ἱλασμός), *declarari* (3:8; 4:9: φανεροῦσθαι).<sup>17</sup> The siglum M indicates the readings of Ambrose that are not attested in other Old Latin texts. The Spanish tradition of the Vetus Latina is represented by Priscillian, Pseudo-Priscillian and the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*. VL 67, which is a source of text type S in James and 1 Peter, goes in a different direction in 1 John, in which the text conveyed by the manuscript features a mixture of early readings, disagrees with the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and is used by Thiele to reconstruct

---

<sup>13</sup> Thiele (1958: 40–1).

<sup>14</sup> Thiele (1958: 41): 'Augustins Text ist also auf der Grundlage des Texttypes T durch Revision nach dem Griechischen erarbeitet worden. Bei dieser Revision schließt sich Augustin in den meisten Fällen an diejenigen lateinischen Texte an, die seinen Absichten am besten entsprechen, und führt nur in seltenen Fällen neue Lesarten ein.'

<sup>15</sup> Thiele (1969: 83): 'Lucifers Text setzt eine Umformung des alten Textes voraus, die für die Textgeschichte deshalb Bedeutung hat, weil die jüngeren Texte T und V wesentlich von ihr abhängen.'

<sup>16</sup> Thiele (1969: 82).

<sup>17</sup> Thiele (1958: 36–7).



text type T.<sup>18</sup> The Pseudo-Ambrose *De fide* does not attest citations of 1–3 John and Jude. Given the absence of these witnesses, the portions of text type S that can be reconstructed in 1 John are very limited. Text type T is the most attested form of text in 1 John, witnessed in a number of direct (VL 32, 55, 64, 65, 67) and indirect sources of African (Fulgentius, Facundus, Ferrandus), Italian (Cassiodorus, Epiphanius Scholasticus), Spanish (*Vita S. Heliae*) and Gallic (Salvian) origin. The lexicon is mainly European and characterised by the renderings *saeculum* (κόσμος) and *permanere* (μένειν).<sup>19</sup>

The Vulgate version of 1 John seems to be connected with the Old Latin texts, especially with text type T. The earliest readings and renderings of the Vulgate are attested in Jerome's citations: 80 cases of agreement with the Vulgate are spread across 229 quotations of 1 John. The instances in common with the Vulgate appear in writings dated to the last decade of the fourth century such as *Commentariorum in Abacuc prophetam* (2:20, 27), Epistle 108 (2:16), *De viris illustribus* (1:1), the second book of *Adversus Iovinianum* (2:2–6; 3:9; 4:13, 15; 5:16, 18). Two late works, *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* (1:5, 7; 3:2, 9; 5:18–19) and *In Hieremiam prophetam* (2:14, 19; 5:17), both dated to 415–6, show noteworthy similarities with the Vulgate but the biblical text is not as close to the Vulgate as in the second book of *Adversus Iovinianum*. The hypothesis that Jerome is the reviser of the Vulgate version of 1 John is questioned by Thiele on the basis of the differences in lexical renderings between Jerome's quotations and the Vulgate and between the Vulgate Gospels and the Vulgate version of 1 John.<sup>20</sup> The instances highlighted by Thiele are the renderings of ἀγάπη and μαρτυρεῖν by *dilectio* and *testimonium*

---

<sup>18</sup> Thiele (1958: 37; 1969: 84).

<sup>19</sup> Thiele (1958: 38).

<sup>20</sup> Thiele (1958: 39).

*perhibere* in the Gospels and *caritas* and *testificari* in 1 John. The Vulgate text of 1 John and Jerome's biblical text also differ in the rendering of χρῖσμα by *unctio* (2:20, 27a, b) in the former and *unguentum* (2:20) and *chrisma* (2:27a, b) in the latter. The writers connected with Pelagius and his antagonists cite a mixture of the Vulgate with Old Latin and unique readings. Half of Pelagius' citations have readings in common with text type K but also features of the Vulgate. Isolated similarities with the Vulgate are attested in the *Hypomnesticon* (2:1, 15–17; 3:8; 4:8–10; 5:20), Cassian's writings (1:1–2, 10; 3:9; 4:1, 3, 15–17, 19; 5:18), Eucherius (2:10, 14, 18; 5:7–8), Caelestius (3:2–3; 5:18) and the Pseudo-Prosper *Epistula ad Demetriadem* (4:4, 6; 5:4, 19–20) and *De vocatione* (3:9; 4:10, 19; 5:20). Although Thiele states that these writers certainly depend on the Vulgate, a more cautious position should be taken considering the mixed character of the citations.<sup>21</sup> The only quotations in complete agreement with the Vulgate are those of verses 2:16–17 by Julian of Eclanum cited by Augustine in *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem* of the years 428–30. Early attestations of the Vulgate 1 John in Pelagian and anti-Pelagian works preceding the fifth century are absent.

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The Latin versions of 1 John feature the following loan-words: *paracletus* (2:1 AM sp; AMst q 125?; NIC > EUGE-C; RUF pri; FAU-R; PS-VIG tri; cf IS<sup>com</sup>, AN cath<sup>com</sup>; PS-PRIS); *scandalum* (2:10 T, V); *antichristus* (2:18 K, T, V; 2:22 T, V; 4:3 K, C, T, V); *chrisma* (2:20 S; PRIS; EP-SC<sup>com</sup> 1/4; 2:27 HI Hab 2 1325C); *diabolus* (3:8a T, V; 3:8b T, V; 3:10 K, T, V); *agape* (3:17 K; CY te; 4:16 K; CY te); *pseudopropheta* (4:1 C, T, V); *idolum* (5:21 T; 67 64;

---

<sup>21</sup> Thiele (1969: 85).

TE; TY Apc > BEA; HI Za; EP-SC; AN cath<sup>com</sup>). The corresponding Latin words are employed instead of the loan-words in the following cases: *unctio* at 2:20 (T, V) and 2:27 (C, T, V); *dilectio* (A) and *caritas* (T, V) at 3:17 and 4:16; *simulacrum* (S, V) at 5:21. Several Old Latin sources transmit the loan-word *paracletus* (παράκλητος), ‘intercessor’, which refers to Jesus at 1 John 2:1 and in most of the instances in which the word is used to the Holy Spirit. The loan-word is well attested in Christian writings and four times in the Vulgate text of the Gospel of John (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7).<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the Vulgate and some Old Latin sources (RUF Nm, Rm 2?; PS-AM pae; CY ep 11; PS-PRIS; AMst q 97, q ap; PS-VIG tri Var; PS-COL) have the Latin translation *advocatus*, which acquires the Christian meaning in addition to the classical meanings ‘witness, legal assistant, lawyer’ through semantic extension, and *consolator* (CYR; CLE-A; cf NIC<sup>com</sup> > EUGE-C<sup>com</sup>; cf RUF pri<sup>com</sup>, FAU-R<sup>com</sup>, AN cath<sup>com</sup>).

---

<sup>22</sup> The following alternative renderings of παράκλητος are attested in the Gospel of John (the cases in which *advocatus* and *consolator* are glosses of *paracletus* are excluded from the list): John 14:16: *advocatus* (VL 2 3 6 13; AMst q 125,23; AN Ar 34; AN sy 14,3; AN Ver s 5,2; AU Ar 19,9; AU tri; PS-AU spe 3; EUS-E; GR-I tr 20; HI Lc 25; HIL Ps 67,7; HIL tri; LUC Ath 26; MAXn co 12; MAXn s 5; NO tri 28; PS-PRIS; S-Mo 719; TE Pra 9; VICTR 4; PS-VIG Var 3,55) and *consolator* (VL 14; CAr hist 5,20,8; HIL Ps 125,7); John 14:26: *advocatus* (VL 3 13; AU tri 1,25; PS-AU spe 3; NO tri 28; PS-VIG tri 4,28) and *consolator* (VL 14; HI Is 11; PEL 2 Th 2,16); John 15:26: *advocatus* (VL 13 14; AN sy 14; GR-I tr 20; HIL tri 8,19; NO tri 89; PS-VIG tri 4,8; PS-VIG tri 7,9) and *consolator* (PS-AU spe 3; CLE-A; HI Did 25; HI Is 11; PS-VIG Var 3,28); John 16:7: *advocatus* (VL 2 13; AN Ver s 4,4; AN Ver s 5,2; AU Ar 4; AU tri 1,18; PS-AU spe 3; EUS-E; HIL tri 2,33; MAXn s 4; MAXn s 5; NO tri 29) and *consolator* (VL 14; HI Is 11; ORO ap 10,5).

*Consolator* is also attested three times in VL 14 at John 14:16, 26; 16:7 and is often used to gloss *paracletus*. Thiele states that *paracletus* is mostly attested in European sources, such as Ambrose, Rufinus and Jerome, whereas *advocatus* is frequent in VL 2, 3, 13, in Augustine's *De trinitate*, the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*, Novatian's *De trinitate*, Hilary's *De trinitate*, Pseudo-Vigilius' *De trinitate*.<sup>23</sup> The loan-words *scandalum*, *antichristus*, *diabolus*, *pseudopropheta* are also attested elsewhere in the Catholic corpus (1 Peter 2:8 A, S, V; 2 John 7 S, V; 1 Peter 5:8 K, A, S, T, V and James 4:7 S, F, V; 2 Peter 2:1 T, V respectively). The term *antichristus*, employed only in 1 and 2 John within the Vulgate Old and New Testament, is first attested by Tertullian (*Scorpiace* 11; *De ieiunio adversus psychicos* 12) and often by the Church Fathers, frequently with reference to heretics, such as Arians (Faustinus, *De trinitate* 5,4; Lucifer, *De Athanasio* 1,23) and Marcionites, to whom Tertullian applies the reference in 1 John 4:3 concerning the denial of Christ's incarnation (Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 3,8),<sup>24</sup> and once to Nero (Commodianus, *Carmen apologeticum* 933). *Chrisma* is of common use in Christian writers from Tertullian onwards (*De baptismo* 7) but in the Vulgate Old and New Testament the corresponding Latin term *unctio* is always employed instead of the loan-word. *Idolum* enters the Latin language earlier than the loan-words described above and acquires different meanings according to the contexts in which it is employed: the term has a technical connotation when it occurs in the philosophic discourse (Lucilius 753; Cicero, *De finibus* 1,21, *Epistulae ad Atticum* 2,3,2; Marius Victorinus, *Adversus Arrium* 4,11 p. 1121<sup>B</sup>), it has the

---

<sup>23</sup> Thiele (1958: 27). See footnote 22 for the attestations of *advocatus* in the Gospel according to John.

<sup>24</sup> ... *Marcionitas, quos apostolus Ioannes antichristos pronuntiavit, negantes Christum in carne venisse.*

meaning ‘ghost’ in Pliny (*Epistula* 7,27,5) and Prudentius (*Contra Symmachum* 1,424) and refers to pagan idols in the Church Fathers, the Bible and once in a non-Christian writing (Pseudo-Apuleius, *Asclepius* 37). The loan-word is more frequent in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles (Romans 2:22; 1 Corinthians 5:10; 6:9; 8:1, 4, 7; 10:7, 14, 19, 28; 2 Corinthians 6:16; Galatians 5:20; Ephesians 5:5; it is also present at 1 Peter 4:3; Acts 21:25; Revelation 22:15) than the Latin rendering *simulacrum*, which, on the other hand, is prevalent in Acts (7:41; 15:20, 29; 17:23) but also attested in 1 Corinthians 12:2; Colossians 3:5; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; 1 John 5:21; Revelation 9:20. The loan-word *agape* is present in two citations in Cyprian’s *Testimonia* 3,1 (1 John 3:17) and 3,3 (1 John 4:16) with the meaning ‘love, charity’: further attestations of the loan-word in this sense are limited to Tertullian (*De oratione* 28; *De baptismo* 9; *De ieiunio adversus psychicos* 17). Therefore, *agape* is considered to be the African rendering of the corresponding term ἀγάπη in opposition to the renderings *caritas* and *dilectio*, the former prevalent in European and the latter in African writings.<sup>25</sup> The loan-word might have been used in the early African versions to express the love of God (3:17: *agape dei* K; 4:16: *deus agape est* K), which had no equivalent expression in Latin, as opposed to secular love.<sup>26</sup> Later on, the words *caritas* and *dilectio* were employed to translate ἀγάπη in this sense.<sup>27</sup> The alternative and specialised meaning of *agape* is ‘a love feast or gifts (provided by the rich Christians for the

---

<sup>25</sup> Bergren (1991: 178).

<sup>26</sup> Pétré (1948: 48): ‘Ἀγάπη, nous l’avons dit, paraît avoir été à peu près inconnu du grec pré-biblique; les auteurs chrétiens avaient donné à ce terme une valeur très haute, jusqu’à l’utiliser pour caractériser la nature même de Dieu ... On a pu hésiter à trouver dans le vieux vocabulaire latin un équivalent à ce mot presque nouveau.’

<sup>27</sup> Mohrmann (1965: 140).

poor Christians)'.<sup>28</sup> *Agape* is employed in this sense from Tertullian (*Ad martyras* 2) onwards (for instance Jerome, Epistle 22,32; Augustine, *Sermones* 178,4; 259,5; *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 20,4; 20,20). According to Funk, the first mention of the charity banquets organised by early Christian communities in order to share their possessions is in 1 Corinthians 11:18–34, in which the Corinthians are reproached by Paul because of their inappropriate behaviour during such events.<sup>29</sup> Tertullian (*Apologeticum* 39) describes these banquets as moderate and charitable dinners as their name explains (*cena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit: id vocatur quod dilectio penes Graecos*) and opportunities to help the poor (*inopes quoque refrigerio isto iuvamus*) preceded and followed by worship. The term ἀγάπη has the meaning 'banquet' at Jude 12 in which the excessive conduct of the false teachers is condemned. However, neither the Vulgate nor the Vetus Latina render the Greek term with the loan-word but with *caritas* (R), *dilectio* (T) and *epulae* (V).<sup>30</sup>

#### b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

1 John features a limited number of calques, i.e. new formations modelled on Greek, as well as renderings of alpha privative compounds, matching words and etymologising renderings, which correspond formally to the Greek terms but often precede or are not exclusive of Christian texts. Instances of Greek compounds rendered by periphrases in Latin are not attested in the letter.

---

<sup>28</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>29</sup> Funk (1903: 5–9).

<sup>30</sup> McGowan (1999: 30).

## b.1 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words

The Latin versions employ calques and words corresponding formally to Greek compounds three times:

3:3: ἀγνίζει: *castificat* (T; TE), *sanctificat* (V; 65; PEL Rm > CAR; 1 Th; PS-AU; Caelestius > AU perf; PS-HIL-A; BEA; PS-ANAC)

3:15a, 3:15b: ἀνθρωποκτόνος: *homicida* (K, T, V)

4:9: μονογενῆ: *unicum* (T, R), *unigenitum* (V; EUS-E; RUF; AU 1 Jo 7,7<sup>txt</sup>.9; ep; PS-AU hyp; CAR; PS-THs; PS-HIL-A; BED cath; BEA; PS-EUS-P; PS-EUTn, PS-JUL I.)

The Vulgate renders ἀγνίζω with *sanctificare* while the Greek verb is rendered by *purificare* and *castificare* at James 4:8 and 1 Peter 1:22.<sup>31</sup> The components of *homicida* (*homo* and *caedo*),<sup>32</sup> a noun attested from Cicero onwards, correspond to those of the Greek noun (ἄνθρωπος and the root of the verb κτείνω). The noun is also employed to translate φονεύς at 1 Peter 4:15 (K, A, T, V) although the Greek and Latin terms do not match formally. *Unigenitus*, ‘only-begotten’, is a Christian calque of μονογενής which appears in the third century in Tertullian (*Adversus Hermogenem* p. 146,4; *De anima* 12,1; *Scorpiace* p. 159,19; *Adversus Praxean* 15,31 and 15,39) and Novatian’s writings (*De trinitate* 13,1 and 31,56).<sup>33</sup> The term has a wide diffusion between the fourth and sixth century in the writings of the Church Fathers. A further attestation of the adjective within the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels is at Hebrews 11:17 in which the Vulgate and text type I feature the calque and text types D, A, J

---

<sup>31</sup> See pp. 63 and 150.

<sup>32</sup> Stolz and Schmalz (1900: 111, 150).

<sup>33</sup> LLT-A.

the adjective *unicus*. *Unigenitus* is the most frequent rendering in the Vulgate version of the Gospel of John (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18) in opposition to the prevalence of *unicus* in Luke (7:12; 8:42; 9:38).

## b.2 Alpha Privative Compounds

The alpha privative compounds in 1 John are rendered with uniformity in the Latin versions:

1:9: ἀδικίας (ἁμαρτίας variant): *iniquitate* (T, V), *iniustitia* (TE; AMst)

3:4a: ἀνομίαν: *iniquitatem* (T, V)

3:4b: ἀνομία: *iniquitas* (C, T, V)

5:17: ἀδικία: *iniustitia* (T; 67 64; TE), *iniquitas* (V; HI; PROS; cf CAR; GR-M > TA; AN cath; PS-EUS-P, PS-EVAR)

The biblical text of Cyprian mainly renders ἀδικία with *iniustitia* and ἀνομία with *iniquitas* and *facinus* while the Vulgate employs *iniquitas* more frequently than *iniustitia* when rendering ἀδικία.<sup>34</sup> In 1 John the Vulgate does not distinguish between ἀδικία and ἀνομία, both rendered by *iniquitas*.

## b.3 Etymologising Renderings

The following instances represent examples (and counterexamples) of matching renderings:

---

<sup>34</sup> Thiele (1958: 30).



1:2, 3: ἀπαγγέλλομεν: *nuntiamus* (T), *adnuntiamus* (1:2: V; PHOE Var; PS-PRIS; AM; AU; CAn; PS-AU s; JO-M; CO; PS-AU spe; FU Mon, Fab; cf ORI?, KA C, Sp; PS-HIL-A; BED Gn, Lc; BEA El; 1:3 V; A-SS Per; cf AU 1 Jo<sup>com</sup> 1/2; VIG-T; PS-VIG frg; CO; cf FAC; EP-SC; PS-HIL-A; BED Gn; BEA)

1:5: ἀναγγέλλομεν: *indicavimus* (T), *adnuntiamus* (V; AU; cf EP-SC<sup>com</sup>?)

1:9: ἀφῆ: *dimittat* (K), *remittat* (T, V)

2:12: ἀφέωνται: *dimittuntur* (T), *remittuntur* (V; PRIS; AU 4/6)

2:19: ἐξῆλθαν: *exierunt* (K, T), *prodierunt* (V; TE; GR-M 1/5; KA Sp; PS-IS; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

4:1: ἐξεληλύθασιν: *prodierunt* (C, T), *exierunt* (V; LUC; IR; cf PEL > CAr, SED-S; AU 1 Jo; PS-VIG Var > PS-ANAC 2; PS-AU spe; cf BED Ct; BEA; PS-ANAC 1)

2:25: ἐπαγγελία: *promissio* (T), *repromissio* (V; cf AM; PS-IS; PS-HIL-A; PS-ANAC)<sup>35</sup>

2:28: παρουσία: *praesentia* (T), *adventu* (V; AU; CAr; CLE-A; BEA; PS-ANAC)

The Latin versions use words that match the Greek counterparts although the preverbs do not exactly correspond to the Greek ones, for example at 1:2, 3, 5 in which the rendering of the Vulgate, *adnuntiare*, translates both ἀπαγγέλλω and ἀναγγέλλω (although Greek variants are attested at 1:2, 3).<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, text type T has the simple words *nuntiare* and *indicare* instead of the compounds. *Repromissio* (2:25), which means ‘counter-promise’ in the classical period (Cicero, *Pro Roscio comoedo* 13,39; 18,56) and seems to imply a variant reading

---

<sup>35</sup> Cfr. 3:11: ἀγγελία (ἐπαγγελία variant): *adnuntiatio* (V), *repromissio* (R).

<sup>36</sup> The variants παραγγέλλομεν (GA 180), ἀναγγέλλομεν (GA 2544) and ἐπαγγέλλομεν (GA 621) are attested at 1:2 and ἀναγγέλλομεν (GA 1609) at 1:3.

ἀναγγελία, assumes the meaning ‘promise’ in Christian literature: the noun, attested only in this verse within the Vulgate Catholic Epistles (ἐπαγγελία is rendered by *promissio* and *promissum* at 2 Peter 3:4, 9), is frequent in Acts and Hebrews and never attested in the Vulgate Gospels. Both the compounds *adnuntiare* and *repromissio* are also attested in Old Latin sources and are not peculiar to the Vulgate. *Praesentia* (2:28 T) matches παρουσία better than *adventus*, attested in the Vulgate and Augustine, from the point of view of the meaning and structure of the word. The rendering *exire* matches ἐξέρχομαι at 2:19 (K, T) and 4:1 (V).

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

*-io*: *communio* (1:3 TE; AM f<sup>txt</sup> Var<sup>com</sup> > PS-AU sol<sup>com</sup>; 1:6 TE; EP-SC<sup>com</sup>; 1:7 TE), *communicatio* (1:3 AM > PS-AU sol<sup>txt</sup>; HI; PS-VIG tri; 1:7 HI), *adnuntiatio* (1:5 T, V; 3:11 T, V), *deprecatio* (2:2 K), *placatio* (2:2 C), *exoratio* (2:2 T), *propitiatio* (2:2 V; 4:10 V), *repropitiatio* (2:2 RUF pri<sup>txt</sup>, Lv), *dilectio* (2:5 A; 2:15 A; 3:1 A; 3:16 A; 3:17 A; 4:7 A; 4:8 K; 4:9 C; 4:10 A; 4:11 A; 4:16 A; 4:17a A; 4:17b C; 4:18a C; 4:18b C; 5:3 A), *ambitio* (2:16 K), *unctio* (2:20 T, V; 2:26 C; 2:27a C, T, V; 2:27b C, T, V), *promissio* (2:25 T), *pollicitatio* (2:25 A), *repromissio* (2:25 V; 3:11 R), *petitio* (5:15 T, V), *postulatio* (5:15 S), *impetratio* (5:15 PS-CHRY), *generatio* (5:18 V), *resurrectio* (5:20 S)

*-tas*: *societas* (1:3a T, V; 1:3b T, V; 1:6 T, V; 1:7 T, V), *veritas* (1:6 T, V; 1:8 K, T, V; 2:4 K, T, V; 2:21a A, T, V; 2:21b C, T, V; 3:18 T, V; 3:19 T, V; 4:6 T, V; 5:6 K, T, V), *iniquitas* (1:9 T, V; 3:4a T, V; 3:4b T, V; 5:17 V), *caritas* (2:5 R, T, V; 2:15 K, T, V; 3:1 T, V; 3:16 T, V; 3:17 T, V; 4:7 T, V; 4:8 T, V; 4:9 T, V; 4:10 T, V; 4:11 T, V; 4:16a T, V; 4:16b T, V; 4:16c T, V; 4:17a T, V; 4:17b T, V; 4:18a T, V; 4:18b T, V; 5:3 T, V), *voluntas* (2:16 S; 2:17 K, T, V; 5:14 T, V), *necessitas* (2:27 A), *facultas* (3:17 A), *nativitas* (5:18 T)

-or: *deprecator* (2:2 PS-TE; CY ep 55<sup>txt</sup> Var, *cf* <sup>com</sup>, ep 11; PAC?; *cf* AMst q ap 77 tit, RUF pri<sup>com</sup>, HI Jr h 11; 4:10 32), *exorator* (2:2 TE<sup>com</sup>), *propitiator* (2:2 AM Lc?; *cf* HI ep 21 Var; AU vg, ep 93, 1 Jo 1,7; 5, Jo 87; CLE-A; codd. *ap* RUF Rm 3<sup>com</sup>; 4:10 T), *expiator* (4:10 R), *litator* (4:10 A), *salvator* (4:14 T, V; 5:9 S), *genitor* (5:2 T)

-do: *formido* (4:18 LEO; KA A; *cf* GR-M Ez 2,10,11)

-antia, -entia: *concupiscentia* (2:16a K, T, V; 2:16b K, T, V; 2:16c K; 2:17 K, T, V), *praesentia* (2:28 T), *substantia* (3:17 K, T, V)

-ura: *scriptura* (5:9 S)

-mentum: *supplicamentum* (4:18 TE fu), *tormentum* (4:18 AU s 23; Ps 67; 149; vg; 1 Jo; na; Ex; Jul im; *cf* SALO > BED Prv)

-lus: *puerulus* (2:18 FU), *filiolus* (2:12 T, V; 2:18 V; 2:28 T, V; 3:7 T, V; 3:18 T, V; 4:4 T, V; 5:21 S, T, V)

The noun *adnuntiatio*, which means both ‘prophecy’ and ‘preaching, announcement’, is a Christian formation corresponding to the Greek ἀγγελία, first attested in Tertullian (*De fuga in persecutione* 6) and derived from the postclassical verb *adnuntiare*, which is frequent in the Vulgate and corresponds to the Greek ἀπαγγέλλω at 1 John 1:2 and to ἀναγγέλλω at 1 John 1:5.<sup>37</sup> *Communio* is the rendering in Tertullian for κοινωνία (1:3, 6, 7) opposed to *societas* of text type T and the Vulgate. The renderings of ἰλασμός at 2:2 vary according to the text types: the African types K and C feature the classical renderings *deprecatio* and *placatio* whereas T

---

<sup>37</sup> See p. 269.

and the Vulgate the postclassical formations *exoratio* and *propitiatio*. *Exoratio* is attested in both pagan and Christian contexts while *propitiatio* is a Christian term present in the Vulgate at 4:10 too. The rendering *repropitiatio* in Rufinus' biblical text is rarely attested elsewhere (Psalms 29:6; 105:4; Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 19,28). The term ἱλασμός is also rendered by the nomina agentis *propitiator*, *expiator* and *litator* at 4:10: *propitiator*, which means 'propitiator',<sup>38</sup> is a Christian coinage as well as *expiator*, 'atoner', which is rarely attested (Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 15; Augustine, *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* 4,108 p. 1403<sup>fin</sup>; Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* app. 2,71; Marius Mercator in Schwartz ACO I 5 p. 18,7). Augustine (*In epistolam Iohannis ad Parthos tractatus* 7,9; *De trinitate* 15,17,31) features the hapax *litator*, derived from the verb *litare*, 'to devote, consecrate', and glossed by Augustine with the noun *sacrificator*. At 2:2 Tertullian (*De pudicitia* 19 p. 265,21) renders ἱλασμός with *exorator*, a revival of an archaic formation attested in the second prologue of Terence's *Hecyra* 10 with the meaning 'one who obtains by entreaty, a successful suppliant'.<sup>39</sup> The noun is rare and also present in Vigilius of Trent (*Epistula ad Simplicianum* 3 p. 552<sup>A</sup>) and Paulinus of Nola (*Carmina* 27,654). At 5:15 αἴτημα is rendered by *petitio*, *postulatio* and *impetratio*: in the classical period *petitio* means 'attack, application, suit, right of claim' while in the postclassical age also 'request' (for instance Pliny, *Naturalis historia* 28,106) and 'prayer' in Christian literature. *Postulatio* means 'request' from the classical period onwards while *impetratio*, 'an obtaining by request, accomplishment', is attested in Cicero (*Epistulae ad Atticum* 11,22,1) and frequently in juridical corpora (*Codex Theodosianus* 8,5,39; 10,10,30; 11,22,4; 2,3 tit; *Codex*

---

<sup>38</sup> Blaise (1954–67: ad loc.): 'intercesseur, victime propitiatoire'.

<sup>39</sup> Pezzini (2016: 40) places this noun in the group of the comic words which do not survive in the Romance languages and are rarely attested in late and medieval Latin.

*Iustinianus* 2,57 tit). The noun is present in Jerome (*Adversus Iovinianum* 2,30), Augustine (*De sermone domini in monte* 2,36; *De diversis quaestionibus* 69,134; *Confessiones* 12,1,1; *De spiritu et littera* 30,52) and others but is not common in Christian literature.

Some of the words in the Latin versions of 1 John undergo semantic extensions. At 4:18 κόλασις, ‘punishment’, is rendered by *poena* in text type T and the Vulgate. Tertullian (*De fuga in persecutione* 9,3) employs *supplicamentum* (editorial correction *supplicamentum*): this word is first attested in Apuleius (*Metamorphoses* 11) and in Arnobius (7,21) with the meanings ‘supplication’ and ‘public prayer’ but means ‘punishment’ in the context of 1 John. The rendering in Augustine, *tormentum*, originally means ‘rope’, ‘instrument of torture’ and consequently ‘torment, pain’. Although *tormentum* corresponds to the Greek βάσανος, ‘torture’, it renders both βάσανος and κόλασις in the African versions.<sup>40</sup> The diminutives *puerulus* of Fulgentius at 2:18 and *filiolus* at 2:12, 18, 28; 3:7, 18; 4:4; 5:21 match the Greek παιδίον and τεκνίον.

#### b. Postclassical and Late Formations, Rare Words and Revivals of Archaic Words

At 1:7 and 1:9 the Vulgate translates καθαρίζω with *mundare* and *emundare* while the Vetus Latina with *purgare*: *mundare* is a postclassical verb attested in Columella (12,3,8) and Petronius (47,8) as well as *emundare*, which is frequent in Columella. In Christian writings they acquire the specific meaning ‘to purify from sin’. In the additional phrase sometimes present in verse 5:20 the biblical text of Hilary features *concernatus est*, which means ‘to unite or clothe with flesh, to incarnate’.<sup>41</sup> the verb appears in a few instances in Tertullian (*De carne*

---

<sup>40</sup> Thiele (1958: 33).

<sup>41</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

*Christi* 20) and in medical writings (Oribasius, *Ad Eunapium* 2,7; Vegetius, *Digesta artis mulomedicinae* 2,22,3; Chiron 86) with the meanings ‘to make flesh grow over, grow into flesh’.<sup>42</sup> The noun *concaratio*, which has only two attestations (Tertullian, *De monogamia* 9; Cyprian, *Ad Quirinum* 2,2 tit) in which Tertullian refers to ‘a uniting with flesh’ and Cyprian to Christ’s incarnation, is formed on the basis of the verb *concarare*. The fourth-century formations *incarnare* (5:20 FAUn) and *incarnatio* prevailed over *concarare* and *concaratio*.<sup>43</sup> The verb *seducere* (1:8 T, V; 2:26 A, T, V; 3:7 T, V) attested from Plautus with the meaning ‘to lead aside or apart’ and later with the meaning ‘to separate’, undergoes a semantic extension in Christian literature (‘to lead astray, mislead, seduce’) developed from the initial meaning of the verb.<sup>44</sup> The only revival of an archaic word in 1 John is *exorator* at 2:2 in Tertullian’s biblical text.

#### 4. Morphology

Both the future forms *transibit* (K; ADΦ<sup>TGV</sup>Ω<sup>OWC</sup>; AU spe Var; CY; ZE; AU ci Var, nu; PEL; HIL-A; QU; PS-AM pae; COL; A-SS Bar; BED cath 93, h), *peribit* (MAX > CAE s 115; Paulinus Aquil. PL 99,221A), *interibit* (PAT) on one hand and *transiet* (T), *praeteriet* (HI Jov Var), *pertransiet* (HI ep; CLE-A) on the other are attested at 2:17. An ambiguity in the concordance of gender is attested at 2:27 in text type T and V:

2:27: ἀλλ’ ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρισμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀληθὲς ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ψεῦδος ... μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ

---

<sup>42</sup> Souter (1949: ad loc.).

<sup>43</sup> Hofmann (1937: 308).

<sup>44</sup> Lewis and Short (1933: ad loc.).

*quia unctio ipsius docet vos de omnibus et verax est et non est mendax permanete in ipsa* (A)  
*sed sicut unctio eius docet vos de omnibus et verum est et non est mendum manete in eo* (T)  
*sed sicut unctio eius docet vos de omnibus et verum est et non est mendacium manete in eo* (V)

The subject of the sentence, *unctio*, is feminine in Latin and neuter in Greek (τὸ χρῖσμα). The neuter adjective *verum* (V; 65; HI; FU; HES; BEA; PS-ANAC) and *in eo* (V; 67 65; HI; PS-VIG Var; EP-SC; BEA; PS-ANAC) might indicate that text type T and the Vulgate considers *unctio* to be neuter. However, if *verum* is used as a noun in T and the Vulgate the concordance with *unctio* is correct. The rendering *verax* of Augustine and VL 67 resolves the ambiguity of the sentence as Thiele affirms: ‘Hs 67 und Augustin gehen mit Rücksicht auf den griechischen Text von der lateinischen Übersetzung *verum* ab, weil *verum* nach *unctio* nicht die Beziehung deutlich machen kann, die zwischen χρῖσμα und ἀληθές gegeben ist’.<sup>45</sup> The form *in ipsa* shows that the demonstrative refers to *unctio* in Augustine’s version (1 Jo 4,2 2005). A metaplasm of gender is present at 4:3:

πνεῦμα ... τοῦτο: *spiritus ... hic* (C, T), *spiritus ... hoc* (V; 64 GI\*JR 251 Q; AU spe; LUC; CAn)

The Old Latin text types C and T correctly use the masculine demonstrative pronoun to refer to the masculine noun *spiritus* while the Vulgate, together with some Old Latin sources (Augustine and Lucifer), retains the neuter according to Greek. The same metaplasm also occurs in the Vulgate at 1 Peter 3:4.<sup>46</sup> The alternative reading *dilectu* instead of *dilectione* at

---

<sup>45</sup> Thiele (1958: 34).

<sup>46</sup> See p. 165.

4:18 in the biblical text of Tyconius (reg 3 25,14) is a secondary form which appears in Christian writers.

## 5. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

1 John features numerous instances of reported speech introduced by *quod*, *quia* and *quoniam* plus the indicative, which are governed by *verba dicendi* and *sentiendi*:

1:5: ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν: *indicavimus vobis quoniam deus lux est* (T), *adhuntiamus vobis quoniam deus lux est* (V)

1:6: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν: *si dixerimus nos societatem habere* (T), *si dixerimus quoniam societatem habemus* (V), *si dicamus nos communionem habere* (TE)

1:8: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν: *si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus* (K), *si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus* (T, V)

1:10: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν: *quod si dixerimus quod non peccavimus* (T), *si dixerimus quoniam non peccavimus* (V), *si dicamus ait nos non deliquisse* (TE)

2:3: καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν: *in hoc intellegimus quia cognovimus eum* (K), *et in hoc scimus quoniam cognovimus eum* (T, V)

2:4: ὁ λέγων ὅτι ἔγνωκα αὐτόν: *qui dicit quoniam cognovit eum* (K), *qui dicit se scire eum* (T), *qui dicit se nosse eum* (V)

2:5: γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμεν: *scimus quoniam in eo sumus* (T), *scimus quoniam in ipso sumus* (V)



2:18a: ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται: *audistis quia antichristus venit* (K, V), *audistis quoniam antichristus venit* (T), *audistis quod antichristus sit venturus* (AU 1 Jo, ci)

2:18b: γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν: *cognoscimus quia novissima hora est* (K), *dinoscimus quoniam novissima ora est* (T), *scimus quoniam novissima ora est* (V)

2:22: ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ὁ χριστός: *is qui negat quia Iesus non est Christus* (T), *is qui negat quoniam Iesus non est Christus* (V), *qui negat Christum in carne venisse* (TE car)<sup>47</sup>

2:29: ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ... ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται: *scitis quoniam iustus est scitote quoniam ... ex eo natus est* (T), *si sciatis quoniam iustus est scitote quoniam ... ex ipso natus est* (V)

3:2: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ... ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα: *scimus quoniam ... similes erimus ei* (T), *scimus quoniam ... similes ei erimus* (V)

3:5: οἶδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη: *scitis quoniam ille apparuit* (T, V)

3:14: οἶδαμεν ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν: *scimus quoniam transivimus* (T), *scimus quoniam translatus sumus* (V)

3:15: οἶδατε ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει: *scitis quia omnis homicida non habet* (K), *scitis quoniam omnis homicida non habet* (T, V)

3:19: γνωσόμεθα (γινώσκομεν variant) ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμέν: *cognoscimus quoniam ex veritate sumus* (T), *cognoscemus quoniam ex veritate sumus* (V)

3:24: γινώσκομεν ὅτι μένει: *scimus quoniam permanet* (T), *scimus quoniam manet* (V), *cognoscimus quia* (C)

---

<sup>47</sup> The same construction with different phrasing is attested in other writings of Tertullian (hae, Marc, Pra).

4:3: ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται: *audistis quoniam venit* (C, V), *audistis quia venturus est* (T), *audistis quod venturus sit* (A)

4:13: γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν: *cognoscimus quoniam in ipso manemus* (T), *intellegimus quoniam in eo manemus* (V)

4:14: μαρτυροῦμεν ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱόν: *testamur quoniam pater misit filium* (T), *testificamur quoniam pater misit filium* (V)

4:15: ὃς ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ: *quicumque confessus fuerit quia Iesus est filius dei* (T), *quisque confessus fuerit quoniam Iesus est filius dei* (V), *et qui non putarent Iesum esse (— R<sup>3</sup>) filium dei* (TE)

4:18: ἐὰν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν: *si qui dixerit quoniam diligit deum* (K), *si quis dixerit diligo deum* (T), *si quis dixerit quoniam diligo deum* (V)

5:1: πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται: *omnis qui credit quia Iesus Christus ex deo natus est* (T), *omnis qui credit quoniam Iesus est Christus ex deo natus est* (V), *omnem qui crediderit Iesum esse Christum* (TE)

5:2: γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν: *cognoscimus quoniam diligimus* (T), *intellegimus quoniam amamus* (R)

5:5: ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ: *qui credit quia Iesus est filius dei* (T), *qui credit quoniam Iesus est filius dei* (V), *et qui non putarent Iesum esse (— R<sup>3</sup>) filium dei* (TE)

5:13: ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον: *ut sciatis quia vitam aeternam habetis* (T), *ut sciatis quoniam vitam habetis aeternam* (V)

5:15a: ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει: *si scimus quoniam audit* (T, V)

5:15b: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν: *scimus quoniam habemus* (T, V)

5:18: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ... οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει: *scimus quoniam ... non peccat* (T, V), *scimus autem quod ... non delinquit* (TE)

5:19: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐκ θεοῦ ἐσμεν: *scimus quoniam ex deo sumus* (T, V)

5:20: οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ... ἦκει: *scimus quia ... venit* (S), *scimus quoniam ... venit* (T, V)

The reported speech introduced by *quod* originated in pre-classical Latin, gradually replaced the infinitive and accusative construction in late Latin and was retained in the Romance languages.<sup>48</sup> The *quod* construction was not directly influenced by the Greek ὅτι but was a development internal to Latin: it derived from the relative clause referred to the direct object *id* dependent on verbs indicating addition, omission and emotion (*gaudere, mirari*), whereas the use of *quia* and *quoniam* may indicate the influence of ὅτι in texts translated from Greek.<sup>49</sup> The prevalence of the accusative and infinitive over the *quod, quia, quoniam* clauses in non-literary texts demonstrates that the former construction was still in use in late Latin and the latter was not perceived as sub-standard.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, the *quod, quia* and *quoniam* clauses outnumber the accusative and infinitive construction in the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles, and in 1 John in particular, because of the influence of the Greek construction.<sup>51</sup> The

---

<sup>48</sup> Adams (2011: 280–1; 2013: 743–4). Coleman (1975: 119) explains the reasons why the accusative and infinitive was replaced in the following way: ‘The rules governing the transformations of case, tense and mood were cumbersome when applied to a complex sentence structure and – far more important – the jejuneness of the infinitive and subjunctive tense systems obliterated crucial semantic distinctions of direct speech especially in sequence with a preterite main verb.’

<sup>49</sup> Coleman (1975: 119–22).

<sup>50</sup> Adams (2005: 205).

<sup>51</sup> Burton (200: 189–90), Vineis (1974: 207–8).

accusative and infinitive is employed only twice, at 1:6 (T, TE) and 2:4 (T, V), when ὅτι is used in Greek.<sup>52</sup> In these cases and at 1:10 (TE), 2:6 (K, T, V) and 2:9 (K, T, V), the accusative pronouns immediately follow the higher verb, as it often occurs in non-literary texts.<sup>53</sup> If the accusative is expressed by a noun, this follows the higher verb too (2:22 TE; 4:2 K, T, V; 4:3 T; 4:15 TE; 5:1, 5 TE; 5:16 T, V). On the other hand, the construction with accusative and infinitive is prevalent in Tertullian's biblical text (1:6, 10; 2:22; 4:15; 5:1; 5:5) against the other Latin versions.<sup>54</sup> The employment of the direct speech instead of the reported speech with the omission of the conjunction is attested once at 4:18 (T): the paratactic construction is typical of the lower register.<sup>55</sup> In the majority of the cases listed above, the *quod*, *quoniam* and *quia* clauses are governed by *verba dicendi et existimandi*, such as *dire*, *credere*, *negare*, *testificari*, *confiteri* (1:5, 6, 8; 2:4; 4:14, 15, 18, 22; 5:1, 5) and *verba sentiendi* (*audire* at 2:18a and 4:3 and *scire*, *intellegere*, *cognoscere*, *dinoscere* at 2:3, 5, 18, 29; 3:2, 5, 14, 15, 19, 24; 4:13; 5:2, 13, 15a, 15b, 18, 19, 20). The construction of the verb of perception *audire* plus *quia*, *quoniam*

---

<sup>52</sup> Verses 2:6 (K T V), 2:9 (K, T, V), 5:16 (C, T, V) have the accusative and infinitive when this is present in the Greek text. At 4:2 and 4:3 the Latin versions attest the accusative and infinitive to render a Greek supplementary participle: ὁ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα: *qui confitetur Iesum Christum in carne venisse* (K, T, V); ὁ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα: *qui autem negat in carne venisse* (K), *qui solvit Iesum et negat in carne venisse* (C), *qui non confitetur Iesum Christum in carne venisse* (T).

<sup>53</sup> Adams (2005: 198–205).

<sup>54</sup> The only exception is verse 5:18. At 4:2, 3 Tertullian features the accusative and infinitive in agreement with the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina to render the Greek supplementary participles.

<sup>55</sup> Adams (2005: 201–2). See also 2 Peter 3:3 (X), pp. 224–5.

and the indicative according to Greek instead of the infinitive clause (2:18a; 4:3) is limited to the Latin Bible with several attestations in the Vulgate Gospels and Acts and none in the Pauline Epistles and Revelation. In the biblical text of Augustine *audire* governs the subjunctive at 2:18a and 4:3 to express uncertainty.<sup>56</sup> *Negare*, which mainly governs the infinitive, is followed by *quod*, *quoniam* and *quia* in Pseudo-Quintilian (*Declamationes* 19,1) and a few Christian writers (Hilary, *Tractatus mysteriorum* 2,14,3; Ambrose, Epistle 10,73,21; *De spiritu sancto* 3,11,76; *Hexaemeron* 1,3,11; Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 6,40 p. 312,6; 7,23 p. 343,20; 10,19; Optatus 1,5,5; 5,1,4; Faustinus, *De trinitate* 1,13). The construction of *confiteri* with *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* and the indicative is attested in Ammianus Marcellinus (29,2,17), in the Vulgate (2 Maccabees 7:37; Acts 24:14; Philippians 2:11 K, D, I, V; Hebrews 11:13 I, D, J, A, V), in juridical texts (*Codex Iustinianus* 8,40,27 and *Leges novellae* 112,2) and in Boethius' translation of Aristotle's *Περὶ ἐμπνεύσεως* (6,13 p. 434,10). The construction of *credere* with *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* appears in Apuleius (*Metamorphoses* 3:14) and frequently in Christian writers and biblical books (for instance at James 2:19 S, F, V). Two epexegetic clauses introduced by *quoniam* and *quia* dependent on the nouns *testimonium* and *fiducia* are attested at 5:11 (T, V) and 5:14 (T, V). The absence of *quod* in the Vulgate and the different use of the conjunctions according to the text types is illustrated by the following table:

---

<sup>56</sup> Burton (2000: 190).

| TEXT TYPES | <i>QUIA</i> | <i>QUONIAM</i> | <i>QUOD</i> |
|------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| K          | 5           | 2              | 0           |
| C          | 1           | 1              | 0           |
| A          | 0           | 0              | 1           |
| S          | 1           | 0              | 0           |
| T          | 6           | 21             | 1           |
| V          | 1           | 29             | 0           |

Table 20. Use of conjunctions in the reported speech in 1 John

The *quod* construction is not uncommon in the literary texts of the classical period but is rare in the Latin versions of 1 John. The fact that Petronius only situates the *quia* clauses in the speeches of the freedmen indicates that the use of this conjunction was a vulgarism.<sup>57</sup> In 1 John *quia* is most attested in Cyprian's biblical text. Text type T and in particular the Vulgate have a high number of attestations of the late construction with *quoniam*. In the other Catholic Epistles, the frequency of the conjunctions is slightly different:

| EPISTLES | <i>QUIA</i> | <i>QUONIAM</i> | <i>QUOD</i> |
|----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| JAMES    | 2           | 7              | 2           |
| 1 PETER  | 2           | 1              | 1           |
| 2 PETER  | 1           | 0              | 4           |
| 1 JOHN   | 1           | 29             | 0           |
| 2 JOHN   | 0           | 1              | 0           |
| 3 JOHN   | 0           | 1              | 0           |
| JUDE     | 0           | 2              | 0           |

Table 21. Use of conjunctions in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

---

<sup>57</sup> Adams (2005: 196–7).

The *quoniam* clauses are frequent in James, 1–3 John and Jude while the *quod* clauses are prevalent in 2 Peter. The *quia* clauses are the least frequent despite Vineis’ affirmation that this is the most common rendering in the Vulgate.<sup>58</sup> To conclude, the analysis of the instances of reported speech of 1 John contradicts the expectations: the *quod, quia, quoniam* construction is the most frequent typology whereas the accusative and infinitive, which is considered by Adams to be characteristic of non-literary texts, is rarely attested. The prevalence of the former construction can be explained by the influence of the Greek text while the presence of the accusative following the higher verb in the latter construction confirms Adams’s observation.

At 5:16 *dicere* is followed by an *ut* clause with subjunctive instead of an infinitive clause:

5:16: οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ

*non pro illo dico ut roget* (C, V)

*non pro illo dico ut postulet* (T)

The construction with *ut* and *ne*, often accompanied by the dative, is attested from the classical period to late Latin: further instances in the Vulgate New Testament are present in the Gospels (Matthew 4:3; 9:4; 20:21; 26:8; Mark 14:4; Luke 9:54; John 5:34; 11:42; 19:35), Colossians 2:4 and Revelation 13:14.

---

<sup>58</sup> Vineis (1974: 208).

## a.2 Greek Constructions

In classical Latin *suadere* is followed by the dative of the person that should be persuaded and the accusative of the object. The instance below represents a deviation from the norm:

3:19: πείσομεν (πείσωμεν variant) τὴν καρδίαν (τὰς καρδίας variant) ἡμῶν

*suadebimus cordi nostro* (T; 55 64; AU)

*suadeamus corda nostra* (V; 32; HES; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BEA; PS-ANAC)

In this verse *suadere* is employed with the meaning ‘to persuade’: the verb governs the dative in sources belonging to text type T while the Vulgate has the accusative according to Greek. The accusative is often attested with *suadere* to refer to the object (that of which someone is persuaded) and not to the person or thing that has to be persuaded. The latter construction appears from the age of Hadrian onwards:<sup>59</sup> further instances are present in Plautus (*Bacchides* 1043: *ego nec te iubeo nec veto nec suadeo*), in which, however, the accusative *te* is governed by *iubeo* and not directly dependent on *suadeo*, in Tertullian (*De cultu feminarum* 1,1: *tu es quae eum suasisti*), in the Vulgate text of Judith 12:10 (*suade Hebraeam illam*; the same construction with different phrasing in VL 130 151 152) and Acts 28:23 (*suadensque eos*: V; VL 51 54 53; AM-A Apc 7). In the instances from Apuleius 5,11 and 9,26 reported by von Geisau the accusative is part of an infinitive clause.<sup>60</sup> The Greek influence might be one of the reasons why the accusative is employed instead of the dative in the Latin versions of the Bible.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 33).

<sup>60</sup> Von Geisau (1916: 270–1).

<sup>61</sup> Plater and White (1926: 36), Thiele (1958: 35).



In addition, there seems to be a trend in late Latin for verbs to take a direct object and towards the fossilisation of the dative.<sup>62</sup>

*Habere fiduciam* is followed by *in* and the ablative at 4:17 (T, V) but alternative constructions are attested twice:

3:21: παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς θεόν

*fiduciam habemus ad deum* (K, V; CY; LUC; RUF; HI; AU 1 Jo 3/4, perf; PEL; Caelestius; SECn; HES; ORI ser 18; GR-M Jb 9; 18; cf KA C; BEA; PS-ANAC)

*fiduciam habemus apud deum* (T; 32 64; CY Var; HI Jr h<sup>com</sup> Var; AU 1 Jo 1/4; ORI ser 32 1/2; EP-SC; CLE-A; GR-M Jb 10;27)

5:14: καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν

*et haec est fiducia quam habemus ad eum* (T, V; 67 64 D; AU spe Var; CAn; CLE-A; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-EVAR)

The construction with *ad* and *apud* plus the accusative is used only three times outside this passage in Jerome (Commentary on Ephesians 3,12 p. 595<sup>C</sup>) and Augustine (*Contra Iulianum* 1,6,25 and *De vera religione* 47,91).

*Credere* governs the dative, the accusative, and *in* with the accusative or ablative, as the following examples show:

4:16: πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην

*credidimus caritatem* (T; 67 32 XΔ 65\*)

*credidimus caritati* (V; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn, PS-JUL I.)

---

<sup>62</sup> Pinkster (2015: 1236–40).

5:10: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ... ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ (υἱῷ variant) ... οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν

*qui credit in filio ... qui non credit deo / filio ... non credidit in testimonium* (T / V)

*Testificari* is usually followed by the accusative, clauses with the infinitive and in 1 John by *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* clauses (4:14 V; 5:6 V). In the cases below the construction derives from Greek:

5:9: μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

*testificatus est de filio suo* (T, V)

5:10: μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ

*testificatus est deus de filio* (T, V)

#### b. Postclassical Constructions

The letter does not attest verbal constructions typical of late Latin apart from the examples outlined above, such as *suadere* plus the accusative, *habere fiduciam* with *ad* and the accusative and the constructions of *credere*. The negative imperative is mostly rendered by *nolite* and the infinitive: 2:15: μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε: *nolite diligere* (K, T, V); 3:13: μὴ θαυμάζετε: *nolite mirari* (T, V), *non admiremur* (HI Pach); 4:1: μὴ ... πιστεύετε: *nolite ... credere* (S, T, V).

## 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

### a. Number

In the following cases the number of the Vulgate matches that of the Greek text against the *Vetus Latina*:

3:16: τὰς ψυχὰς: *animam* (T), *animas* (V; AU spe 47; TE; LUC; AMst; PEL > CAr, SED-S; AU s; vg; 1 Jo 5,11; 6,1 1/2; s Gue; pec Var; Ps 51; 102; 141; Jo 47; 84; spe 9; ep; ER s 2A Var, 2B; QU pro; PS-AU spe; FU; EP-SC < Vorlage; CLE-A; GR-M Var; ORA; PS-HIL-A; BED Lc, h; BEA El 1; PS-ANAC, PS-ALE I.)<sup>63</sup>

4:4: αὐτούς: *eum* (T), *illos* (C; PS-CY sng), *eos* (V; 64 S<sup>1</sup>; BEA)

The plural *animas* is supported by the Vulgate and numerous Old Latin sources while the singular is attested in text type T, perhaps under the influence of the previous singular *animam*. At 4:4 the plural demonstrative pronoun is rendered by the corresponding plural in the Vulgate and text type C against T.

### b. Comparatives and Superlatives

This section examines the rendering of adjectives in order to determine whether the Latin versions translate the adjectives with the same degree as in Greek:

2:18a: ἐσχάτη: *novissima* (T, V), *extrema* (HI Za; PAL)

2:18b: ἐσχάτη: *novissima* (K, T, V), *ultima* (MART I.)

---

<sup>63</sup> In the apparatus of the ECM the singular is recorded as attested in GA 1127 and two other versions (K:S<sup>mss</sup>>B>V>. SI:MSI).

2:7: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (A)

3:2: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (C), *dilecti* (AM fi)

3:21: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (A)

4:1: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (A)

4:7: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (A)

4:11: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (T, V), *dilectissimi* (A)

3:1: μείζον: *maius* (S, F, V), *magis* (T)

3:20: μείζων: *maior* (T, V)

4:4: μείζων: *maior* (K, T, V), *potior* (EUS-V; PAU-N ep 20), *fortior* (LEO s; PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup>)

5:9: μείζων: *maius* (T, V)

4:19: πρῶτος: *prior* (T, V), *primus* (Δ<sup>L</sup>)

A tendency to increase the degree of the adjectives is evident in 1 John. The rendering of the adjective ἀγαπητός with the superlatives *carissimus* (in T and the Vulgate) and *dilectissimus* (in Augustine) is a common feature of the biblical versions and of Christian discourse more generally, for instance of letters and homilies. These superlatives, which in Cicero's letters denote affection and kinship, become crystallised forms which lost their original intensity in Christian epistolography.<sup>64</sup> The use of the superlative *dilectissimus* instead of *dilectus* to render ἀγαπητός is criticised by the adversaries of Jerome, who reproach him for using the superlative at the beginning of Epistle 51, as we learn in Epistle 57,12,2.<sup>65</sup> The superlative πρῶτος is rendered by the comparative at 4:19 (T, V) and the positive adjective ἔσχατος by the superlative

---

<sup>64</sup> Burton (2000: 177–8), Vineis (1974: 158–9).

<sup>65</sup> Vineis (1974: 159) wrongly attributes the criticism to Jerome.

*novissimus* in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina at 2:18a, b. The Vulgate does not differ from the Vetus Latina in the degree of the adjectives.

## 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Rendering of Greek Articles

The Latin versions of 1 John attest several instances in which Latin demonstratives correspond to Greek articles:

2:15a: τὸν κόσμον: *mundum* (K, V), *saeculum* (T), *hunc mundum* (CY te A; AMst 1 Cor, Gal, q<sup>txt</sup>; PAU-N ep 25), *mundum hunc* (AMst q<sup>txt</sup> Var; cf AU mor?; EPH cor), *istum mundum* (AU ag 1/3), *mundum istum* (AU ag 1/3; EPH iud), *hoc saeculum* (cf AU cf)

2:15b: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: *in mundo* (K, V), *in saeculo* (T), *in hoc mundo* (Δ<sup>L2B</sup>; CY te A; AMst Gal, Col, q<sup>txt</sup>; PAU-N ep 23; AN Casp ep; A-SS Bar Var; RUF Rm 9), *in mundo hoc* (Δ<sup>L\*</sup>)

2:15c: τὸν κόσμον: *mundum* (K, V), *saeculum* (T), *mundum hunc* (cf CAr), *hunc mundum* (τ; CY te A; PS-IS; Brev. Goth. 951A)

2:16a: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: *in mundo* (K, V), *in saeculo* (T), *in hoc mundo* (AMst; AN Casp ep; cf ex hoc mundo AU ep 147), *in hoc mundum* (CY te A)

2:16b: τοῦ βίου: *huius vitae* (HI Jov), *vitae huius* (HI ep; A-SS Bar)

2:16c: τοῦ κόσμου: *saeculi* (K), *saeculo* (T), *mundo* (V), *hoc mundo* (Σ<sup>TC</sup>τ; PRIS; PS-AM vg; AN Casp ep; Brev. Goth. 951A; M-M 403A)

2:17: ὁ κόσμος: *mundus* (K, V), *saeculum* (T), *iste mundus* (A-SS Felix et Fortunatus), *mundus iste* (RUF; COL carm), *saeculum istud* (CAE s Vi), *saeculum hoc* (EPH)

3:1: ὁ κόσμος: *mundus* (V), *saeculum* (T), *hic mundus* (D 1/2; RUF?)

3:13: ὁ κόσμος: *mundus* (V; HI; PAU-N; AU; CAr; EP-SC; KA C; AN cath; BEA Apc; PS-ANAC), *hic mundus* (T; 32 55 64 65 Σ<sup>T\*?A\*</sup> X 54\*Δ; BEA El), *mundus hic* (D), *saeculum* (LUC)

3:17: τοῦ κόσμου: *mundi* (K, V), *huius mundi* (T; 32 55 64 DSΣ<sup>AQ</sup> 54 Ω<sup>OW</sup> 51, Ambros. E. 53 inf.; CY te Var; RUF reg; BEA; PS-ANAC), *mundi huius* (CΣ<sup>TCO</sup>Λ<sup>H1</sup>, *clm* 6230; CY te Var; GR-M; BED cath 103 Var)

4:1: εἰς τὸν κόσμον: *in hoc mundo* (C, T), *hoc mundo* (TY), *hunc mundum* (DCΣ<sup>TCO2</sup> X 54\* ΔΘ; TY Var; AU s; PS-VIG Var > PS-ANAC 2; PS-AU spe; PS-IS; BEA), *hoc mundum* (Σ<sup>O\*</sup>; PS-ANAC 2 Var), *istum mundum* (AU 1 Jo), *hoc saeculo* (64; EP-SC<sup>txt</sup>), *hoc saeculum* (67), *saeculo* (LUC; IR), *in mundum* (V; TE; PEL > SED-S; EP-SC<sup>com</sup>; BED Ct; PS-ANAC 1), *mundo* (FLM\*; CAr)

4:3a: τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου: *antichristi* (K, V), *antichristo* (C), *illius antichristi* (T; 67 64 CΣ<sup>A\*O</sup> X 91<sup>2</sup> 94 95 54\* Δ<sup>LB\*</sup>Θ<sup>M\*</sup>; PS-IS; BEA EI 1,28.42<sup>txt.com</sup> 1/2), *illis antichristus* (Θ<sup>A</sup>)

4:3b: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: *in isto mundo* (C; TY, AU), *hoc mundo* (X), *in saeculo* (T), *in mundo* (V)

4:4: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: *in isto mundo* (K; CY Fo), *in hoc mundo* (D; CY te, ep, Fo Var; PS-CY sng; EUS-V; AMst; PAU-N; AU; MAX; CAn; GEL > COL-C; AN sen), *in saeculo* (T), *in mundo* (V; PROS; GR-M; AN cath<sup>txt</sup>; BEA)

4:9: τὸν κόσμον: *in saeculum* (T), *in mundum* (V; PS-AU hyp; PS-THs; BEA; ANT-M; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn; PS-JUL I.), *hunc mundum* (ΦΩ<sup>O</sup> 54\*; RUF?; AU; PS-AU spe; CAr; A-SS?)

5:8: οἱ τρεῖς: *isti tres* (K; PS-CY reb), *hi(i) tres* (C; LCΣ 91 94 95 54\* Φ<sup>T2</sup>; AM; AU<sup>com</sup>?; LEO Var; PS-AU spe > AN te; FAC; CLE-A; PS-HYG Var; et Λ<sup>H2Q2</sup> 54<sup>2</sup>), *haec tria* (S; PRIS), *tria haec* (S; XΔ<sup>L</sup>; BEA; cf haec BED cath<sup>com</sup>), *tres* (V; AU<sup>txt</sup>; LEO<sup>txt</sup>; PS-VIG Var > PS-JO II.; HES; EP-SC; PS-AM tri; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; PS-EUS-P; et Ω<sup>WM2</sup>, Vat. lat. 10511<sup>2</sup>; BED cath Var; PS-EUS-P Var)

The majority of the instances in which the Greek articles are matched by the demonstratives in Latin concern the fixed expression *hic mundus* and *iste mundus* (2:15a, b, c; 2:16a, c; 2:17; 3:1,

13, 17; 4:1, 3, 4, 9), the latter typical of Cyprian and Augustine.<sup>66</sup> The demonstratives are attested in both the European and African text types but never in the Vulgate as far as 1 John is concerned. In contrast, the Vulgate renders the Greek article with the demonstrative when attesting this formula at James 1:27; 2:5 and 2 Peter 3:6.<sup>67</sup> The semantically related expression *huius vitae* (also inverted in *vitae huius*) at 2:16b is present in the biblical text of Jerome and in the seventh-century *Visio Baronti monachi Longoretensis* (A-SS Bar) while text types K and T have the simple *saeculi* and the Vulgate *vitae*. The demonstratives *hic* and *iste* precede a numeral at 5:8 in text type K, C and S: in this verse the demonstratives are not semantically empty words but have anaphoric function in that they refer to *spiritus*, *aqua* and *sanguis* named above.<sup>68</sup>

5:7–8: ὅτι (οἱ variant) τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσὶν<sup>69</sup>

*quia tres testimonium perhibent spiritus et aqua et sanguis et isti tres in unum sunt* (K)

*tres sunt qui testimonium dicunt in terra spiritus aqua et sanguis et hi(i) tres unum sunt* (C)

*quoniam tres sunt qui testificantur in terra spiritus et aqua et sanguis* (T)

*quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant spiritus et aqua et sanguis et tres unum sunt* (V)

---

<sup>66</sup> *Iste* appears to be a widespread rendering in the African versions (Thiele, 1958: 26).

<sup>67</sup> See pp. 94–6 and p. 232.

<sup>68</sup> On the juxtaposition of demonstratives and numerals see Abel (1971: 163–7).

<sup>69</sup> The variant *οἱ* is rendered by *(h)i(i)* in LEO (Var).

The only instance in the letter in which the demonstrative corresponding to the Greek article has an uncertain function is at 4:3a (T): *illius antichristi*. In this case the demonstrative precedes a relative clause and seems to anticipate it:

4:3: καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται  
*sed est de antichristi spiritu* (K)

*sed hic de antichristo est quod audistis quoniam venit* (C)

*et hic est illius antichristi quem audistis quia venturus est* (T)

*et hoc est antichristi quod audistis quoniam venit* (V)

The use of *ille* as antecedent of a relative clause is noted by Abel.<sup>70</sup> Although the antichrist is mentioned twice in the epistle, at 2:18 and 2:22, it is improbable that *ille* has an anaphoric function at 4:3 since these passages are too far apart.

#### b. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions

In the following instances the readings and renderings of the Vulgate are either more suitable or accurate to render the Greek text than those of the Vetus Latina:

1:4: ἧ̃ πεπληρωμένη: *sit in pleno* (T), *sit plenum* (V; AU; PS-HIL-A)

2:8: ὃ ἐστιν ἀληθές: *quod est vere* (T), *quod est verum* (V; AU > JUL-T; PS-HIL-A)

2:16: βίου: *saeculi* (K, T), *vitae* (V; AM; RUF Rm Var; JUL-E; CAn; PS-AU hyp; FU Mon; GR-M; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED Sam, Lc, Egb; PS-AU s 290 Var)

2:28: φανερωθῆ̃: *venerit* (T; 67 55 65; AU<sup>com?</sup>), *apparuerit* (V; PS-HIL-A; ANT-M; BEA; PS-ANAC), *apparuit* (Ω<sup>o</sup>), *manifestatus fuerit* (AU<sup>txt</sup>; CLE-A)

---

<sup>70</sup> Abel (1971: 91–127).



3:1: ἴδετε (ἴδε variant): *ecce* (T), *videte* (V; AU Ps; BED Ct; BEA; PS-ANAC)

4:1: εἰ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν: *si ex deo sunt* (T), *si ex deo sint* (V; AMst Var; PS-AU Do Var; CAn; BEN-N; PRIM; BED cath 107; BEA e1 1,42)

4:11: ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν: *si diligimus* (T), *si diligamus* (V; 32 64; AU; BED Lc, Ct; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn, PS-JUL I.; KA Tur)

5:2: ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν: *cum diligimus deum et mandata eius facimus* (T), *quando / quoniam deum amamus et mandata eius facimus* (LUC), *deum diligimus* (C), *cum deum diligamus et mandata eius faciamus* (V; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn)

At 1:4 and 2:8 the Vulgate and Augustine employ the adjectives *plenum* and *verum* to render the Greek perfect participle *πεπληρωμένη* and the adjective *ἀληθές* instead of the locution *in pleno* and the adverb *vere* of text type T, which may be an interpretation of the Greek adjective in the adverbial sense. At 2:16 βίος is rendered by the Vulgate and a minority of Old Latin sources (Ambrose, Rufinus, Fulgentius) with the corresponding Latin word *vita* whereas text type T features *saeculum*, which matches the Greek term semantically but usually indicates the earthly world expressed in Greek by κόσμος (no variant in the Greek text is attested in the ECM). At 2:28 the rendering of text type T, *venire*, does not match the meaning of the Greek verb φανερόω, ‘to make manifest’, and may derive from a lost Greek variant which was present in the *Vorlage* of T: the rendering of the Vulgate on one hand (*apparere*) and that of Augustine and the Latin translator of Clement of Alexandria on the other (*manifestare*) correspond to the original text. At 3:1 the imperative ἴδετε is rendered literally by the Vulgate and Augustine with the corresponding imperative *videte*. However, ἴδε is often intended as an interjection when used at the beginning of the sentence: for this reason, text type T renders it with the adverb *ecce*, ‘behold’. The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in the tense of verbs in subordinate clauses. At 4:1 and 4:11 the Vulgate employs the subjunctive in the if-clauses while text type

T has the present indicative. Nonetheless, the subjunctive is also attested in Old Latin sources and does not seem to be an innovation of the Vulgate. At 5:2 *cum* is followed by the subjunctive in the Vulgate and the indicative in the *Vetus Latina*: this is a hypercorrection in that when *cum* means ‘whenever’ it is usually followed by the indicative. The instances listed above represent focused renderings of the Vulgate in opposition to the unfocused renderings of the *Vetus Latina*. However, considering that in most of the cases the Vulgate agrees with a minority of Old Latin sources (1:4; 2:8; 3:1; 4:1,11), these renderings are not distinctive of the Vulgate. In 1 John the Vulgate does not introduce any significant alteration to the previous Latin versions.

### c. Unfocused Renderings

The Vulgate features lexical renderings and constructions that do not match the Greek text:

2:14: *παιδία*: *pueri* (T), *infantes* (V; KA Sp; PS-HIL-A), *fili* (CLE-A), *parvuli* (cf HI ep)

2:21: οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι οἶδατε αὐτήν: *scribo vobis non quod nescieritis veritatem sed quia nostis eam* (A), *non scripsi vobis quasi ignorantibus veritatem sed scientibus eam* (T), *non scripsi vobis quasi ignorantibus veritatem sed quasi scientibus eam* (*quasi*: V; PS-HIL-A; BEA)

4:10: ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήκαμεν τὸν θεόν: *in hoc est caritas non quod nos dileximus deum* (T), *in hoc est caritas non quasi nos dileximus deum* (V; PROS Ruf; [PROS]; PS-AU hyp; GR-M Var; PS-HIL-A; BED Ct, h; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn, PS-JUL I.)

At 2:14 the Vulgate renders *παιδίον* with *infans*, which usually refers only to toddlers and translates βρέφος and νήπιος in the Vulgate (Matthew 21:16; Luke 1:41, 44; 2:12, 16; 18:15;

Acts 7:19; Romans 2:20; 1 Peter 2:2).<sup>71</sup> Another exception in which *infans* corresponds to παιδίον is at Hebrews 11:23 (I, D, J, V) in which, however, *infans* refers to the newborn Moses. On the other hand, at 2:14 *infantes* is a synonym of the preceding *filioli* (τεκνία) at 2:12 (T, V)<sup>72</sup> and indicates the members of the community:

2:14: ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, παιδιά, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα

*scribo vobis pueri quoniam cognovistis patrem* (T)

*scripsi vobis infantes quoniam cognovistis patrem* (V)

The context of the passage makes clear that John does not refer to infants and therefore the rendering of the Vulgate is surprising. *Infantes* might mean ‘neophytes, baptised’ according to the definition of Caesarius of Arles (*Sermones* 129,5 p. 511,5): *omnes, qui baptizantur, sive senes sunt sive iuvenes, omnes tamen infantes appellantur*.<sup>73</sup> At 2:18 παιδιά is rendered by the expected *pueri* (T) and *filioli* (V) and at John 21:5 by *pueri*, which is unanimously attested by the Vulgate and Vetus Latina (VL 2 4 5 6 10 13 14 15 27 30 56; AU Jo; EP-L; GR-M; HI Pach; M-M; PET-C; PS-THI; PS-VIG).

At 2:21 the Vulgate is the only text type that renders the second causal ὅτι with *quasi*, which is omitted by text type T (55? 65\* Φ<sup>B</sup> 51) and rendered by *quia* in the biblical text of Augustine. Nonetheless, the presence of *quasi* in the Vulgate implies the influence of text type

---

<sup>71</sup> Thiele (1958: 39) reports that Jerome attests the use of *infans* instead of *filius* in the popular language of his time.

<sup>72</sup> The same rendering is also present at 2:28 (T, V); 3:7 (T, V); 3:18 (T, V); 4:4 (T, V); 5:21 (S, T, V).

<sup>73</sup> See the section *neophyti, baptizati* in TLL 7.1.1349.35.

T which translates the first ὅτι with *quasi* as well as the Vulgate.<sup>74</sup> At 4:10 the Vulgate differs again from T in the rendering of ὅτι by *quasi*. The renderings of participles with finite verbs are other free constructions of the Vulgate version of 1 John.

## 8. Variations

The Latin text of 1 John is characterised by a repetitive structure which reflects the Greek text. The instances in which both the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* do not vary neighbouring lexical renderings occur with high frequency throughout the letter. The cases in which either the Vulgate or the *Vetus Latina* change the vocabulary in order to introduce variations are rare.

### a. Absence of Variations

1:1–2: τῆς ζωῆς ... ἡ ζωὴ ... τὴν ζωὴν: *vitae ... vita ... vitam* (T, V)

1:1–2: ἐώρακαμεν ... ἐώρακαμεν: *vidimus ... vidimus* (T, V)

1:2–3: ἀπαγγέλλομεν ... ἀπαγγέλλομεν: *nuntiamus ... nuntiamus* (T), *adnuntiamus ... adnuntiamus* (V)

1:2–3: τὸν πατέρα ... τοῦ πατρός: *patrem ... patre* (T, V)

1:5–6: σκοτία ... ἐν τῷ σκότει: *tenebrae ... in tenebris* (T, V)

1:6–7: κοινωνίαν ... κοινωνίαν: *societatem ... societatem* (T, V)

1:6–7: περιπατῶμεν ... περιπατῶμεν: *ambulamus ... ambulemus* (T, V)

---

<sup>74</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 60) highlights this free rendering of the Vulgate but affirms that it derives from the African version. Evidence of citations of this verse in the African witnesses are lacking in Thiele.

- 1:7: ἐν τῷ φωτί ... ἐν τῷ φωτί: *in lumine ... in lumine* (T), *in luce ... in luce* (V)
- 1:7–8: ἁμαρτίας ... ἁμαρτίαν: *peccato ... peccatum* (T, V), *delicto ... peccatum* (K)<sup>75</sup>
- 1:9: τὰς ἁμαρτίας ... τὰς ἁμαρτίας: *delicta ... delicta* (C), *peccata ... peccata* (T, V)
- 1:10–2:1: ἡμαρτήκαμεν ... ἀμάρτητε: *peccavimus ... peccetis* (T, V)
- 2:1: ἀμάρτητε ... ἀμάρτη: *delinquatis ... deliquerit* (K), *peccetis ... peccaverit* (T, V)
- 2:3–4: τὰς ἐντολάς ... τὰς ἐντολάς: *praecepta ... mandata* (K), *mandata ... mandata* (T, V)<sup>76</sup>
- 2:7: ἐντολήν ... ἐντολήν ... ἡ ἐντολή: *mandatum ... mandatum ... mandatum* (T, V)
- 2:7: παλαιάν ... παλαιά: *vetus ... vetus* (T, V)
- 2:7–8: καινήν ... καινήν: *novum ... novum* (T, V)
- 2:7–8: γράφω ... γράφω: *scribo ... scribo* (T, V)
- 2:8–9: ἡ σκοτία ... ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ: *tenebrae ... in tenebris* (T, V)
- 2:9–11: τὸν ἀδελφόν ... τὸν ἀδελφόν ... τὸν ἀδελφόν: *fratrem ... fratrem ... fratrem* (T, V)
- 2:11: ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ... ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ... ἡ σκοτία: *in tenebris ... in tenebris ... tenebrae* (K, T, V)
- 2:12–14: γράφω ... γράφω ... γράφω ... ἔγραψα ... ἔγραψα ... ἔγραψα: *scribo ... scribo ... scribo ... scribo / scripsi ... scribo / scripsi ... scribo / scripsi* (T / V)
- 2:13–14: πατέρες ... τὸν πατέρα ... πατέρες: *patres ... patrem ... patres* (T, V)
- 2:15–16: τὸν κόσμον ... τῷ κόσμῳ ... τὸν κόσμον: *mundum ... in mundo ... mundum* (K, V), *saeculum ... in saeculo ... saeculum* (T)
- 2:15: ἀγαπᾶτε ... ἀγαπᾶ: *diligere ... dilexerit* (K), *diligere ... diligit* (T, V)
- 2:15–16: τοῦ πατρός (θεοῦ variant) ... ἐκ τοῦ πατρός: *patris ... a / ex patre* (K / V), *dei ... de patre* (T)

---

<sup>75</sup> Variation in text type K.

<sup>76</sup> Variation in text type K.

2:16–17: ἡ ἐπιθυμία ... ἡ ἐπιθυμία ... ἡ ἐπιθυμία: *concupiscentia ... concupiscentia ... concupiscentia* (K, T, V), *desiderium ... desiderium ... desideria* (C)

2:16–17: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ... τοῦ κόσμου ... ὁ κόσμος: *in mundo ... saeculi ... mundus* (K), *in saeculo ... saeculo ... saeculum* (T), *in mundo ... mundo ... mundus* (V)<sup>77</sup>

2:18: ἀντίχριστος ... ἀντίχριστοι: *antichristus ... antichristi* (K, T, V)

2:18: ἐσχάτη ... ἐσχάτη: *novissima ... novissima* (T, V)

2:21–22: ψεῦδος ... ὁ ψεύστης: *mendacium ... mendax* (T, V)

2:22–23: ὁ ἀρνούμενος ... ὁ ἀρνούμενος ... ὁ ἀρνούμενος: *qui negat ... qui negat ... qui negat* (T, V)

2:23: τὸν υἱόν ... τὸν υἱόν: *filium ... filium* (K, T, V)

2:23: τὸν πατέρα ... τὸν πατέρα: *patrem ... patrem* (K, T, V)

2:24: ἠκούσατε ... ἠκούσατε: *audistis ... audistis* (T, V)

2:24: μενέτω ... μείνη: *permaneat ... permanserit* (T, V), *maneant ... manserit* (A)

2:27: τὸ χρῖσμα ... τὸ χρῖσμα: *unctio ... unctio* (C), *unctionem ... unctio* (T, V)

2:27: διδάσκη ... διδάσκει: *doceat ... docet* (A, T, V)

2:27–28: μένετε ... μένετε: *manete ... manete* (T, V)

2:29: εἰδῆτε ... γινώσκετε: *scitis / sciatis ... scitote* (T / V)

2:29: δίκαιος ... δικαιοσύνην: *iustus ... iustitiam* (T, V)

3:1: οὐ γινώσκει ... οὐκ ἔγνω: *ignorat ... ignoravit* (T), *non novit ... non novit* (V)

3:3: ἀγνίζει ... ἀγνός: *castificat ... castus* (T), *sanctificat ... sanctus* (V)

3:4: τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ... τὴν ἀνομίαν ... ἡ ἁμαρτία ... ἡ ἀνομία: *peccatum ... iniquitatem ... peccatum ... iniquitas* (T, V)

---

<sup>77</sup> Variation in text type K.

- 3:5: ἀμαρτίας ... ἀμαρτία: *peccata ... peccatum* (T, V)
- 3:6: ἀμαρτάνει ... ὁ ἀμαρτάνων: *peccat ... peccat* (T, V)
- 3:7: τὴν δικαιοσύνην ... δίκαιος ... δίκαιος: *iustitiam ... iustus ... iustus* (T, V)
- 3:8: διαβόλου ... διάβολος ... τοῦ διαβόλου: *diabolo ... diabolus ... diaboli* (T, V)
- 3:8–9: τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ... ἀμαρτάνει ... ἀμαρτίαν ... ἀμαρτάνειν: *peccatum ... peccat ... peccatum ... peccare* (T, V)
- 3:9: ὁ γεγεννημένος ... γεγέννηται: *qui natus est ... natus est* (T, V)
- 3:10: τέκνα ... τέκνα: *fili ... filii* (K, T, V)
- 3:10: τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: *dei ... de deo* (K, T, V)
- 3:10–11: ἀγαπῶν ... ἀγαπῶμεν: *diligit ... diligamus* (T, V), *amat ... amemus* (R)
- 3:12: ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ... πονηρά: *ex maligno ... maligna* (T, V)
- 3:12: ἔσφαξεν ... ἔσφαξεν: *occidit ... occidit* (T, V), *interfecit ... interfecit* (R)
- 3:12–13: τὸν ἀδελφόν ... τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ... ἀδελφοί: *fratrem ... fratris ... fratres* (T, V)
- 3:14: ἀγαπῶμεν ... ἀγαπῶν: *diligimus ... diligit* (T, V), *amamus ... amat* (R)
- 3:14: ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου ... ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ: *de morte ... in morte* (T, V)
- 3:15: ἀνθρωποκτόνος ... ἀνθρωποκτόνος: *homicida ... homicida* (K, T, V)
- 3:16: τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν ... τὰς ψυχὰς θεῖναι: *animam suam posuit ... animam / animas ponere* (T / V)
- 3:16–17: τὴν ἀγάπην ... ἡ ἀγάπη: *caritatem ... caritas* (T, V)
- 3:18–19: ἀληθεία ... ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας: *veritate ... ex veritate* (T, V)
- 3:19–21: τὴν καρδίαν ... ἡ καρδία ... τῆς καρδίας ... ἡ καρδία: *cordi / corda ... cor ... corde ... cor* (T / V)
- 3:20–21: καταγινώσκη ... καταγινώσκη: *reprehendat / reprehenderit ... reprehendat / reprehenderit* (T / V), *male senserit ... male senserit* (A)

3:20–21: ὁ θεός ... τὸν θεόν: *deus ... deum* (T, V)

3:22–24: τὰς ἐντολάς ... ἡ ἐντολή ... ἐντολήν ... τὰς ἐντολάς: *mandata ... mandatum ... mandatum ... mandatum / mandata* (T, V)

4:1: πνεύματι ... τὰ πνεύματα: *spiritui ... spiritus* (T, V)

4:2–3: τὸ πνεῦμα ... πνεῦμα ... πνεῦμα: *spiritus ... spiritus ... spiritus* (T, V)

4:2–3: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: *de deo ... de deo* (K), *ex deo ... ex deo* (T, V)

4:3–5: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ... ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ... ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ... ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ... ὁ κόσμος: *in saeculo ... in saeculo ... de saeculo ... de saeculo ... saeculum* (T), *in mundo ... in mundo ... de mundo ... de mundo ... mundus* (V)

4:5–6: ἀκούει ... ἀκούει ... ἀκούει: *audit ... audit ... audit* (T, V)

4:6: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... τὸν θεόν ... ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: *ex deo ... deum ... ex deo* (T, V)

4:6: τὸ πνεῦμα ... τὸ πνεῦμα: *spiritum ... spiritum* (T, V)

4:7–8: ἀγαπῶμεν ... ὁ ἀγαπῶν ... ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν: *diligamus ... qui diligit ... qui non diligit* (T, V)

4:7–8: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... τὸν θεόν ... τὸν θεόν ... ὁ θεός: *ex deo ... ex deo ... deum ... deum ... deus* (T, V)

4:8–10: ἀγάπη ... ἡ ἀγάπη ... ἡ ἀγάπη: *caritas ... caritas ... caritas* (T, V)

4:9–10: τοῦ θεοῦ ... ὁ θεός ... τὸν θεόν: *dei ... deus ... deum* (T, V)

4:10–12: ἠγαπήκαμεν ... ἠγάπησεν ... ἠγάπησεν ... ἀγαπᾶν ... ἀγαπῶμεν: *dilexerimus ... dilexit ... dilexit ... diligere ... diligimus* (T, V), *amaverimus ... amaverit ... amavit ... amare* (R)

4:11–12: ὁ θεός ... θεόν ... ὁ θεός: *deus ... deum ... deus* (T, V)

4:12–13: μένει ... μένομεν: *manet ... manemus* (T, V)

4:14–15: τὸν υἱόν ... ὁ υἱός: *filium ... filius* (T, V)

4:15: τοῦ θεοῦ ... ὁ θεός ... ἐν τῷ θεῷ: *dei ... deus ... in deo* (T, V)



4:15–16: τὴν ἀγάπην ... ἀγάπη ... ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ: *caritatem / caritati ... caritas ... in caritate* (T / V)

4:16: ὁ θεός ... ὁ θεός ... ἐν τῷ θεῷ ... ὁ θεός: *deus ... deus ... in deo ... deus* (T, V)

4:16: ὁ μένων ... μένει ... μένει: *qui manet ... manet ... manet* (K), *qui permanet ... permanet ... manet* (T), *qui manet ... manet* (V)<sup>78</sup>

4:17–18: ἡ ἀγάπη ... ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ... ἀγάπη ... ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ: *caritas ... in caritate ... caritas ... in caritate* (T, V), *dilectione ... dilectio ... dilectione* (C)

4:17–18: φόβος ... τὸν φόβον ... ὁ φόβος ... ὁ φοβούμενος: *timor ... timorem ... timor ... qui timet* (T, V)

4:18: τελεία ... τετελείωται: *perfecta ... perfectus* (T, V)

4:19–20: ἀγαπῶμεν ... ἠγάπησεν ... ἀγαπῶ ... ἀγαπῶν ... ἀγαπᾶν: *diligimus / diligamus ... dilexit ... diligo ... diligit ... diligere* (T / V), *diligit ... diligit ... diligere* (K), *diligis ... diligere* (C), *amat ... amare* (R)

4:20: τὸν θεόν ... τὸν θεόν: *deum ... deum* (K, T, V)

4:20–21: τὸν ἀδελφόν ... τὸν ἀδελφόν ... τὸν ἀδελφόν: *fratrem ... fratrem ... fratrem* (K, T, V)

4:20: ἐώρακεν ... ἐώρακεν: *videt ... videt* (T), *vidit ... vidit* (V)

4:21: ὁ ἀγαπῶν ... ἀγαπᾶ: *qui diligit ... diligit* (T, V), *amat ... amet* (R)

5:1–2: ὁ ἀγαπῶν ... ἀγαπᾶ ... ἀγαπῶμεν: *qui diligit ... diligit ... diligimus / diligamus* (T / V)

5:2–3: τὰς ἐντολάς ... τὰς ἐντολάς: *mandata ... mandata* (T, V), *praecepta ... praecepta* (A)

5:4: νικᾷ ... ἡ νίκη ... ἡ νικήσασα: *vincit ... victoria ... vincit / vicit* (T / V)

5:4: τὸν κόσμον ... τὸν κόσμον: *saeculum ... saeculum* (T), *mundum ... mundum* (V)

---

<sup>78</sup> Variation in text type T.

5:4: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... τοῦ θεοῦ: *ex deo ... dei* (T, V)

5:6: δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος (πνεύματος variant) ... ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ... ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ αἵματι: *per aquam et sanguinem ... in aqua ... in aqua et sanguine* (K, T), *per aquam et spiritum ... in aqua ... in aqua et sanguine* (T)

5:6: τὸ πνεῦμα ... τὸ πνεῦμα (ὁ Χριστός variant): *spiritus ... spiritus* (K, T), *spiritus ... Christus* (V)

5:9: τὴν μαρτυρίαν ... ἡ μαρτυρία ... ἡ μαρτυρία ... μεμαρτύρηκεν: *testimonium ... testimonium ... testimonium ... testificatus est* (T, V)

5:9: τοῦ θεοῦ ... τοῦ θεοῦ: *dei ... dei* (T, V)

5:10: ὁ πιστεύων ... πιστεύων ... πεπίστευκεν: *qui credit ... credit ... credidit* (T, V), *crediderit ... crediderit* (A)

5:10: τοῦ θεοῦ ... ὁ θεός: *dei ... deus* (T, V)

5:10–11: τὴν μαρτυρίαν ... εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν ... μεμαρτύρηκεν ... ἡ μαρτυρία: *testimonium ... in testimonium ... testificatus est ... testimonium* (T, V)

5:10–12: εἰς τὸν υἱόν ... περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ... ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ... τὸν υἱόν ... τὸν υἱόν: *in filio ... de filio ... in filio ... filium ... filium* (T, V)

5:11–13: ζωὴν ... ἡ ζωὴ ... τὴν ζωὴν ... τὴν ζωὴν ... ζωὴν: *vitam ... vita ... vitam ... vitam ... vitam* (T, V)

5:12–13: ὁ ἔχων ... ὁ μὴ ἔχων ... ἔχει ... ἔχετε ... ἔχομεν: *qui habet ... qui non habet ... habet ... habetis ... habemus* (T, V)

5:14–15: αἰτώμεθα ... αἰτώμεθα: *petierimus ... petierimus* (T, V)

5:14–15: ἀκούει ... ἀκούει: *audit ... audit* (T, V)

5:15: οἶδαμεν ... οἶδαμεν: *scimus ... scimus* (T, V)

5:16: ἀμαρτάνοντα ἀμαρτίαν ... τοῖς ἀμαρτάνουσιν ... ἀμαρτία: *peccare peccatum ... qui peccat ... peccatum* (C, T), *peccare peccatum ... peccantibus ... peccatum* (V)

5:16: πρὸς θάνατον ... πρὸς θάνατον ... πρὸς θάνατον: *ad mortem ... ad mortem ... ad mortem* (C, T, V)

5:17–18: ἀμαρτία ... ἀμαρτία ... ἀμαρτάνει: *peccatum ... peccatum ... peccat* (T, V)

5:18–20: οἶδαμεν ... οἶδαμεν ... οἶδαμεν: *scimus ... scimus ... scimus* (T, V)

5:18–19: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: *dei ... ex deo* (T, V)

5:18–19: ὁ πονηρός ... ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ: *malignus ... in maligno* (T, V)

5:20: ὁ υἱός ... ἐν τῷ υἱῷ: *filius ... filio* (S, T, V)

5:20: τὸν ἀληθινόν ... ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ ... ὁ ἀληθινός: *qui verus est ... in vero ... verus* (S), *quod est verum ... in vero ... verus* (T), *verum ... in vero ... verus* (V)

#### b. Variations in the Vetus Latina

2:13–14: νεανίσκοι ... νεανίσκοι: *iuvenes ... adulescentes* (T), *adulescentes ... adulescentes* (V)

2:13–14: ἐγνώκατε ... ἐγνώκατε ... ἐγνώκατε: *cognovistis ... cognovistis ... agnovistis* (T), *cognovistis ... cognovistis ... cognovistis* (V)<sup>79</sup>

3:2: ἐφανερώθη ... φανερωθῆ: *manifestatum est ... apparuerit* (T), *apparuit ... apparuerit* (V), *revelatum ... revelatum fuerit* (M)<sup>80</sup>

3:14–15: μένει ... μένουσαν: *permanet ... manentem* (T), *manet ... manentem* (V)

3:24: μένει ... μένει: *manebit ... permanet* (T), *manet ... manet* (V)

---

<sup>79</sup> Partial variation in text type T.

<sup>80</sup> Absence of variation in text type M.

c. Variations in the Vulgate

1:2: ἐφανερώθη ... ἐφανερώθη: *palam facta est ... palam facta est* (T), *apparuit ... manifest(at)a* (S, M), *manifestata est ... apparuit* (V)

1:5, 7: φῶς ... ἐν τῷ φωτί: *lux ... in luce* (V), *lux ... in lumine* (T)

2:8–10: τὸ φῶς ... ἐν τῷ φωτί ... ἐν τῷ φωτί: *lumen ... in lumine ... in lumine* (T), *lumen ... in luce ... in lumine* (V)

2:14: ὅτι ... ὅτι: *quoniam ... quoniam* (T), *quoniam ... quia* (V)

2:24: μείνη ... μενεῖτε: *permanserit ... permanebitis* (T), *permanserit ... manebitis* (V)

4:6: ὁ γινώσκων ... γινώσκομεν: *cognoscit ... cognoscimus* (T), *novit ... cognoscimus* (V)

4:11–12: ἀλλήλους ... ἀλλήλους: *invicem ... invicem* (T), *alterutrum ... invicem* (V)

5:1: τὸν γεννήσαντα ... τὸν γεγεννημένον: *genitorem ... qui genitus est* (T), *eum qui genuit ... qui natus est* (V)

5:15: τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ἠτήκαμεν: *petitiones quas petivimus* (T), *petitiones quas postulavimus* (V)

5:18: ὁ γεγεννημένος ... ὁ γεννηθείς (ἢ γέννησις variant): *qui natus est ... nativitas* (T), *qui natus est ... generatio* (V)

d. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina

2:3: γινώσκομεν ... ἐγνώκαμεν: *intellegimus ... cognovimus* (K), *scimus ... cognovimus* (T, V)

2:3–4: τηρῶμεν ... τηρῶν: *custodiamus ... servat* (K), *servemus ... servat* (T), *observemus ... custodit* (V)

2:25: ἡ ἐπαγγελία ... ἐπηγγείλατο: *promissio ... pollicitus est* (T), *repromissio ... pollicitus est* (V), *pollicitatio ... pollicitus est* (A)<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Absence of variation in text type A.

5:6: μαρτυροῦν ... οἱ μαρτυροῦντες (μαρτυροῦσιν variant): *testimonium perhibet ... testimonium perhibent* (K), *testimonium dat ... testificantur* (T), *testificatur ... testimonium dant* (V)<sup>82</sup>

The introduction of variations is not characteristic of either the Vulgate or the Vetus Latina. At 2:29 and 3:1 the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina employ the same renderings for different Greek underlying verbs. At 2:25 and 5:15 the Vulgate avoids the *figura etimologica* and varies the lexical renderings in fourteen instances in total. Text type T introduces variation on nine occurrences and text type K five times.

## 9. Participial Renderings

### a. Articular Participles

The renderings employed in 1 John to translate the Greek participles preceded by the article are the following:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | FINITE VERB | NOUN |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|
| T          | 47              | 0                  | 0           | 1    |
| S          | 1               | 0                  | 0           | 0    |
| K          | 14              | 0                  | 1           | 0    |
| C          | 3               | 0                  | 1           | 1    |
| M          | 1               | 0                  | 0           | 0    |
| V          | 47              | 1                  | 0           | 0    |

Table 22. Rendering of articular participles in 1 John

---

<sup>82</sup> Absence of variation in text type K.

The relative clause appears to be the most frequent rendering in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. The present participle *peccantibus* at 5:16 (V), the nouns *patrem* (C) and *genitorem* (T) at 5:1, and the finite verbs *diligis* at 4:20 (C) and *testimonium perhibent* at 5:7 (K) are the only alternative renderings of articular participles attested in the Latin versions of the letter.

#### b. Participles

The non-articular participles, which are not numerous in 1 John, are rendered in most cases by finite verbs:

| TEXT TYPES | PRESENT ACTIVE | FINITE VERB |
|------------|----------------|-------------|
| T          | 1              | 5           |
| A          | 1              | 0           |
| K          | 2              | 4           |
| C          | 0              | 1           |
| V          | 1              | 5           |

Table 23. Rendering of non-articular participles in 1 John

The Greek present participles are twice rendered by finite verbs when they are coordinated to a preceding relative clause translating an articular participle (2:4 K, T, V; 2:9 K, T, V). In three cases the Greek participles following verbs of perception (3:17 T, V), opinion (4:2 K, T, V) and cognition (5:16 K, C, T, V) are rendered by infinitives. This practice differs from what was observed in 2 Peter 2:10, in which the supplementary participle is retained in the Vulgate, a phenomenon that is also noticeable in 2 John 7 and 3 John 4.<sup>83</sup> The employment of finite verbs

---

<sup>83</sup> See pp. 227, 329, 348.

to render Greek participles is usually avoided in the Vulgate version of the other letters in which Latin participles correspond to Greek ones.

## 10. Statistics

### a. Lexicon

The relationship between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* text types with a focus on the lexical renderings is shown in the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 159/199 | 80%        |
| C          | 63/127  | 50%        |
| A          | 28/92   | 30%        |
| M          | 11/22   | 50%        |
| R          | 11/54   | 20%        |
| S          | 25/42   | 59%        |
| T          | 758/886 | 86%        |
| V (unique) | 103/890 | 12%        |

Table 24. Lexical renderings in 1 John

The results of the analysis of the relationship of the Vulgate with the *Vetus Latina* text types in 1 John correlates with the data from 1 Peter: in both the letters the lexical renderings of the Vulgate are unique in 12% of the cases and agree with text type T in 86% of the instances. In 1 John the Vulgate is also close to text type K (80%) and has around half of the instances in common with text types S, C, M (59%, 50%, 50%). The biblical texts of Augustine and Lucifer are not closely related to the Vulgate version of 1 John (30% and 20%). On the other hand, the Vulgate appears to be closer to text types S and A in 1 Peter (73% and 81%) and 2 Peter (60% and 68%) and more distant from K in 1 Peter (66%). The high number of similarities between the Vulgate and text types K and T demonstrates the probable existence of a common archetype.

## b. Participles

The table below shows the cases of agreement between the Vulgate and the Old Latin text types:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 19/21   | 90%        |
| C          | 3/6     | 50%        |
| A          | 0/1     | 0%         |
| T          | 52/54   | 96%        |
| V (unique) | 2/54    | 4%         |

Table 25. Participial renderings in 1 John

The Vulgate text of 1 John agrees with text type T in almost all the instances (96% of the cases) except two participial renderings at 5:1 and 5:16 in which the Vulgate stands on its own. The close relationship with text type K is also significant: the agreement in 90% of the cases shows the continuity between the Latin versions. The low number of participial renderings of text types C and A do not permit us to get a meaningful indication of their relationship with the Vulgate. The low percentage of renderings unique to the Vulgate (4%) contrasts sharply with the results of the analysis of the participial renderings of James, 1 and 2 Peter in which the Vulgate is unique in 27%, 14% and 21% of the instances.

## c. Word Order

The following table presents the agreement between the Vulgate and each Old Latin text type in word order and their relationship with the Greek text:



| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| K          | 5/8     | 62%        | 5/8: 62%           | 3/8: 37%               |
| C          | 3/7     | 43%        | 3/7: 43%           | 4/7: 57%               |
| A          | 0/9     | 0%         | 0/9: 0%            | 9/9: 100%              |
| M          | 1/3     | 33%        | 1/3: 33%           | 2/3: 67%               |
| R          | 2/5     | 40%        | 2/5: 40%           | 3/5: 60%               |
| S          | 0/2     | 0%         | 0/2: 0%            | 2/2: 100%              |
| T          | 20/30   | 67%        | 21/30: 70%         | 9/30: 30%              |
| V (unique) | 7/30    | 23%        | 29/30: 97%         | 1/30: 3%               |

Table 26. Word order in 1 John

The word order of the Vulgate is unique only in 23% of the cases, in which it is mostly in agreement with Greek (97%). The Vulgate has the highest number of similarities with text type T (67%), a result that corresponds to that of the analysis of the lexicon and participles. The word order of text type T matches the Greek text in 70% of the instances, a percentage that represents a good number of similarities with Greek although it is inferior to that of the agreement between the Greek text and the Vulgate. It is also possible to observe a close relationship between the Vulgate and text type K, as it occurs in the lexical and participial renderings: K agrees with the Vulgate in 62% of the cases in which the Old Latin text type follows the Greek word order. Text types C, A, M, R and S differ from the Greek word order in most of their attestations (57%, 100%, 67%, 60%, 100%). Text types C, R and M agree with the Vulgate in 43%, 33%, 40% of the instances while text types A and S never match the Vulgate. On the other hand, text type A is fairly close to the Vulgate in 1 Peter and 2 Peter (50% and 67%), despite the low number of attestations, and S agrees with the Vulgate in 40% of the cases in 1 Peter. Further differences between the Vulgate text of 1 John on one hand and James, 1 and 2 Peter on the other will be highlighted in the concluding section. The fact that the Vulgate matches the Greek word order in most of the letter leads von Harnack (1916: 57) to the conclusion that the Vulgate is an interlinear version: ‘Die von der Vulgata gegebene

Übersetzung des 1. und 2. Johannesbriefes ist augenscheinlich eine Interlinear-Version'. The fact that the word order of the Vulgate in 1 John matches the Greek text is not a sufficient reason to hypothesise an interlinear origin: the interlinear translations of VL 27 and VL 77 not only have the same word order as the Greek text but also reflect the Greek grammar and feature errors in dividing the Greek words that demonstrate their interlinear character.

#### 11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text

This section discusses and updates the results of von Harnack (1916) on the readings of the Vulgate which imply the existence of variants not transmitted by the Greek tradition. Some of the cases identified by von Harnack, who relies on Wordsworth and White's edition, are no longer printed in the Stuttgart Vulgate because the tradition of the Vulgate is divided, such as the addition of *gaudeatis* (in GA 629 and F $\Phi$ <sup>T2B</sup> $\Sigma$ <sup>A2</sup> $\Lambda$ <sup>H</sup> $\Omega$ <sup>OWC</sup> 54; BED cath) at 1:4; *videt* (Wordsworth and White) instead of *vidit* (Stuttgart Vulgate) at 4:20 to render  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ; *peccanti* (Wordsworth and White) instead of *peccantibus* (Stuttgart Vulgate) to render the variant  $\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\iota$  and  $\tau\omicron\zeta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\nu$  respectively; the addition of *nostrum* (Wordsworth and White) at 3:20; the omission of *si* at 5:15 (Wordsworth and White). According to von Harnack, the following readings of the Vulgate might reflect variants no longer preserved in the Greek tradition:<sup>84</sup>

2:20:  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ : *et* (T), *sed* (V; AN cath; PS-IS; BEA)

2:27:  $\tau\omicron$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$ : *unctio ipsius* (C), *unctio eius* (T, V)

2:28:  $\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\omega\theta\eta\acute{\iota}$ : *venerit* (T; 67 55 65; AU<sup>com?</sup>), *apparuerit* (V)<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 62–3).

<sup>85</sup> See p. 293.

3:17: ὃς δ' ἄν: *qui autem* (T), *qui* (V, K; BEA; PS-ANAC; CY; PHOE; RUF > CAE; IS; GAU; PEL 2 Cor Var; GR-M; LUCU 4 1/2; 5; BED Lv, aed; PIR)

4:12: πώποτε τεθέαται: *vidit umquam* (T, V)

4:16: πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην: *credidimus caritatem* (T), *credidimus caritati* (V; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-EUTn, PS-JUL I.)

5:9: addition of *quod maius est* (V; AU Var; BEA; PS-EUS-P Var, PS-EVAR)

5:16: ἐάν τις ἴδῃ: *si quis scit* (C, T), *qui scit* (V; AM; HI; CAn; [COL]; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED Lc; PS-AU s 62; PS-EUS-P, PS-EVAR)

*Sed* at 2:20 may be caused by dittography since the reading is preceded by another *sed* at 2:19.

The word order *unctio ipsius / eius* at 2:27, attested in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina, disagrees with Greek but might also be a change in the word order internal to Latin. Thiele notes in the apparatus at 3:17 that the omission of the translation of δέ is also present in the Bohairic, Sahidic and Armenian versions but this information is not indicated in the ECM and not reliable. The word order *vidit umquam* at 4:12 is not attested in Greek. However, in the apparatus Thiele identifies this variant in the Bohairic and Sahidic version and notices a similarity in the word order with John 1:18 (ἐώρακεν πώποτε: *vidit umquam* in the Vulgate), which could have influenced this passage. The dative *caritati* at 4:16 does not match the Greek ἀγάπην (no variants in the ECM) but this observation is not sufficient to hypothesise the existence of a variant reading considering that the dative following *credere* is normal in Latin. The addition of the Vulgate at 5:9 is not supported by Greek manuscripts and can be considered to be a repetition of the preceding and similar expression *testimonium dei maius est*. At 5:16 both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina render the variant εἰδῆ, which is supported by Greek manuscripts, as is shown in the list below. None of the readings selected by von Harnack, therefore, unequivocally represents a lost Greek variant: alternative hypotheses, such as scribal

mistakes, changes internal to Latin and confusion with similar biblical passages, can easily explain how and why these unique Vulgate readings arose.

In a number of verses, the Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina in the rendering of attested Greek readings: an example is the reading *Christus* (ὁ χριστός in GA 61, 629 and V; AM sp 3,67 Var; LEO Var; BED cath<sup>txt</sup> Var; BEA; PS-EUS-P; cf KA Tur?) against *spiritus* (τὸ πνεῦμα: text types K, T) at 5:6.<sup>86</sup> In the following cases the Vulgate and the Old Latin versions render the same Greek variants:<sup>87</sup>

2:16: + ἐστίν (in GA 254, 1523, 1524, 1844, 1852): *est* (K, T, V); + ἃ (in GA 442, 621, 1243, L596): *quae* (K, T, V)

2:18: καὶ νῦν (omission of καὶ in GA 398, K: SBV): *nunc autem* (K, T), *nunc* (V; 55; IR; HI ep; AU 1 Jo; QU; ORI ser 1/2; AU leg; GR-M; BEA El 2)

3:23: τῷ ὀνόματι (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι in GA 614, 2412) *nomini* (T), *in nomine* (V; 67<sup>2</sup>; LUC; PS-HIL-A; BEA; PS-ANAC)

---

<sup>86</sup> Other significant instances are attested at 2:27: μένει – μενέτω: *manet* (V; I R; PS-VIG Var) – *maneant* (C, T); 5:10: θεῷ – υἱῷ: *deo* (T) – *filio* (V; PRIM; BEA; PS-EVAR); 5:17: πρὸς θάνατον – οὐ πρὸς θάνατον: *ad mortem* (T) – *non ad mortem* (V; I 251; AU spe; HI {vel 5,16? GEL}).

<sup>87</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 64–5). The translation of the perfect ἀφείωνται with the present *remittuntur* (V; 65?; PRIS; AU 4/6) instead of the perfect is not taken into consideration since both the present and perfect tense may be employed to render the Greek perfect.

5:8: οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν (variant οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν in GA 1448, Cyr, S:H):<sup>88</sup> *isti tres in unum sunt* (K), *hi(i) tres unum sunt* (C), *tres unum sunt* (V; 91 94 95; PS-CY reb 15 Var; 19; AM my; sp > CAr Rm<sup>com</sup>; AU; LEO; PS-AU spe > AN te; FAC; HES; EP-SC; CLE-A; PS-AM tri; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED cath<sup>txt.com</sup>; BEA; PS-EUS-P, PS-HYG Var; *et ~ Ω<sup>W</sup> Λ<sup>H2</sup> Q<sup>2</sup> M<sup>2</sup> 54<sup>2</sup>*, Vat. lat. 10511<sup>2</sup>; BED cath<sup>txt</sup> Var; PS-EUS-P Var)

5:16: ἴδῃ (εἰδῆ in GA 5, 33, 181, 442\*, 614, 623, 630, 1175, 1359, 1735, 1751, 1836, 1874, 1875, 2541): *scit* (C, T, V)

5:18: ὁ γεννηθείς (ἡ γέννησις in GA 1127, 1505, 1852, 2138): *nativitas* (T), *generatio* (V; HI; Caelestius; CAn; PET-C; GR-M; AN cath; PS-EUS-P; PS-EVAR; KA Tur)

The addition of *est* and *quae* at 2:16 is attested in text types K, T and the Vulgate. The Vulgate and some Old Latin sources omit the translation of καί (*autem* in K, T) at 2:18. Both the Vulgate and Lucifer translate ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (*in nomine*) instead of τῷ ὀνόματι (*nomini*) at 3:23. At 5:16 both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina render εἰδῆ instead of ἴδῃ: *scit* is attested in all the Latin versions (except TE pud and PS-HIL-A<sup>com</sup>, which have *viderit* and *vidit*). A similar instance is present at 5:18 in which the Latin versions unanimously render the noun γέννησις and not the perfect participle. The omission of εἰς at 5:8 occurs in the Vulgate and in a number of Old Latin witnesses: the omission of εἰς following τρεῖς is probably a scribal mistake but the reading *tres unum sunt* acquires a different theological nuance from *tres in unum sunt*. The instances at 5:8, 16, 18, together with the word order *vidit umquam* at 4:12, in which the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina translate the same variants, might indicate the single origin of the Latin tradition or at least the use of the same Greek source.

---

<sup>88</sup> Thiele also adds the Bohairic and Sahidic tradition.

## 12. Conclusions

The Latin versions of 1 John are characterised by a plain, paratactic and often repetitive text, which matches the Greek original word for word. Nonetheless, each Old Latin text type and the Vulgate have their own distinctive features, which can be summarised as follows. All the loan-words of 1 John express Christian and religious concepts: those attested in the Vulgate (*scandalum, antichristus, diabolus, pseudopropheta*) are of common use and also present in the other Catholic Epistles. In four cases in which some of the Old Latin versions have the loan-words *paracletus, chrisma, agape* and *idolum*, the Vulgate features the Latin equivalent renderings *advocatus, unctio, caritas* and *simulacrum*. The use of the African term *agape* (3:17 K; 4:16 K) in 1 John with the meaning ‘love of God’ is not common outside the letter, in that *agape* usually refers to the banquets held by early Christians in which the members of the community dined together. The Greek compounds of 1 John are not numerous and rendered by calques (*unigenitum* at 4:9 V) or matching words (*homicida* at 3:15a, 3:15b K, T, V) and never by periphrasis. The verb ἀγνίζω is rendered by *sanctificare* in the Vulgate at 3:3 while the renderings *purificare* and *castificare* are employed in James and 1 Peter. The alpha privative compounds ἀδικία and ἀνομία are both translated with *iniquitas* in the Vulgate (1:9; 3:4a; 3:4b; 5:17), which does not distinguish between the different Greek roots. The compounds ἀπαγγέλλω / ἀναγγέλλω and the noun ἐπαγγελία are rendered in the Vulgate by *adnuntiare* (1:2, 3, 5) and *repromissio* (2:25), although the Latin preverbs do not match the Greek ones. The Vulgate renders ἐξέρχομαι once with *prodire* (2:19) and once with *exire* (4:1) and παρουσία with *adventus* (2:28) whereas the rendering of text type T, *praesentia*, is a better match for the Greek term. These instances demonstrate that the Vulgate is not always accurate in the rendering of Greek compounds.

Abstract words ending in *-io* are frequent in 1 John, such as the postclassical formations *admuntiatio* (1:5 T, V; 3:11 T, V), *exoratio* (2:2 T) and *propitiatio* (2:2 V; 4:10 V). Two *nomina agentis* in *-or*, *litator* (4:10 A) and *exorator* (2:2 TE), are peculiar: the former is a hapax in Augustine and the latter a comic word first attested in Terence and then in Christian writings with a different meaning. Tertullian's rendering *supplicamentum*, 'punishment', is attested only twice outside 1 John 4:18, in Apuleius and Arnobius, with the different meaning 'public prayer'. The rare verb *concernare*, used in a citation of 5:20 by Hilary, once in Tertullian and in medical texts, is later replaced by *incarnare* to indicate Christ's incarnation.

The Latin versions of 1 John do not present noteworthy cases of metaplasms. An ambiguous concordance, in which the noun *unctio* may be considered to be neuter according to Greek, can be noticed at 2:27 in text type T and the Vulgate. The reference of the neuter pronoun *hoc* to the masculine *spiritus* in the Vulgate at 4:3 is due to confusion with the gender of *πνεῦμα*, which is neuter in Greek. Several verbal constructions influenced by Greek are attested in the Latin versions of the letter: *suadere* plus the accusative instead of the dative in the Vulgate (3:19), the different constructions of *credere* (4:16; 5:20), *habere fiduciam* plus *ad / apud* and the accusative (3:21; 5:14) and *testificari* with *de* and the ablative in text type T and the Vulgate (5:9, 10). Among the Catholic Epistles, 1 John has the highest number of clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia* and *quoniam* plus the indicative following *verba dicendi et sentiendi*. The dependence of the Latin versions on the Greek *ὅτι* clauses in the rendering of the reported speech explains the frequency of this construction in the biblical translations, although the *quod* construction has proved to be originally a Latin phenomenon. On the other hand, according to Adams, the *quod* clauses are not sub-standard and absent from non-literary texts, in which the accusative and infinitive is employed instead. The accusative and infinitive construction is attested twice when the *ὅτι* clause is present in Greek, three times to match the Greek infinitive

and accusative and twice to translate Greek supplementary participles: in these cases, the accusative follows the higher verb, as noted by Adams in other non-literary texts. In the Vulgate text of 1 John the conjunction *quoniam* prevails over *quia* and *quod*, which is never employed in the letter despite its frequency in 2 Peter. The Vulgate also matches the Greek text in the number of nouns and pronouns although these instances are not distinctive of the Vulgate while the superlatives and comparatives are often used in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina with an emphatic function when the Greek text has positive adjectives.

The Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina in the rendering of Greek articles with demonstratives: this practice is never attested in the Vulgate version of 1 John. The same tendency was noticed in 1 Peter in contrast to James and 2 Peter. The Vulgate features some focused lexical renderings but these are not peculiar to this version. Variations in neighbouring words are rarely made by the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. The only reading introduced by the Vulgate independently of the Vetus Latina is the translation of φανερωθῆ with *apparuerit* instead of *venerit* (T) perhaps because of their dependence on a different *Vorlage*. On the other hand, the Vulgate features three unfocused renderings in comparison with the Vetus Latina: *infans* translating παιδίον, and *quasi*, which renders ὅτι twice. Participles are also freely rendered by the Vulgate with main verbs when this happens in the Vetus Latina: Greek supplementary participles are translated three times by the infinitive whereas the participles are kept in the similar instances in 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.

The statistical examination confirms the presence of differences between the Vulgate version of 1 John and the other Catholic letters. Nonetheless, the data of the lexical analysis of 1 John agree with those of 1 Peter: in both the letters the Vulgate agrees with T in 86% of the cases and is unique in 12% of the instances. The relationship with K is closer in 1 John (80%) than in 1 Peter (66%) although the gap between the percentages is not wide. The low number



of unique lexical renderings in 1 John (12%) differs from the results of James (25%) and 2 Peter (22%), in which the Vulgate is often independent of the Old Latin text types, while the similarities with T are lower in James (56%) and 2 Peter (73%) than in 1 John. The examination of the relationship between the text types and the Vulgate in the renderings of participles confirms these results. The participial renderings of the Vulgate are often unique in James, 1 Peter and 2 Peter (27%, 14%, 21%) in contrast with 1 John (4%). The relationship of the Vulgate with K and T is close in both 1 John (90% and 96%) and 1 Peter (90% and 83%) whereas in James and 2 Peter the Vulgate agrees with T in 33% and 64% of the cases respectively. The results of the study of the word order of 1 John do not match the data from the other letters: the Vulgate rarely differs from the Old Latin versions in 1 John (23%) while it is often unique in James, 1 Peter and 2 Peter (46%, 32%, 55%). The relationship between the Vulgate and text types K and T, which is close in 1 John (62% and 67%), is rather loose in 1 Peter (33% and 38%) and 2 Peter (35% of similarities with T). The revised analysis of von Harnack's study of the relationship between the Vulgate and the Greek text shows that there are no readings in the Vulgate that make it necessary to posit the existence of variant Greek readings now lost. Some instances in which the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* translate the same poorly-attested Greek text might demonstrate dependence on a common archetype.

It can be concluded in accordance with Thiele that the interventions introduced by the reviser of the Vulgate version of this letter are minimal and that 'der Schöpfer der Vulgata in der Wortwahl wenig Änderungen vorgenommen hat. Auch stilistische Korrekturen anderer Art haben, wenn sie überhaupt nachzuweisen sind, höchstens eine untergeordnete Bedeutung'.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Thiele (1969: 85). See also von Harnack (1916: 74): 'Mir ist es bis dahin wahrscheinlich, dass der Vulgata-Text der Johannesbriefe ganz wesentlich oder durchweg nichts anderes ist als

The close links with text types K and especially T demonstrate a unitary origin of the Latin versions: the Vulgate rarely innovates and differs from the preceding translations. The verbal constructions, concordances and metaplasms influenced by Greek are defining features of the Vulgate, in which they are more frequent than in the *Vetus Latina*, although the loan-words are more numerous in the latter than in the former. The Vulgate is not always accurate in rendering the Greek alpha privative compounds, in matching the Greek preverbs and sometimes free in the rendering of lexicon and participles. The consistent avoidance of the demonstratives corresponding to Greek articles seems to be the only distinctive feature of the Vulgate in opposition to the *Vetus Latina* and shared with the Vulgate version of 1 Peter. The similarities with 1 Peter in the principles of revision are highlighted by the statistical data which, on the other hand, emphasise the differences from the other Catholic Epistles. In the light of this, it is unlikely that the revision of the Catholic corpus was undertaken by a single reviser.

---

die konservativ und glücklich revidierte Ausgabe einer sehr alten, auf einen ganz vorzüglichen griechischen Text zurückgehenden lateinischen Übersetzung.’

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN

#### 1. Introduction

The earliest Latin source for 2 John is the Protocol of the Synod of Carthage of 1<sup>st</sup> September 256 (CY sent), grouped by Thiele under text type K: the Latin versions of the ‘Apostolic Fathers’, Tertullian and Novatian’s biblical text are not extant in this letter. Thiele reconstructs the following text types (although some are only present in a few verses):

K:

- *Sententiae Episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis* (CY sent) quotes verses 10–11.
- Firmilian of Caesarea ([CY] ep 75) and Optatus (OPT) cite verse 10.
- PS-AU spe (β).

C: three isolated readings and renderings identified by Thiele at 1, 5, 9.

A: the biblical text of Augustine when it is unique.

R: Lucifer of Cagliari (LUC) cites verses 4–11 in *De non conveniendo cum haereticis*. In Thiele’s edition the siglum R represents the readings and renderings unique to Lucifer.

S:

- The Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* (PS-AU spe) quotes verses 7, 10–11.
- Priscillian (PRIS) cites 7.

T:

- Direct tradition: VL 64 (only the title), 67.
- Indirect tradition: Jerome (HI), Augustine (AU), Cassiodorus (CAr), Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC).
- Readings in the manuscripts of the Vulgate CΣ D S.

The African text types K and C are poorly attested in 2 John: K is reconstructed only in verses 10–11 and C in three isolated readings (*mi* transmitted by Δ at 1; *praeceptum* in the biblical text of Augustine and KA A at 5 and the addition of *Christi* in DΔ; AU spe; KA Sp; BED cath<sup>txt</sup>; BEA at 9). Thiele states that the biblical text of Lucifer in 2 John is less revised than in 1 John and appears to be a precursor of text type T, with which it is often in agreement, but also has similarities with the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and the Vulgate.<sup>1</sup> The sources at the base of text type T are not as numerous as in the other Catholic Epistles: the only manuscript that preserves 2 John is VL 67 and citations by several writers that normally transmit this type, such as Vigilus of Thapsus, Fulgentius, Ferrandus, Verecundus, Facundus, Primasius, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Rufinus, Chromatius, are lacking. Text type S represents the biblical text of the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and Priscillian at verses 7 and 10–11, in which the siglum S is not indicated in the critical edition when the text of the *Speculum* agrees with text type T. The decision of Thiele to omit the reference to text types R and S in the schema when these agree with T blurs the boundaries between the text types and is confusing: therefore, the renderings of Lucifer and Pseudo-Augustine which are omitted in the Vetus Latina critical edition are supplied in this chapter and in the spreadsheet on which it is based in order to give

---

<sup>1</sup> Thiele (1969: 88–9).

a more complete framework and accurate statistical examination. According to Thiele, the Vulgate version of 2 John renders the Greek text more accurately than the *Vetus Latina*.<sup>2</sup> Jerome cites 2 John eight times but his biblical text agrees with the Vulgate only in the citation of verse 1 contained in *De viris illustribus*, in which the rendering of the Vulgate (*natis*) is present instead of *filiis* of text type T. However, in the other three citations of verse 1 attested in Jerome's Epistles 123, 146 and in *Commentariorum in Aggaeum prophetam* the renderings *filiis* and *filios* are employed. Pelagius, his followers and opponents do not quote the letter while Vincent of Lérins cites verses 10–11 in agreement with the Vulgate although the only distinctive reading of these verses is the word order *recipere eum* and Vincent agrees with text types K and T on *eius* against the Vulgate rendering *illius*.

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The Latin versions of 2 John feature three loan-words: *presbyter* (1 HI ep 146; PS-HI ep<sup>com</sup>; cf BED cath<sup>com</sup>); *antichristus* (7 S, V); *charta* (12 T, V). The use of *presbyter*, which appears for the first time in the *Vetus Latina* and Tertullian, is characteristic of the biblical text of Jerome considering that further instances of this loan-word are present in Jerome's biblical text at 1 Peter 5:1 and 3 John 1 whereas the other versions have the Latin translation *senior*. On the other hand, the loan-word is employed at James 5:14 in text type F and the Vulgate. *Antichristus* is attested three times in 1 John. The loan-word *charta* (χάρτης), referring to a leaf

---

<sup>2</sup> Thiele (1969: 89): 'Es gibt kaum eine Stelle, an der die Vulgata den für sie gültigen griechischen Text nicht wortgetreu wiedergibt.'

of papyrus, is common in classical and postclassical literature but is attested only in this verse of the New Testament.

#### b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

The Latin versions of 2 John do not present either renderings of compounds with periphrases, calques and ‘matching’ words or renderings of alpha privative compounds. The only case of an etymologising rendering in the Vulgate is the translation of ἐξῆλθον at 7 with *exierunt* (V; IR; COL-AV; BEA) instead of *prodierunt* (S).

### 3. Latin language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

*-tas*: *veritas* (1a T, V; 1b T, V; 2 T, V; 3 T, V; 4 T, V); *caritas* (3 T, V; 6 T, V)

*-or*: *seductor* (7a V, 7b V)

*-mentum*: *atramentum* (T, V)

The lexicon of the letter is not diverse and the number of abstract words is very limited. The only Christian formation is the *nomen agentis seductor*, ‘corruptor, deceiver’, derived from the verb *seducere*, which appears in Christian writers such as Augustine and Jerome and translates πλάνοϋς in the Vulgate text of Matthew 27:63 and 2 Corinthians 6:8. The other terms listed above are attested in classical Latin and none of them is rare.

## 4. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

2 John does not contain *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* clauses dependent on *verba dicendi et sentiendi*. In the following instance the verb *gaudere* governs a *quoniam* clause plus the indicative:

4: ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι εὑρηκα: *gavisus sum valde quoniam inveni* (T, V)

*Gaudere* is followed by *quod* from the classical period while *quia* and *quoniam* are less frequent. The *quod* construction was originally an adverbial accusative with causal meaning according to Hofmann and Szantyr while Coleman states that *quod* was initially a relative pronoun referring to an antecedent demonstrative and then used as a causal conjunction.<sup>3</sup> Other instances of the *quoniam* construction are attested at Luke 10:20 (VL 2 5 6 14; AU 1 Jo 2,13, q 79,3; CHRY cor 1,9; FIL 149,7; HI Is 2; PRIM 1), Jerome (Epistle 21,38,1) and in the Vulgate and Old Latin version of Matthew 5:12 (*gaudete et exultate quoniam*: VL 1 3 4 9 10 11 12 27 56; AM Jb, off; AN Ps sen; AU Jul, Ps. s, s dni, s Fra, spe; PS-AU spe; BAS; CHRO; CHRY; PS-CLE I.; EUTR; HIL; LUC; LUCU; M-M; MUT; PAU-N; PRIM; RES-R; RUF ap H, reg; RUS; SALO; TE sco; *gaudete et laetamini quoniam*: DIDa).

---

<sup>3</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 579), Coleman (1975: 120).

## a.2 Greek Constructions

The following construction matches the Greek text but probably does not derive from the corresponding Greek structure:<sup>4</sup>

12: πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν

*multa habens vobis scribere* (T)

*plura habens vobis scribere* (V)

The use of the verb *habere* plus the infinitive, which is at the base of the future and conditional forms in the Romance languages, is first attested in Cicero but becomes widespread in late Latin, particularly in Tertullian.<sup>5</sup> The construction is used to express possibility, ability, capacity in classical Latin and acquires new semantic functions in late Latin such as obligation, permission, generalised deontic possibility, necessity and futurity.<sup>6</sup> The confusion in late Latin between present and future indicative on one hand and future indicative and present subjunctive on the other fostered the use of *habere* plus infinitive as a future form.<sup>7</sup> In the instance at 12, *habere* works as an auxiliary and the construction is equivalent to the classical use of *habere* plus *verba dicendi* in the active voice and the object (*habere aliquid dicere*) to express

---

<sup>4</sup> Coleman (1971: 227–8).

<sup>5</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 314–5). See the table with the chronological distribution of the construction in Hertenberg (2009: 375).

<sup>6</sup> Hertenberg (2009: 382–9), Pinkster (1985: 198). Rönsch (1875: 449–50) notes that the use of have to plus infinitive expressing necessity in English derives from this construction.

<sup>7</sup> Coleman (1971: 221).



possibility, ability and capacity.<sup>8</sup> Pinkster hypothesises that *habere* plus infinitive originated from the similar construction of *habere* plus the gerundive expressing purpose and by analogy with the construction of *dare*, which could govern both the infinitive and the gerundive.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, Rönsch and Plater and White support the idea of the influence of the Greek construction ἔχω plus infinitive on the Latin *habere* plus infinitive.<sup>10</sup> Coleman objects that the Greek influence is unlikely considering that Cicero, who is the first writer to attest *habere* plus infinitive, does not customarily introduce Greek constructions.<sup>11</sup> Given the low number of instances of *habere* with infinitive in Christian writings characterised by a high register, such as Cyprian's tractates and Augustine's works preceding his conversion, Pinkster concludes that the construction must have been widespread in non-standard Latin.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, Adams notes that the construction is more frequent in learned writings than in 'vulgar' ones: *habere* plus infinitive has not to be considered a colloquial expression only because it survives in the Romance languages.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Hertenberg (2009: 376–8), Pinkster (1985: 198).

<sup>9</sup> Pinkster (1987: 208–9).

<sup>10</sup> Plater and White (1926: 38), Rönsch (1875: 447).

<sup>11</sup> Coleman (1971: 215).

<sup>12</sup> Pinkster (1987: 213–4), Coleman (1971: 227).

<sup>13</sup> Adams (2011: 277–80).

## 5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with the Greek Text

### a. Number

The rendering of the Vulgate at 8 matches the number of the Greek relative pronoun whereas the singular *quod*, the number of which does not correspond to the original text, does not translate any extant Greek variant reading:

8: ἃ: *quod* (T; CΛΔΘΩ<sup>D</sup> 59, *clm* 6230; LUC; IR; BEA), *quae* (V; PS-HIL-A)

### b. Comparatives and Superlatives

The only comparative of the epistle, πρεσβύτερος at 1, is rendered by the corresponding comparative *senior* in text type T and the Vulgate.

## 6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Rendering of Greek Articles

The demonstrative matches the Greek article in the following instance:

7: εἰς τὸν κόσμον: *in hunc mundum* (S; D; IR; PS-AU spe; cfKA A), *in mundum* (V; COL-AV; cfKA A Var; BEA), *saeculo* (LUC), *modo* (S)

The fixed formula *hic mundus* is attested in text type S while the Vulgate omits the demonstrative, as it occurs in 1 John. The demonstrative is unlikely to be a translation of the Greek article but probably arose in Latin as part of the formula.

### b. Verbal Constructions

At 10 the Vulgate varies the rendering of the expressions of prohibition:

μη λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μη λέγετε

*nolite eum admittere in domum vestram et have illi ne dixeritis* (K)

*nolite eum recipere in domum et have illi nolite dicere* (T)

*nolite recipere eum in domum nec have ei dixeritis* (V)

Text type T employs twice the classical construction with *nolite* and the infinitive to render the Greek negative imperative while K renders the second imperative with the subjunctive preceded by *ne*, which corresponds to μή. The Vulgate features *nolite* plus the infinitive and *nec* plus the subjunctive: the former construction is prevalent in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles. The latter construction, rarer and more colloquial than the former, is sometimes attested in the Vulgate Gospels in which it is used not only to match μή and the aorist subjunctive but also to render μή and the imperative.<sup>14</sup> Harrison's observation that the perfect subjunctive expresses future prohibitions in contrast with the present tense for present prohibitions is also applicable to this instance.<sup>15</sup>

## 7. Variations

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina mostly repeat neighbouring renderings with the exception of verse 9 in which the Vulgate introduces a variation:

### a. Absence of Variations

1–2: τὴν ἀλήθειαν ... τὴν ἀλήθειαν: *veritatem ... veritatem* (T, V)

---

<sup>14</sup> Harrison (1986: 258–60).

<sup>15</sup> Harrison (1986: 261).

4–6: ἐντολήν ... ἐντολήν ... τὰς ἐντολάς ... ἡ ἐντολή: *mandatum ... mandatum ... mandata ... mandatum* (T, V)

6: περιπατῶμεν ... περιπατήτε: *ambulemus* (T, V) ... *ambuletis* (R, V)

7: πλάνοι ... ὁ πλάνος: *fallaces ... fallaces* (S), *seductores ... seductor* (V)

9–10: ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ ... ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ ... τὴν διδαχὴν: *in doctrina ... in doctrina ... doctrinam* (T, V)

10–11: χαίρειν ... χαίρειν: *have ... have* (K, T, V)

#### b. Variations in the Vulgate

9: μένων ... ὁ μένων: *permanet ... permanet* (T), *manet ... manet* (R), *manet ... permanet* (V)

### 8. Participial Renderings

#### a. Articular Participles

The following table illustrates the renderings of the participles preceded by the article in 2 John:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE |
|------------|-----------------|
| K          | 1               |
| R          | 4               |
| S          | 2               |
| T          | 5               |
| V          | 6               |

Table 27. Rendering of articular participles in 2 John

The present (verses 2; 7; 9a; 9b; 11) and perfect (verse 1) participles are rendered by relative clauses in both the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina*.

## b. Participles

The participles not preceded by the article are rendered either by the present participle or by a finite verb:

| TEXT TYPES | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | FINITE VERB |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| R          | 0                  | 1           |
| T          | 2                  | 1           |
| S          | 0                  | 1           |
| V          | 3                  | 1           |

Table 28. Rendering of non-articular participles in 2 John

At 9 the present participle μένων is translated by a finite verb in text types T, R and the Vulgate because it is coordinated with an articular participle rendered by a relative clause. The present participles at 4 and 12 are rendered by the corresponding present participles in T and the Vulgate. The example below shows differing renderings of a present participle:

7: οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί

*qui non confitentur Iesum Christum venisse in carnem* (R)

*qui non confitentur Iesum Christum dominum nostrum in carne venisse* (S)

*qui non confitentur Iesum Christum venientem in carne* (V; KA C)

This verse of 2 John is almost identical to 1 John 4:2 (*qui confitetur Iesum Christum in carne venisse* K, T, V) in which, however, the Vulgate renders the participle with an infinitive clause.

The present participle *venientem* may be interpreted either as a supplementary participle dependent on *confitentur* or as an attributive participle referred to the accusative *Iesum Christum* governed by *confiteri*. Considering that there are no other instances of *confiteri*

governing the supplementary participle according to the TLL, the hypothesis that the participle has an attributive function seems to be more plausible.

## 9. Statistics

### a. Lexicon

The relationship between the Old Latin text types and the Vulgate is shown by the table below:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 8/11    | 73%        |
| C          | 0/1     | 0%         |
| A          | 1/1     | 100%       |
| R          | 52/68   | 76%        |
| S          | 18/22   | 82%        |
| T          | 83/92   | 90%        |
| V (unique) | 10/106  | 9%         |

Table 29. Lexical renderings in 2 John

The closest text type to the Vulgate is T with 90% of common renderings followed by S (82%), R (76%) and K (73%). The relationship between the Vulgate on one hand and A and C on the other is uncertain given that only one lexical rendering is reconstructed for each text type. The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* in a limited number of cases, precisely 9% of the total. These data correspond to the results for 1 John and support the hypothesis of the existence of a common archetype for the Latin versions.

### b. Participles

The agreement between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* on the rendering of participles is exemplified as follows:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 1/1     | 100%       |
| R          | 5/6     | 83%        |
| S          | 2/3     | 67%        |
| T          | 8/8     | 100%       |
| V (unique) | 1/10    | 10%        |

Table 30. Participial renderings in 2 John

The Vulgate agrees with text type T on all the eight participial renderings of the letter and has also a close relationship with R (83%). The Vulgate differs from the *Vetus Latina* only once, at 7. Although 2 John does not present numerous participial renderings, the table confirms the results of the lexicon.

### c. Word Order

The table demonstrates that the Vulgate follows the word order of the Greek text when the *Vetus Latina* differs:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| K          | 1/3     | 33%        | 1/3: 33%           | 2/3: 67%               |
| R          | 2/3     | 67%        | 2/3: 67%           | 1/3: 33%               |
| S          | 0/3     | 0%         | 0/3: 0%            | 3/3: 100%              |
| T          | 2/4     | 50%        | 2/4: 50%           | 2/4: 50%               |
| V (unique) | 2/6     | 33%        | 6/6: 100%          | 0/6: 0%                |

Table 31. Word order in 2 John

The Vulgate appears to be close to both text types R (67%) and T (50%) and always matches the Greek word order with only two instances in which it differs from the *Vetus Latina*. On the other hand, text type K and S tend to change the word order of the Greek text.

## 10. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text

In 2 John the Vulgate does not bear witness to variant readings not preserved in Greek manuscripts. Von Harnack highlights the inversion *Christo Iesu* at 3, which, however, renders the variant Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ attested in GA 326, 629V, 642, 808, 1127, 1837. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina often differ in the rendering of variant readings attested in Greek, for instance at 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12.

## 11. Conclusions

This chapter gathered information on the language of the Latin versions of 2 John, the first epistle of the Catholic corpus which only consists of a single modern chapter. Three loan-words are attested in the letter, *presbyter*, *antichristus* and *charta*: the former is exclusive to the biblical text of Jerome while the latter nouns are present in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. The Greek text does not feature compounds and alpha privative formations and the only etymologising rendering is the Vulgate verb *exierunt* at verse 7. The *nomen agentis seductor* is the only postclassical coinage attested in the Vulgate. The Greek verbal constructions are not numerous as well: the verb *gaudere* governs a *quoniam* clause in both the Vulgate and text type T. Although *gaudere* is followed by *quod* clauses from the classical period, the employment of the conjunction *quoniam* is much rarer and shows the influence of Greek. The employment of *habere* plus the infinitive expressing possibility in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina matches the Greek text but is not a borrowing from Greek: the construction, attested from the classical period, was probably widespread in non-standard Latin. The Vulgate and text type K attest at 10 the infrequent rendering of Greek expressions of prohibitions with *ne / nec* and subjunctive in order to vary the coordinated construction with *nolite* and the infinitive. The Vulgate text of 2 John rarely differs from the Vetus Latina with three exceptions: the focused translation of the



relative *ǎ* with *quae* instead of *quod* at 8, the rendering of the participle ἐρχόμενον at 7 with the corresponding present participle *venientem* instead of the infinitive of the Vetus Latina and the omission of the demonstrative in the formula *hic mundus* at 7. The Vulgate varies neighbouring words once, at 9, and usually repeats them in agreement with the Vetus Latina. The Vulgate version of 2 John is the most conservative with only 9% of renderings unique of the Vulgate against the Vetus Latina (12% in 1 Peter and 1 John). The closest text type to the Vulgate in the vocabulary is T (90% of similarities), as it occurs in 1 Peter and 1 John (86%), but the relationship with text types R and S is much closer in 2 John (76% and 82% respectively) than in 1 John (20% and 59%). In both the letters the Vulgate is often in agreement with text type K (80% in 1 John and 73% in 2 John). The analysis of the participles confirms the observations on the lexicon: text type T is the closest to the Vulgate (100% of common renderings in 2 John and 96% in 1 John) and the participial renderings of the Vulgate are rarely unique (4% in 1 John and 10% in 2 John). The Vulgate shows a tendency to match the Greek word order where the Vetus Latina changes it: the cases in which the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina differ in word order are not numerous enough to draw conclusions on the relationship between text types. The high number of similarities between the Old Latin text types and the Vulgate suggests that these versions derive from a common archetype.

Early attestations of the Vulgate in the biblical text of Pelagius and his circle are absent because of the lack of citations, while Jerome's quotations of verse 1 are inconsistent and only the citation in *De viris illustribus* has the Vulgate rendering *natis*. Von Harnack concludes that the reviser of 1 and 2 John is the same on the basis of the common rendering of τέκνον with *natus* (1 John 5:2; 2 John 1) instead of *filius*.<sup>16</sup> However, τέκνον is translated four times by *filius*

---

<sup>16</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 61).

at 1 John 3:1, 2, 10a, 10b and 2 John 13. Other features in common between 1 John and 2 John are the translation of ὅτι with *quoniam* and the omission of the demonstrative pronoun before *mundus*. On the other hand, the verb *confiteri* is followed by the infinitive in 1 John and the participle in 2 John. The statistical analysis of 2 John suggests that in both the epistles the Vulgate seldom differs from the Vetus Latina and is almost identical to text type T. However, the brevity of 2 John does not allow us to reach fixed conclusions about the origin of 1 and 2 John by comparing the two letters.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN

#### 1. Introduction

The ‘Apostolic Fathers’ and the early African sources, such as Tertullian, Cyprian and the Pseudo-Cyprianic writings, do not cite 3 John: the Latin versions of the Epistle are attested for the first time in fourth-century writers. Only two Old Latin text types are reconstructed by Thiele in 3 John:

T:

- VL 67 (verses 1–10).
- The Vulgate manuscripts CΣ X D.
- Indirect tradition: Jerome (HI), Augustine (AU), Cassiodorus (CAr), Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC).

D: VL 5: *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. Cambridge University Library, Nn. II. 41. Codex Bezae is a fifth-century bilingual manuscript probably copied in Berytus and containing the Gospels, 3 John 11–15 and Acts.<sup>1</sup> The supplementary pages to the Gospels, which were added in the ninth century, are affiliated to the Vulgate.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Houghton (2016: 28), Burton (2000: 22–3). For the history of the codex, its palaeographical and textual description see Parker (1992).

<sup>2</sup> Mizzi (1963), Fischer (1972: 40).

Text type T is formed on the basis of VL 67, Jerome's citations contained in the Commentary on Titus at verses 5–7, 9–10, Augustine's quotation of verse 1 in *Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio* (Rm in), Cassiodorus (1, 3–9, 11–15) and Epiphanius Scholasticus (11). According to Thiele, the biblical text of T in 3 John is characterised by more ancient readings (*dilectio, dilectus, dilectissimus, testimonium dare, optime, admonere*) than in the other letters.<sup>3</sup> The text of Codex Bezae, indicated by the siglum D, transmits 3 John 11–15 without the corresponding Greek folio. Thiele affirms that the text is a translation *ad hoc* of the Greek counterpart now lost with a few similarities with T and that the rendering *protinus* at 14 derives from the influence of the Vulgate.<sup>4</sup> However, the observation that text type D is close to the Vulgate does not support the hypothesis that the biblical text of Codex Bezae is a translation *ad hoc* from Greek which occupies a unique position among the Latin versions. The witnesses of text type S in 1 and 2 John, i.e. the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*, Priscillian and Bachiarus, are lacking in 3 John as are the citations of Lucifer of Cagliari. Therefore, the Vulgate can only be compared with text types T and D. The earliest attestations of the Vulgate in the indirect tradition cannot be identified with certainty: Jerome quotes verse 1 in *De viris illustribus*, which features the distinctive rendering of the Vulgate *carissimo* in opposition to *dilectissimo* of text type T. The same rendering is also present in the quotation of verse 5 in the Commentary on Titus, although the citations in this writing agree mainly with text type T, with the exception of the reading *facit* at 10 in agreement with the Vulgate. The citation of 9 by Pelagius is too general to be compared with the other Latin texts.

---

<sup>3</sup> Thiele (1969: 90).

<sup>4</sup> Thiele (1969: 90–1).

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The Latin versions attest three loan-words: *presbyter* (1 HI ep 146), *ecclesia* (6 T, V; 9 T, V; 10 T, V) and *calamus* (13 D, V). The loan-word *presbyter* instead of *senior* (T, V), placed at the beginning of the letter, is comparable with the same rendering in Jerome's Epistle 146 at 2 John 1. *Ecclesia* is a widespread loan-word used to refer to Christian congregations. *Calamus* enters the Latin language in the classical period and means 'reed-pen' at 13: this is the only instance in the Vulgate New Testament in which the loan-word is employed with this meaning but two further attestations of the term can be noticed:<sup>5</sup> at Mark 15:36 *calamus* refers to the reed at the top of which there was the sponge full of vinegar and at Revelation 11:1 *calamus* means 'measuring-rod'.<sup>6</sup> *Calamus* is a polysemic word in Augustine's *Sermo* 300,5,5 in which the loan-word is used twice in the same sentence with the different meanings reed-pen and reed.<sup>7</sup>

### b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

3 John features a number of Greek compounds in the rendering of which the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* often differ.

---

<sup>5</sup> Bergren (2019) identifies the loan-word at Mark 15:36 and omits the attestations at 3 John 1 and Revelation 11:1.

<sup>6</sup> The alternative rendering *harundo* is attested at Mark 15:36 in VL 1 6 8 17; AU Jo; PS-BED and Revelation 1:11 in VL 7; BEA; CAE; CAr; HI; PRIM; TY; VICn.

<sup>7</sup> Mohrmann (1961: 334).

## b.1 Periphrases

The following compounds are rendered by periphrases in Latin:

2a: εὐοδοῦσθαι: *bene agere* (T), *prosperare ingredi* (V; RD 1/2 Δ<sup>L</sup>; AIL; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

2b: εὐοδοῦται: *bene agit* (T), *prosperare agit* (V)

9: φιλοπρωτεύων: *qui primatus agere cupit* (T), *is qui amat primatum gerere* (V; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

The Vulgate varies the renderings of the verb εὐοδόω, ‘to prosper, be successful’: the translation *prosperare ingredi* expresses the idea of being on the way to success, which corresponds to the root of the Greek verb while the meaning of *prosperare agere* and *bene agere* is more generic. *Bene agere*, ‘to go well’, is often used with impersonal function. Further translations of εὐοδόω in the Vulgate New Testament are *prosperum iter habere* at Romans 1:10 and *beneplacere* at 1 Corinthians 16:2.<sup>8</sup> The verb φιλοπρωτεύω, ‘to strive to be first’, is translated differently in text type T and the Vulgate with *qui primatus agere cupit* and *is qui amat primatum gerere* respectively: both the periphrases match the meaning of the Greek compound but the word order and the correspondence between φίλος and the verb *amare* make the rendering of the Vulgate closer to the Greek verb than that of text type T. The plural *primatus* in text type T is attested only in late Latin.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Prosperum iter habere* is also the rendering of VL 65 75 76 77; AIL; AMst; AN Ps sen; CAr; GR-M; M-M; PEL; RUF; SED-S whereas *beneplacere* is present in VL 51 65 77 78; ANI; AU spe; CAr. *Placere* is attested in VL 75 76; AN Mt h; AU, *volere* in AMst and *commodum esse* in CHRY.

## b.2 Calques and ‘Matching’ Words

The following renderings match the components of the Greek words:

8: συνεργοί: *participes ut amatores* (T), *cooperatores* (V; GR-M; BED Esr)

11: ὁ ἀγαθοποιῶν: *qui benefacit* (V)

11: ὁ κακοποιῶν: *qui malefacit* (D, V)

At 8 text type T has the doublet *participes ut amatores* which does not reflect the structure and meaning of συνεργοί, ‘fellow-workers, collaborators’. The Vulgate rendering *cooperator*, a *nomen agentis* coined on the basis of the verb *cooperari*, is attested only in Christian writings from Tertullian onwards.<sup>9</sup> The Greek adjective is present several times in the Vulgate Pauline Epistles and is rendered as a rule by *adiutor* (Romans 16:3, 9, 21; 1 Corinthians 3:9; 2 Corinthians 1:24; 8:23; Philippians 4:3 D, I, V; Colossians 4:11 D, I, V; Philemon 1 D, V; 24 D, I, V), once by *minister* (1 Thessalonians 3:2 V) and once by *cooperator* (Philippians 2:25 V). The compounds *benefacere* and *malefacere* render the corresponding compounds ἀγαθοποιέω and κακοποιέω as also occurs in 1 Peter.<sup>10</sup>

## b.3 Etymologising Renderings

In the instances below text type T employs renderings that correspond to the Greek verbs:

---

<sup>9</sup> Further attestations of *cooperator* in the biblical translations are present at Romans 16:9 (77 78); 16:21 (77); 2 Corinthians 1:24 (64); 8:23 (88\*).

<sup>10</sup> See pp. 148–9.

6: προπέμψας: *si praemiseris* (T), *deducens* (V; FGILRDCΣ<sup>T2CA0X 54\*?</sup> ΛΔΘΦ<sup>T\*</sup>QMΩ<sup>D</sup>; AU spe)

7: ἐξῆλθαν: *exierunt* (T), *profecti sunt* (V; GR-M; BED Esr), *egressi sunt* (Ω<sup>0</sup>)

The verb προπέμψω means ‘to escort, conduct’:<sup>11</sup> the rendering of the Vulgate, *deducere*, corresponds to the meaning of the Greek verb while that of text type T, *praemittere*, ‘to send forward or before’, matches the structure but not the original sense. The rendering *exierunt* of text type T matches ἐξῆλθαν whereas the Vulgate features *exierunt* at 2 John 7 and *profecti sunt* at 3 John 7.

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

-io: *oratio* (2 V), *dilectio* (6 T)

-tas: *veritas* (1 T, V; 3a T, V; 3b T, V; 4 T, V; 8 T, V; 12 T, V), *caritas* (6 V)

-or: *cooperator* (8 V), *amator* (8 T)

-mentum: *atramentum* (13 D, V)

The Latin versions of 3 John do not attest a wide variety of abstract and derived nouns: *cooperator* and *dilectio* are the only Christian formations.

---

<sup>11</sup> Lampe (1961: 1162).



## 4. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

The Vulgate attests a *quoniam* clause with the indicative dependent on a verb of perception:

12: οἶδας ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθῆς ἐστίν: *scis testimonium nostrum verum est* (T), *nosti quoniam testimonium nostrum verum est* (V)

In text type T the conjunction is omitted and the subordinate clause is juxtaposed with the main verb *scis*: this phenomenon, characteristic of colloquial language, is not rare in the Vetus Latina, for instance at 2 Peter 3:3 (X) and 1 John 4:18 (T).<sup>12</sup> A *quod* clause is present in the instance below:

10: μὴ ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς ἀδελφούς: *non sufficit ei quod ipse non recipit fratres* (T), *quasi non ei ista sufficiant nec ipse suscipit fratres* (V)

The impersonal construction of the verb *sufficere* is attested from Quintilian and usually followed by accusative and infinitive.<sup>13</sup> In text type T *quod* introduces either a causal or explanatory clause which may refer to an omitted demonstrative pronoun *hoc*. The translator

---

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 224 and 280. Thiele identifies the omission of the conjunction in the Bohairic tradition (but this information is not present in the ECM).

<sup>13</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 358–9).

might have misread οὔτε as ὅτι. On the other hand, the Vulgate employs the personal construction of *sufficere*.

## a.2 Greek Constructions

In the following instances the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina feature Greek constructions:

3: μαρτυρούντων σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ

*testantium de veritate* (T)

*testimonium perhibentibus veritati tuae* (V; Σ<sup>A\*</sup>.3; PS-HIL-A)

The locution *testimonium perhibere* is normally followed by the dative of the person and the genitive of the object. In the Vulgate this expression governs the dative of the object according to Greek: the construction with the dative is first attested in Gellius (5,13,6; 12,5,3), in Christian writings, and in two biblical passages:<sup>14</sup>

John 5:33: μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ

*testimonium perhibuit veritati* (V; VL 2 4 5 6 8 7 9A 10 11 11A 13 14 15 28 29 30 33 35 47 48; HI; AU; PAU-N; PS-AU Fu; MAXn; DION-E; CU-D; JUL-T)

Hebrews 11:4: μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις ... τοῦ θεοῦ

*testimonio perhibente muneribus ... Deo* (I, V)

The passage in John is similar to that of 3 John: the construction is present in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. In Hebrews, on the other hand, the dative is not present in Greek.

---

<sup>14</sup> Further examples in TLL 10.1.1442.8–19.

In the following verse the comparative is followed by the genitive:

4: μειζοτέραν τούτων οὐκ ἔχω χαράν (χάριν variant):

*maius autem horum non habeo gaudium* (T)

*maiozem horum non habeo gratiam* (V)

The comparative is followed by the genitive according to Greek instead of the ablative in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina.<sup>15</sup>

The verbs in the Latin versions govern the same case as in Greek in the instance below:

10: ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα

*admonebo eius opera* (T)

*commoneam eius opera* (V; GR-M; PS-HIL-A)

First of all, it can be observed that the Vulgate has the analogical future form *commoneam* while text type T presents *admonebo*.<sup>16</sup> *Commonere* governs the accusative of what will be reproached: this construction is limited to a few instances in Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* 6,1,50), Codex Theodosianus (11,30,41), Martianus Capella (1,90 and 6,643) and the Vulgate version of 2 Timothy 2:14. The accusative might derive from Greek but also from the analogy with the construction of *admonere*, which governs the accusative from the classical period.

The verb *habere* is followed by the infinitive in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina, as attested at 2 John 12:<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Burton (2000: 177).

<sup>16</sup> Vineis (1974: 131–2).

<sup>17</sup> See pp. 324–5.

13: πολλὰ εἶχον γράψαι σοι:

*plura habui scribere tibi* (T)

*multa habui scribere tibi* (V)

## 5. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

### a. Comparatives and Superlatives

The Greek adjectives are rendered in the following ways in the Latin versions:

1: πρεσβύτερος: *senior* (T, V)

1–2: ἀγαπητῶ: *dilectissimo* (T), *carissimo* (V; HI; KA C; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

1–2: ἀγαπητέ: *dilectissime* (T), *carissime* (V)

5: ἀγαπητέ: *dilecte* (T), *carissime* (V; HI)

11: ἀγαπητέ: *carissime* (V)

4: μειζοτέραν: *maius* (T), *maiorem* (V)

6: καλῶς: *optime* (T), *bene* (V)

The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina differ in two cases: at 5 the rendering of text type T, *dilecte*, matches the Greek positive adjective ἀγαπητέ despite the widespread use of the superlatives at 1–2 (T, V) and 11 (V) while at 6 the adverb καλῶς is rendered by the corresponding positive adverb *bene* in the Vulgate and by the superlative *optime* in text type T.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> According to Thiele (1969: 90) the use of the superlative is an archaic feature of text type T.

## 6. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions

In the following instances the Vulgate employs renderings that match the Greek text:

10: ποιεῖ (ποιῆ variant): *fecit* (T), *facit* (V; HI; GR-M)

10: φλואρῶν ἡμᾶς: *detrahens de nobis* (T), *garriens in nos* (V; GR-M)

The present ποιεῖ is rendered by the corresponding *facit* in the Vulgate.<sup>19</sup> *Garrire*, ‘to chatter, prattle’, is a precise rendering of the verb φλואρέω, ‘to prate against’, while the correspondence with *detrahere*, ‘to take down’ and metaphorically ‘to slander’, is less evident. *Detrahere* plus *de* and the ablative is also attested at James 4:11 (S, V) and 1 Peter 2:12 (PS-CY sng).

### b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate

The Vulgate features a periphrastic rendering in the instance below:

2: εὐχομαι: *opto* (T), *orationem facio* (V; AIL; PS-HIL-A), *obsecro* (C)

The periphrasis *orationem facere* is a hapax within the Vulgate New Testament: εὐχομαι is rendered by either *orare* (2 Corinthians 13:7, 9; James 5:16) or *optare* (Romans 9:3; Acts 26:29; 27:29).

---

<sup>19</sup> Thiele indicates in the critical apparatus that the perfect *fecit* of text type T matches the Syriac version but this reference is lacking in the ECM.

## 7. Variations

The tendency to vary or repeat neighbouring words is illustrated by the examples (and counterexamples) below:

### a. Absence of Variations

3: τῆ ἀληθείᾳ ... ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: *veritate ... in veritate* (T), *veritati ... in veritate* (V)

3–4: περιπατεῖς ... περιπατοῦντα: *ambul<ave>ris ... ambulare* (T), *ambulas ... ambulantes* (V)

13: γράψαι ... γράφειν: *scribere ... scribere* (D, V)

### b. Variations in the Vulgate

1: τῷ ἀγαπητῷ ... ἀγαπῶ ... ἀγαπητέ: *dilectissimo ... diligo ... dilectissimo* (T), *carissimo ... diligo ... carissimo* (V)

2: εὐοδοῦσθαι ... εὐοδοῦται: *bene agere ... bene agit* (T), *prospere ingredi ... prospere agit* (V)

9–10: ἐπιδέχεται ... ἐπιδέχεται: *recipit ... recipit* (T), *recipit ... suscipit* (V)

12: μεμαρτύρηται: *testimonium perhibetur ... testimonium perhibemus* (D), *testimonium redditur ... testimonium perhibemus* (V)

The Vulgate varies neighbouring words four times against the Vetus Latina, which does not introduce any variations: the Vulgate version of 3 John eliminates lexical repetitions in contrast with what was observed in 2 John, in which the lexical renderings are often repeated. The Vulgate also varies the following constructions:

11: μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν

*noli imitari malum sed quod bonum est* (V)

14: ἐλπίζω δὲ (γὰρ variant) εὐθέως σε ἰδεῖν καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλήσομεν (λαλήσαι variant)  
*spero enim protinus te visurum et os ad os locuturum* (T)  
*spero autem protinus te videre et os ad os loquemur* (V)

At 11 the Vulgate renders differently the substantivised adjectives, once with a simple adjective and once with a relative clause. At 14 the verb *sperare* governs two coordinated future infinitives in text type T and a present infinitive and a future form in the Vulgate, the latter matching the Greek future. Both the present and future infinitives follow the verb *sperare* in the classical period: the present infinitive is used when the action has begun or the verb means ‘to be confident’.<sup>20</sup>

## 8. Participial Renderings

### a. Articular Participles

All the articular participles of 3 John are rendered by relative clauses, as shown below:

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE |
|------------|-----------------|
| T          | 2               |
| D          | 1               |
| V          | 3               |

Table 32. Rendering of articular participles in 3 John

The three Greek participles in the present tense are translated with the corresponding tense in Latin.

---

<sup>20</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 357–8).

## b. Participles

The participles not preceded by the article are rendered as follows:

| TEXT TYPES | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | FINITE VERB |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| T          | 2                  | 3           |
| V          | 4                  | 1           |

Table 33. Rendering of non-articular participles in 3 John

The Vulgate renders the Greek present participles with the corresponding forms at 4, 7 and 10.

The aorist participle προπέμψας at 6 is translated by the present *deducens* in the Vulgate and the conditional clause *si praemiseris* in text type T. At 4 the Vulgate attests the present participle following the verb *audire* instead of the infinitive:

4: ἵνα ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ περιπατοῦντα: *ut audiam filios meos in veritate ambulare* (T), *ut audiam filios meos in veritate ambulantes* (V; PS-HIL-A)

This instance can be compared with the similar case at 2 John 7: the present participle may be either dependent on the verb of perception or referred to the accusative *filios meos*.<sup>21</sup> The Vulgate version of 3 John also renders the genitive absolute with the ablative absolute:

3: ἐχάρην γὰρ λίαν ἐρχομένων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαρτυρούντων: *valde gavisus sum in adventu fratrum testantium* (T), *gavisus sum valde venientibus fratribus et testimonium perhibentibus* (V)

---

<sup>21</sup> See p. 329.



On the other hand, text type T employs *in* plus a noun and refers the participle *testantium* to the preceding genitive *fratrum*.

## 9. Statistics

### a. Lexicon

The following table shows the relationship between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as far as the lexicon is concerned:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| D          | 25/29   | 86%        |
| T          | 47/71   | 66%        |
| V (unique) | 26/97   | 27%        |

Table 34. Lexical renderings in 3 John

Text type D is the closest to the Vulgate with 86% of similarities while text type T agrees with the Vulgate in 66% of the cases. The percentage representing the relationship between the Vulgate and text type T is lower than in the other Johannine Epistles (86% in 1 John and 90% in 2 John). The number of unique renderings of the Vulgate (27%) is higher than in each of the Vulgate texts of James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John and 2 John.

### b. Participles

The table below illustrates the agreement between the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina on the rendering of participles:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| D          | 1/1     | 100%       |
| T          | 5/7     | 71%        |
| V (unique) | 2/8     | 25%        |

Table 35. Participial renderings in 3 John

The results show that the Vulgate stands on its own in 25% of the cases, more frequently than in 1 John (4%) and 2 John (10%). The relationship with text type T (71%) is not as close as in the other Johannine Epistles (96% in 1 John and 100% in 2 John). The only participle attested in the final verses of the letter, in which the text type D is preserved, is rendered in the same way by text type D and the Vulgate.

### c. Word Order

The word order of the Latin versions of 3 John matches the Greek text with three exceptions:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| D          | 1/1     | 100%       | 1/1: 100%          | 0/1: 0%                |
| T          | 0/3     | 0%         | 1/3: 50%           | 2/3: 67%               |
| V (unique) | 2/3     | 67%        | 2/3: 67%           | 1/3: 33%               |

Table 36. Word order in 3 John

In the three instances in which some of the Latin versions vary the Greek word order the Vulgate agrees once with D and never with T. The Vulgate matches the Greek text twice whereas text type T does not keep the Greek word order. Given the limited number of changes to the Greek word order in 3 John, the relationship between 3 John and the other Epistles cannot be securely reconstructed.

## 10. The Vulgate and the Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text

Von Harnack identifies a unique reading of the Vulgate not corresponding to any Greek texts: the omission of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  at 12.<sup>22</sup> However, the omission of  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is also attested in the Greek tradition in GA 61 and GA 629. In the Stuttgart Vulgate the Greek particle is rendered by *autem* (FL 251 YS $\Delta^{LB*}\Theta\Phi Z^*$ ), which is omitted in Wordsworth and White, on which von Harnack is dependent, because of its absence in part of the tradition of the Vulgate (IRAX $\Phi^{TZ2BGV}\Delta^{B2}\Omega^{DWC}$ ).

## 11. Conclusions

The Vulgate version of 3 John is characterised by unique lexical renderings, such as the rendering of  $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  with *orationem facere*, variations of neighbouring words and a higher number of differences with text type T than in 1 and 2 John. Three loan-words are attested: *presbyter*, *ecclesia* and *calamus*. Jerome is the only source that uses *presbyter* at 1 instead of *senior* (T, V): the loan-word, also attested in the citation of 2 John 1 in *De viris illustribus*, is a typical feature of Jerome. *Calamus* is a polysemic loan-word, which means ‘reed-pen’ in 3 John but also ‘reed’ and ‘measuring-rod’ in other New Testament passages. The Greek text of 3 John features a number of Greek compounds in the rendering of which the Vulgate shows renderings that partly correspond to the Greek roots:  $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\delta\omicron\omega$  is once translated by *prosperie ingredi* at 2 in opposition to the Old Latin rendering *bene agere* and  $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\pi\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega$  by the periphrasis *amare primatum gerere* at 9. The Christian formation *cooperator* is employed to render  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  at 8 (V) in contrast with the unfocused doublet of text type T, *particeps ut amator*. The attempt to find Latin words that match the meaning of Greek terms is evident in the Vulgate in the

---

<sup>22</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 63).

rendering of προπέμπω with *deducere* at 6 whereas text type T has *praemittere*, which corresponds formally but not semantically to the Greek verb, and in the translation of φλυαρέω at 10 with *garrere* instead of *detrahere* of text type T. From the point of view of the relationship with Greek in the grammatical constructions, the Vulgate shows the influence of Greek in the use of the dative of the object following *testimonium perhibere* at 3 and of the accusative dependent on *commonere* at 10. In both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina the genitive follows the comparative according to the Greek construction at 4. At 12 the reported speech dependent on a verb of perception is introduced by *quoniam* in the Vulgate while the paratactic construction is present in text type T. At 10 the verb *sufficere* is constructed impersonally in text type T with a *quod* clause and personally in the Vulgate. In the majority of the cases, the Vulgate renders the non-articular participles with present participles while text type T often employs finite verbs. The verb *audire* is followed at 4 in the Vulgate by the present participle according to Greek whereas text type T has the infinitive and the genitive absolute is rendered at 3 by the corresponding ablative absolute in the Vulgate against text type T. These observations lead to the conclusion that the syntactical constructions of the Vulgate reflect the influence of Greek more than the Vetus Latina. What especially distinguishes the Vulgate from the Vetus Latina is the tendency to vary the vocabulary and sometimes the grammatical constructions, a phenomenon not attested in 2 John. The statistical examination confirms the exceptional character of the Vulgate text of 3 John: the lexical renderings of the Vulgate are often unique (27%) and the Old Latin text type closest to the Vulgate is D with 86% of similarities. The high number of lexical renderings in common with D seems to refute Thiele's statement that D is a translation *ad hoc* without any link to the rest of the Latin tradition. However, the limited number of verses in which D is attested and the absence of a number of witnesses such as the citations of African and Spanish writers, do not permit us to draw

confident conclusions on the Old Latin archetype of 3 John. The relationship with text type T is not as close as in the other letters (66%) in which T and the Vulgate frequently agree (90% in 2 John, 86% in 1 Peter and 1 John, 73% in 2 Peter). The participial renderings and word order, despite the low number of instances in both the categories, confirm these results: the Vulgate is often independent and not very close to T, especially in word order. The fact that the Vulgate text of 3 John shows different principles of revision from that of 1 and 2 John is noticed in passing by von Harnack, who identifies the peculiarity of the Vulgate in the lexicon: ‘Dagegen spricht einiges gegen die Annahme, daß der Übersetzer des 3. Briefs mit dem der beiden ersten identisch ist; denn er hält die Wortfolge nicht so streng ein und übersetzt freier und voller’.<sup>23</sup> The qualitative and quantitative analyses of this chapter reinforce von Harnack’s hypothesis with new arguments: the presence of focused vocabulary that match the meaning of the Greek terms and the introduction of lexical variations suggest a different authorship of the Vulgate version of the Epistle. Unfortunately, the earliest attestations of the Vulgate text of 3 John cannot be traced: the only instance that might demonstrate the early use of the Vulgate in Jerome’s *De viris illustribus* is the rendering *carissimus* at verse 1, which, however, is widespread in Jerome’s works.

---

<sup>23</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 61).

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

#### 1. Introduction

The earliest references to Jude are the allusions of Tertullian at verses 14–15 in *De cultu feminarum* 1,3,3 (347) and at 25 in *Ad uxorem* 1,1,2 (16): in the former citation Tertullian names the witness of the apostle Jude in support of the acceptance of 1 Enoch (since Enoch is mentioned at Jude 14) but does not quote the biblical text whereas the latter citation might be a widespread liturgical formula.<sup>1</sup> The Epistle is not cited by Novatian or Cyprian but text type K is reconstructed at 14–15 according to the Pseudo-Cyprianic writing *Ad Novatianum* (PS-CY Nov). The biblical text in Pseudo-Cyprian differs from the other text types in the translation of Greek variants (the omission of *καί* and *κύριος*, the addition of *nuntiorum*, the translation of *περὶ πάντων* with *de omnibus* instead of the Vulgate *contra omnes*, the addition of *perdere omnes impios*) and features the readings *multis* instead of *sanctis* at 14 and *carnem* instead of *impios* at 15, which are not paralleled in any Greek manuscripts. The citation of verse 15 in *Ad Novatianum* agrees with the citation of Pseudo-Vigilius in *Contra Varimadum* on the addition of *perdere*, on the reading *carnem* and the lexical rendering *operibus*. The reconstruction of text type C is limited to the readings *dilectio* (PS-HIL ap) at 2 and the addition *et redditioni lamech confiderunt* (Σ<sup>T2O</sup>ΧΔ<sup>LB\*</sup>) at 11. The following text types are better attested:

---

<sup>1</sup> Thiele (1969: 92), Haupt (2019: 293), Frisius (2011: 15–6).

D:

- Lucifer of Cagliari (LUC) cites Jude in *De non conveniendo cum haereticis* in a textual form close to PS-AU spe at 1:6–7, 11–12 (partly).
- The Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* (PS-AU spe) cites 6–7 and 12.
- Isolated readings in Priscillian (PRIS) at 12–13.

R: the biblical text of Lucifer when it is unique at 1–5, 8, 12–13 (partly), 17–19.

S:

- VL 56:  $\tau^{56}$ : *Comes Silensis*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acquis. latin 2171. The manuscript, dated to the middle of the eleventh century, was copied in Silos in visigothic minuscule.<sup>2</sup>
- VL 70:  $\tau^{70}$ : *Comes Aemilianus*. Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Aemil. 22. It was copied in visigothic script in San Millán de la Cogolla in the year 1073.<sup>3</sup>
- Bachiarius cites 22–23 in *De reparatione lapsi* (BACH lap).

T:

- Augustine (AU), Fulgentius of Ruspe (FU), Facundus of Hermiane (FAC), Primasius (PRIM), Cassiodorus (CAr), Epiphanius Scholasticus (EP-SC), Clement of Alexandria (CLE-A), isolated readings in the citations of Pope Martin I (MART I).
- Readings in the manuscripts of the Vulgate CΣ D.

---

<sup>2</sup> Houghton (2016: 235), Thiele (1969: 40).

<sup>3</sup> Houghton (2016: 241), Thiele (1969: 40).

Text type D represents the agreement between the biblical text of Lucifer, the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and Priscillian at verses 6–7 and 12. The siglum D is chosen by Thiele to recall text type D of the Pauline Epistles, which groups together the citations of Lucifer and the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum*.<sup>4</sup> However, the naming of text type D is misleading considering that the same siglum represents the biblical text of Codex Bezae in 3 John. According to Thiele the similarity between Lucifer and Pseudo-Augustine is more evident in Jude than in 2 John in which the *Speculum* and the citations of Priscillian are grouped into text type S and separated from Lucifer's citations, indicated by the siglum R, which is also employed in Jude to refer to the biblical text of Lucifer when it is unique. The different grouping of these sources in 2 John and Jude is confusing and urges us to rethink how to express these relationships in a more effective and clearer way than with text types. Both the citations in the *Speculum* and Priscillian show similarities with text type T.<sup>5</sup> The Spanish text type S is reconstructed at verses 20–25 on the basis of the closely related lectionaries  $\tau^{56}$  and  $\tau^{70}$  and the citations of Bachiarus, which partly agree with other Italian sources belonging to text type T.<sup>6</sup> In Jude text type T is not transmitted by manuscripts but only by the indirect tradition. Augustine is representative of text type T in writings belonging to different periods of his production and his citations do not present unique readings and renderings which would be grouped under text type A. From a geographical point of view, text type T is attested in Africa (Fulgentius, Facundus, Primasius) and Italy (Cassiodorus and his translation of the *Adumbrationes* of Clement of Alexandria;

---

<sup>4</sup> Thiele (1969: 92).

<sup>5</sup> Thiele (1969: 93, 95). At 15 text type T is reconstructed on the basis of the citation of Priscillian.

<sup>6</sup> Thiele (1969: 93).



Eriphanius Scholasticus). The vocabulary of text type T is often inconsistent (ἀγάπη and ἀγαπητός are rendered by both *dilectio / dilectissimus* and *caritas / carissimus* and σῶζειν by *liberare* and *salvare*).<sup>7</sup> The biblical texts of Jerome, Ambrose at 6 and 9, and Ambrosiaster at 13 cannot be ascribed to any reconstructed text types because of their unique features.<sup>8</sup> The rendering of ἀστέρες πλανῆται with *stellae in errorem ducentes* by Ambrosiaster is unique and differs from the Vetus Latina (*procellae seducentes* in R; *sidera seductionis* in T) and the Vulgate (*sidera errantia*). Jerome's citations contain readings and renderings of the Vulgate in early writings: Thiele notices the influence of the Vulgate in the citations of verses 5–6 in the Commentary on Galatians of the year 386.<sup>9</sup> Nonetheless, the biblical text was brought into agreement with the Vulgate.<sup>10</sup> The similarity between the Vulgate and Epistle 46, written in the year 386, is more convincing:

5:

ὑπομνήσαι: *commonere* (HI: Ep 46,7, 3–4, Gal 1 344A= V)] *admonere* (R), *conmemorare* (T)

ἅπαξ πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς (θεός and κύριος variant readings): *semel omnia quoniam Iesus* (HI: Ep 46,7, 3–4, Gal 1 344A= V)] *omnia quoniam deus* (R), *omnia quoniam deus semel* (T)

σώσας: *salvans* (HI: Ep 46,7, 3–4, Gal 1 344A= V)] *salvum fecit* (R), *liberans* (T), *salvavit* (Jov 1,21 239A)

τὸ δεύτερον: *secundo* (HI: Ep 46,7, 3–4, Gal 1 344A= V)] *secundum* (R), *deinceps* (T)

---

<sup>7</sup> Thiele (1969: 95).

<sup>8</sup> Thiele (1969: 95).

<sup>9</sup> Thiele (1969: 96).

<sup>10</sup> Houghton (2014, 2017: 90).

6:

τε (δέ variant): *vero* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)] *quoque* (Gal 1 319D, Joan 15 367B= D), *autem* (T), *enim* (Ez h 4,1 361,16)

τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν: *suum principatum* (HI: Ep 46,7,4, Joan 15 367B= V)] *ordinem suum* (D), *dignitatem suam* (T), *principatum suum* (Gal 1 319D, Ez h 4,1 361,16)

τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον: *suum domicilium* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)] *habitaculum suum* (D), *suum habitaculum* (T), *proprium domicilium* (Gal 1 319D, Ez h 4,1 361,16, Joan 15 367B)

ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις: *diei vinculis aeternis* (HI: Ep 46,7,4, Gal 1 319D, Joan 15 367B= V)] *dei vinculis* (D, T), *diei vinculis sempiternis* (Ez h 4,1 361,16)

7:

ὥς: *sicut* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)] omission (D, T)

omission of *quoque* (T) / *autem* (D), *quae, harum* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)

ἐκπορνεύσασαι: *exfornicatae* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)] *cum adulterium fecissent* (D), *quae ... fornicatae sunt* (T)

ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας πρόκεινται: *abeuntes post carnem alteram factae sunt* (HI: Ep 46,7,4= V)] *carnem secutae essent cinis propositae sunt* (D)

Not only does Jerome agree with the Vulgate on peculiar lexical renderings (*commonere, salvare, principatum, domicilium, diei vinculis aeternis, exfornicatae, abeuntes post carnem alteram*) but also on the translation of the same Greek variant readings (*Jesus* at 5 and *aeternis* at 6) and on the participial renderings (the past participle *exfornicatae* instead of *cum* and subjunctive and the relative clause of the Old Latin versions; the present participle *abeuntes* instead of the coordinated *cum* and subjunctive of text type D). Some of the Vulgate renderings of 5–6 are also attested in the Commentary on Galatians and in *Contra Ioannem*

*Hierosolymitanum* of the year 397, such as *diei* instead of the erroneous *dei* of text types D and T at 6, although the rest of the verse differs. On the other hand, Jerome's citations of 2, 8–9, 13, 23 contained in other writings feature unique renderings and similarities with the *Vetus Latina*.

The citations of the followers and opponents of Pelagius attest Vulgate readings and renderings in fifth-century writings. Two out of four citations of verse 5 in Cassian's *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium* of the year 430 present the verb *salvare* in agreement with the Vulgate. Verse 6 in Cassian's *Conlationes Patrum* of the year 420–6 has the same lexicon as the Vulgate (*vero, principatum, domicilium*), the addition of *aeternis* and the reading *diei* instead of *dei*. The citation of 4 in the *Hypomnesticon* agrees with the Vulgate on the rendering of μετατιθέντες with the present participle *transferentes* while text type R employs a finite verb but the *Hypomnesticon* differs in word order and in the addition of *impii*. The quotation of verse 7 in the Pseudo-Pelagian Epistle 33 differs from the Vulgate and the citation of verse 10 in the Pseudo-Prosper *De vocatione* does not contain distinctive readings of the Vulgate that permit us to clarify its affiliation.

## 2. Greek Lexicon

### a. Loan-words

The following loan-words are attested in the Latin versions of Jude: *angelus* (6a D, T, V; 6b D) but *nuntius* at 14 (K); *blasphemare* (8 T, V; 10 T, V); *archangelus* (9 T, V); *diabolus* (9 T, V); *blasphemia* (9 T, V); *prophetare* (14 T, V); *apostolus* (17 R, T, V); *amen* (25 S, T, V). The Vulgate always agrees with the *Vetus Latina* on the introduction of foreign words and all the loan-words of Jude are of common use in Christian literature.

## b. Rendering of Greek Compounds

None of the compounds attested in Jude is rendered by periphrases or calques. The alpha privative compounds are variously rendered while the etymologising renderings are numerous and sometimes rare in their attestation.

### b.1 Alpha Privative Compounds

The compounds with alpha privative are rendered as follows:

4: ἀσεβεῖς: *impii* (R, T, V)

15: ἀσεβεῖς: *impios* (K, V)

15: ἀσεβείας (ἀσεβείων variant): *impiorum* (K), *impietatis* (V; PS-VIG Var > PS-ALE I.; EP-SC Var)

15: ἀσεβεῖς: *impii* (V)

18: ἀσεβειῶν: *impias* (R), *in impietatibus* (T), *impietatum* (V; PS-ANAC; PS-COR)

10: ἄλογα: *muta* (T, V)

12: ἀφόβως: *sine timore* (R, T, V)

12: ἄνυδροι: *sine aqua* (D, T, V)

12: ἄκαρπα: *sine fructu* (D), *infructuosae* (T, V)

24: ἀπταίστους: *sine delicto* (S), *sine offensione* (T), *sine peccato* (V; HI; cf CAR; PS-HIL-A; PS-ANAC)

24: ἀσπίλους: *inlibatos* (S)

24: ἀμόμους: *inmaculatos* (S, T, V)

The prefix *in-* corresponds to the alpha privative, such as in the renderings *impious*, *impietas*, *infructuosus*, *inlibatus*, *inmaculatus*. *Sine* plus a noun is employed in six instances (*sine timore*,

*sine aqua, sine fructu, sine delicto, sine offensione, sine peccato*) whereas the simple adjective *muta* translates ἄλογα at 10 in text type T and the Vulgate. Some of the alpha privative compounds presented above are rendered differently in the Vulgate version of other New Testament books: ἄλογος is translated by *irrationabilis* at 2 Peter 2:12 (V, X), *sine ratione* at Acts 25:27 (V; VL 50) and *mutus* at Jude 10 while ἄκαρπος by *sine fructu* at Matthew 13:22, Mark 4:19 (I, V), 1 Corinthians 14:14, 2 Peter 1:8 (S, T, V) and *infructuosus* at Ephesians 5:11 (X, D, I, V), Titus 3:14 (D, I, V), Jude 12 (T, V).<sup>11</sup> At 1 Peter 1:19 ἀμώμου and ἀσπίλου are rendered in text types S, T and the Vulgate by *incontaminati* and *inmaculati* while at Jude 24 the former is translated by *inmaculatus* in text types S, T, V and the latter by *inlibatus* in text type S.<sup>12</sup> The adjective ἄνυδρος is rendered by *sine aqua* at 2 Peter 2:17 (V) and Jude 12 but by *aridus* at Matthew 12:43 and *inaquosus* at Luke 11:24.<sup>13</sup>

## b.2 Etymologising Renderings

The following instances include examples (and counterexamples) of Latin renderings that match formally the Greek corresponding terms:

---

<sup>11</sup> See pp. 212–3. *Sine fructu* is also attested in the Vetus Latina at Matthew 13:22 (VL 2 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15 27 30; BED Ct, Sam; GR-M; HI Mt; M-M; SALV) and 1 Corinthians 14:14 (VL 51 54\* 58 61 64 76 77 78 88 89; AMst; PEL<sup>A</sup>).

<sup>12</sup> See p. 151.

<sup>13</sup> See p. 212. *Aridus* is present in the Vetus Latina at Matthew 12:43 (VL 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15 27 30; ABD; AN Mt; AU; CAE; CAn; PS-CY; EUS-E; FAU-R; GR-M; PS-GR-T; HI Mt, Za; PS-HI Ev; HIL; M-M; RUF Ex, Jdc, Lv 13,5, Rm 9,42; SED-S) and *inaquosus* at Luke 11:24 (VL 15 27 30; AM-A; ATH; BED; CAR; LIC; RES-R).

- 3: ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι: *perlaboretis* (R), *supercertari* (V; 54<sup>2</sup>?; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED Apc, cath<sup>txt</sup>), *concertari* (T)
- 4: προγεγραμμένοι: *praescripti* (R, T, V)
- 6: ἀπολιπόντας: *dereliquerunt* (D, T, V)
- 7: ἐκπορνεύσασαι: *cum adulterium fecissent* (D), *fornicatae sunt* (T), *exfornicatae* (V; HI)
- 7: ἀπελθοῦσαι: *secutae essent* (D), *abeuntes* (V; HI; cf AN cath; BED Gn)
- 7: πρόκεινται: *propositae sunt* (D), *factae sunt* (V)<sup>14</sup>
- 9: ἐπενεγκεῖν: *inferre* (T, V)
- 11: ἀντιλογία: *contradictionem* (R), *contradictione* (T, V)
- 12: ἐκριζωθέντα: *a radicibus evulsae* (D), *eradicatae* (T, V)
- 17: προειρημένων: *praedictorum* (R), *quae praedicta sunt* (T, V)
- 20: ἐποικοδομοῦντες: *aedificamini* (S), *superaedificantes* (T, V)
- 22: διακρινομένου: *diiudicatos* (T), *iudicatos* (V; PS-HIL-A; PS-ANAC; PS-COR)

At 3 *perlabi*, ‘to slip or glide through’, is mostly attested in poetry and does not match the meaning and structure of ἐπαγωνίζομαι, ‘to contend for’. On the other hand, *supercertari*, which is a hapax not attested elsewhere, was coined to correspond to the Greek verb. The rendering of text type T, *concertari*, might render the variant μεταγωνίζεσθαι present in GA 522. The rendering *exfornicatae* of the Vulgate matches the Greek ἐκπορνεύσασαι at 7. The verb is also attested in isolated instances at Hosea 2:5 (VL 176), Hosea 9:1 (VL 176), Exodus 34:5 (VL 100), Judges 2:17 (VL 100), Judges 8:33 (VL 100). At 20 text type T and the Vulgate employ the etymologising rendering *superaedificare*, which is also the rendering of the Vulgate

---

<sup>14</sup> See pp. 373–4.

at 1 Peter 2:5.<sup>15</sup> At 22 text type T has the rendering *diiudicatos* against the simple verb of the Vulgate. The verb *eradicare*, ‘to pluck up by the roots’, matching the Greek ἐκρίζω at 12, is attested in comedy (Plautus, *Aulularia* 299, *Bacchides* 1092, *Epidicus* 434, *Mercator* 775, *Persa* 819, *Rudens* 1346, *Truculentus* 660; Terence, *Andria* 761, *Hautontimorumenos* 589), once in Varro (*De re rustica* 1,27,2) and reappears as a revival in Christian literature from Tertullian onwards.<sup>16</sup> *Eradicare* corresponds to ἐκρίζω in three passages of the Vulgate Gospels: Matthew 13:29, 15:13 and Luke 17:6.<sup>17</sup>

### 3. Latin Language

#### a. Abstract and Derived Words

*-io*: *dilectio* (2 C; 12 T; 21 T, V), *dominatio* (8 R, T, V), *seductio* (11 R; 13 T), *contradictio* (11 R, T, V), *confusio* (13 T, V), *offensio* (24 T), *exultatio* (24 S, V)

---

<sup>15</sup> See p. 156.

<sup>16</sup> Pezzini (2016: 31–2).

<sup>17</sup> *Eradicare* is also attested in several Old Latin sources at Matthew 13:29 (VL 1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15 27 30; AM-A; AN Mt; AU; PS-AU Do; CHRO; FAC; HI; PS-HI bre; M-M; PET-C; RES-R; RUF; SED-S), Matthew 15:13 (VL 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 13 15 27 30 32; AM; AMst; AU; CAEL; CAr; CHRO; CHRY; COL-C; CY; DAM; FAUn; GR-M; HI; HIL; PS-IGN; LEO s 81,3; ORI; PROS; RES-R; RUF Ct; SED-S; TE; VER) and Luke 17:6 (VL 2 3 4 6 8 10 11 13 14 15 17 21 27 30; AGN; AM Lc; AU; BED; PS-BED; CAE; PS-HI; PS-MEL; QU).

-tas: *caritas* (2 R, T, V; 12 R), *societas* (3 R, T), *dignitas* (6 T), *civitas* (7 D, T, V), *maiestas* (8 T, V), *impietas* (15 V), *voluntas* (18 R), *claritas* (25 T), *potestas* (25 S, T, V)

-do: *sollicitudo* (3 R, T, V), *turpitude* (13 R)

-or: *dominator* (4 R, T, V), *peccator* (15 K, T, V), *murmurator* (16 V), *inrisor* (18 R), *delusor* (18 T), *inlusor* (18 V), *salvator* (25 S, T, V)

-entia: *potentia* (25 T), *magnificentia* (25 V)

Most of the derivational words listed above are recurrent throughout Latin but some of them appear to either undergo a process of semantic extension or are later formations. *Civitas*, meaning ‘city, town’ at 7 instead of ‘citizenship’, replaces *urbs*, which is only attested in the Vulgate at Acts 16:12, 39, and *oppidum*, never employed in the Vulgate New Testament.<sup>18</sup> *Contradictio*, ‘contradiction, controversy’, starts being used from the postclassical period, in Seneca, Tacitus and Quintilian. At 11 the term is employed in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina with the meaning ‘rebellion’, which is deprived of its reference to juridical and rhetorical disputes. *Contradictio* means ‘controversy’ in the Vulgate at Hebrews 7:7 and ‘hostility’ at Hebrews 12:3 while ἀντιλογία is rendered by *controversia* (D, J, V) at Hebrews 6:6. *Exultatio* is a postclassical formation employed to render ἀγαλλίασις, ‘great joy’, at Jude 25 (T, V) and uncommonly κἀγήσις, ‘boasting’, at James 4:16. The noun *seductio* means ‘leading aside’ in the attestation in Cicero (*Pro Murena* 24,49) and acquires the meaning ‘a misleading, seduction’ in Christian literature. The term δεσπότης is usually rendered by *dominus* in the

---

<sup>18</sup> Adams (2016: 259–60), Burton (2000: 158–9).



biblical versions.<sup>19</sup> Nonetheless, when δεσπότης is associated with κύριος, as it occurs at 4, the former is rendered by *dominator*.<sup>20</sup> The *nomen agentis* refers to pagan gods (Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2,4; Seneca, Epistle 107,11; Apuleius, *De deo Socratis* 3 p. 124 and often in poetry) and later to the Christian God. The *nomen agentis murmurator*, ‘murmurer’, is a Christian coinage rendering the Greek term γογγυστής. The noun is mainly attested in Augustine (*Enarrationes in Psalmos* 105,18; 132,12,12; *Sermones* 311, 312, 313; 51,20,30; *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 26,11; *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* 2,7,12 p. 57,17; *Retractationes* 2,20,2; *Sermones collectionis a Morin confectae* p. 107,3; p. 407,13). The term ἐμπαίκτης, ‘mockers, deceiver’, is translated by three different *nomina agentis* in the Latin versions: *inrisor* (R), *delusor* (T) and *inlusor* (V; PS-AU Fu; KA C, cf Sp; PS-ANAC; PS-ANIC; PS-COR). The rendering of text type T, *delusor*, is attested twice, in a passage of Cassiodorus related to Jude 18 (*Complexiones in epistula Iudae* 4) and in Jerome (*Tractatus in psalmos* I p. 4,8) in which *delusor* translates a Hebrew term referring to plague victims. The rendering of the Vulgate, *inlusor*, is also a Christian formation present from Tertullian onwards and rendering ἐμπαίκτης at 2 Peter 3:3 in text type X and the Vulgate. On the other hand, *inrisor*, has two attestations in the classical period (Cicero, *Paradoxa Stoicorum* 13; Propertius 1,9,1). The noun *habitaculum*, ‘dwelling-place’, is a postclassical formation first attested in Gellius (5,14,21) with reference to a lion’s den. The term is frequent in Christian literature and used twice in the Vulgate, at Ephesians 2:22 (I, V) and at Acts 12:7 (V; VL 50; A-SS Wand; ABD; ARA; PS-HI; RES-R; STE-A), in which it refers to Peter’s prison cell. The Latin versions of Jude also attest rare lexicon: at 16 the adjective *querellosus* (also spelled *querulosus*), ‘full of complaints,

---

<sup>19</sup> For instance at 1 Peter 2:18 and 2 Peter 2:1.

<sup>20</sup> See TLL 5.1.1884.1–21.

querulous', is a derivational form with a few attestations (Porphyrius, *Commentum in Horatium* 3,21,2; Cassiodorus, *Variae* 7,14,2; 9,14,1; Augustine, *Sermo* 302,2; Pelagius I, *Vitae patrum* 5,10,54; Ferreolus, *Regola monastica* 7).

#### 4. Morphology

The verb *odi* is defective in that only the forms based on the perfect stem are used with present meaning in classical Latin. Nonetheless, analogical forms based on the present stem were coined in order to complete the paradigm of the verb and were in circulation in late Latin: the present participle *odientes* translating  $\mu\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  is attested at Jude 23 in text types S, T and the Vulgate.<sup>21</sup> At 9 the auxiliary in the perfect tense is employed in text type T (*fuit ausus*) to form the analytic passive perfect instead of the present auxiliary attested in the Vulgate (*est ausus*).<sup>22</sup> The employment of the *fu-* auxiliaries begins with Plautus and continues in classical Latin alongside the *es-* auxiliaries. Different hypotheses have been made to explain the surge in these double perfect forms in which the anteriority is marked by both the perfect participle and the perfect copula: the origin of the perfect auxiliaries might have been influenced by the interpretation of certain past participles as adjectives although this is not the case at Jude 9.<sup>23</sup> The *fu-* auxiliaries could have been introduced as a mark of the past when the perfect passive forms with the *es-* auxiliaries were analysed as present verbs and replaced by the synthetic

---

<sup>21</sup> Plater and White (1926: 66), Vineis (1971: 113–5). The present participle is also attested in the Vulgate at Romans 12:9 and Titus 3:3 and the future forms *odiet* and *odient* at Luke 16:3 and Revelation 17:16.

<sup>22</sup> The Vulgate features *ausus fuit* at Matthew 22:46.

<sup>23</sup> Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 322).

forms.<sup>24</sup> In addition, it is noteworthy that in Plautus the *fu-* auxiliaries occur with deponents in the majority of cases attested: the perfect copula accompanied the participles of the deponents which at an early stage, when the present participles were recent formations, expressed both simultaneous and anterior actions: the *fu-* auxiliaries with deponents originally marked their anteriority and were later extended to passive forms.<sup>25</sup> Burton demonstrates that it is not possible to identify a category of verbs, a typical syntax of the clause, pattern or register in which the *fu-* auxiliaries normally occur.<sup>26</sup> On one hand, the *fu-* auxiliaries are often employed in the biblical versions in the pluperfect indicative, future perfect, perfect and pluperfect subjunctive but, on the other, the perfect indicative is rare.<sup>27</sup> A peculiarity of the *fu-* auxiliary, which can be also observed at Jude 9, is its anteposition in contrast with the *es-* auxiliary, which usually follows the participle.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Burton (2016: 164–5).

<sup>25</sup> De Melo (2012), Pinkster (2015: 473–8). However, this hypothesis is refuted by Danckaert (2016: 142–5).

<sup>26</sup> Burton (2016: 165–71).

<sup>27</sup> Danckaert (2016: 147). Burton (2016: 177): ‘In the use of those speakers educated enough to write, *amatus fuit* remains on the borders of acceptability’.

<sup>28</sup> Danckaert (2016: 153).

## 5. Syntax

### a. Graecisms

#### a.1 Reported Speech

Two ὅτι clauses are attested in Jude: the former governed by a verb of perception and the latter by a verb of saying:

5: εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα ὅτι Ἰησοῦς (θεός variant) ... ἀπόλεσεν

*scientes omnia quoniam deus ... perdidit* (R, T)

*scientes semel omnia quoniam Iesus ... perdidit* (V)

18: ἔλεγον ὑμῖν (ὅτι variant) ... ἔσονται (ἐλεύσονται variant)

*dicebant ... erunt* (R)

*dicebant vobis quoniam ... venient* (V; PS-ANAC; PS-ANIC; PS-COR)

The ὅτι clause at 5 expands the preceding πάντα while at 18 ὅτι is omitted in part of the Greek tradition: *dicebant* governs a *quoniam* clause in the Vulgate whereas in text type R the clause with the predicate *erunt* is juxtaposed and not subordinated to that with the verb *dicebant*.

#### a.2 Greek Constructions

The following constructions according to Greek are attested in Jude:

3: ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν

*necesse habui scribere vobis* (V; cf GEL)

*Habere* with the infinitive is also employed in the Latin versions of 2 and 3 John.<sup>29</sup> Two different constructions of *deprecari* are attested in the instances below:

3: παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι

*deprecor ut perlabetis* (R)

*deprecans supercertari* (V; 54<sup>2?</sup>; AN cath; PS-HIL-A; BED Apc, cath<sup>txt</sup>)

*Deprecari* governs *ut*, *ne* and the subjunctive in most of the attestations of the verb. The infinitive alone is employed from the postclassical period (Lucan 9,213; Statius, *Thebais* 8,116), in Christian writers (Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 5,11 p. 610; Lucifer, *De non parcendo in deum delinquentibus* 22 p. 256,19; Rufinus, *Origenis homiliae in exodum* 4,9; Cassiodorus, *Institutiones divinarum litterarum* 8 p. 1121<sup>C</sup>; Ennodius, *Opuscula miscella* 8,3 p. 415,4; Gregory of Tours, *Passio martyrum VII dormientium apud Ephesum* 7) and once in the Codex Theodosianus 15,14,4. A further biblical instance is attested at Hebrews 13:19 in text types I, J and the Vulgate (*deprecor vos hoc facere*).

The Vulgate matches the Greek text at 20:

20: ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει

*sanctissima fide aedificamini* (S)

*superaedificantes vosmetipsos sanctissima vestra fide* (T)

*superaedificantes vosmetipsos sanctissimae vestrae fidei* (V; PS-ANAC; PS-ANIC; PS-COR)

The preposition *super* in the verb *superaedificantes* governs the ablative in text type T, as it is expected, whereas the dative derived from the Greek construction is attested in the Vulgate. In the other instances of the Vulgate in which *superaedificare* is present, the verb is either used in

---

<sup>29</sup> See pp. 324–5, 343–4.

an absolute way (1 Corinthians 3:10, 14; 1 Peter 2:5) or followed by the preposition *supra* and *super* with the accusative (1 Corinthians 3:12; Ephesians 2:20) and *in* plus the ablative (Colossians 2:7), depending on the corresponding Greek constructions.

## 6. Renderings of the Vulgate and Their Relationship with Greek

### a. Comparatives and Superlatives

The following superlatives are attested in Jude:

3: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (R, V), *dilectissimi* (T)

17: ἀγαπητοί (ἀδελφοί variant): *carissimi* (T, V), *fratres* (R)

20: ἀγαπητοί: *carissimi* (S, T, V)

20: ἀγιωτάτη: *sanctissima* (S, T), *sanctissimae* (V)

The positive adjective ἀγαπητός is rendered by the usual superlatives *dilectissimus* and *carissimus* in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina. The superlative ἀγιωτάτη is rendered by the respective Latin forms.

## 7. Cases in Which the Vulgate Differs from the Vetus Latina

### a. Focused Lexical Renderings and Constructions

The vocabulary of the Vulgate matches the meaning of the Greek terms in the following instances:

12: ἀγάπαις: *caritatibus* (R), *dilectionibus* (T), *epulis* (V; 91 94 95; AU<sup>com</sup> 1/2; EP-SC)

12: συνευωχούμενοι: *copulantur* (T; AU; EP-SC), *convivantes* (V)

13: ἀστέρες πλανῆται: *procellae seducentes* (R), *sidera seductionis* (T), *stellae in errorem ducentes* (cf AMst), *sidera erroris* (EP-SC<sup>com</sup>; MART I.), *sidera fallacia* (PRIS), *sidera errantia* (V; HI; CLE-A; KA Sp; AN cath; PS-HIL-A)

25: μεγαλωσύνη: *gloria* (S), *claritas* (T), *magnificentia* (V; PS-HIL-A; PS-ANAC)

At 12 the Vulgate employs two focused renderings: *epulis* and *convivantes*. The translation *epulae*, ‘banquet’, points to the concept of the early Christian ἀγάπαι while *caritates* (R) and *dilectiones* (T) appear to be the Latin terms equivalent to ἀγάπαι but obscure from a semantic point of view.<sup>30</sup> The rendering of the Vulgate at 2 Peter 2:13, *convivia*, is different from that of Jude but equally suitable for ἀγάπαι. The Vulgate differs from text type T in its rendering of συνευωχέομαι, ‘to feast sumptuously with’. The rendering of the Vulgate, *convivari*, ‘to feast or banquet with’, has an explicit convivial connotation supported by the preceding *epulis*. On the other hand, the form *copulari*, ‘to join’, which is attested twice in Augustine’s citation in *De fide et operibus* (op 46 91,24), may be a scribal mistake for *coepulari*, which is also attested in two quotations (op 46 91,19 and 26) contained in the same writing and referring to 2 Peter 2:13. Nonetheless, *copulari* might be the translation of the Greek variant reading συνερχόμενοι attested in GA 1875C and derived from συνέρχομαι, ‘to come together’, often with reference to sexual intercourse. Petraglio corrects the rare calque *coepulari* attested at 2 Peter 2:13 with *copulari* under the influence of Jude 12.<sup>31</sup> Conversely, Thiele considers *copulari* to be a scribal mistake for *coepulari* and a proof that Augustine did not improve his text of Jude.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> See the discussion of ἀγάπη at pp. 265–6.

<sup>31</sup> See pp. 215–6.

<sup>32</sup> Thiele (1969: 94).

The adjective *πλανήτης*, ‘wandering’, is accurately rendered by *errantia* in the Vulgate, Jerome and Clement of Alexandria. The Vetus Latina gives a different interpretation: the stars are defined as ‘seductive, tempting’ (*seducetes, seductionis* in text types R, T) in that they lead into error (*in errorem ducentes* in AMst, *erroris* in EP-SC<sup>com</sup>; MART I.) and are deceiving (*fallacia* in PRIS). This meaning derives from the verb *πλανάω*, ‘to lead astray’, but is not elsewhere attested as meaning of the derived adjective *πλανήτης* of Jude 13. At 25 the Vulgate employs the matching word *magnificentia* to render *μεγαλωσύνη*, ‘greatness, majesty’, while the Old Latin renderings *gloria* and *claritas* are less focused and usually correspond to the Greek *δόξα*. On the other hand, at Hebrews 1:3 and 8:1 *μεγαλωσύνη* is rendered by *maiestas* (1:3 J, A, V) and *magnitudo* (1:3 D; 8:1 D, J, V).

The Vetus Latina sometimes presents mistakes in the translation and concordance which are absent from the Vulgate. Text type T does not accurately translate verse 7:

7: ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι  
*Sodoma autem et Gomorra et quae circa eas erant civitates his simili modo cum adulterium fecissent* (D)

*Sodoma quoque et Gomorra et finitimae civitates quae simili harum modo fornicatae sunt* (T; CΣX 262 54\*)

*sicut Sodoma et Gomorra et finitimae civitates simili modo exfornicatae* (V; HI)

Text type T refers the demonstrative *harum* only to the antecedent *civitates* while in Greek the masculine *τούτοις* refers to Sodom and Gomorrah, and not to the neighbouring towns which are the subject of the following participle *ἐκπορνεύσασαι*. The masculine *his* is present in text type D whereas the Vulgate omits the translation in agreement with some Greek manuscripts (GA 88, 181, 629\*V, 915, 1836, 1845, 1875).



A mistake in the concordance of the sentence is attested at 23 in text type S:

23: μισοῦντες καὶ (καὶ omitted in GA 1881 and versional evidence) τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα

*odientes quae est a carne maculata tunica* (S; τ)

*odientes eam quae carnalis est maculatam tunicam* (T)

*odientes et eam quae carnalis est maculatam tunicam* (V)

The verb *odi* governs the accusative, which is employed in text type T and the Vulgate. On the other hand, text type S features a *nominativus pendens* which does not refer to any predicate and is not influenced by the Greek text.

#### b. Unfocused Lexical Renderings and Constructions in the Vulgate

In the cases below the renderings of the Vulgate are not straightforward:

2: πληθυνθείη: *multiplicetur* (R), *adimpleatur* (T, V)

7: πρόκεινται δεῖγμα: *propositae sunt exemplum* (D), *factae sunt exemplum* (V; HI; BED Gn; cf PS-HI bre)

13: ζόφος: *tempus* (R), *caligo* (T), *procella* (V; cf ALD)

At 2 the rendering *adimplere*, ‘to fulfill’, does not correspond precisely to πληθύνω, ‘to multiply’: this rendering is also employed by the Vulgate at 2 Peter 1:2 while *multiplicare* is attested at 1 Peter 1:2.<sup>33</sup> The verb προκεῖμαι, ‘to be placed before the eyes’, is rendered by the generic expression *factae sunt* at 7 in the Vulgate, Jerome and Pseudo-Jerome while the

---

<sup>33</sup> See pp. 182 and 236.

rendering of text type T, *propositae sunt*, matches the meaning and structure of the Greek verb. At 13 ζόφος, ‘nether darkness’, is translated by the free renderings *procella*, ‘storm’, in the Vulgate and *tempus* is text type R whereas the rendering of text type T, *caligo*, ‘fog, darkness’, corresponds to the meaning of the Greek noun.

The following rendering of the Vulgate poses an interpretative problem:

15: περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας (ἀσεβειῶν, ἀσεβῶν variant readings) αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν  
*de omnibus factis impiorum quae fecerunt impie* (K)

*de omnibus operibus impietatis eorum quibus impie egerunt* (V; EP-SC Var)

*Quibus* refers to *operibus* in the Vulgate: the accusative *quae* would be expected, as it occurs in text type K, but the ablative is present instead, perhaps to link the relative pronoun to the antecedent *operibus*, which is in the ablative case. It is unclear how *quibus* should be interpreted: the meaning of the sentence may be ‘of all their works of ungodliness through which they have behaved in an ungodly way’. If the pronoun had been in the accusative with the meaning ‘of all their works of ungodliness which they have done in an ungodly way’, the rendering of the sentence would have been more straightforward.

## 8. Variations

The following list shows the presence or absence of variations in the renderings of neighbouring words with a focus on both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina.

### a. Absence of Variations

7–8: σαρκός ... σάρκα: *carnem ... carnem* (D, T)

8–10: βλασφημοῦσιν ... βλασφημίας ... βλασφημοῦσιν: *blasphemant ... blasphemiae ... blasphemant* (T, V)

16–18: τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι ... τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι: *desideria sua ambulantes ... sua desideria ambulantes* (V)

19–20: πνεῦμα ... ἐν πνεύματι: *spiritum ... in spiritu* (T, V)

24–25: τῆς δόξης ... δόξα: *honorem ... honor* (S), *gloriae ... honor* (T), *gloriae ... gloria* (V)<sup>34</sup>

#### b. Variations in the Vulgate

20–21: ἑαυτούς ... ἑαυτοῦς: *vosmetipsos ... vosmetipsos* (T), *vosmetipsos ... ipsos vos* (V)

#### c. Variations in the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina

6: τηρήσαντας ... τετήρηκεν: *servaverunt ... servavit* (D), *servaverunt ... reservavit* (T, V)<sup>35</sup>

The Greek text of Jude does not feature many repeated words in neighbouring verses. The Vulgate varies the lexical renderings twice, at 20–21 and at 6, in the latter case in agreement with text type T. In the majority of the instances the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina retain the same renderings even when they occur in neighbouring passages.

## 9. Participial Renderings

### a. Articular Participles

The participles preceded by the articles are rendered as follows:

---

<sup>34</sup> Variation in text type T.

<sup>35</sup> Absence of variation in text type D.

| TEXT TYPES | RELATIVE CLAUSE | PRESENT PARTICIPLE | PERFECT PARTICIPLE |
|------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| T          | 7               | 0                  | 1                  |
| S          | 1               | 0                  | 0                  |
| R          | 2               | 0                  | 4                  |
| D          | 1               | 0                  | 0                  |
| V          | 6               | 1                  | 2                  |

Table 37. Rendering of articular participles in Jude

The most common rendering of articular participles in the Vulgate and text type T, S, D is the relative clause while text type R features a higher number of perfect participles. The perfect participles are employed to render Greek participles in the passive voice (aorist passive participle at 3 R, V and perfect middle-passive participles at 1 R, T, V; 4 R; 17 R). A case of contamination between the perfect participle and the relative clause is attested below:

1: τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις

*his qui in deo patre dilectis* (R, V; cf KA C; PS-HIL-A)

*in domino patre dilectis* (T)

In text type R and the Vulgate the relative pronoun *qui* is not followed by the expected finite verb which is needed to complete the relative clause but by a perfect participle. This hybrid construction is also attested in the Gospels and occurs when the relative pronoun is separated from the participle by a few words.<sup>36</sup> The contamination between the two different constructions probably derives from a word-for-word translation of the Greek text.

---

<sup>36</sup> Eklund (1970: 144–53).

## b. Participles

The wide variety of renderings of participles in Jude is illustrated by the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | PRESENT PART. | PERFECT PART. | RELATIVE CLAUSE | FINITE VERB | <i>CUM</i> + SUBJUNCTIVE | GERUNDIVE |
|------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| T          | 14            | 5             | 2               | 1           | 0                        | 0         |
| S          | 1             | 0             | 0               | 2           | 0                        | 0         |
| R          | 7             | 1             | 1               | 2           | 0                        | 0         |
| D          | 1             | 2             | 0               | 1           | 2                        | 1         |
| V          | 17            | 6             | 1               | 1           | 0                        | 0         |

Table 38. Rendering of non-articular participles in Jude

The present participle is the most frequent rendering in text types T, R and the Vulgate and matches the corresponding Greek present participles (3a R, T, V; 3b V; 4a T, V; 4b R, T, V; 7 D, T, V; 9 T, V; 12 R, T, V; 13 R, T, V; 14 T, V; 18 R, V; 19 R, T, V; 20 T, V; 23a T, V; 23b S, T, V), perfect (5 R, T, V) and aorist active participles (5 T, V; 7 V). The Latin perfect participles render the aorist passive (7 V; 12b D, T, V), aorist active (12a D, T, V), middle-passive perfect participles (1 R, T, V; 23 S, T, V) and the present participle of a deponent (22 T, V). The attributive participles at 4 (R), 7 (T) and 12 (T, V) are rendered by relative clauses. The gerundive employed by text type D at 12 is functionally equivalent to a perfect participle and the two instances of *cum* and subjunctive at 7 render the aorist active participles. A finite verb is used to render the aorist participle at 6 (D, T, V) which is coordinated to a preceding

articular participle rendered by the relative clause. Further cases of rendering of participles with finite verbs are attested at 3 (R), 5 (R), 20 (S), 23 (S).<sup>37</sup>

## 10. Statistics

### a. Lexicon

The following table illustrates the relationship of agreement between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* as far as lexicon is concerned:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| K          | 13/18   | 72%        |
| C          | 0/2     | 0%         |
| D          | 25/36   | 69%        |
| R          | 63/93   | 68%        |
| S          | 20/31   | 64%        |
| T          | 161/194 | 83%        |
| V (unique) | 29/213  | 14%        |

Table 39. Lexical renderings in Jude

The table shows the close relationship between the Vulgate and text type T (83% of common renderings), also observed in 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John in which the agreement is superior to 80%. The percentage of agreement with text type K is also high (72%) and the similarities with text types D, R and S are numerous (69%, 68%, 64%). The Vulgate has unique renderings in 14% of the cases, a percentage in line with the data of 1 Peter and 1 John.

---

<sup>37</sup> However, the variant παρακαλῶ at 3 is attested in Greek manuscripts (GA 915, 1243, 1827) and the variant ἀπάσατε at 23 in P72.

## b. Participles

The agreement between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* on the rendering of participles is shown by the following table:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|---------|------------|
| D          | 5/8     | 63%        |
| R          | 10/17   | 59%        |
| S          | 3/5     | 60%        |
| T          | 27/30   | 90%        |
| V (unique) | 4/34    | 12%        |

Table 40. Participial renderings in Jude

The data confirm the results of the analysis of the lexicon: the text type closest to the Vulgate is T (90%), followed by D, S, R (63%, 60%, 59%). The unique renderings of the Vulgate amount to 12% of the cases, a result corresponding to that in the lexicon.

## c. Word Order

The variations in word order are represented by the table below:

| TEXT TYPES | VULGATE | PERCENTAGE | LITERAL WITH GREEK | NOT LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| D          | 1/4     | 25%        | 1/4: 25%           | 3/4: 75%               |
| R          | 0/2     | 0%         | 0/2: 0%            | 2/2: 100%              |
| T          | 2/4     | 50%        | 2/4: 50%           | 2/4: 50%               |
| V (unique) | 3/6     | 50%        | 6/6: 100%          | 0/6: 0%                |

Table 41. Word order in Jude

The low number of changes to the Greek word order attested in the Latin versions of Jude do not permit us to draw certain conclusions. The Vulgate follows the order of the Greek text in all the instances gathered from the Epistle while text types D and R, although scarcely attested,

often introduce changes. Text type T agrees with the Vulgate twice when the Old Latin text type keeps the word order of the Greek text.

## 11. The Vulgate and Vetus Latina as Sources for the Greek Text

The Latin versions of Jude transmit readings not attested in the Greek tradition:

3a: ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι (ἐπαγωνίζεσθε in P72, GA 02, 93, 378, 915): *ut perlaboretis* (R), *supercertari* (V), *concertari* (T)

3b: πίστει: *societati* (R), *fidei* (V)

6: ἡμέρας: *dei* (D, T; FRCΣX 262 54\* Δ<sup>B</sup>Λ<sup>L2</sup>Ω<sup>OW</sup>; LUC; HI ep Var, Joan Var; PS-AU spe; CLE-A; BED cath 3 mss, h Var), *diei* (V; LUC Var; RUF; HI Gal, ep; CAn; CLE-A Var?; BED h)

8: ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι (omission in GA 629\*): *somniantes* (D, T), omission in V

14: ἁγίαις: *multis* (K; PS-CY Nov), *sanctis* (T, V)

15a: τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς: *carnem* (K), *impios* (V)

15b: κατ' αὐτοῦ (κατὰ θεοῦ in GA 1881): *de deo* (K), *contra eum* (T, V)

15c: ψυχήν (ἀσεβεῖς in GA 442, 621, L596): *impii* (V; EP-SC Var), omission in K and T

18: χρόνου (χρόνων variant): *diebus* (R), *temporibus* (T), *tempore* (V)

20: ἁγίῳ: *dei* (D; τ), *sancto* (T, V)

At 3 the biblical text of Lucifer has *perlaboretis* (rendering the variant ἐπαγωνίζεσθε) and *societati* while the Vulgate translates ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι and πίστει with *supercertari* and *fidei*. At 6 the reading *dei* (D, T) instead of the Vulgate *diei*, which renders ἡμέρας, derives from a probable confusion between the two similar Latin words. The omission of ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι at 8 is attested only in the Vulgate and GA 629\* while text types D and T have the rendering *somniantes*. The reading *multis* in text type K at 14 is not present in any Greek manuscript,



which all have either *ἀγίαις* or *ἀγίων*, the former rendered by the Vulgate and text type T with *sanctis*. At 15 the reading of K, *carnem*, is not attested in Greek and none of the Latin versions translate *ψυχήν*, the reading printed as the Initial Text in the ECM: the Vulgate has *impios*, which renders the variant *ἀσεβεῖς*. Text type K has the reading *de deo* at 15 instead of *contra eum* (κατ' αὐτοῦ) of text type T and the Vulgate. It is probable that *de deo* is a scribal mistake for *de eo*, as Thiele indicates in the apparatus, but the variant *κατὰ θεοῦ* is attested in GA 1881. At 18 text type R has the variant *diebus*, unattested in Greek and perhaps influenced by 2 Peter 3:3, while text type T *temporibus* and the Vulgate *tempore* translating *χρόνων* and *χρόνου* respectively. Text type S features *dei* at 20 instead of *sancto* (T, V) rendering *ἀγίῳ*.

## 12. Conclusions

This chapter described the linguistic features of the Latin versions of Jude in order to identify their character and relationship between these texts. All the loan-words of the Epistle (*angelus, blasphemare, archangelus, diabolus, blasphemia, prophetare, apostolus, amen*) are well-known in Christian literature and equally attested in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina. A number of alpha privative compounds and etymologising renderings are present: the words in the former category are rendered by adjectives introduced by the prefix *in-*, *sine* plus nouns and once by the adjective *muta*, which does not match the corresponding Greek term, while the latter forms are either matching words attested before in Latin or calques. The new formations matching the structure of the Greek counterparts are the hapax *supercertari* (3 V) rendering *ἐπαγωνίζομαι*, the rare verb *exfornicari* (7 V) translating *ἐκπορνεύω* and the biblical calque *superaedificare* (20 T, V) corresponding to *ἐποικοδομέω*. *Supercertari* and *exfornicari* are calques unique to the Vulgate while the renderings of the Vetus Latina do not match formally the Greek verbs. The Epistle features numerous abstract and derived nouns: some are

postclassical formations, such as *exultatio* and *habitaculum*, others are words attested in classical Latin but subject to semantic extensions in the Christian era, for instance *contradictio*, *seductio*, *dominator*, and nouns first attested in Christian literature, such as *murmurator*, *inlusor* and *delusor*, the latter with only two attestations. Further peculiarities of the lexicon of Jude are the rare derivational adjective *querellosus* at 16 and the verb *eradicare* at 12, which, following a few attestations in comedy and Varro, reappears as a revival in Christian literature.

Two verbal forms stand out for their morphological relevance: the present participle *odientes* at 23 (S, T, V), which is formed on the basis of the present stem unlike the classical forms of the verb *odi* modelled on the perfect stem but with present meaning, and the analytic perfect passive *fuit ausus* at 9 (T), in which the anteriority is marked twice, by the auxiliary and the perfect participle. The present stem forms of *odi* are postclassical phenomena whereas the occurrences of the perfect auxiliary start with Plautus and increase in classical and late Latin, although the perfect indicative forms remain unproductive.

The Greek text influences the syntax of the clause: two instances of reported speech introduced by *quoniam* are present at 5 and 18. The Vulgate attests three verbal constructions modelled on Greek: the use of the infinitive following *habere* and *deprecari*, both at 3, and the dative governed by *superaedificare* instead of the ablative of text types S and T at 20. The Vulgate also differs from the Vetus Latina in four lexical renderings (*convivantes* and *epulis* at 12, *sidera errantia* at 13, *magnificentia* at 25) which match the meaning of the Greek words better than the Old Latin renderings. On the other hand, the Vulgate has the unfocused rendering of  $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$  with *adimplere* at 2, perhaps under the influence of text type T, instead of *multiplicare*, the free renderings *factae sunt* to translate  $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  at 7 and *procella* to render  $\zeta\acute{o}\phi\omicron\varsigma$  at 13 as well as an ambiguous translation of verse 15. The concordance of the constituents of the sentence is problematic at 7 in text type T and at 23 in text type S while the translations

of the Vulgate are fluent and correct. The Vulgate introduces two variations in the rendering of neighbouring words and translates the frequent positive adjective ἀγαπητός with superlatives, as it often occurs in the biblical versions. The most common renderings of Greek articular participles are the relative clause and the perfect participle, which corresponds to the Greek participles in the middle-passive voice. Text type R and the Vulgate employ at 1 the hybrid construction *his qui ... dilectis* which combines a relative pronoun and a perfect participle in order to render a Greek articular participle. The participles not preceded by the article are variously rendered: the present participle translates not only the corresponding Greek form but also perfect and aorist active participles while the perfect participles render the Greek verbs in the same voice. The relative clause, gerundive, *cum* and subjunctive and finite verb are less attested renderings.

The statistical examination identifies a close relationship between the Vulgate and text type T in the lexicon (83%), comparable with that in 1 Peter (86%), 1 John (86%) and 2 John (90%). The percentages representing the proportion of unique renderings of the Vulgate are also similar in Jude (14%), 1 Peter (12%) and 1 John (14%). The closeness between the Vulgate and text type K is illustrated by the high number of common lexical renderings (72%), which seems to support the unitary origin of the Latin versions, a hypothesis corroborated by the proximity of the Vulgate to text types D (69%), R (68%) and S (64%). Von Harnack points to the biblical text of the type used by Lucifer as the source of the Vulgate, although the latter does not appear to be a consistent revision.<sup>38</sup> Nonetheless, the percentages listed above show

---

<sup>38</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 99): ‘Nicht wenigens spricht dafür, daß es [the text of Lucifer] sich um eine Übersetzung handelt und daß der Text der Vulgata die Verbesserung dieses Textes ist, der

that text type T is the closest to the Vulgate. The data of the participial renderings are in agreement with those of the lexicon: the Vulgate renders the participles in the same way as text type T in 90% of the cases and is unique in 12% of the instances whereas the relationship with D (63%), S (60%) and R (59%) is fairly close. These results are in line with those of 1 Peter and 2 John. The analysis of the word order shows that the Vulgate always matches the Greek text when the Vetus Latina changes the order of the constituents. However, the number of the instances gathered from Jude is too limited to draw safe conclusions on the relationship between text types.

The similarity of certain passages in the Greek text of 2 Peter and Jude provides the opportunity to compare the lexical renderings of the Vulgate in these letters. The following table shows the lexical variations between the epistles:

| GREEK                          | 2 PETER   | JUDE   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| ἀκάρπους – ἄκαρπα              | 1:8: <i>sine fructu</i>                         | 12: <i>infructuosae</i>                        |
| δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι            | 2:1: <i>dominum negant</i>                      | 4: <i>dominatorem ... negantes</i>             |
| ζόφου – ὑπὸ ζόφον              | 2:4: <i>inferni</i>                             | 6: <i>sub caligine</i>                         |
| δόξας                          | 2:10: <i>sectas</i>                             | 8: <i>maiestates</i>                           |
| ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα φθείρεσθαι     | 2:12: <i>velut inrationabilia pecora perire</i> | 10: <i>tamquam muta animalia corrumpi</i>      |
| ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις συνευωχούμενοι | 2:13: <i>in conviviis luxuriantes</i>           | 12: <i>in epulis convivantes</i>               |
| ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται  | 2:17: <i>caligo tenebrarum reservatur</i>       | 13: <i>procella tenebrarum ... servata est</i> |
| ἄνδρῳ                          | 2:17: <i>sine aqua</i>                          | 12: <i>sine aqua</i>                           |
| ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας   | 3:3: <i>inlusores iuxta concupiscentias</i>     | 18: <i>inlusores secundum desideria</i>        |

Table 42. Comparison between 2 Peter and Jude

---

Lucifer zu Gebote stand ... Endlich ist auch die Vulgata, ob sie schon an vielen Stellen besser ist als der Text des Lucifer, doch keineswegs durchweg eine Verbesserung.'

Despite the differences, the Vulgate versions of 2 Peter and Jude agree on the rendering of ἐμπαῖκται with *inlusores* (2 Peter 3:3; Jude 18) and ἄνυδροι with *sine aqua* (2 Peter 2:17; Jude 12). However, in the majority of the cases the lexicon of the Vulgate varies substantially. Thiele states that the divergences are due to the dependence of the Vulgate on different Old Latin sources in each letter but this hypothesis is weakened by the observation that the Vulgate differs from the Vetus Latina in some of the cases listed above (2 Peter 2:1; 2 Peter 2:4; 2 Peter 2:10; 2 Peter 2:12; 2 Peter 2:13 – Jude 12; Jude 13; 2 Peter 3:3 – Jude 18) and is not therefore dependent on the preceding versions.<sup>39</sup> In addition, the text type that is the closest to the Vulgate is T with 73% and 83% of similarities respectively in the letters: the dependence of the Vulgate on different Old Latin models is unlikely. The lexical divergences demonstrate that either the reviser of the Vulgate was not consistent in the choice of the vocabulary and not concerned about levelling or the reviser of 2 Peter and Jude was not the same person.

---

<sup>39</sup> Thiele (1969: 96): ‘In beiden Briefen ist die Revision, die der Schöpfer der Vulgata vornimmt, offenkundig, aber das Prinzip der Angleichung an das Griechische führt bei den gegebenen altlateinischen Texten zu durchaus unterschiedlichen Ergebnissen.’

## CHAPTER NINE

### CONCLUSIONS

The primary goal of the research has been to present a complete study of the language of the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles by situating their linguistic phenomena in the history of Latin, comparing them with the Greek text and identifying the relationship between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina*. In addition, it has been demonstrated that it is possible to draw philological conclusions from a linguistic study and that the knowledge of the language is the essential prerequisite for philological investigations. The application of a double methodology, consisting of complementary qualitative and quantitative analyses, aims to present the data from different perspectives, substantiate the claims and overcome the drawbacks of either approach in isolation. The qualitative method alone would have been too descriptive and the quantitative one too abstract and approximate. These approaches have been combined in order to give a complete overview of the texts under analysis: the description of the language gives the opportunity to look directly at the texts, to get a sense of their language and to compare them with the preceding and contemporary literary production, while the statistical examination expresses numerically the relationship between the Vulgate Epistles and the *Vetus Latina*. This study has been possible thanks to electronic and online resources which were not available in the past: the Excel spreadsheets have been helpful for tabulating a huge amount of data and calculating the numerical relationships between the text types. Databases such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL) Online, *Library of Latin Texts* and *Database of Latin Dictionaries* made possible the checking of the attestations, frequency, usages and meanings of the words under analysis in the click of a mouse. The *Accordance* software gives

the possibility of swiftly comparing biblical passages, critical editions and modern translations of the Bible as well as consulting commentaries and lexica. The *Vetus Latina* Database and the databases of biblical citations, such as *Bibindex* and the *ITSEE* citations database, are essential tools for the study of the direct and indirect tradition of the *Vetus Latina*. Ongoing technological advances will certainly provide us with further electronic tools which will permit us to reach more precise and comprehensive results than those achieved so far.

The consistency of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles is affirmed by Thiele who maintains that in James: ‘werden die gleichen Revisionsprinzipien wie in den übrigen Katholischen Briefen deutlich, so daß für alle sieben Briefe der gleiche Schöpfer der *Vulgata* anzunehmen ist.’<sup>1</sup> The linguistic analysis and the earliest attestations of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in the indirect tradition reveal a more complex and multifaceted scenario. Although the earliest citations of some of the Catholic Epistles in the *Vetus Latina* versions date back to the end of the second century, the Catholic Epistles are quoted according to the Vulgate only from the end of the fourth century. The Vulgate text of the Catholic Epistles begins to be cited at different times: James is quoted in Pseudo-Jerome Epistle 41 of the year 384, which is contemporary with Jerome’s Vulgate Gospels, and Jude is cited in Jerome’s Epistle 46 of the year 386. Both these attestations precede those of the other epistles, which are cited by Jerome in writings during the last decade of the fourth century. However, Jerome is not responsible for the Vulgate revision: his citations are mixed and feature numerous unique readings inserted in an Old Latin substratum and a minority of readings distinctive of the Vulgate (35% overall).<sup>2</sup> Most of the Church Fathers who quote the Catholic Epistles are not consistent in following a precise type

---

<sup>1</sup> Thiele (1969: 66).

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 11–14.

of text. Augustine represents a typical example: he knows the Vulgate version of James, which is cited in writings covering a wide timespan, but cites the other epistles in textual forms related to the Old Latin African and European texts, corresponding to text types C and T, and according to a version unique to him.<sup>3</sup> The fact that Augustine cites only James according to the Vulgate reinforces the hypothesis that the different Epistles had a separate origin: had the whole corpus been available to him in the Vulgate version, we would expect Augustine to have quoted this form of the other letters too.<sup>4</sup> It is also possible that the version of James known as the Vulgate was included in the Vulgate corpus because of its association with Augustine, who knew this form of text.

The testimony of the followers and opponents of Pelagius, who have traditionally been associated with the appearance of this version of the biblical text in the first half of the fifth century, is later than the attestations of Jerome, with the exception of Pseudo-Jerome Epistle 41 attributed to Pelagius.<sup>5</sup> The biblical text of the Pelagian circle and adversaries is partly related to the Vulgate and partly to the *Vetus Latina* or unique: the affiliation of the citations changes according to the writers, the writings and the epistles cited. The anti-Pelagian writings are closer to the Vulgate than those of the followers of Pelagius: the anonymous *Hypomnesticon*

---

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 14–16.

<sup>4</sup> Augustine expresses admiration for Jerome's revision of the Gospels in Epistle 71,6: *Proinde non parvas deo gratias agimus de opere tuo, quod evangelium ex Graeco interpretatus es, quia et paene in omnibus nulla offensio est, cum scripturam Graecam contulerimus ... et si quaedam rarissima merito movent, quis tam durus est, qui labori tam utili non facile ignoscat, cui vicem laudis referre non sufficit?*

<sup>5</sup> Gryson (2007: 551).



*contra Pelagianos*, composed in the early fifth century, consistently attests Vulgate readings, sometimes alternating with those of the *Vetus Latina*, in all the citations from the Catholic Epistles contained in this work.<sup>6</sup> The cross contamination between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* in the direct and indirect tradition is a widespread phenomenon lasting through the centuries. At an early stage the Vulgate Catholic Epistles circulated either as a separate corpus, as was common practice in antiquity, or as groups of letters, perhaps together with other New Testament books.<sup>7</sup> In the fifth century the revised Catholic Epistles were combined for editorial purposes with Jerome's Old Testament and Gospels and the revised versions of the Pauline Epistles, Acts and Revelation to form an authoritative corpus attributed to Jerome and copied in pandects, as VL 7 attests.<sup>8</sup> The Catholic Epistles were introduced by the pseudepigraphic prologue *Non ita ordo est*, composed in the mid-fifth century to legitimise the authorship of Jerome. The attribution of the entire corpus to Jerome or of the Vulgate New Testament outside the Gospels to either Pelagius or Pseudo-Rufinus the Syrian derives from mistaken premises and reflects the tendency of twentieth-century biblical scholarship to give a name to the reviser of the Vulgate in contrast with the anonymous *Vetus Latina* versions. Pseudo-Rufinus the Syrian, the candidate proposed by the *Vetus Latina* editors, did not revise the Catholic Epistles if we take into consideration the fact that their earliest attestations predate Rufinus' arrival in

---

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 16–19.

<sup>7</sup> See pp. 7–11. VL 66 is an example of a fifth-century manuscript that contains biblical and non-biblical books: it transmits an Old Latin text of James together with the Epistle of Barnabas and Novatian's *De cibis iudaicis*.

<sup>8</sup> See Bogaert (2013: 519–22).

Rome in the year 399 as well as the textual evidence attributed to him in the *Liber de fide*.<sup>9</sup> It is, therefore, clear that the evidence available is insufficient to identify with certainty the reviser or revisers of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles: the absence of citations of writers active at the end of the fourth century that closely and consistently match the Vulgate Catholic Epistles does not permit us to name the person responsible for the revision of these letters. As a consequence, the focus of this research shifted from the question of the authorship, outlined in Chapter One, to the study of the linguistic character of the texts in order to gather evidence about their origin. The linguistic features of each of the seven Catholic Epistles were described separately, from Chapter Two to Chapter Eight, which engage with the relationship of the Vulgate with the Greek text and preceding and contemporary Latin literature from a qualitative perspective and with the *Vetus Latina* text types from a quantitative perspective.

The belief in the linguistic superiority of the Vulgate in comparison with the *Vetus Latina* continues to be asserted in scholarship, fed by the prestige of Jerome: ‘The earliest Christian communities were mostly from the least privileged parts of society, often not of Roman origin at all, and so the kind of Latin that the biblical texts were translated into – that is, those made before the great fourth-century translation of Saint Jerome, known as the Vulgate – had a popular character containing many nonstandard usages.’<sup>10</sup> Burton refutes this

---

<sup>9</sup> See pp. 23–8.

<sup>10</sup> Herman (2000: 23). See also Pinkster (1990: 207–8): ‘Differences as exist between the vulgar Itala text of the Bible and its less vulgar counterpart, the *Vulgata* ... seem to point to some awareness among the more educated people that in certain expression types prepositions ought to be avoided’. Vineis (1974: 32) underlines ‘[il] bisogno che senti la *Vulgata* di temperare alcune diseguaglianze dell’Itala, tanto da sacrificarne in certi casi la rigorosa letteralità di

commonplace in the appendix of his monograph on the Old Latin Gospels in which he demonstrates that ‘Jerome has changed the rendering found in the consensus of Old Latin versions in the direction of something more literal ... namely the pursuit of exact correspondence between source – and target – language, with resulting distortions of natural usage and idiom’.<sup>11</sup> The close relationship with the Greek text is the feature that, generally speaking, most characterises the Vulgate Catholic Epistles: in the rendering of lexicon, participles and word order the revision matches its Greek source as much as possible. The influence of Greek is noticeable in the vocabulary, in which loan-words are frequent. Calques and new formations, rarely attested in contemporary and later writings, are coined in order to match the Greek text such as *intemptator* at James 1:13 rendering ἀπειράστος and *supercertari* translating ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι at Jude 3. The verbs often govern the same cases as in Greek and syntactical constructions according to Greek are frequently attested in the Catholic Epistles, notably the numerous clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* depending on verbs of saying and perception, the infinitive of purpose at 1 Peter 2:5 (V), the genitive absolute at 2 Peter 3:11 (S) and the genitive following the comparative at 3 John 4 (T, V). Differences from the preceding versions are isolated and changes are introduced to restore the correspondence with Greek rather than to eliminate Graecisms or produce a stylistically improved text, as it is evident from the low number of lexical variations and free translations. The Vulgate introduces

---

traduzione in nome di una veste generale più dimessa e insieme più *corretta*, che si adeguasse più allo spirito che alla lettera qualora il rispetto assoluto di quest’ultima avesse irrimediabilmente portato alla creazione di mostri linguistici – San Girolamo era troppo imbevuto di cultura per accettarli incondizionatamente.’

<sup>11</sup> Burton (2000: 199).

renderings that either have a closer semantic correspondence with the original terms than those of the *Vetus Latina* or are word-for-word translations of the Greek text, such as the analytical constructions consisting of present participles with *esse* modelled on Greek at James 1:17, 3:15, 4:14 and 1 Peter 2:25. The language of the Latin versions cannot be described by denominators such as ‘Christian’, ‘Vulgar’ or ‘Late’ Latin:<sup>12</sup> words belonging to these categories are certainly attested but the language is a composite mixture of late and archaic formations, classical words that either retain their usual meanings or increase them to express a new system of beliefs, terms attested in poetry (such as *volucris* at James 3:7 and *lucifer* at 2 Peter 1:19), as well as characteristics of the technical languages of medicine and law (for instance the medical term *concernare* at 1 John 5:20 in HIL). Rare terms and hapaxes are introduced to match closely the Greek corresponding words and a few revivals of archaic words are identified, of which only *malefactor* and *eradicare* might be recoinages of the Greek words *κακοποιός* and *ἐκριζόω*.<sup>13</sup> Metaplasm and analogical forms are attested more frequently in the *Vetus Latina* than in the Vulgate but *spiritus* is considered to be neuter according to Greek in the Vulgate at 1 Peter 3:4 (and at 4:14 in text type T) and 1 John 4:3 against the *Vetus Latina*.<sup>14</sup> Passive verbs often have

---

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 30–8.

<sup>13</sup> The revivals of archaic words in the Catholic Epistles are the following: James 1:21 and 2 Peter 2:10: *inmunditia* (V), 3:13: *disciplinosus* (F), 3:14: *alapari* (F); 1 Peter 2:12 (T, V), 2:14 (V), 3:16 (T): *malefactor*; 2 Peter 1:17: *complacere* (V), 2:4: *retrudere* (T); 1 John 2:2: *exorator* (TE); Jude 12: *eradicare* (T, V).

<sup>14</sup> Further analogical forms and metaplasms are attested at James 2:6: *vocitum* (F), 3:4: *parvissimus* (S), 3:7: *domata* (32 351 65 ADL<sup>2</sup>M; AN; PS-HIL-A; BED cath), 5:2: *putruerunt* (S), *putrierunt* (F), 5:8: *longanimi* (G); 1 Peter 3:3: *absconsus* (S), 3:5 (S) and 3:7 (S, T, V):

active and reflexive meaning in order to match the Greek middle verbs in both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina, for example *armamini* at 1 Peter 4:1 (A, T, V) and *humiliamini* at 5:6 (V).<sup>15</sup>

The Vulgate is particularly close to Greek in word order and differs from the Vetus Latina when the latter makes variations: the sequence of the words attested in the Greek text is matched word for word by the Vulgate in most of the instances collected, as the following summary table shows:

| EPISTLES | VULGATE UNIQUE | VULGATE LITERAL WITH GREEK |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------|
| JAMES    | 46%            | 75%                        |
| 1 PETER  | 32%            | 97%                        |
| 2 PETER  | 55%            | 95%                        |
| 1 JOHN   | 23%            | 97%                        |
| 2 JOHN   | 33%            | 100%                       |
| 3 JOHN   | 67%            | 67%                        |
| JUDE     | 50%            | 100%                       |

Table 43. Word order in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The word order of the Latin texts has been compared with the Initial Text in the ECM. Variation in word order is a well attested phenomenon in Greek manuscripts: the word order of the ECM is reconstructed on philological criteria with the aim of representing the sequence closest to that of the earliest attainable text. In order to study the variations internal to Latin, the cases in which the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina translate an alternative word order supported by Greek manuscripts have been excluded from the count. In 2 John and Jude the Vulgate matches the

---

*vasum*, 5:9: *firmes* (S); 2 Peter 2:22: *sues* (S); 1 John 4:18: *dilectu* (TY); 3 John 10: *commoneam* (V); Jude 23: *odientes* (S, T, V). The analogical future forms of *ire* are attested at James 1:10 (F); 2 Peter 2:12 (S), 3:10 (V); 1 John 2:17 (T).

<sup>15</sup> Several cases are present in James: see pp. 74–5 and 81–2.

Greek word order in all the instances in which variations in the *Vetus Latina* are registered: this observation demonstrates that the Vulgate is closer to surviving Greek witnesses than the *Vetus Latina* in the rendering of word order.<sup>16</sup> The percentages are also high in 1 Peter, 2 Peter and 1 John but lower in James and 3 John. The Vulgate often differs from the *Vetus Latina* in James (46%), 2 Peter (55%) and 3 John (67%) while it is closer to the preceding translations in 1 Peter (32%), 1 John (23%), 2 John (33%) and Jude (50%). The Vulgate disagrees with the *Vetus Latina* when the latter does not correspond literally to the Greek text and usually matches the Greek word order: this appears to be the most distinctive feature of the Vulgate Catholic Epistles. Differences between the Epistles are also noticeable in the lexicon and the rendering of participles:

| EPISTLES | VULGATE UNIQUE | OLD LATIN TEXT TYPE CLOSEST TO THE VULGATE |
|----------|----------------|--|
| JAMES    | 25%            | F  |
| 1 PETER  | 12%            | T  |
| 2 PETER  | 22%            | T  |
| 1 JOHN   | 12%            | T  |
| 2 JOHN   | 9%             | T  |
| 3 JOHN   | 27%            | D  |
| JUDE     | 14%            | T  |

Table 44. Lexicon in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles

The percentages represent the instances in which the Vulgate differs from the previous versions. The identification of the Old Latin text type closest to the Vulgate in each letter is indicative given that these are reconstructed by the editor (and their reconstruction in some cases has been

---

<sup>16</sup> The same tendency is noticed by Adams (2016: 439–40) in his analysis of John 6: the Vulgate often attests the Greek word order with the verb followed by the object in contrast with VL 2 in which the object precedes the verb.

shown to require reassessment): the text type provides a representation of the branch of the Old Latin tradition to which the Vulgate is most closely related. Although at first sight the gaps between the percentages do not seem to be wide, the numbers would be much higher if the words which have only one possible equivalent translation in Latin were excluded (for example *πατήρ* is always rendered by *pater*). The quantitative divergences between the individual letters may also be due to different underlying Greek texts (for instance some letters might have a higher number of compounds and words which are difficult to render) but this factor exercises only a minor influence: the relationship between the Latin versions in the rendering of participles was investigated in order to reduce this type of noise proper to the lexicon:

| EPISTLES | VULGATE UNIQUE | OLD LATIN TEXT TYPE CLOSEST TO THE VULGATE |
|----------|----------------|--|
| JAMES    | 27%            | S  |
| 1 PETER  | 14%            | K, T                                       |
| 2 PETER  | 21%            | C, A, X                                    |
| 1 JOHN   | 4%             | T  |
| 2 JOHN   | 10%            | K, T                                       |
| 3 JOHN   | 25%            | D  |
| JUDE     | 12%            | T  |

Table 45. Participial renderings in the Vulgate Catholic Epistles<sup>17</sup>

The percentages in the analysis of the lexicon are confirmed by those of the participles: the comparison between these categories permits us to identify two groups of letters with similar principles of revision: on one hand 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John and Jude, which are conservative revisions of the *Vetus Latina* in that they are unique in less than 15% of the cases, and on the

---

<sup>17</sup> Text types K, C and A are indicated in the table when these have the same percentage of agreement with the Vulgate as T and X although it must be borne in mind that they are less attested.

other James, 2 Peter and 3 John which differ from the *Vetus Latina* in more than 20% of the instances as far as lexicon and participial renderings are concerned. These results correspond to von Harnack's cursory observations, based on a qualitative examination of the letters, that the Vulgate version of James stands on its own, the reviser of 1 Peter did not revise 2 Peter and that 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John were revised by the same person while the revision of 3 John was undertaken by a different reviser.<sup>18</sup> It is perhaps not a coincidence that the epistles with a higher number of innovations are James, 2 Peter and 3 John, the authorship of which was debated in antiquity and which were last to be accepted into the canon, as Jerome testifies in Epistle 120 and *De viris illustribus*.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, the language of 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John and Jude is plainer and more standard as well as closer to the *Vetus Latina*: for example, in these epistles demonstratives are never employed to translate or match the Greek articles when the *Vetus Latina* texts have them, a phenomenon well attested, on the other hand, in James and 2 Peter (a comparison in 3 John and Jude is not possible). The Vulgate text of 2 Peter is characterised by a high number of unfocused and free renderings in comparison with the other Epistles, for instance the puzzling *sectas* at 2:10 to render *δόξας*, and a prevalence of reported speech introduced by *quod* in contrast to *quoniam* as the most frequent conjunction in the rest of the corpus. 3 John and 2 Peter attest several lexical variations in proportion to their length whereas repetitions are widespread in the other letters. The lexical renderings in similar passages in 2 Peter and Jude are surprisingly inconsistent while the rendering of participles with finite verbs in 1 John probably derives from the *Vetus Latina* and is avoided in the rest of the Vulgate corpus. The wider circulation of 1 Peter, 1 John and Jude, considered to be canonical from an

---

<sup>18</sup> Von Harnack (1916: 2, 61, 78, 94, 111–2, 116).

<sup>19</sup> See pp. 6 and 22.



early date, might have encouraged the standardisation and revision of the text while James, 2 Peter and 3 John, which were less read and cited because of their debated authorship, remained in a primitive form. 2 John is first cited in the Protocol of the Synod of Carthage of the year 256 and therefore appears to be attested in Latin earlier than 3 John, which is known from the fourth century: this observation might explain the different character of the Vulgate text of these epistles.<sup>20</sup> As outlined in the introductory chapter, the seven Catholic Epistles enter the western canon at the end of the fourth century according to the evidence of Jerome dated to 393–4:<sup>21</sup> in the same years he started to cite all the Vulgate Catholic Epistles in his writings. Jerome also attests that debates existed about the authorship of James, Jude and 2 Peter.<sup>22</sup> This situation is confirmed by the earliest Old Latin sources: Tertullian cites only 1 Peter and 1 John and knows Jude, Cyprian only 1 Peter and 1 John, and the Cheltenham canon, dated to the second half of the fourth century, seems to have recognised only 1 Peter and 1 John as canonical writings.<sup>23</sup> A possible hypothesis to explain the different linguistic character of these groups of letters is that the revised versions of 1 Peter, 1 John, 2 John and Jude, which circulated, either separately or with other New Testament books, as canonical epistles, were incorporated with the versions of James, 2 Peter, 3 John, which had been revised to a lesser extent, in order to form the Vulgate

---

<sup>20</sup> McDonald (2007: 945): ‘There appears to have been a time when only two letters of John were accepted in the West and in Alexandria. There is no certain reference to 3 John until the time of Jerome and Augustine.’

<sup>21</sup> See p. 4.

<sup>22</sup> See p. 6.

<sup>23</sup> See p. 6. The indication *una sola* in the Cheltenham canon arguably refers to 1 Peter and 1 John.

Catholic Epistles corpus. If, on one hand, the established canonical status of 1 Peter and 1 John in the West is beyond doubt, on the other, the early canonicity of 2 John and Jude is less certain although the Muratorian Fragment seems to include two letters of John and Jude in the canon.<sup>24</sup> The hypothesis of a common origin of the Vulgate texts of 1 Peter and 1 John is highly plausible while the origin of 2 John and Jude is less certain as far as canonicity is concerned. In addition, it is difficult to reach safe conclusions on such short texts although their language suggests points of contact with 1 Peter and 1 John.

The study of the textual relationship between the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* is complicated by the interwoven tradition of these texts. It is not possible to determine with certainty to what extent the Vulgate is dependent on previous translations, since Old Latin readings no longer attested in extant sources may be present in its tradition. Similarly, it is unclear how extensively surviving *Vetus Latina* witnesses may have been harmonised towards the Vulgate.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, the Vulgate might preserve otherwise lost Old Latin readings and renderings which now appear to be unique to the Vulgate but are actually of Old Latin origin. The results of this study are based on the full evidence of the material which is known to be preserved but should be taken with caution: new discoveries may lead to a reassessment of the conclusions offered here. All the Vulgate Catholic Epistles are dependent on the preceding translations: the version indicated by the siglum T is the closest to the Vulgate in 1 Peter, 2

---

<sup>24</sup> See p. 6. The authenticity of the fragment is disputed and the text corrupt: Guignard (2015) maintains that the Muratorian fragment is a translation of a Greek original made in the second half of the fourth century while Rothschild (2018) affirms that it is a forgery produced in order to support the antiquity of the fourth-century canon.

<sup>25</sup> Houghton (2016: 68), Burton (2000: 7).

Peter (in the lexicon), 1 John, 2 John and Jude. Although text type T is less attested in James than in the other epistles, the Vulgate version of the letter does not seem to be very close to it (with an overall agreement of only 56%) and instead is more closely related to text type F, mostly reconstructed on the basis of VL 66, in the lexicon and text type S in participial renderings. The Vulgate text of 3 John is closely connected with the Latin text of Codex Bezae (text type D) in both lexicon and rendering of participles. The participial renderings in the Vulgate version of 2 Peter often agree with the biblical text of Jerome, indicated by text type X. The high percentages representing the agreement with the biblical text of Cyprian and Pseudo-Cyprianic writings (text types K and C) in 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John and Jude, in which the citations of the African sources are preserved, confirm the unitary origin of the Latin versions of the Catholic Epistles which derive from a single original translation. Not only is this conclusion based on the statistical examination of the relationship between text types but also on the qualitative analysis of the language: the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* often agree on rare renderings and in passages which are difficult to translate. To give a few examples, both the Vulgate and the citation of the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* at 1 Peter 2:18 feature the uncommon loan-word *discolus* and translate two compounds which are hapaxes in the New Testament, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος at 1 Peter 4:15 and ἀρχιποίμην at 1 Peter 5:4, with the same renderings, *alienorum adpetitor* (T, V) and *princeps pastorum* (S, T, V). Thiele also points out the rendering of ἁμαρτία by *delictum* at 2 Peter 2:14 (C, S, T, V) and 1:9 (S, T, V).<sup>26</sup> The presence of the same syntactical constructions also shows the dependence of the Vulgate on the *Vetus Latina*: the participles in the Vulgate version of 1 John are rendered by finite verbs at 4:2 (K, T, V) and 5:16 (K, C, T, V) when these are attested in the *Vetus Latina* and the hybrid

---

<sup>26</sup> Thiele (1969: 78).

construction at Jude 1, which combines a relative pronoun and a perfect participle, is present in the biblical text of Lucifer and in the Vulgate.

The statistical examination aimed at identifying the instances in which the Vulgate differs from the previous translations. On the other hand, the quantitative relationship between the Vulgate and the Old Latin text types as reconstructed by Thiele is indicative: Thiele's text-critical methodology is sometimes questionable in that text types do not always give a clear and accurate overview of the Old Latin tradition. The sources at the base of the text types change according to the Epistles (VL 67 is a source for text type S in James, 1 and 2 Peter but for text type T in 1–3 John), while the sigla X and D can be easily confused with the text types reconstructed in the *Vetus Latina* editions of the Pauline Epistles in which X indicates *ad hoc* translations (in particular the biblical text of Tertullian) and D a form of text found in VL 75. In addition, the siglum D represents different textual sources in 3 John, in which D refers to the text of Codex Bezae, and Jude in which D groups together the citations of Lucifer of Cagliari, the Pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* and Priscillian. A new and alternative presentation of the *Vetus Latina* material on the model of the *Vetus Latina* edition of John, which does not employ text types, would be welcome. In addition, it might incorporate the following developments:

- a. Evidence derived from manuscripts should be given in full and presented separately from the indirect tradition.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Thiele does not quote the text of the manuscripts either in the schema or in the critical and witness apparatus.

- b. The biblical text of the Church Fathers that cite each letter extensively needs to be printed independently: in Thiele's edition it is quoted in the witness apparatus together with the minor sources.<sup>28</sup>
- c. The relationship between the Old Latin texts should be indicated by the sigla of manuscripts and writers to be placed in the critical text (for instance VL 67= PS-AU) only in the passages in which both the sources are attested and agree.<sup>29</sup>
- d. If two or more manuscripts and writers consistently agree in the letter, their relationship could be shown in a stemma or explicitly stated at the beginning of the critical edition.

The goal of point a. is to cite the text of the manuscripts in full and present the text under the siglum of the manuscript instead of the siglum of the text type (VL 66 instead of F and VL 5 instead of D) when the manuscript is the only source for the text type. In the current edition, both VL 67 and PS-AU spe are represented by text type S in James: the biblical text of the latter is cited in the witness apparatus but that of the former is not reported in Thiele's edition and is it therefore not clear whether it matches the text associated with the siglum S. The relationship between the Old Latin sources could be indicated either in the critical text or in the apparatus in the verses in which it can be ascertained, according to point c, without resorting to text types. A stemma might make the readers aware that the relationship between the witnesses is consistent in the letter, if this is the case. Point b. aims to eliminate text types which correspond

---

<sup>28</sup> Sparks (1957: 303) affirms that 'the only satisfactory alternative is to print the chosen representatives of each text-type in full with their own accompanying apparatuses'.

<sup>29</sup> In the *Vetus Latina* edition it is the norm to reconstruct the text type on the basis of only one source.

to a single Church Father, for instance K for Cyprian, M for Ambrose, R for Lucifer, X for Jerome, A for Augustine, when the text type extends only to a few citations or readings and renderings of the writer.<sup>30</sup> The biblical text of each Church Father who quotes at least half of the epistle should stand on its own: the variant readings may be listed in the critical apparatus or reported under the line of the main text of the writer, as often occurs in the *Vetus Latina* edition. In this way, the undesirable attribution of the Church Fathers to more than one text type within a single letter would be avoided. Indirect sources that cite only a few verses of the letter would be reported in the apparatus following the reading of the main witnesses if they agree with them, or by themselves if their reading is unique: a positive apparatus would be suitable for the complexity of the *Vetus Latina*. As a consequence, the text types composed of many minor witnesses, such as T, would be eliminated. These suggestions can be adapted according to practical needs, the different extension and attestation of the epistles.

This research thus contributes to an improved understanding of the text and history of the Latin New Testament. Its findings should stimulate further research from different but related perspectives, for instance paleographical, codicological, philological, historical, exegetical and linguistic approaches. The Latin translations are also useful to trace the textual

---

<sup>30</sup> The same criticism is made by Willis (1966: 455): ‘The classification of Lucifer, Ambrose, and Augustine has evidently proved to be more than the system can stand. But is it really satisfactory to include peculiar readings of these three Fathers as if they were text-types, and therefore to print them (even with a label) at the head of a page? To cite them in full in the apparatus would be reasonable ... but to label them with a bold-type letter, signifying a text-type, and to print them in the text as distinct from the apparatus, scarcely seems to conduce to clarity or indeed to fairness of presentation.’

history of the Greek New Testament when they support existing Greek variants or preserve variant readings not attested in the Greek tradition.<sup>31</sup> When the Latin versions agree in word order against the Greek tradition they might preserve unattested variants although these could also be changes internal to Latin.<sup>32</sup> Mistakes in the translation of the Greek text are either errors of sight or harmonisations due to the influence of the context and similar biblical passages.<sup>33</sup> Variant readings unattested elsewhere and scribal mistakes are often confined to one or a few sources but some of the cases in which the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* agree seem to

---

<sup>31</sup> The following readings have no obvious surviving Greek equivalent: James 1:5: *abundanter* (G), *affluenter* (V), 2:14: *fides sola* (S, F), 3:13: *in mansuetudine et prudentia* (S), 3:17: *dei* (F), 4:14: *favor* (S), *momentum* (T), 5:4: *ipsorum* (V), *eius* (T), 5:15: *peccatis sit* (V), 5:17: *ut non plueret super terram* (V); 1 Peter 1:5: *in veritate* (A), 1:22: *fidei* (S), *caritatis* (V), 3:14: *quid* (T, V), 3:16: *videntes* (S), the addition at 3:22 (C, T), 5:3: *ex animo* (V), 5:14: *gratia* (V); 2 Peter 1:10: *fratres magis* (V), 2:10: *pietatem* (S), 2:14: *refigurantes spiritus stabilitos* (S), 3:2: *praeceptorum* (V), 3:4a: *dicentes* (V), 3:4b: *aut adventus* (V); 1 John 2:18: *venerit* (T); Jude 3a: *perlaboretis* (R), 3b: *societati* (R), 14: *multis* (K), 15: *carnem* (K), 18: *diebus* (R), 20: *dei* (S).

<sup>32</sup> 1 Peter 3:13: *vos nocebit* (T), *qui vobis noceat* (V), 4:16: *in isto nomine* (A, T, V); 2 Peter 3:1: *vobis carissimi secundam* (V); 1 John 2:27: *unctio ipsius / eius* (C, T, V), 4:12: *vidit umquam* (T, V).

<sup>33</sup> For instance, James 1:1: *nostri* (V), 2:12: *liberalitatis* (F), 3:5 and 4:13: *quidem* (V), 3:6: *genitura* (S), 3:7: *ceterorum* (V), 2:19: *faciunt* (S), 2:18: *operam ... fidem* (F); 1 Peter 1:8: *quem cum videritis* (C), 4:14: *nomine* (K); 1 John 2:20: *sed* (V), 5:9: *quod maius est* (V); Jude 6: *dei* (D, T), 15: *de deo* (K).

demonstrate the close relationship between the Latin versions. A noteworthy example is the translation *iniuste* at 1 Peter 2:23 in the Vulgate and Cyprian: it is unlikely that the rendering, which is not suitable for the context of the verse, originated in both versions independently.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, Augustine and sources belonging to T have *iuste*. The Latin versions also agree on the rendering of Greek variant readings: at 1 John 5:16 the Vulgate and text types C and T translate εἶδῃ with *scit* with the exception of Tertullian, who translates directly from Greek and renders ἴδῃ with *viderit*.<sup>35</sup> At 1 John 5:16 the Vulgate and text type T render the variant reading ἡ γέννησις with *generatio* and *nativitas*.<sup>36</sup> These instances support the hypothesis proposed above on the basis of the analysis of the lexicon that the Latin versions derive from a common archetype.

The study of the Latin versions provides information on the patristic sources that cite the Bible: it is to be hoped that the forthcoming critical editions of Jerome's *Adversus Iovinianum* in Brepols *Corpus Christianorum* and *Sources Chrétiennes* will clarify the affiliation of the citations of Jerome, which appear to be close to the Vulgate in the former critical editions. Several writings attributed to Pelagius' followers and adversaries, which are early witnesses to the Vulgate, await updated critical editions in which the biblical text has been reconstructed according to rigorous and scientific principles. The Vetus Latina is a rich linguistic source which remains partly unexplored. It offers a starting point for synchronic and diachronic studies on specific linguistic phenomena. The language of the Vulgate New Testament has also not been sufficiently well studied: the results of this research would benefit

---

<sup>34</sup> See pp. 184–5.

<sup>35</sup> See the conclusions of Haupt (2019: 300–1).

<sup>36</sup> Further instances are listed at pp. 198–9 and pp. 312–3.



from a comparison with the Vulgate Gospels in order to see if Jerome's principles of revision agree or differ from those applied to the other books of the New Testament and to identify any changes in the relationship to the Greek text and the Old Latin versions. The language, origin and early attestations of the Vulgate and Old Latin Pauline Epistles, Acts and Revelation need to be investigated in order to determine whether the New Testament outside the Gospels was revised at different moments and by multiple revisers, as the present research has indicated for the Catholic Epistles.

## APPENDIX

The linguistic data at the basis of the quantitative analysis are organised in spreadsheets which can be downloaded from <http://edata.bham.ac.uk/604> and <http://purl.org/itsee/persig>. Each letter has its own spreadsheet and each spreadsheet contains three tables for the categories under analysis: lexicon, participles and word order. The lexicon is arranged in alphabetical order according to the nominative singular form for nouns, the masculine nominative singular form for adjectives and the first person singular present indicative for verbs, even when these forms are not attested in the letter. The augment is not taken into consideration when cataloguing the verbs while the forms of irregular verbs made of different stems are put together although they break the alphabetical order of the list. This system of cataloguing groups in sequence the renderings of the same lexical unit in order to find easily the words the users look for and to facilitate the comparison of the renderings within each epistle and between the epistles. On the other hand, the tables with the renderings of participles and word order follow their order of appearance in the letter. The first column of the spreadsheets contains the Greek word units, the second one the reference to the chapters and verses of the epistles, the following columns the renderings of each Vetus Latina text type and of the Vulgate and the last column summarises the relationship between the text types.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Fritz (1971) *L'adjectif démonstratif dans la langue de la Bible latine*. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 125 Heft). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Adamik, Béla (2011) 'The Periodization of Latin. An Old Question Revisited' in Haverling, Gerd V.M. (ed.) *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Uppsala, June 6<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>, 2011*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 35). Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 640–52.
- Adams, James Noel (2005) 'The accusative + infinitive and dependent *quod-/quia-* clauses: the evidence of non-literary Latin and Petronius' in Kiss, S., Mondin, L. and Salvi, G. (eds) *Latin et langues romanes: études de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 195–206.
- Adams, James Noel (2011) 'Late Latin' in Clackson J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Chichester, England – Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 257–83.
- Adams, James Noel (2013) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adams, James Noel (2016) *An Anthology of Informal Latin, 200 BC – AD 900: Fifty Texts with Translations and Linguistic Commentaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Altaner, Berthold (1950) 'Der *Liber de Fide*, ein Werk der Pelagianers Rufinus des „Syrers“' *Theologische Quartalschrift* 130, 432–49. [Reprint in Altaner B. (1967) *Kleine Patristische Schriften. Herausgegeben von Günter Glockmann*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 83). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 467–82].

- Arias Abellán, Carmen, (1999) ‘Innovaciones sintácticas en el latín cristiano: participio de presente en lugar de forma personal del verbo’ in Kettemann, R. and Petersmann, H. (eds.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif V. Actes du Ve Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Heidelberg, 5–8 septembre 1997*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 195–207.
- Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* (ed. R.P.H. Green, 1995, Oxford Early Christian Texts). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Augustine, *Operum sectio II. S. Augustini Epistulae* (ed. A. Goldbacher, 1898, CSEL 34).
- Augustine, *Retractationum libri duo* (ed. Pius Knöll, 1902, CSEL 36).
- Ayuso Marazuela, Teofilo (1947a) ‘Nuevo estudio sobre el «Comma Ioaennum» Acompañado de la edición crítica del Cap. V de la primera Epístola de San Juan (Continua)’. *Biblica* 28.1/2, 83–112.
- Ayuso Marazuela, Teofilo (1947b) ‘Nuevo estudio sobre el «Comma Ioaennum» Acompañado de la edición crítica del Cap. V de la primera Epístola de San Juan (Continua)’. *Biblica* 28.3, 216–35.
- Ayuso Marazuela, Teofilo (1948) ‘Nuevo estudio sobre el «Comma Ioaennum» Acompañado de la edición crítica del Cap. V de la primera Epístola de San Juan (Continua)’. *Biblica* 29.1/2, 56–72.
- Bauer, Walter, Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur (1957) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Samuel (1893) *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen age*. Paris: Hachette [Reprint (1976). Hildesheim: Olms; New York: Burt Franklin].

- Berger, Samuel (1904) *Les préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la vulgate*. (Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres de l'Institut de France 11.2). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Bergren, Theodore A. (1991) *A Latin–Greek Index of the Vulgate New Testament*. (Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 26). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars.
- Bergren, Theodore A. (2018) *A Latin–Greek Index of the Vulgate New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 403). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bergren, Theodore A. (2019) ‘Greek Loan-words in the Vulgate New Testament and the Latin Apostolic Fathers’. *Traditio* 74, 1–25.
- Birdsall J.N. (1970) ‘The New Testament Text’ in Ackroyd, P. and Evans, C.F. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 308–77.
- Blaise, Albert (1954–67) *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*. [Revised and corrected under the direction of Paul Tombeur (2005)]. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Blass, Friedrich, Debrunner, Albert and Funk Robert W. (1961) *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A Translation and Revision of the Ninth – Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Blümer, Wilhelm (2020) ‘Die Vetus Latina-Edition der Apostelgeschichte: Überlegungen zu Chronologie, Konstituierung und Disposition der „Texttypen“’ in Houghton, H.A.G, Parker, D.C. and Strutwolf. H. (eds.) *The New Testament in Antiquity and Byzantium*.

- Traditional and Digital Approaches to its Texts and Editing. A Festschrift for Klaus Wachtel*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 449–65.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice (1988) ‘La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge. Aperçu historique, état des questions’. *Revue théologique de Louvain* 19, 137–59, 276–314.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice (2012) ‘The Latin Bible c. 600 to c. 900’ in Marsden, Richard and Matter E. Ann (eds.) *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. II. From 600 to 1450*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 69–92.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice (2013) ‘The Latin Bible’ in Carleton Paget, James and Schaper, Joachim (eds.) *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 505–26.
- Bonner, Ali (2018) *The Myth of Pelagianism*. (British Academy Monograph). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonner, Gerald (1970) ‘Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism’. *Augustinian Studies* 1, 31–47.
- Bonner, Gerald (2004) ‘Pelagius’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bortolussi, Bernard and Sznajder Lyliane (2018) ‘Les relatives substantives antéposées dans la Vulgate: permanences et innovations’ in Leal, Alfonso García and Prieto Entrialgo, Clara Elena (eds.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif XI. XI Congreso Internacional sobre el Latín Vulgar y Tardío, Oviedo, 1–5 de septiembre de 2014*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms-Weidmann, 293–308.
- Braun, René (1985) ‘L’influence de la Bible sur la langue latine’ in Fontaine, Jacques and Pietri, Charles (eds.) *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 129–42.

- Brown, Peter (1970) 'The Patrons of Pelagius. The Roman Aristocracy between East and West'. *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 21.1, 56–72.
- Buck, Carl Darling (1949) *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Buonaiuti, Ernesto (1915–16) 'Pelagius and the Pauline Vulgate'. *The Expository Times* 27, 425–7.
- Burkitt, Francis Crawford (1896) *The Old Latin and the Itala*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, Philip H. (2000) *The Old Latin Gospels. A Study of their Texts and Language*. (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burton, Philip H. (2008) 'On Revisiting the Christian Latin *Sondersprache* Hypothesis' in Houghton, H.A.G and Parker, D.C. (eds.) *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 149–171.
- Burton, Philip H. (2011) 'Christian Latin' in Clackson J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Chichester, England – Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 485–501.
- Burton, Philip H. (2012) 'The Latin Version of the New Testament' in Ehrman, Bart D. and Holmes, Michael W. (eds.) *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 167–200.
- Burton, Philip H. (2016) 'Analytic passives and deponents in classical and later Latin' in Adams, James N. and Vincent, Nigel with the assistance of Valerie Knight (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163–79.
- Burton, Philip H., Houghton, H.A.G., MacLachlan, R.F. and Parker, D.C. (2011–13) *Evangelium secundum Iohannem*. VL 19. Freiburg: Herder.

- Cavallera, Ferdinand (1920) 'Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres et de l'Apocalypse'. *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* VI 11, 269–92.
- Chapman, H. J. (1908) *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Chapman, H. J. (1933) 'St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament'. *Journal of Theological Studies* 24, 33–51, 113–25, 283–99.
- Charlier, Célestin (1963) 'Cassiodore, Pélage et les origines de la vulgate paulienne'. *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2.461–70.
- Cimosa, Mario (2008) *Guida allo studio della Bibbia Latina, dalla Vetus Latina, alla Vulgata, alla Nova Vulgata*. Rome: Augustinianum.
- Clackson, James and Horrocks, Geoffrey (2007) *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Malden, Massachusetts; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clackson, James (2010) 'Colloquial language in linguistic studies' in Dickey, Eleanor and Chahoud, Anna (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7–11.
- Coleman, Robert (1971) 'The Origin and Development of Latin *Habeo* + Infinitive'. *The Classical Quarterly* 21, 215–32.
- Coleman, Robert (1975) 'Greek Influences on Latin Syntax'. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 101–56.
- Coleman, Robert (1987) 'Vulgar Latin and the Diversity of Christian Latin' in Herman, József (ed.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du I<sup>er</sup> Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 37–52.
- Crystal, David (2008) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. [6<sup>th</sup> edition]. Malden (USA), Oxford (UK), Victoria (AU): Blackwell.



- Danckaert, Lieven (2016) ‘Variation and change in Latin BE-periphrases: empirical and methodological considerations’ in Adams, James N. and Vincent, Nigel with the assistance of Valerie Knight (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 132–62.
- De Melo, Wolfgang (2012) ‘Kuryłowicz’s first ‘law of analogy’ and the development of passive periphrases in Latin’ in Probert, Philomen and Willi, Andreas (eds.) *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 83–101.
- De Bruyn, Theodore S. (1993) *Pelagius’ Commentary on St Paul’s Epistle to the Romans*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- De Bruyne, Donatien (1914) *Sommaires, divisions et rubriques de la Bible latine*. Namur: Godenne. [Reprint (2014) *Summaries, Divisions and Rubrics of the Latin Bible: Introductions by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Thomas O’Loughlin*. Turnhout: Brepols].
- De Bruyne, Donatien (1915) ‘Étude sur les origines de notre texte latin de Saint Paul’. *Revue biblique* ns 12, 358–92.
- De Bruyne, Donatien (1920) *Préfaces de la Bible latine*. Namur: Godenne. [Reprint (2015) *Prefaces to the Latin Bible: Introductions by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Thomas O’Loughlin*. Turnhout: Brepols].
- De Bruyne, Donatien (1931) ‘Saint Augustin reviseur de la Bible’ in Casamassa A. (ed.) *Miscellanea Agostiniana* vol. 2. Rome: Tipografia poliglotta vaticana, 521–606.
- De Savignac, Jean (1983) ‘Une attribution nouvelle et une édition critique de l’Hypomnesticon’. *Scriptorium* 37.1, 134–140.
- Diehl, Ernst (1921) ‘Zur Textgeschichte des lateinischen Paulus’. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 20, 97–132.

- Dickey, Eleanor (2010a) 'Introduction' in Dickey, Eleanor and Chahoud, Anna (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–6.
- Dickey, Eleanor (2010b) 'Preliminary conclusions' in Dickey, Eleanor and Chahoud, Anna (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 65–8.
- Dunphy, Walter (1983) 'Rufinus the Syrian's 'Books''. *Augustinianum* 23, 523–9.
- Dunphy, Walter (2000) 'An Unlisted Profession of Faith (Pseudo-Rufinus *De fide*)'. *Sacris Erudiri* 39, 37–53.
- Dunphy, Walter (2009) 'Rufinus the Syrian: Myth and Reality'. *Augustiniana* 59.1, 79–157.
- Dunphy, Walter (2012) 'Ps-Rufinus (the "Syrian") and the Vulgate. Evidence wanting!'. *Augustinianum* 52, 219–56.
- Dunphy, Walter (2013) 'Glosses on Glosses: On the Budapest Anonymous and Pseudo-Rufinus. A Study on Anonymous Writings in Pelagian Circles (Part 1)'. *Augustinian Studies* 44.2, 227–47.
- Dunphy, Walter (2014) 'Glosses on Glosses: On the Budapest Anonymous and Pseudo-Rufinus. A Study on Anonymous Writings in Pelagian Circles (Part 2)'. *Augustinian Studies* 45.1, 49–68.
- Dunphy, Walter (2015) 'Glosses on Glosses: On the Budapest Anonymous and Pseudo-Rufinus. A Study on Anonymous Writings in Pelagian Circles (Part 3)'. *Augustinian Studies* 46.1, 43–70.
- ECM (2013) *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior. IV. Die Katholischen Briefe/Catholic Letters*. [ed. Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Ehrman Bart D. (ed.) (2003) *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press.

- Eklund, Sten (1970) *The Periphrastic, Completive and Finite Use of the Present Participle in Latin*. (Studia Latina Upsaliensia 5). Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Elliott J.K. (1992) 'The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate' in Haase, Wolfgang and Temporini, Hildegard (eds.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.26.1 (Religion). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 198–245.
- Ernout, Alfred and Meillet, Alfred (2001) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. [4<sup>th</sup> edition, 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1932] Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fischer, Bonifatius (1955) 'Der Vulgata-Text des Neuen Testamentes' *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46, 178–96. [Reprinted in Fischer, Bonifatius (1986) *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltex-te*. Freiburg: Herder, 51–73].
- Fischer, Bonifatius (1972) 'Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache. Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte' in Aland, Kurt (ed.) *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1–92.
- Fischer, Bonifatius (1985) *Lateinische Bibelhandschriften im frühen Mittelalter*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Forcellini, Egidio, Furlanetto, Giuseppe, Corradini, Francesco and Perin, Giuseppe (1940) *Lexicon totius latinitatis cum appendicibus*. [Reprint of 1864–1926]. Padova: Tipografia del seminario.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1961) *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1964) *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1966–71) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses*. VL 24/2. Freiburg: Herder.

- Frede, Hermann Josef (1972) 'Die Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei den lateinischen Kirchenvätern. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte' in Aland, Kurt (ed.) *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 455–78.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1974) *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1975–82) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum*. VL 25/1. Freiburg: Herder.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1983–91) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Epistulae ad Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*. VL 25/2. Freiburg: Herder.
- Frede, Hermann Josef (1987) 'Lateinische Texte und Texttypen im Hebräerbrief' in Gryson, Roger and Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice (eds.) *Recherches sur l'histoire de la Bible latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Faculté de Théologie, 137–53.
- Fredouille, Jean-Claude (1996) '« Latin chrétien » ou « latin tardif »?' *Recherches augustiniennes* 29, 5–23.
- Frisius, Mark A. (2011) *Tertullian's Use of the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, James, 1 and 2 Peter, and Jude*. (Studies in Biblical Literature 143). New York: Peter Lang.
- Fröhlich, Uwe (1995–8) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Epistula ad Corinthios: Einleitung*. 3 vols. VL 22. Freiburg: Herder.
- Funk, F. X. (1903) 'L'agape'. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 4, 5–23.
- Gaffiot, Félix (1934) *Dictionnaire latin-français*. Hachette: Paris.
- Galdi, Giovanbattista (2016) 'On *coepi/incipio* + infinitive: some new remarks' in Adams, James N. and Vincent, Nigel with the assistance of Valerie Knight (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 246–64.

- Gamble, Harry Y. (1985) *The New Testament Canon. Its Making and Meaning*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Gamble, Harry Y. (1995) *Books and Readers in the Early Church. A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- García De La Fuente, Olegario (1981) ‘Sobre el empleo de quod quia quoniam con los verbos de ‘lengua y entendimiento’ en Samuel-reyes de la Vulgata’. *Analecta Malacitana*, 3–14.
- García De La Fuente, Olegario (1994) *Latín Bíblico y Latín cristiano*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Madrid: Ediciones Cees.
- Grandgent, Charles Hall (1907) *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Gribomont, Jean (1985) ‘Le plus anciennes traductions latines’ in Fontaine, Jacques and Pietri, Charles (eds.) *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 43–65.
- Gribomont, Jean (1987) ‘Aux origines de la Vulgate’ in Stramare, Tarcisio (ed.) *La Bibbia ‘Vulgata’ dalle origini ai nostri giorni*. Rome, Abbazia San Girolamo: Libreria Vaticana, 11–20.
- Gryson, Roger (1999) *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscrits Vieux Latins. Première partie: Mss 1–275. VL 1/2A*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Gryson, Roger (2000–3) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Apocalypsis Johannis. VL 26/2*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Gryson, Roger (2004) *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscrits Vieux Latins. Deuxième partie: Mss 300–485. VL 1/2A*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Gryson, Roger (2007) *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut moyen âge. VL 1/1*. [5<sup>th</sup> edition]. Freiburg: Herder.
- Guignard, Christophe (2015) ‘The Original Language of the Muratorian Fragment’. *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 66.2, 596–624.

- Haelewyck, Jean-Claude (2013–18) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Evangelium secundum Marcum*. VL 17. Freiburg: Herder.
- Harbert, B. (1989) ‘Romans 5,12: Old Latin and Vulgate in the Pelagian Controversy’ in Livingstone E.A. (ed.) *Studia Patristica* 22. Leuven: Peeters, 261–4.
- Harrison, Rebecca R. (1986) *Jerome’s Revision of the Gospels*. [PhD thesis. University of Pennsylvania]. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.
- Haupt, Benjamin Douglas (2019) *Tertullian’s Text of the New Testament outside the Gospels*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham, <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9608>].
- Heine, Roland E. (2002) *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Roland E. (2004) ‘The Beginnings of Latin Christian Literature’, in Casiday, A., Young, F., Ayres, L. and Louth, A. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 131–41.
- Herman, József (2000) *Vulgar Latin*. [Translated by R. Wright]. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Hertzenberg, Mari Johanne (2009) ‘The use and development of *habere* + infinitive in Latin’ in Van Kemenade, Ans and De Haas, Nynke (eds.) *Historical Linguistics 2009. Selected Papers from the 19<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Nijmegen, 10–14 August 2009*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 373–97.
- Hill, Charles E. (2004) *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmann, Roland (2008) ‘Causative Constructions in Late Latin Biblical Translations’ in Wright, Roger (ed.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VIII. Actes du VIII<sup>e</sup> colloque international*

- sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6–9 septembre 2006*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms-Weidmann, 160–72.
- Hoffmann, Roland (2017) ‘On Word Order in the *Vulgate*’ in Leal, Alfonso García and Prieto Entrialgo, Clara Elena (eds.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif XI. XI Congreso Internacional sobre el Latín Vulgar y Tardío, Oviedo, 1–5 de septiembre de 2014*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms-Weidmann, 406–21.
- Hofmann, J.B. (1926) ‘Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Vulgärlateins’. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 43, 80–122.
- Hofmann, J.B. (1937) ‘Ernout A. und Meillet A. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*’. [book review]. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 55, 298–308.
- Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr Anton (1965) *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. [vol. 2 of Leumann, M., Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. (1963, 1965) *Lateinische Grammatik*]. München: C. H. Beck.
- Holmes, Michael W. (ed.) (2007) *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. [3<sup>rd</sup> edition]. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2008a) ‘Augustine’s Adoption of the Vulgate Gospels’. *New Testament Studies* 54.3, 450–64.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2008b) *Augustine’s Text of John. Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2012) ‘The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism’ in Ehrman, Bart D. and Holmes, M.W. (eds.) *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Leiden: Brill, 375–403.

- Houghton, H.A.G. (2014a) ‘The Biblical Text of Jerome’s *Commentary on Galatians*’. *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 65.1, 1–24.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2014b) ‘*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 17. Evangelium secundum Marcum*. Edited by Jean-Claude Haelewyck. Fascicules 1–2. Freiburg: Herder 2013’. [book review]. *Journal of Theological Studies* 65.1, 189–93.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2015) ‘*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 17. Evangelium secundum Marcum*. Edited by Jean-Claude Haelewyck. Fascicule 3. Freiburg: Herder 2014’. [book review]. *Journal of Theological Studies* 66.1, 394–7.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2016) *The Latin New Testament. A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2017) ‘The Layout of Early Latin Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and their Oldest Manuscripts’ in Vinzent, Marcus (ed.) *Studia Patristica. Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2015*. 91.17. Leuven, Paris, Bristol: Peeters, 71–112.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2018) ‘The Text of the Gospel and Letters of John’ in Lieu, Judith M. and De Boer Martinus C. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 5–22.
- Houghton, H.A.G. (2019) ‘The Text of the Gospels in Codex Amiatinus’ in Hawkes, Jane and Boulton, Meg (eds.) *All Roads Lead to Rome. The Creation, Context and Transmission of the Codex Amiatinus*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Houghton, H.A.G, Kreinecker C.M., MacLachlan R.F. and Smith C.J. (2019) *The Principal Pauline Epistles: A Collation of Old Latin Witnesses*. (New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 59). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Jerome, *Epistulae* (ed. Isidor Hilberg, 1910–18, CSEL 54–56).



- Jülicher, Adolf, Matzkow, W. and Aland K. (1963–76) *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinische Überlieferung. I. Matthäus-Evangelium.* (1972) [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. *II. Marcus-Evangelium.* (1970) [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. *III. Lucas-Evangelium* (1976) [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. *IV. Johannes-Evangelium* (1963). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kaulen, Franz (1904) *Sprachliches Handbuch zur biblischen Vulgata. Eine systematische Darstellung ihres lateinischen Sprachcharacters.* [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Freiburg: Herder.
- Kennedy, Benjamin Hall (1896) *The Shorter Latin Primer.* London, New York, Bombay: Longmans, Green, and co.
- Kreinecker, Christina M. (2016) ‘Rufinus’ Translation of Origen’s Commentary on Romans’ in Houghton, H.A.G (ed.) *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition. Papers from the Ninth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, in Association with the COMPAUL Project.* (Texts and Studies 13). Piscataway: Gorgias, 227–52.
- La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie (1957) ‘L’*épître aux Hébreux* dans l’oeuvre de saint Augustin’. *Revue des études augustiniennes* 3.2, 137–62.
- La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie (1959) ‘La date du «*De Continentia*» de saint Augustin’. *Revue des études augustiniennes* 5, 121–7.
- Lagrange, M.-J. (1916) ‘La Vulgate latin de l’*Épître aux Romains* et le texte grec’. *Revue biblique* 13, 225–35.
- Lagrange, M.-J. (1917) ‘La Vulgate latin de l’*Épître aux Galates* et le texte grec’. *Revue biblique* 14, 424–50.
- Lagrange, M.-J. (1918) ‘La révision de la Vulgate par S. Jérôme’. *Revue biblique* 15, 254–7.
- Lampe, G.W.H (1961) *A Patristic Greek Lexicon.* Oxford: Clarendon.

- Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles (1933) *A Latin Dictionary*. [1<sup>st</sup> edition 1879]. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. [Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie]. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lieu, Judith M. (2008) *I, II & III John: A Commentary*. (New Testament Library). Louisville, Kentucky; London, Westminster: John Knox.
- Lieu, Judith M. and De Boer, Martinus C. (2018) 'Introduction' in Lieu, Judith M. and De Boer Martinus C. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Johannine Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–4.
- Lockett, Darian (2012) *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*. (T & T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies). London, New York: T & T Clark.
- Löfstedt, Einar (1911) *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Löfstedt, Einar (1936) *Vermischte Studien zur Lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Löfstedt, Einar (1959) *Late Latin*. [Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning]. Oslo: H. Aschehoug.
- MacLachlan, Rosalind F. (2014) 'A Reintroduction to the Budapest Anonymous Commentary on the Pauline Letters' in Houghton, H.A.G. (ed.) *Early Readers, Scholars and Editors of the New Testament*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 93–106.
- Maltby, Robert (2006) 'Gerunds, Gerundives and their Greek Equivalents in Latin Bible Translations' in Arias Abellán, Carmen (ed.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VII. Actes du*

- VII<sup>ème</sup> Colloque international sur le Latin vulgaire et tardif, Séville, 2–6 septembre 2003.*  
Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, secretariado de publicaciones, 425–42.
- Marini, Emanuela (2014) ‘Les verbes en -ficare dans les siècles II/III à VII: une mise au point’ in Molinelli, Piera, Cuzzolin, Pierluigi and Fedriani, Chiara (eds.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif X. Actes du X<sup>e</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Bergamo, 5–9 septembre 2012.* Bergamo: Bergamo University Press, Sestante edizioni, 133–50.
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée (1968) ‘Les attaches orientales du Pélagianisme’. *Comptes rendus de séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 112.3, 459–72.
- Mason, Eric F. and Martin, Troy W. (eds.) (2014) *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students.* (Resources for Biblical Studies 77). Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- McDonald, Lee Martin (2007) *The Biblical Canon. Its Origin, Transmission and Authority.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- McGowan, Andrew (1999) *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals.* (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford: Clarendon.
- McGurk, Patrick (1994) ‘The Oldest Manuscripts of the Latin Bible’ in Gameson, Richard (ed.) *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–23.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1977) *The Early Versions of the New Testament. Their Origins, Transmission and Limitations.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1987) *The Canon of the New Testament.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Ehrman Bart D. (2005) *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration.* [fourth edition]. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Miller, Mary W. (1964) *Rufini Presbyteri Liber De Fide. A Critical Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. (Patristic Studies 96). Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Mizzi, Joseph (1963) 'The Vulgate Text of the Supplemental Pages of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis'. *Sacris Erudiri* 14, 149–63.
- Mohrmann, Christine (1948) 'Les elements vulgaires du Latin de chrétiens'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 2.2, 89–101.
- Mohrmann, Christine (1961) *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens. Tome I: Le Latin des Chrétiens*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.
- Mohrmann, Christine (1965) *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens. Tome III: Latin Chrétien et liturgique*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.
- Morin, Germain (ed.) (1894) *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios. Epistulae versio latina antiquissima*. (Anecdota Maredsolana vol. 2). Oxford: J. Parker.
- Nellessen, Ernst (1968) 'Der lateinische Paulustext im Codex Baliolensis des Pelagius-kommentars'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59, 210–30.
- NA28 (2012) *Nestle–Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*. [ed. Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, 28<sup>th</sup> edition]. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Nienhuis, David R. (2007) *Not by Paul Alone: the Formation of the Catholic Epistles Collection and the Christian Canon*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press.
- Norberg, Dag (1943) *Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des Frühen Mittellateins*. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, Leipzig: Otto Harassowitz.
- Norelli, Enrico (1990) 'La tradizione ecclesiastica negli antichi prologhi latini alle epistole paoline' in *La tradizione: forme e modi*. Rome: Augustinianum, 301–24.

- Palmer, Leonard Robert (1954) *The Latin Language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Parker, David C. (1992) *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, David C. (2002) 'The First Edition of the New Testament by David Trobisch'. [book review]. *Journal of Theological Studies* 53.1, 298–305.
- Parker, David C. (2008) *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, David C. (2012) *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petitmengin, Pierre (1985) 'Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine' in Fontaine, Jacques and Pietri, Charles (eds.) *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 89–127.
- Petraglio, Renzo (1975) *Epulum epulae epulatio nella Volgata. Considerazioni sul latino biblico*. Brescia: Morcelliana, 163–71.
- Pétré, Hélène (1948) *Caritas. Études sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne*. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.
- Petzer, Jacobus H. (1991) 'St Augustine and the Latin Version of Acts'. *Neotestamentica* 25. 1, 33–50.
- Petzer, Jacobus H. (1993) 'The Textual Relationships of the Vulgate in Acts'. *New Testament Studies* 39, 227–45.
- Petzer, Jacobus H. (1995) 'The Latin Version of the New Testament' in Ehrman, Bart D. and Holmes, M.W. (eds.) *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 113–30.
- Pezzini, Giuseppe (2016) 'Comic lexicon: searching for 'submerged' Latin from Plautus to Erasmus' in Adams, James N. and Vincent, Nigel with the assistance of Valerie Knight

- (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 14–46.
- Pinkster, Harm (1985) ‘The Development of Future Tense Auxiliaries in Latin’. *Glotta* 63, 186–208.
- Pinkster, Harm (1987) ‘The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin’ in Harris, Martin B. and Ramat, Paolo (eds.) *The Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 193–223.
- Pinkster, Harm (1990) ‘The Development of Cases and Adpositions in Latin’ in Pinkster, Harm and Inge Genee (eds.) *Unity in Diversity*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 195–210.
- Pinkster, Harm (2015) *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plater, W.E. and White, H.J. (1926) *A Grammar of the Vulgate, being An Introduction to the Study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Plinval, Georges de (1964) ‘Le problème des versions pélagiennes du texte de S. Paul’. *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 59.3, 845–53.
- Plinval, Georges de (1966) ‘Précisions sur l’authenticité d’un prologue de Pélage: *Primum quaeritur*’. *Revue des études augustiniennes* 12, 247–53.
- Rebenich, Stefan (1993) ‘Jerome: the “Vir Trilinguis” and the “Hebraica Veritas”’. *Vigiliae Christianae* 47.1, 50–77.
- Refoule, F. (1963) ‘La datation du premier concile de Carthage contre les Pélagiens et du *Libellus fidei* de Rufin’. *Revue des études augustiniennes* 9, 41–9.
- Rönsch, Hermann (1875) *Itala und Vulgata*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition]. Marburg: Elwert.
- Rothschild, Clare K. (2018) ‘The Muratorian Fragment as a Roman Fake’. *Novum Testamentum* 60, 55–82.

- Sanday, W. (1885) 'Some Further Remarks on the Corbey St. James (ff)'. *Studia Biblica* 1, 233–63.
- Schäfer, K.T. (1929) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hebräerbriefs*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schäfer, K.T. (1962) 'Pelagius und die Vulgata'. *New Testament Studies* 9, 361–6.
- Schäfer, K.T. (1963) 'Der Paulustext des Pelagius' in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2.453–60.
- Schatkin, Margaret A. (1970) 'The Influence of Origen upon St. Jerome's Commentary on Galatians'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 24.1, 49–58.
- Scherbenske, Eric W. (2013) *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schlosser, Jacques (2004) 'Le corpus des épîtres catholiques' in Schlosser, Jacques (ed.) *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 176). Leuven: Leuven University Press, 3–41.
- Schlossnikel, Reinhard F. (1991) *Der Brief an die Hebräer und das Corpus Paulinum. Eine linguistische "Bruchstelle" im Codex Claromontanus und ihre Bedeutung im Rahmen von Text- und Kanongeschichte*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schmid, Ulrich B. (1995) *Marcion und sein Apostolos. Rekonstruktion und Historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. (Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung 25). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Schrickx, Josine (2015) 'Reflexionen über lateinische re-Komposita'. *Glotta* 91, 264–80.
- Schrijnen, J. (1932) *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegten J. W. van Leeuwen.

- Souter, Alexander (1922–31) *Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Souter, Alexander (1927) *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St Paul*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Souter, Alexander (1941) 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel'. *Journal of Theological Studies* 42.165–166, 12–18.
- Souter, Alexander (1949) *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Sparks, H.F.D. (1957) '*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron. Band 26/1. Epistulae Catholicae, Apokalypsis; 1. Lieferung: Jac.*'. [book review]. *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 8.2, 301–7.
- Sparks, H.F.D. (1970) 'Jerome as Biblical Scholar' in Ackroyd, P. and Evans, C.F. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Bible. I. From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 510–41.
- Stelzer, Wilbert P. (2018) *A New Reconstruction of the Text of 2 Corinthians in Pelagius's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles*. (Texts and Studies 17). Piscataway: Gorgias.
- Stolz, Friedrich and Schmalz, J.H. (1928) *Lateinische Grammatik Laut- und Formenlehre Syntax und Stilistik in fünfter Auflage völlig neu bearbeitet von Manu Leumann und Joh. Bapt. Hofmann*. [fifth edition]. München: C.H. Beck.
- Suárez Martínez, Pedro Manuel (1994) 'VIXIT ANNIS XXX MENSES III DIES XIX' in Herman, József (ed.) *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991)*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 55–63.



- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. (1948a) 'The Council of Trent on the *Authentia* of the Vulgate'. *Journal of Theological Studies* 49, 35–42.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. (1948b) 'The Name "Vulgate"'. *Biblica* 29.4, 345–52.
- Svennung, J. (1935) *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*. Uppsala: Almqvist und Wiksell.
- Tertullian, *Opera* (ed. Emil Kroymann, 1906, pars III, CSEL 47, 290–650).
- TeSelle, Eugene (1972) 'Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy'. *Augustinian Studies* 3, 61–95.
- Thiele, Walter (1955) 'Augustinus zum lateinischen Text des Jakobusbriefes'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46, 255–8.
- Thiele, Walter (1956–69) *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Epistulae Catholicae*. VL 26/1. Freiburg: Herder.
- Thiele, Walter (1959) 'Beobachtungen zum Comma Iohanneum (I Joh 5 7 f.)'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 50, 61–73.
- Thiele, Walter (1965) *Die lateinischen Texte des 1. Petrusbriefes*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Thiele, Walter (1969) 'Zum lateinischen Paulustext. Textkritik und Überlieferungsgeschichte'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60, 264–73.
- Thiele, Walter (1972) 'Probleme der Versio Latina in den katholischen Briefen' in Aland, Kurt (ed.) *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 93–119.
- Tkacz, Catherine Brown (1996) 'Labor Tam Utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 50, 42–72.
- Trobisch, David (2000) *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Väänänen, Veikko (1981) *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. [3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1963]. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Vaccari, A. (1915) ‘Alle origini della Volgata’. *La civiltà cattolica* 4, 21–37, 160–70, 538–48.
- Vaccari, A. (1961) ‘Notulae Patristicae’. *Gregorianum* 42.4, 725–36.
- Valgiglio, Ernesto (1985) *Le antiche versioni latine del Nuovo Testamento*. Napoli: M. D’Auria.
- de la Villa, Jesús (2002) ‘The Translation of Greek Participles in the *Vulgata*’ in Sawicki, Lea and Shalev, Donna (eds.) *Donum grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*. Louvain: Peeters, 385–94.
- Vincent, Nigel (2016) ‘Causatives in Latin and Romance’ in Adams, James N. and Vincent, Nigel with the assistance of Valerie Knight (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 294–312.
- Vineis, Edoardo (1974) *Studio sulla lingua dell’Itala*. Pisa: Pacini.
- Vogels, H. J. (ed.) (1966–9) *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas*. 3 vols. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- von Geisau, Hans (1916) ‘Syntaktische Gräzismen bei Apuleius’. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 36.3, 242–87.
- von Harnack, Adolf (1916) *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament. VII. Zur Revision der Prinzipien der neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Die Bedeutung der Vulgata für den Text der Katholischen Briefe und der Anteil des Hieronymus an dem Übersetzungswerk*. (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 7). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- von Harnack, Adolf (1931) ‘Studien zur Vulgata des Hebräerbriefs’. *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche I*. Berlin, Leipzig: De Gruyter, 191–234.

- Vööbus, Arthur (1954) *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*. (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 6). Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society, 53–65.
- Vosté, J.-M. (1946) ‘La Volgata al Concilio di Trento’. *Biblica* 27.4, 301–19.
- Weber, Robert, Gryson, Roger et al. (eds.) (2007) *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. [5<sup>th</sup> edition]. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Willis, Geoffrey G. (1966) ‘*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron*. Band 26/1. *Epistulae Catholicae*; 4. Lieferung: 1 Jo 1:1 – 3:17’. [book review]. *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 17.2, 453–6.
- Wölfflin, Eduard (1896) ‘Die lateinische Übersetzung des Briefes des Clemens an die Korinther’. *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* 9, 81–100.
- Woodcock, E.C. (1959) *A New Latin Syntax*. London: Methuen and Co.
- Wordsworth, John (1885) ‘The Corbey St. James (ff) and its Relation to Other Latin Versions, and to the Original Language of the Epistle’. *Studia Biblica* 1, 113–50.
- Wordsworth, John and White, H.J., et al. (eds.) (1889–1951) *Nouum Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem sancti Hieronymi*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Yevadian, Maxime (2017) ‘Le grec de Jean Cassien’ in Mellerin, Laurence (ed.) *Le livre scellé*. (Cahiers de Biblindex 2). Turnhout: Brepols, 179–203.
- Zimmermann, H. (1960) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altlateinischen Überlieferung des zweiten Korintherbriefes*. Bonn: Hanstein.

Electronic Sources:

Accordance Bible Software: <https://www.accordancebible.com/>

Bibindex: <http://www.bibindex.mom.fr/>

ITSEE citations database: <https://itsee-wce.birmingham.ac.uk/citations/>

Database of Latin Dictionaries – Brepols: <http://clt.brepolis.net/dld/pages/QuickSearch.aspx>

Library of Latin Texts – Series A – Brepols: <http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/pages/QuickSearch.aspx>

Library of Latin Texts – Series B – Brepols: <http://clt.brepolis.net/lltb/pages/QuickSearch.aspx>

Vetus Latina Database – Brepols: <http://apps.brepolis.net/vld/default.aspx>

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL) Online – De Gruyter: <https://www.degruyter.com/view/db/tll>