

hardly be maintained in any case that it is older than the twelfth or thirteenth century. Possibly the more exact investigation of the vocalization and accentuation of other Biblical MSS, a task which must be undertaken first, will in time enable us to say something more definite about this MS.

I would point out, in conclusion, that the Masoretic apparatus in it, so far as it can be ascertained from the two leaves in facsimile, agrees in general with the printed Masora of Jacob b. Chaiyim. This fact also does not suggest a very high antiquity for the Codex.

P. KAHLE.

## THE ARMENIAN *CAPITULA* OF IRENAEUS *ADV. HAERESSES* IV

THE editor of the Armenian text tells us that it has no chapter-divisions, but only a table of headings prefixed to Bk. IV. This table has no numeration, but he has supplied numbers in square brackets to the various items. That there is no such table to Bk. V is of interest when we remember that in the Latin MSS also this book has neither headings nor chapter-divisions.

The Latin *capitula* of the first four books are best given by Feuardent in his second edition (1596). Grabe (1702) attempted a rearrangement of them where they did not correspond to the matter of the text. Massuet (1710) rejected them altogether, as worse than useless, and wrote a new series of his own; accepting for Bk. V those which Feuardent had composed with a few verbal changes. Stieren (1853) gave no *capitula* at all. Harvey (1857) produced a mongrel set, largely under the influence of Grabe: that he did not follow *Cod. Clarom.* may be seen at once by comparing his facsimile of that MS with his heading to I xx (p. 204). Such being the case, it is unfortunate that we must for the convenience of readers use Harvey's *capitula* in our comparison with the Armenian.

1. The first point of importance is at Harvey's *c. iv* (i. e. *c. v* in Feuardent and Grabe; for he has combined their *c. iv* with *c. iii*): *Ostensio quoniam coelum quidem et terra transient, Dominus autem qui fecit ea manet in aeternam; et ipse est Pater Domini nostri.*

The chapter to which this heading is prefixed is twice as long as any of the preceding, and the heading is not *ad rem* until we reach § 3 (*Quoniam malignantes . . .*). When we look at Feuardent we see that

Harvey has again combined two chapters; viz. *c. v*, which has the heading already given (*Ostensio quoniam*), and *c. vi*, headed *Quae causa est quod coelum et terra transierit*, which fits the subject-matter and looks like a shorter duplicate of *Ostensio quoniam*.

Now in *c. v*, in spite of its heading, two topics only are treated: (1) the Creator as 'the great King' of Matt. x 35, and (2) the acceptance or refusal of Christ's mission. Grabe was so disturbed by this incongruity that he left *c. v* without any heading at all; and he moved the heading *Ostensio quoniam* on to *c. vi*, displacing *Quae causa est*, which he then added to the heading of *c. viii*, a poor makeshift in which he was followed by Harvey.

It is time to turn for help to the Armenian. Here we find two headings before *Ostensio quoniam*, which have been wholly lost in the Latin. The sequence is as follows:

'[5] Proof that the Lord knew the Creator alone (as) the perfect Father, and God (as) the great King.

'[6] Who were instructed (*or* made disciples) by the Lord, and who those (were) who received not His word.

'[7] Proof that heaven and earth . . . (= *Ostensio quoniam*).

'[8] What is the cause that heaven and earth shall pass away? (= *Quae causa est*).'

Thus the Armenian preserves to us two headings which exactly cover the subjects of *c. v*—the chapter which Grabe felt obliged to leave without a heading. There can be little doubt that the Latin translator or a copyist overlooked these two headings, because the next to follow began with the same words as the first of the two.

Grabe's difficulty thus finds a natural solution. As to the two headings, *Ostensio quoniam* and *Quae causa est*, either the second must be added on to the first, or we may suppose that one was a marginal alternative of the other which had crept into the Greek text before either of our translations was made.

The tiresome discussion will at any rate have shewn us the value of the Armenian translation as an independent witness to the Greek text, which Loofs shrewdly suspected to underlie the Latin *capitula* (cf. *N. T. Sancti Irenaei*, p. xxviii).

2. We come next to Harvey's *c. x*, where he has combined Feu-  
dent's *cc. xii* and *xiii*, of which the headings are:

*Quoniam Abraham vidit Christum*, and

*Quoniam una et eadem Abrahae fides et nostra*.

After this the Armenian again has a heading which is not in the Latin: '[16] What is (it) that Abraham offered (his) son a sacrifice to God?' This falls in well with the subject-matter, and its loss in Latin is

explained when we see that the next heading (H. c. xi) begins in like manner, *Quid est quod*.

3. After this the Armenian in its turn has lost a heading: *Quemadmodum Abraham a Verbo doctus est* (H. c. xii). It will suffice to note that the next Latin heading also begins with *Quemadmodum*.

4. It is not so easy to account for the absence from the Armenian of no less than  $8\frac{1}{2}$  of the Latin headings (H. xvi–xxiv = Feu. xix–xxvii). The loss actually begins with the last word of heading xv (*coelorum*); and it continues until we reach the words in xxiv, *secundum quid plus abundat justitia nostra quam scribarum et Pharisaeorum*, which have their equivalent in Arm. [21]. This seems to point to a defect in the Armenian archetype.

5. *Et quemadmodum per actus prophetabant prophetae futura* (H. xxxiv).

Feuardent gives this as the second part of his heading xxxv (*Quorum typum accipiebat populus* = H. xxxii); but here it is quite out of place. Grabe removed it to the end of xxxvii (= H. xxxiv), thus bringing it in just before *Quemadmodum in Abraham praefiguratur . . .* (xxxviii). Harvey followed suit.

This is undoubtedly the right place according to the subject-matter; and Grabe's transposition is supported by the Armenian, which has it as [45], and so also just before *Quemadmodum in Abraham . . .*

How the dislocation arose is not obvious. But it is to be noted that the six preceding headings, [39]–[44], of the Armenian are missing from the Latin. The sequence is as follows:

[37] = *Secundum quod notus Deus*.

[38] = *Quod ipse Pater . . . hominem*.

[39] Who are the Hands of God?

[40] To whom said God, Let us make man?

[41] Whence is the substance of created things?

[42] Proof that the Lord always is with the Father and the prophetic Spirit.

[43] In what manner the invisible God is seen.

[44] Through what forms the Word of God makes Himself known.

[45] = *Quemadmodum in Abraham . . .*

The six missing headings correspond to the matter of pp. 213–233 of Harvey's exceptionally long chapter xxxiv [= Feu. xxxvii]. It is possible that their minuteness of detail offended the Latin translator. They certainly could never have been intended as headings of separate chapters, though in groups they could have been so employed: we should not then have had the excessive length of c. xxxiv.

Their omission is of no importance other than palaeographical; but their preservation in the Armenian may possibly suggest that the Greek,

like the Armenian, had only unnumbered *capitula*—a table of contents to guide the reader—and no chapter-divisions to correspond to them.

If this be so, the division into chapters must be attributed to the Latin translator. When he came to Bk. V he had, as we have seen, no headings to distribute, and consequently he made no division into chapters. In the earlier books he did what he could with materials never intended for the purpose. As headings to chapters these brief summaries, however skilfully grouped, were, as Massuet said, quite futile (*prorsus inepta*). And we have too often (as at ix, x; xxxi, xxxii; xxxix, xl) reason to complain of the chapter-divisions themselves as breaking the sense and causing unnecessary difficulties of interpretation.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

## THE HARLEIAN MS OF VITRUVIUS (*H*) AND THE CODEX AMIATINUS

### I

THE history of the text of Vitruvius in modern times is in some respects like that of the Greek Text of the New Testament. The first editor of Vitruvius to produce a satisfactory critical edition was Rose, Leipzig, 1867. He carried back the sources of all the MSS which he examined to the Harleian *H*, and to the Guelferbytanus *G*; in this he was followed by Krohn the last editor. Hence in the critical apparatus it is rarely necessary to quote any other MSS. We are reminded of the almost exclusive emphasis laid upon *N* and *B* for the Greek N.T.

*H* was assigned by Rose to the ninth century, *G* to the eleventh. This latter was regarded by him as an independent source because of some apparent omissions in *H*. In other respects the variations of *G* from *H* rather bear the character of recensions. Krohn himself goes further than Rose in giving the preference to *H* over *G*.

After examining fourteen MSS of Vitruvius I have found only three which follow *G* and these of late date. This in itself means nothing except that the tradition of *G* does not seem to have been widespread.

On examining the readings in which *H* differs from *G*, I was struck by the fact that *H* furnishes readings which agree with the Old Latin MS *k* of the N.T., notably the use of participles instead of nouns of agency, and the omission of parts of *esse*.

Following up this clue, I compared some of the readings of *H* rejected by the editors with the characteristic readings of the Vulgate