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 ℵ 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

in the Codex Amiatinus. There were many resemblances of spelling in addition to the resemblances of grammatical form.

In the ninth century the Vulgate was submitted to a recension by Alcuin. The corrections of the Amiatinus recorded by Tischendorf often coincide with the recension of Alcuin, as though the Amiatinus had followed him to Tours. It is instructive to compare the Prolegomena of Tischendorf, pref. xxxii, with the critical apparatus of Wordsworth and White, especially *re* Codex Vallicellensis.

Now we know that MSS of Vitruvius were multiplied in order to help the revival of architecture at the court of Charlemagne. There is reason to think that the Harleian MS of Vitruvius from which they were derived was written in the same scriptorium as the Amiatinus. It is probable that the text of Vitruvius was corrected in the same way when it reached Alcuin.

On the last of the blank pages in the body of the manuscript there is the sketch of a cross in the same style as those which precede each of the Lindisfarne Gospels. This trace of the Celtic tradition helps to define the origin of *H* in Northumbria.

When we turn to the Codex Amiatinus, we find that the scribe has added *amen* to each of the four gospels at the end, but to the Acts of the Apostles he has affixed at the end *Deo gratias amen*. In the same way *H* adds to the first book of Vitruvius *dō gratias amen*, and a similar ending marks the tenth book. When the script of *H* is considered, there appears a close resemblance of the rubrication and the uncial letters to the style of the Amiatinus. If anything, *H* has marks of a greater antiquity: where it differs so far as the uncial writing is concerned, it suggests the lapidary style of Pope Damasus. Although *H* was in Cologne at the Monastery of St Pantaleon at the beginning of the eleventh century, it almost certainly came two centuries before from the scriptorium of Jarrow along with the Amiatinus, so that the German court owed to Saxon England the Latin Vulgate and the canon of Roman architecture.

II

The exploration of the vernacular Latin of the early empire has many treasures to give up for the determination of the sacred text. The first reason has often been overlooked. The vernacular includes the technical vocabulary of working life. Hence the pages of Vitruvius, which deal with roads, city walls, gates, farmhouses, illustrate the provincial life of Syria. For Vitruvius wrote almost in the vernacular.

But there is a vernacular science too. The problems of building sometimes lead to experimental results which have a meaning for science. At any rate the builder's workmen must have at least a rough

knowledge of arithmetic and geometry. Medical terms have been enumerated for the Greek N.T. by Hobart. But there is a parallel of medical notions. When Paul wrote 1 Cor. xv, he seems to have drawn upon the same source as Vitruvius I iv 7 : 'aliam enim mixtionem habet genus avium, aliam piscium, longe aliter terrestrium natura.' But the whole passage is relevant. The weather furnishes cases too. The ancient reading Euraquilo in Acts xxvii 14 is taken from a Latin diagram of the winds such as that described by Vitruvius I vi 14. Such diagrams were laid out in public places by the Roman architects following Vitruvius. There is a notable example at Dougga ninety miles from Carthage in which *Euroaquilo* occurs between Aquilo and Vulturnus. I have selected these cases out of several which go to show that Vitruvius influenced directly or indirectly the writers of the N.T.

H is evidence that Vitruvius held some form of the Logos doctrine. In a passage which was altered in the later MSS, *H* reads : 'ne putet me erravisse si credam rationem.' The use of *credo* with the accusative of an impersonal object is found elsewhere. Tertullian has : ' unicum deum credimus', a personal object. And generally speaking Vitruvius is evidence for the wide currency of religious and moral notions which were to receive a more definite expression from Jewish and Christian teachers. But we must guard ourselves against a misconception. In Vitruvius the background of religious and moral notions is positive, non-mystical, unauthoritative, and therefore his belief in reason directs itself towards the free movement of thought, as distinguished from an unreflecting lack of method, II i 8. Hence too the light which we get from him is a dry light. And it is to this quality that we owe the genuine contribution which he makes to the history of aesthetic ideas.

I will conclude with an instance in which *H* undoubtedly preserves the primitive text, I xii 5 : ' reliqua quae non sunt ad necessitatem sed ad deliciarum voluntatem ', ' the other things which rather serve luxury and delight than utility'. Jocundus, followed by all the editors, alters *voluntatem* to *voluptatem*. This confusion of *voluptas* and *voluntas* goes back to a very early date. Diehl *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften* quotes four cases : ' ex voluptate testamenti ' (313), ' mi voluptati sati non fecerit ' (785), ' si qui voluptati meae contenderit ' (1095), ' ex voluptate eius ' (1529). The same editor in his *Latin Christian Inscriptions* quotes an African instance : ' gloria in excelsis deo et in terra pax hominib(us) bone bolumtatis.' Have we here a vernacular form of *voluntatis* or *voluptatis* ? The question has some bearing on the Vulgate for which the Amiatinus is early evidence.

Εὐδοκία is rendered *bona voluntas* in Psalms v 13 and l 20. The later Psalms change over to *beneplacitum*: lxviii 14, lxxxviii 18, cv 4,

cxl 5. It is doubtful, therefore, whether *bona voluntas* ever meant in this context anything but good pleasure. Tyndale's translation of the nominative agrees with this : 'vnto men rejoisinge' (Luke ii 14).

III

We have seen that Vitruvius's influence was fairly widespread over the Mediterranean world from an early date. Yet he is rather to be regarded as a sample of popular literature than as the immediate cause of the following characteristic which the first, third, and fourth gospels share with the popular literature of the early empire. The prefaces which accompany each book of Vitruvius are only partly germane to their context, and were in some cases at least (undoubtedly for the first book) written after the body of the work was complete. This prefatory character was recognized by the person who, as early as the second century, divided the four gospels into larger chapters : section A begins at the first verse of the second chapter in Matthew, Luke, and John. There is this difference, however, that whereas Vitruvius often acknowledges the sources upon which he drew, the editors of the first and third gospels did not. The fourth gospel is the only one in which the editor claims also to be the author of the whole book.

FRANK GRANGER.

1 Pet. iii 21

Βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν. The older translations of ἐπερώτημα must now be discarded in view of the technical sense of the word = 'stipulatio'. So far we seem to have only one instance from the papyri, given in L. & S. (new edition) and Moulton-Milligan, viz. P. Cairo Preisigke, I 16. But the stipulatory formula ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὡμολόγησα occurs several times. Gaius defines 'stipulatio' thus : 'verborum conceptio quibus is qui interrogatur daturum facturumve se quod interrogatus est respondet'. The catechumen is asked if he believes, and he replies in the formula interpolated into Acts viii 37, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God'. This is 'a *pledge* to God proceeding from a clear conscience'. 'Επερώτημα is a promise elicited by a formal question. The interpolator of Acts thought it necessary to put in something to show that S. Philip did not baptize the Ethiopian without the formal interrogation universally required in the second century.

G. C. RICHARDS.