

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Lindsay's *Notae Latinae Notae Latinae*. By W. M. Lindsay. Pp. 1–500. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. 21s.

Albert C. Clark

The Classical Review / Volume 30 / Issue 03 / May 1916, pp 90 - 92
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0001012X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0001012X

How to cite this article:

Albert C. Clark (1916). The Classical Review, 30, pp 90-92 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0001012X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(as he remarks in his prefatory note) has its peculiarities.

The best test of a book of this kind, however, is given by the conditions under which it can be read with pleasure rather than by minute examination; and I have read Professor Perrin's version with enjoyment under conditions which he could never have contemplated when asking that same kindly indulgence which his author too requests. As an example of Mr. Perrin's general style I would quote a passage from the *Life of Lycurgus* (vol. i., p. 241), which has something of a topical interest to us in England during these days: 'After drinking moderately, they go off home without a torch; for they are not allowed to walk with a light . . . that they may accustom themselves to marching boldly and without fear in the darkness of night.'

It remains only to point out the few places which seem to have escaped the translator's revision:

Vol. i.—

- P. 31 (last line): the Hesiod reference = Plato, *Minos*, p. 320 D, Hesiod *Catalogues* (Loeb edition), frag. 74.
 P. 37 (l. 19): *for youth read youths*.
 P. 281 (l. 22): 'so-called' would more properly be rendered 'what are called.'

P. 409 (l. 18): the sentence, 'and Plato defrayed the expenses of his sojourn there by the sale of oil in Egypt,' reads rather stiffly. It would be better to omit 'there' altogether, and to put 'in Egypt' in its place.

Vol. ii.—

P. 27 (ll. 9-10): 'or to confound them by bringing the Barbarians into suspicion of them,' reads rather heavily.

(l. 20): for 'and went to running a wall through the Isthmus,' something like 'and were building a rampart across the Isthmus' might be substituted.

P. 35 (l. 16): ἡ γὰρ should surely be rendered 'Indeed!' or the like, rather than 'Aha!'

P. 43 (l. 13): the notice of Ariamenes reads rather ambiguously. I would suggest something like, 'A., who being on a great ship, kept shooting . . . as though from a city-wall.'

(l. 16): 'justest' has a somewhat displeasing sound.

To translate Plutarch is no easy task, and we would congratulate Professor Perrin on his success in dealing with his somewhat wayward author.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

LINDSAY'S NOTAE LATINAE.

Notae Latinae. By W. M. LINDSAY. Pp. 1-500. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. 21s.

THIS very important work, which is dedicated to the memory of L. Traube, is called 'an account of abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the early minuscule period, c. 700-840.' It is to be noted that reference is also made to a number of MSS. described as half-uncial or uncial. The volume is divided into three chapters, under the headings *notae communes*, *nomina sacra*, *notae iuris*.

Prof. Lindsay starts from the position that abbreviations found in Latin MSS. of the seventh and eighth centuries go back to an earlier period. In legal writers, e.g. in the Verona Gaius (fifth

century), we find, in addition to *notae iuris*, i.e. symbols for legal terms, other compendia (*notae communes*) for ordinary words, e.g. $\bar{e}e = esse$, $\bar{p} = prae$. A collection of these is given by Studemund in his index. Similar compendia are found in scholia written in the margin of capital or uncial MSS., e.g. the Bembine Terence (cent. iv/v). Lindsay concludes that 'they were in continuous use in non-calligraphic writing, and that it is only the loss of early writing of this kind which hides the continuity from us' (p. 3). The gap in the evidence is during the seventh century, but a glimpse into this dark period is afforded to us by certain eighth-century MSS., which reproduce obsolete symbols used in their originals.

The present volume gathers up the results of many monographs already published by the author in recent years upon national hands, *e.g.* Irish, Welsh and Breton, or on the products of particular *scriptoria*, *e.g.* those of Corbie, Laon, St. Gall, Bobbio and Verona. It also contains, in addition to much new matter, an immense collection of examples taken from MSS. examined by the writer in the course of his long researches. The labour which lies behind this book may be inferred from the brief statement that 'the project has been fairly realised of examining every extant minuscule MS. of the eighth century and a sufficient number of the first half of the ninth' (Preface, p. 1). Lindsay has given us a dictionary of abbreviations, which is as indispensable to workers on Latin palaeography as a lexicon is to ordinary students of the classics.

The author's method is to take in alphabetical order words for which symbols were employed and to classify the abbreviations. Where there was an ancient *nota*, this is given first, and then the regional and local varieties are treated. A prominent place in such discussions is taken by the Insular script, and especial attention is given to minute points of difference between the practice of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes, whether writing at home or in various Continental foundations, *e.g.* Bobbio, St. Gall, Würzburg, etc. Unfortunately, however, it is often not possible to say more than that a symbol is common in Irish and rare in Anglo-Saxon, or *vice versa*. Also it is necessary to be cautious when we are dealing with questions of provenance. Sometimes compendia characteristic of a particular script or centre are found far from their home. Thus *āūm* is the Spanish symbol for *autem*, the Insular equivalent being the familiar *h* sign, while scribes in other parts of the Continent generally used *āū*. We are told that *āūm* is found in an Anglo-Saxon MS. from Murbach, which at first sight seems odd. The tract in question, however, contains a work by a Spanish author founded upon a passage in the *Etymologies* of Isidorus, Bishop of Seville. The survival, therefore, of this Spanish symbol is easily

explained (p. 25). Insular abbreviations were carried to the Continent by Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes, and were employed not only in recognised centres of the script, but in others which fell within its sphere of influence. The most interesting case is that of the Old-French hand connected with Corbie, which uses freely Insular symbols, including the *h* sign for *autem*.

It is impossible to give any adequate account here of the results contained in this work. The scale upon which Lindsay's investigations have been conducted may be judged from a few instances. The statistics for *autem* cover thirteen pages, those for *dico* seventeen, those for *omnis* twelve, those for *per*, *prae*, *pro* twelve. It is possible only to single out a few conclusions of special interest. Thus the abbreviations *glā* (= *gloria*), *grā* (= *gratia*), in an eighth or early ninth century MS., afford a presumption of Italian or Spanish origin or influence. They are not found in Insular script, whether written at home or on the Continent, except in the case of Bobbio, where the Irish monks learned them from their Italian neighbours. The use of *hō* (= *homo*) is common in Irish and Welsh MSS., but rare in Anglo-Saxon: so also that of the old *nota* for *inter*, formed by a capital *i*, with a cross stroke. The abbreviation *mā* for *miseri-cordia* is the distinguishing mark of the Verona *scriptorium*, while elsewhere in Italy *mā* was employed. The contraction *nī* (= *nostrī*) was driven out by *nīri* early in the ninth century. Lindsay's statistics show that '*nī* does not survive in MSS. later than about 815, and so gives us a good clue to dating' (p. 152). The symbols for *omnis* and its cases, *e.g.* *ōms*, *ōis*, *oā*, etc., which are used both in Irish and Continental scripts, are alien to Anglo-Saxon, and thus form a useful criterion for deciding whether an Insular script is to be called Irish or English (p. 173). The symbol for *prae* (*ḡ*) is not only unknown to Spain, but is shunned by many scribes of other countries during this period. The unpopularity of this symbol is due to the risk of confusion with *per* as written in cursive script (pp. 176-178). The confusion of *per* and *pro* in a MS. generally points to a Spanish, some-

times to an early French original. This confusion may be illustrated from a MS. to which Lindsay does not refer, *Laud. Misc.* 135, ninth century. In this the first hand regularly writes *pro* for *per*, e.g. *proseueret*, and the corrector substitutes *per*, e.g. on f. 17^v three times, f. 18^v five times. Spanish scribes affected symbols of a 'Hebrew type,' formed by suppression of the vowels, e.g. $\overline{p}\overline{p}\overline{t}\overline{r}$ = *propter* (p. 198). Perhaps the most interesting discussion is that of the various symbols for *-tur*. The ancient *nota* was an apostrophe added to the letter *t* (i.e. *t'*); this was superseded by what Lindsay calls a 2-mark (*t*²); a special Italian symbol was \bar{t} , while Anglo-Saxon writers employed a special symbol, viz. *t*⁺. This we are told is 'the best criterion for distinguishing Anglo-Saxon from other Insular types,' i.e. Irish, Welsh, Cornish and Breton (p. 374). The '2-mark' in Continental minuscule is 'as sure a criterion of lateness within our period as the use of *nī*, *nō* (= *nostrī*, *nostro*) is of earliness.' It is said to appear, as a rule, 'somewhere about the year 820, although in some centres its appearance may be later' (pp. 376-7). These few instances must serve as samples of the treasure to be found in Lindsay's store.

The Appendix contains a list of MSS. used, also two tables of symbols. In the first table the symbols are classified under the headings Britain, Spain, Italy, and the rest of the Continent; in the second Irish and Anglo-Saxon symbols are distinguished. The list of MSS. will be found invaluable by subsequent workers in the same field. Some of them are of peculiar interest. Those to which Lindsay most frequently refers are *Milan C.* 301 *infr.* eighth century (Theodorus on the Psalms), written probably at Bobbio by Diarmaid, an Irish monk, 'perhaps from St. Columban's own copy' (p. 323), and Boulogne 63-64, eighth century (Augustine's Letters), from St. Bertin. Both of these are full of ancient *notae*, which were obviously unfamiliar to the writers and copied by them from the

model. Other MSS. of great interest are Fulda, *Bonif.* 1, a New Testament written in 546, with marginalia apparently in the hand of St. Boniface, and *Bonif.* 3, 'probably Boniface's pocket-copy' of the Gospels in Insular cursive and 'full of capricious suspensions' (p. 78). Oxford *Lat. theol. d* 3 is a puzzling MS., which is frequently alluded to. It combines the Spanish *āum* (= *autem*), and the Insular *eius* symbol, with the Italian *mīa* (= *miseri-cordia*) and the Italian or Spanish *glā* (= *gloria*).

The list of early ninth-century MSS. does not claim to be exhaustive. Thus, while it includes *Laud. Misc.* 120 (A.D. 842-855), written for Gozbold, Abbot of St. Kilian's, Würzburg, it does not mention *Laud. Misc.* 135, which has the inscription *Gozbaldus iussit ut scriberet. Laud. Misc.* 124, which is described in the list as 'ninth century,' was written for the same person. Among the number of Bodleian MSS. which have not been used may be mentioned *Laud. Lat.* 108, ninth century, a good specimen of Anglo-Saxon writing, employing e.g. the Anglo-Saxon symbol for *-tur*.

Very few MSS. of classical authors figure in the list. It is difficult to suppose that such MSS. as *Holkham* 29 (Cicero, *Cat.*, in *Verrem*, etc.) from Cluni, and *Paris Regius* 7774 A (Cicero, in *Verrem*), also probably *Paris* 7794 (Cicero, *post reditum*, etc.) do not fall within the period. Probably Lindsay did not think it worth while to mention these and others. There are, however, omissions among the MSS. of earlier date. Thus, he does not mention *Laud. Misc.* 126, eighth century (Augustine, *de Trinitate*), written in uncials, or Rome, *Archivio di S. Pietro*, H. 25, the first quaternion of which, containing Cicero in *Pisonem*, was written in half-uncials in the eighth century.

It may be well to mention that on p. 5 '*Douce* 25' must be a slip for *Junius* 25, a MS. frequently quoted by the author.

ALBERT C. CLARK.