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PREFACE

This small work has been so long in hand that I have almost certainly forgotten some of those who in its earlier stages helped it on. I think Dr Henry Jackson more than any one else made me undertake it; and I have owed much all along to his suggestive encouragement. A chance question addressed to the Rev. H. M. Bannister after the text was set up in pages, has given a new value to the edition as far as the A-text is concerned; for Mr Bannister at once offered to collate the proofs with the Vatican manuscript; and this he did at least twice, noting every detail (such as erasures, &c.) which could have any significance, and communicating to me his own conclusions formed on the spot. Monsieur Léopold Delisle, besides taking a friendly interest in my desultory labours, deposited the Paris fragments in the University Library at Cambridge and enabled me to study them minutely at my leisure. Ludwig Traube has not lived to receive my thanks for his abundant sympathy and readiness to give more than I asked for and more than I was competent to use. Of those to whom we must look to carry on Dr Traube's work, I am especially grateful to Professor W. M. Lindsay for several letters containing information supplementary to his remarkable pamphlet on Contractions. Mr Hessels has looked with a friendly eye on a by-path
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running near the line of his own studies, and has more than once told me of articles and paragraphs which otherwise I should not have seen. The Rev. W. G. Searle searched charters of Athelstan, among which he is more at home than I am, for Hisperic words. The Bishop of Salisbury, visiting Cambridge for a few hours, found, it seems, the solution of one enigma (see Index s.v. dedronte). The Provost of King's, Dr Rudolf Ehwald, Professor Paul Meyer, and others 'quorum forte preteriui nomina,' have all added pebbles to my heap; and the smaller the heap the more each pebble counts.

The infrequent reader may wonder what I have done myself. I am under no illusion as to that. 'Cedo illi qui plus nouerit in ista peritia.'

CAMBRIDGE,

September 27, 1908.

F. J. H. J.
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INTRODUCTION

When Henry Bradshaw died, several investigations upon which he had been more or less constantly engaged as opportunity offered, perished with him. They had been so much a part of himself that while he lived it seemed unnecessary to commit them to paper. He would pour out enchanting disquisitions upon them to sympathetic listeners, who however seldom knew enough of the matter to carry away a clear recollection of what had sounded so delightful and so convincing. He would write and re-write what may be called the documents of the subject; but the conclusions he drew from them were not often committed to paper.

It was so with the Hisperica Famina, upon which, as he told a friend a few months before his death, only a fortnight's work remained to be done.

Bradshaw died in February, 1886. Exactly a year afterwards, appeared J. M. Stowasser's edition of the Vatican (the only complete) text; we may be sure that if Bradshaw had heard that it was in preparation, he would have communicated the results of his own work to the editor; and so have preserved what it is now impossible to recover.

Such a text as he desired to see has not yet been printed. Every editor has been content to reproduce the work as prose; whereas Bradshaw points out its metrical character and arranges it in lines, with a colon or point to mark the middle of each line. He had written out the A-text and as

1 The preface is dated February 1, 1887.
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much as was known to him of the B-text; and I have reproduced his arrangement, occasionally but very rarely introducing modifications of my own.

My ambition has been to provide a text as correct as I could make it and also easy to cite or refer to. I have added an Index verborum, partly to shew what the vocabulary is, and partly to facilitate the comparison of different passages in which a word occurs, and so in some cases to suggest its meaning. In this index the order is by the nominative of nouns and the infinitive of verbs, even though such nominative or infinitive does not occur. This interferes to some extent with the appearance of strict alphabetical sequence to the eye; but I hope it will not make the index inconvenient to consult.

Further than this I have not dared to go. I do not feel that like Bradshaw I can construe the whole. And where the meaning of a word does not come home to me, I prefer to leave others to pursue the investigation without prejudice or infelicitous suggestion to lead them from the right way.

A good general account of the Hisperica Famina has been given by Dr M. Roger, who sums up, sanely if not sympathetically, most of what has been written about them by Mai, Rhys, Stowasser, Zimmer, and others. In fact little ground has been gained since Mai, who first printed the A-text from the Vatican manuscript, attributed them to an Irish source. Bradshaw (Memoir, p. 341) wrote to Mr Hessels in March,

1 For instance in line 41 Bradshaw writes

Melchillentaque ... : sorbillant fluenta alueariis.

Regarding alueariis as an escape from the preceding line, I print

Melchillenta : que sorbillant fluenta.

And I have made two lines of line 40, also of line 53, and of a few others. I have also transposed 14 lines on page 24.

2 L’Enseignement des lettres classiques d’Ausone à Alcuin. 8°, Paris, 1905.

3 ‘L’attention que nous avons accordée à un homme comme le grammairien Virgile, à des textes comme les Hisperica Famina, ne vient pas d’un choix personnel; il nous a fallu répondre en détail à certains ouvrages où leur est attribuée une importance qu’ils n’ont jamais eue en réalité.’ Ib. (Preface, p. viii).
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1874; ‘it is by an Irishman’: and elsewhere he says, ‘the author, who must have been an Irishman...' He did not record his reasons for thinking so. But one incontestable fact seems enough. The scene is laid in a country where the language of the inhabitants is Irish. The work is therefore presumably written in Ireland, and the author (if we are to attribute the various texts, or even any one whole text, to a single hand) was an inmate, student or master, of an Irish school.

Analysis of the work: the A-text.

As the A-text is the only one which is complete, it supplies a standard to which the other fragmentary texts may be referred.

1–48. Glorification of the rhetors or sophiae arcatores and their school, and of the speaker himself as a match for any of his contemporaries.

49–86. A would-be scholar, a grazier, who has mistaken his vocation, is recommended to go home to his family, where confusion reigns in his absence. 87–115. The superiority of the speaker's Latin is illustrated by similes. 116–132. The connexion of this passage with what precedes is not clear. It describes the faults which writers of Latin are liable to commit.

133–357. A day, from sunrise to sunset, and its occu-

1 See A 171—274, B 65—69. By misunderstanding these passages Professor Zimmer was led to construct a hypothesis which cannot be maintained. But all that he has written deserves careful study; for his wide knowledge of all things Celtic is only equalled by the freshness, enthusiasm, and ingenuity with which he applies it.

2 Stowasser (Archiv fur Lat. Lexicographia, iii. 168) explains the terms of this passage minutely by a reference to Charisius 368 K.

3 This section is introduced by the rather singular rubric ‘Incipit lex diei.’ It has occurred to me that there may be here a reminiscence of the rubric ‘Incipit lex dei,’ with which at any rate one collection of extracts from the Law of Moses begins. See H. E. Dirksen's Hinterlassene Schriften, Vol. ii. (Leipzig, 1871), p. 103 (Ueber die Collatio Legum Mosacarum et Romanarum).

It should be observed that at line 303 and again at line 358 space is left for a heading, but no heading has been written in.
pations are described. (133–177 the awakening of nature, 178–189 of the rural population, 190–221 of the school: 222–302 midday; a walk and a meal, provided by possessores, who have to be addressed in Irish, about which there is some difficulty as the scholars may only talk Latin: 303–357 sunset; another meal, apparently provided by inhabitants of the town; then the scholars turn in, some to sleep, and others to sit up.)


It may be worth while to point out that the two peculiar passages, 116–132 and 486–496, are very similar in language; also that the second passage recurs verbatim (the word terrestri or terreno has probably fallen out in the A-text before spumaticum) in the D-text; a recurrence of which our existing fragments shew no other instance.

The B-text.

The B-text is a curious relic. Lines 1–52 correspond more or less to lines 10–78 of the A-text: then about 200 lines (two leaves) are missing. Lines 53–102 = A 262–304. Another leaf is lost here. Line 103 = A 362 (de caelo). From this point to the end the manuscript is complete; but a large block of text (= A 381–560) is lost, the scribe having, as Bradshaw pointed out, written the end of line 125 (= A 561) straight on after the beginning of line 124 (= A 380). Consequently there is nothing left of the short sections de mari, de igne, de campo, de uento, de plurimis, de taberna, de tabula, de oratorio (except the last half of the last line), or whatever may have taken their place in this text. The
section de oratione (126–156) is three times as long as in
the A-text; and the section which concludes the series is
half as long again as the corresponding section (de gesta re)
in the A-text, and the stories are developed quite indepen-
dently.

The C-text.

As this text is only represented by 223 words (with ac-
companying glosses), not much can be said about it except
that it was different from the other three, but, to some extent
at least, covered the same ground. It has preserved 69 words
(besides various spellings) not contained in the other texts as
we possess them.

The D-text.

Of this text we have a remnant amounting to about
150 lines and parts of lines. It contains the short sections
de mari, de igne, de caelo, de campo, de uento, de taberna.
It reproduces (120–132) the singular passage A 484–496 ver-
batim, as far as we can judge from the fragmentary text. It
is unfortunate that the last line, corrupt in A, is lost. The
D-text has preserved about 60 words which are not found in
the other texts. Five of these occur in one line (D 70).

The vocabulary of the Hisperica Famina.

This is too large a subject to be dealt with here: and
Stowasser, Zimmer, Roger, and others have said a good
deal about it already. In fact too much in general terms.
The words are said to have been hunted up in glossaries.
But what glossaries existed then? and why have they left
so little trace among the glossaries that exist now? What
most strikes me in working through Götz’s Corpus Glossari-
orum is the entire absence of the most characteristic Hisperic
words. The Leyden Glossary contains one (tithicam), from
Gildas, and one (las. ignis) from Ars Phocae—perhaps one or
two more that I have forgotten. The Index to Götz tells the same story. Epinal and Corpus have rather more; but we know that by the ninth century the *Hisperica Famina* themselves were being transcribed in such places as Echternach, and other pieces containing some of their peculiar words were in circulation in that part of the continent.

Herr Georg Götz, whose familiarity with glossaries must be greater than that of most people, puts forward what seems to be a fallacious argument to show that the word *auellum* is an instance of a word taken from a glossary. He quotes CGL. v. 442, 2, *auellum bellum ciule dum in duas partes dividitur*. This is all very well; but he continues ‘Die Quelle dieser Glosse ist eine *differentia* bei Isidor VII. 438 ed. Arcv.: *Inter bellum et auellum hoc interest quod bellum inter ceteras gentes, auellum inter ciues dictum, quod auellantur populi in duas partes*.‘ But in the passage from Isidore the point seems to be ‘auellum…quod auellantur’: in the gloss ‘duellum…dum in duas’: so that it is at any rate far from certain that one is the direct source of the other. On the other hand the Hisperic writer may very well have got the word from Isidore, and not from a glossary at all. Herr Götz then praises Stowasser’s illustration of *cidones* (shields) by the gloss *cidones puerorum amatores*, as to which I can only say I have no idea what they mean.

There is one glossary, not utilized by Götz, which I must mention here. Mr Hessels very kindly told me of it, having himself heard from Mr Otto B. Schlutter that ‘it quoted the *Hisperica Famina*.‘ It is a late tenth century manuscript in the British Museum, Harl. 3376, unfortunately imperfect, ending on fo. 94 in the middle of FU. I had no time, when I saw it, to do more than run my eye over a few pages here and there. The following words (among others) attracted my

---

2 The Anglo-Saxon interpretations (with their lemmas) have been printed by Wülcker and Wright in *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, Vol. 1. col. 193—247.
notice, either as unusual in themselves or as being peculiarly
glossed:—

cataclismus. diluuium. See D 170 (but also C.C.C.
Interp. 67).

fo. 22 b cellem .i. siluam uel collem. See A 466, 575.
30 cluat nobilitat. jihp. uel defendit. See A 33.
32 b competis. terminis.
33a compaginat .i. coniungit. generat.
33b comptus. ornatus.
35 sculos.
45 conas.
45b cous. pars celi.

crasius.

46 cremonicat. See Index uerborum under ceremonicat.
sententialas creperatas. See C 206.
crepita. fundamenta. See A 89, 245.
curuanas. scethas.

60 b dodrans .i. malina.
drariende dodrante. See A 402.

62 efferat .i. narrat. exportat.
effertur .i. dicitur.

66 equipensium.

69b exprimo .i. designo.
85 Folicia .i. folia. See A 365.

conas and crasum may well come from the Lorica.
The gloss of creperatas agrees with C 206, while Gotz
gives gl. sermons (three times): so the secondary cluit,
defendit may come from A 33. Comptus, cremonicat, crepita,
curuanas, dodrante, expimro, folicia may also come directly
from our texts. Can cellem be from A 329 in an uncor-
corrected copy?

I see from Mr Schlutter's paper in Modern Language
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Notes, Vol. xv, col. 419–421, that he noticed in this glossary words taken from the Irish hymn Altus prosator, and, it may be added, they are taken from the original form of the hymn and not from Rabanus Maurus (see Liber Hymnorum II, 146). It would be interesting to ascertain whether any words occur which can be referred to Pseudo-Prosper de uita contemplativa, with which this hymn is associated in several ninth-century manuscripts. Mr Schlutter also traces some words to the Lorica (p. 51 in the present volume), and suggests one or two emendations which I do not understand. Binas quinques (W. W. 194, 33) may perhaps be referred to Lorica 66.

This is the only glossary I have come across which seems to have used Hisperic texts. Of glossaries which were utilized as sources of Hisperic Latin I have at present found no trace. Everything goes to show that the jargon represents an isolated growth or tradition, of which whatever literary product there may have been has mostly perished.

I give a brief list here of some common words which do not occur in the Hisperica Famina. It must be regarded only as a specimen.

agere auxilium deus panis
albus barba dignus pes
ambo bellum facere posse
animus bonus, malus ille saepe
annus brachia labor sanguis
ante breuis legere sol
apud caelum liber (book) terra
aqua carere lua uelle
arma cogere magnus, paruus uenire
ars communis mortuus uerbum
arx corpus mox uidere
atque cum (prep.) not in A neque uius
audire dare nouus uocare
uis debere omnis uox

1 This remarkable periodical has column numbers (at the top of the page) and pagination (at the bottom). The former numeration is used in the Table of Contents, while the Index refers to the other.
The syntax of the Hisperica Famina.

The structure is usually so simple that there is not much room for syntactical peculiarity. One usage, however, occurs constantly, viz. *ut* (final) followed by the perfect subjunctive (?) (once, B 156, by *captaueru*). It is so constant that I should be inclined to attribute *oliuarent* in line 16 to the copyist.

In A 77 (*irruere*), 204 (*cudere*), 212 (*tergere*), 320 (*poscere*), 353 (*rapere*), the infinitive is used where *ut* with the subjunctive would be more usual.

The preposition *de* is used partitively in A 210, A 598, B 64.

The strange use of *caeteri* in the A-text (e.g. in A 500) for the first of three alternatives may be noticed here. It does not occur in the extant parts of the other texts.

Instances of *nominativus pendens* occur in B 175 and 187.

The rhythm of the Hisperica Famina.

Bradshaw says: ‘It took some little time to master the rhythm of the lines occupying the first leaf’ [of the *Folium Luxemburgense*], ‘and to see that each line formed a sentence, and that a sort of assonance was effected by an adjective and substantive, one of which might be said to form the middle of the line, while the other came at the end.’ And when he had found Migne’s reprint of Mai’s edition of the A-text, he went on: ‘Here was a long piece entirely written in this assonant rhythm, though printed by Mai as prose... I have here only so far departed from Mai’s edition as to print the matter in lines, and to insert a colon, or middle point, after the adjective which forms the assonance with the substantive at the end of the line.’ Stowasser quotes hexameters from Virgil, Ovid, and Sedulius, which have exactly the form of what I may call the normal Hisperic line: e.g.

*amplia pectoralem : suscitat uernia caueruanu,*

and considers it to be developed from such verses as

*mollia securae peragebant ota gentes.*
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If this is true, which is quite possible, the pattern was not very closely followed. No knowledge of quantities can be traced, nor any constancy in the number of syllables. But, besides this, the double assonance between two adjectives and two substantives is not generally maintained: it is found, for instance, only about 25 times in the first 100 lines of the A-text.

Leaving out of the question the origin of this peculiar verse, I will select some specimens shewing its varieties, from the simplest to the most complex.

1. quos: edocetis fastos?
   statutum: adeamus oppidum.
2. mestum: extrico pulmoone tonstrum.
   roseum: laricomir torriminis alite in aremulo clibanum.
3. rhetorum florigera: flectit habenas catera.
   alterum barbarico auctu loquelarem: inicit tramitem.
4. quis gnarus decoram: ducet per triua caterum?
5. tianeus diurnas: rutiat orion metas.
6. multiformis solifluis: pretenui nubium uapore stemicatur arcus radis.
7. belhcinas multiformi genimin e harenosu m: euoluit effigies ad portum.

It will soon be seen that, although in general each verse is a sentence, this is by no means always the case. Sometimes a sentence undoubtedly makes two verses or even three: as A 53–4, B 157–159, &c. Sometimes two verses can be made out, but some doubt remains: as A 52

Qui florigerum: agmen
regulos: soluerit discriminate.

A difficult case is B 215, where a verse ‘nuditatis: crito tegmine uerticibus’ seems to be imbedded in another ‘Improuium: illico prospectant latrunculum.’

This simple form is handled with much ability and taste by the writer or writers who use it. Such a line as that which I have quoted above as no. 6 is very remarkable: and we are left to wonder how such a vocabulary came to be associated with such artistic feeling. It is not enough to suppose that behind the Latin expression may stand thoughts conceived in
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native Irish. That seems likely enough. But, apart from that, there is a directness and freedom in the expression itself which, as far as I know, cannot be matched among other remnants of contemporary literature. As with the vocabulary, so with the style; there is nothing to compare it with. Aldhelm, in his metrical work de laude virginitatis, falls often into the form of verse (see above, p. xvii), which has been looked on as a possible source of the rhythm of the Hisperica Famina: e.g.

sacra pudiciorum quae rerem lucra ulorum (l. 1453),

unicae comitorum passuras blandas tororum (l. 2127),

and in the prose epistola ad Eahfridum there are such passages as these:

naugero aequorea fretantium calle gurgites (Giles, p. 94),

aethralibus opacorum melitum in aestigmatibus problematum (ib.).
caelustis tetrica enodantes bibliothecae problemata (ib. p. 94).
pollardines astriferi micantibus ornentibus sideribus (ib.),

and there is altogether quite a Hisperic atmosphere.

Dr Ehwald, on reading the Hisperica Famina, was at once struck by this resemblance. But in his longer prose work, de laudibus virginitatis, Aldhelm’s style is ponderous and dull and runs into sentences of interminable length. Only in chapter 4, where he is describing the ways of bees, I find myself reminded of such passages as A 41–, A 146–, etc.

Lios monocus uses many Hisperic words; but he writes in laboured hexameters.

The hymn Altus Prosator (L. H. i. 66) in certain parts comes nearer to the Hisperica Famina: and this resemblance is the more important because of the early date assigned to that hymn.

The Hisperica Famina and Gildas.

The chief word which has been quoted as tending to connect the Hisperica Famina with Gildas is the adjective tithica (= marina), which is found in the De excidio c. 19
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(ed. Mommsen, p. 35, line 9) trans tithicam\(^1\) uallem euecti, whence it found its way into the *Historia Brittonum* (ed. Mommsen, p. 177) perhaps indirectly through a life of St Germanus now lost. The earliest existing manuscript evidence of the word is in fact the Leiden Glossary (VI. 9), which gives, from Gildas, tithicum; marinam.

As M. Roger remarks, the occurrence of a single word in two authors determines nothing as to the relation in which those authors stand to each other. And it may be added that Gildas can hardly have invented the phrase *tithica uallis* or used it here for the first time; seeing that in this context it would have been as unintelligible to his readers as it afterwards proved to be to the copyists.

Zimmer (*Nennius vindicatus*, p. 316) notes also uses of *coruscum* (substantive), *sablones*, *ruminare*, *piaculum*, *macero*, common to Gildas and the *Hisperica Famina*.

It is possible that *toruis fluctibus* (*A* 412) is a reminiscence of *toruis multibus* (Gildas, p. 29, 12 and 62, 13).

And it is possible that Gildas used the word *populare* as it is used in the *Hisperica Famina*. In c. 21 (Mommsen, p. 36, 19) where the other manuscripts read *fame...pul- lulante*, one manuscript (A) reads *populante*. In c. 24 (id. p. 39, 12) *ignis...ciuitates agrosque populans*, A reads *depopulans*. Now A, which thus uses popularis in the sense of pullulans and does not use it in the sense of de-populans, is the codex Abrincensis (from Mont-St Michel), of which Mommsen (ib. p. 15) says ‘Ruyensis monachus is qui scripsit uitam Gildae...affert locos duos ex Gildae epistula... usus libro tali qualis est Abrincensis’; and a glance at the apparatus criticus in the two passages which are quoted in the *Life* is sufficient to establish the truth of his statement. That is to say, the Hisperic use of *populans* by Gildas is

\(^{1}\) This form is preserved in the Cambridge manuscript Ff. 1.-27 (from Sawley Abbey), also (*titicam*) in the margin of the other Cambridge manuscript (Dd. 1. 17, from Glastonbury). The passage is missing both in the Cotton manuscript (from Canterbury) and in the Avranches (Mont-St Michel) manuscript.
attested by the Breton tradition against the tradition of Glastonbury and Canterbury.

In c. 3 (ib. p. 28, 20) the Cambridge manuscript Ff. 1. 27 reads *pallantibus*, the Heidelberg annotator ‘*palantibus forte perluentibus*.’ In c. 33 (ib. p. 45, 5) *palata* C (Cotton Vitell. A. vi), D (Cambridge MS. Dd. i. 17), but *propalata* A. We have therefore some grounds for attributing to Gildas the Hisperic use of *palo* (= uncoo).

Gildas is in any case so interesting to the student of Celtic Latin that I am tempted to record two small facts which I have noticed in the course of a somewhat minute examination of the text of the *De excidio.* One is that Aldhelm’s vocabulary runs very close to that of Gildas; so that words in glossaries which at first sight seem to be from Gildas are often demonstrably from Aldhelm. Once indeed (c. 47) he shews acquaintance with a particular passage of Gildas, when he describes a tower in these words: ‘turrem minací proceritatem in edito porrectam et forti liturae compage constructam’; which must be a reminiscence of Gildas’s description of the buildings which adorned the island of Britain: ‘...turrium... quarum culmina minací proceritatem porrecta in edito forti compage pangebantur’.

The other fact tells in the same direction. The Leyden glossary is not alone in containing consecutive lemmas from Gildas. The alphabetical portion of Cleopatra A III (W. W. pages 338–473), a tenth century manuscript, has also incorporated upwards of fifty words, *all accompanied by Anglo-Saxon glosses*; nine, for instance, *in order* under the letter *c*, ten under *d*, four under *i*, four under *m*, four under *o*. Except the all-pervading Aldhelm, no other insular writer seems to appear at all. The source of these glosses is not noticed by Lübke, nor as far as I know by anyone else. It seems clear

---

1 It is well known that Bede reproduced portions of the first 26 chapters of Gildas. See Plummer’s edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, pp. 9–41.
also that one common source of the Corpus Glossary and of the Cleopatra Glossary was either a copy of Gildas containing Latin and Anglo-Saxon glosses, or a set of glossae collectae from Gildas (which comes to the same thing): and that in view of the age of the Corpus Glossary, this source may be assigned to a date not later than the eighth century. An index verborum to Gildas is much wanted: and when Dr Ehwald’s text of Aldhelm is out, it would not be lost labour to make an index verborum to that.

The Lorica.

This has been printed so often that it is included here merely for convenience. Of the four principal manuscripts:

B is printed in the Liber Hymnorum (ed. Bernard and Atkinson): also in the facsimile of the Leabhar Breac.
C is printed in the Book of Cerne (ed. Dom Kuypers).
H is printed in the Book of Nunnaminster (ed. W. de G. Birch).
K is printed by Zimmer, Nennius vindicatus, p. 337.

Its connexion with the Hisperica Famina seems to consist merely in the use of certain words also found in that work.

It seems to have been known to Aldhelm, if tuta pelta protecti (de laud. virginitatis, c. XI.) is a reminiscence of line 30: also perhaps to the compiler of Harl. 3376 (see above, pp. xv, xvi).

1 Cleopatra A III. and C. C. C. have about 1000 glosses (under the letters a—p) from a common source: and these include some glosses from Gildas, which occasionally retain their order. Thus in C. C. C. (ed. Hessel, p. 70) we find inhibentibus (Gildas, c. 1), intransmobilis (id. c. 3), inergiae (?) in edito (id. ib.), inclamitans (id. c. 4), inhellem (id. c. 5). Inergiae seems to be an intruder. The glosses to inhibentibus, in edito, inclamitans are Latin glosses: but the other three words with their A.S. glosses occur in Cleopatra A III. in the same order (W. W. p. 421, 32—34). The glosses of the other group under the letter i (W. W. p. 427, 17—20) are these: insertum (Gildas c. 1), inelitum (id. ib.), in cucumerario (id. c. 42), inmane (id. c. 53), none of which will be found in C. C. C.

2 And lastly by Clem. Blume, Analecta hymnica, I. 358.
THE ALPHABETICAL POEMS

The Rubisca'.

Bradshaw of course knew this poem, and recorded its existence in a note attached to the Luxemburg fragments (as Professor Zimmer kindly informed me). But it and the next poem are dismissed in the Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge, vol. III. p. 204, as ‘two pieces in the Greek language, but written in the ordinary characters’! And it has not, as far as I know, been printed before. In my account of the manuscripts (see below, p. xxxvii) I have mentioned the pieces that are copied into the volume before and after it; as they may possibly throw some light on the road by which it travelled to Canterbury. It is presumably of Irish origin, and, though obscure in diction, metrically excellent. Obscure it undoubtedly is, owing partly to the extraordinary way in which the words are shaken into their places to suit the metre. Thus in the third stanza it is not at once obvious that the sense is: ‘O bifax ales, ab heri nudiussque tertius animaduerit tam uim nius mei, quoquo modo quit, quam nedulam normam tis (=tui) ingenii.’ The next stanza resembles a verse in a passage printed by Giles (p. 273) at the end of the Aenigmata of Aldhelm from ‘Codex A’: Pauper poeta nescit antra musarum sicut ego.

The glosses are due to someone who understood the texts.

The Hymn (A—&c) ‘Adelphus adelpha.’

In the Cambridge manuscript (Gg. 5. 35) this is copied immediately after the Rubisca; and it probably comes from the same source. It shews, in the Cambridge copy, no traces of having passed through Breton hands; but many of the glosses are the same as in the St Omer manuscript which does shew such traces; and these glosses are generally correct; while those which are not the same are sometimes

1 The piece has no title or heading in the manuscript.
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wide of the mark (e.g. tanaliter, equaliter; agialus, omnes sanctos), where the glosses in the St Omer manuscript are correct. In one passage (line 57) the Cambridge manuscript has replaced the true readings antrophum, macula by the glosses hominem, peccata. It is useless at present to attempt to guess where the writer of the Canterbury volume found these poems. He may have been working in one monastery, or he may have travelled about from place to place, selecting from each library what took his fancy or what he happened to come across.

This Hymn has been printed from the St Omer manuscript by Bethmann (Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum v. 206-08), and after him by Stowasser (De quarto quodam Scoticae Latinitatis specimine), who illustrates the phraseology by quotations from the Bible, but inserts rash conjectures and makes chaos of the last two stanzas.

The Manuscripts.

The texts printed in this volume (exclusive of the Lorica) are found in five manuscripts or fragments of manuscripts. These are:

1. The Vatican MS. regin. lat. 81 (V).
2. The Echternach MS. (E).
3. The St Victor MS. (X).
4. The Cambridge University Library MS. Gg. 5. 35 (C).
5. The St Omer MS. 666 (S).

1. The Vatican manuscript once belonged to Paul Petau, of Orleans: it may have come from Fleury¹, but there is no proof that it did, still less that it was written there. It contains the A-text of the Hisperica Famina, bound up in modern times with another work.

The character of the writing is shewn in Plate I, of the exact size of the original. Various opinions have been ex-

¹ I hear from Mr Bannister (November 19, 1908) that MS. Regin. 1560, a copy of Ethicus, &c., is in a hand very similar to Regin. 81, and that it once belonged to Pierre Daniel of Orleans. See Bradshaw, Collected Papers, p. 464.
pressed by competent judges as to the date; but I think we shall not be far wrong if we place it at the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century.

Its precise date is not of importance for our purpose. We would gladly know more of the original from which it was copied. That original contained (probably seven times) an abbreviation for Nam (see below), which the scribe of A did not understand. It probably contained the square forms of the spiritus asper (‘) in lines 188, 305, 407, and of the spiritus lenis (‘) in line 545. It made possible the confusion between n and r (line 161 and perhaps line 243); between r and s (496 and perhaps 128 and 458); in line 23 the omission of the fourth letter in plasmauerit may be due to the same cause. In line 520 h−f should represent huius (see Traube, Nomina sacra, p. 248): in Cod. Bern. 363 I find it so used: as Mr Bannister pointed out to me, it can hardly stand for his. He also writes: ‘sed (line 395) is s: est is twice + (lines 126 and 523): sunt is once iht (line 552). All these suggest an Irish exemplar. The early use of a letter over q is seen in descunt (318), cuperatum (47), (562), aësi (460). (for quae) occurs four times (131, 361, 510, 514).’

The abbreviation q− is very common for que (and): q in loquelarem (line 120).

Verř is certainly for uerrunt in line 421, probably also in line 459. In 301 populaũ = populauit. In 454 territa is indicated by a horizontal line over the t, which should mean territa (cf. line 122 quaterna, &c.); and in line 61 pũferum is not normal for propriferum (pũ is given by Traube, Nomina sacra, p. 262, as ‘insular saec. VIII’ for propter). In line 573 qda stands for quidam, which in 577 is Ḟdā.

The punctuation (;) at the end of line 134 must be a survival from the older manuscript.

1 This use of the spiritus lenis to cancel an aspirate Wattenbach had never seen; and Professor Lindsay once only in the Codex D of Plautus (Vat. lat. 3870, saec. x—xi) at Capt. 144 hostium. [He has since noticed it in the Bamberg Macrobius and in the Brussels Paschasius.]

J.
Mr Bannister believes that in lec-triceis (line 207) and cohor-tem (line 251) we have instances of hyphens which are the work of the original scribe. About several others he is doubtful.

Professor Zimmer has pointed out (Nachrichten, p. 159) that the spelling in A is probably reformed by the copyist; it is certainly more normal than the spelling of the Echternach (B and C texts) and St Victor (D text) manuscripts. I give some instances:

- amputauit A, ambutare B
- (?) abucat A, apocant C
- aligera A, alligeris C
- assat A, asat B D
- cyclum A, cicus D
- delphinas A, delfines D
- exuberas A, exsuperas B
- faullis A, fauellis D
- flammas &c. A, flamas &c. B D
- guttericant A, guturicauit C
- massae A, masas D
- obello A, auello &c. B C
- obuallat A, oballatur D
- palidá A, palidis D
- scaphas A, scafis D
- scintilla &c. A, scindelli B
- spathas A, spadas B C D
- tyrannus A, tirannus B

And in particular

- frondosa, montosa, mundanus, terrestrem, uerbalis A,
- fronduoso, muntuosus, mundianus, terrestreum (-ium), uer-balis and uerbiosus the others.

Trophea (A) seems likely to be an intended correction for tropea (B) and tropia (D).

I have noticed a few cases in which A has the less normal spelling: e.g. auriae (≈ auree), congellat (≈ congelat), gleuas (≈ glebis), motuuo (≈ mutuum), colligio (≈ collegio). But these are quite exceptional. There are traces of confusion between
Not content with altering the spelling, the scribe of A must be suspected of changing the order of the words, sometimes through mere carelessness, sometimes because a fitful sense that his text was in some way metrical led him to construct intrusive hexameters. His performances in this line have been surpassed by a modern editor who ought to have known better: and we must not forget that the verse from Virgil which the scribe of A innocently wrote in the text after line 192 implies an earlier scholar whose familiarity with classical writers might tempt him to better the versification where he saw a chance.

The compendium for nam in the Vatican MS.

This mark resembles a large lower-case n, with an oblique stroke upwards through its second limb. (See Plate I.) It seems to have been used in a manuscript now lost to represent nam whenever it occurred, viz. in lines 24, 40, 79, 82, 199, 235, and 273. In the first four cases the scribe of V contented himself, fortunately for us, with imitating the symbol he did not understand, generally leaving some space after it, and calling attention to it the first time by writing RQ (i.e. quaere) in the margin just below. In the last three cases he ventured to expand it, and wrote non; in each case at the beginning of a line, where non is not found elsewhere in the Hisperica Famina. It seemed strange that Mai had written et wherever he found this compendium; and stranger still that others who have seen the manuscript followed him, especially as et makes nonsense of two passages out of four. I therefore wrote to the late Dr Traube, enclosing a photograph and asking whether he knew the symbol as a compendium for nam.

On August 23, 1900, Dr Traube wrote informing me that

1 Thus line 46 should probably run "Pnoaque roses: pollut preda sacris"; but it is difficult to retrace such operations.
the symbol goes back to the *Notae iuris*, in the manuscripts of which it occurs in the form \( \mathfrak{N} \), with variants \( \mathfrak{N} \) and \( \mathfrak{N}^* \); and that in the Verona manuscript of Gaius the various hands write sometimes \( \mathfrak{N} \), sometimes \( \mathfrak{N} \), and sometimes \( \mathfrak{N} \). (This last form, he says, accounts for the interchange of *non* (\( \mathfrak{N} \)) and *nam* (\( \mathfrak{N} \)) in some old texts.)

In Irish manuscripts, Dr Traube had noted \( \mathfrak{N} \) only in Diarmaid’s Latin commentary on Theodorus of Mopsuestia in the Ambrosian Library (c. 301 inf.). He suggests that further search would probably lead to the discovery of other examples; but considers these sufficient fully to confirm my view that the symbol in Vat. reg. lat. 81 represents *nam*.

Perhaps someone who sees more early manuscripts than I can hope to see will find instances in which the same form of \( \mathfrak{N} \) is used with the same stroke through the second limb.

[Since this was in type, Professor Lindsay has kindly sent me some fresh information which I refrain from printing only because he considers his material is not complete.]

*Additional notes on the Vatican manuscript by the Rev. H. M. Bannister.*

63 tabulatis: atis in ras. manu 1a.
72 albores: albor in ras.
80 over the first letter of pubescentes a later scribe has written b. pecorea: c is by a later hand and the o was originally u?
82 inuagitus: the scribe wrote inuaguis and corrected the first u into it.
84 externum: nū added by a later scribe or in any case ū is over an erasure.
87 p: the p much above the line: qu. a capital?
89 mormore crepita: a later scribe has added u above each o, and also over the a of crepita.
91 concretas: retas apparently by a different hand.
94 acaruca: a later hand has inserted a separation mark (,) after ac.
NOTES BY MR BANNISTER

99 The gloss is late. "I give it up; but I am not satisfied to pass your note." HMB in litt. October 30, 1908.

102 MS. parerum nosos.

105 lustrauerunt. Final -int in this MS. is always written in full, except l. 290 aderit.

147 Tinulas: ul re-written by first hand (?) over (?) three original letters, the foot of the I being extended so as to join the a.

159 Insontes: the I is as large as the T of Titaneus, l. 133.

178 The original scribe probably wrote solidum, subsequently changed into solitus by erasing the loop of d and crossing the straight stroke.

192 uirg, i.e. Virgilius, of which name the final syllable appears in the margin, which must once have been much wider than it is now. The same word is written in the top margin in a hand very like that of Petavius on fol. 1.

220 frondosa: final m erased.

224 fame: a late hand has added contraction mark for m over e.

256 a letter (?) final m or initial t) erased between coenosū and ætre.

281 Aquatico: the o seems to be added by a later hand than the one which inserted the c: the erased q is quite legible.

284 precordis, with i written above i.

294 trices: s added, followed by a comma (,) to separate from next word.

302 A French hand (qu. 16th cent.) underlined celiam, and wrote in margin 'Plinius est usus'.

322 The apparent erasure is, I believe, due to a crease in the parchment, which made the script irregular: the crease ends between coe and tum.

325 Rutilantem: the final ē seems to me to be by the same hand (m, 2) which added que.
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The original scribe began to write framina or framina, but placed his g after the first member of the m.

protelauerit with n above i and , below.
predones: o by second hand over ?a.
flauore, with open a!
tabescunt corr. ex tabiscunt manu prima.
furiu[m]: there is no contraction mark, and a punctum follows immediately after the u.
cruda: r in rasura.
spungia: he must have written spaingia and altered it by blotting out the belly of the a. The a is underlined.

No break in MS. after rictu.
turrita: MS. írita. This contraction is used elsewhere for er not ur.
pecodum: eco in rasura and dū squeezed in before tellatus, with a separating comma.
The erased letter seems to be o with a comma (,) below to call the attention of the corrector.
carnali: li written above after na, and a comma below.
domescas: over the last syllable is m (?) erased.

The Echternach Manuscript (E). Six leaves only remain: still attached in pairs. Their relation may be seen by means of the diagram on the next page.
The dotted lines represent lost leaves. Leaves 1, 2, 3, and 6 are at Luxemburg, and are now classed by themselves as MS. 89. Leaves 3 and 6 were found by Mone and published in 1851; leaves 1 and 2 in 1875 by Bradshaw, who describes how he took from the shelves a volume which looked as if it might be the one from which the first pair of leaves had been taken, and found not only that it was the one, but that 'the

1 Collected Papers, p. 468.