

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE
HISPERICA FAMINA

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE
HISPERICA FAMINA

EDITED
WITH A SHORT INTRODUCTION
AND INDEX VERBORUM

BY
FRANCIS JOHN HENRY JENKINSON,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN

WITH THREE FACSIMILE PLATES

CAMBRIDGE :
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1908

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107617179

© Cambridge University Press 1908

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1908

First paperback edition 2011

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-61717-9 Paperback

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR THIS PUBLICATION AT WWW.CAMBRIDGE.ORG/9781107617179

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

vi

PREFACE

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 preteritui 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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.	PAGE
Origin and aim of this edition	ix
Authorship of the Hisperica Famina	x
Analysis of the A-text	xi
The B-text	xii
The C-text	xiii
The D-text	xiii
The vocabulary of the Hisperica Famina	xiii
Hisperic words in a glossary	xvi
The syntax of the Hisperica Famina	xvii
The rhythm of the Hisperica Famina	xvii
The Hisperica Famina and Gildas	xix
The Lorica	xxii
Ad rubiscam	xxiii
'Adelphus adelpha'	xxiii
The manuscripts	xxiv
The Vatican manuscript	xxiv
The compendium for <i>nam</i> in the Vatican manuscript	xxvii
Additional notes on the Vatican manuscript by the Rev. H. M. Bannister	xxviii
The Echternach manuscript	xxx
The St Victor manuscript	xxxiv
The Cambridge (Canterbury) manuscript (Gg. 5. 35)	xxxvi
The St Omer (St Bertin) manuscript	xxxviii
Authorities quoted	xxxix
TEXTS:	
Hisperica Famina, A-text	I
" " B-text	23
Sphaera Pythagorae	31
Miscellaneous entries	32
Dialogus: 'Ad deum meum'	33
Hisperica Famina C-text (Glossae collectae)	35
" " D-text	43
Lorica	51
Rubisca	55
Hymnus: 'Adelphus adelpha'	61
INDEX VERBORUM	65

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

LIST OF PLATES

(to follow page xi)

- I. Cod. Vat. Regin. Lat. 81. The first page, containing the first 24 lines of the A-text.
- II. Paris MS. Latin 11411, fo. 100^a. The recto of the fourth remaining leaf of the Echternach manuscript, containing lines 155 to 186 of the B-text. One Breton gloss occurs.
- III. Paris MS. Latin 11411, fo. 102^b. The verso of the first remaining leaf of the St Victor manuscript, containing lines 45 to 80 of the D-text.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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 afterwards¹, 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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The *Hisperica Famina*: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

x

INTRODUCTION

much as was known to him of the B-text; and I have reproduced his arrangement, occasionally but very rarely introducing modifications of my own¹.

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. Roger², who sums up, sanely if not sympathetically³, 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 42 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 52, 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).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

AUTHORSHIP

xi

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 Irish¹. 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 commit².

133-357. A day³, from sunrise to sunset, and its occu-

¹ See A 271-274, 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 für Lat. Lexicographie*, III. 168) explains the terms of this passage minutely by a reference to Charisius 265 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 Mosaicarum 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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xii

INTRODUCTION

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.)

Here follow a number of short sections on various subjects: 358–380 de caelo: 381–425 de mari: 426–451 de igne: 452–476 de campo (*or* de terra): 477–496 de uento: 497–512 de plurimis (the point of this is not clear. The D-text omits it. The material recalls B 25 &c. and A 32, 34): 513–530 de taberna (apparently a book-chest): 531–546 de tabula (a tablet): 547–560 de oratorio: 561–570 de oratione: 571–612 de gesta re.

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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE FOUR TEXTS

xiii

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 independently.

The C-text.

As this text is only represented by 223 words (with accompanying 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 verbatim, 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 Glossariorum* 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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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 forward¹ what seems to be a fallacious argument to shew that the word *auellum* is an instance of a word taken from a glossary. He quotes CGL. v. 442, 2, *auellum bellum ciuile dum in duas partes diuiditur*. This is all very well: but he continues ‘Die Quelle dieser Glosse ist eine *differentia* bei Isidor VII. 438 ed. Arev.: *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. 3376², 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

¹ ‘Berichte über die Verhandlungen der k. sächsischen Ges. der Wiss. zu Leipzig,’ *Phil.-Hist. Classe*, Bd. 48 (1896).

² The Anglo-Saxon interpretations (with their lemmas) have been printed by Wülcker and Wright in *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, Vol. I. col. 192—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 ^{hi} cluat nobilitat. pihþ. uel defendit. *See* A 33.

32^b competis. terminis.

33^a compaginat .i. coniungit. generat.

33^b comptus. ornatus.

45 ^{oculos} conas.

45^b cous. pars celi.

^{dorsum} crasum.

46 ^{conligat} cremonicat. *See* Index uerborum *under* ceremonicat.

^{sententias} creperatas. *See* C 206.

crepita. fundamenta. *See* A 89, 245.

curuanas. scethas.

60^b ^{egur} dodrans .i. malina.

^{dreariende} dodrante. *See* A 402.

62 ^{explicet. asportat} efferat .i. narrat. exportat.

effertur .i. dicitur.

66 ^{efenwæge} equipensium.

69^b ^{narro scribo} exprimo .i. designo.

85 Folicia .i. folia. *See* A 565.

conas and *crasum* may well come from the Lorica.

The gloss of *creperatas* agrees with C 206, while Gotz gives *gl. sermones* (three times): so the secondary *cluit*, *defendit* may come from A 33. *Comptus*, *cremonicat*, *crepita*, *curuanas*, *dodrante*, *exprimo*, *folicia* may also come directly from our texts. Can *cellem* be from A 329 in an uncorrected copy?

I see from Mr Schlutter's paper in *Modern Language*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xvi

INTRODUCTION

Notes, Vol. xv, col. 419–421¹, 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 contemplatiua*, 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 quinquies* (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 shew 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	lābor	sanguis
ante	breuis	legere	sol
apud	caelum	liber (book)	terra
aqua	carere	luna	uelle
arma	cogere	magnus, paruus	uenire
ars	communis	mortuus	uerbum
arx	corpus	mox	uidere
atque	cum (<i>prep.</i>) not in A	neque	uiuus
audire	dare	nouus	uocare
auis	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!

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE SYNTAX

xvii

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 *captauero*). It is so constant that I should be inclined to attribute *oliuarent* in line 16 to the copyist.

In A 77 (*irruere*), 204 (*cadere*), 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.

'*ampla pectoralem : suscitāt uernia cauernani,*'

and considers it to be developed from such verses as

'*mollia securae peragebant otia gentes.*'

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

INTRODUCTION

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 pulmone tonstrum.
roseum : laricomi torriminis alite in aremulo clibanum.
3. rhetorum florigera : flectit habenas caterua.
alterum barbarico auctu loquelarem : inficit tramitem.
4. quis gnarus decoream : ducet per triuia cateruam?
5. titaneus diurnas : rutilat orion metas.
6. multiformis solifluis : pretenui nubium uapore stemicatur arcus radiis.
7. belbicanas multiformi genimine harenosum : 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
reguloso : soluerit discrimine.

A difficult case is B 215, where a verse 'nuditatis: crito tegmine uerticibus' seems to be imbedded in another 'Improuisum: 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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The *Hisperica Famina*: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE RHYTHM

xix

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 uirginum*, 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 pudicorum quaerentem lucra uirorum (l. 1453),
uincula comptorum passuram blanda tororum (l. 2127),

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

nauigero aequoreas fretantium calle gurgites (Giles, p. 92),
aethralibus opacorum mellita in aenigmatibus problematum (*ib.*),
caelestus tetrica enodantes bibliothecae problemata (*ib.*, p. 94),
poli cardines astriferis micantium orientur uibraminibus siderum (*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 uirginitatis*, 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

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xx

INTRODUCTION

(ed. Mommsen, p. 35, line 9) trans tithicam¹ uallem eucti, 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, thiticum; 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, cespitis, piaculum, macero, common to Gildas and the *Hisperica Famina*.

It is possible that *toruis fluctibus* (A 412) is a reminiscence of *toruis uultibus* (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...p

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 *populans* in the sense of *p

lulans* and does *not* use it in the sense of *depopulans*, 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 ('tithicam') 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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

GILDAS

xxi

attested by the Breton tradition against the tradition of Glastonbury and Canterbury.

In c. 3 (*ib.* p. 28, 20) the Cambridge manuscript Ff. I. 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* (= reuelo).

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 minaci proceritate 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 minaci proceritate porrecta in edito forti compage pangebantur¹.'

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 Lübke², 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.

² *Ueber verwandtschaftige Beziehungen einiger altenglischer Glossare* (Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen, lxxxv. 399).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxii

INTRODUCTION

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 century¹. 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 often² 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. virgininitatis*, 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. Hessels, p. 70) we find *inhibentibus* (Gildas, c. 1), *intransmeabili* (id. c. 3), *inergiae* (?), *in edito* (id. ib.), *inclamitans* (id. c. 4), *inbellem* (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. 422, 32–34). The glosses of the other group under the letter *i* (W. W. p. 427, 17–20) are these: *insertum* (Gildas c. 1), *inolitorum* (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*, LI. 358.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)THE ALPHABETICAL POEMS xxiii*The Rubisca*¹.

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 nudiusque tertius animaduerti tam uim nisus 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 sicuti ego.*

The glosses are due to someone who understood the texts.

The Hymn (A—&) '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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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 antropum, 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. 1260, 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.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT

xxv

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* (ʳ) in lines 188, 305, 407, and of the *spiritus lenis* (˙) in line 545¹. 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 h̄f 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 \bar{s} : *est* is twice ÷ (lines 126 and 523): *sunt* is once $\bar{s}t$ (line 552). All these suggest an Irish exemplar. The early use of a letter over q is seen in \dot{q} escunt (318), eq̄peratum (47), \dot{q} (562), aq̄si (460). \ddot{q} (for *quae*) occurs four times (131, 361, 510, 514).’

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

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

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 h̄ostium. [He has since noticed it in the Bamberg Macrobius and in the Brussels Paschasius.]

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

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 *Echter-nach* (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	ciclus D
corusco A	corruscis D
delphinas A	delfines D
exuberans A	exsuperas B
fauillis A	fauellis D
flammas &c. A	flamas &c. B D
gutturicant A	guturicauit C
massae A	masas D
obello A	auello &c. B C
obuallat A	oballatur D
pallida A	palidis D
scaphas A	scafis D
scintilla &c. A	scindellis B
spathas A	spadas B C D
tyrannus A	tirranus } B
	tirannus }

and in particular

frondosa, *montosa*, *mundanus*, *terrestrem*, *uerbalis* A,
fronduoso, *muntuosus*, *mundianus*, *terrestreum* (-ium), *uer-*
bialis 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*), *motuo* (≈ *mutuum*), *colligio* (≈ *collegio*). But these are quite exceptional. There are traces of confusion between

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT xxvii

b and *p*, in *preçibui*, *pabuļa* (*gl.* uel *p*), *saborem* (↻ *saporem*), &c.

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 hexameters¹. 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 *RQ̄* (*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 462 should probably run 'Fēnosaque roseis : pollut predia scaltis'; but it is difficult to retrace such operations.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-61717-9 - The Hisperica Famina: Edited with a Short Introduction and Index Verborum

Francis John Henry Jenkinson

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxviii

INTRODUCTION

the symbol goes back to the *Notae iuris*, in the manuscripts of which it occurs in the form Ñ, with variants Ñ̄ and Ñ̇; and that in the Verona manuscript of Gaius the various hands write sometimes Ñ, sometimes Ñ̄, and sometimes Ñ̇. (This last form, he says, accounts for the interchange of *non* (Ñ̄) and *nam* (Ñ̇) in some old texts.)

In Irish manuscripts, Dr Traube had noted Ñ 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 Ñ 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* 1^a.
 72 alboreis: 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 inuaguus 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 hand 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 xxix

- 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. *parierum 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 l 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 *solitum* 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 *ætræ*.
- 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*.

- 337 The original scribe began to write *framina* or *framina*, but placed his *g* after the first member of the *m*.
- 339 *protelauerit* with *n* above *i* and , below.
- 352 *predones*: *o* by second hand over ? *a*.
- 371 *flauore*, with open *a*!
- 395 *tabescunt* *corr. ex* *tabiscunt manu prima*.
- 427 *furiu[m]*: there is no contraction mark, and a punctum follows immediately after the *u*.
- 435 *cruda*: *r in rasura*.
- 442 *spungia*: he must have written *spaingia* and altered it by blotting out the belly of the *a*. The *a* is underlined.
- 451 No break in MS. after *rictu*.
- 454 *turrita*: MS. *trita*. This contraction is used elsewhere for *er* not *ur*.
- 472 *pecodum*: *eco in rasura* and *dū* squeezed in before *tellatus*, with a separating comma.
- 495 The erased letter seems to be *o* with a comma (,) below to call the attention of the corrector.
- 503 *carnali*: *li* written above after *na*, and a comma below.
- 546 *domescas*: over the last syllable is *m* (?) erased.
- 574 *inimicos etelluris* MS.

2. *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 describes¹ 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.