

LATIN PALEOGRAPHY - SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY--C. E.
Murgia

Paleography is the study of ancient writing, most properly writing on parchment or paper or equivalent material, such as wooden tablets, leaves, canvas, or any other material on which one can write with a pen, reed, or paintbrush. Latin Paleography covers writing from the beginning of the Latin alphabet through the Italian and English Renaissances. Several related disciplines are distinguished from it, based on the material on which the writing is found. Papyrology, the study of writing on papyrus, requires special skills, but is essentially a branch of paleography (at least so far as it is occupied with reading papyri, and identifying their dates, provenance, place and style of writing, and other facts about the circumstances of copying and transmission; so far as the papyrologist is concerned with editing papyri, he practices textual criticism; so far as he uses the papyri for historical analysis, he is an historian). The study of writing stamped on coins belongs to the separate discipline of numismatics. Inscriptions on stone, metal, pottery, gems, seal-stones, stamps, weights, lamps, and other household items belong to epigraphy. Although regarded as a separate discipline, epigraphy is of importance to the paleographer, since the earliest examples of writing are usually found in inscriptions, and since there continues to be a mutual influence of inscriptions and other forms of writing on each other. For a bibliography of Latin Epigraphy see A. E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*, (Berkeley 1983) 54-65, which supplements the bibliography of Ida Calabi Limentani, *Epigrafia latina, con un'appendice bibliografica di Attilio Degrossi*, ed. 3 (Milan 1974) 423-466. The easiest introduction to Latin Paleography is B. L. Ullman, *Ancient Writing and Its Influence*, originally published in 1932 (and so out of date in some respects), but published again (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) with an introduction and supplementary bibliography by Julian Brown, this second edition now reprinted in paperback from Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching (Toronto 1980). The bibliographies and Brown's evaluation of the bibliography in his introduction should be consulted. Forthcoming from the University of Toronto Press is *Medieval Latin Paleography: A Select Bibliography*, edited by L. Boyle. Also worthy of consultation (although out of date) is the bibliography of M. R. P. McGuire, *Introduction to Classical Scholarship* (Washington 1961) 100-107. Especially noteworthy, or missing from these sources, are the following:

1. PERIODICALS

Paleographia Latina
Scriptorium
Speculum

2. FACSIMILES

Chatelain, E., *Paléographie des classiques latins* (Paris 1884-1900)
Lowe, E. A., *Codices Latini Antiquiores* I-XI and Supplement (Oxford 1934-1971);
abbreviated *CLA*

Dec 1984

Toronto Latin Paleography # 8

now
out



- Samaran, C. and Marichal, R., *Catalogue des Manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste* (Paris 1959-1981-)
Umbræ Codicum Occidentaliū I-XI (Amsterdam 1960-1966)
- Lieftinck, G. I., *Manuscrits datés conservés dans les Pays-Bas: Catalogue Paléographique ...* (Amsterdam 1964 -)
- Thomson, S. H., *Latin Bookhands of the later Middle Ages 1100-1500* (Cambridge 1969)
- Unterkicher, F., *Katalog der datierten Handschriften in lateinische Schrift in Oesterreich* (Vienna 1969 -)
- Masai, F and Wittek, M., *MSS datés conservés en Belgique* I-IV (Ghent 1970-1982)
- Scarpattetti, Beat Mattias von, *Katalog der datierten Handschriften in der Schweiz in lateinischer Schrift vom Anfang des Mittelalters bis 1558* (Zuerich 1977-)

3. GENERAL

- Lowe, E. A., *Paleographical Papers 1907-65* (Oxford 1972): his collected articles
- Bischoff, B., Lieftinck, G. I., and Batelli, G., *Nomenclature des Écritures Livresque*. CNRS (Paris 1954)
- Bischoff, B., *Palaeographie des roemischen Altertums und des abendlaendischen Mittelalters* (Berlin 1979)

4. ABBREVIATIONS

- Capelli, A., *Dizionario di abbreviature latine ed italiane* (3rd ed. Milan 1929)
- Lindsay, W. M., *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915, reprinted with *Supplement* by D. Bains 1936)
- Traube, L., *Nomina Sacra* (Munich 1907)
- Mentz, A., *Die Thronische Noten* (Berlin 1944) *idem*, *Geschichte der Kurzschrift* (Wolfenbuettel 1964)
- Pelzer, A. *Abbreviations latines médiévales* (Louvain and Paris 1964)

5. EARLY LATIN WRITING

- Thomas, J. D., "New Light on early Latin Writing: the Vindolanda Tablets," *Scriptorium* 30 (1976) 38-43
- Anderson, R. D, Parsons, P. J., and Nisbet, R. G. M., "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm" *JRS* 69 (1979) 125-155

6. MAJUSCULES

- Traube, L., *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* (Munich 1909-1920)
- Lowe, E. A. and Rand, E. K., *A sixth-century fragment of the letters of Pliny the Younger* (Washington 1922)
- Lowe, E. A., "A hand-list of half-uncial mss." In *Miscellanea Ehrle* vol. 4 (1924) *Studi e testi*
- idem*, *English Uncial* (Oxford 1960)
- idem*, *CLA (Codices Latini Antiquiores)*, particularly vol. 1 } Mallon, J, *Paleographie romaine* (Madrid 1952) - but read the reviews too

7. MINUSCULES

7.1. INSULAR

CLA 2, Introduction

Bieler, L., "Insular Paelography, present state and problems," *Scriptorium* 3 (1949) 267-289

Masai, F., *Essai sur les origines de la miniature dite irlandaise* (1947) Pbn. de *Scriptorium* 1

Reviewed in *GBA* 92 (1950) 37, 134-138

Brown, T. J., anything you can find

7.2. LUXEUIL

Lowe, E. A., "The script of Luxeuil. A title vindicated," *Revue Benedictine* 63 (1953) 132-142

Putnam, M. C. J., "Evidence for the origin of the script of Luxeuil," *Speculum* 38 (1963) 256-266

7.3. CORBIE

CLA 6, Introduction

Paleographia Latina 1 and 5

Articles in *Scriptorium* 8 (1954) 24-37; 20 (1966) 265-272; *Speculum* (1947) 191-204, 375-394

7.4. TOURS

Rand, E. K.; *Studies in the Script of Tours*. 2 vols. (Cambridge 1929-1934)

Jones, L. W., "The script of Tours in the tenth century," *Speculum* 14 (1939)
idem, "The art of writing at Tours from 1000 to 1200 A. D.," *Speculum* 15 (1940)

7.5. BENEVENTAN

Lowe, E. A., *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford 1914) and *Scriptura Beneventana* (Oxford 1929)

7.6. LATE CAROLINE / GOTHIC - see FACSIMILES, particularly Thomson

7.7. HUMANISTIC SCRIPT

7.8.

Ullman, B. L., *The origin and development of humanistic script* (Rome 1960)

Fairbank, A. J. and Hunt, R. W., *Humanistic Script of the 15th and 16th centuries* (Oxford 1960)

Meiss, M., "Towards a more comprehensive Renaissance paleography," *Art Bull* 42 (1960)

Wardrop, J., *The script of humanism* (Oxford 1963)

Ogg, O., *Three classics of Italian calligraphy* (New York 1963)

LATIN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

While the paleographer is concerned with a MS "as a physical entity when it was written, where, by whom, and what features of interest it presents in its

writing, ruling, binding and the like" (J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* [Urbana 1972] 5), the textual critic's object is to reconstruct as accurately as possible the original text of an author; the text must be based on evidence, and normally the primary evidence is the reading of one or more MSS, though other evidence, such as quotations by other authors (called the "secondary tradition"), imitations, the requirements of language and sense, and stylistic consistency, must also be used. When there is more than one extant MS of a text, the textual critic's job involves also determining the relations of the MSS, to see if one MS is the source of the others, or if one or more lost common sources of the MSS can be reconstructed from the evidence of the extant MSS; by this process of eliminating *codices descripti* (codices copied from an extant codex) or grouping related MSS into families descending from a single lost witness, the textual critic seeks to reduce the number of witnesses to the minimum number needed to reconstruct the original text or the earliest reconstructable witness to the text. The editor of a literary text must first familiarize himself with the author, reading as much as he can of the author's extant writings, and of related works (works in the same genre, on the same subject, or other works which may have influenced the work which he will edit). Next he must assemble his evidence. For scribal evidence, this means searching out and examining the MSS which transmit the work to be edited. It is necessary to consult published and unpublished catalogues and inventories of libraries housing collections of Latin MSS. The following works (the first a catalogue of catalogues and inventories) are invaluable aids to such a search:

Kristeller, P. O., *Latin Manuscript Books before 1600*, (New York, 3rd edition 1965)
idem, *Iter Italicum*, 2 vols. (London 1963-7)

Cranz, F. E., *A microfilm corpus of the indices to printed catalogues of Latin manuscripts before 1600 A.D.* I: Text (New Haven, Conn. 1982)

Once the MSS have been discovered and examined, it is necessary to determine which ones are worthy of use: *codices descripti* are eliminated, as are any other MSS which contribute no readings of value missing from earlier or more reliable witnesses (real or reconstructable MSS which are relatively free of scribal interpolation or careless error). An attempt is made to reduce the divergences in the MSS to a single archetypal reading (the reading of the latest common source of all known MSS, if there is a single reconstructable source), or to "presumptive variants" (that is, to readings which could possibly have been transmitted from the author, or from the archetype). Often, when there has been contamination (scribal comparison of more than one source), there will not be a single, unchanging archetype for all readings, but it may yet be possible to establish an archetypal reading on a reading by reading basis (that is, one may be able to determine a single reading which was the basis for several different errors or conjectural attempts at emendation found in the MSS, but this need not mean that the archetype of this reading was the same MS which will be found to be the archetype of the next reading for which a latest common source could be reconstructed). Once the archetypal readings or presumptive variants have been isolated, it is necessary to examine the readings and test them by other evidence (the evidence of the "secondary tradition," language, sense, style, meter or prose rhythm) to see whether they are correct. Readings found to be correct are printed in the text, with the authority for the reading (wherever there is any opposing evidence), and any presumptive variants in the MSS or secondary tradition, recorded (usually at the bottom of the page) in a critical apparatus (I describe a positive apparatus; in a negative apparatus, only the opposing evidence is recorded). When the archetypal reading (or all presumptive variants when it is not possible to establish a single archetypal

reading) is judged to be incorrect, it is necessary to emend the transmitted reading either from the secondary tradition or by a conjectural emendation based on evidence (language, sense, style, comparison with related works, and such). Often the correct emendation will already have been made by a scribe in a later MS or by one or more scholars or previous editors. It is important that the editor identify the earliest scholar or scribal witness to offer the emendation, and report the information in the critical apparatus; any scholar who first identified a previously unsuspected passage as corrupt, or contributed to the correct emendation by a partially correct conjecture, should also be given credit in the apparatus. When (as often happens) there is insufficient evidence to emend a corrupt text, the words suspected of corruption (printed as transmitted, so far as the available evidence permits the reconstruction) should be identified by enclosure between obeli (†).

8. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- McGuire, M. R. P., *Introduction to Classical Scholarship* (Washington 1961) 42-54
Maas, P., *Textkritik* (Leipzig 1927; 3rd ed. 1957);
-----, *Textual Criticism* (trans. B. Flower, Oxford 1958)
West, M. L., *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973)
Willis, J., *Latin Textual Criticism* (Urbana 1972)
Hall, F. W., *Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford 1913)
Housman, A. E., *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, J. Diggle and F. D. R. Goodyear edd., 3 vols. (Cambridge 1972)
idem, *Selected Prose*, J. Carter ed. (Cambridge 1961)

9. METHODOLOGICAL EXAMPLES

For editing a text from an autograph:

- Rodgers, R. H., *Petri Diaconi: Ortus et Vita hystorum Cenobii Casinensis*. *University of California Publications: Classical Studies* 10 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1972)

For handling a contaminated tradition:

- Murgia, C. E., *Prolegomena to Servius 5 - The Manuscripts*. *University of California Publications: Classical Studies* 11 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1975) Section III and Appendix B

- idem*, "Critical Notes on the Text of Servius' Commentary on *Aeneid* III-V," *HSCP* 72 (1967) 311-350

For identifying *codices descripti*, and for handling MSS descended from an archetype supplied with corrections and variants:

- Murgia, C. E., "The Minor Works of Tacitus: A Study in Textual Criticism," *CP* 72 (1977) 323-343