

The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Two Tachygraphical Notes

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 07 / October 2006, pp 349 - 349

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994885, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994885

How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (1906). Two Tachygraphical Notes. The Classical Review, 20, pp 349-349
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994885

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TWO TACHYGRAPHICAL NOTES.

Schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 184.

πρόσεχε τῇ ξ τοῦ δ
νείρου ἀναγνώσει

Since the sign which follows $\tau\eta$ is printed by Dähnhardt (Scholl. in Aesch. *Pers.* 1894) and Wecklein (in his edition) with a certain mystery, it may be worth while to notice that the facsimile clearly shews that it means $\alpha\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$. The writer of the scholia (all in one hand) added the word above the line, and to save space used this abbreviation. $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is regularly abbreviated by the symbol for the case-ending with a stroke across to indicate omission: so

ζ = αἰρόν, Coislin 387 (Rhetorica), Paris
 grec 1678 (Plutarch), Vat. Pal.
 173 (Plato), Nonnus B. M. Add.
 MSS. 18231, Paris grec 2036
 (Aristotle, etc.), Vat. Reg. 181
 (a. 1364) in a table of signs.

$\bar{\alpha}$ = $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$, Coislin 387, Nonnus.

$\bar{\upsilon}$ = αὐτός, Nonnus.

$\bar{\lambda} = \alpha \nu \tau o \hat{\iota} s$, Nonnus.

All these MSS. except Reg. 181 are of s. x or x-xi. Except in the Nonnus MS. the

system is not common in the *Scuola di san Nilo*. Zereteli has a case of $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ from the facsimile of the same MS.

Tachygraphy occasionally intrudes into literary texts for the same reason, to economise space. Barocci 50 (s. x-xi) the admirable MS. to which we owe the oldest text of the *Batrachomyomachia*, and of *Hero and Leander*, beside many grammarians, on f. 8 v. runs thus :

ἡ ὁ συλλαβὴ ἔχουσα μεθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐν τι τῶν
 διπλῶν εἴτε κατὰ τὸ μέσον ἐν ἀπλῇ καὶ ἀκινήτῳ
 λέξει κ.τ.λ. (Theognostus in Cramer, *An. Ox.*
 ii. p. 14). The sentence though printed telle
 quelle in the *An. Ox.* is defective, and the
 scribe noticed the defect, for above the line,
 from διπλῶν to κατὰ we have eight signs, of
 which the following is an enlarged repre-
 sentation :

6740 4194

i.e. syllabically εἰ τε καὶ τὰρ χὴν λεξέως,
or εἴτε κατ' ἀρχὴν λεξέως. This should be
restored in the text after διπλῶν.

T. W. ALLEN.

THE *CODEX LUSATICUS* OF PROPERTIUS.

In or about the year 1893 Herr Peper discovered a paper manuscript of Propertius and published an account and estimate of it in the *Neues Lausitzisches Magazin* together with a collation of Book I. As scholars are not habitual readers of the *Neues Lausitzisches Magazin*, it is hardly strange that Herr Peper's discovery attracted no attention, and so Herr P. Koehler chose it for his degree thesis at Marburg in the year 1899. The codex was again unfortunate; and (as Herr Koehler complains) no notice was taken of his dissertation save by the Professor who suggested and examined it. Now for a third time the codex woos public favour, in the pages of *Philologus* vol. xviii. pp. 414 *sqq.*, under the title 'Eine neue Properzhandschrift.'

Herr Peper named his codex *Lusaticus*, although it was found 'in bibliotheca Gorlitziana,' and Herr Koehler lettered it as

L, though he was aware¹ that this was already the denotation of Lord Leicester's manuscript at Holkham. To the capital which has now been employed for the latter MS in two editions of Propertius the 'Lusaticus' has no right; but it may be, and in this paper will be, abbreviated as l for a reason that will presently appear.

At the end of I stands a subscription *Finis. padue* 1469. The latter word and the figures Herr Peper naturally thought fixed the place and the date of writing. But Herr Koehler insists that they are not in the handwriting of the scribe but of the reviser. This they may be, and yet the date be correct, for the revision may well have been contemporary. The particulars of Herr

¹ From my pamphlet *On Certain Manuscripts of Propertius*, published as a part of vol. iv. of the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 1894.