# A CLASSICAL TECHNOLOGY

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

#### ISBN 9780649457069

A Classical Technology by John M. Burnam

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

### **JOHN M. BURNAM**

# A CLASSICAL TECHNOLOGY



### A Classical Technology

Edited from Codex Lucensis, 490

BY

JOHN M. BURNAM

Professor of Latin, University of Cincinnati



BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER
THE GORHAM PRESS

Copyright, 1920, by John M. Burnam

Ga. 60.80

All Rights Reserved

APR 5 1921

Constanting from

MADE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE GORHAM PRESS, BOSTON, U. S. A.

#### PREFACE

This pamphlet is presented to the learned world as an attempted fulfillment of the author's promise made p. 7 of "Recipes from Codex Matritensis A 16," ("A"); see University of Cincinnati Studies 1912. The editor had been lead to discuss Codex Lucensis 490 in so far certain leaves contain a series of antique recipes for colors, inks, stains, varnishes, alloys, etc. Reference was made to L. Duchesne, Le Liber Pontificalis tom. I pp. CLXIV-CLXVI for the earlier bibliography and that editor's mention of the recipes; to Wattenbach, Schriftwesen, third ed. Leipzig 1896, p. 252 n. 3; to the Arezzo ed. of Muratori Antiquitates Italicae ton. IV 1734, cols. 674-717 ("M"). To those references must now be added Loew, Studia Palaeographica München 1910, pp. 30 and 44, Scriptura Beneventana, Oxford, 1914. pp. 108, n. 2 ("one of the hands makes a very decided Visigothic impression"), 110 ("s. viii ex. probably written in Lucca), 211; Blümmer Terminologie u. Technologie, etc." tom. I second ed. Leipzig 1912, p. 240 n. 2, 246, n. 3 (he could not thoroughly utilize this MS because its text is "sehr verderbt"); and finally Lindsay in the Revue des Bibliothèques, 1914, p. 19 mentioning the script of the earlier part of the MS as Visigothic.

The present editor held that A and M are ultimately offshoots of the same text, that M is Spanish in its own writing as well as that of its archetype (this last statement proving erroneous as the reader will presently learn); that their archetype was from about 700 and was in a semiuncial hand. But having since then secured through Auguste Picard 82 rue Bonaparte and the overseers of the Capitular Library of Lucca a photographic facsimile of this portion of the MS plus an additional folio, the editor has somewhat modified his views.

Writing: fol. 211 Vo. has two chapter headings I and III done in a mixture of ungainly Capitals and Uncials, whereas the text of I and II is in a transitional style halfway between a legible cursive and the Carolingian Minuscule, with some queer combinations e. g. LaBorant. There are numerous erasures of the prothetic h (a Spanish symptom), many occurrences of the dot employed to separate words or word-combinations. The scribe who did the chapter headings seems to have copied the chapter III likewise, using a singular wide rounded hand with less word separation, fewer dots and without erasures. Fol. 217 Ro. is done chiefly in a cursive, unlike either of the preceding; this hand reaches to DE TINCTIO OMNIUM MUSIUORUM.

Here we first meet the symbol  $\div$  for uncia, of such frequent occurrence in this text; we must not fail to mention the existence of two or three blurrs rendering the decipherment of the text somwhat uncertain. The remainder of the MS is in Uncials with an admixture of cursives; these latter are often traceable to a corrector, perhaps all are due to him. It seems that sometimes the scribe, unable to decipher his *Vorlage*, left a vacant space later filled in by the corrector, a much more expert palaegrapher; he did the other work usually devolving on a corrector. The abbreviations are the aforementioned symbol for uncia, a d with cross stroke for dragma, bar with nasal or general value, the usual p series, q; for que etc.

Spanish character of the text: Besides the prothetic h already mentioned, observe the frequent confusion of b and v, the use of ipse\* as an article; occurrence of calentem sometimes rather than caldum for warm (Sp. and Port.) denante 688E; the occurrence of several words from the Syriac and Arabic which can scarcely have reached our territory otherwise than via Spain viz luza (Syriac), lulax, lazurizon (Arabo-Persian), zebel i. e. gebel (Arabic for rock): these facts compel us to refer the arche-

<sup>\*</sup>Which must antedate the Carolingian invasion in the eighth century.

type to a Spanish territory, and that territory (note ipse) must be Catalonia. Furthermore, the only convent in the Barcelonese region which could have made a home for such a text ultimately going back (as the reader will presently see) to Greco-oriental sources, must have been Santa Maris de Ripoll.

The writing of the archetype: must have been a Spanish cursive. At 701 A we read omam corr. from umam, which must be changed to autem, i. e. it was aum in the archetype. Note also quoquis 702 E. corr. from quopis, tinquere 677 E for tinquere, several occasions e. g. 686 C when z is written for g;er for tr and et for tt 711 E; ainquis for tinquis 679 E; tarbonibus 707 D for car-; 714 E where we find r for s and e for t etc.: these errors and exchanges require us to posit a Visigothic cursive in the scribe's Vorlage.

Writing of the parent of the archetype: temperatiorum 707 C for temperationum and some similar exchanges in 714 E of n for r demonstrate an earlier copy in a Roman Semiuncial hand. We must also state that the error of unum for unde 716 B, the loss of erunt, i. e. er after —ter 687 D, the form cumflatura 694 C for conflatura, the existence of he for habet 687 Sodica for ferotica 696 C etc., all furnish cogent evidence for the existence of some abbreviations in the archetype or its parent. It must also be remarked that one of these MSS had some marginal summaries or catchwords as well as probationes pennae which have been perpetuated in the Codex Lucensis. For instance 698 D we find that impossible word unguatum which was a Spaniard's side note i. e. aquatum, the correct Latin for that Lombard for unatu of the text. This, as a result of its cursive Visigothic form, was misread uquatum and then made to resemble unquentum, a good enough Latin term, but quite out of place here: it must be admitted, however that our scribe may really have had before him aguatum preceding modern Spanish aquada, aquado.

The further history of the text and Ms: the scribe of this codex at least of this portion of it, can be only Italian. For, at 697 D, he began the word lilium with a g, i. e. the modern Italian giglio. The recurrence of g with its modern force proves nothing since that phenomenon was quite as prevalent in Catalonia and in fact all Spain. What is more important is the fact that the text in spite of its strong Spanish affinities in its present state, must have originated in N. Italy. The combination post tote bullite 690 B can come only from Italian territory: fersa 690 A producing Lombard fers, suventium 690 D whence old N. Italian suvenço, uvatum 698 D a Lombard word from aquatum are decisive for the particular region that produced the translation. Some other words worth noting are banga