

Conversion Conventions from Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus

Here I outline those formatting conventions I have used in converting the Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus edition of the Milan Codex to an electronic format (here a PDF created from a Microsoft Word document). One of the goals of the digitization was to create searchable texts for the Milan Glosses and for the Thesaurus edition of it. The complete Milan Glosses will appear later, as part of an FWF (Austrian Science Foundation) project, but the digitized version of the Milan Codex as presented in the Thesaurus is complete, though currently only in draft form.

I should note that for those interested in the Latin text of the Milan Codex, the Thesaurus, and therefore the current digitized edition, are inadequate, and thus reference should be made to the complete text, which appears in Ascoli (1887). For those interested in the digitized version of the Thesaurus text, the following paragraphs should be of some use.

The formatting of the original is largely preserved, but slight changes have been introduced. An effort was made to preserve, at least in broad outline, the look of the Thesaurus. Thus, page breaks are as they appear in the Thesaurus¹, but the arrangement of footnotes as well as line breaks (and the justified text of the original) have not been observed. The non-preservation of line breaks does have the consequence that notes and corrections to the Thesaurus text cannot be as easily located, but this negative consequence is mitigated by the fact that all corrections to the text (as printed in both Volumes I and II of the Thesaurus, as well as in the Supplement) have been incorporated into the digitized text as footnotes. Simple interpretations of forms, as often appear in the Supplement, have not been noted, mostly because the complete edition of the glosses (part of the above-mentioned FWF project) will make such notes superfluous. Other corrections and additions, however, have been incorporated into the electronic document.²

The Latin of the Thesaurus edition contains many lacunæ, indicated either by “..” or “...” (for smaller lacunæ) or by a rather large space between text elements (for larger lacunæ). In the electronic text, the “..” and “...” of the Thesaurus are rendered identically, but the large space of the Thesaurus was deemed inadequate for the electronic edition. Thus, the convention to show large lacunæ in the electronic edition is to have a “...” surrounded by five spaces on either side.³

One further limitation imposed by Microsoft Word applies to the marking of folio divisions. These appeared beside the text in the Thesaurus, which creates a clean text but makes it unclear where the folio break lies. In the electronic text, folio breaks are shown where they occur in the manuscript and are indicated by a | where possible, but otherwise with a hard return. The folio number is given in 10pt type, followed by a tab and the Latin text in normal type.

These changes are meant to allow users of the Thesaurus to use the electronic edition with relative ease. While some changes were necessitated by the demands of electronic media, the preceding has hopefully made clear what those changes are and how they are represented in the PDFs.

¹ The only exception comes on page 278. There, the entire text could not fit on one page. Thus, some of the translation was placed on the subsequent page.

² Such corrections and additions have been silently incorporated into the text. Additionally, little attempt was made to homogenize the various styles used in the footnotes and corrections (e.g. the various bibliographic methods employed).

³ At the end of every psalm appears the formula: *explicit psalmus Y incipit Y+1*. This formula was left out of Thes Pal and was not marked here as a lacuna since its position is totally predictable.