

Dear John,

As far as I'm concerned ! QUAD ratur- is good enough. The French-Latin dictionaire goes directly from CARRE to QUAD (several varieties) meaning rectangle in general, before going to carr'e for square in particular. Since this volume is rather American than Cambridgian, the question of a pun in QUAD is non-existent. It might have been a pun in America in my father's college days, and even later among the Ivy League colleges, and in my college days it was known to have been used, and for what. But it was not used. And I bet the French don't pun with it either. So I think we are happy to accept QUAD ~~Quadx~~ QUAD+KE ought to sound very nice. Wonder what one is.

As for the dooted tens and hundreds. Apparently your blind following is indistinguishable from your reasoned judgment. You come up with precisely Jean-Pierre's ruel. You are mad, both of you. I do not know how to write up the description ~~without~~ and still hide the fact that I am a fool. But since it will be obvious that I am just as foolish in describing the difference between .0 sup mut and just plain sup. mut. when sup in .0 sup mut mean not sup, but right there, and sup in just plain sup mut means not sup but down below in the next line. Ah, I think you're mad. And then those rules about - if there's a trace of a sign before ), you don't put a dot to represent a sign, but simply hint at the sign, by writing )-te, and insist that that means there is something there.

And then there's the use of mutila not to mean cut off, but broken off, abraded, etc, or simply not there, while ~~poor~~ poor cut off has to hide down in the vulgar obscurity of a vernacular language. And the use of .0, again, for some thing which isn't there, while poor old margo, which is there, and for me is significant, can't even appear in the apparatus, but is ignored, while the religua (?) pars sine regulis, which for me is hardly ever significant (exception Tn 316, at least) gets - bottom - billing. But I will try to write a description of what 100 and 100 mean. It's a pity I can't think of a sophistication which ~~will~~ will permit 100, 100, 100, 100, & 100 .

Jean-Pierre's just come back, and we've checked to see if we've got the dots right as far through the MS as we are now. Apparently there's just a bit of uncertainty in application - or so it seems to me. There's also as special rule about 10 100 &c as opposed to 200 20 &c, which to my jaundiced eye sounds as if the rules are just reversed in that special case. There 10 seems to mean it might be 20?, but not zero? But I'm sure I'll never trust anybody's (and not mine either) transcription of a number if there's a dot anywhere about or if there's a bracket about. Not simply the being warned that there's doubt, but the failure to know what he thought he saw.