

Newly deciphered Old Irish glosses in the Cadmug Gospels



Elliott Lash

Celtica 31 (2019), 1–4

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-vgeqr-6eqhc

DIAS

Institiúid Ard-Léinn | Dublin Institute for
Bhaile Átha Cliath | Advanced Studies



© School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

This work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. To view a copy of this
license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

NEWLY DECIPHERED OLD IRISH GLOSSES IN THE CADMUG GOSPELS¹

ABSTRACT

I provide a new edition of the glosses on fol. 39r of the eighth-century Cadmug Gospels. I also correct the reading of one of the glosses on fol. 3va.

INTRODUCTION

In his edition of the Old Irish glosses in the Cadmug Gospels,² Kuno Meyer (1912: 174) gives the impression that there are six glosses on fol. 39r9, although he was only able to read two of them. With regard to these glosses, he says:

Die Lesung der letzten Glossen ist noch dadurch erschwert, daß sie mit Ausnahme von *nech* durchgestrichen sind. (Meyer 1912: 174)

‘The reading of the last glosses is even more difficult due to the fact that, with the exception of *nech*, they are crossed out.’

On account of this difficulty, he leaves the glosses largely undeciphered. The following is his edition of the passage, in which the glosses are enclosed in parentheses and inserted after the words to which he thought that they referred:

nemo (nech) *autem* lucernam (lucarn:?) accendens operit (.i. ::::)
eam uasso (....) *aut* sub lectum ponit (.i. ...) sed supra candalabrum
(.i. ::a:.....)

‘No one (nech), however, after lighting a lamp (lucarn:?), hides
(.i. ::::) it under a jar (....) or puts [it] (.i. ...) beneath the bed, but
on a lampstand (.i. ::a:.....) ...’ (Luke VIII:16; my translation)

¹This article was written as part of the research project *Chronologicon Hibernicum* (*Chron-Hib*), which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 647351). I am grateful to Prof. David Stifter, Dr Fangzhe Qiu, and Dr Bernhard Bauer for discussion of this passage, an anonymous reviewer for helpful suggestions, and Nadine Hecht of the Fulda Landesbibliothek for providing an electronic photograph of fol. 39r.

²Fulda, Landesbibliothek, MS Bonifatianus 3 (eighth century). The manuscript is described in Lowe (1959), no. 1198. For further references, see Bronner (2013: 16) and the Earlier Latin Manuscripts database hosted by the National University of Ireland, Galway (<https://elmss.nuigalway.ie/catalogue/1674>, accessed 15 February 2019).

A fresh examination of the evidence is clearly called for. Having received an electronic photograph from the Fulda Landesbibliothek,³ I am able to read all of the glosses and provide a new transcription of the Latin text along with a new edition of the glosses in section two.

EDITION

Where Meyer saw six glosses, there are in fact only four, two of which consist of two words separated by .i. ‘that is’. Below, I present my transcription of the Latin first and then an edition and translation of the glosses. I use <E> to denote the tall <e> found in the manuscript. Scribal abbreviations are expanded in italics. The glosses associated with the Latin words are indicated by superscript numbers at the right of the first word over which the gloss occurs in the manuscript. Two of the glosses in fact extend over several words. This fact, along with the extremely cramped writing due to the size of the manuscript, is probably what led Meyer to believe that there were more glosses than there actually are, and that they were crossed out, which they are not.

Latin text

Nemo¹ *autem* lucErnam² ascEn[dens] operit Eam uasso³ *aut* sub[tus?]⁴ lEctum ponit *sed* super candalabrum

Glosses

1. *nech*
2. *lucernam* .i. *luac.rn*
3. *cErn*
4. *lucernam* .i. *luachairnnn*

Translation of the glosses

1. ‘no one’
2. ‘*lucernam*, that is, “lamp”’
3. ‘dish’
4. ‘*lucernam*, that is, “lamp”’

NOTES

When referring to words or individual letters found in the Latin text or in the glosses, I enclose them in angle brackets.

- a. <Nemo> is written with a large <n> within which <e> is written. This is followed by <mo> written after the second descender of the <n>. The first gloss is placed over the letters <mo> and extends part way over the Tironian note for *autem*.

³There is a digital facsimile of the manuscript available online at <https://fuldig.hs-fulda.de/viewer/image/PPN325292043/1/> (accessed 15 February 2019).

- b. The second gloss consists of one Latin word and one Irish word. It starts over the <u> of <luernam> and extends over the <u> of <uasso>. The Irish part of the gloss begins over the <p> of <operit>. In the Irish word, the letters <ac> are written together. There are one or two letters between <c> and <r> that are not written because the m-stroke of <Eam> intervenes. These letters were probably <hi>, <ha> or merely the vowels alone, making the entire word <luac(h)arn> or <luac(h)irn>. The latter represents a possible spelling for the accusative singular of *luacharn*, and agrees with the case of the Latin word.
- c. The third gloss begins over the <a> of <uasso> and extends to the end of the Latin word. The word must be the one listed in *eDIL* s.v. 2 *cern* ‘dish or receptacle (of fixed capacity)’, although this example is not found in the dictionary.
- d. The fourth gloss starts over <sub> and extends to the end of <candalabrum>. The gloss is essentially the same as the second gloss, except it is fully spelled out. The Irish word *luachairnnn* is again in the accusative singular to agree with the Latin word. The glossator writes <n> three times seemingly in order to finish the gloss over the end of the Latin word.
- e. The scribe uses the same abbreviation over the <p> in <operit> as he uses in <super>. This contrasts with a more common reading of Luke VIII:16 where *supra* instead of *super* is found. Perhaps the scribe was thinking of the equivalent verse in Matthew:

neque accendunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio sed
super candelabrum ...

‘neither do they light a lamp and put it under a bowl, but on
a lampstand ...’ (Matthew V:15, my translation)

- f. Meyer (1912: 174) silently corrects the Latin word <ascen[dens]> to *accendens*, which is found in the Vulgate text of Luke VIII:16. Although the form as it stands is an error and must be corrected, to do so without comment is misleading. The word is clearly written with an <s> before the <c>, as if the scribe were writing *ascendens* from the verb *ascendo* ‘I go up’. Furthermore, one should note that there is actually no room for the letters <dens>. It is likely that an abbreviation stroke was left out.⁴ A somewhat different case is <sub[tus?]>, which Meyer prints merely as *sub*. Both the Latin word *subtus* and the word *sub* are equally plausible in this context; indeed other manuscripts containing

⁴To account for the <s>, one possibility, though speculative, is that the exemplar of the passage was more akin to the redaction also found in the Usserianus Primus (TCD MS 55, fol. 100v2) and the Book of Mulling (TCD MS 60, fol. 62rb20), both of which have *accensam* rather than *accendens*. The medial <s> in *accensam* could well have been misplaced.

Old Latin versions of Luke show the same variation. One cannot be certain, therefore, whether the scribe of the Cadmug Gospels was copying his exemplar faithfully. This uncertainty is indicated in the above edition with the question mark added at the end of the word. Somewhat inconsistently with his correction of <ascen[dens]> to *accendens*, Meyer did not correct <candalabrum> to the standardized form *candelabrum*.

DISCUSSION

Only the fourth gloss is in need of extended comment. Because it is essentially the same as the second gloss, it seems initially to be redundant. One way to account for this is to suppose that the two glosses have different functions. The second gloss seems to be a simple translation gloss, providing the translation for the Latin word <*lucernam*>. The fourth gloss is rather a syntactic gloss.⁵ Its function is to clarify the grammatical object of the Latin verb <ponit>, since it is not actually mentioned in the Latin text of Luke. Perhaps the glossator was concerned that, without this clarification, a reader may have wrongly understood the object of <ponit> to be *vasum* ‘jar’ (the noun immediately preceding the gloss) instead of *lucerna* ‘lamp’. A comparison with the Latin text of the passage from Matthew suggests that the gloss does indeed have a syntactic function. Unlike in Luke, the verb *ponunt* has an explicitly mentioned object in Matthew, namely *eam*, which is coreferential with *lucernam*.

A NOTE ON A GLOSS ON FOL. 3VA6

Meyer’s (1912: 173) edition of one of the glosses on fol. 3v of the same manuscript can also be updated. The first gloss, which is found over *in umbra* (Matthew IV:16), is printed in his edition as <.i. fos> with a footnote saying that the Irish word should be read as *fos[cad]*. In fact, the gloss is clearly written as <.i. hi fos>, which should be read as *.i. hi fos[cud]* ‘i.e. in (the) shadow’.

REFERENCES

- BLOM, ALDERIK H. 2017: *Glossing the Psalms: The Emergence of the Written Vernaculars in Western Europe from the Seventh to the Twelfth Centuries* (Berlin).
- BRONNER, DAGMAR 2013: *Verzeichnis altirischer Quellen, vorläufige Version* (Marburg), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01638388> (accessed 15 February 2019).
- LOWE, E. A. 1959: *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, Vol. 8. (Oxford).
- MEYER, KUNO 1912: ‘Neu aufgefundene altirische Glossen’, *ZCP* 8, 173–7.

ELLIOTT LASH

Maynooth University, Dept. of Early Irish

⁵For a recent discussion of the various functions of glosses, including syntactic glosses, see Blom (2017: 26–35).