

Who are we? On the usage of ‘we/us’ in the St Gall Priscian Glosses



Bernhard Bauer

Celtica 31 (2019), 5–18

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-a3q4z-hfprc

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/>

WHO ARE WE? ON THE USAGE OF ‘WE/US’ IN THE ST GALL PRISCIAN GLOSSES*

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the usage of ‘we/us’ in the early medieval glosses on Priscian’s *Institutiones Grammaticae* found in the ninth century manuscript St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 904. Detailed discussion of Latin and Irish examples aims to shed light on the question who is behind the pronoun ‘we’ in the glosses. In doing this the present article tries to find possible answers to the question of whether or not the Irish glosses are original compositions or translations from Latin.

INTRODUCTION

IN HIS article on language interaction in the St Gall Priscian Glosses, Moran (2015: 136) made the following thought-provoking observation: ‘We may [...] question whether the Irish glosses are original compositions at all, or merely translations from inherited Latin sources.’ Inspired by this, the following article tries to find an answer to the question ‘Who are we?’, that is, to determine whether glosses containing the notion ‘we’ are composed from an Irish or Latin(-speaking) point of view. The main source used is the Latin and Old Irish glosses featuring ‘we/us’ found in the manuscript St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS 904. Ó Néill (2000) has convincingly shown that this manuscript was written in the years AD 850–1. Hofman (1996, i, 12–31) offers strong arguments for an Irish origin. It contains Priscian’s Latin grammar with c. 9412 interlinear and marginal glosses, of which c. 3478 are in Old Irish.¹ The rest is in Latin. The glosses are available in a digital edition,² established by Moran, which is based on the previous work of Hofman (1996) and Bauer (2015). For the present study this database was searched for glosses containing the Latin phrase *apud nos* ‘with us’ and the conjugated Old Irish prepositions *linn(i)* ‘with us’ and *dún/dunni* ‘to us’. This allows for a direct comparison of the two languages. The article is divided into three main parts. The first deals with the Latin glosses, followed in part two by the vernacular glosses. The third section further extends the scope of the discussion and addresses specific glosses concerning geographical names, followed by general conclusions.

*The work on this article was undertaken as part of the IRC-funded project Languages in Exchange: Ireland and her Neighbours (Irish Research Council Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship Award No. GOIPD/2016/174). I express my gratitude for assistance and suggestions to the editors and readers, and David Stifter.

¹Cf. Moran (2015: 115).

²Bauer et al. (2017).

Apud nos-GLOSSES

As a first step the database was searched for glosses containing the Latin phrase *apud nos* ‘with us/in our language’.³ The phrase occurs eleven times in the glosses but is also very frequent in the main text (94 occurrences). It is interesting to note that there are also two bilingual glosses⁴ (L6 and L11)⁵ featuring this Latin phrase. Most of the *apud nos*-glosses are written from a Latin point of view and serve to distinguish Latin from Greek. In fact, only one example does not occur in a Greek context:

- (L1) **Sg. 122a20 f**⁶ *apud nos*
 ‘in our language’
 gl. *uetustissimos* (Keil ii, 310, l. 17)⁷
 ‘oldest’⁸

This gloss emphasizes the difference between the usage of certain genitive and dative plural forms by the *uetustissimi* ‘oldest [authors]’ and contemporaries. The following list comprises nine examples of Latin *apud nos*-glosses and one bilingual one:

- (L2) **Sg. 18a16 m** .i. in *subiunctione* .i. *apud nos*
 ‘i.e. in subjunction i.e. in our language’
 gl. *quam pro omni i longa scribebant more antiquo Graecorum. invenitur haec eadem i post u in Graecis nominibus, ut Ἀρπυιᾶ: nam υι diphthongus est.* (Keil ii, 37, ll. 10–12)
 ‘which they wrote for every long *i*, in the ancient Greek manner. This same *i* is also found for *i* after *u* in Greek names, like Ἀρπυιᾶ: because υι is a diphthong.’
- (L3) **Sg. 19a19 i** .i. *apud nos*
 ‘i.e. in our language’
 gl. *κωμῳδία comedia* (Keil ii, 40, l. 3)
 ‘comedy comedy’.

- (L4) **Sg. 26b23 w** .i. *Quia carecter eius apud nos non invenitur.*
 ‘i.e. because its character is not found in our language’

³Where applicable, the phrase *apud nos* is translated as ‘in our language’ in this paper.

⁴In this article the term ‘bilingual gloss’ is used for any gloss that features two languages. The concerns raised about whether or not all glosses containing two (or more) languages are really bilingual (multilingual) utterances given at a single moment in time (cf., e.g., Bisagni (2013–14)) do not modify the outcome of this study.

⁵The combination of letter and digit is used to simplify references to specific glosses within this paper. ‘L’ stands for glosses in which the personal pronoun is in Latin, ‘V’ where it is in the vernacular and ‘G’ for geographical glosses.

⁶The numbering system used is that introduced by Hofman (1996). Where applicable, i.e. with the Old Irish glosses, the gloss numbering of *Thes* follows in brackets.

⁷The main text is quoted from the edition of Hertz in Keil (1855–80).

⁸All translations of the Latin citations are the author’s.

gl. *apud Graecos* [...] *apud Latinos uero articulum addebant, quem purum per se apud nos non inveniri supra docuimus.* (Keil ii, 55, l. 2)

‘in Greek⁹ [...] in Latin, however, they added the article, which, as we have taught above, does not exist as such in it (Latin).’

(L5) **Sg. 111a26 m** 7 *apud nos* .i. in nominativo

‘and in our language i.e. in the nominative’

gl. (*et apud*) *graecos* (Keil ii, 272, l. 6)

‘(and) in Greek’.

(L6) **Sg. 148b30 q (= 148b10)** .i. ut *est huius apud nos genitivus* articol του dano *apud graecos*

‘i.e. as *huius* is the genitive of the article in our language, so in Greek is τοῦ’

gl. *genetiuo casui articuli apud Graecos* (Keil ii, 409, l. 9)

‘to the genitive case of the article in Greek’.

(L7) **Sg. 198b31** *apud nos*

‘in our language’

gl. *id est* ὁ δοῦλός μου; *sic hic meus seruus* (Keil ii, 582, l. 6)

‘i.e. ὁ δοῦλός μου (‘my slave’); thus *hic meus seruus* (‘this slave of mine’)’.

(L8) **Sg. 205b18 h** *apud nos*

‘in our language’

gl. *apud Graecos relatiua est, quomodo et sui sibi se a se* (Keil iii, 5, l. 7)

‘in Greek it is relative, just like *sui sibi se* from *se*’.

(L9) **Sg. 218a24 p** .i. *adverbium est apud nos*

‘i.e. it is an adverb in our language’

gl. *et quod apud Graecos absque ulla dubitatione aduerbium est* (Keil iii, 39, l. 26)

‘and which is, without any doubt, an adverb in Greek’.

(L10) **Sg. 234a10 b** [...] *apud nos qui loco oy/ fit.* [...]]

‘in our language which takes the place of *oy*’

gl. *potest subiunctiui loco articuli accipi* (Keil iii, 125, l. 6)

‘it can be taken instead of the subjunctive article’.

⁹Similar to the translation of *apud nos* as ‘in our language’, the phrases *apud Graecos* ‘with the Greeks’ and *apud Latinos* ‘with the Latins’ are translated as ‘in Greek’ and ‘in Latin’ in this paper.

These examples all show a Latin perspective, but there is also one gloss which reveals an Irish or hypothetical Latin point of view. It is the second bilingual gloss:

(L11) **Sg. 209b7 i (= 209b7)** .i. *combad* .si. *apud nos*

‘in our language it would be *si*’

gl. *quomodo enim* oŭ *sui et* oŭ *sibi et* ě *se, sic nominatiuus* ĩ *si debuit esse.*
(Keil iii, 16, ll. 17–18)

‘just as oŭ [corresponds to] *sui* and oŭ to *sibi* and ě to *se*, so the nominative should be ĩ *si*.’

This gloss states that the nominative of the Greek third singular feminine pronoun ĩ would be *si* ‘with us’. However, such a form as a counterpart to Gr. ĩ does not exist in Latin, because the original personal pronoun is only used as a reflexive and therefore does not have a nominative. There are two possible explanations for the *si* in **Sg. 209b7 (= 209b7 i)**: (1) the glossator artificially created a Latin nominative *si* on the basis of the oblique cases *suī, sibi* etc. and the Greek nominative ĩ; or (2) the form is not Latin at all but Irish. And indeed, there is a pronoun *sí* in Old Irish, the third singular feminine personal pronoun. The gloss could therefore be an original Irish composition, which informs the reader about an Irish parallel, half in Irish and half in Latin. In fact, the second part does not necessarily have to be a Latin composition at all. The phrase *apud nos* appears frequently in the main text and in the St Gall glosses (see above). It could therefore have been interpreted as a *terminus technicus* by the glossator. This means that he might have used it without actively thinking about its Latinity. The gloss could therefore be understood in two ways: (1) *si* is a made-up Latin form created by the glossator and the past subjunctive *combad* means that ĩ would hypothetically be *si* in Latin; or (2) it is an original Irish gloss and the gloss gives a possible Irish parallel.

VERNACULAR GLOSSES

Old Irish glosses featuring conjugated prepositions in the first person plural can be treated as equivalents to the *apud nos*-glosses. In what follows, the emphasis lies on vernacular glosses containing the prepositions OIr *la* ‘with, by, etc.’ and OIr *do* ‘to’.

OIr *la* ‘with’

OIr *la* occurs 15 times with the suffixed pronoun of the first plural. One example, (V1) .i. *intí diarobe briathar linn riam* ‘i.e. he of whom we have spoken before’ (Sg. 197b34 gg = 197b12), does not offer us any insights on the topic of the present study. This is because it merely refers to the writer of the manuscript in the *pluralis modestiae*, and so it is ambiguous as to a Latin or Irish viewpoint. Again, the majority of examples are those in which Greek is featured in the main text:

- (V2) **Sg. 6a18 x (= 6a9)** nǫbbu machdath betis *grecdi* 7 nothath foraib linni 7 dano it latin amal sódain ut *dixit prius*. [...] ‘it were no wonder that they were Greek since we call them loan-words¹⁰ and yet they are Latin in that case, as he said before. [...]’
gl. *quas a Graecis sumpsimus, hoc est fama, fuga, fur* (Keil ii, 11, ll. 20–1)
‘which we have taken from the Greeks, that is *fama, fuga, fur*’.
- (V3) **Sg. 26b4 e (= 26b3)** is follus nach mór bríg articuil linni¹¹
‘it is clear that in our language the article is not of much account’
gl. *nam cum dicimus idem, ὁ αὐτός, non solum articulum praepositivum, sed etiam pronomen in eadem dictione significamus*. (Keil ii, 54, 16–18)
‘for when we say *idem, ὁ αὐτός*, we not only convey the preposed article, but also the pronoun in this same word’.
- (V4) **Sg. 37a34 cc (= 37a8)** .i. ní exceptaid linn són *sed* regula
‘i.e. we do not deem this an exception but a rule’
gl. *nam quod a Taurominio Taurominitanus dicimus, sequimur Graecos, qui Taurominites dicunt*. (Keil ii, 79, ll. 10–11)
‘because when we say *Taurominitanus* from *Taurominium*, we follow the Greeks who say *Taurominites*’.
- (V5) **Sg. 38b14 o (= 38b5)** cari^{vel a}lis nomen civitatis plurale co-mbed caralites la *grecu* 7 caralitanus linni
‘*Carilis* or *Caralis* [is] the name of the city [used as] a plural, [its derivative] would be *Caralites* in Greek and *Caralitanus* in our language’
gl. Τριπολίτης Tripolitanus. similiter a Caralibus Caralitanus (Keil ii, 82, ll. 4–5)
‘Τριπολίτης *Tripolitanus*. Similarly from *Caralibus Caralitanus*.’
- (V6) **Sg. 149b41 q (= 149b7)** (m.l.) atá dano linni/ insin .i. dede/ doairbert/ ageriind/ gnímo/ et coitchin
‘we too have that feature, i.e. to express two things by the gerund of an active and a common (verb)’.
gl. ut oratum, πρὸς τὸ παρακαλεῖν καὶ πρὸς τὸ παρακαλεῖσθαι, oratu, τῷ παρακαλεῖν καὶ τῷ παρακαλεῖσθαι ἥτοι τῇ παρακλήσει, idem enim significamus. (Keil ii, 412, ll. 14–16)
‘like¹² *oratum* [supine], πρὸς τὸ παρακαλεῖν [present infinitive active] καὶ πρὸς τὸ παρακαλεῖσθαι [present infinitive medium], *oratu* [second

¹⁰This first part of this translation is by Lambert (1985: 188).

¹¹In a parallel manner to the translation of *apud nos*, where appropriate OIr *linni* is also translated as ‘in our language’.

¹²This passage explains which Greek forms correspond to the Latin ones.

supine], τῷ παρακαλεῖν [present infinitive active] καὶ τῷ παρακαλεῖσθαι [present infinitive medium] ἦτοι τῇ παρακλήσει [dative singular], so we express the same’.

- (V7) **Sg. 160b20 h (= 160b2)** .i. confil linni hisind óin šečmadachtu afile leosom indib sečmadachtib

‘i.e. so that we have in the one preterite what they have in two preterites’

gl. nam amaui περιλήξα καὶ ἐφίλησα *significat* (Keil ii, 445, ll. 23–24)

‘for *amaui* means [=corresponds to] both περιλήξα and ἐφίλησα’.

- (V8) **Sg. 207b32 u (= 207b11)** cit comsuidighthi lagrecu ní ecen dunni beta comsuidighthi linn

‘although they are compounds in Greek (lit. with the Greeks), they do not necessarily have to be compounds in our language’

gl. *apud nos simplicia, quae apud Graecos composita sunt, ut felix εὐτυχής, sanctus εὐαγής, pius εὐσεβής, et alia mille. non tamen ideo significationem Graecam attendentes debemus ea composita dicere* (Keil iii, 12, ll. 2–4)

‘simple nouns in our language, which are compounds in Greek, like *felix* εὐτυχής, *sanctus* εὐαγής, *pius* εὐσεβής, and thousands of others. Therefore, we should not pay attention to the Greek expression and call them compounds.’

- (V9) **Sg. 208b24 m (= 208b7)** .i. acuit foraib linni

‘i.e. we have the acute on them’

gl. *quod omnia pronomina apud Latinos absoluta sunt et tam praepositiva quam subiunctiva rectique accentus* (Keil iii, 14, ll. 7–8)

‘that all pronouns are independent words in Latin and can appear both pre-posed and post-posed of a fully stressed word’.

- (V10) **Sg. 214a8 e (= 214a1)** .i. file linni

‘which we have’

gl. *apud nos* (Keil iii, 28, l. 21)

‘with us’.

These nine glosses function in the same way as the *apud nos* examples above (L2–L10), i.e. to distinguish Latin from Greek. The ‘we’ in them reflects a Latin point of view. Therefore, they are likely to be translations from original Latin glosses, or else they are original Irish glosses that adopt a Latin perspective. However, there are also glosses that reveal an Irish perspective. Before discussing the first example, it is necessary to have a short look at glosses that open with direct quotations from the main text. These are mainly marginal glosses which repeat the glossed word for referential purposes, e.g., *Sg. 14b21*” x, which has *ignavus* to refer back to *ignavus* of the main text (Keil ii, 30, l. 9), *Sg. 14b22*” z, which glosses *ignarus* (Keil ii, 30, l. 9) and

starts with the same lexeme, and Sg. 22a10 i, which starts with *alterutrum*, the word it is glossing (Keil ii, 61, l. 24). No examples for this type of reference occurring with interlinear glosses could be found through a search of about a quarter of the manuscript. It seems to be restricted to the marginal glosses (cf. also G2 below). This is important for the next example, an interlinear gloss found on fol. 47:

(V11) **Sg. 47a32” f (= 47a5)** centat iss *ed* a cennbart s6n linni

‘a little head, that is, in our language, the capital’

gl. *capitulum* (Keil ii, 107, l. 3)

‘A head-like object or structure; little head’.

The first word of this gloss is the exact Old Irish equivalent to Lat. *capitulum* ‘a small/little head, the capital or chapter of a column’ (Lat. *caput* ‘head’ plus the diminutive suffix *-ulum*), i.e. the lexeme for head *cenn* plus the diminutive suffix *-t(h)at* (cf. GOI 175). This means that if one assumes that V11 is a translation from Latin, the hypothetical original gloss would have started with *capitulum*, the same word as is found in the main text. Considering the discussion about referential words above and excluding the possibility of this gloss being an exception, the hypothetical original Latin gloss would have had to feature *capitulum* as a reference to *capitulum* in the main text, something which seems to be otherwise unattested in the relevant interlinear glosses. V11 can therefore be interpreted as an original Irish composition. In contrast to this, the next example is a translation from an original Latin gloss:

(V12) **Sg. 67a37” bb (= 67a17)** .i. amal as·berar amnis reliqua 7 it masculinni immurgu linni

‘i.e. as *haec amnis* etc. is said, and yet they are masculine in our language’

gl. *quos nos sequimur*, ut *haec amnis, funis, anguis* (Keil ii, 160, 17–18)

‘which we follow, like *amnis, funis, anguis*’.

Similar to L1 above, Priscian is talking about the diachronic changes of Latin. The gloss states that the lexemes *amnis* ‘river’, *funis* ‘rope, sheet, line, cord’ and *anguis* ‘serpent, snake’ mentioned in the main text are masculine ‘with us’. The corresponding Irish lexemes, however, are feminine: OIr *ab/aub* ‘river’ (f., *n*-stem), *tét* (f., *ā*-stem) ‘rope, cord’ and *escong(a)* (f.) ‘eel’. This means that the gloss cannot originally be Irish. Other cases remain ambiguous, because there is no possibility of defining which language they originate from:

(V13) **Sg. 30a15 w (= 30a8)** .i. dóig linn bed n-acuit preter qualis 7 combad chirchunflex far suidiu.

‘i.e. it seems to us that it is the acute, except (on) *qualis*, and that it is the circumflex on this.’

gl. *ut quis, qualis, quantus, quot, quotus, [...]* seruant accentus (Keil ii, 61, ll. 5–6)

‘like *quis, qualis, quantus, quot, quotus, [...]* they keep the accents’.

(V14) **Sg. 40a13 n (= 40a11)** (m.l.)¹³ *Atá linn chaenae ní asa-n-arbaram daerscugud di neuch di hilib a chenéuil feissin .i. a superlait.*

‘we have besides something whereby we can express the surpassing by one of many of its own type, i.e. its superlative’

gl. *superlatiuo possumus uti* (Keil ii, 86, l. 1)

‘we can use the superlative’.

(V15) **Sg. 198a8 5 (= 198a6)** .i. is coimdig linn inso

‘i.e. this is customary with us’

gl. *quod autem tertiae est, ostenditur ex eo quod dicimus ego feci, tu fecisti, ipse fecit* (Keil ii, 579, l. 31–580, l. 1)

‘that it is also [of] the third person, is evident from the fact that we say *ego feci, tu fecisti, ipse fecit*’.

These instances do not offer any indications from which point of view the glosses were composed, because they are equally in accord with the grammatical expectations of both languages. Both languages have a superlative (V14), and the other two examples also do not reveal any insights that would be specific to one language.

OIr *do* ‘to, for’

There are four instances of the preposition *do* ‘to’ with the suffixed pronoun of the first plural in the glosses.¹⁴ One is V8, already mentioned. There is also another gloss where the main text deals with Greek:

(V16) **Sg. 31b25 rr (= 31b17)** .i. do gluaiss *ar* is meinciu dún-ni a n-aitherrechtai^gthe in des.

‘i.e. [he adds Pelides] for a gloss, for the patronymic in *-des* is more familiar to us.’

gl. *quae est propria Iadis linguae (Πηλείων pro Πηλείδης)* (Keil ii, 65, ll. 15–16)

‘which is peculiar to the Ionian language (Πηλείων for Πηλείδης)’

The next example is also found within an context that was already mentioned above, i.e. distinguishing recent usage from the ancient usage (cf. L1 and V12 above) and, therefore, also seems to be a translation from an original Latin gloss:

¹³m.l. = the gloss is found in the left margin.

¹⁴The marginal note 194a m.i. (= lower margin) (= 194a) *do inis maddoc dún .i. meisse 7 choirbbre* ‘We are from Inis Maddoc, i.e. Coirbbre and I’ is not discussed here, because it is not a gloss, but a personal note by the scribe.

(V17) **Sg. 40b37 y (= 40b14)** is foluss dún tra as riagoldu leo-som nad-mbíet cid int súperlati huare nad-mbiat na compariti.

‘it is clear to us that it is more regular with them (arduus etc.) that there will not be superlatives either, because the comparatives do not exist’

gl. «asperrimo atque arduissimo aditu». (Keil ii, 87, l. 18)

‘most harsh and most difficult approach’

Unfortunately, the fourth example does not help to answer this study’s research question, because it works from both points of view:

(V18) **Sg. 151b29 k (= 151b7)** .i. isfollus dún file choibnius etir sechmadachte 7 todochaide ex participiis

‘i.e. it is manifest to us from the participles that there is an affinity between the past and the future’

gl. *cum igitur in aliis modis praesentis, sicut dictum est, consonantes seruat futurum, in subiunctiuo praeteriti perfecti regulam sequitur, ostendens cum eo quoque habere iura affinitatis. idque ex participiis maxime est conicere* (Keil ii, 417, ll. 9–12)

‘as the future therefore retains in other modes the consonants of the present, in the subjunctive it follows the rule of the preterite perfect, showing that it has some affinity with it as well. This can be conjectured particularly from the participle.’

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

Most of the examples discussed so far go back to original Latin glosses or were at least written from a Latin point of view, but there are also two glosses that are (possible) Irish compositions, i.e. L11 and V11. Aside from looking at the language(s) there is also another possible way of finding out from which point of view specific glosses were composed, i.e. to look at examples dealing with geographical names. These instances, however, only help us to define whether or not the glosses were written in Ireland, with their author being physically present there. Their original language need not necessarily have been Irish, but could also have been Latin. Nonetheless, they are another piece of the puzzle of who ‘we’ are in the glosses.

Hofman (1996) has established a categorisation of different gloss types for his edition and assigned each gloss to one or more of them. His categorisation comprises five big groups with subcategories:

1. Glosses on prosody
2. Lexical glosses
3. Glosses on morphology (grammatical glosses)
4. Glosses on syntax
5. Explanatory glosses.

Within these five categories there are 89 subcategories in total. One of them is ‘Geographical names’, which belongs to category 5. A query for this tag in the database returns 200 matches. Most of them are single word glosses that, for instance, inform the reader that a specific name stands for a *civitas*¹⁵ or a *mons*.¹⁶ These are not important for this study, but there is one densely glossed passage on fol. 217 which gives further information. The main text deals with the Latin preposition *cis* ‘on or to this or the near side of; short of; before’:

cis et componitur et separatur et magis localem habet
significationem, ut Cisalpina Gallia et cis Rhenum. possumus
tamen per translationem et in tempore et in aliis rebus ea uti [...]
(Keil iii, 38, ll. 28–30)

‘*cis* occurs in compounds and separately and it has more local meaning, like Cisalpina Gallia and Cis Rhenum. We can nevertheless use it in a transferred sense and for time and in other cases.’

The examples in question gloss *Cisalpina Gallia* and *cis Rhenum*. Each phrase is glossed twice:

(G1) **Sg. 217b32 s (= 217b8)** .i. cenalpande .i. fri alpai ñ desin¹⁷

‘i.e. cisalpine, i.e. on the right hand side of the Alp(s)’

(G2) **Sg. 217b32 t (= 217b9)** (m.l.) *cisalpina* .i. com/suidigthe .i. in gal/lia
cenalpan/de. cenalpai/ ñ etarru.

‘cis-alpina, i.e. a compound i.e. Cisalpine Gaul, without the Alps between them (and it)’

(G3) **Sg. 217b32 u (= 217b10)** .i. comasñdís

‘i.e. apposition’

(G4) **Sg. 217b33 w (= 217b11)** .i. cenrian ñ etrom

‘i.e. without the Rhine between me (and it)’

G1 offers a translation or transposition of the compound *cisalpina* into Irish .i. *cenalpande*, which is only attested here. The Irish compound is one of the few that are composed with a preposition that does not have a corresponding preverb (cf. Wodtko 1995: 35–6). This seems to be restricted to calques.¹⁸ The compound consists of the Old Irish preposition *cen* ‘without, deprived of, not

¹⁵E.g., Sg. 38b4 e gl. *luceria* or Sg. 73a27 dd gl. *bactra*.

¹⁶E.g., Sg. 92a35 y gl. *soracte* or Sg. 20a32 ee gl. *etna*.

¹⁷To this point, the final word of this gloss has been read as *desiu* (cf. *Thes* ii, 220 and also the entry in Bauer et al. 2017). However, with the help of Prof David Stifter it has been possible to establish this new reading, hence the updated translation ‘on the right-hand side of’ as opposed to *Thes* ii, 220 ‘on this side of’.

¹⁸Wodtko (1995: 36 n. 1) references Russell (1990: 89), De Bernardo Stempel (1990) and Ahlqvist (1984–8).

having, -less' plus an adjectival form *alpande* 'alpine'. This second member is only attested here. It is formed with the productive Old Irish suffix *-dae*.¹⁹ The *-n-* before the suffix suggests that the adjective is not based on the Irish noun *alpa*, but that it is directly derived from the Latin adjective *alpīna* 'alpine', as found in *cis-alpīna*. The meaning of OIr *cenalpande* could therefore be 'alpine-less'. But how is this semantically connected with Lat. *cisalpīna* 'on this side of the Alps'?

An explanation has already been offered by Thurneysen (*GOI* 510). He states that the original meaning of OIr *cen* is 'on this side (of)'. He bases his conclusion on *cenalpande*, OIr *centar* '(this) world' and OIr *cé*, which perhaps also originally meant 'on this side, here'. According to Eska (1990: 153), these derive from the deictic pronominal **ké-nā* (from PIE **kéy*),²⁰ as also do MW *amgen*, MC *ken*, MBret. *quen* 'other'. Neither of them, however, traces a semantic development from 'on this side of' to 'without' in Irish and 'other' in the British Celtic languages. A parallel to Irish *cen*, previously mentioned by Thurneysen (*GOI* 510), is found in Lat. *citrā*, which can mean 'on this side of' and also 'without'. A possible explanation for the semantic development is that if one is 'without' something one is on 'this side' of it, i.e. not on the side on which it is actually found, hence one is 'without' it. Accepting the original meaning 'on this side of' for OIr *cen*, OIr *cenalpande* can therefore also be translated as 'on this side of the Alps', like Lat. *cisalpīna*. The rather unusual form OIr *cenalpande* is further explained by the clause *.i. fri alpai n desin* 'on the right hand side of the Alp(s)'. The form *alpai* can either be interpreted as singular or plural.²¹ The following nasalising *n*, however, confirms that it is accusative singular. The singular here shows that the glossators imagined a single mountain called 'Alp'. This might be an indication that the whole gloss was of Irish origin and not based on a Latin origin, if the glossator was not familiar with continental European geography.

The second gloss (G2) is found between two columns. The first word refers back to *cisalpina* in the main text, therefore the scribe used an abbreviation. The second part of G2 consists of *.i.* 'i.e.' plus the participle of the Old Irish verb *con-suidigedar* 'to compound, to arrange together', OIr *comsuidigthe*, which can be used as an adjective (*io*, *iā*-stem) 'compounded' or as a noun (*io*-stem) 'compound'. The gloss tells the reader that the Latin word is a compound. The final part of the gloss is of high relevance for the present study: *.i. in gal/lia cenalpan/de. cenalpai/ n etarru* 'i.e. cisalpine Gaul, without the Alp(s) between them (and it)'. The crucial part is the final word *etarru* 'between them'. Cisalpine Gaul was the part of Gaul that was, from the perspective of the Romans, on the hither side of the Alps, in contrast to Transalpine Gaul, which was on the far side of the Alps. In the light of this

¹⁹For a detailed analysis of the suffix and its attestations see Wodtko (1995: 258–311).

²⁰Cf. Dunkel (2014: 409–10).

²¹The inflection class of the lexeme *alpa* was not completely fixed. Most of the attestations suggest that it is a feminine *iā*-stem, but the form in G1 could also be an accusative singular of a *io*-stem.

and the data on geographical names presented above, if the gloss were a translation from Latin, one would rather expect the conjugated preposition to be in the first person plural again —, i.e. **cenalpai/ ñ etron* ‘without the Alp between us (and it)’. Since it, however, is in third person plural, the gloss is likely composed from an Irish point of view — ‘they’, for an Irish glossator, being the Romans. Therefore, G2 (similar to L11) dissociates the glossator from Latin-speakers.

The third gloss (G3) indicates that, in contrast to *cisalpina*, *cis Rhenum* is not compounded but rather the *cis* is in apposition (OIr *comasñdís*) here. G4 is likewise of immediate interest for this article, because it also features a conjugated preposition, this time in the first person singular: *etrom* ‘between me’. A literal translation of this gloss might be ‘i.e. without the ocean between me’, since OIr *rian* (m., *o*-stem) commonly means ‘the sea, the ocean’. From the context, however, it is clear that the gloss means the river Rhine. This is accepted by Ó Corráin in his revised version of Hogan’s *Onomasticon Goedelicum*.²² The form seems to be an (*ad hoc*) loanword from Lat *Rhēnus*, with the regular outcome of the soundchange long $\bar{e} > ía$, hence *rén > rian*. The conjugated preposition is in the first person singular here, informing us that the Rhine is not ‘between me [i.e. the glossator]’ and *cis Rhenum*, i.e. *Germania* to the west of the Rhine. Unfortunately, this self-localisation of the glossator does not give us any information as to whether or not the gloss was composed from an Irish or Latin/Roman point of view, because in both cases the Rhine is not between the glossator and the territory of the *germani cisrhenani*. It remains ambiguous.

CONCLUSIONS

Nineteen (L2–10, V2–10, V16) out of the thirty-three glosses discussed in this study refer to Greek material in the underlying text. These mostly serve to distinguish Latin from Greek, e.g., L8, which emphasizes that the pronouns that it presents are the ones that ‘we’ (i.e. the Latin speakers) use. Another example is L3, where *apud nos* ‘with us/in our language’ glosses Lat. *comedia* ‘comedy’, which immediately follows Gr. $\kappa\omega\mu\omicron\delta\iota\alpha$ ‘id.’. A Latin point of view is also expressed in vernacular glosses such as V5. V5 informs the reader that a derivative of *Caralis* would be *Caralites la grecu* ‘with the Greeks/in Greek’ and *Caralitanus linni* ‘with us’. As the form of the derivative shows, the ‘us’ in this Old Irish gloss definitely stands for Latin-speakers. L1 is the only *apud nos*-gloss that occurs without a Greek connection. Nonetheless, it is an original Latin gloss, because it distinguishes older usages of Latin genitives and datives from the contemporary ones, just like V17. The same is true for V12, which states that the lexemes used in the main text are masculine ‘with us’, even though not all of them are so in Irish. Seven glosses (G1, G3–4, V13–15) will have to remain ambiguous regarding the mindset that they reflect, especially

²²S.v. *rian* I (p. 2441). Available in PDF format on the website of the School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: <https://www.dias.ie/celt/celt-publications-2/onomasticon-goedelicum> (accessed 29 July 2019).

the single-word glosses, G1 and G3, for which there is no way of determining whether or not they are translations from original Latin glosses. The first of the vernacular glosses (V1) also does not answer the main question of the present study, because it is a reference to the glossator himself and does not deliver any further insights. This leaves three glosses (L11, V11 and G2) which include evidence, to some degree or another, that they may have been composed from an Irish point of view. L11 possibly mentions the Old Irish third singular feminine pronoun *si* as a parallel to Gr. *ἡ*. V11 gives itself away by using the exact Old Irish correspondence of Lat. *capitulum* as the first word of an interlinear gloss. And G2 must have been composed from an Irish position, because of its explanation of where Cisalpine Gaul lies.

To return to the question raised at beginning, who are ‘we’ now?, the St Gall Priscian glosses are not homogeneous. Strachan (1903) and more recently Lambert (1996) and Roost (2013) have discussed the different chronological layers in the Old Irish glosses. Although the present study does not take a temporal dimension into account — in fact the data considered here do not allow any conclusions in this direction — it still exposes the heterogeneity of the material. Most of the glosses are written from a Latin(-speaking) point of view, but there is also pertinent evidence that some glosses were composed in accordance with an Irish(-speaking) mindset. Even though the corpus for this study is rather small, it still shows that not all of the Old Irish glosses in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 904 are mere copies of original Latin glosses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHLQVIST, ANDERS 1984–8: ‘Téarmaíocht ghramadaí na Gaeilge’, *Studia Hibernica* 24, 89–96.
- BAUER, BERNHARD 2015: *Dictionary of the Old Irish Priscian Glosses*, online at www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/priscian (accessed 29 January 2019).
- BAUER, BERNHARD, HOFMAN, RIJCKLOF and MORAN, PÁDRAIC 2017: *St Gall Priscian Glosses*, version 2.0 online at www.stgallpriscian.ie/glosses (accessed 29 January 2019).
- DE BERNARDO STEMPER, PATRIZIA 1990: ‘Calques linguistiques im älteren Irischen’, in Hildegard Tristram (ed.), *Deutsche, Kelten und Iren: 150 Jahre deutsche Keltologie; Gearóid Mac Eoin zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Hamburg), 87–113.
- BISAGNI, JACOPO 2013–4: ‘Prolegomena to the study of code-switching in the Old Irish Glosses’, *Peritia* 24–5, 1–58.
- DUNKEL, GEORGE 2014: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme* (Heidelberg).
- HOFMAN, RIJCKLOF 1996: *The Sankt Gall Priscian Commentary: Part 1*, 2 vols (Münster).
- KEIL, HEINRICH 1855–80: *Grammatici Latini*, 6 vols (Leipzig).
- LAMBERT, PIERRE-YVES 1985: ‘Varia VI. 1. Old Irish *nothath*’, *Ériu* 36, 187–8.

- , 1996: ‘Les différents strates de gloses dans le Ms. de Saint-Gall No. 904 (Priscien)’, in Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (eds), *Irland und Europa im früheren Mittelalter: Bildung und Literatur* (Stuttgart), 187–94.
- MORAN, PÁDRAIC 2015: ‘Language interaction in the St Gall Priscian glosses’, *Peritia* 26, 113–42.
- Ó NÉILL, PÁDRAIC 2000: ‘Irish observance of the Three Lents and the date of the St. Gall Priscian (MS 904)’, *Ériu* 51, 159–80.
- ROOST, JULIANA 2013: ‘Stages of language development in the Old Irish glosses on Priscian’, unpublished BA Thesis, University College, Dublin.
- RUSSELL, PAUL 1990: *Celtic Word-Formation: The Velar Suffixes* (Dublin).
- STRACHAN, JOHN 1903: ‘On the language of the St. Gall glosses’, *ZCP* 4, 470–92.
- WODTKO, DAGMAR 1995: *Sekundäradjektive in den altirischen Glossen* (Innsbruck).

BERNHARD BAUER

Maynooth University