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# AMERICAN <br> JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY 

Vol. LIV, 4
Whole No. 216

## OLD ENGLISH SCRATCHED GLOSSES IN COTTON MS. TIBERIUS C. ii.

This contribution is made as one result of an examination of manuscripts which I have undertaken with the aim of adding to the Old English glosses and to Old English lexicography. The reason for this lay partly in the fact that for Old English glosses there has never been made a comprehensive search of manuscripts such as that, for instance, which yielded the five volumes of Die althochdeutschen Glossen. Many glosses have indeed been published. The Brussels Aldhelm MS. 1650 and the Boulogne Prudentius MS. 189 alone contain over six thousand Old English glosses which were early published as journal articles. The large glossaries, such as the Corpus and Epinal and those in the Wright-Wülcker collection, provide a rich store of material. Napier's Old English Glosses contains a great number of more scattered glosses. It does not, however, represent an examination of all possible sources. Napier considered it a small instalment towards the future Corpus of OE. glosses and in the preface remarked that, in addition to what had been published, there must still be many glosses to be found in Latin manuscripts. More recently the recognition of the considerable Old English content in the Old High German glosses has extended the field of search for Old English glosses. The collection of OHG. glosses by Steinmeyer and Sievers brought to the attention of philologists Old English in many scattered Continental libraries, and while much has been done in the way of bringing together and explaining this material, ${ }^{1}$ the work is

[^0]not finished. Occasional journal articles show that new glosses are to be found both in England and on the Continent, and this has also been my experience. ${ }^{2}$

In the course of examining many manuscripts I have come upon some glosses scratched in the parchment without ink. Napier has published a considerable number of such glosses in his Old English Glosses and chapter five of that book deals exclusively with scratched glosses. He has noted that these are sometimes quite plain, sometimes visible only when the MS. is held at a certain angle, and at times quite illegible. Recently a considerable number of Old High German scratched glosses have been published, ${ }^{3}$ many from manuscripts from which the inked glosses had previously been collected. Good eyes, a steady gaze, and especially patience are given as requisites for such work. In the manuscripts which I have seen containing scratched glosses, if the parchment is thick and smooth, the letters are impressed much as if they were in wax, but if the parchment is rough or thin, the point of the writing implement has often torn the surface and since it then did not move so evenly the letters may be jagged. In the latter case the glosses can be readily seen and a strong glass brings out doubtful letters. The former case is deceptive. A page of thick smooth parchment which, looked at from one angle, seems to be devoid of glosses may, if held at a different angle, show four or five legible ones. It is essential that the light strike the page at an angle which will make the impressed letters appear most clearly. Good eyesight is of course a necessity for reading these glosses, but much straining of the eyes is avoided by shifting the manuscript until the best angle of vision is found.

In his edition of Bede's Ecclesiastical History ${ }^{4}$ Plummer has

[^1]listed the folios from Cotton Tiberius C.ii on which he noticed scratched glosses, and this fact is mentioned in Napier's Old English Glosses. ${ }^{5}$ Having worked on scratched glosses in manuscripts in Munich, Basel, and St. Gall, I followed this reference and found that there were more glosses in this manuscript than in any other one that I had seen. In it I have read four hundred and one glosses. ${ }^{6}$ There are traces of about thirty others, ${ }^{7}$ but they are too faint to be read.

In some of the glosses the letters are small and neat but in others the letters are large and at times rather scrawling. They are the work of at least two glossators, which appears not only from the difference in the writing but also from the fact that some words are glossed twice, once above and once on the margin. In one or two cases one gloss has been scratched over another. It is difficult to determine any particular kind of hand in the scratched glosses, a fact which prevents any definite statement about their date. ${ }^{8}$ They show traces of the Kentish dialect, ${ }^{9}$ which is not surprising as there is Kenticism in the inked glosses in the manuscript.

Cotton Tiberius C. ii is an eighth-century manuscript, 156 folios in double columns, containing Bede's Ecclesiastical His-

[^2]tory. On folios $5 \mathrm{r}, 34 \mathrm{v}, 60 \mathrm{v}$, and 124 v are late ninth-century Old English glosses (in ink) which have been published by Sweet in The Oldest English Texts. ${ }^{10}$ Most of the scratched glosses are interlinear. Those occurring elsewhere I have referred to in the foot-notes. ${ }^{11}$

${ }^{10} \mathrm{Pp} .179 \mathrm{ff}$. Published again, with the quantity of the vowels marked, by Holthausen, Archiv 136, 290-2.
${ }^{11}$ In addition to general discussion, I have also used the foot-notes (1) to discuss glosses not documented in the Bosworth-Toller Dictionary and Supplement, and the 1931 edition of Hall's Dictionary, such glosses being designated with an asterisk by the reference number; (2) using the sign $=$, to give a more normal spelling for some glosses; (3) using the sign Read, to give a correct spelling for some glosses evidently miswritten by the scribe.
${ }^{12}$ The numbers at the right refer to page and line of Plummer's edition, Oxford, 1896. In counting lines I have not included chapterheadings.
${ }^{13}$ In each gloss in which $w$ occurs, this letter is represented in the MS. by the Old English runic character for $w$.
${ }^{14}$ In ligature in the MS.
${ }^{15}=$ ele. $\quad$ There are some other examples of additional initial $h$ among these glosses: herne 9v, hæठelan 7lv, hic 87r, hellenbogan 128r, hincan 129v, hin 138v. Also some with initial $h$ lacking: lide 109v, luttran 130v; alga, lutran 131r. For other such cases cf. OEG. xxx. The loss or addition of initial $h$ is not distinctly dialectical as it occurs in WS., Kent., and North.; cf. Sievers, Grammatik, 3 aufl., p. 111.
${ }^{16}$ Above marini. In the case of a few incomplete glosses I have added letters in italics when there is no trace of more in the MS. If there is a trace of additional letters in the MS., I have added letters in brackets.

17* Compound of $h \bar{\epsilon} w e$ and pp. of mœngan, literally purple-mixed. For the interpretation of coccineum as a combination of colors cf. coccineum brunbasne, OEG. 5125. In combination with a color-word mongedes may be interpreted tinged, in which case the gloss is analogous in formation with brūnfāg and rēadfäh.

> boreales per plagas סurh סa eastdælas 11,2
> 6v sibi . . . uindicarunt
> agnodan ${ }^{18} \quad 11,21$
> magno equore mid
> micle brime 11, 34
> 7 r petentes gesecende 12,10
> ita ut raro סaete seldan ${ }^{18} \quad 12,27$
> expers orlete ${ }^{19} \quad 13,7$
> ceruorum heorata 13,7
> 7v nauibus actuariis cnearrum 13,25
> 8r humani femoris
> monnes סeoes 14, 18
> grossae greate 14, 18
> dēphensum arasad 14,20
> abdidere adaeglad ${ }^{20} 14,22$
> obsidib: gislu ${ }^{-}$14,24
> in foedus in were 14,26
> $\begin{array}{cc}\text { inter duas paludes } \\ \text { biteh tu fen } & \\ 14,27\end{array}$
> obtentu fore[f]eng-
> nisse ${ }^{21} \quad 14,28$
confertissimum $\quad$ ðæt
wealigoste 14,29
to rennianne ${ }^{22} \quad 15,4$
in deditionem in onwalde $\quad 15,9$
8 v distinguenda to del-
ende 16,20
9 r in perniciem in deaठ 17,13
in prouectum in סa
gescildnisse ${ }^{23} \quad 17,14$
suspicionem resunge
17, 16
artifici neglegentia
mid searacræft[e] 17, 17
mentionem gemynd 18,8
9v ęmulari onhyrgan 18, 16
penes mid 18,21
ad tugurium to
סaem herne ${ }^{24} \quad 18,23$
aris aet סaem wi-
bedum 19,2
ultro mid willan 19,4
discrimine $\bar{o}$ freced-
nissum 19,5

[^3]|  | parere heran | 19, 15 | 13v | trementi byfende | 28, 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10r | afficeretur wereged | 19, 34 |  | adcelerantur efste |  |
|  | meatu ferelde | 20, 5 |  |  | 28, 6 |
|  | ocius bi hradost | 20, 14 | 15 r | diuortii mislimpes | 32, 11 |
| 10v | collega gefera | 20, 24 | 18 r antestitum frumne ${ }^{27}$ |  |  |
|  | decentissima mid |  |  |  | 38, 9 |
|  | 才am gedæfenestan | 20, 28 |  | madidus wete | 38, 20 |
|  | depictus afæd | 20, 29 | 20v | aptum gescrepe ${ }^{28}$ | 44,5 |
|  | equoris emnesse | 20, 32 | 22 r | coacticium nyd | 47, 31 |
|  | pro insita specie fore |  | 38 r | eruti generede ${ }^{29}$ | 80, 18 |
|  | [ $¢ æ m$ ] gesettan |  | 49 v | dematura ${ }^{30}$ of |  |
|  | megwl[it]e | 20, 33 |  | סeare ripan ${ }^{31}$ | 105, 31 |
|  | uenustatis feger- |  | 50r | propitiationis mil |  |
|  | nesse ${ }^{25}$ | 20, 33 |  |  | 106, 19 |
|  | meatu utgange | 21, 2 |  | infesti סes ungewera | $\mathrm{n}^{33}$ |
|  | arduo heah[r]e | 21, 5 |  |  | 110, 22 |
|  | nutu mægene | 21, 16 |  | qua conuenit sua |  |
|  | referre bringan | 21, 22 |  | hit g-34 | 119, 13 |
|  | opinabatur hogde | 21, 23 |  | subrogare under ${ }^{35}$ | 119, 33 |
| 11 r | perfecto agone |  | 58 r | uirus ater ${ }^{36}$ <br> obolita ${ }^{37}$ est wes | 123, 25 |
|  | סorhtogene compe | 22, 4 |  |  |  |
| 12 r | edax etende | 24, 11 |  | aotilgad | 123, 30 |
| 13 r | conspicum swutul | 27, 21 |  | conamen ongin | 124, 1 |
|  | sumptu gafol | 27, 21 |  | actuali peccato |  |
|  |  |  |  | wyfcinde ${ }^{38}$ | 124, 9 |

${ }^{25}$ Two spaces above, the immediate space being taken by preceding gloss.
${ }^{26}$ In margin at right.
${ }^{27}$ Under the Latin.
${ }^{28}$ In bottom margin.
${ }^{29}$ There are traces of ink in the gloss.
${ }^{30}$ Taken by glossator as de matura.
${ }^{31}$ In bottom margin.
${ }^{32}$ In left margin.
${ }^{33}=$ ungepweran. In the two cases in these glosses where $b$ and $w$ might come together (this and awogan, 118v) $b$ is dropped. The characters for $b$ and $w$ are at times so similarly made that one might say the $w$ is dropped. But in the character $b$ the non-vertical stroke is usually rounded whereas the character for $w$ is usually written $\vDash$ (as in these two glosses).
${ }^{34}$ Perhaps gerisneठ, cf. conuenire gerisnian, WW. 366, 37.
${ }^{35}$ I know of no OE. equivalent for subrogare to complete this gloss.
${ }^{36}$ In left margin.
${ }^{37}$ Ed. abolita.
${ }^{38}$ In bottom margin preceded by a reference mark $\hbar$. Above the Latin is scratched wyf $\delta$. The OE. is not a direct gloss but an interpretation of the general idea of the passage, which has to do with Adam and original sin.


[^4]
suggests that stramen is used incorrectly for stragulus in the sense of saddle or horse-cloth. The OE. version of the History renders the passage $b$ gebæte of ateah and pane bridel of ateah, GW. Bibliothek 4, 230ab, 4.
${ }^{54}$ For initial $h$ cf. note to hele, 6 r .
${ }^{55}$ Beneath the Latin. Here as in the case of gebrece 63r, the OE. is a correct gloss for the lemma taken by itself but not in the context where it means to the point: crescente corporis molestia ad articulum subeundae mortis compellor. The OE. version of the History (GW. Bibliothek 4, 249a, 2) reads: beos hefignes mines lichoman swide шеахеб $b$ ic eom nyded $b$ ic sceal hraঠe deaঠ underhnigan. It is doubtful if a phrase to бœm liðe was ever used in speech to convey the idea that ad articulum here does.
${ }^{56}$ In margin at right.
${ }^{57}$ Rcefter is a more usual gloss for tignum but cf. tigillo, .i. tigno, hrofe, OEG. 2, 110.
${ }^{58}$ This may be a corruption of magistras. The OE. History has magistras 7 lare for pedagogos ac magistros, GW. Bibliothek 4, 273b, 18. I think however that the glossator meant it as singular and that it is for magateau, a compound of mago, child and bēow, servant, formed on the analogy of lättēow. Cf. pedagogus lateow, OEG. 5154; pedagogis latteow, 3358. The ending of this word varied greatly as may be seen by the forms documented under ládteów in BT. Among the Kentish glosses occurs lateau. That a gloss to pedagogus might contain a word for child appears from paedagogus cildahyrde, WW. 163, 43.
${ }^{59}=\omega$ б̈elnesse.
${ }^{60}=$ genihtsume.
${ }^{61}=$ embsald, p. p. of embsellan (WS. $y m b-$ ). For the initial $h$ cf. note to hele, 6 r and for $e m$ instead of $e m b$ note emhferte for embhwerfte, Kent. Glos. 271.

62* Similar to onwece but apparently from a nominative singular in $n$ is onwaccano, documented once in BT., from the Durham Ritual, where it translates incitamenta.


[^5]|  | in aequitate in reht | nes ${ }^{79}$ |  | africam | suut ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 184, 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 172, 5 |  | assiam | east | 184, 25 |
|  | uili yfilicum | 172, 6 |  | obstinatio | onis eorum |  |
|  | inculcaret spyrede | 172, 11 |  | hero a | nwilnesse | 184, 28 |
|  | ecclesiam folc | 172, 28 | 86 r | abdicare | wiðcueða |  |
| 81 v | reuisere niosian | 174, 24 |  |  |  | 185, 7 |
|  | uotis willum | 175, 12 | 86 v | ad . . d | decreta to |  |
| 82r | uiror calami growines |  |  | \%em do | man ${ }^{85}$ | 186, 17 |
|  | hr [eodes] | 175, 17 |  | elminatis | asuorben | 186, 31 |
|  | commorari | dan ${ }^{80}$ | 87 r | sapuit | wiste | 187, 1 |
|  |  | 175, 19 |  | $\overline{\mathrm{n}}$ desist | to hic |  |
|  | normam bisene | 175, 31 |  | ablinno |  | 187, 10 |
|  | adquiesceret geðafede |  | 87v | decreta | domas | 188, 9 |
|  |  | 176,5 |  | perorante | sprecun | um ${ }^{86}$ |
|  | educatus afeded | 176, 8 |  |  |  | 188, 21 |
| 83 r | possessiunculis | land |  | statutis | hatum ${ }^{87}$ | 189, 1 |
|  |  | 178, 25 |  | contione | gemote | 189, 8 |
|  | suppeteret $g$ [ e$]$ sette |  | 88r | parsimoni | iae nee\%- |  |
|  |  | 178, 29 |  | nesse ${ }^{88}$ |  | 190, 19 |
| 84r | nefaria ${ }^{81}$ maanlice secto gehewenre | 180, 16 | 88 v | (domus) | puideri |  |
|  |  | 181, 5 |  | timbran |  | 190, 28 |
| 84v | confligens feohtende |  |  | simplici | aanfalde | 191, 1 |
|  |  | 181, 19 | 89 r | canitiei | hæra ${ }^{89}$ | 192, 31 |
|  | inquisitionem sooen |  | 89v | sodalem | his geferan | 193, 17 |
|  |  | 181, 20 | 90r | incedendo | gonende |  |
| 85 v | praefatione forespr |  |  |  |  | 195, 21 |
|  |  | 183, 27 | 91 r | parum | medmicel | 197, 9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exorsus } \%^{83} \text { spre- } \\ & \text { cende wes } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | tenorem ${ }^{01}$ | gerece | 198, 1 |
|  |  | 184, 19 |  | zizaniam | wyod | 198, 6 |

[^6]
${ }^{92}$ In top margin.
${ }^{93}=$ arendwrecan.
${ }^{94}$ Gehæpie for geheapie perhaps owes its vocalism to the fact that the glossator had just written daele.
${ }^{25}=$ ge aldormonnum.
${ }^{00}$ In bottom margin.
${ }^{97}$ Apparently taken by glossator as sicilia.
${ }^{98}$ The ending scer I take to be metathesis of resc; cf. ligetrcesc and ligræsc, $B T$.
${ }^{99}$ MS. uixa.

${ }^{100}=$ eor $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { buendas. }\end{aligned}$
${ }^{101}$ Under the Latin.
${ }^{102}=$ Des hatenan; cf. credita ठ̈a bebodenan, WW. 533, 12.
${ }^{103}$ Probably to hœmdscipe.
104* Preterite of atwiccian, cf. BT. twiccian carpere and note to adaeglad, 8r.
${ }^{105}$ Cf. ceruical pylewer, OEG., 56, 16 and note; also Napier's etymology of pillow in Mod. Lang. Quarterly for 1897, p. 52. He has cited a 12 th cent. pulewar and a 15 th cent. peloware and considered the ending wer to be ON. uer a cover. Beside OE. pyle there existed also pylu

(OEG. 29, 4) and, as Napier has stated, very probably genitive and dative forms pylwes and pylwe. From pylu and *pylwe, forms in $r$ such as pylwer may have arisen by analogy with two OE. words for pillow which end in $r$, re: bolster and wangere.
${ }^{106}$ In space at right.
${ }^{107}$ Under the Latin.
${ }^{108}$ Above annus. Gloss to annus is in space at left.
${ }^{109}$ In space at right.
${ }^{110}$ Ed. ostium.
${ }^{111}$ In bottom margin with arrow scratched to line containing lemma, which the glossator evidently mistook for exortum est.
${ }^{112}=$ hlide ; cf. note to hele, 6 r .
${ }^{113}$ Suscepto negotio refers to an urgent demand that has been made, hence bibode.
${ }^{114}$ In bottom margin.
${ }^{115 *}$ In bottom margin. Cf. prescius forewis, WW. 464, 31.
${ }^{116}$ MS. adfertere.
${ }^{117}=$ gefremednisse $;$ cf. commissum gefremed, $W W .364,32$.
${ }^{118}$ Read forecumende.
${ }^{119 *}$ Cf. BT. scrífan with prefix for, ge. See note to adaeglad, 8r. The analogous awritan is documented in $B T$.
${ }^{120}$ In the OE. History this passage reads ge pa maran ge pa meetran, GW. Bibliothek 4, 498a, 10.

118 r in commessationum
in oferwesnesse ${ }^{121} 265,14$
texendis wefendum 265,18
sui status hera hadas
265, 20
multati ${ }^{122}$ slægene 265,34
$118 v$ luerent awogan ${ }^{123} 266,24$
119 v profanabant aidladon
269, 18
fylacteria lyfesne 269, 21
120r ad eius imperium to
his bibode $\quad 269,29$
ac rusticitate $\bar{o}$ mid
ungelærednisse $\quad 270,7$
ebdomedę wican 270,10
120 v et simplici oratione
ond mid anfal[da]n
[tr]umnisse 271, 7
tellus folde 271, 22
uenę eöre 271,23
121v opem frofre 273,23
$122 r$ foedere fir ${ }^{124} \quad 274,10$
obtutib: $\quad$ gū ${ }^{125} \quad 274,22$
sodalis geØoftan 274,27
$122 v$ atq: pomorū gofata ${ }^{126}$
276, 3
$123 v$ uix tandem beh uneØelice ${ }^{127} \quad 278,11$
innitens wreethende
278, 14
artus leomo 278, 26
sustentans wreethende
278, 26
124 r probante gebetende 279,12
pigmentorum wyrta
279, 26
fomentis beठenum ${ }^{128}$
279, 27
abscidendum to
nsiðenne ${ }^{129} \quad 279,27$
124v fefellit gelehag ${ }^{130}$
280, 24

121* The glossator seems not to have noticed that in governs a following cubilia and that commessationum is genitive. Cf. comesationibus oferętum, Kent. Glos. 888; commessatores .i. wesan oppe eteras, Kent. Glos. 1044 where Zupitza compares ealowösa and remarks wēsa scheint sich zu wōs liquor zu verhalten wie zb. myrঠra zu morðor. An adjectival form wése is documented once in BT. 1210: onuppan סám sý gedón wóta, סæt hi pearle wel wése beón. From this with suffix $a$ the noun of agency weesa and with suffix ness the abstract noun wésness would be grammatically normal developments. In semantics Mod. Eng. soaked and a soak are comparable. The formation of oferwesnesse, in which the prefix seems excessive, may likely have been influenced by ofercot. In the OE. History comessationum is rendered by oferceta and ofermettas, GW. Bibliothek 4, 501ab, 1.

122 Taken by glossator as mulcati.
${ }^{123}=a$ bwogan. See note to ungeweran 52r. Luerent here means suffered but the glossator has taken it as from luo $I$ wash.
${ }^{124}$ In margin at right.
${ }^{125}=$ eagum.
${ }^{126}=$ ge ofata.
${ }^{127}$ In bottom margin. Tandem was perhaps taken as tamen.
${ }^{128}$ This passage in the OE. History reads mid bebenum, GW. Bibliothek 4, 545a, 9. Aside from these two citations the word is documented with stem-ending $n g$, beðung, English beathing. Hall's Dictionary, 3d edition, gives beбеп $=$ beठung.
${ }^{129}$ Read to sniঠenne.
${ }^{130}=$ geleah.

| 126 r | $\begin{array}{rll} \begin{array}{l} \text { educatus est } \\ \text { gelęred }{ }^{131} \end{array} & \text { wæs } & \\ 281,12 \end{array}$ | 129r | exp̄tus sū ic wæs onfunden | 289, 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | neq: remigio ne ðа |  | mortis dea[ $\begin{aligned} & \text { es }]\end{aligned}$ | 289, 13 |
|  | geroðor ${ }^{132} \quad 281,19$ |  | et ${ }^{138}$ amplam ${ }^{\text {on bra }}$ | adne |
|  | conamine tolene ${ }^{138} 282,3$ |  |  | 289, 19 |
|  | fragore ${ }^{\text {dy }}$ gebrece 282, 8 |  | laici laede men | 289, 21 |
| 126v | tumida ठ̀a aঠ̌undnan | 129v | contendere flitan | 290, 7 |
|  | 282, 13 |  | cespite tenui ठynre |  |
|  | secundi $\quad$ a gesyngan ${ }^{134}$ |  | tyrf | 290, 15 |
|  | 282, 15 |  | pollici ${ }^{\text {duman }}$ | 290, 20 |
|  | intercapedo first 282, 21 |  | reuiuesco ic wæs | ednew |
|  | nemore raro mid |  |  | 290, 25 |
|  | bearwum medmiclum |  | uomebam ic spau | 290, 26 |
|  | 283, 7 |  | scrupulo hincan | 291, 11 |
| 127 r | et ${ }^{135}$ scabiem $\bar{o}$ hreofle | 130r | emicranii $\mathrm{m}_{\text {are }}$ |  |
|  | 283, 24 |  | habudpannan ${ }^{189}$ | 291, 24 |
|  | ac furfures $\bar{o}$ scyrf 283,24 |  | uitali . . . unda |  |
|  |  |  | mid dy liiflican se | 291, 28 |
|  | 284, 1 | 130v | fixa fæst | 293, 3 |
| 127v | et reuma on[d] flod 285, 28 |  | exuuias wælreaf | 293, 8 |
|  | opido suiðe 285, 30 |  | proceres aldormen | 293, 8 |
| 128r | nihil prorsus in cu- |  | moenia wallas | 293, 8 |
|  | bito flexionis stio æ |  | lares fyr | 293, 8 |
|  | in hellenbogan ${ }^{137}$ 286,5 |  | liquit læfde | 293, 10 |
| 128v | carere סolian 287, 25 |  | meras $\delta$ a luttran ${ }^{1}$ |  |
|  | conualescas truma 288,17 |  |  | 293, 12 |

${ }^{131}$ MS. bagelered.
132* This seems to be a collective noun meaning the oars, formed from rodor with collective prefix ge, analogous to gebroठor compared with broðor. Aplustra geroeðro, WW. 6, 14 and aplustra gerepro, 357, 15 show a different vocalism.
${ }^{133}$ The ending $n e$ of the gloss is by attraction from conamine.
${ }^{134}$ Read gesyndigan. In the OE. History secundi is translated gesundige, gesyndge, GW. Bibliothek 4, 553a, 13.
${ }^{135}$ In ligature in MS.
${ }^{136}$ Cyne is so faint in the manuscript that the reading is uncertain.
${ }^{137}$ In the MS. there is no division between the four OE. words. $a=a$, adverb expressing the emphasis of the Lat. prorsus. Cf. the various meanings under $a^{\text {in }}$ BT. Sup. For initial $h$ in hellenbogan see note to hele, 6 r .
${ }^{138}$ In ligature in MS.
${ }^{139}$ Emicranii is less correctly rendered in the OE. History: he pa tolysdan gepeodnesse minre heafudwunde gesette 7 wriðe, GW. Bibliothek 4, 581a, 7, for the Latin dissolutam mihi emicranii iuncturamb componere atque alligare.
${ }^{140}=$ hluttran. See note to hele, 6r.

${ }^{141}$ A deviation from the normal spacing of the Latin lines left a cuic vacant spot into which were crowded two glosses: glidedcesedan. The adjective edcwic is documented once in BT. Sup., edcwicum rediuiuis.

142* Noun formation from adjective rif rapacious. BT. Sup. cites forms such as hrifra and rifista under hrife (?) and compares gehrifnian. But the initial $h$ is probably secondary. Falk-Torp $(2,905)$ are inclined to take ags. rif gewaltig, anord. rifr heftig as cognate with riue (reissen) and hence to IE. root reip. Walde-Pokorny (2, 345) give ags. rif, anord. rifr under IE. root rei (reip) but give gehrifnian under IE. sqer, qer, 2, 586.
${ }^{143}=$ halga. See note to hele, 6r.
${ }^{144}=$ hlutran.
${ }^{145}$ The glossator has taken suspecti as respected, but it here means mistrusted.
${ }^{146}$ Read growendra.
${ }^{147}$ At the right.
${ }^{148}$ Above rigidis. Read fracne.

| 138 r | ```ne exprobrarent sibi ठy læs heo hine abetigen }\mp@subsup{}{}{149}\quad311,1 enormis unm[aet]re }\mp@subsup{}{}{150``` |  | e regione ad eurum suðeast ferrament | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { onefn }^{158} \\ & \text { on } \begin{array}{l}  \\ \text { ona } \end{array} \\ & \text { Chalfe }{ }^{159} \end{aligned}$ | $318,5$ <br> 318, 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 312, 14 |  | ðæra tol |  | 318, 10 |
| 138v | et ${ }^{151}$ in cumulum $\bar{o}$ | 141r | uitib: w | wyngeardur |  |
|  | hin heapunga 312, 23 |  |  |  | 318, 26 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { obnubilauit } \\ & \text { mistede }^{152} \end{aligned} \text { ofer- } \quad 313,18$ |  | olivis ${ }^{160}$ | elebeam | 318, 26 |
| 139 r | uel saltim oððe ænge oring ${ }^{153} \quad 314,27$ | 141v | procella metropolis | $\begin{gathered} \text { storm }{ }^{16{ }_{1}} \\ \text { aldorbu } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 319,11 \\ & \text { rh } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | protomartyr se aerista |  |  |  | 319, 15 |
|  | 314, 29 |  | dolatis | gesmeðedre | 319, 19 |
| 140r | gnarus ungewis ${ }^{154} 316,27$ |  | uilioris | yflicran | 319, 20 |
| 140v | uallibus ${ }^{155}$ wallum 317, 11 |  | haut longe | noht feor |  |
|  | humili medmicle 317, 12 |  |  |  | 319, 21 |
|  | muro walle 317, 12 |  | truncus | stofn | 319, 27 |
|  | semiantrum scræf 317, 13 |  | opusculis | geweorce |  |
|  | infra bineðan ${ }^{156}$ 317, 28 |  |  |  | 319, 28 |
|  | interim sume סrage ${ }^{157}$ | 142v | uenustatis | fegerni |  |
|  | 317, 30 |  |  |  | 322, 8 |
|  | rotunda seonewald 318, 1 |  | repedantes | s feðende | 322, 25 |

148* Documented without the prefix, beteón, BT. 94. See note to adaeglad, 8r. The verb here preserves its Class I conjugation and has not fallen in with tëon to draw.
${ }^{150}$ Under the Latin.
${ }^{151}$ In ligature.
152* Documented without prefix, mistian, BT. 692.
${ }^{153}$ For this adverbial use of cenge bing see quo quo modo aengepinga, Corp. Glos. 100, 75 (ed. Hessels) ; quoquomodo aengi pinga, Ep. Glos. p. 21 (ed. Schlutter) and NED. 3 under anything.
${ }^{154}$ Evidently the glossator was thinking of ignarus.
${ }^{155}$ Taken by glossator as if from uallum.
${ }^{156} \mathrm{MS}$. binə̈an.
${ }^{157}$ Cf. interim brage, $W W, 26,30$ and for a similar adverbial construction, partim sumedaeli, Ep. Glos. p. 18 (ed. Schlutter).
${ }^{158} E$ regione is used adverbially meaning in a direct line, directly: introitus per tres e regione parietes habet. NED. cites anent adverbially only as opposite but the idea of in a direct line appears once in a dialectical prepositional use: A cricket-ball in a line with the wicket is anent it, Al under anent.

159* The lack of inflectional ending in the first part shows this to be a compound; cf. súpeástende, súphealf, BT. 939.

[^7]

In a blank space at the end of book three and also in one at the end of book four where are some of the glosses published by Sweet in OET. ${ }^{164}$ there are a few rather corrupt scratched glosses. ${ }^{165}$

$$
93 v \text { foticompos }{ }^{168} \quad \text { wilful }{ }^{167}
$$

$$
{ }^{162} \text { MS. a } \frac{\mathrm{u} \text { bunculi. }}{}
$$

${ }^{163}$ MS. monigheoulie. ${ }^{\mathbf{c}}=$ monigheowlice, analogous to monigfealdlīc; cf. [mœeni]hiwan multiformem, Sup. under manighiwe(?).
${ }^{164}$ The remark in OET. p. 179 that these glosses (i. e. the inked ones) are written in the blank spaces at the end of each book is hardly correct as there are no inked glosses at the ends of books $1,2,3$, and 5 . Those on $5 \mathrm{r}, 34 \mathrm{v}$ and 60 v (present foliation) are in spaces at the ends of tables of chapters preceding books 1,2 , and 3 , and only those on 124 v come at the end of a book.
${ }^{185}$ Zupitza has noted (ZfdA. 31, 28) that the Latin words of the inked glosses which Sweet published from this MS. are to be found in Bede's History 1, 10-22. The source of these scratched glosses is somewhat doubtful, as these seven words might be found in the works of various pertinent Latin writers. Besides cum, which could probably be found anywhere, in Bede's History occur uoti compos (Plummer 302, 3); proprie, 335, 8 and elsewhere; gerulis, 198, 13; ruderibus, 211, 13. The forms flagitat and protemnentes do not occur in Bede's History. Flagitat occurs in Aldhelm's De Laudibus Virginitatis (Giles, 69, 35 and 79, 9 ) and here too occurs a word for which I believe the glossator wrote protemnentes, namely portendentes in the context ruinam et regalis monarchiae discrimen portendentes, 22, 16. The great number of OE. glosses to this work of Aldhelm makes it a likely source.
${ }^{188}$ Read uoti compos.
${ }^{187 *} B T$. has only the adverbial form wilfullice and NED. gives wilful as not recorded in OE. Judging from the lemma, wilful here has a meaning with which none of those given in NED. quite agrees. Here it means full of one's will in the sense of satisfied, having attained one's desire. Cf. uoti compos wilfagen, WW. 502, 35; uoti compos wiltipe, OEG. 2219; uoti compotibus blipum, OEG. 809. As in several cases in the MS. the glossator has misunderstood his lemma, it seems probable that he did not quite understand it here.

| proprie ${ }^{168}$ sundra | cum [m]io ${ }^{171}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| flagitat baeed ${ }^{169}$ | gerulis ierendwrif ${ }^{171}$ |
| protemnentes ${ }^{108}$ | ruderib: myxsennum ${ }^{\mathbf{1 7 2}}$ |
| forあaelihicgand[e] 170 |  |

Herbert Meritt.
${ }^{168}$ pro in ligature in MS.
${ }^{169}$ Read baedep.
170* Read forðbealohicgande. Above ae are two small marks which may be meant as a correction to ea. BT. gives one documentation of the simplex with the meaning intending evil: bealohycgendra, Beowulf 2565.
${ }^{171}$ The MS. reads: cumiəlisierendwrif and beneath this is gerulis. Ierendwrif is probably a corruption of arendwrican, glossing gerulis and the first five letters are probably for cum miס. The following lis I take to be the ending of gerulis, as if the glossator had written only lis at first and had put the whole word below.
${ }^{172}$ MS. myxsennum. The $s$ above, which in glosses in Continental MSS. often signifies saxonice, is here surely part of the word.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. especially Leydecker, Über Beziehungen zwischen ahd. und ags. Glossen, and Michiels, Über englische Bestandteile altdeutscher Glossenhandschriften.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. for example Förster, Spätae. Prosper-Glossen in Cambridge, Archiv 136, 290; Die altenglische Glossenhandschrift Plantinus 32 (Antwerpen) und Additional 32246 (London), Anglia 4l, 94 ff.; Craster, The Glosses of the Codex Oxoniensis Posterior, Revue Celtique 40, 135-6; Schlutter, Altenglisch-althochdeutsches aus dem Codex Trevirensis No. 40, Anglia 35, 145 ff .; Altenglisches aus Leidener Handschriften, Anglia 33, 239 ff . The final results of my work I hope to publish as a book.
    ${ }^{3}$ Bischoff and Lehmann, Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen, Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, Bd. 52, pp. 153 ff .
    *Vol. 1, p. xciii.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5} \mathrm{P}$. xxxiii.

    - Since writing this, I have read about the same number of scratched glosses in the Sedulius section of the Corpus Christi Cambridge MS. 173.
    ${ }^{7}$ This does not include a few Latin scratched glosses.
    ${ }^{8}$ Annotations and corrections in ink have been made by a hand nearly contemporary with the text and by another hand of the 10th century. It is highly probable that these two scribes put in some of the scratched glosses. This is especially likely since in some cases where a correction has been made in ink there is also a scratched gloss the first letters of which show a trace of ink, as if the glossator, having used the writing implement with ink, continued with it to scratch in the OE. gloss. I think that none of the glosses are later than the tenth century.
    ${ }^{9}$ The chief feature is the use of the $e$ vowel (1) for WS. $\bar{x}$ : hele 6 r , were 8 r , wete 18 r , ungeweran 52 r , gebrece 63 r , wepnedmonnes 69 r , mere 76 v , bel 77 v , mere 79 r , ठem 94 v , erende 95 r , wete 110 r , lessan 117 v , eठre 120 v , se 130 r , weran 133 r , wetan 137 v , (2) for WS. æ: herne 9 v , ferelde 10r, fegernesse 10v, berdan 78r, scer (in legetscer) 97v, segde 131r, fegernisse 142 v , (3) for WS. $\overline{\mathrm{y}}$ (i-umlaut of $\overline{\bar{a}}$ ) : heran 9 v , (4) for WS. y: hemsald 76v.

[^3]:    ${ }^{18}$ Under the Latin.
    ${ }^{19}=$ orhlete, cf. orhlyte expers, BT. and orhlet expers, BT. Sup.
    ${ }^{20 *}$ Cf. BT. díglian with prefix be and ge. In this and several other cases the glossator seems to have added a prefix to make the gloss correspond as closely as possible with the Latin. The writing ae I take to be scribal for ea, cf. celare bedeahlian, Kent. Glos. 952 (ZfdA. xxi).
    ${ }^{21 *}$ There is space for several letters after fore, but nothing visible before ( f ). I take it as a literal translation, fore for $o b$ and fengnisse for tentu as if from teneo. fengness occurs in and- and onfengness. The glosses sub obtentu under intingan, WW. 482, 31, obtentu gewilnunge, for begeat, OEG. 2698 show a different interpretation of obtentu. Here it means a protective skirting (of woods): obtentu insuper siluarum munitum.
    ${ }^{22}$ This gloss occurs above a Latin word in which there has been an erasure and correction. Edited text: expeditionem. In the MS. the first $i$ is written above in darker ink and the letter $d$ is doubtful, seemingly $t$ corrected in darker ink to $d$. Above is scratched the Old English gloss, infinitive of regnian and meaning to be put in order, referring to the incorrectness of the Latin word probably as originally written.
    ${ }^{23}$ The glossator has taken prouectum as protectionem.
    ${ }^{24}=$ erne; cf. note to hele, 6 r.

[^4]:    ${ }^{39}$ Read reठnesse. Cf. this passage in the OE. version of the History (Grein, Bibliothek 4, 185a, 12) mid wildeorlice reठnesse.
    ${ }^{40}$ Under the Latin.
    ${ }^{41}$ Of two different meanings for rheuma the glossator has taken the wrong one. In the context it means tide. Both meanings are given in the Epinal Glossary : rema stream, reuma gibrec, p. 22, ed. Schlutter.
    ${ }^{42}$ Read healfe. The glossator's carrying the lemma in mind accounts for the misplaced $l$ and the unusual masculine ending.
    ${ }^{43}$ Ablative plural of iugum. The glossator took it as the adjective iugis.
    ${ }^{44 *}$ Cf. BT. týdran, with prefix $a ́$, on, ge and see note to adaeglad, 8r.
    ${ }^{45}$ Both gloss and lemma scratched in bottom margin.
    ${ }^{46}$ Both gloss and lemma in top margin.
    ${ }^{47}$ Past participle of $h \bar{y} n$. Cf. BT. Sup. under heán, and porrectam gehydne, OEG. 8, 237.
    ${ }^{48}$ Both gloss and lemma scratched in bottom margin.
    ${ }^{49}$ In top margin.
    ${ }^{50}$ Ed. aboleri.
    ${ }^{51}$ In margin at left.
    ${ }^{52}$ In ligature in MS.
    ${ }^{53}$ The glossator has interpreted stramine rather well. The Bede MSS. vary at this point mainly between stramine substrato and stramine subtracto (cf. Plummer 1, 145 , note 5). The oldest MSS., including Cott. Tib. C. ii, support the latter reading. Plummer (2, 154)

[^5]:    ${ }^{63}$ The $y$ for $a$ in my $\begin{gathered}\text { els } \\ \text { is perhaps Kentish, cf. lyssan for l} \bar{\propto} s s a n, ~\end{gathered}$ Kent. Glos. 1100.
    ${ }^{64}$ For wyn the MS. has only the runic character, which represents either $w$ or $w y n$, in this case the latter.
    ${ }^{65}$ Under the Latin.
    ${ }^{66}$ Read gehigde. The noun is meant but confusion with the verb gehogde may have caused the writing $o$ for $i$.
    ${ }^{67}=$ leasum. Evidently taken by the glossator as false accusations. For another case of departure from usual inflection cf. doman, 86v.
    ${ }^{68}$ Second gloss in bottom margin.
    ${ }^{69}$ In bottom margin preceded by $\hbar$.
    ${ }^{70}$ Read berndan.
    ${ }^{71}$ Read westensetle. The glossator took his lemma as eremitam.
    72* In lower margin. Here eremiticam is correctly taken as adjective. Westensetla is a usual gloss for eremita and eremitica would suggest a * westensetlalic, but the glossator probably interpreted the lemma merely as solitary.
    ${ }^{73} \mathrm{MS}$. almen but der is scratched in left margin.
    ${ }^{74}$ In the group in loco latineaco nominato, the gloss is above the last word. I take it as Kentish for mœre, cf. in mórum in uicos, BT. under mœ́re.
    ${ }^{75}$ In bottom margin. $=$ wrostlicra .
    ${ }^{78}$ MS. noṭius.
    ${ }^{77}$ Read cupra.
    ${ }^{78}$ Above and also in bottom margin.

[^6]:    ${ }^{79} t$ is scratched over part of the final stroke of $h$. The first three letters of this gloss are peculiarly written, there being an ornamental left-slanting stroke across the top of the first stroke of each letter.
    ${ }^{80}$ In bottom margin preceded by + . The first stroke of the first $n$ is high as in $h$ and has the additional stroke noticed in in rehtnes, 80 v ; cf. oneardedon for commorari in this passage in the OE. version, GW. Bibliothek 4, 300a, 22.
    ${ }^{81}$ Ed. nefarie.
    ${ }^{82}$ MS. Ftende. The runic character for $f$ here represents feoh in sound but not in sense.
    ${ }^{83}$ This introduces a speech.
    ${ }^{84}$ Read su\%.
    ${ }^{85}=$ domum, cf. leason, 77 r .
    ${ }^{86}$ In bottom margin.
    ${ }^{87}$ In space at right.
    ${ }^{88}$ In bottom margin preceded by $\hbar$. = gneat'nesse.
    ${ }^{89}$ Two spaces above. $\quad{ }^{00}$ Read gongende. $\quad{ }^{91}$ MS. tenorúm.

[^7]:    ${ }^{100}$ MS. olibis.
    ${ }^{161}$ Beneath the Latin.

