



---

Old High German Scratched Glosses

Author(s): Herbert Meritt

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 55, No. 3 (1934), pp. 227-235

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/289774>

Accessed: 08/01/2014 05:02

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## OLD HIGH GERMAN SCRATCHED GLOSSES.

While searching through manuscripts in numerous Continental and English libraries for Old English glosses, I occasionally found unpublished Old High German glosses.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of a few, such that I came upon are scratched glosses.<sup>2</sup> The extensive search of manuscripts that was made in the preparing of the five volumes of *Die althochdeutschen Glossen* made it seem unlikely that many more Old High German glosses would ever come to light, yet since the appearance of the fifth volume in 1922 various publications have brought forth considerable new material.<sup>3</sup> It is to this increasing sum of new glosses that this present contribution is made. As many of the scratched glosses here given are from a manuscript from which the inked glosses had been collected previously,<sup>4</sup> without the mention of any of the scratched ones, it seems likely that other manuscripts which have been examined may yet contain unpublished glosses. Unless one were looking specifically for scratched glosses one might fail to notice them, especially if the supply of daylight was not at its best. But the careful scrutiny, in plenty of daylight, of manuscript leaves for words which may be scratched there without ink is at times rewarding.

<sup>1</sup> This work was made possible for me by a Research Fellowship with the American Council of Learned Societies.

<sup>2</sup> This method of glossing texts by scratching in words instead of writing them with ink I have discussed in *Old English Scratched Glosses in Cotton MS. Tiberius C. ii*, *AJPh.*, LIV. It is also spoken of by Napier, *Old English Glosses*, p. xxxiii, and Bischoff and Lehmann, *Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 52, 153 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Recent publications of OHG. glosses: Naumann, *Glossen aus Admont*, *ZfdA.*, 64, pp. 77-79 (1927); Schröder, *Handschriftliche Funde von meinen Bibliotheksreisen*, *Nachrichten v. d. Ges. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, p. 95 (1927); *Spätalthochdeutsche Bibelglossen*, *ZfdA.*, 68, pp. 66-68 (1931); Lehmann, *Fuldaer Studien*, *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, p. 50 (1927); *Mitteilungen aus Handschriften*, ii, *MSBphKl.*, p. 35 f. (1930); Bischoff and Lehmann, *Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen*, *Beiträge*, 52, pp. 153 ff. (1928); Hartl, *Ein neues althochdeutsches Glossenfragment*, *Festschrift für Georg Leidinger*, pp. 95 ff. (1930); Pyritz, *Althochdeutsche Horaz-glossen*, *ZfdA.*, 68, pp. 215-16 (1931).

<sup>4</sup> *Clm.* 6293. Cf. *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5, 66.

## Staatsbibliothek, München

Cl. 6293, 9th century,<sup>5</sup> 158 folios, ff. 1-65 Gregorii Dialogi  
Migne, Patrol. Lat. 66 and 77

1v eminebat furi uuas <sup>6</sup>	11r opem helfoo	213, 16
77, 152, 2	11v studiis lirnungon	
2v ut opinor so uuanu 153, 1		66, 126, 8
3r contingere pir'nan 153, 40	12v incole elilenti <sup>13</sup>	128, 23
5v in tam ampla in so	15v conspirantes kihantre <sup>14</sup>	
preiteru <sup>7</sup> 164, 12		136, 30
nuper nunahiu <sup>8</sup> 164, 17	usum sito	136, 33
subprimo piduingu 164, 19	excederet arfori <sup>15</sup>	136, 33
7r lacessiunt kaarindent 180, 8	17r inuitus kanotit	152, 43
excreuerat aruuos 180, 14	21v impetrant kahalongt	194, 4
reficiens <sup>9</sup> zuntenti 180, 19	23r transfunderent	
uidendum kasiuni <sup>10</sup> 180, 21	kafastinotin <sup>16</sup>	198, 5
7v probat cauuaigta 180, 42	in spera ignea in suti	
8r crebro ofto 184, 2		198, 27
9r ex obsesso uona	exigua luzzil	198, 32
pisessanemo <sup>11</sup> 201, 36	24v ampliatur kipur'itit	200, 11
9v derogatione lastrungu	liquide uuazure	200, 28
204, 16	25r acri pittro	202, 8
10v putandam <sup>12</sup> furpanne	sustentans stiurrente	
212, 28		202, 13

<sup>5</sup> The dates which I give for the MSS. are those assigned to them in the catalogues of the respective libraries.

<sup>6</sup> There are traces of an immediately following gloss. If the position of a gloss is not referred to in the foot-notes, it is found above its lemma.

<sup>7</sup> There is an illegible gloss above the immediately following *congregatione*.

<sup>8</sup> Read *nu nahun*. Cf. *nuper nu*, Die ahd. Gl., 1, 216, 30; *nuper nahun*, 4, 9, 3; *nuper nu nahun*, 1, 285, 29.

<sup>9</sup> Ed. *reficiendis . . . lampadibus*.

<sup>10</sup> Under the Latin. The glossator has used a noun instead of following the gerund form of the Latin.

<sup>11</sup> In the writing *ss*, for *zz*, there may be attraction from the *ss* in the lemma.

<sup>12</sup> MS. *potandam*, but above *o* is scratched *u*.

<sup>13</sup> In interpreting *eius loci incole* the glossator may have thought of *incole* as natives of some land other than his own, i. e. strangers.

<sup>14</sup> Illegible at the end. Read *kihantreihhante*.

<sup>15</sup> The unbroken *o* in *arfori*, *hrodar* 34r, *armoti* 38r, *dursochenti* 39r, *sochan* 60r, and the dative ending *u* in *izzu* 43r, *nidarunku* 48r, *sonu* 52r, *sniumidu* 54r, *paru* 57r, point to a date hardly later than the beginning of the tenth century.

<sup>16</sup> The glossator took the lemma as from *fundare* to make fast.

25v	tendebatur	uwas kiuört	35v	inquiet	chuatun	309, 37
		202, 20		compendiosa		
27v	satis	kenuoc 77, 264, 13		kalimflihharo		309, 45
28r	frigauit	reip 264, 32	36r	calce	spore <sup>24</sup>	312, 9
	frigaretur	kiripan 264, 32		adnisu	uullin	312, 15
28v	exenio <sup>17</sup>	phrazumen 272, 36		expectaculum <sup>25</sup>		
29r	saltim	doh 273, 3		uuntarsiun		312, 19
31r	euanuit	kileid 277, 21	36v	tendendo <sup>26</sup>		
	respectus	ursuni 277, 25		kidinnanne <sup>27</sup>		312, 29
32r	retorqueat	kiride 280, 30		depraedati	herionte	312, 36
32v	transferre	frampringan		disponente	kimarch <sup>28</sup>	
		297, 48				312, 43
34r	rimis	hrodar <sup>18</sup> 304, 28	37r	supplime <sup>29</sup>	furist	313, 22
34v	caruisset	anuuari 305, 6		eminet	opacuum	313, 26
	onustam	kahlad <sup>19</sup> 305, 10	37v	rareseunt	kadunnet	313, 34
35r	ausum	katurst 305, 25		paenitus	zesperi	313, 33
	fateri	sakenti <sup>20</sup> 305, 27	38r	aerumnam	armoti	317, 25
	cogebatur	uwas kipeit		uenit	chuam	317, 25
		305, 27		perfrui	pruhanti uesan	
	exterius	uzzaro <sup>21</sup> 309, 10				317, 28
	deliberasse	kaendraftot	38v	diffidunt	missatruent	
	uuarin <sup>22</sup>	309, 17				320, 15
	conditione	kiskēfti <sup>23</sup>	39r	percontari	dursochenti	
		309, 20				320, 36

<sup>17</sup> Ed. *xenio*.

<sup>18</sup> The glossator confused *rimis* with *remus*; cf. *rimis scruntussun*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 257, 27; *remus ruoder*, 4, 92, 1.

<sup>19</sup> Illegible at the end. Read *kahladana*.

<sup>20</sup> The first letters *uu* of a following gloss, possibly *uuesan*, can be read but the gloss to the following *cogebatur* has been scratched over the rest of it and has obscured it.

<sup>21</sup> A few illegible scratches follow.

<sup>22</sup> As there is no connection between the lemma and gloss as they stand, I believe that the glossator took *deliberasse* as from *delibo*, and that *kaendraftot* is for *kaentraffot*. Under *raffen* in Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (11th edition) the existence of an OHG. *raffōn* is given as by chance unattested.

<sup>23</sup> Beneath the Latin.

<sup>24</sup> The gloss does not suit the lemma; perhaps there was confusion with *calcar* which in OHG. is rendered by *sporo*.

<sup>25</sup> Ed. *spectaculum*.

<sup>26</sup> In the MS. *tentendo* is corrected by a scratch to *tendendo*.

<sup>27</sup> Read *kidinsanne*.

<sup>28</sup> Illegible at the end; cf. *disponant kimarchoen*, Die ahd. Gl., 1, 277, 31.

<sup>29</sup> Ed. *sublime*.

40r	facerem tati	325, 45	45r	summi opificis meistris	
	condiscensione <sup>30</sup>				344, 41
	kizunft	325, 47	45v	sculpta kakrapaniu	344, 42
40v	incircumscibitum			limat fihlot	344, 44
	unumpimerctan	328, 27		decubans hlinenti	345, 2
41v	disponi pimarchon	329, 24		incrementa õuuast	345, 6
42r	inquires chuidis	329, 43	46r	refoueret kasatoti	345, 30
	ut opinor so ih uuanu			fraglantia prunst	345, 37
		332, 8		uiaticum uuekanest	345, 39
	obsistit uuidarstat	332, 9	46v	exhiberentur uuarun	
	questus es rochenti <sup>31</sup>			karo <sup>38</sup>	345, 46
	uuari	332, 11		elongata kilanctiu	345, 50
42v	fassus sum <sup>32</sup>			replicabo piuendu	348, 4
	sprehanti <sup>33</sup>	332, 22	47r	coeuas ebanaltiu	348, 33
	laxato lichtemo	332, 27	47v	leue loso	348, 39
43r	calore izzu <sup>34</sup>	340, 29		reuerenter rufendo	349, 10
	deformitatis unupari			habitatura farantiu	349, 13
		340, 31	48r	dilationis kilengida <sup>39</sup>	
	uerita est scamenti				357, 2
	uuas, rehtiu <sup>35</sup>	340, 32		damno nidarunku	357, 3
	foedaretur uuari			perfruuntur	
	kazokan <sup>36</sup>	340, 33		sinzpruhanti <sup>40</sup>	357, 25
44r	asciuit <sup>37</sup> kiuuista	341, 11		geminata <sup>41</sup> kazuiualtot	
	permittantur lopit	341, 24			357, 27
	ambigo zuiualon	341, 28			

<sup>30</sup> MS. *con discensione*. Below and close to the second part is scratched *con* and after this the gloss.

<sup>31</sup> The first letter of the gloss might be read as *s*.

<sup>32</sup> Ed. *praefatus sum*.

<sup>33</sup> Following this is a faint trace of a gloss, possibly *uuas*.

<sup>34</sup> Read *hizzu*.

<sup>35</sup> Over the first gloss is scratched the second one, seemingly an interpretation of *uerita* as *uera*.

<sup>36</sup> The glossator has misunderstood the lemma, possibly taking it as from *foederare*.

<sup>37</sup> Ed. *accivit*.

<sup>38</sup> The second part of this gloss is not clear in the MS. and the reading is doubtful.

<sup>39</sup> The meaning *dilatatio* here distinguishes this gloss from *gilengida cognatio, affinitas* (Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 2, 225; Die *ahd. Gl.*, 1, 272, 31). The present gloss corresponds in meaning with the lemma if it is taken as a nominal formation from *gilengan* to *protract*. Cf. *dilationis altisonis*, Die *ahd. Gl.*, 2, 139, 29 and *dilatatio altinod*, 2, 259, 23.

<sup>40</sup> Reflecting the force of the Latin *per* is the prefix *sin ever, entire* as in *singrun* and *sinfluot*. The letter *z* between the *n* and *p* is perhaps a transition sound, similar to the *t* in forms such as *sintgrune* and *sintfluote* (Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 4, 299 and 3, 754).

<sup>41</sup> Ed. *germinata*.

49v	rigorem suhti <sup>42</sup>	368, 21	56v	grabant suarent	396, 25
51r	exalans uf	384, 31		stipulam strau	396, 30
	probatio pichorunc	385, 1		adhibito zokihalatemo	
51v	auctoritate katursti	385, 18			396, 35
	sinceritate k . . liho <sup>43</sup>		57r	et luculenti enti	
		385, 19		leohtostin	396, 50
	coxas deoh	385, 24		extant sint	397, 1
	luctamen esset rinkanti <sup>44</sup>			refutauit uuidarstreit,	
		385, 26		uuidarota <sup>50</sup>	397, 9
52r	examine sónu	385, 36		praesulis heroston	397, 11
	arbitris <sup>45</sup> sonares	385, 36		feretro paru	397, 12
	latet pimitan ist	385, 37		dictauerunt lertun	397, 16
	uitare piuuisan	385, 46		sensi kahancta	397, 23
	metallis kazimprun	388, 3	58r	fallerentur pitrogan	400, 22
	si ipu	388, 5	58v	temere katurstliho	400, 32
	ex eo <sup>46</sup> fon diu	388, 6	59r	exute uzarfaraniu	401, 7
52v	uictu lipleitu	388, 24	59v	insanus unuuiser	401, 41
	fabrica zinprur	388, 27		adserere kasaken	401, 43
	non inmerito ni unkauu <sup>47</sup>		60r	expetere sochan	417, 1
		388, 27		diocaesi farru	417, 4
53r	ima nidaristun	388, 38		perageret durhteta	417, 14
	obsideat pisizzen	388, 45	60v	disparuit kaleid	417, 35
	infecit archelit <sup>48</sup>	389, 9	61r	sedule emazigo	420, 5
53v	necaret chueliti	389, 18		excubare kaanpahten	
	deridendo pihuhonto	389, 38			420, 6
54r	inguine hlanchun	389, 40		stipendiis lipleiton	420, 11
	protegerent scirmtin	389, 42	61v	percipiat antfahe	420, 29
	enixius langor	392, 1	62v	arcana uuihiu	421, 46
	caeleritate sniumidu	392, 2		mactabat plau	421, 46
55r	aestimationis chuiti	393, 17	63r	nauta ferio <sup>51</sup>	424, 21
55v	abstrahit <sup>49</sup> ziuhit	393, 34		rupto farprohanemo	424, 23
	ebibens trinken	393, 34		fune seile	424, 24
	non euasit ni entcheeng		63v	uictime friskinka	424, 33
		393, 39			

<sup>42</sup> While in the MS. the first letter of the gloss appears to be *s*, it is very likely that one should read *f*. Cf. *rigor fuhti*, Die ahd. Gl., 4, 92, 46 and *rigor fuhti*, 4, 158, 17.

<sup>43</sup> Perhaps *katriulihho*.

<sup>44</sup> After *rinkanti* comes *uu* and a trace of more; possibly *uuari*.

<sup>45</sup> Ed. *arbitri*.

<sup>46</sup> Ed. *per hoc*.

<sup>47</sup> Illegible at the end. Perhaps *unkauerdot*.

<sup>48</sup> Scratched over and running into the letters of this gloss is a gloss which I could not read.

<sup>49</sup> Ed. *extrahit*.

<sup>50</sup> The first gloss is above the lemma, the second is beneath it.

<sup>51</sup> Here and also in *herionte*, 36v, the letter *i* is made with a much longer stroke than elsewhere in these glosses.

restaurata kazehotiu		funditus karo	425, 1
	424, 34	64v ima nidarostun	428, 3
quo oblata <sup>52</sup> demo		65r eruemus <sup>54</sup> arlaosemes	
kaoffarotiu	424, 34		428, 13
inopinata		incuria unrohun	428, 15
unpiuuonetlih	424, 36	65v placitum sona	428, 37
uersatus fargozzan	424, 41	fidenter paldliho	429, 7
carine mastes <sup>53</sup>	424, 43		

Cl. 6272, ninth century, 184 folios, Hieronymus in Matthaicum  
Migne, Patol. Lat. 26

35r prerogatiuum era <sup>55</sup>	52, 6	cautione scrip <sup>60</sup>	150, 35
50r gehenon hel- <sup>56</sup>	66, 29	tecnam suih	150, 39
87v os mund	106, 36	130r malo afol	155, 4
109v arbitratus est son- <sup>57</sup>		nodo masor	155, 4
	130, 40	153v gemma proz	180, 37
rapina urtof. <sup>58</sup>	130, 40	intellegitis uuiztut	180, 38
126v rursum empta <sup>59</sup> urchuft		176v roseo <sup>61</sup> rot	208, 24
	150, 29	limbo tuhh- <sup>62</sup>	208, 24

Cl. 4554, 8/9th century, 164 folios, Passiones Sanctorum  
Acta Sanctorum Jan. tom. 1 and 2

110r inpedistis <sup>63</sup> camartut		111r piget trac <sup>64</sup>	586, 16
	1, 585, 29	154v gradum castegail	2, 717, 23

<sup>52</sup> Ed. *oblato*.

<sup>53</sup> This is an incorrect interpretation of *carine*, which means *keel* and *ship*, not *mast*. Cf. *carine. naue. scalmo. po dame*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 258, 59.

<sup>54</sup> Ed. *servemus*. In the MS. *eruemus* begins a line and the *s* is left attached at the end of the preceding line.

<sup>55</sup> With the exception of the interlinear gloss *masor*, 130r, all glosses from this MS. are marginal.

<sup>56</sup> Read *hella*.

<sup>57</sup> Read *sona*.

<sup>58</sup> Read *urtoffi*. Cf. *temeritas paldi. urtoffi*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 332, 67.

<sup>59</sup> MS. *membra*, deleted by dots, and *empta* written in darker ink above.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *cautio scripgezuch*, Die ahd. Gl., 3, 313, 25.

<sup>61</sup> Ed. *rufo*.

<sup>62</sup> Perhaps one should read *tuhhil*; cf. *peplo, pallio tuhil*, Die ahd. Gl. 2, 569, 22 and *strophium tuhil*, 2, 569, 39.

<sup>63</sup> Ed. *irretistis*.

<sup>64</sup> There is no trace of more in the MS. Read *tracot*.

Stiftsbibliothek, St. Gallen  
 MS. 217, 9th century, 342 pages, pp. 1-249 Gregorii Cura  
 Pastoralis

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 77

p. 18 dedecore	unscenin	19, 34	p. 130 fomentis	fascun	71, 38
p. 32 horum <sup>66</sup>	ire <sup>66</sup>	24, 50	p. 150 supersticione		
p. 63 torpescit	caslauet <sup>67</sup>	39, 8	ubarmezzikin <sup>69</sup>		81, 50
p. 74 effrenata	unzapritlota <sup>68</sup>	44, 5	p. 208 conglutinata		
p. 116 suspitionibus	uuanun		pichliban <sup>70</sup>		108, 28
		64, 49			

Stadtbibliothek, St. Gallen  
 MS. 312, 10th century, 158 folios, Horati Opera  
 Keller and Holder, Horati Opera

90v sicarius mxchfrk <sup>71</sup> 2, 34, 4

Universitätsbibliothek, Würzburg  
 Mp. th. f. 19, 8/9th century, 97 folios, Gregorii Dialogi  
 Migne, Patrol. Lat. 77

8v ferramentum id est		48v uangas .i. scuuala	245, 23
bluothisan <sup>72</sup>	flebotomum		
			169, 28

Bodleian Library, Oxford  
 MS. Auct. T. 2. 22, 10th century, 128 folios, Prudentii  
 Carmina <sup>73</sup>

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 59 and 60

26r maculis	mascun	59, 799, 15	48r callum	suil	389, 4
44r calyps	stahel	60, 288, 3	51v ludibria	spil	403, 8

<sup>66</sup> MS. *eorum*, with *h* written above.

<sup>66</sup> In left margin preceded by reference mark *fi*.

<sup>67</sup> In right margin.

<sup>68</sup> In left margin. Read *ungapritlota*.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. *supersticio ubermezzihi*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 96, 53.

<sup>70</sup> In left margin.

<sup>71</sup> In ink, in 10th century hand that has put in many Latin glosses. Read *mucheri*.

<sup>72</sup> Read *bluotisarn*. The two glosses from this MS. are in ink.

<sup>73</sup> From this MS. six glosses not given here are noted by Lehmann, *Mitteilungen aus Handschriften*, MSBphKl., p. 36 (1930). The glosses are in ink.



82v prurit iuchit	313, 4	98r trulla kella	471, 4
scalpit skebit	313, 5	119v fragitidas <sup>74</sup> bregkun	525, 12
strumas kelca	313, 8		

## Universitätsbibliothek, Basel

MS. F III 15 c, 8th century, 62 folios, Isidorus de Synonymis,  
Sancti Basilii Admonitio ad Filium Spiritualem<sup>75</sup>

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 83 and 103

12r relegio eua <sup>76</sup>	83, 845, 28 <sup>77</sup>	24r nec modicum ni galic <sup>84</sup>	
14r interime <sup>78</sup> slah <sup>79</sup>	848, 39		862, 43
16v ultor rehhari <sup>80</sup>	852, 23	24v (nullim) defendas ni	
17v ad reconciliationem		scirmi <sup>85</sup>	863, 35
zigidingon <sup>81</sup>	853, 22	27r nec quod ni desiu	867, 19
18v tribulatione arpeiti <sup>82</sup>		28v uite huius disses lipes	
	854, 38		103, 685, 39
21r celari bimidan <sup>83</sup>	859, 5	29r deuersus <sup>86</sup> meslihhen	
21v si opa	859, 19		686, 15
te dih	859, 20	res <sup>86</sup> dingun	686, 15
23r inpertienda ziteilen <sup>83</sup>		lucrum gięri	686, 20
	861, 19		

<sup>74</sup> Ed. *sphragitidas*.

<sup>75</sup> The glosses here given are from a copy which I made in the spring of 1932. On seeing the MS. again some months later, I found that an attempt had been made to trace in many of the scratched glosses with pencil. This has made it impossible to read again these glosses as originally scratched in the MS.

<sup>76</sup> After *eua* there is a trace of a gloss under *peruersa*. In the right margin opposite *nihil* . . . *offendas* is the beginning of a gloss, *nigi*. Most of the glosses in this MS. occur either above or below their respective lemmata; I give the position of those only which occur elsewhere.

<sup>77</sup> Only lines of the text, not notes or chapter-headings, are included in the lines counted.

<sup>78</sup> Ed. *interimunt*.

<sup>79</sup> Right margin.

<sup>80</sup> Although the form of letters in scratched glosses is apt to be irregular, this gloss and others bear evidence of a pointed insular hand. In the left margin of this folio are several scratched glosses difficult to read. One seems to be Latin *mitiga* which occurs in the text nearby. Another I read with doubt as *resci gipur*, glossing the neighboring (*iracundia*) *praeoccuparit*.

<sup>81</sup> Top margin.

<sup>82</sup> Left margin.

<sup>83</sup> Right margin.

<sup>84</sup> Following this is a gloss of which I could read the first letters *nis*, perhaps *ni sat* glossing *nec satis* which follows *modicum*.

<sup>85</sup> MS. *niscirmi*. In left margin.

<sup>86</sup> Ed. *in diversis rebus*.

29v et enti <sup>87</sup>	686, 26	erroribus irridon	687, 21
abominare leidene	686, 27	uagaremur ueruallot	
mendacium lugia <sup>88</sup>	686, 28		687, 21
ab omni stultitia fon		exquesiuit sohita	687, 24
allemo ungi <sup>89</sup>	686, 31	31v detinetur giuestinot <sup>94</sup>	
obtinere bihaben	686, 35		688, 46
et . . eius entes gotes <sup>90</sup>		33v fraudes feihnes <sup>95</sup>	690, 49
	686, 38	34r facultates ehti	691, 37
inpensius ingiuegan <sup>91</sup>		35v aliquod <sup>96</sup> einig	693, 5
	686, 39	37r disciplinas <sup>97</sup> lera	694, 22
meditaueris <sup>92</sup> lere	686, 39	et iusit <sup>98</sup> enti gipot	
eris bist	686, 39		694, 36
et ex seruo en . .		38v fulgere scinen	695, 43
deotome <sup>93</sup>	686, 42	39r molestia <sup>99</sup> suernessa	
30r obnoxios scadonti	687, 20		696, 18

HERBERT MERITT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

<sup>87</sup> There is a trace of following letters under *tumorem*.

<sup>88</sup> Read *lugina*.

<sup>89</sup> Perhaps *ungiuuizili*.

<sup>90</sup> Read *enti gotes*. *eius* refers to *dei*.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *de inpenso fona unkauekanemo*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 307, 5.

<sup>92</sup> Ed. *meditatus eris*.

<sup>93</sup> The traces of two or three intervening letters are visible.

<sup>94</sup> In left margin.

<sup>95</sup> The ending *es* of the gloss may be by attraction from the ending of the lemma, or perhaps the glossator took *fraudes* as genitive.

<sup>96</sup> Ed. *quoddam*.

<sup>97</sup> Ed. *disciplinis*.

<sup>98</sup> Ed. *iussis*.

<sup>99</sup> Ed. *molestiam*.