

A newly deciphered gloss on the Cadmug Gospels (Fulda, Landesbibliothek, MS Bonifatianus 3, folio 39a)<sup>1</sup>

#### ABSTRACT

In this article I provide a new edition of the glosses on folio 39a of the 8<sup>th</sup> century Cadmug Gospels. I also correct the reading of one of the glosses on folio 3v.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

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

Die Lesung der letzten Glossen ist noch dadurch erschwert, daß sie mit Ausnahme von *nech* durchgestrichen sind. (Meyer 1912: 174)  
'The reading of the last glosses is even more difficult by the fact that, with the exception of *nech*, they are crossed out.'

On account of this difficulty, he leaves the glosses largely undeciphered, giving the following as his edition of the passage with glosses in parentheses,

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

'No one (nech), however, after lighting a lamp (lucarn:?), hides (.i. :::) it in a jar (...) or puts (it) (.i. ...) under the bed, but on a lampstand (.i. ::a:::) ...' (Luke 8: 16, my translation)

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

### 2. EDITION

The first thing to note is that where Meyer saw six glosses there are in fact only four, two of which consist of two words separated by *.i.* 'that is'. Below I first present my transcription of the Latin. The glosses associated with the Latin words are indicated by superscript numbers at the right of the first word over which the gloss occurs in the

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was written as part of the research project *Chronologicon Hibernicum (ChronHib)*, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 647351). I thank Prof. David Stifter for discussion of this passage and Nadine Hecht of the Fulda Landesbibliothek for providing an electronic photograph of folio 39a.

manuscript. Two of the glosses in fact extend over several words. This fact is probably what led Meyer to believe that there were more glosses than there actually are.

#### LATIN TEXT<sup>2</sup>

Nemo<sup>1</sup> *autem* lucErnam<sup>2</sup> ascEn[dens] operit Eam uasso<sup>3</sup> aut sub<sup>4</sup> lectum ponit *sed* super candalabrum

#### GLOSSES

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

#### TRANSLATION OF THE GLOSSES

1. 'no one'
2. '*lucernam*, that is, "lamp"'
3. 'dish'
4. '*lucernam*, that is, "lamp"'

### 3. NOTES

- a. <Nemo> is written with a large <n> within **with** <e> is written. This is followed by <mo> written after the second descender of the <n>. The first gloss is placed over the letters <mo> and extends part way over the abbreviation *autem*.
- b. The second gloss is bilingual, consisting of one Latin word and one Irish word. It starts over the <u> of <lucernam> and extends to over the <u> of <uasso>. The Irish part of the gloss begins over the <p> of <operit>. In the Irish word, the letters <ac> are written together **there are one and there are one** or two letters between <c> and <r> that are not written because the m-stroke of <Eam> intervenes. These letters were probably <hi>, <ha> or merely the vowels alone, making the entire word <luac(h)arn> or <luac(h)irn>. The latter possibility represents a possible spelling for the accusative singular of *luacharn*, and agrees with the case of the Latin word.
- c. The third gloss begins over the <a> of <uasso> and extends to the end of the Latin word. The word must be the one listed in eDIL s.v. 2 *cern* 'dish or receptacle (of fixed capacity', although this example is not found in the dictionary.
- d. The fourth gloss starts over <sub> and extends to the end of <candalabrum>. The gloss is essentially the same as the second gloss, except it is fully spelled out. The Irish word *luachairnnn* is again in the accusative singular to agree with the Latin word. The glossator writes <n> three times seemingly in order to finish the gloss over the end of the the Latin word.

---

<sup>2</sup> I use <E> to denote the tall <e> found in the manuscript. Scribal abbreviations are expanded in italics. When referring to words or individual letters found in the Latin text or in the glosses **are** **enclose them** in angle brackets.

- e. The scribe uses the same abbreviation over the <p> in <operit> as he uses in <super>. The canonical text of Luke 8: 16 has, however, *supra* instead of *super*. Perhaps the scribe was thinking of the equivalent verse in Matthew,

neque accendunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio sed  
super candelabrum ...  
'neither do they light a lamp and put it under a bowl, but on a  
lampstand... ' (Matthew 5:15, my translation)

- f. Meyer (1912: 174) silently corrects the Latin word <ascen[dens]> to *accendens*, which is found in the canonical text of Luke 8: 16. Although the form as it stands is an error and must be corrected, to do so without comment is misleading. The word is clearly written with an <s> before the <c>, as if the scribe were writing *ascendens* from the verb *ascendo* 'I go up'. Furthermore, one should note that there is actually no room for the letters <dens>. Somewhat inconsistently, Meyer did not correct <candalabrum> to standard form *candelabrum*.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The only part of the passage that needs discussion is the fact that the second and fourth glosses seem initially to be redundant. Why should the glossator have written the gloss twice? One possibility is that the two glosses have different functions. The second gloss seems to be a simple translation gloss, providing the translation for the Latin word <lucernam>. The fourth gloss is rather a syntactic gloss. Its function is to clarify the grammatical object of the Latin verb <ponit>, since it is not actually mentioned in the Latin text. Perhaps the glossator was concerned that, without this clarification, a reader may have understood the object of <ponit> to be *vas* 'jar' (the immediately preceding noun) instead of *lucerna* 'lamp'.

#### 5. A NOTE ON THE GLOSSES ON FOLIO 3V

Meyer's (1912: 173) edition of one of the glosses on folio 3v of the same manuscript can also be updated. The first gloss, which is found over *in umbra* (Matthew 4: 16) is printed in his edition as *.i. fos*, with a footnote saying that the Irish word should be read as *fos[ca]*. In fact, the gloss is clearly written as *.i. hi fos*, which should be read as *.i. hi fos[cud]* 'in (the) shadow'.

#### REFERENCES

MEYER, KUNO 1912: 'Neu aufgefundene altirische Glossen', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 8: 173–7.