RETHINKING AND RECONTEXTUALIZING GLOSSES
NEW PERSPECTIVES IN THE STUDY OF
LATE ANGLO-SAXON GLOSSOGRAPHY

Edited by

PATRIZIA LENDINARA
LOREDANA LAZZARI
CLAUDIA DI SCIACCA

PORTO
2011
ILLUSTRATIONS

Plate I  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 411, f. 4v
Plate II  Worcester, Cathedral Library, f. 173, f. 1r
Plate IV  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, f. 121v
Plate VI  The Rule of S. Benet: Latin and Anglo-Saxon Interlinear Version, ed. by H. Logeman, Tribner, London 1888, p. 10
Plate VII  London, British Library, Harley 110, f. 3r23-32
Plate VIII  London, British Library, Harley 110, f. 3r
Plate IX  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 448, f. 1r
Plate X  Reykjavik, Stofnun Arna Magnússonar, AM 249 I fol, f. 4r
Plate XI  Reykjavik, Stofnun Arna Magnússonar, AM 249 I fol, f. 4v
Plate XII  Bern, Burgerbibliothek 207, f. 264v
Plate XIII  Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19410, p. 58
Plate XIV  Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19410, p. 59
Plate XV  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C.i, f. 11r
Plate XVI  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 144, f. 1r

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Permission to publish photographs has been granted by Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München (pls. XIII and XIV), the British Library, London (pls. III, IV, VII, VIII, and XV), Burgerbibliothek, Bern (pl. XII), the Chapter of Worcester Cathedral (pl. II [Photograph by Mr. Christopher Guy]), the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (pls. I, IX, and XVI), and Stofnun Arna Magnússonar, Reykjavik (pls. X and XI).
THE LATIN-ICELANDIC GLOSSARY IN AM 249 I FOL 
AND ITS COUNTERPART IN GKS 1812 4°

Fabrizio D. Raschella

The collection of Latin-Icelandic glosses contained on f. 4rv of the manuscript fragment Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar (Árni Magnússon Institute), AM 249 I fol (henceforth AM 249) is, together with the analogous collection on ff. 24r and 34v of the manuscript Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, GKS 1812 4° (henceforth GKS 1812), one of only two extant examples of medieval Icelandic glossaries. While this in itself is remarkable, it should be mentioned that the two glossaries, which originally formed a single glossary, are some of the earliest Icelandic writings. Dated to the end of the twelfth century or c. 1200, they were written about half a century after the supposedly oldest extant Icelandic manuscript, an Easter table written in the second quarter of the twelfth century. They are virtually contemporary with the earliest Icelandic text of some length, the Icelandic ‘Book of Homilies’ (Hómlíðabók), which dates back to about 1200 and also contains Icelandic glosses in a section devoted to the Credo.

Since the very beginning of research on the two manuscripts, it has been noted that the computistical sections containing the glosses were


4 Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket (National Library of Sweden), Perg. 4° nr 15.
written by one and the same hand and that they must originally have belonged to a single manuscript, containing a collection of computistical and astronomical writings. The same would apply to the glossaries themselves, which are only slightly later than the main text and may originally have been parts of a single glossary. A total of about 260 Latin lemmata, mostly nouns, with their respective Icelandic interpretamenta are included in the two manuscripts. As can be seen from the reproductions (Plates XI-XII), in AM 249 they are inserted in the blank spaces and in the side margins of a computistical table, while in GKS 1812 they appear on the first and last page of the manuscript’s oldest section, an extensive treatise on ecclesiastical computus, and are arranged, as those in AM 249, in parallel columns. The words occurring in the two lists are extremely diverse and refer most frequently to household utensils, agricultural and handicraft tools, domestic animals, furniture and parts of the house, games and entertainment, official plants, and the names of stars and planets (the latter two categories occur only in GKS 1812). A considerable number of verbs and adjectives, equally disparate, are also represented. The lemmata are most often grouped on the basis of semantic and metonymical relationships and, albeit less frequently, according to their form, i.e. graphic and phonetic, affinity. Relevant examples taken from AM 249 will be discussed below.

The purpose of the present study is threefold. Firstly, I propose to validate Guðmundur Þorlákssson’s statement that the two glossaries were originally the constituent parts of a single glossary in such a way that the glosses contained in AM 249 preceded, in the original manuscript, those in GKS 1812; then I will briefly introduce the glossary in AM 249 in its overall structure and present a new edition and commentary.

The original composition of AM 249 as well as its connection with GKS 1812 was effectively reconstructed and described by Guðmundur Þorlákssson (hereafter abbreviated GP), whose arguments can be summarized as follows. Relying on the assumption that the original quire making up the manuscript was complete, i.e. consisting of 4 bifolia for a total of 8 leaves, it follows that 4 leaves in all are missing. Considering that the first preserved leaf (f. 1rv) in AM 249 contains the calendar for the months of March and April, the first conclusion to be drawn is that the original first leaf, which should have contained the calendar for the months of January and February, is missing. Consequently, the eighth (and final) leaf, which formed a bifolium together with the first leaf, is also missing. The other months contained in AM 249, on ff. 2rv and 3rv, are May-June and November-December, respectively, which filled the third and sixth leaves of the original manuscript. This circumstance allows us to infer that the intermediate leaves containing the months May to October are also missing and that these were the original fourth and fifth leaves. The current last leaf (f. 4rv) in AM 249, containing computus tables (calculations to determine the beginning of fasting periods) and the collection of glosses investigated in the present study, corresponds therefore to the seventh leaf of the original manuscript. The question arises as to what the eighth lost leaf might have contained. Observing that

---

5 This was first noticed by Guðmundur Þorlákssson in his edition of the glossary in AM 249, published in 1884: Guðmundur Þorlákssson, Íslensk-latinska gloser i et kalendarium i AM. 249, folio, in Smátrykk 1-16 udgivne af Sanfund til Udgivelse af Gammel Nordisk litteratur, Møllers Bogtrykkeri, Copenhagen 1884-1891, pp. 78-99, at 79-80.
6 The part of the glossary in GKS 1812 was edited for the first time in 1878 by Hugo Gering (Gering, H. «Íslensk-danske Gloser»), Zeitchrift für deutsche Philologie 9 (1878), pp. 383-94). In 1883 a new and a more accurate edition of the glosses appeared in Ludvig Larsson’s comprehensive study of the oldest part of the manuscript (Áldey delen af cod. 1812 4th Gml. kgl. samling på Kgl. biblioteket i København, i diplomatiskt aftryk utg. af Ludvig Larsson, Møllers Bogtrykkeri, Copenhagen 1883, pp. 41-51), and in 1914-1916 Natanael Beckman and Kristian Kállund published the astronomical terms contained in the glossary’s last section (Alfreði Íslensk Islandsk encyklopædik litteratur II, Ritmi, udg. ved N. Beckman og K. Kállund, Møllers Bogtrykkeri, Copenhagen 1914-1916, pp. 72-75); both these works made substantial improvements to Gering’s edition. In 1988 Piergiuseppe Scardigli and Fabrizio D. Raschella proposed a new edition of the glossary with several emendations and additions and provided it with an extensive commentary (Scardigli, P. and Raschella, F.D., «A Latin-Icelandic Glossary and Some Remarks on Latin in Medieval Scandinavia», in G.-W. Weber (ed.), Idee Gestalt Geschichte. Festschrift Klaus von See, Odense University Press, Odense 1988, pp. 299-323). The other part of the glossary — that in AM 249 1 fol. — has only one edition to date, made by Guðmundur Þorlákssson in 1884 (see above, note 5).
7 In the following I will use the terms ‘interpretamentum’-ta’ and ‘gloss(es)’ interchangeably, provided this does not cause confusion with the other more comprehensive meaning of the term ‘gloss’ as the sum of lemma and interpretamentum.
8 This figure is necessarily approximate. In fact, well over 70 of the lemmata are found in AM 249, while at least 177 appear in GKS 1812. However, allowance must be made for a number of lemmata which, due to the poor state of the parchment, are illegible or have completely disappeared (see the edition and commentary below).
10 Áldey delen af cod. 1812 4th, ed. by Larsson, pp. 1-41.
11 Cf. GP, p. 83.
the last part of the sixth and the whole of the seventh leaf (corresponding to the actual ff. 3v-4v of AM 249) are filled with computus tables and glosses, and that the tables are apparently incomplete, GP concludes that the following leaf also contained in all likelihood computus tables. Moreover, since both the last leaf in AM 249 and the first leaf in GKS 1218 contain lists of glosses, it is equally probable that the missing eighth leaf did as well.

The hypothesis that AM 249 and GKS 1812 were closely connected and originally part of a single manuscript, initially suggested to GP by the presence of similar lists of glosses in both, was confirmed by his careful examination of the script and the ink in the two manuscripts, which proved to be the same for both the glosses and the computistical sections, respectively. In fact, GP’s thorough codicological analysis of AM 249, together with the equally accurate investigation of the oldest part of GKS 1812 made by L. Larsson, leaves no doubt as to their common origin. This achievement has yet to be disputed and can therefore be used as a sound premise for further and possibly combined examination of both the main text and the glosses. On the other hand, this does not imply that the materials collected in the two manuscripts are original. On the contrary, the presence of orthographic variation, miswritings, lacunae, and occasional discrepancies between lemmata and interpretamenta in the glosses clearly testify that they are copies of one or more earlier manuscripts.

The glosses in AM 249 are written on the fragment’s last two pages (f. 4rv). They start in the blank spaces of the penultimate column of f. 4r, of which they occupy only the upper half, and continue in the right margin of the same page. They then start again in the left margin of f. 4v and continue, as in the preceding page, in the blank spaces of the penultimate column and in the right margin, where they come to an end (disregarding their continuation in GKS 1812). Due to damage suffered by the parchment in the outer margin of the leaf, several glosses, especially those in the upper half, are now partially or completely illegible. Moreover, they are written in a pale brownish ink (compared to the dark brown ink of the main text), which sometimes makes them even harder to read. As noted by GP, the glosses are written by a hand different from that of the main text and are also slightly later in date. It may be further observed that the Latin lemmata are, as a rule, written in larger letters than the Icelandic glosses and start, with very few exceptions, with a capital letter. A glance at the photographic reproduction of the leaf will help the reader get a clearer picture of the whole.

Although a valuable edition of the glossary in AM 249 is already available within GP’s study of 1884, it has nonetheless seemed appropriate to undertake a new one, which, moving from GP’s reading and commentary of the glosses, should first of all give a reliable picture of the manuscript’s present state. As a matter of fact, some of the glosses — or parts of them — which seem to have been clearly legible to GP have become very faint, and others which were difficult to read at GP’s time are now totally illegible. GP’s reading and interpretation of most of the words contained in the glosses (both lemmata and interpretamenta) have seemed reliable and reasonable to me and have therefore been accepted in the present edition. Where alternative or contrasting positions are taken, they are discussed in footnotes to the text.

GP presented his edition of the glossary in a semi-diplomatic form, thus retaining the arrangement of the glosses in columns according to the manuscript, reproducing variant forms of one and the same letter, and expanding most of the abbreviations. In my edition I did not think it useful to repeat his procedure, all the more so since I, unlike him, had the possibility to accompany my edition with a facsimile of the manuscript. The following criteria have been applied in the present edition:

The Latin lemmata are given in the first column on the left. These are followed, in the second column, by their English translation (sometimes tentative). The third and fourth columns contain the Icelandic glosses.

12 Ibid., pp. 79-80 and 83.
13 See above, note 6.
14 Cf. GP, pp. 84 and 88.
15 I take the opportunity to express here my deepest gratitude to the staff of the Stofnun Árna Magnússonar (the Icelandic Árni Magnússon Institute), first for providing me with excellent photographic reproductions of the manuscripts AM 249 I fol and GKS 1812 4vo and then for allowing me to work extensively at both manuscripts during my stay in Reykjavík in the summer of 2010. The facsimiles included in this paper are printed with the Institute’s permission.
16 For the meaning of the Latin lemmata — at least of those whose reading is sufficiently certain — the dictionaries of medieval Latin by Charles Du Cange and Lorenz Diefenbach have been consulted as a rule, besides other standard Latin dictionaries: D Cange (Du Fresne), Ch., Glossarium mediae et infimae Latiniae, 10 vols., Favre, Niort 1883-1887; Diefenbach, L., Glossarium Latino-Germanicum mediae et infimae aetatis, 1.
and their English equivalents, respectively. For clarity’s sake, each gloss is linked to the corresponding lemma by an arrow. When the meaning of the Icelandic gloss corresponds closely to that of the Latin lemma, no English equivalent is given. All abbreviations are expanded and the added letters are written in italics. Letters or words that are no longer clearly legible because of deterioration of the parchment are underlined. Missing letters in partially illegible words are included in square brackets, and dots are used to signify the presumable number of missing letters, while angle brackets are used for conjectural additions. Question marks are used throughout to point out uncertain readings, doubtful completions or tentative interpretations, often with reference to an explanatory footnote.

f. 4r

**col. I**

Accubito

‘(from a?) couch’ → af sannhila

‘from/of a common bed’

Baer, Frankfurt am Main 1857; id., Novum glossarium Latino-Germanicum medieae et infiniae aetatis, Sauerländer, Frankfurt am Main 1867. However, explicit reference will not be made to them for every lemma but only for those which pose particular problems.

17 This lemma admits of several interpretations. If it does not contain miswritings, it may be intended either as the dat./abl. sg. of accubium – accubitus, a noun denoting a (large) couch to recline on at meals or to rest, i.e. a kind of triclinium (see Du Cange, Glossarium, I, pp. 30–31, and Diefenbach, Glossarium, p. 8, s.v. accubitus), or as a verb meaning ‘to recline at table’ or ‘to rest, to sleep’ (not, in this case, it usually has the form accubus). Supposing, on the contrary, that its original form was somewhat different, we might think of the abstract feminine noun accubito, obviously belonging to the same lexeme as the aforementioned words and meaning ‘a lying or reclining, especially at meals’. On the basis of comparison with the Icelandic gloss, it might perhaps be inferred that the Latin lemma is actually a masculine or neuter noun in the dative or, more probably, ablative case and that the Icelandic glossator intended to emphasize the grammatical case by adding the preposition ‘from’ or ‘of’ (see below, note 18). Why the lemma would be recorded in a form different from the nominative is a question probably bound to remain unanswered.

18 Unless one or more words are missing at the beginning of the Icelandic gloss, the most likely interpretation of this prepositional phrase (in normalized spelling: af sannhila) would seem to be the one conjectured in the preceding footnote. Sannhila, a compound noun derived from the phraseal verb hvíta saman ‘to rest together’, is rather infrequent word, and its meaning ranges from ‘a common place to rest’ to ‘sexual intercourse’, see Cleasby, R., Vígfusson, G. and Craige, W.A., An Icelandic-English Dictionary, 2nd ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford 1957, p. 511, and Frizener, I. and Hóðnebó, F., Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog, I–III; rettelser og tillegg ved Finn Hóðnebó (IV); Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, Bergen and Tromsø 1972, IV, p. 299.

[ue] occursus 19  ‘return, recurrence’ → aftar quauna

Malone  20  ‘flood tide’ → flop

ledona  ‘ebb tide’ → fiara

Paunimentum  ‘floor’ → golf

tectum  ‘roof’ → bekiia

Tegula  ‘roof tile’ → fiol uel pekia ‘board’ – ‘roof’

**col. II**

Ciriath[a(m)]  uel caduceum? ?

? → bed-cover  22

Crater  ‘crater’ (a drinking vessel) → ker ‘vessel, goblet’

Catinus  ‘large, round dish’ → discr ‘plate’

Parapsis[a]  24  ‘basin, bowl’ → biðð ‘tray’

Patera  ‘(libation) saucer’ → biþþ(c)qð 25  ‘drinking vessel’

19 One or more words with the same meaning of occursus are obviously missing at the beginning of this lemma.

20 The right form would be malina. The ending -ona is probably due to analogy with the following lemma, ledona.

21 No other occurrence of ciriath or similar nouns seems to be attested anywhere outside the glossary (cf. GP, p. 89).

22 Cf. Du Cange, Glossarium, II, p. 15, and Diefenbach, Glossarium, p. 87, s.v. caduceum.

23 The parchment is wrinkled and faded here, and only the sequence bo- is clearly legible. GP has bolli, which it interprets as bolli ‘bowl’. Considering the meaning of the second Latin lemma, caduceum, which denotes a kind of linen or of bed-cover, possibly used as a tent, a word like boldung (n. ‘a sort of thick linen’: Clesby, Vigfusson and Craige, An Icelandic-English Dictionary, p. 72) might originally have appeared in this place, provided that the term was already in use in the twelfth century. In fact, its first written record in Icelandic is dated to the seventeenth century; see Blöndal Magnússon, Á., Íslensk orðabók, Orðahöfði Háskólahóms, Reykjavík 1989, p. 70.


25 GP, pp 89–90, assumes here a mistranscription of *biþþ*cqð, i.e. biððskål. This word is attested only once in Old Norse literature, namely in Snorri Sturluson’s Háttatal, and is rendered as «god, behagelig skål, om drikkekårret», i.e. ‘a pleasurable drinking vessel’, by Finnur Jónsson in his revised edition of Sveinbjörn Egilsson’s dictionary of skaldic poetry see Sveinbjörn Egilsson and Finnur Jónsson, Lexicon poeticon antiquae linguae septentrionalis. Ordbog over det norsk-islæske skjaldesprog, 2nd edn., Møllers
Ciphus uel  'bowl, goblet'  →  ker  'vessel, goblet'
Sciatius  'ladle'
Clitella  'pack-saddle pannier'
Numallo  γ'  →  τασκα  'chest; basket'
Pume  'pumice'  →  τυσκοσσειν  'chest-bearer; porter'
Truncex  'trunk'  →  στοφν  'stump, trunk'
Mastigia uel  'scourge, whip, cane'  →  κηλβα  'club'
Claus  'key'  →  λυκι  
Clausus  'nail'  →  ναγλε
Lethargius  'drowsiness, lethargy'
butulm uel  'missile'  →  κουφρ  'bolt, missile'
Catapulta  'catapult, missile'

f. 4v

col. I

Pulina  'bolster, cushion, pillow'
Culiciper  'cushion, mattress'  →  βεγρ  'bed; bolster, pillow'

Capulum  'handle' (esp. a sword-hilt)  →  hialt  'cross-guard of the hilt'
Acetum  'vinegar'  →  νυστρ  'yeast'
[...]bbo  ?  →  κιλπρ  'handle' (esp. of a bucket)
Oggo  ?  →  γριν  'grip'
Adorior  ?  →  [εκ] μελε  νιπαδγα  '[I] talk to others'
[Ad]sorbus  'he swallowed down, devoured'  →  [σαλαγ γα]νεκ  'I defile, soil; desecrate'
Lenociunum  'pandering'  →  σαυρλιι  'dissolute life'

31 Reading according to GP. The parchment is now entirely dark in this place.
32 For classical acetum.
33 The parchment has become so dark and wrinkled in this place as to make any reading conjecture impossible. '[...]bbo' is from GP, who, however, gives up any attempt of completion.
34 See above, note 31.
35 GP's reading is '[...]ggo', with three presumably missing letters at the beginning and a final -o. No conjecture, however, is made concerning the identification of the word.
36 The first letter of this word is fairly legible, while all the others are very faded. GP conjectures griu 'servant'; nevertheless, considering the meaning of the preceding word, griju would perhaps be a more plausible reading. The Latin lemma is, of course, of no help.
37 The Latin word most resembling this lemma is the verb adorior, which means 'to attack, assail'. This meaning does not match, however, that of the Icelandic gloss in normalized spelling: [εκ] μελε νιπαδγα. Semantically closer to the latter would certainly be adoro, which in its wide semantic spectrum includes the meaning 'to address sb.', but it is formally too distant from adorior. It must be concluded that it is probably a misinterpretation on the part of the glossator.
38 So GP. The first letter seems in fact to be an 'A', and the reading of the following letters is certain enough. Nonetheless, the meaning of the Latin lemma is quite distant from that of the corresponding Icelandic gloss. Actually, it is not unlikely that another verb, resembling the Latin absorbere in form but much closer to the Icelandic saurgr in meaning, that is, absorbere 'I get dirty' (Du Cange, Glossarium, V1, p. 22, s.v. obserbre: asordesus flow), was present in the original. If so, absorbuit would be a banal miswriting for absorbuit. Moreover, it is not clear why the perfect (3rd pers. sg.) is used in the Latin lemma instead of the present. The Icelandic gloss is in the present form (1st pers. sg.).
39 The first letters of the gloss are now illegible; the word is completed according to GP.

Bogtrykkeri, Copenhagen 1931, p. 53: GP's conjecture seems reasonable and is accepted here.
26 GP, p. 90, reasonably assumes for this word a derivation from num(m)ius, 'money', conjecturing the meaning 'den som bærer pengepungen, en almisseuddele drenge', i.e. 'he who carries the purse, the assistant of an alms distributor'. Diefenbach, Glossarium, p. 385, has num(m)arius and num(m)nularius, both with the meaning 'moneymaker'.
27 Probably a secondary feminine form for classical truncus, m.
28 For classical lethargus.
29 The neuter noun vengi (related to masc. vanggi, 'check') is found only once with the meaning 'pillow' in Icelandic literature, namely in Gudrunarkviða; see Sveinbjörn Egilsson and Finnur Jónsson, Lexicon poetica, p. 604, s.v. vengi, and Fritzner and Hardarso, Ordbog, III, p. 907, and IV, p. 418. In prose it usually occurs as a synonym of vanggi, m. 'field, ground', both words having the same etymology.
30 The parchment has become very dark in this place, and the reading of all the words from 'Culiciper' to '[...]bbo' is, except for 'Capulum', very uncertain.
Luperca ul
Lupanar ul
Mercatoria
Manzer
Postora
Cautior
[Tor]ris
Omen; fausta
Sciolus
Sciolitas
bubo
Paus
Dedalus

brothel
'sonr
'shame' (i.e. pudenda?)
i burn myself
'brand'
'omen' - 'favourable prognostics'
'sciolist'
'sciolism'
'owl'
'peacock'
'Daedalus'
→ hot bus
→ sör
Portcono
→ brigdle
→ gc em
→ [s]v[il]pu
brand
→ [h]eill; idom
→ Scrgjarn
→ Scrgjarni
→ vfr
→ Pái
→ [v]olundr
Wayland (the Smith)

The Latin-Icelandic Glossary in AM 249 I FOL

Inter lunium
Malaue
Altercor
mixtiousis
Pastiles
col. III
Pelta
Aleam
[Tenis]gera

'interlunation' → Nepar
'under bad auspices' → illo heille
'wrangle' → þrekt
'loaf made of mixed grain' → braucpogyn
-light, crescent shaped shield'
'tables' (a board game with dice)
'checker; die'

Waning moon' in an evil hour' 'grains for bread-making'
'schild'
tafl
'bean; pellet'

mythology, i.e. Wayland the Smith (Vulnund in Old Norse). Both are actually represented as skilful craftsmen in their respective traditions. This is the only proper name occurring in the glossary. The continuation of the glossary in GKS 1812 includes several proper names, yet all referring to stars.

48 GP reads 'Inter lunium', stating that this is a miswriting for interlunium. However, it seems to me that the word may be read as interlunium as well.

49 Usually: nídar.

50 I.e. mala ave, literally 'under the influence of' an ill bird', i.e. of a 'bird of ill omen'.

51 The Latin terms nears to the manuscript's pastiles I have been able to find are - considering the possible meaning of the Icelandic gloss (see below, note 52) - pastilla, pastill, pastilles 'small loaf or flat cake': Diefenbach, Glossarium, p. 415; cf. GP, p. 97. As for mixtiousis, this is in all likelihood, as already noted by GP, a miswriting for mixtiosis, i.e. the genitive of mixtio 'mixture, blend'. We thus have for this lemma a noun phrase approximately meaning 'a small bread made by mixing various ingredients', which would also satisfy to some extent the correspondence with the Icelandic gloss.

52 GP has braucpogyn in his transcription, but admits in his commentary that this gives no plausible meaning. After discussing at some length the possible readings of this gloss, he concludes that braucpogyn, in which a presumably lost original r is restored between o and n, would be the most suitable one.

53 Cf. Du Cange, Glossarium, I, p. 173, and Diefenbach, Glossarium, p. 21, s.v. alea.

54 I.e. tessera. Completion according to GP. See further below, note 55.

55 Completion according to GP. Actually, the initial part of both the Latin lemma and the Icelandic gloss are illegible at present, and, to judge from GP's words («Dette ord er meget uydøelig i hårkr., og læsningen er ingenlunde sikker», p. 97), the situation must not have been much better in his times. While GP's completion of the Latin word is plausible in consideration of the adjacent glosses, the same cannot be said about the Icelandic one, the meaning of which is considerably different from that of the former - unless beans were occasionally used as checkers (less probably as dice).
Pir gum 'game board' → taflborh
Largus 'lavish' → orr
Prodigus 'prodigal, spendthrift' → glaspjöf ull?56 'recklessly generous'
Dilapidator 'squanderer' → glotrona maðr57
Corbanas 'treasure chamber' → fe hirzla 'treasury'
Errarium 'public treasury' → fe hirzla 'treasury'
Crumena 'money bag' → siðr
Marsupium 'pouch, purse' → Pnugr '(small) bag, purse'
Bursa 'purse' → skópla 'small skin bag'
Farulus sel| Far[r]?ago59
Loculns 'coffer, casket' → fe hirzla 'treasury'
Fenerator 'money-lender, usurer' → leigo seð(ing)?50 'one who gets rich from lending money'.
Fen us 'interest, usury' → fá61
Censum; Duitie 'riches, wealth' → aupr; item
Gazas 'treasure, riches' → aupr
Gothofilium 'treasury' → fe hirzla

Let us now briefly consider some characteristics of the words contained in the glossary.

As already mentioned, lemmata are, as a rule, grouped on the basis of semantic affinity, although other criteria are applied as well. In any case, the sequence of words seems to be determined by mere association of ideas, that is, words have apparently no other connection with each other than their affinity or contiguity of meaning. That these glosses, at least in their current arrangement, refer to any fully developed and coherent written Latin text can therefore be excluded. On the contrary, more than a few of them look as if they were taken at random from what must have been a common and unrefined variety of spoken language. Words like 'brothel' (luperca|, lapanar, mercatoria, and another, totally illegible, word)52, 'pandering' (lenocinium), 'bastard' (manzer), 'squanderer' (dilapidator), 'usurer' (fenerator) – especially if associated with couches (accubatum), mattresses and pillows (culcita|, pulvinar), money bags and purses (crumena, marsupium, bursa), board games and dice (alea, pirgum, tessera) – inevitably evoke the image of a lifestyle quite different, say, from that of monasteries, churches and schools, i.e. the places where books were written and read. Other words denote, as mentioned above, objects of everyday and practical use, such as household and work tools, while still others are associated according to interest'. In my opinion still another conjecture is conceivable, namely that some letters – possibly an abbreviation – may have slipped from the pen of the scribe, and that the second member of the compound was originally seljung 'a wealthy man'; see Cleasby, Vigfusson and Craige, An Icelandic-English Dictionary, s.v. seljung, and, on the abbreviations for 'ing-', Hreinn Benedikttsson, Early Icelandic Script, pp. 53-54 and 87. Consequently, leigosejling would be 'one who gets rich from lending goods or money'. Unlike GP's assumption, this explanation would, among other things, account properly for the manuscript's spelling of the root vowel – 'e' ("e") – against the 'e' of selja and related forms.

61 This form is not found anywhere outside the glossary and is probably a misspelling for fe 'money'. GP's suggestion that it may be a neologism coined by the glossator himself from Latin flo(nus) i.e. the word appearing in the lemma, is scarcely tenable.

62 See above, note 40.
their formal similarity, that is sound structure, rather than to semantic affinity (e.g. *clava* 'club', *clavis* 'key', *clavis* 'nail', on f. 4r, col. II). All in all, it can be said that the *lemmata* contained in the glossary belong to a category of words mostly used in daily and practical life, even in the worldliest of circumstances, and therefore not likely to occur in books, least of all in church and school books. Indeed, this must have been the principal aim of the glossator: to make known – by occasionally filling the blank spaces of a computus table (a typically ecclesiastical instrument, among other things) – words and expressions that young students and aspiring clerics would have looked up in vain in their edificatory school readings.

Moreover, a number of the Latin *lemmata* show a distorted or incomplete form, which may sometimes be due to copying mistakes on the part of the scribe (e.g. *malona* for *malina* 'flood tide'; *postora* for *postera* 'posterior, buttocks'; *mixtiovis* for *mixture*). Yet it cannot be excluded that, in some instances at least, the 'unorthodox' Latin forms reported in the glossary belong to an uncultivated variety of spoken language and differ therefore to some extent from classical or written standard forms. Thus, for example, nouns frequently occur in cases other than the nominative (*accubito* for *accubitum* 'couch'; *aleam* for *alea* 'tables' (a game with dice); *pirgum* for *pirgus* 'game board'), or show a grammatical gender different from that usually found in literary and formal writings (*trunca* for *truncus* 'trunk'; *acetum* for *aceta* 'vinegar'), while verbs may occur in forms other than the first person singular of the present indicative (as *absorbut* for *absorbeo* 'to swallow'). Some of the Icelandic *interpretamenta* are very approximate, if not entirely wrong. Thus *cilita* 'pack-saddle pannier' is glossed by *taska*, a general term for 'chest' or 'basket'; *lethargius*, a noun meaning 'drowsiness, lethargy', is rendered with a verb (to boot in the third person singular!), i.e. *sæfr i hel* 'he sleeps to death'; *lenocinium* 'pandering' is equated to *saullif* 'dissolute life'. Sometimes, however, the comparison is impracticable because the Latin word is not found anywhere else in the same form: this is the case, among others, of *numallo*, which is glossed by *töskusveinn* 'chest bearer, porter', and of the verb *adorgior*, rendered as *(ek) mal* ni *adra* 'I talk to others' 63.

None of these shortcomings is an unexpected one for those familiar with the Latin-Icelandic glossary in GKS 1812, of which AM 249 was originally the initial and complementary section, as stated above. Both glossaries show all of the characteristics previously described, and much of what has already been observed about the glossary in GKS 1812 64 applies perfectly to the glossary in AM 249 as well.

A further question which arises in considering the overall tenor of the glosses contained in AM 249 regards the kind of Latinate culture this vocabulary belonged to and where this variety of language was spoken. Certainly, it was not spoken in Iceland, least of all in Icelandic schools and monasteries, which were the only places on the island where spoken Latin was likely to be in use, if nothing else as a school subject. In reality, much of such a vocabulary was of no practical use in the sober and morally sound society of Iceland in the High Middle Ages. Rather, as already suggested in the above-mentioned study by Scardigli and Raschella, the glossary – which does not show any overt reference to the ecclesiastical milieu – «has the imprint of eminent practicality, almost as though it were a manual of expressions to be used in the most mundane circumstances of daily life» 65. In addition, it may be observed that such a vocabulary would have proved especially useful in those foreign countries where the Icelanders went for a long time, after their conversion to Christianity, to acquire their higher education or on pilgrimages to Christian holy sites. Such journeys often led to experiences which were very different from the trip's original purpose 66. This may, among other things, give us a hint as to the presumable origin of the glossary and the reason why it was written. In this regard, again, I cannot but repeat what I have already observed in commenting on the

---

63 See above, notes 26 and 37, respectively.
65 Ibid., p. 309.
nature of the glossary in GKS 1812 in the previously mentioned study: although other hypotheses on the origin of the glossary cannot be excluded a priori, the most feasible one would seem that it is a transcription – possibly made with an informal teaching purpose\(^6\) – of the personal and, therefore, originally private jottings of an Icelandic scholar who had studied abroad in a place where Latin, in addition to being a learned language, was also used in everyday life.
