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In this paper, I provide an edition of the glosses in Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 207 along with some discussion of their linguistic features.
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INTRODUCTION

LINDSAY (1923: 63) mentions that there are Old Irish glosses on folios 146v and 148r of Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 207, but he only explicitly gives the example of amre on the Latin word papae. HAGEN (1870: 158) notes the gloss uup above the Latin interjection atat on folio 148r, line 33 and again notes the gloss amre above papae on the same page. BRONNER (2017: 2, n.7) supposes that uup is the word listed in eDIL s.v. upp. This constitutes the entire scholarly attempt to provide a list of the Old Irish glosses found in the manuscript. Nowhere, however, has an edition of the glosses on folio 146v been published. Admittedly, there are very few Old Irish glosses in the manuscript, but this should not be taken as an excuse to ignore them. In this contribution, I provide a full edition of the glosses and some discussion. This edition is based on an analysis of the digitized manuscript hosted on the University of Fribourg, e-codices website (https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/bbb/0207).

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 Dr. Fangzhe Qiu for helpful comments.
Edition

Latin text and glosses on Fol. 146v
illinc · per locum\(^1\) hac · illac\(^2\)

1. deinud
2. annal

Translation of Latin and glosses on Fol. 146v
‘from that place, by this place, from that side’

1. ‘from a place’
2. ‘from there’

Latin text and glosses on Fol. 148r
interiectio est pars orationis, quae sensum mentis exprimit: si laetus. an non. ut si dicam. hei. uch. attat.\(^1\) papae.\(^2\) laetantis. ut uach. alia quoties dolentis. ut oh. …

1. uup-
2. amrae

Translation of Latin and glosses on Fol. 148r
“An interjection is a part of speech which expresses a sensation of the mind: whether happy or not; if, for example, I should say, ‘hei’, ‘uch’, ‘attat’, ‘papae’ [to express a sense] of rejoicing; for example, ‘uach’ [and] others whenever [expressing a sense] of mourning, like ‘oh’…”

1. ‘woe!’
2. ‘wondrous!’

Discussion

The gloss <deinud>, standardized as de inud, is unusual because the final <d> is spelled as a suspension stroke placed over the <u>.\(^2\) To my knowledge, this usage of the suspension stroke to represent a single d is

\(^2\) I use angled brackets to refer to words and letters found in the manuscript.
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unparalleled, although it frequently is used to indicate verbal endings such as -ad. Employing it to represent single d may be viewed as an extension of this function. Despite this difficulty, the edited form given here seems appropriate as a translation of either <illinc> ‘from that place’ or <per locum> ‘by this place’. If the gloss is meant to translate <illinc> perhaps the misplacement of the gloss can be traced to the exemplar. Instead of the suggested <deiνud>, another (slim) possibility may be that the gloss is <deiνuνν>, standardized as dé inonn ‘from the other side’. The problem with this interpretation is twofold. First, the scribe uses slightly different suspension strokes over <i> and <u>, perhaps indicating that two different sounds are being abbreviated. Second, the collocation dé inonn is nowhere else attested. Nonetheless, if eDIL (s.v. inonn) is correct in saying that inonn need not per se imply motion, then the addition of a preposition to signify motion would in theory be possible. The typical preposition according to the eDIL entry seems to be ó but perhaps de could be used as well. The conjugated form dé ‘from it’ is proposed in recognition of the fact that inonn seems to always follow a nominal or pronominal element when it is part of a prepositional phrase. In favor of inonn is the fact that this word is in other sources occasionally paired with anull, which is the following gloss. Despite this, de inud is preferred here, because of the previously mentioned problems with inonn.

The gloss <anall> over <hac illac> ‘from that side’ is only somewhat unexpected in its orthography, although in general a double <n> is occasionally found when one is abbreviated. More unusual is the single <l>. One possible explanation for this spelling indicates quite an early date for these glosses. This is so, because, if the spelling is an accurate reflection of the exemplar, it implies that the exemplar was written before the operation of Mac Neill’s Law (GOI §140), such that <l> was not doubled following <n>. Mac Neill’s Law is sometimes dated to the seventh century (OLIVER 1992: 105). In any case, in its standardized form the word should be anall.

The gloss <uup> provides evidence that the vowel of this interjection could occasionally be long. KELLY (2007: 103) discusses some of the evidence for this word and mentions another early attestation that is found in THES. II (147.28, Sg. 120b3), there spelled <upp>. Reasoning that the interjection is so widely attested in both Old Irish and Welsh, Kelly dismisses a suggestion found in GREENE (1971: 167, fn. 1) that Irish ub (Kelly’s standardized form) may have been borrowed from Welsh. This may be correct, but it should be pointed out that both Old Irish and Welsh have at least two variants with varying vowel qualities or quantities: uup and upp in Old Irish, and ub and wb in Welsh. The double vowel in <uup> is indicative of an early composition of the glosses.

The gloss <amre>, standardized amrae, provides evidence for the use of this adjective as an interjection. This usage is not noted in KELLY (2007).
Furthermore, the gloss lacks a glide vowel between \(<r>\) and \(<e>\). This is perhaps again indicative of an early date for these glosses, which were likely found already in the exemplar for Cod. 207. The manuscript itself is thought to be from the end of the eighth century (BRONNER 2017: 2) and the lack of glide vowels is certainly consistent with that time period and before. Compare, for instance, the examples from the mid-eighth century Würzburg glosses mentioned in GOI §98, or examples such as indarbe (THES. II 244.24–25, Cam. fol. 37b), cruche (THES. II 244.29, Cam. fol. 37c) and so on in the seventh-century Cambrai Homily.

The word \(<uch>\), which is incorporated into the Latin text after \(<hei>\) is suspicious. It does not have the look of a Latin interjection, although it could be an unusual spelling of \(oh\) (LEWIS & SHORT 1897, s.v. \(oh\)), cf. the spelling of \(vah\) as \(uach\) just a few words later. Another possibility is that it represents the Old Irish word EDIL s.v. \(uch\). If so, it is an Old Irish gloss on the Latin interjection \(hei\) that has been incorporated into the Latin text. This may be evidence of transmission from a non-Irish scribe.
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