

A Critical Edition of the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary

Editorial Principles

We follow, to the extent possible, the principles and examples laid out by Michael W. Herren and Hans Sauer in “[Towards a New Edition of the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary: A Sample](#),” in *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 26 (2016), 125–98. Although readers will find some differences in detail from the present work, it is hoped that the article still provides a helpful orientation to the historical and philological issues pertaining to the glossary.

What is New: The Corpus Glossary as a Manuscript Witness

We build on the insight of Joseph Pheifer that the Corpus Glossary derived its ÉpinalErfurt entries directly from the seventh-century archetype and can be used to help reconstruct it. The proof is laid out in great detail in his “Relationship of the Épinal, Erfurt, Werden, and Corpus Glossaries,” in *The Épinal, Erfurt, Werden, and Corpus Glossaries*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff et al. (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 17–44 (summarized, for convenience, in “A Sample Edition,” pp. 131–33). The Corpus Glossary contains nearly all the entries given by the Épinal and Erfurt manuscripts and presents them in the same order in a number of places, despite the fact that Corpus uses AB-ordering throughout, whereas Épinal and Erfurt primarily employ A-ordering. It is likely that the agreement of any two of the three manuscripts constitutes an archetypal reading.

Reconstructing the Old English Archetype Glosses

Establishing the archetype of the Old English glosses is complicated by phonological, dialectal, and orthographic developments in the language during the transmission of the glossary. Where the manuscripts disagree, we consider the agreement of Épinal and one other manuscript to constitute the archetype of an Old English gloss. But since Erfurt and Corpus are ninth-century manuscripts and sometimes show evidence of modernizing, we rely in some instances on the authority of Épinal alone. Where all three manuscript witnesses differ and Épinal fails to provide authority, we try to reconstruct an archetypal form from which all extant readings may plausibly derive. These are marked [r.] in the edition. In the section C248–F1, where Épinal is discontinuous, reconstructions are necessarily more frequent. We attempt to restore readings that are consistent with Épinal’s phonological and orthographic practices elsewhere, and that may plausibly explain the extant readings in both Erfurt and Corpus. When there is sufficient comparative evidence to support a reconstruction, it appears in col. 4, followed by [r.] in the usual manner. For a detailed study of the Old English in Épinal-Erfurt, see Pheifer, *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*, pp. lvii–lxxxviii.

The Entries

Each document contains five corresponding columns. The first three offer diplomatic transcriptions of the principle manuscript witnesses to the glossary. The fourth column offers a reconstruction of the archetype text. Below each entry in column 4, when necessary, suggested corrections to the archetypal forms are offered in round brackets. The fifth column contains an English translation of the archetype.

Indices

At the end of the document there are alphabetized indices of the lemmata and of the Old English glosses. Clicking on any number in the indices will bring the reader automatically to the full entry. Both indices alphabetize the archetypal readings as they appear in the fourth column of the edition. The index of Old English glosses also includes the headwords used by the Dictionary of Old English in round brackets. When a DOE entry has multiple headword forms (e.g. *feccan*, *fetian*), only the relevant headword appears in the index (e.g. *fetod* [*fetian*] A226). For those words that have yet to be defined by the Dictionary of Old English, we provide headwords projected by the editors.

Interpretative Aids

Because the relationship between lemma and gloss is not always clear, interpretative aids in square brackets suggest how they may be related. These include [etym.] for an etymological association (sometimes concealed as in A124 and A439); [meton.] for metonymic association (e.g. A172 *alnus* : *ratis*); [incomp.] for an incomplete entry due to excessive abbreviation or missing information (e.g. A53 *assellum* : *spolium*); [recomp.] for entries where the gloss gives the classical verb of a verb in the lemma that has been recomposed with its original root vowel.

Presenting the Archetype

Readers may note that mistakes in definitions occur throughout the glossary, particularly in the glosses to Latin and Greek words. Old English glosses are more reliable for definitions, although variation in forms does occur due to modernization and, in the case of Erfurt, the influence of Old High German. We establish the archetype without correction, and give suggestions for correct classical Latin and Greek forms in round brackets below the corresponding words. Only conventional word separation and capitalization have been restored. Old English glossing words are printed in bold.

Translating the Archetype

We cannot translate both the archetypal and suggested readings in this format. If the corrections placed in round brackets render an entry more coherent, then this is translated in the fifth column and the corresponding translation is also placed in round brackets. However, this procedure is not intended to represent the archetype, or an earlier glossary.

In very many cases, the corruptions are due to the seventh-century archetype rather than the manuscripts that preserve it. Occasionally, our own suggested corrections are matched by readings in Corpus. However, in these cases it is likelier that Corpus intervened to correct the archetype than to represent it.

Problem Cases

Not every problematic entry can be resolved satisfactorily. In some cases, words have been seriously corrupted in transmission. In others, attested words that are correctly spelled stand in a relationship to each other that appears inscrutable. For entries A1–A117 some of the problems are resolved in the commentary in the “Towards a New Edition,” to which the reader is directed. Hopefully, many more will be resolved in the print commentary that comprises phase 2 of this project.

Finally, although great care has been taken to ensure accuracy of the manuscript readings, and much thought given to the establishment of archetypal readings as well as to the suggested corrections, we invite readers to send us their observations for improvements or corrections to the presentation. Please direct your suggestions to epinal.erfurt@gmail.com.