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Until recently, Western early medieval glossaries have been regarded primarily as objects of philological study. This is due to their structure, and the way in which they were compiled. Glossaries are lists of words or glosses, and their interpretations or interpretamenta – pairings that are, confusingly, sometimes also called glosses.¹ Both glosses and their interpretamenta take the form of single words or very short descriptive phrases. The most basic glossary form is glossae collectae or batch glosses: explanatory notes to certain words, entered in the margins or between the lines of texts, that have been copied out into a list and transmitted separately from their source. Over time, many glossae collectae have been combined, or absorbed into existing glossaries, where they are often arranged alphabetically – sometimes simply by first letter, but regularly also by two, three or four letters. Such glossaries were copied repeatedly; to make it easier to distinguish between them, and to keep track of their numerous copies, scholars have developed the practice of naming them after their first gloss (although a few glossaries are named after their supposed compilers). Glossaries were among the most common texts copied in the early Middle Ages. Many were collected together in the Liber glossarum, the major alphabetised compilation of glossaries made around the turn of the eighth century, which runs to over fifty thousand entries.²

* I am very grateful to Franck Cinato, A.C. Dionisotti and Nicholas Everett for their comments on a draft version of this chapter. Any remaining errors or omissions are my own.

¹ The constituent parts of a glossary are also frequently called the lemma (plural lemmata) and its gloss. Since the word lemma refers specifically to a word in a text to be glossed, it is avoided here to focus on glossaries as whole texts rather than as selections of extracts. In lexicography, a lemma can also refer to the non-inflected form of a word.

² The Liber glossarum is the subject of the LibGloss project led by Anne Grondeux in Paris. More information is available at liber-glossarum.linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr/node/8.
The origin of glossaries can be difficult to ascertain, particularly since, alphabetised or not, glossaries can be arranged internally in other ways as well: by theme, for example, as with lists of animals and the sounds they make, known as the *voces animantium*; or by source chapter, particularly with biblical glosses, which are often arranged in the order of the books of the Bible. These arrangements could originate with the source text, or could occur over time. In addition, many glossaries contain non-Latin content, as with the Epinal–Erfurt glossary, which gives the Old English equivalents of Latin words. Glossaries wholly or partially in Hebrew, Greek, Old French and Old High German also circulated. The linguistic content and complex arrangements of glossaries are of interest to philologists, who have sought to recover information about the various changes undergone by glossaries in order to examine their evidence for linguistic practice in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. As a result of this approach, however, glossaries have often been treated as collections of discrete glosses, whose groupings merely indicate a particular phase in their transmission. In particular, since the rearrangement and collation of glossaries has disassociated them from their sources, we tend to see them merely as proto-dictionaries: that is, collections of individual words that do not yet form a coherent whole. This gloss-by-gloss method has dominated glossary studies before and since the publication, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, of Georg Goetz’s monumental seven-volume edition of glossary epitomes, the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum (CGL)*; and Wallace Martin Lindsay’s seminal series of research articles, now published as *Studies in Early Mediaeval Latin Glossaries*. These works are still essential reference points, and represent the peak of research on glossaries, which attracted little interest after Lindsay’s death in 1937. Yet they are also based on out-of-date research methods, and their readings are increasingly problematic and unreliable for the growing number of scholars who see early medieval lexicographic and compilatory activity as both critical and creative.

The study of glossaries has been revived to some extent in more recent scholarship, which has shown that they were living texts with a variety of uses, and transmitted knowledge in ways that we do not yet fully understand. A.C. Dionisotti has noted that, in order to explore glossaries as
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3 Such early medieval glossaries can be found in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 135 and Monte Cassino, Archivio dell’Abbazia, 316 + 323.
4 CGL; Lindsay, *Studies*, ed. Lapidge.
5 For an excellent inquiry into the advantages and limitations of the classic studies by Goetz and Lindsay, see Dionisotti, ‘From Ausonius’ schooldays?’.
witnesses of linguistic practice, ‘we need the glossary, not the individual gloss’. Rosamond McKitterick is, however, probably the first scholar to view glossaries not just as coherent texts, but as part of an approach that considers the whole book. For her, the individual words in glossaries are evidence of the conveyance and migration of ideas in the early Middle Ages, rather than signs of an older and more important source; or, to put it another way, they are evidence of the practical ways in which ideas were exchanged, and the connections these ideas suggest between individuals and institutions. As one of the most common products of early medieval scriptoria, glossaries have much to reveal about the formation of particular categories of knowledge and therefore of cultural memory. The term ‘glossary chrestomathy’, coined by McKitterick in acknowledgment of this, denotes composite collections of glossaries and refocuses our attention on the contents of such books and their function, rather than their origin.

This approach to glossaries also reflects McKitterick’s seminal work on the extent of literacy in the early Middle Ages, which revealed how the written word facilitated networks and exchanges of ideas within a complex society, and opened up new ways of understanding the transmission of different types of texts. By considering early medieval glossaries within their specific codicological context, it becomes possible to see in what ways early medieval compilers rearranged and categorised information, and for what reasons: evidence that is not easily found in other kinds of early medieval texts.

This chapter explores the potential of these ideas by examining some strategies of knowledge organisation, and their implications for early medieval intellectual culture, using the example of the manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388. Approximately a third of the texts in this manuscript are glossaries or word-lists of some kind, but the rest represent different text genres, which makes it a glossary miscellany rather than a glossary chrestomathy. As a miscellany, it is therefore a manuscript that has, traditionally, been considered to be a more or less random collection of extracts from a range of diverse texts. This view of miscellanies requires revision in the light of Rosamond McKitterick’s ideas about the importance of whole books. The word-lists in Clm 14388, for instance, provide evidence of several organisational strategies that suggest the miscellany was compiled deliberately and as

7 Dionisotti, ‘From Stephanus to Du Cange’, p. 305.
8 McKitterick, ‘Glossaries’.
9 The manuscript is publicly accessible at http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00022465/image_1.
part of a unified programme. These strategies, and their significance, are explored below. After an introduction to the manuscript, this chapter considers the arrangement of information across three sets of glossaries in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388: the glossary known as Accipe; glossaries based on the *Instructiones* of Eucherius of Lyon (Eucherian word-lists); and glossaries on weights and measures (metrical word-lists). A final set of extracts on balms and spices is used to complete a portrait of this manuscript as a deliberately assembled book. The connections between these unrelated texts in this manuscript demonstrate the ways in which inherited knowledge was adapted for new uses and contexts at the basic level of the lexical gloss, and argue for the continued importance of the whole-book approach for early medieval cultural and intellectual history.

**The Manuscript**

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 is a composite manuscript in three parts, bound together in the second half of the fifteenth century. Part II (fols. 8–112), containing Jerome’s commentary on the letters of Paul to the Ephesians and Titus, was copied from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 13038 (fols. 262v–387v), which was made at St-Emmeram, Regensburg. The copy in Clm 14388, however, was thought by Bischoff to have been copied not at St-Emmeram but in an unknown scriptorium in south-west Bavaria in the middle of the ninth century. The first quire of the manuscript (fols. 1–7), which constitutes part I, dates from the twelfth century and was added as a supplement to the otherwise incomplete part II. These two first parts of the manuscript will be omitted from the present discussion as they are not related codicologically to the third part.

Part III (fols. 113–238) dates from the middle of the ninth century and was tentatively located by Bischoff to north-west Germany. It contains a varied selection of texts in a single codicological unit, written throughout by one hand using a rapid, frequently rather cramped Caroline minuscule with regular abbreviations and ligatures. The manuscript is mostly very plain, with the exception of decorated pen-work initials, which start to appear from fol. 133r, executed in the same brown ink as the main text and adorned with geometric patterns, natural motifs and dots that
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10 Available online through the manuscript portal of the Bavarian State Library at http://bsb-mdz12-spiegel.bsb.lrz.de/~db/0002/bsb00022465/images.
suggest insular influence. The parchment has obvious hair and flesh sides, with frequent split holes. Occasionally the scribe has left spaces in the text to avoid sections of parchment that were particularly hairy and therefore difficult to write on (for example, on fol. 151r). These details together strongly suggest that it was a book intended for everyday use rather than display or gift.

The manuscript’s contents are as follows (italics represent expanded abbreviations):

**Parts I and II**

1. 1r–112v: Jerome, commentary on the letters of Paul to the Ephesians and Titus.
   
   *Inc.* ‘ xprefatione Hieronimi in epistolam pauli ad effesios…’

**Part III**

   
   *Inc.* ‘In nomine domini summi. Incipit expositio evangeli...’

3. 172v–183v: *Physiologus*.
   
   *Inc.* ‘Incipiunt capitula. i. De leone...’

4. 183v: Description of balms and spices.
   
   *Inc.* ‘De pigmentis nardi spicatæ. Nardus est arbor habet fructum...’

5. 184r–222v: Latin glossary (A–P), Accipe.
   
   *Inc.* ‘Accipe audi cognosce...’

   
   *Inc.* ‘Incipiunt nomina interpretatio de hebraico in latino quod exposuit beatus hieronimus...’

   
   *Inc.* ‘De grecis nominibus...’

8. 227v–228r: ‘De ponderibus.’ Contains many excerpts, some paraphrased, from book sixteen of the *Etymologiae*.
   
   *Inc.* ‘Incipiunt nomina hebreorum de ponderibus...’

   
   *Inc.* ‘Incipiunt glossae de A. Abauu pater proaui id est auis aui...’
The Accipe Glossary

The Accipe glossary (no. 5; fols. 184r–222v) is not listed among the word-lists named by Goetz and Lindsay after their first glosses, and it has not been identified in any other manuscripts so far. According to its early twentieth-century editor Karl Thielo, however, it is probably an earlier and shorter version of the more widely used Auctores antiquissimi (AA) glossary from a cousin manuscript branch. It received new additions in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 that permit us to detect specific early medieval strategies for organising information.

The key to this glossary are those of its glosses written using the Greek alphabet. They are spread through Accipe, and continue into the Hebrew–Latin onomastic word-list that follows. A preliminary list of these Greek glosses is provided in the Appendix (see pp. 163–8 below). There appears to be no single source for the thirty-seven or more Greek entries in these two word-lists, including contemporary word-lists that make use of the Greek alphabet such as the huge Greek–Latin glossary of Pseudo-Cyril. However, the precise source of the words is less important than the question: why were these glosses not provided in a separate list, but spread over two unrelated glossaries?

We might suppose that a major source of Accipe, if not its direct exemplar, was a list of glossae collectae, or even an annotated text whose marginal notes were copied over directly into Accipe. Yet this is unlikely: each chapter has a heading, such as ‘incipit close de b capitul um ii’15, referring to the place-number of the letter in the Latin alphabet, and each is alphabetised.16 To get from glossae collectae, or an annotated text, to the organised glossary that we have in Accipe, requires several acts of copying.

However, a look at the alphabetisation of Accipe reveals that it is peculiarly uneven. The letter ‘i’, for instance, begins on fol. 208r with glosses
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13 De glossario codicis monac. 14388, ed. Thielo, p. 30.
14 As preserved in Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 444, and also known as the Cyrillus glossary. Not to be confused with the Byzantine glossary of the same name.
15 ‘Begin the glosses of the letter b, chapter two.’
16 De glossario codicis monac. 14388, ed. Thielo, p. 2, supposed that the chapter headings refer to a source text of twenty chapters from which the glossae collectae were drawn. It is possible that these ‘chapters’ were the sections of the glossary from which Accipe was copied.
starting with ‘in’, interspersed with glosses beginning ‘iu’, ‘id’, ‘it’, ‘ir’, ‘ig’ (in that order), and others; the principal list then moves on to ‘iu’, which is also mixed in with other, non-alphabetised, glosses. Neither of the groups ‘in’ or ‘iu’ is arranged alphabetically beyond the first two letters. From fol. 208v, however, the glosses return to the beginning of the alphabet with ‘ia’, continuing with ‘iec’, ‘igi’, ‘ign’, ‘ili’, ‘ily’, ‘imi’, imo’ and so on. The degree of alphabetisation is three or sometimes even four letters from this point. Notably, Greek words occur only in the first part of the chapter on the letter I: that is, in the groups of ‘in’ or ‘iu’ glosses. The same phenomenon occurs with other letters. The glosses for the letter H have a high degree of alphabetisation until they end with ‘humeneus nuptiae’; from there they continue with twelve further entries beginning with H that are in no apparent order. All the Greek words in the chapter on H occur among these last twelve glosses. Many of the Greek glosses in this manuscript are, therefore, additions made at the beginning or end of each chapter. More work remains to be done on the exact structure of Accipe, but the evidence suggests that this glossary derives from a previously existing word-list, perhaps indeed a precursor of the AA glossary; and that at some stage in its history it had been expanded from an unknown source or sources that contained Greek. This is also the case with the following word-list, whose structure requires some explanation before we can examine what the Greek contents of these glossaries have to tell us about the manuscript’s structure.

**Eucherian Word-lists**

Two relatively short unnamed Hebrew–Latin and Greek/Hebrew–Latin glossaries appear after Accipe in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388. I have chosen not to name these two word-lists after their first entries since, unlike Accipe, AA and other glossaries named by scholars, they derive from a single source and are not distinguishable from it except in word order and reduced content. This does not necessarily detract from their independence as texts transmitted in their own right; but it does mean that we ought to distinguish them from early medieval glossaries in their now traditional sense of word-lists compiled from a variety of sources, that can also draw on each other. The first word-list gives Hebrew proper names and some nouns, while the second gives Greek and Hebrew words, principally biblical or liturgical nouns such as diacon and criisma (sic on fol. 226r).

The first (onomastic) list in particular is the product of two separate processes: compilation and expansion. This is clear from the way in which the list’s contents have been organised. The source of both lists has
so far remained unidentified in the published scholarship on this manuscript, but despite the rubric attributing the list to Jerome, it is clear that they take their content from the second book of a fifth-century teaching manual by Eucherius of Lyon: the *Instructiones*.\(^{17}\) Both lists rely on this text in the same way, but we shall focus here on the first list only, since the structure of the second is straightforward and has not been modified.\(^{18}\) The reliance of the first list on Eucherius’ text is evident from the example of the letter A on fol. 223\(^3\), whose first few entries are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Adonai} & \cdot \quad \text{dominus significat;} \\
\text{adam} & \cdot \quad \text{homo siue}^{19} \text{terrigena;} \\
\text{abel} & \cdot \quad \text{luctus uel miserabilis} \\
\text{abraham} & \cdot \quad \text{pater excelsus} \\
\text{abraham} & \cdot \quad \text{pater uidit populum uel pater multarum} \\
\text{agar} & \cdot \quad \text{aduena uel conversa;}
\end{align*}
\]

These words appear in exactly the same order as Eucherius’ original text, which is not alphabetised. They have simply been extracted and inserted into new lists alphabetised by first letter. Compare the above section for the letter A with its source passage from Eucherius’ *Instructiones* (names beginning with A are in bold font for emphasis):


\(^{17}\) CCSL 66.185–6.11–27.  
\(^{18}\) The second (Greek–Latin) word-list contains only two Greek entries, both of which derive directly from the *Instructiones* (see Appendix, nos. 38 and 39).  
\(^{19}\) Note the unusual abbreviation for ‘siue’, in which the common mark of abbreviation is used to represent the letter e rather than the more usual m or n. This is not usual for the scribe of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388, and may be a mistake.  
\(^{20}\) ‘Adonai in Latin denotes the Lord. Sabaoth, army or virtue, or, as some prefer, omnipotent. Jesus, the Saviour. Nazarene, holy or the world. Messiah, the Anointed, that is, the Christ. Michael, who is like God. Gabriel, strength of God. Raphael, healing of God. Adam, human being, or born of the earth. Eve, life, or calamity … Abel, sorrow, or the wretched one. Cain, possession, or lamentation. Enoch, consecration. Methuselah, he who died and was sent. Noah, respite. Shem, named. Ham, clever. Japheth, breadth. Lot, he who strays, or anointed. Melchisedech, just king. Abram, exalted father. Abraham, father that beholds the people, or father of a multitude, that is of a nation. Sarrai, my princess. Sarra, princess … Hagar, foreigner, or she who was converted.’
This kind of systematic reading and extracting is also evident in the other letters of the alphabet. The letter S begins with Sabaoth and the letter N with Nazarenumus, the second and third glosses in the same section of the Instructiones.

Since we know the origin of this word-list, it is also possible to identify additional inserted words. These have been added in exactly the same way as in Accipe — that is, at the beginning or end of each group of words beginning with the same letter. For instance, the section for the letter R ends with ‘rabbi magister’, a gloss also found in Eucherius’ Instructiones II.21 A further three R-letter glosses are then inserted, one of them Greek, from an unknown source:

Res capiti siue caput
Rabaim ØEOMAKH medici aut gigantes
Raab superbum

This pattern is not quite so neat in other parts of the word-list. From the beginning of the first column on fol. 225v, for example, those glosses for the letter S that derive from the Instructiones are no longer arranged in the same order as the original text, and are mixed in with glosses from another source. The Instructiones contain almost no nouns beginning with the letter T; moreover, so that section of the word-list is composed entirely of glosses from another source.

The precise ways in which this and other word-lists in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 were arranged requires further study; but the word configurations in this onomastic list and in Accipe suggest that these glossaries were paired together during an early phase in their transmission. Each section for each letter of the alphabet has been expanded through additional words at the start or at the end, or both. Among these additional words in both glossaries are Greek terms, which probably derived from a single text source. This shared pattern of expansion indicates that the additions to these two otherwise unrelated lists were made by the same person. This person may have been working from an exemplar which had many marginal annotations, as well as notes inserted here and there in available blank spaces, which were incorporated into the new copy; and he or she was probably not the scribe of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388, to judge from the copying errors evident throughout.22 In other words, the additions to the glossaries in this Munich manuscript were made in one of its direct or indirect exemplars. Nevertheless, that the two lists were expanded

21 CCSL 66.193.133.
22 Suggested by Dr Franck Cinato.
together is evidence of a compilatory practice which sought to gather and synthesise available information. This practice was highly valued in the early Middle Ages, particularly following the liturgical and educational reforms undertaken by Charlemagne in the eighth and ninth centuries. The rearrangement into alphabetical order and supplementation of existing glossaries was a feature of the compiler’s awareness of the diversity of available sources, of the need to facilitate the finding of individual entries in lists of words, and of the ways in which lists such as glossaries could be made to function effectively for their users, who had their own specific needs. In re-copying the two glossaries, the compiler of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 recognised their continued utility in the mid-ninth century for linguistic and biblical learning.

**Metrological Word-Lists**

The organisation of discrete sources into an alphabetised list was only one of the means used in this manuscript to create a sophisticated reference work. We can see this in the metrological texts (that is, texts on weights and measures) on fol. 227v. The first of these is a list of fifteen terms, arranged alphabetically, which is appended to the end of the second Eucherian word-list (Figure 10.1).

This short list, from ‘talentum’ to ‘siculum’, gives the principal function and features of weights and measures. So, for example, *oboli* are the units into which a drachma divides. Here, too, Eucherius’ *Instructiones* is the source text, as evident from the manuscript entry for ‘sicel’, which differs only in minor ways from the corresponding passage in the *Instructiones*:

Fol. 227v: ‘sicel Ὸ qi in latina lingua corrupte sidis dicitur; ut in questionibus supra dictis indicatur uniaeq.’

Eucherius, *Instructiones*: ‘Secel qui in Latina lingua corrupte siclus dicitur, ut in Quaestionibus suprascriptis indicatur, unciae pondus habet…’

Although the fifteen terms in this short list depend on the *Instructiones*, they form a thematic group with the other texts, which derive from the seventh-century encyclopaedia by Isidore of Seville, the *Etymologiae*. One of these other texts is *De ponderibus*, a short chapter based on the *Etymologiae* XVI.25 and presented here under the heading ‘incipiunt nomina hebreorum de ponderibus’. It is followed on fol. 228r by five lines headed ‘De mensuris’ (*Etymologiae* XVI.26). These two passages

23 CCSL 66.211.408–9. ‘The shekel, which in the Latin language is incorrectly called the *siclus*, as is indicated in the above-mentioned questions, is [has the weight of] an ounce.’ Note the confusion of *cl* and *d* in *siclus* and *sidis.*
Figure 10.1 The end of the second Eucherian word-list, followed by fifteen metrological nouns and De ponderibus (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Clm 14388, fol. 227v).
provide numerical lists of weights and measures (dracma, untia, libra, gomor and others), and mathematical information about how these divide into each other. Both De ponderibus and De mensuris are rearranged and heavily paraphrased, as may be seen from a single example split between columns one and two, which reads: ‘...duo obuli quod sunt silique sex; | faciant scribulum,i.’.\(^\text{24}\) Isidore’s original read ‘scripulus sex siliquarum pondere constat’.\(^\text{25}\) The information provided is more or less the same, but in quite a different form.

Lists of weights and measures are fairly common in miscellanies and in glossaries, for they frequently occur in the Bible. The names of weights and measures for liquids, volume, solids, length, distance and value, and their systems of division, were different in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and different again in the vernacular. Those who worked with texts in these languages therefore required information about these matters.\(^\text{26}\) The precise source and authorship of the Isidorean lists in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 is unknown – they may well have been transmitted from Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, reworked by one or more of their copiers over a series of books, before they were entered into this Munich manuscript – but they were clearly useful. They were needed in order to understand the Bible fully, and, most importantly, contained information that was not otherwise provided in the preceding Eucherian list. The metrological texts begin with a short description and definition of weights and measures, derived from one source, and continue with their mathematical values, derived from another source – paraphrased and rearranged. The neat coherence of these themed extracts is such that it does not matter whether or not they were brought together for the first time in this manuscript: even if they are not original to Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388, the rationality of their pairing made them a valuable source of information in the ninth century.

For such supplementary extracts, it could actually be a disadvantage to combine and alphabetise them. In a manuscript such as this, which did not use rubrication or another visual technique to make it easy for the reader to find certain terms, division of information into separate, short, clearly demarcated thematic lists made it both easier to find the required term within the codex, and to find the specific information sought – whether it was a simple definition of a particular weight or measure, or its precise value. We are unused to talking about this kind of ‘encyclopaedic’ categorisation and expansion of information in the Middle Ages before the late eleventh century, especially in manuscripts that were not a great compilatory undertaking such as that represented by the *Liber glossarum*; but the example of this manuscript suggests that complex compilation

\(^{24}\) ‘Two oboli which are six siliquae, which make 1 scruple.’


was recognised and actively exploited by the Carolingians even in relatively low-grade books.

**Balms and Spices**

One further text completes the portrait of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 as an internally coherent collection. This text is a short paragraph about balms and spices on fol. 183, entitled ‘De pigmentis nardi spicatæ’ or ‘On the balm of the spikenard’ (Figure 10.2).

Nard is mentioned several times in the Bible as an expensive perfume, notably in the story of Mary Magdalene drying the feet of Christ with her hair (John 12:3 and Mark 14:3) and in the Song of Songs (1:11 and 4:13–14). A salve made using nard and other ingredients is listed by Pliny, and Isidore describes the plant. The appearance and mystical meaning of nard is also explained in the ninth-century homily *In die sancto palmarum* (homily 64) by Haimo of Auxerre.

29 PL 118.359–60.
was generally well known to exegetes in the early Middle Ages. Neither Isidore nor Haimo is the source for this passage, however. The text is taken entirely from the Second Commentary on the Gospels from the School of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury, composed between the mid-seventh and mid-eighth century and preserved in its fullest form in an eleventh-century manuscript.\textsuperscript{30} No Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the commentaries survive, which suggests that they were transmitted to the continent by missionaries during the eighth century. They were known in Werden and Würzburg, an indication that Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 (made in north-west Germany) may have been copied in a scriptorium associated with one of these centres.\textsuperscript{31} In the Second Gospel Commentary, the nard recipe accompanies the passage on nard from the Gospel of Mark and is probably intended to explain what the substance used by Mary Magdalene actually was.

It is not surprising that, in their edition of the commentary, Michael Lapidge and Bernhard Bischoff do not list Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388 among its extant witnesses, since the short paragraph it contains is a patchwork of extracts from the full text that have remained unidentified until now.\textsuperscript{32} The paragraph is extraordinarily selective, choosing only those five parts of the commentary (which runs to 121 articles) to do with precious balms and spices, and compiling them into a single coherent entry. This demonstrates the same selectiveness that is evident in the glossaries in this manuscript. Moreover, the entry itself may have been intended as a supplement. Its format resembles that of the Physiologus, a late antique work on Christian nature allegory that was popular in the early Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{33} Like the Physiologus, this short passage deals with a feature of the natural world and provides a short exposé of its appearance and principal properties. The position of this passage in an otherwise empty space immediately after the explicit to the Physiologus suggests that it may have been meant as an extension of the text. The passage also expands on the two entries for nard in the second Eucherian word-list on fol. 227\textsuperscript{r}, where it is listed as a spiky or lobed plant to be prepared by infusion.\textsuperscript{34} As with the lists of weights and measures, the two texts supplement each other instead of providing variant readings.

\textsuperscript{30} Bischoff and Lapidge, \textit{Biblical Commentaries}, p. 1. The manuscript is Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS M. 79 sup.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 291.
\textsuperscript{32} Bischoff and Lapidge, \textit{Biblical Commentaries}.
\textsuperscript{33} For more information on this text, whose Latin recension in particular has received little attention since the 1970s, see Dorofeeva, ‘Reception and manuscript context’, PhD thesis, University of Cambridge (2015).
\textsuperscript{34} ‘Nardum \textsuperscript{\textdagger} pisticum nardus fidelem idem sine inpositu [sic] grecum est;’ and ‘Nardus spicatum ab e [sic] quod species ipsi nardi in modo spica sit quam infusa conficitur.’ CCSL 66.197.190–93.
Table 10.1 provides a transcription of the paragraph on balms and spices (column one) against its source articles in the Second Gospel Commentary (column two), together with its sequence number in the edition by Bischoff and Lapidge and the relevant Bible verse in square brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388, fol. 183v</th>
<th>Second Gospel Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nardus est arbor habet fructum ut lauribaga et in calderium mitteretur et coquitur usque ad pinguedinem et super cocleario de super tollitur oleum spica erba est deinde commiscetur cum oleo super dicte arboreis et inde odorem sumit et fit unguentum</td>
<td>79. Nardi spicati [XIV.3]. Nardus est arbor cuius est fructus ut lauribaceae, et in calderium mitteretur et coquitur usque ad pinguedinem, et cocleario desuper tollitur oleum. Spica herba est. Deinde commiscitur cum oleo supradictae arboreis et inde odorem sumit et fit unguentus.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyria cyncretae pigmentum quae de uipera fit</td>
<td>53. Thyriazin. i. pigmentum quod de uipera fit.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parauerum aromata et unguentum. hoc distat inter aromata et unguentum quod aromata sicca sunt unguentum uero commixta cum oleo</td>
<td>119. Aromata et unguenta [XXIII.56]. Hoc distat inter aromata et unguentum, quod aromata sicca sunt, unguentum commixta cum oleo.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quasi deleramenta gloriæ [grece, latinae] quasi uana uerba uiderent ur</td>
<td>120. Deliramenta [XXIV.11] grece, latine quasi uana uerba.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixture myrræ et oleo aloe arborem quæ ducitur de perside bonum odorem habet tunditur minutatim et puluis eius mistitur cum myrrha. myrrha uero pigmentum est;</td>
<td>148. Mixture miræ et aloæ [XIX.39]. Aloeæ arbor est quæ ducitur de Perside; bonum odorem habet; tunditur minutatim et puluis eius miscetur cum mirra. Myrrha uero unguentum est.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 ‘79. Of precious spikenard [Mark 14:3]. The nard is a tree whose fruit is like the berries of the bay-tree, and it is put into a cauldron and cooked until it becomes fatty, and then the oil is skimmed off with a spoon. The “spike” is an herb. It is next mixed with the oil of the aforementioned tree and it then acquires fragrance and becomes an unguent.’

36 ‘53. Thyriazin (θηριαζίν): that is, a pigment which is produced from a viper.’

37 ‘119. Spices and ointments [Luke 23:56]. The difference between spices and ointments is that spices are dry, whereas ointments are mixed with oil.’


39 ‘148. A mixture of myrrh and aloes [John 19:39]. The aloe is a tree which is brought from Persia; it has a fine fragrance; it is pounded up into tiny particles and its powder is mixed with the myrrh. Myrrh, however, is an ointment.’
The Latin of this passage is quite strange and difficult to decipher. It is only by comparing the Latin of the Second Commentary with the Latin of the passage on balms and spices that it becomes possible to understand some of the mistakes. The least comprehensible word can be found in the middle of line eleven (Figure 10.2), where the scribe has conflated the abbreviations for ‘graecae’ and ‘latinae’, making them look like the abbreviation for the word ‘gloriat’. \(^\text{40}\) The translation of the passage below uses square brackets to replace those words that are meaningless with the translation made by Lapidge and Bischoff from the Second Gospel Commentary:

**On the balm\(^\text{41}\) of the spikenard**

The nard is a tree whose fruit is like the berries of the bay-tree, and it is put into a cauldron and cooked until it becomes fatty, and then the oil is skimmed off with a spoon. The ‘spike’ is a herb. \(^\text{42}\) It is next mixed with the oil of the aforementioned tree and it then acquires fragrance and becomes an unguent. \(*\text{Tyriazin}\) in truth is a thick balm which is produced from a viper. For genuine spices \(^\text{43}\) and ointments. The difference between spices and ointments is that spices are dry, whereas ointments are mixed with oil. Idle tales \([\text{in Greek and Latin}]\) were seen as if ‘empty words’. Of mixing myrrh and aloe. The aloe is a tree which is brought from Persia; it has a fine fragrance; it is pounded up into tiny particles and its powder is mixed with the myrrh. Myrrh is in fact a balm. \(^\text{44}\)

The compiler appears to have gone through the commentary systematically, drawing out all its statements on balms and spices more or less in order; only the first two articles in the above text are out of sequence. This passage is a model example of selective reading of an early medieval text by an early medieval compiler, perhaps even the scribe of this manuscript, who clearly struggled with reading his Latin exemplar, but nevertheless assembled a passage on a subject he thought worth knowing in a space that may have been reserved for the purpose.

**Conclusion**

The works discussed above do not represent the whole of the third part of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388, but their remarkable

---

\(^{40}\) My thanks to Pádraic Moran for pointing this out.

\(^{41}\) For the meaning of the word *pigmentum* in the early Middle Ages, see Miller, *External Influences on English*, p. 87. ‘Balm’ seems the best fit in this passage, though ‘spice’ is also possible.

\(^{42}\) Possibly *lavandula spica* or lavender.

\(^{43}\) A late antique use of *aromata* for ‘spices’ is attested in Everett, *Alphabet of Galen*, p. 14.

\(^{44}\) Adapted from the edition and translation by Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries*, pp. 411, 419, 423, 560.
coherence despite their variety of sources and contents demonstrates how vital the manuscript context can be for understanding the uses of texts. This manuscript appears to be a low-grade miscellany, without apparent thematic unity, plain and written on somewhat ill-prepared parchment by a scribe whose skill in Latin as well as Greek was imperfect. Nevertheless, the manuscript represents sophisticated early medieval organisation strategies that included alphabetisation, contraction, expansion and supplementation. It is these strategies that bring these apparently discrete texts together into a single whole. None of the texts contains the same information; instead, they separate into complementary extracts on discrete but related subjects: a general Latin glossary, nouns deriving from Hebrew and Greek, the names and values of weights and measures, and information on balms and spices. Some of these glossaries are, as we have seen, expanded from additional sources. All of them complement each other, forming a lexical reference work that could assist with the reading and understanding of the Bible. This is a purposeful, coherent and highly organised book.

From the complete contents of the third part of this Munich manuscript, we know that the scribe must have had access to sources which contained not only glossaries and a Gospel commentary from Canterbury, but also the *Etymologiae* of Isidore, a Gospel commentary by Pseudo-Jerome, the *Physiologus*, and a list of synonyms. The presence of the Second Gospel Commentary in the manuscript, and its decorative elements – as well as, perhaps, its Greek contents, for the language was taught at Theodore and Hadrian’s Canterbury school – suggest that the scribe was working in a centre with links to Britain. It may have been an Anglo-Saxon or Irish monastic foundation, or it may have had ties to Werden or Würzburg. Unfortunately there is no way to know any more about the production setting of the manuscript; but these observations are enough to show that it was produced in a dynamic context, in which people and books moved between centres and across the Channel – exchanges that were common in the early Middle Ages. This kind of mobility demanded that texts be adapted to answer new needs. In such a context, it would have been strange indeed to copy texts without changing them to suit their new purposes, or to select them without reference to the requirements of the people who would be using them. Doing so would have produced a useless book.

For our Munich manuscript, this means that it was deliberately copied from existing exemplars to assist with reading and understanding the Bible and its language. This compilation therefore reflects the Carolingian emphasis on language learning and on the correct reading of canonical books, which reached its fullest expression during the ninth century. But
it is also a utilitarian book, in that any monastic centre that required its monks to read the Latin Bible would have needed similar objects as learning and reference tools. It is, in short, a living product of its time and place; and, together with other glossary miscellanies and glossary chrestomathies, an overlooked piece of evidence in the everyday reception and transmission of knowledge in the early Middle Ages.

Appendix

Preliminary List of Greek Words in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14388

The Greek words in Munich 14388 require a great deal of explanation, as they are difficult both to read and to understand. A preliminary annotated list of a representative sample of these words is therefore provided in this appendix, in order of their appearance by folio and glossary.

Treatment of Latin and Greek: Where possible, Latin terms and features of spelling have been clarified, together with the antique or medieval Greek etymologies of recognisable words, in a note below the numbered gloss. The *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum* has been used for this. Each gloss is numbered in sequential order. With the exception of gloss 37, this list includes only those glosses whose *interpretamenta* are written wholly or partially using the Greek alphabet. Greek glosses written in the Latin alphabet with Latin *interpretamenta* only are omitted, since it is those words written using the Greek alphabet, and their source, that are of interest in this chapter.

Transcription: Half-uncial – the only other script apart from Caroline minuscule in this section of the codex – is transcribed in majuscule. Occasional majuscule letters (usually B, I or N) in words otherwise written in minuscule are retained. Words that are distinctly larger than the surrounding text, and whose letter forms are the same in both Caroline minuscule and half-uncial, are also transcribed in majuscule. It is important to note, therefore, that the below transcriptions in majuscule and minuscule generally do not represent script, but letter size. The letter A, for example, retains its single-compartment shape in the glossaries, whether it is written as a majuscule or as a minuscule. This differentiation of majuscule and minuscule becomes important when attempting to identify letter shapes and draw out the meaning of the glosses. For

---

45 Goetz, *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum*. 
instance, it has sometimes been possible to identify the Greek syllable ΛI where it is written as Latin N, and the Greek letter Γ where it is written as Latin T. These as well as possible variants in unclear cases are indicated in the note to each entry.

**Punctuation:** The majority of glosses have no punctuation, but many do include three dots arranged in an equilateral triangle between the gloss and its *interpretamentum*. This sign is used only where there is insufficient space in the column to leave a proper space between the two: in other words, it is a separation mark. It has been transcribed below. Occasionally the scribe also uses a *punctus versus* to separate two disparate glosses written too close together. These are not transcribed here. Finally, some of the glosses also contain a dot mid-line, which may represent a *distinction media*, though other *distinctiones* appear to be absent. These dots are represented by the full stop.

**Accipe glossary**

184\* 1. auernum. *infenum* aaxepona

*Auernus:* hell. *infenum:* infernal regions. *Αγέρων:* river of the Greek underworld. The modern Greek is *Αγέρωντας*, which approximates to this gloss.

190\* 2. buffum *ΦΥCA*  
*ΦΥCA* written over erasure.

3. caementum. et ωa memah enxopoton  
*Caementum:* stones, cement.

191\* 4. calluerat TETY AOKH  
Possible variant reading: ΓΕΓΥ AOKH. *δακτίαν:* to exercise, train. *calleo,* *callui:* to be experienced, hardened. Possible confusion of -ο for -o.  

5. casta pudica ATNA  
Possible variant reading: ΑΓΝΑ. *castus,* *pudicus:* chaste, modest, virtuous. *ἄγνοις:* chaste.

195\* 6. celsa cykak hNa  
*Celsus:* high, haughty. The Greek spelling is unclear.

196\* 7. culicularemTZINT ZΑΛΑΠΙΟ  
Possibly related to Latin *zinzala* and/or *culiculum:* gnat.

8. cunctatur ḳ: ductat contio. EKKNICIA  
9. clumen MYNDIKIN
Possible variant reading: ΠΙΠΙΝΙΚΙΝ. *Clumen pyncyn* in the *AA* glossary. Corruption of ἀγγίζω: buttocks?

10. donarium ὤ TAΣΩΨΥΑΑΚΙΟΜ
Possible variant reading: ΓΑΣΩΨΥΑΑΚΙΟΜ. *Gazophylacium*: treasure chamber or offertory box. ω plays the role of majuscule Ω.

11. duces principes APXON’TEC

12. exquisio ὤ kadkoroc
Possible variant reading: ὤ kadkoricoc.

13. edulia BPACA T
 Possible variant readings: ΒΡΑΓΙΑ and ΓΕΛΛΟΜ. *edulia*: foodstuffs. See also *edulum aesus* in the glossary Abauus maior. *κοπιλιοθυμιακόλιθος*: spoon. Also Latin *cochlear*: spoon. *BPACA* from Latin *braca*: white grain?

14. flagellio KOTADEPNOC
Possible variant reading: ΚΟΓΑΔΕΡΝΟΚ. The Greek is a compound of δέρμα, skin, and κόπτω, to cut or strike. Given by Goetz as *copidermos* (κοπιδέρμος) in the epitome of the *AA* glossary and as *flagello copidermor verbero* in the additions to *AA* he takes from MS Vatican 1468. *Verbero* is translated as ‘esclave qui mérite le fouet’ by Gaide. *Flagellio* is likely a confusion of *flagello, flagellum*, whip, or *flagello, flagellare*, to whip.

15. fibrat partes ficati pellinosus ΧΟΛΙΚΟΣ
Possible variant reading: ΧΟΝΚΟΣ. *Ficatum*: liver. ΧΟΛΙΚΟΣ may be a cognate of the Greek γολή, γολῶ (gall, bile).

16. faeles animal quadrupedu ΕΑΛΟΥΡΟC

17. framea ΡΟΝΦ ea fana templap

---

46 CGL V (Leipzig, 1894), p. 446.
47 As noted by Theander, *AA Glossarum Commentarioli*, p. 20.
48 CGL V, p. 628.
49 Gaide, *Les substantifs masculins*, p. 127; CGL V, pp. 457 and 501. A full explanation of this word in Greek and Latin may be found in Hamblenne, ‘Un nouveau corpus des substantifs masculins’, p. 170.
50 With thanks to Zachary Guiliano for this suggestion.
18. gesticulum xiponon nii
χειρονομία: pantomimic movement, gesticulation.

19. gesticulanus opxhqha
ὀρχηστής: dancer, dancing-master.

20. habitata oikos reNhlieiste.
habito: inhabit. oίκος: household.

21. harundo canna stipula kaaakhn.
har undo: reed, cane. can na: reed. stipula: stalk. kaa akhn most probably a corruption of κἀκαμ φ: reed. Compare with har undo canna kalamos in St-Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 912, fol. 119.51

22. herudo sangui suga. Bdeaa
hirudo, sanguisuga, βδέλλα: leech. The sanguisuga is mentioned in the Vulgate (Prov. 30:15).

23. histrio kirochiberihupani.
histrio: actor.

24. hyrundo xetilidon
Possible variant reading: xεαδόν. hirundo, χελιδόν: swallow (bird).

25. inerx segnis piger
inerx, segnis, piger: lazy or slow.

26. iantaculum BOYKKICPAOLI
i entaculum: breakfast. Given by Goetz as βουκκημος or βουκκημος.53 It seems not to appear anywhere else, except a dictionary of 1833, in which it is given as βουκκημος i entaculum, or βουκκημη gustarium.54

27. manus BOYPIXLIN
Possible variant reading: BOYPIXLIAI. manus: hand.

28. mango o̱kater ΠΟΡΟΣ
mango: dealer. ἐμπορος: merchant.55

51 www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0912/119/small. The gloss appears in a mixed Abba/Abauus glossary.
52 The reading of this double gloss, and its separation, is that of Franck Cinato. Dr Cinato notes that gegov should read ὶεγορ, with both i and c confused with g (see CGL 7, p. 537).
53 As βουκκημος in Goetz’s Thesaurus glossarum enendarum: CGL 6, p. 535; and as βουκκημος in the list of Greek glosses edited by Goetz from Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 444: CGL 2, p. 259.
54 Estienne, Thesaurus graecae linguae, col. 353.
55 Appears as σοματίμπορος in Goetz, CGL 2, p. 450.
29. percusus AETROCOC
Possible variant reading: AETROCOC. agrosus: rich in land.

30. pocillator Ʌ. ΠΗΝΚΕΡΝΗC
Possible variant reading: ΠΗΑΙΚΕΡΛΗΗC. pocillator, πιγκήρης: cup-bearer. From ἐκεράννυμι, to mix fresh wine. Given as πιγκήρης in the CGL.\(^{56}\)

31. pugil par kaxrix
pugil: boxer. ποικρατωτής appears in the CGL.\(^{57}\)

32. poeni Ʌ. afri.

32\(^{\text{bis}}\). prestigiator ψφαC.\(^{58}\)
prestigiator: trickster, juggler, impostor.

33. prostitutta Ʌ. meretrix penula. φεαολιh
prostituta: prostitute. meretrix: courtesan.

Hebrew–Latin onomastic word-list

225\(^{r}\) 34. Rabaim ΘΕΟΜΑΚΗ medici aut gigantes
rabbanim (רביים): plural of רבי, Talmudic Hebrew and Aramaic ‘master, teacher’ and biblical Hebrew ‘great, much, superior, important’.\(^{59}\) Likely confusion of Rephaim (רפאים), biblical race of giants. medicus: physician (n.), healing (adj.). θεαματικα: battle of/against gods.

225\(^{v}\) 35. Sadai Ʌ. ikanon
El Shaddai is one of the names of God in the Hebrew bible, first used in Gen. 17:1 and meaning ‘he who is sufficient’. ikanôn: sufficient, great; in relation to Shaddai: the Mighty One (ὁ ικανός).\(^{60}\) The Greek word is mentioned in Jerome’s letter of c.384 to Marcella.\(^{61}\)

36. futue Ʌ. ΑΠΙοKYND
futuo, futui: to fuck.

37. Aγω sanctus
ἀγω: saint. sanctus, sancta: holy. No resemblance to Hebrew יְשָׁש: saint, holy, sacred.\(^{62}\)

---

\(^{56}\) Goetz, CGL 2, p. 407.
\(^{57}\) Goetz, CGL 2, p. 391.
\(^{58}\) See CGL 7, p. 123: praestigiator γηροποιήτης. The reading of this double gloss, and its separation, is that of Franck Cinato.
\(^{59}\) Steinmetz, Dictionary of Jewish Usage, p. 140.
\(^{60}\) Taylor, Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint, p. 286.
\(^{61}\) Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae, ed. Hilberg, esp. 25.
\(^{62}\) Brown et al., A Hebrew and English Lexicon, Strong’s no. H6918.
Greek/Hebrew–Latin word-list

226r  38. catholicam uniuersalis AMOTO ΚΑΘΟΕΜΟΝ quod est totum
The source is Eucherius of Lyon, Instructiones II: ‘Catholica uniuersalis ἁπὸ τοῦ καθ’ ὅλον, quod est secundum totum.’

227r  39. Theus deus theus autem ut quorundam opinio habet ΑΠΟΓΟΥΕ ΑΓΑΓΘΑΙ a spectando id est omnia prospiciendo
The source is Eucherius of Lyon, Instructiones II: ‘Theos Deus. Theos autem, ut quorundam opinio habet, ἁπὸ τοῦ θεάσασθαι, a spectando, id est omnia prospiciendo.’

---

63 CCSL 66.214.441–42.
64 CCSL 66.213.432–33.