

AUTHOR'S VARIANTS AND INTERPRETATIONS IN FRITHEGOD

The Ducange citations of Frīdegodus (Frithegod) *Breviloquium Vitae Beati Wilfredi* derived from the *editio princeps* by Mabillon, in volumes III and IV of the *Acta SS. Ordinis S. Benedicti* (1672-7). Recently the manuscript basis for the text has been put in a different light by the edition of Alistair Campbell, *Frithegodi Monachi Breviloquium Vitae Beati Wilfredi* (Zürich, 1950. *Thesaurus Mundi*. 12 Swiss francs).

The object of the present discussion is twofold : first, to show, in opposition to Campbell, that we have to deal with author's variants in the extant tradition ; and, second, to suggest a number of interpretations of possible interest to medieval Latin lexicography. Some of these interpretations are put forward concurrently with the codicological argument.

I. THE MANUSCRIPTS OF FRITHEGOD

Campbell, having recollated the principal manuscripts, gives an account in his preface (*op. cit.* vii-x). We have to concern ourselves with three, which he lists thus :

C Codex Londinensis Cottonianus Claud. A i ; saec. x dim. alt.

P Codex Parisinus Latinus 8431 ; saec. xi.

L Codex Petropolitanus O. v. xiv. 1 ; compluribus manibus saec. x scriptus.

1. I have to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor C. J. Fordyce, who sent me the *Thesaurus Mundi* volume to notice for *The Classical Review*, in which I have dealt chiefly with omissions and errors in the text of Wulfstan. For helpful discussions on various points I am obliged to Professor Fordyce, and to my colleagues Professor J. H. Baxter, Emeritus Professor Rose, Professor W. L. Lorimer, Professor R. C. Johnston, and Dr W. M. Hackett. Professor Otto Skutsch kindly sent me Mr A. Campbell's paper in *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1953, with most valuable comments.

Campbell mentions two MSS of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, Londin. Harleian. 310, fol. 88, and Lambeth Palace 159, f. 74. Mabillon's text was based on a transcript of C, sent to him by Thomas Gale, and on L, then at Corbie, now at Leningrad (photographs of which Campbell has given to the Bodleian Library).

The fundamental manuscript is C, of which Campbell states : « C est codex accurate quidem descriptus, sed ipse librarius libro exscripto plurima poetae uerba induxit, sua tum metri causa, tum autem ad se acerrimo uirum ingenio comprobandum introduxit. L et C inter se nihil aut non fere multum differunt, nisi quod L ipsius uerba scriptoris eis locis seruat ubi C ea praebet quae librarius ille omnium mortalium stultissimus scripsit. Litterae quas, quamvis in C inductae sint, tamen luce secunda utentes etiam nunc dispicere possumus, ad ea quae habet L uerba sunt accommodatae. P ex C iam tum librarii ineptiis uitiatu mendose descriptus ad poema recensendum est inutilis ».

In other words, C is a careful copy, capriciously (on Campbell's view) corrupted by its own scribe, who erased original readings and substituted his own variants, either for the sake of scansion or to show his smartness. L's variants agree with the original readings of C, legible in erasure, while P was copied from the corrupt state of C, and is useless.

On the glosses in the three books Campbell writes : « Supra omnia paene minus usitata uerba, ut in aevi Anglo-Saxonici codicibus moris est, C habet alia idem fere declarantia. Plurima praeterea uerba librarius ea mente in margine descripsit ut descripta interpretaretur, sed incepto nescio qua causa destitit. Omnes fere quae in C exstant linguae praebet P, saepe tamen aut fusius aut compressius ; praebet etiam alias a librario additas, inter quas nonnullas inuenimus haud despicendas eis qui optimarum artium Anglo-Saxonum studio incensi sunt. Linguae perpaucas et eas quidem tritas habet L, inter quas una in C quoque exstat. » The only gloss shared by L and C is at v. 126 : *cosmica : mundana*, which is too banal to indicate any connection.

It should be stressed that L is doubly defective : it ends at v. 1218, omitting vv. 1219-1396, and it lacks the prefatory epistle by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, found in C and P. William of

Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum* i, 15, states that Odo commissioned from Frithegod a versified life of St. Wilfred of York, and blames the Canterbury Benedictine's excessive addiction to Grecisms. It is from this testimony, taken with the abundance of Grecisms in the text, that the anonymous *Breviloquium* is attributed to Frithegod.

On the above facts it is possible to hold that L is a hasty transcript from C in its original state, while yet lacking its end and its prefatory letter, or from a lost antigraph of the original text of C ; while P derives, years later, from the revised text of C and its incomplete series of glosses. Mr G. R. C. Davis, of the British Museum Department of Manuscripts, kindly examined C at my request, and reported : « I have had a look at Claudius A. i. ff. 6^v-36^v... The glosses throughout are apparently in a single hand, which is probably contemporary, and possibly (though I am inclined to think not) identical, with that of the text. The variant readings given by the glossator fall into two sets (both executed with great neatness), of which the first are written interlineally and the second in the outer margin. Often, the marginal reading will agree with the text as against the interlineal rendering : but I failed to notice an instance where the reverse was the case. Sometimes all three renderings are different. The impression left was of a collation with two other MSS, the whole being possibly a copy from another MS, glosses and all. Words written over erasures seem to be in the hand of the main text, but the vellum has been roughened where they occur, giving them in some cases an air of unsteadiness. I do not think the possibility that they are in another hand can be completely excluded. »

Concerning the origin of the glosses in C, almost all of which were taken into P, Campbell thinks that ten of them can be attributed to the author Frithegod himself (p. ix). « *Lingua tamen ad uerba in poemate mendose scripta spectantes Frithegodo certe tribuere possumus : quotus enim quisque praeter ipsum scriptorem inuentus esset qui talia intellegeret ?* » In this category he cites three instances : 1293 *diorsismata : diffinitiones* ; 1324 *archilionum : archileus dicitur qui super mille constituitur* ; 1390 *prothemata : propositiones*. He finds a further seven « *linguae, per quas significationes uerborum uel falsae uel arcessitae*

sed ad poema interpretandum idoneae memoriae traduntur, scriptori tribuendae ». While allowing these ten, Campbell denies the general attribution of glosses to Frithegod for which Manitius argued ¹.

Not all will be convinced that no other than the author Frithegod could have thought up the glosses at vv. 1293, 1324, 1390, or the others listed by Campbell. But if some glosses can be ascribed to him, it tends to support the view that some of the variants in erasure also derive from revision by the author. Yet Campbell firmly excludes every such variant, and prints in his text the readings of the defective Leningrad book, L, agreeing with the erased words in C. But better meaning and metre result from the substitutes found in C *in rasura*, whence copied into P.

Individually, almost every substitution in C is such as the average monkish copyist could have thought up *suo Marte*; but collectively the numerous changes, some eighty in all, are far more suggestive of an author's revision of his draft. Consider, for instance, the changes made at vv. 122-3 (the young Wilfred rejects a proposal of marriage): « ardent excoctis *fibrarum omenta lâternis* | *abâita*, conceptis dum detrahor, optime, uotis ».

That appears in L, and in C *primitus*. C *ex correctura*, and P, give: « ardent excoctis *omenta latentia fibris, ah mihi!*, conceptis dum detrahor, optime, uotis ». Translate: « The membranes lying hid in my heated fibres burn, wee is me! as I am dissuaded, good sir, by the vows I have taken ». The corrected version scans and makes sense, but it is hard to make anything of the original form seen in L, which Campbell prints. *Laterna*, i. q. *lanterna*, must have a long *â* in the first syllable. Just possibly Frithegod took it in the sense of *latebra*, which would scan: cf. Ducange (Favre's edition) *s. v. Laterna, Lanterna*:... carcer monachicus, ubi delinquens *latere* cogitur (from a Cistercian statute of the year 1276). One hardly debits Frithegod with *laternis* as an error for *lateribus*. The erasure and substitution improve sense as well as metre, and strongly suggest author's revision rather than the caprice of a « librarius, omnium mortaliu stultissimus ».

1. M. MANITIUS, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. Zweiter Teil (1923), pp. 497-501.

Changes made wholly or chiefly *metri gratia* are the following (listed in the sequence of their occurrence) :

43 « est », *aiunt*, « *pape*, diuini numinis omen », L, changed to « est », *dixere*, « *pape* ! diuini... », C *corr.*, P. Here *pape* is for *papae*, from Greek *παπαῖ*, cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 207 ; Ter. *Eun.* 416 ; *etc.*

94 tandem *triquadro* postquam seruauerat anno L. tandem *continuo*... C *cr.*, P. Besides breaking scansion, *triquadrus* has an unsuitable meaning, In tres partes diuisus (Ducange) ; also, 'having three corners' (J. H. Baxter and C. Johnson, *Medieval Latin Word List from British and Irish Sources*, ed. 2, 1947).

161 liberius *lata* perfudit *blande karita*, L, is changed to liberius *carite* perfudit *summipotentis*, C *cr.*, P, where *carite* is for Greek *χάριτι*. Frithegod must have noted on revision that he had mistaken the declension of the word and its short iota. (He could find *carite* in Mart. Capella 9, 888, where a variant is *caritate*).

169 prius animo maerens is changed, *metri gratia*, to prius maerens animo.

212 uigētum L. serenum C *cr.*, P.

228 cōgitet L. pāriat CP.

279 caecūtiens L. cecutit CP.

291 dicite, quaeso, patres, *nou* feruore calentes, L, will scan only if *quaeso*, *patres* are spondees, in which case there is no cesura. C *cr.*, P, have *sophiae* substituted for *nou*, which scans and makes slightly better sense, « wisdom » rather than « wit ». Baxter and Johnson, *op. cit.*, cite *Noys*, meaning 'mind', c. 1200. Martianus Capella, 1, 92, has the curious phrase : *interpresque meae mentis, ὁ νοῦς sacer*.

332 indulgent proceres, magnates, necne cālones. So L, the sense of *calones* appearing from earlier in the context, v. 308, *necnon hortamine plebis*. But *calo*, a camp-follower or drudge (with a further low meaning of wooden shoe, or *galoche*, Ducange s. v.) does not scan, with its long *a*, and is in meaning too vulgar for the solemnity of the occasion with its popular assent to the bishop's collation to his diocese. C *corr.*, P, change L's *calones* to *meandri*, with the gloss *flexurae*, « windings ». Possibly *meandri* was intended as an elevated word for *meatores*, in this context « pilgrims » or « worshippers ». Ducange cites *permeans* in the

sense *viator* (Paul. Diac. *Coll.* 1388, 11). More likely it means « processional windings », winding processions of worshippers. Baxter and Johnson, *op. cit.*, find *meandrus* in the sense 'winding' in 1345, 1527.

411 sepe licet proprias *uetetur* pascere ouillas, L. For *uetetur* C *corr.*, P, have *liceat non*, which scans, but is awkward after the conjunction *licet*: not, however, too incompetent a *Verbesserungsversuch* for Frithegod.

417 terris et honore *ditauit*, L, changed to *locauit* by C *cr.*, P. With this correction of scansion of the verb *ditare*, compare v. 990, where multa tellure *ditasti*, L, is emended to *beasti*, CP. Clearly we have here an author's self-corrections.

447 incumbunt fessi uasto sudore *lātomi*, L, changed to *ministri*, CP.

460 illic planata *decūsatum* uomere terra, L: *triuuatum*, CP, involving a change of sense as well as of scansion. Wilfred is founding a new church and laying out the site: *decussatum*, 'crosswise', seems more exact and relevant than *triuuatum*, which perhaps means here 'on all sides, everywhere' (Baxter, *op. cit.*).

483 liceat iam rumpere longas / *inscītia* cogente moras, L, where CP have *inficia*, a mysterious word, perhaps a coinage, *metri gratia*, intended to have a similar meaning to *inscītia*, possibly as an equivalent to *inefficacia* or *inficientia*. More likely Frithegod adopts a singular from *infitiæ* (*inficiæ*), 'denial', in the sense of 'refusal, reluctance'.

505 imple *fidem* gestis, L. imple *spem* gestis, CP, better sense and metre.

547 *mānubiis* farti regis uenere manipli, L. *exuuiis*, CP, a synonym that scans correctly.

644 obliquo litore *caelox*, L. *classis*, CP, realising that *cēlox* has short *e*.

662 *āperuit* dulces in salsis rupibus amnes, L. *aptauit*, CP.

684 num tibi quadripatens *ōboedit* machina ruris? L. *famulatur*, CP.

698 *Is* equidem, L. *ipse* quidem, CP.

701 *excepi* mestas tenero olim somate *ērumnas*, L. somate *rimas*, CP, where « *excepi...rimas* », 'I suffered fissures', is appropriate to an exiled prince suffering political wreck.

710 *ultrā*, L, is changed to *longē*, CP, as he commonly allows the final *e* of adverbs to be short, but likes the final *a* of such words to be long. Cf. at 842 *frustrā* altered to *uanē*; and 1084, where *intrā palatia* is changed to *intrā moenia*.

711 ...*uetitas ālacrior arces*, L. *uiolentior*, CP.

724 *externo sub rege dēgens* *sensī cicatrices*, L. *dolens*, CP. But the false scansion of *cicātrices* is left unemended.

746 *fiunt discīdia fines*, L. *discrimina*, CP. Compare 1163, where *discīdia* is changed to *contraria*. The change at 746 involves a consequential change at 747: *arguto fratres fratrum discrimine clades / pendite*, L, which CP alter to *moderamīne*.

862 *praesidis, infaustas, hā ! hā !, procurantis abenas*, L. *hāhā curantis*, CP.

947 *prōfecto alterius...*, L. *protinus alterius...*, CP.

1024 *morte sōpito*, L. *morte grauato*, CP.

1081-2 *accessit, regis dirum patefecit āmentum, | toxica loetiferae uolitant quo tela pharetrae*. L. C *corr.*, P, have: *accessit, regis iram patefecit et ipsi, toxica loetiferae caueat quo tela pharetrae*. What mere copyist could make such changes? The lengthening in *arsi* of the *-is* of *regis* is a licence Frithegod allows himself at 579 *mitis*, 1001 *humilis*.

1083 *nec etenim puduit dīcacem audire fidelem*, L. *legatum*, CP.

1095 *tunc āperit ora loquelis*, L. *extulit*, CP. Cf. correction of unmetrical *aperuit* at 662.

1157 *Ausoniae coeunt Graiae mox atque sōritae*, L, which C *corr.*, P, change to *Ausoniae coeunt soritae, mox quoque Graiae*.

1159 *protinus ammisso micuit sintagma bēnillo*, L. *benigno*, CP. St. Wilfred is coming to read a memorial (*sintagma*). Tr.: «Forthwith, the jewel (*v. l.* the saintly man) having been admitted, the document shone» (*i. e.* was unfolded).

1180 *comminīscentes*, L. *commemorantes*, CP.

1181 «*hac*», *dixere*, «*Phāro mundi rudis arsit origo*», L. «*hac mundi Phāro*», *dicunt*, «*rudis arsit origo*», C P. Ducange, *s.v. Pharos*, quotes the anonymous poet of the *De pontificibus Eboracensibus*, as using the word with short *a*, and neuter: *Hoc altare Farum supra suspenderat altum*. But the author of a piece on St. Willibald's church at Eichstätt has it feminine and

with a long *a*: Hanc Willibaldo Pharum construxerat almo. Frithegod frequently lengthens syllables of his Grecisms in which the original bore the Greek accent.

In the foregoing forty instances metrical considerations dominate in the emendation found in *C corr.*, *P*; and by these forty improvements the bulk of Frithegod's false quantities are in fact removed.

At 106 and 192 the proper name Daluvinus is changed to Maluvinus, and at 185 Balthild to Brunhild, for reasons best known to the emender. In Eddius Stephanus' prose Life of Bishop Wilfred the martyr is called Dalfinus (c. iv), but his persecutress the « malivola regina nomine Baldhild » (c. vi) has a variant name Brunechild in the manuscript C (British Museum, Cotton. Vespasian, D. vi, eleventh century. Cf. Bertram Colgrave, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, Cambridge, 1927, p. XIII, and p. 154, where he notes: « Brunechild however died in 613. The insertion of this name may of course be an interesting reminiscence of Brynhold, the heroine of the Volsunga Saga. Some of the MSS of both Fridegoda's *Vita Wilfridi* and of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* read « Brunechild », probably following the Eddius MS »).

Coming now to changes not involving metrical validity, we find some that certainly effect improvement in sense or grammar. E. g. at v. 14 the original reading, in *L*, was: dissepsit *uarios* eliso principe *lurcos*. But *lurco*, or *lurgo*, means 'glutton' (Ducange: Gluto, devorator), a sense little suited to the context: still worse, its accusative plural should be *lurcones*. *C corr.*, *P*, give *uarias... laruas*, which is much better, meaning 'devils' (Ducange: Larvae, Daemones aeri. Cf. Paulinus Nolanus, *Carm.* 5, 3, 5, *linguae laruas repellunt ultra mundi limites*).

At 471-2 St. Wilfred, in *L*'s version, *optima quaeque dedit libens exenia miris / deflorata modis*. *C corr.*, *P*, give *efflorata*, meaning 'in full bloom' (cf. A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A. D.*, 1949). Frithegod may have at first intended *deflorata* in the sense 'selected, chosen' (cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s. v. sense 2. i. q. *delibare, eligere, decerpere*: and, for a British Latin use of this sense, Baxter & Johnson. s. v.). Later he may have realised, or had his attention drawn by Archbishop

Odo to, an inappropriate alternative sense, 'destroyed, dishonoured' (*apud* Souter, and *Thesaurus*, s. v. 3). *Libens* does not scan. Is it perhaps a miswriting, in the antigraph of L and C, for *libans*?

At 1086-7 Wilfred withstands the slings and arrows of accusations: excipit horrissonas illeso *parmate* fundas, nec potuit ualidis penetrari pelta sagittis. So L. But, though his *pelta* was not penetrated by arrows, it was at least struck: so that one ought not to hear of a *parma illesum*. Further, *parmate* is not the right ablative for Greek *πάρμη* or Latin *parma*, neither of which is neuter. C *cr.*, P, have *pectore*, obviously an author's second thought on revision.

At 1186 *conquirenda* tamen *huiusce refragia* sectae, L, must mean « Yet the resistances of this sect are to be conquered ». The author must have realised that he was using *conquirere* in a non-literary sense (cf. Ducange: *Conquirere*, *Armis comparare*). His revision, found in C *cr.*, P, runs: « *conuincenda* tamen *huius praesumptio* sectae », « The presumption of this sect must be overcome », which is clearer and in better style.

Most of the non-metrical changes are minor, and can be listed baldly here:

2 ...*en mutilum* quo fert fiducia sensum? L. *insipidum*, CP.

60 *sueta comitate*, L. *Domino comitante*, CP, (cf. 57 for the sense).

116 *conubia*, L. *sponsalia*, CP.

151 *studio... inormi*, L (i. q. *enormi*). *acuto*, CP. *inormi* would be felt as vulgar, and perhaps unmetrical also.

158 *papae*, L. *Petri*, CP.

172 *sero*, L. *tarde*, CP.

172 *tria lustra peregit*, L. *tres mansitat annos*, CP.

199 *rennuit*, L. *restitit*, CP.

265 *menda*, L, in the sense of *mendosa*, changed to *uana*, CP. Compare 1066, where *menda* is changed to *dira*. At 1052 Frithegod uses the form *mendosus*, and presumably came to suspect the legitimacy of *mendus* and to devise alternatives for different contexts.

484 *neque enim*, L. *nec enim*, CP.

561 *instanter mente pererrat*, L. *instanti...*, CP, correcting a mere error.

865 pene, L. nempe, CP.

1023 memor esto, L. memorare, CP.

1031 Petri uectigal *alentes*, L.... *amantes*, CP, perhaps for euphony.

1034 ceu *decuīt*, L. ceu *docuīt*, CP : equally possible.

1085 *summi* stans igitur ducis inter castra perennis, L. *sanctus*, CP, makes the sense clearer and avoids two epithets with one noun, at awkward distances.

1105 refellit, L. repressit, CP.

1133 impensas *eleis* palmis fundebat apertis, L. *elegis*, CP, where C adds the *g* in the interline. *Elegus* meaning *Miser* is attested (Ducange, *sv.* : also *Elegia*, *Miseria*. Cf. *Elegius*, *Elegicus*). *Eleis* of L, C *prim.*, looks like a mere mistake of writing, and can hardly derive from Greek ἔλεος.

1134 ceu praecinuit *Dauitica* psaltes, L. *Dauitice*, CP, presumably as an adverb, « in David's style ». But for Frithegod the *psaltes* no doubt was David, not an anonymous lumped in under his name ; and this may be a case of mere miswriting in CP, not of author's revision. Or the miswriting may be in L.

1140 cercis C, an undoubted miswriting. *cerus*, L, worse error. *certis*, P, correct interpretation of C.

1141 aedituus, L, a Vulgate word. *aedilis*, CP, perhaps a rarer and more solemn word for Frithegod ; but probably rhythm suggested the change.

1149 sacra *archisteria* scandit, L. *consistoria*, CP.

Archisteria is used chiefly of monasteries (cf. Ducange, *s. v.* *Asceterium*, of which it is a confused variant), whereas *Consistoria* is more appropriate of the Papal hall of audience to which the context refers.

A few changes are more difficult to appreciate. E. g. at 217 ...*latae* penetrans *ginnasia* Romae, L, is amended to... *ydraulia*, CP. The gloss in C and P, *ydraulia* : *organa cum aqua canentia*, seems irrelevant to the seats of learning with which the context deals, convents or churches, in fact. At 138 *cliaulia* is used of such establishments, glossed by CP *famosum atrium*, with an obvious derivation from κλέος and αὐλή. Doubtless *ydraulia* at 217 means « halls with water », *i. e.* baptisteries, or former pagan *Thermae* converted for worship. *Ginnāsia* may be amend-

ed for metrical reasons, but its antepenultimate could, on Frithegod's system, be lengthened as being a transliteration of a proparoxytone word in Greek.

At 226-7 we find : dapsilis ast cunctis, dedans *ermenia* uitae, pauperibus largas praebebat sedulus escas. So L. But C *cr.*, P. have *epimonia*, glossed *fornesta*. *Epimonia* means monthly gifts (Ducange s. v. quotes the definition, *exenia quae dabantur per singulos menses... post novilunium*). *Ermenia* looks like a mere slip of the pen, since there is no relevance in a form of *Erminea* (ermine) or a derivative of *ἐρμηνεα*. It is a psychological, as much as a graphical, slip, because the writer's mind would be partly occupied with thoughts of glossing, or interpretation, which is *ἐρμηνεα*.

In the account of St. Wilfred's disputation with Colman about the reckoning of Easter there is a puzzling change at vv. 260-1 : docte quidem morem narrans depromsit auitum, utpote preteritae recolens coragia *zoe*. So L, of Colman's exposition of the Celtic Church's system of calculation. Tr. : — « Learnedly discoursing, indeed, he expounded the ancestral custom, rehearsing as he was the arrangements of the departed era ». Here *zoe* is interpreted as genitive, for *zoae*, from *zoa*, derived from Greek *ζωή*. It can mean *Aeon* (Tertullian *adv. Valentin.* 12). But Martianus Capella, iii, 291, has a rule, to which Emeritus Professor H. J. Rose kindly drew my attention : « nam quae E producta in nominatiuo finiuntur, cum Graeca sint generis feminini, ut Agaue Autonoe, Graecorum more sunt declinanda, ut nominatiuus, datiuus, uocatiuus et ablatiuus pares sint, genetiuus S, accusatiuus N finiatur ». On revising Frithegod perhaps noted that he ought to have written the genitive *zoes*, and then went on to consider that the meaning was not quite suitable to his general drift, because he was concerned to treat Colman's Celtic Quattuordeciman tradition as a heresy ; he therefore changed *zoe* to *sectae*, found in C *corr.*, P. (At 1186 *sectae* is glossed *heresis*).

On *coragia* Ducange refers to its use in this place as « non omnino certae notionis ». A connection may be suggested with *Choragium*, which, from meaning the bringing out of a chorus, came to mean any other special preparation (*Thesaurus*, s. v. 2. sensu latiore, i. q. *pompa, caerimonia*), and so could perhaps be ex-

tended to the computation of Easter and the accompanying observances.

Puzzling is the original reading in L and C *primitus* at 456 : non igitur coeptum dissoluit *dexia* uotum, where C *corr.*, P, give *inertia*. Ducange, s. v. suggests that it derives from δεξιά and means *Prosperitas*; but this involves, first, a misinterpretation of a Greek neuter plural as a feminine singular, and, second, a shift of meaning, to a meaning which, in any case, hardly suits the context. Campbell printed *dexia*, with the note : *uocabulum ignotum*. But in his paper, « Some Linguistic Features of Early Anglo-Latin Verse and Its Use of Classical Models », in *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1953, pp. 1-20, he discusses *dexia* interestingly (p. 17). « Is it simply 'the right hand', so that the sense is that what was on the right hand did not destroy the vow (nor of course what was on the left), for the saint turned neither to the right nor the left ? Professor Skutsch, however, would prefer to read *orexia* (by-form of *orexis*) ». See p. 98 note.

At 678 there is a curious change. The original, in L, had : infestos iussit remeare *sodales*, the *sodales* being agents coming with a treacherous proposal. The amended reading is *latrones*, C *cr.*, P. Ducange quotes Aponius (*lib. 2 in Cantica Canticorum*) : « malorum dogmatum inventores *Sodales* Christi Ecclesia appellavit, quia dulcia verba Sanctae Scripturae venenosis sensibus suis inficientes, diverso sapore lethali inter se variante, unius mortis aeternae convivium praeparant animarum ». Frithegod may have thought *sodales* in this sense non-Classical, and preferred the more straightforward *latrones*, which Ducange cites in the sense *Proditor*, traitor (year 1205). It also means *daemones eorumque ministri* (At. Ep. 306, 16. *Archivum* 12 (1938) 124).

At 1080 the original ran : expertus causas in sanctum *aptare sinistras*, L. In C *cr.*, P, this is changed to... *aptarier aspras*, for no very obvious reason. Frithegod affects archaic infinitives in — *ier*, e. g. 128 uescier, 174 scrutarier, 220 sternier, 1326 finirier. But *aptari* deponent is not found. Perhaps he felt that *aptare* active had the wrong meanings : Ducange cites it in the senses *Verberare* and *Curare*.

Among these thirty-three non-metrical changes, the bulk are clearly better than the original version preserved in L. Even if

two or three may be thought worse, is it not a common experience that authors sometimes, on revision, make changes for the worse ?

There remain a few changes that are hard to interpret at all : 160 *quique fidem* cernens, dextram praetendit, L. Here *quique* looks like an erroneous form for *cuique*. (Souter records *qui* for *cui*.) C *corr.*, P, have *quemque papa* cernens. Here *Papa*, meaning Pope, would not scan, and would hardly fit the context. Perhaps *papa* is for the exclamation *παπα*. Cf. 43, where the original scansion was : « est », aiunt, « pape,... », which was altered, *metri gratia*, to « est », dixere, « pape !... » Compare the amending of the scansion of the interjection *Ha! Ha!* at 86z.

A puzzling passage is at vv. 193-6. The Frankish queen Balhild (emended to Brunhild in C *cr.*, P) was persecuting the Saints, — *instabat laceris agios laniare creagris* (v. 187), — and condemned to death a certain Daluwinus (emended to Maluwinus). L's version, as punctuated by Campbell, runs thus :

193 quem *fera multatrix* lictoribus impietatis,
addixit saeuas mucronis pendere poenas.‡

195 hi mox arcessunt crudelia iura furentis
multiuolae Domini beluae quam iura *tueri*.

Translate : « Him then the wild persecutress assigned to the guardsmen of impiety to pay the savage penalties of the sword. They forthwith summon him to death, to observe the cruel laws of the Lord's raging penalty-wishing beast (rather) than laws ». It is stressed in 'Eddius Stephanus', prose Life of Bishop Wilfrid (ed. Colgrave, Cambridge, 1927, p. 14, c. vi) that the martyrdom was intended by God's providence. Eddius uses the epithet *malivola* of Balhild (v. l. Brunehild), but this does not scan in hexameters, whence, presumably, Frithegod's *multiuolae* (doubtless for *mulctiuolae*). *multiuolae... beluae* expresses the same ideas as *fera multatrix* (v. 193), the parts of speech being interchanged. She is « the Lord's penalty-wishing beast » because her action is in accordance with Divine providence, a point clear in Eddius, but less clear in Frithegod's metrical formulation of it. On the above interpretation *tueri* is an infinitive of purpose. *quam* is used without *magis* or *potius* (cf. Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1933, s. v. II, A, 20). But the main defects

of L's version are the possibilities of misapplying epithets to the nouns in the genitive.

In C *corr.*, P, there is no change in v. 195, but v. 196 runs : *malentes firi domini quam iura uereri*. I take *firi* as a Grecist synonym for *beluae*, which has a long *e* and would have to be scanned *belvae* or *beluāe*. *firi* could be formed from *θήρ*, or, as Professor H. J. Rose thinks, directly from the Aiolic form *φήρ*, (*Iliad* i, 268, *al.*). Translate : « They forthwith summon him to death, preferring to respect the cruel laws of the raging brute rather than the laws of the Lord ». One could, of course, still take *Domini* with *firi*, as it must be taken with *beluae*, making Eddius' point about Divine providence : on this view *iura* in v. 195 is, as it were, in inverted commas, contrasted with *iura* in v. 196, standing unqualified.

One has the impression in these corrections, not of a mere copyist's caprice, but of a renewed attempt, by the original mind creating the whole poem, to express some difficult material found in his source, Eddius. The whole aspect of the Cottonian manuscript, with fine vellum, gold chapter headings, large deliberate writing, and carefully executed erasures and substitutions, tells against the Campbell theory of scribal caprice. C may well be a fair copy of a copy commissioned by or for Archbishop Odo, and emended under Frithegod's personal supervision or by his own hand. One could entertain the view that Odo himself devised the changes, because his prefatory epistle shows Grecist tastes and erudition on the level of Frithegod's ; but my impression is that the changes display the same mentality or personality as the original draft found in L and C *primitus*.

In Eddius (cc. xxiv, xxxiv, xxxix) we read how Queen Iurmenburg, wife of Ecfrið, stole the reliquary from Wilfred's neck and hung it on her own person, « in thalamo suo manens, aut curru pergens », while the Saint languished in gaol. She took ill at Coldingham, being possessed by a devil, « nocte arrepta a daemone » ; the Abbess Aebba made a diagnosis and advised the return of the reliquary. Frithegod makes a « regia nutrix » address the stricken queen thus, in vv. 915-917 :

915 Excipis en dignas irato iudice penas.

capsaces collo dempsisti immunda uerendo :

917 nunc moribunda Baal uinciris et ipsa *ueruto*. So L. C *corr.*, P, change *ueruto* to *caueto*. L's version can be rendered : « You are receiving, Behold !, due penalties, your judge being angry. Unclean, you have taken necklaces from a reverend neck : now, dying, you yourself are bound by (or on) the *uerutum* of Baal ». *capsaces* is an erroneous plural from *καμψάκης*. *uerutum* most obviously means a spit (Ducange : *Verutum*, *Veru*, Gall. *Broche*. Baxter & Johnson, *uerutum*, spit, 1459). The notion of a sinner bound on the Devil's spit is not a bad one, and consistent with Frithegod's phrases at v. 908, *uindex ira subit*, *Satan per uiscera gannit*, and v. 913, *at tua terrifico quatuntur daemone membra*. Why then was it changed ? It occurred to me to wonder whether some one might have objected to Frithegod that *uerutum* meant 'worm', a sense found by Souter in a Lyons manuscript of Deuteronomy (28, 39) : this would be a formation from French *ver*, but it is doubtful if the form *ver* could have emerged by Frithegod's time, for my colleague Professor R. C. Johnston tells me that *ver* is first found in the twelfth century, while the etymological form *verm* persists.

From whatever motive, a change was made from *ueruto*, and we read now *caueto*. If this is imperative of *caueo*, and allowing for the indeclinability of *Baal* (cf. Souter s. v., p. 27), one might render the amended form of v. 917 : « Now, dying, you are bound by the Devil. Do you also beware ». This is a possible sense, but not obviously better than the original found in L. I have been inclined to consider the possibility of a third variant in the common antigraph of L and C *primitus* (assuming they were *gemelli*, or in the antigraph of C *prim.*, if it is a tenable view that L can wholly derive from C *prim.*). The supposed variant would be *cauato*, 'hollowed place', meaning Hell, cf. Frithegod's phrase at v. 315, *blasphemiae... praerupta cauernae*. The variant *ueruto* would spring from a mixture of the first syllable of *uerendo* in the line above, which caught the scribe's eye, with the final syllable of *cauato*, from which mixture the scribe formed *currente calamo* the common word *caueto*. Alternatively, *caueto* is copied from *cauato* smudgily amended from *ueruto*. Tr. : « You yourself are imprisoned in Satan's pit ». This change is a more pointed expression of Iurmenburg's getting her deserts.

The very small degree of miswriting in C and L is compatible with the view that C is a copy from Frithegod's holograph or a careful apograph of it, and that L derives either from the anti-graph of C in its original state or from C before it was completed and amended. Whether L can derive from C *ante rasuram* might be verified by examination of C under special lighting; on the data adduced by Campbell the possibility appears open.

Most difficult is the sentence at vv. 1116-1118, with two changes of text and a *crux pessima*:

1116 extorres *stauunt* (L, C *prim.*) *agio incassum palinodo*, L, C *prim.*

1117 quos sacer electis gradibus *formarat adelphos*, L, C *prim.*

1118 *dulsos coenosi lichinos audititidestos*. So all MSS, except that L has *audititi destos*, *separatim*.

The context is that a Court clique has bribed the Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury to support the royal council in depriving Wilfred of his monasteries and properties (cf. Eddius Stephanus, c. xxiv). With the correction of the mere miswriting *stauunt* to *statuunt* (C *cr.*, P), the verses can be translated: « They render exiled from the saint who vainly recanted those whom the holy man had formed as brothers in chosen grades, lamps sweetened by fellowship... *audititidestos* ». The *agio incassum palinodo* is St. Peter, to whom Wilfred dedicated Ripon (Eddius, c. xvii). The dative is presumably *Dativus incommodi*, an ablative of separation being more usual with *extorris*. In v. 1118 *dulsos* is perhaps past participle from *dulcesco*, found transitive in the sense 'make sweet' (Souter, s. v.). *lichinos* represents *λίχινος*, cf. 107, *lichino*, and Baxter & Johnson, s. v. *lichenus*, who report the form *lichinus* in 790 and c. 1123. *coenosi* could represent *κωώσει*, cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v. *κοίνωσις*, 'mingling', or 'sharing'. Alternatively, *coenosi* can be genitive, meaning '(lamps) of foulness', cf. Frithegod at v. 72, *caenosi... saecli*.

What now of *audititidestos*? One expects to find a noun or adjective, perhaps a Grecism, probably not more than one Grecism. As to the likely sense, in Eddius c. xlvii, Wilfred boasts that, with the Benedictine rule, he introduced into Northumbria proper choral performances. « Aut quomodo iuxta ritum primitivae ecclesiae assono vocis modulamine, binis adstantibus

choris, persultare responsoriis antiphonisque reciprocis instruerem » ? Tentatively, I interpret and slightly emend to *auditu et idestos*, (*i. q. ἡδίστους*): « and in hearing most sweet ». The lexicæ do not give anything corresponding to ἡδίστος, *s. vv.* (h)ed-, (h)id-, yd- ; but Frithegod has Grecisms that are peculiar. I hesitate to suggest *auditū idestos*, graphically an even easier explanation, because I do not find in Frithegod an example of the epic correption implied in such a reading. To arrive from *auditu et* at the manuscripts' *auditit*, one supposes the misinterpretation of *u* as *it*, which is very easy in the relevant type of writing, and then the haplographic omission of *et*, or the not uncommon neglect of an ampersand. Such a double error in copying could plausibly be supposed to happen once, but is much less likely to occur twice, which tells against the view that L and C *prim.* are *gemelli* unless the corruption stood already in their common antigraph: if it stood there, that antigraph can hardly have been in Frithegod's own hand, though it could have been a copy made under his general supervision from his own holograph. The same arguments apply to the miswriting *stauunt* in L and C *prim.*

So much for the *crux* line 1118. In vv. 1116 and 1117 there are changes, one of which is obviously explicable. For L's *agio incassum palinodo*, meaning St. Peter, we find in C *corr.*, and P *mensae incassum benedictae*, « (exiled) from the table vainly blessed ». Clearly, Frithegod recalled that not only the monks of Ripon, dedicated to Peter, were driven out, but also those of Hexham, which Wilfred had dedicated to St. Andrew, (Eddius, c. xxxii): therefore a more general phrase was required and he wrote « mensae... benedictae », no doubt with an allusion to St. Benedict, whose rule he introduced.

Why was *formarat adelphos* of L changed to *formauerat apte*, in C *cr.*, P ? Perhaps because he disliked the contracted form of the verb, or because he thought he had enough accusatives in v. 1118, or because, for once, he wanted to reduce the element of Grecism that William of Malmesbury later censured. Other relevant places are at 261, 447, perhaps 456, 1086, 1149, 1159, possibly 1164: at all of these, however, metrical or other grounds can be detected, so that a purge of Grecisms can hardly be made out.

For *auditidestos* a more elaborate Greek flight would be $\alpha\upsilon\delta\iota\delta\eta\tau\prime\ \xi\theta\prime\ \eta\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, « and still most sweet in voice ». But my more risky suggestions are put forward as much to provoke as to explain. *Si quid nouisti rectius istis, candidus imperti...*

The last passage involving a probable author's variant is at vv. 1163-6. St. Wilfred appeals to the Pope to confirm a previous decision about his archiepiscopal properties, which his rivals had disputed, with some support from the King and a faction at Court. Wilfred says :

1163 « nulla damus patriae, fateor, *discidia* nostrae. L. *contraria*, C. *cr.*, P.

1164 non reges, non tristatas, regumue clientes, So L.

1165 matris ad eximiae gremium concurrere gratis

1166 elegi, collata prius michi iura probare... »

Tr. : — « We cause no dissensions, I assert, to our fatherland. Not (to) kings, not (to) leading nobles, or (to) the subjects of kings, (but) to my glorious mother's bosom I have chosen to have recourse gratuitously, to confirm the rights previously conferred on me ». This is possible, but awkward, especially the having to anticipate with the accusatives in v. 1164 the *ad* found with *matris... gremium* in 1165. In C *corr.*, P, we find *discidia* of 1163 changed to *contraria*, for metre, as at 746 *discidia* was changed to *discrimina*. We also find new inflections at v. 1164, thus : non regi (C. regis, P), non reginae regumue clientis... Taking all these as datives, they can only depend, like *patriae*, on *damus* in v. 1163. Tr. : — « We cause no dissensions... to the king, to the queen, or to the subjects of kings » (where *clienta* means 'one who enjoys protection', cited by Souter from Ausonius, 183. 12). The view that v. 1164 should have datives and go with the preceding verse 1163, not with the following verse 1165, receives some support from the gist of two passages in Eddius Stephanus. At c. xxx Wilfred claims, in petitioning the Pope, « ...neque de pristina sede pulsus tumultuosus cuiquam apparui neque seditionis quaestionem succensi neque ambitiosus contentionibus obstiti, sed confestim huius sacrosanctae sedis appellavi subsidium ». In a later appeal (c. L) he uses the phrase : « ... ad hanc gloriosissimam sedem quasi ad matris gremium confugimus... » P probably errs in writing *regis*, genitive, on which basis *reginae* and

clientis would be taken as genitives also, and all three would be taken, along with *matris* in v. 1165, as possessive genitives with *gremium*. Then one would translate: « Not (to the bosom) of the king, nor (to that) of the queen, or (that) of the subject of kings, (but) to the bosom of my glorious mother... » The least awkward version is that of C, which is not the sort of variant a mere copyist produces; and probably it is acceptable, *ut in tali materia*. Frithegod is not a very good or clear poet. At the start, vv. 2-3, he speaks of his *mutilum* (emended to *insipidum*) *sensum ausibus infidis*. If he was not sure what he meant to write, an editor cannot be sure how to take his attempts, especially when the manuscripts conflict. But, with certain reservations on a dozen points, one must conclude that, of some eighty changes, half are metrical corrections and the other half are amendments of sense or grammar consistent with the personality of Frithegod and attributable to his own revision.

CONCLUSION

Campbell, misconceiving the value of L as against the substitute readings in C (and in P), has constituted a text inferior in metre, grammar, and sense to that offered by Mabillon, used by Ducange. Lexicographers have to deal with both sets of readings, those of L and the substitutes in C as corrected, because both derive from Frithegod at different stages. Campbell's service consists in giving completely the glosses of P, the starting-point of his own interest, and in supplying an apparatus of variants. Some of the glosses in C and P may derive from Frithegod, but this is by no means so demonstrable as the ascription to him of variants in the text itself.

II. INTERPRETATIONS OF GRECISMS

William of Malmesbury objected to Frithegod's addiction to Grecisms, admitting that he himself was baffled by some of them, as later students have been, including Ducange and Campbell. At v. 659, for instance, we find: *gentiles stupuere nimis, sed summa mekotes / regem cum ducibus placatos reddidit omnes*.

Ducange observes on *mekotes*: « Vox haud dubie a Graeco, efficta et corrupta, f(ortasse) a μῆχος, consilium; ita ut sensus sit: summo consilio, summa prudentia animos delinivit ». Campbell simply notes: *mekotes*: *vocabulum ignotum*. But it can be a mere transliteration of μηκότης, used by Galen for μῆκος, which can mean « greatness » in general (Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. vv.). Translate: — « his supreme Highness »... The Greek accent can lengthen the *o* of the penultimate syllable, and its lack shorten the *e* of the antepenultimate. The gloss found in C and P, *maculantes*, is typical of the ineptitude of many of the glosses, proving that by no means all can derive from the author, though some may.

A Classical allusion may be suspected at 1152, where the Saint is deploring the intestine conflicts of the English Church: *intestina pater postquam dirrachia planxit*... Campbell notes: *dirrachia*: *vocabulum ignotum, fortasse uias, Hebr. derek*. Now there seems to be no instance of Frithegod's drawing directly from Hebrew words not common in Greek or Latin forms in the Scriptures. But he knew something of Lucan (cf. at 289, 320, 362, 541, 694, 863, 897, 905, 992), including a reference (v. 905) to Lucan's sixth book, which deals with the struggles of Caesar and Pompey for Dyrrhachium. Accordingly he may use *dirrachia* in the sense of *proelia civilia, dissensiones*. The gloss *sacerdotalis principatus* is to be taken as genitive: « (the internal struggles) of the (English) hierarchy ».

Frithegod employs a strange nexus of Grecisms in apologising for his incapacity to express St. Wilfred's miraculous achievements, at vv. 1311-14, which Campbell prints thus:

1311 ennea si melico chelim michi carmine *tangam*,
 1312 septenasque iugem ciclico dulcore sorores,
 1313 aut sim magniloqui multus sectator Homeri,
 1314 non plane absoluiam...

Campbell makes no comment on how he takes this, but, presumably, one could render: « If I were to touch my lyre with enneamelic song, and join the sevenfold sisters in (or with) cyclic sweetness... ». But the manuscripts give us, not *tangam* (Campbell; Mabillon and Migne printed *tangant*), but *ptangan* C, *ptongan* P. And here we have a clue to the interpretation, because

«enneapthongon chelyn» is a Grecist phrase used by Martianus Capella, I, 66, meaning 'a lyre of nine notes'; and Frithegod alludes to Martianus Capella elsewhere (v. 1295 to 7, 729). I should therefore read :

1311 ennea si melico chelim michi carmine *ptongan*

1312 septenasque iugem ciclico dulcore sorores... and translate : « If I were to join my nine-voiced lyre with lyric song and the sevenfold sisters with cyclic sweetness... ». Strictly *ἐννεάφθογγος* is of two terminations, but the tmesis may have helped Frithegod in giving gender to its second element. For *melico... carmine* cf. Martianus Capella 9, 888, *melicum... carmen*.

On *ciclico* in v. 1312 Ducange remarks : « Per *Ennea* bene Mabilionus novem sorores (i. e. *the Muses*) intelligit et per *septenas sorores* septem artes liberales totidemque mechanicas : *Ciclicus* autem *dulcor*, Chorus dulcis omnium artium intelligendus ». I had rather doubted whether Frithegod has not interchanged the number of the Muses (nine) with the number of strings on a lyre (traditionally seven) ; but *cyclicus* has the sense 'encyclopaedic' in Martianus Capella 9, 998, as well as the meanings 'circular, spherical, recurrent' (Souter s. v.) ; while *dulcor* means 'pleasantness of speech' (*ibid.*, s. v.). Frithegod wants to say that he could not discharge his task even if he were to join all the resources of lyric poetry and encyclopaedic learning ; cf. Martianus Capella, *sub fin.* (9, 998) : (Satura) disciplinas cyclicas garrire agresti cruda finxit plasmate. Frithegod goes on, v. 1313, ... aut sim magniloqui *multus* sectator Homeri... On this Campbell has the odd note : *multus* : pro *mulctus*. But *multus* can mean *assiduus* (F. Arnaldi, *Lexicon Imperfectum*, Archivum xx (1950) 128, quoting a tenth century source, *Tabularium Ecclesiae S. Mariae in via Lata*, mai. 988, 20, 7).

There is a picturesque possibility of interpretation at 51-2 : hic membris etenim *compto glaucomate* firmis / aequuos habitu studuit superare uenusto.

The young Wilfred, « with strong limbs *compto glaucomate*, strove to surpass his contemporaries in comely demeanour ». Campbell notes : *glaucomate* : *significationem uocabuli ignorauit noster*. C and P have the gloss : *glaucoma superductio uel caligo pupillarum* (for which Campbell cites Papias). But besides mea-

ning 'white spot in the eye' (caused by thickening of the cornea), *glaucoma* can also mean 'darkening of the mind' (Souter s. v.); while *glaucus* means 'dark-grey' or 'sky-blue', and 'grey-eyed', as well as 'suffering from cataract or white spot' (Souter). Now Frithegod at 728 writes of *glaucci... Britanni*. I suggest that *compto glaucomate* means 'with elegant tattooing'. Frithegod uses the verb *comere* at v. 311. Baxter reports the word *Glaucitas* meaning 'bluish-grey colour' (A. D. 1266).

It is perhaps not 'prima facie' likely that an Angle of Wilfred's standing would be tattooed, like the «*populi bestiales Pictorum*» (to use Eddius' phrase, c. XIX). But when he was stripped for martyrdom at Lyons his physical appearance attracted attention. «*At vero cum sanctus Wilfrithus spoliatus et paratus ad palmam martyrii intrepidus staret, duces interrogaverunt, dicentes: 'Quis est iste iuvenis formosus, qui se praeparat ad mortem?' Dictumque est illis: 'Transmarinus de Anglorum gente ex Britannia'»* (c. VI). Perhaps mere beauty, unembellished with woad, prompted the dukes' curiosity.

In his paper to the Philological Society (*Transactions*, 1953, p. 18) Campbell ingeniously suggests that Frithegod may have meant *glaucoma* as equivalent to the first word of the gloss on it found in C and P, viz. *superductio*, to which he gave an etymological sense, 'covering, thing drawn over', i. e. 'dress'. «The sense of the passage then is that Wilfred with neat attire on sturdy limbs sought to surpass the other young men in dress».

It is perhaps worth noting that at v. 220 the adjective *glaucus* is applied to purple. King Alhfrid prostrated himself: *non puidit glauco telluri sternier ostro*. If *glaucoma* refers not to tattooing with woad but to dress, is it possible that Wilfred, whose family rank is represented as high, should have been conceived by Frithegod as having worn purple in his youth? Translate: ... «with elegant purple on strong limbs...».

At 1245 we read of: *archanus* Michahel, *nitido lampabilis ore*. On this Ducange quaintly comments: *pro Archangelus, licentia plusquam poetica, ut solet*. But *archanus* is used even by Classical writers for *sacrosanctus*, and also for *fidelissimus* (e. g. Hor. C. 3. 2. 27, *Cereris sacrum... arcanae*). A Briton might have known that the frontier police of Hadrian's Wall in the later Empire

were called *Arcani* (Ammian. Marc. xxviii, 3, 8, on which J. C. Rolfe, Loeb ed., III, 1939, p. 134, n. 2, suggests a connection with *Angarii*, cf. Greek *ἀγγαρος* (from Persian), in charge of the mounted courier service). In Eddius (c. lvi) the Archangel introduces himself, « Ego sum Michael summi Dei *nuntius* »... Apart from this specialised sense, perhaps relevant here, the *Thesaurus*, s. v. Arcanus, 2, gives appropriate general meanings : sanctus, mysticus, magicus.

At 559-560, *neue supercilio subrectis nisibus extra | iustitiae uerum diduci quibat oestrum*, C has no gloss, but P has the gloss : *templum*, on which Campbell remarks : *oestrum* = *asilus*, *asylum* = *templum* ; cf. 424 (where *asilo* is glossed *templo* CP (refugii add. P) ; Abauus as 1). But the Greek *οἶστρος* is quoted by Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v. II, 3, with the sense of 'religious zeal' in a papyrus of the sixth century A. D. Translate ; — « nor by pride, in (*or* from) his upright strivings, could (the hero's virtue) be led astray outside the true zeal for justice ». Souter s. v. quotes *subrectus* meaning (literally) 'straight up, erect, perpendicular', and a metaphorical sense may be allowed here. Lactantius Placidus, on Stat. *Theb.* 1. 32, has : *oestro* : *instinctu*, *stimulo*, *quem Romani asilum dicunt*, *Graeci oestrum*. Cf. Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* IV, 306 : *Oestrum* (-us ?) *furor Graeco vocabulo*.

At 1127, *figitur et notis uehemens lautomia harenis*, Campbell comments : *lautomia* : *significationem uocabuli ignorauit noster*. Ducange, s. v. quotes this passage for the sense, « *Species navis* ». But the clue to Frithegod's intention appears at 447, where he wrote *latomi* (as in L) and changed it, *metri gratia*, to *ministri*. Ducange and Souter quote *latomus* only in technical senses, as 'quarryman, stonemason' ; but Frithegod may have taken it to mean any humble labourer : whence *λατομία*, *lautomia*, would be transferred, according to his ideas, from a quarry and its workers to any labour-force, such as a ship's crew, as at 1127 here.

At vv. 448-451, in the rebuilding of the church, Campbell prints :

448 nec minus approperant *opicizi emblemata* proni,
 449 arcus incultos hialino claudere uelo.
 450 pondus et informes Athlantes ferre priores
 451 iussit, et expletum...

Campbell notes : *opicizi* : *uocabulum ignotum*. Ducange quotes the place, and remarks : Legendum forte *obrysi*, auri. But Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v. Ὀπικοί, provide a clue, citing ὀπικίζω in the sense of βαρβαρίζω (Lydus, *de mensibus*, I, 13, where a variant doubles the pi). They further cite ὀπικιστής, meaning *opicus*, from a Glossary.

Latin *Opicus* is well-attested in the sense of *barbarus* (Cato *apud* Plin. 29, 1, 7. Juv. 3, 207). Wilfred was apparently using native artisans for his mosaic pavements.

Still at v. 448, we find the gloss : *emblemata* : *prospiciones* ; to which P adds *uarietas pauimenti*. *Emblemata* meaning mosaics is found in Lucilius 85 Marx and Varro RR 3. 2. 4. The fact that the *Opicizi* are *proni* bears out that they are making mosaic pavements, not mosaics elsewhere, on roof or walls. The puzzling word *prospiciones* perhaps refers to perspective designs.

One should put a full stop after *proni* and a comma after *uelo*, for *claudere*, like *Athlantes ferre*, depends on *iussit*. « He ordered (them) to close with glassy cover the untended arches and that the shapeless former pillars should bear weight... ».

Campbell has the strange observation on the gloss *prospiciones* : « *pro* propositiones, i. e. *prothemata* : cf. 1390 ». When one turns to v. 1390, one reads, in the *Thesaurus Mundi* edition : *fistula rurestris cecinit prothemata cannis*, where Campbell has emended *canis* of the manuscripts to *cannis*. There is a gloss : *prothemata* : *propositiones*, on which Campbell notes : « i. e. *προβλήματα*, cf. Gloss. Graec.-Lat., Goetz ii, 416 ». But in Baxter's *Word-List* *prothema* is found meaning 'exordium, invocation' in the year 1267, a sense appropriate enough here ; and the Greek *πρόθεμα* means 'public notice' (L. S. J., s. v.) in Eunapius (iv/v A. D.), *Hist.* p. 231D. Frithegod can lengthen an epsilon bearing the Greek accent. Campbell's reference from 448 to 1390 is misleading ; and the gloss *propositiones* at 1390 can very well apply to *prothemata* in a slightly extended sense of that given by Baxter, for Ducange (s. v.) records *propositio* in the sense *Oratio gratulatoria*. Alternatively, as *thema* (from a sense of θέμα) can mean a 'theme, subject of discourse', so *prothema* can perhaps mean 'a theme proposed, a task enjoined' (by the Archbishop Odo).

Nor is Campbell's *cannis* for the manuscripts' *canis* necessary, for Ducange records *Canum* in the sense of *Album*, as a tablet for painting upon, and he finds *Cana* in ecclesiastical use for certain kinds of document (s. v. *Cana*, 2).

Translate 1390 : « My rustic pipe has sung its themes on (or to) these white sheets »...

At 865 Campbell prints : *extis iam condolomatis*, the reading of L, for which *condilomatis* appears in CP. The form with *condil-* reflects better the Greek origin with *κόνδυλος, κονδύλωμα*, cf. Ducange, s. *vv.* *condiloma, condilomaticus, condilus*.

At 1189-91 appears an unknown word, perhaps a Grecism : *nec Romana prius falsi pilotria testes | excedent, iustas donec pro crimine poenas / iure luant...* Ducange, s. v. suggests : *Legendum forte Palatia*. But he cites also a word *Pelotria*, glossed : *magna uel ingentia*. Clearly this comes from *πελώρια*, with epenthetic *t*. Now there is a Greek word *πυλώριον*, a porter's lodge, Pollux 1, 77, which could suit Frithegod's context at v. 1189 quite well, meaning a gateway with guardrooms, such as Rome had. *Pilotria* may be formed from *πυλώρια* under the influence of *atria* : for confusion of words in derivation consider *parochia*, from *παροικία* influenced by *πάροχος* ('provider'), (cf. C. Battisti, *Avviamento allo studio del latino volgare*, 1949, 119). Compare also Frithegod's *cliaulia* (138) and *ydraulia* (217). But *pilotria* might come from *πυλώρια* with epenthetic *t*, as *pelotria* from *πελώρια*. Why the epenthetic *t*? Could it be to aid differentiation of the liquids *l* and *r* occurring inside the same word, and perhaps liable to confusion in British mouths at one time?

The gloss in CP at v. 1189 is *coenum*, perhaps derived from the notion of *πηλός* as first element in *pilotria*.

III. INTERPRETATIONS OF LATIN USAGES

A few interpretations of Latin words are suggested by observations of Campbell. For instance, at v. 588, we read of a mason who had a bad fall during the building of a church : *cruscula gressutos non norunt soluere tractus*, on which Campbell notes : *fortasse gressuros leg(endum)*, a proposal already in Migne. But Ducange quotes *Gressutus, Pedester*, from Papias. *Tractus* has

many senses, fourteen in Ducange, among them that of 'conveyance' (Souter), 'transport, carriage' (Baxter & Johnson). *Soluere* means, *apud* Ducange, *finire, peragere*.

Translate : « His poor shanks know not how to perform their pedestrian transportations ». Eddius (c. xxiii) tells how his multiple fractures were healed : his name was Bothelm.

At 705 all three MSS give us « miles delecte », that is 'choice knight !', with which compare 600, delecto... milite caeso. There is no need for Campbell's *dilecte*.

At 794-5 Campbell prints : « an prauum gessi, regem dum forte remisi, | *in quid?* et opto pati gaudens pro nomine Christi ». *In quid* must be a mere scribal error for *inquit*, cf. 722, where C and L have *in quid*, but Campbell prints P's *inquit*.

At 700 King Dagobert refers to his former exile : « perditus, ut nostis », *inquit*, « popularibus *alis*,... », where P glosses : *uulgaribus suffragiis*. Campbell suggests : *fortasse auris legendum*.

Now the word *Allex* (Ducange, s. v.) has a form *Allux* and a form *Allus*, meaning a thumb. And Frithegod may have had the notion of the people voting with their thumbs at gladiatorial contests, cf. J. D. Duff and others on Juvenal 3, 36 : *munera nunc edunt et verso pollice vulgus | cum iubet, occidunt populariter*...

Read therefore *alis* or *allis*, and translate : « destroyed by the people's vote by show of thumbs... ».

Alternatively, an easy emendation would be *altis*, « on the popular surges », Dagobert going on with the metaphor of a ship springing leaks : *excepi mestas tenero olim somate rinas* (C cr., P.). Virgil uses *alta* of the deep seas, *Aen.* 7, 362.

It is not inconceivable that *alis* is from *ala*, 'wing', meaning 'military squadrons of the people', or even, metaphorically, 'the people's flightiness'. But none of these possibilities accords with the gloss in P, the writer of which was nearer to Frithegod's ways of thinking than we are, and may sometimes be right in his interpretation. If so, he supports the view that *Allus* can mean a thumb, as well as a big toe (cf. Paul. ex Fest. p. 7 Lindsay, s. v. *Allus*, *ibid.* p. 91, s. v. *Hallus*, and *Glossaria Latina*, IV, 101, where Lindsay emends by adding thus : *Allus pollex* <pedis>

scandens proximum digitum, quod velut insiluisse in alium videatur, quod Graece ἀλλεσθαι dicitur).

At 828-830 we hear of the rewards of the twelve Apostles' sufferings :

heroum duodenus apex patiendo beatas
sidereumque decus Iesu tribuente coronas
excepit, multum *modico* lucratur ab ipso.

Campbell suggests : *fortasse* modio *legendum*. But at 1044 he prints : nam *modicum* trita uiguit peruersius hidra. At both places *modicum* must mean *malum*, Evil. But I find no parallel for so extreme a pejorative development of *Modicus*, nor of such words as *Medius* and *Mediocris*. It may be a usage peculiar to Frithegod. Lewis & Short, s. v. *Modicus*, give the meanings : « ...middling, ordinary, mean, *bad* » ; but offer no example truly signifying 'bad'. Yet one can compare the extreme pejorative development of English *mean*.

At 1015-1017 we hear how the Pope ordered the ageing Wilfred to be restored to his monasteries :

... mox pastor scripsit Eous
sedibus abreptis reddi debere beatum
Christi mathiten post tanta pericula *sennem*...

Campbell notes : *uocabulum ignotum*. Ducange quotes the passage s. v. *Sennis*... Id est, ni fallor, *sanum*, incolumem, quod sequentia suadent. But what follows refers not to Wilfred but to the King Aldfrid, who is warned against the fate of Wilfred's persecutor Ekfrid.

Perhaps *sennem* is the spelling of a pronunciation of *segnem* (cf. Battisti, *op. cit.* 165, for the development of -gn- to -nn-, even in Classical Latin), and means 'wearied'. Souter quotes *segnesco* in the sense 'become slow' (Cael. Aur. *acut.* 2, 18, 110).

Alternatively, *sennem* may be the spelling of a pronunciation of *senem* in which the accent prolongs the syllable. Cf. the spelling of *senior* as *sennior*, in the Latin of Spain, recorded by Ducange.

Migne's suggestion that *sennem* is an erroneous Grecism, representing *σεννόν*, is worth mentioning.

While I have had to join issue with M^r Campbell both on the construction of his text and on several of his comments on points

of detail, I should like to pay tribute to his enterprise in regard to this interesting poem and to his frequent ingenuity in interpretation ; and to express the hope that he, or another, will before long re-issue the text with an ample commentary, in the preparation of which it may be suggested that a very thorough acquaintance with Martianus Capella would not come amiss, for he is probably one of Frithegod's linguistic progenitors in his hardly divine afflatus, and many of the Grecisms and other locutions in the *Breviloquium* could be illuminated from the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*.

University of St. Andrews.

DOUGLAS C. C. YOUNG.

ADDENDUM

Professor O. SKUTSCH, in a letter of May 29, 1955, asks me to withdraw his suggestion at v. 456, *orexia* for *dexia* (see p. 82 *supra*). It was made on the spur of the moment in discussion of Mr CAMPBELL'S paper at the Philological Society. Dr SKUTSCH writes: « Perhaps *dexia* is right. After all, the right hand makes a vow, so the breaking of it might be said to involve the right hand too ». He reports that Prof. F. WORMALD, who examined with him the manuscript C (Brit. Mus. Cotton Claud. A i), found Archbishop Odo's prefatory epistle to be written, in smaller writing and browner ink, by the same hand as that which wrote the original text of Frithegod's poem ; the ruling and rubrication are identical ; the poem begins on the verso of the epistle's end. They reached no conclusion about the hand that wrote in the variant readings over the erasures.

To Mr K. R. POTTER of Edinburgh I am indebted for the interpretation of vv. 122-3 at p. 74.

I have not had an opportunity to collate C or L, and base my remarks on CAMPBELL'S collations, which sometimes conflict with the obviously unreliable apparatus of J. RAINE'S edition (London, 1879). RAINE'S variants for L at 145, 230, 315, 354, 386, 427, 431, 494, 516, 557 crosshead, 566, 569, 597, 618, 628, 719, 725, 784, 840, 884, 1034, 1064, 1134, 1182, are compatible with L's being copied from C *prim*.
