

naturally it must be examined in the presence of a text of Giraldus's works. Maggioni's discussion in the introduction of the ways in which Giraldus has been used or corrected will be helpful in such a comparison.

As for the editing, I must say that I am pleased by the decision to reproduce the orthography of British Library, MS Additional 19513. In at least one case that I noted, this preserves an aspect of specifically insular Latin that might otherwise have disappeared. In the dedicatory epistle (section 9, p. 8), Maggioni reads for the standard *peculiariter*, *peculialiter*, an orthography which Latham notes in his *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List*, but which, as far as I can tell, does not occur in non-insular Medieval Latin. Likewise, I find very little to complain about in the treatment of the text. There are only a very few infelicities. At 5.12 (p. 18) a reference to Cicero does not merit a mention in the *apparatus fontium* (perhaps it is not traceable, but if so, this ought to have been mentioned). Likewise, at 5.56 (p. 26), Maggioni has put quotation marks around a phrase which is not given a source. The same occurs also at 30.1 (p. 80) and 37.7 (p. 94). At 19.8 (p. 54) a marginal heading (*mentiri*) has been misplaced into the text, with resultant incoherence. At 20.33 (p. 62) there seems to be a phrase missing (corresponding to "che trasformavano" in the Italian translation, p. 63). I am not entirely convinced by the conjecture *Partholomum* at 41.2 (p. 100), though I see why Maggioni has decided on this, but besides this the Italian translation reads "Partholomus." The only misprints I have found are at 45.1 (p. 110), where *de* has been reversed to read *ed*, and at 49.14 (p. 122), where I think *culpam* has been printed for *culpa*. There are also one or two in the notes, but they are unremarkable and easily corrected.

This handsome and well-edited volume should be added to the library of everyone interested in the history of Ireland and not merely that of medievalists. I say this because in the early modern period (of the Latin writing of which I know more) Giraldus became a major bone of contention. The further rewriting of his work (this time in elegant Ciceronian Latin) by Richard Stanihurst in his *De rebus in Hibernia gestis* of 1584, led to a torrent of debate in the seventeenth century from Irish scholars who resented the way in which he repeated the calumnies of Geraldus. One day, someone will perhaps write an account which includes all this material.

Keith Sidwell, University College Cork and University of Calgary

De Origine Scoticae Linguae (O'Mulconry's Glossary): An Early Irish Linguistic Tract, with a Related Glossary, Irsan, ed. Pádraic Moran. *Lexica Latina Medii Aevi* 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 2019. Pp. 592 (1 plate).

The previous edition of the *De Origine Scoticae Linguae* appeared well over a century ago – in 1898 – and to see a new edition of this important text, the origins of which lie in the seventh century, is momentous to say the least. Pádraic Moran's edition is well

grounded in the philological tradition and contains an extensive introduction (pp. 11–103) that discusses the origins of the text and its structure, the languages used in it, the relationship between the extant manuscripts, and his editorial policy. Extensive textual and linguistic notes (pp. 275–551) accompany each lemma of the *De Origine Scoticae Linguae* as well as each lemma of the related glossary *Irsan*, an edition of which is also included (pp. 249–71).

The text, which contains etymologies for ca. 880 words, is generally thought to contain two strata: an early stratum dating to the seventh century and a later stratum dating to the ninth century. It is better known under its alternative title *O'Mulconry's Glossary* (pp. 127–245), a name given to it by its first editor, Whitley Stokes, following a suggestion by Eugene O'Curry. The name O'Mulconry refers not to the supposed author of the text but to the learned family who was responsible for copying it into one of their manuscripts: the Ó Maelchonaire (pp. 13–14). The title *O'Mulconry's Glossary* has since been in widespread use, which is why Moran retains it throughout the book, despite the fact that the original title of the work fits its purpose and contents much better.

The original title, *On the Origins of the Irish Language*, should be seen in the context of early-medieval Irish linguistic thought, which teaches that, in the chaos that ensued after Babel, the Irish language was created out of “a mba ferr iarum do cach bérlu ⁊ a mba leithiu ⁊ a mba cáimiu” – “what was best of every language and what was widest and finest.”¹ To prove this point, the *De Origine Scoticae Linguae* traces the origins of Irish words through etymologies to the three sacred languages: Latin (28%), Greek (22%), and Hebrew (6%), and sometimes to a combination of these languages (30%) (pp. 39–43). Some lemmata even seem to have been considered ambiguously Irish/Hebrew or Irish/Greek by the author(s) (pp. 28, 40). As such, this text is “strongly programmatic” (p. 14) in its nature.

This strongly programmatic nature also comes to the fore in the prologue to the text, which lists among its sources “Greek writings” (“per litteras Graecorum”), a statement which, according to Moran, “is striking both for its vagueness with regard to authors and for the specificity of its evocation of Greek dialects” (p. 48). As it is generally accepted that Irish authors had only very limited access to information on Greek dialects, this statement is taken by Moran to have a largely symbolic value, which “claims a place for Irish linguistics” in the long Graeco-Roman linguistic tradition (p. 48). Other sources that are referred to in the prologue include Isidore of Seville, Priscian, and Charisius, as well as Cicero and Cassian, even though Moran has found no evidence for the use of the latter two authors (pp. 42–45, 48).

¹ Anders Ahlqvist, *The Early Irish Linguist: An Edition of the Canonical Part of the Auraicept Na nÉces with Introduction, Commentary, and Indices* (Helsinki, 1983), p. 48 (1.12).

Much of Moran's linguistic scholarship and notes relate to the Irish language, and great effort is made to allow the reader unfamiliar with it to follow the line of reasoning, which will make his book accessible to an interdisciplinary audience. For each argument, he takes into account all potential explanations and guides the reader towards the most logical one. The use of linguistic dating of Old Irish, for example, is explained step by step, including the methodological issues that accompany it (as in, for example, the discussion of the "mechanical updating" by one particular copyist, p. 66). Only the section of dating based on verbal morphology could perhaps have benefited from some further discussion, both for the initiated and the uninitiated, as some of the verbal forms listed as late seem to display only minor orthographical modernizations rather than late morphology (see for example *ad-ruille* as later a form of *ad-roilli* and *gonus* for *gonas*, p. 73). Moran's linguistic dating confirms the stark difference in date of composition between the two strata as proposed by Mac Neill in 1932:² the first stratum is dated by Moran to the seventh century, the second stratum to the late-ninth to early-tenth century (pp. 76–77).

The notes that accompany each entry provide very valuable linguistic and contextual insights. On several occasions, Moran's analyses provide improvements or additions for the *Dictionary of the Irish Language* (www.dil.ie), such as OM 65 in which the code-switched Latin word *sol* has been adopted into the dictionary as a ghostword (other examples include OM 42, 222, 294, 655). Sometimes, however, in notes where Moran provides the reader with conflicting arguments or ideas about an entry, it remains unclear where he himself stands (see, for example, OM 582 and 678).

Despite the strong focus on Irish, Moran never loses sight of the other languages involved in the text, all of which are extensively discussed in the linguistic notes. This inclusive approach does justice to the nature of *O'Mulconry's Glossary*, which is truly an exceptional work of medieval multilingual scholarship. Besides the three sacred languages used in the first stratum, the second stratum includes some references to Brittonic (p. 86) and Norse (p. 87). The explanations of the etymologies themselves may be composed in Latin, Irish, or a mixture of both. While one entry might present its etymology entirely through Latin (OM 2), the next may prefer Irish (OM 12), or may mix the two, as happens for example in OM 235 (p. 156), where we see a code-switch into Latin in the Irish clause starting on *ní•bí fer[r]*:

OM 235 *Cóem* .i. *comes* .i. *céomt[h]eichtaige rí*g .i. *ní•bí fer[r]* dond | *ríg quam illi, unde cáem dicitur*.

Cóem "dear, lovely, noble", i.e. [Lat.] *comes* "companion, attendant", i.e. *cóemthechtaide* "attendant" of a king; i.e. there is none better for the king than he, hence he is called *cáem*.

² Eoin Mac Neill, "De origine Scoticae linguae," *Ériu* 11 (1932), 112–29.

It seems oddly misleading, therefore, that the book is listed as containing only the languages English and Latin on the Brepols website.

In the light of the multilingual nature of the text, the editorial choice to expand silently “common suspensions” (p. 99) is slightly unfortunate in terms of code-switching research: well-known Latin abbreviations, such as the abbreviation for *quam*, often functioned as visual diamorphs. This means that they came to represent the equivalent word in other languages. Consequently, in a monolingual Irish context, the Latin abbreviation for *quam* may be expanded as the equivalent Irish word *indáas*. Due to this ambivalence, it is unclear in Moran’s edition whether the Latin *quam* that appears between Irish words in OM 257 is a code-switch into Latin or an expansion of an ambiguous abbreviation which could have been solved as *indáas* (similarly, *quam* in Irish syntax in OM 827, and at switch point in OM 253, 403; see also *quia* in Irish syntax in OM 75). Needless to say, however, this new edition of the text will prove to be an important source and perhaps also a new impetus for the study of medieval multilingualism.

It is heartening to see that, throughout the book, Moran never dismisses the etymologists, compilers, or copyists as fanciful or disorganized. This approach leads to several significant contributions, such as his conclusion that *O’Mulconry’s Glossary* was constructed largely according to a system of alphabetization not previously recognized. In this system, “a consonant intervening between an initial letter and a following vowel is not simply ignored, but sometimes determines the place of the entry” (p. 32); this conclusion leads to a better understanding of modernizations in the text and the process of stratification (pp. 30–32). Moran also points to correlates of this type of alphabetic sequencing in the Latin tradition and suggests that many more examples may come to light now that the system is better understood.

Additionally, Moran is able to demonstrate that each etymology follows a coherent structure of analysis (p. 36), which has to account for the formal and/or the semantic aspect of an etymology. This awareness of the underlying structure in the entries greatly aids the editing and translation process: even when an entry is obscure or problematic, examining them in the light of a coherent praxis helps to tease out some of its information (see, for example, OM 112–114). The compilers’ analytical linguistic approach is laid bare by Moran with regard to Hebrew words found in Jerome’s *Hebrew Names*. On the basis of analogy in entries such as “*dacon piscis tristitiae*” (*Hebrew Names* 32.7), the compilers correctly equated the Hebrew ending *-on* with Latin *tristitiae* (p. 86). This, of course, did not always work, as witnessed by OM 133 in which Hebrew *-tan* was incorrectly equated with the Latin diminutive suffix *-ulus*. Moran rightly states, however, that “a sure confirmation of this analytical approach is the evidence for its failure” (p. 86).

The text itself is well worth a read for its own qualities, with superb etymologies like OM 96 (second stratum), in which the etymology of “Astal” – “wood shaving,” is

explained as “assai-te a dul” – “going to it is easier,” because wood shavings functioned as a “gaí liubir” – “book spear,” or book marker. Or take OM 583, in which the Irish “forbortach” – “overbearing,” is further explained as “quia po[s]tulat superflu(ui)um” – “because he demands the unnecessary.” The vivid imagery of the expression found in OM 752, “is fén for mentae” – “it is a wagon on little birds,” neatly captures the meaning “mórchumus for becpersain” – “a great ability put on little people.” Particularly apt is OM 677, on the otherwise unknown headword “Guilgende,” which is glossed “.i. i merful dot ngníat” – “i.e. into confusion they put you,” as this can be said for some of the entries, which have become difficult to comprehend due to textual corruptions.

Importantly, however, Moran has embraced this uncertainty and sees this edition not as a finished project but as an ongoing enterprise. He invites the readers to contribute, as “[s]everal entries have several problems of interpretation outstanding, which I have not been able to resolve. I try at least to frame these problems clearly, in the hope that other readers will be able to make progress where I have not” (p. 103). Moran intends to make any corrections and additions sent to him available online with acknowledgements (p. 6). This inclusive and progressive approach ensures that the latest corrections and the newest insights will be easily accessible and will not have to wait for a reprint to see the light of day. Although the Brepols price of 230 Euros is quite steep, especially for students or early-career researchers, it is clear that this edition is a work of a high philological standard and an important contribution to the field of medieval studies.

Nike Stam, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

The Letter Collections of Nicholas of Clairvaux, ed. Lena Wahlgren-Smith. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2018. Pp. xcvi, 325.

Nicholas of Clairvaux is known mainly as the secretary of Bernard who was expelled from the Clairvaux Abbey after it was revealed that he had circulated unauthorised letters using the abbot’s seals. Upon dismissal in 1152, Nicholas returned to the Benedictine monastery in Montiéramey, where he had first entered monastic life. Evidence that Nicholas carried out his own correspondence and continued to write letters in the name of others can be found in Lena Wahlgren-Smith’s volume, the first-ever critical edition and translation of his letters. The collections are preceded by an introduction of just under one hundred pages, in which Wahlgren-Smith discusses the monk’s life and work along with the history of the collections and her editorial principles.

The first collection covers a brief period from shortly before Nicholas’s arrival in Clairvaux to his time as Bernard’s secretary (see Letters 14, 30, and 37), though most letters were written during his time in Clairvaux. It also contains numerous letters that