

VALERIA DI CLEMENTE

(Università degli studi di Catania, sede di Ragusa)

*A Note on the Glosses to the Zürcher Arzneibuch*¹

The text of the so-called Zürcher Arzneibuch, one of the earliest medicine books written in German (end of the 12th century), is completed by three interlinear (two German/German and one German/Latin) glosses. The first gloss presumably offers a common synonym for a rarer verb contained in the main text, the second one explains a portion of text otherwise not immediately understandable, due to two subsequent abbreviations, and the third one appears as a grammatical note to a word whose form could be ambiguous.

1. *Textual tradition of the so-called Arzenîbuoch Ypocratis*

The so-called *Arzenîbuoch Ypocratis*, one of the oldest medicine books in High German, derives its name from its attribution to Hippocrates in the text prologue ('here begins the medicine book of Hippocrates, which he wrote against all sort of illness'), but it brings together passages from Latin authors of Late Antiquity and medieval re-elaborations; parallel passages have also been identified in medieval Latin remedies such as those recorded in the manuscripts St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 44 and 217; Linz, Landesarchiv, Ms. Cc II 15 membr.; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cgm. 92; or Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Vindob. 2532². The earliest witness (c. 1150) is a fragment kept in the endleaves of the codex Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Misc. Hist. 146, containing a Rhine Franconian text with an Alemannic substrate³; a

¹ I express here my thanks to Denise Filmer (University of Catania / Durham University), who improved the English text, and to Dr. Andreas Nievergelt (University of Zurich), who gave me precious information and material on recently found German glosses. I also thank the anonymous reviewers of this essay for their useful criticisms and suggestions.

² See Keil (1967), (1978) and, for a more detailed source comparison, Wilhelm (1916: 137-153); on the text tradition and analysis of some words, see also Riecke (2004, Bd. I: 40, 493, 499-500).

³ The *Bamberger Arzneibuch* or *Bamberger Fragment* is described in Hellgardt (1988: no. 149), Leitschuh / Fischer (1897: 242-243), Priebisch (1915: 203-205), and published and studied in Priebisch (1915: 205-221), Wilhelm (1916: 244-253), and Stricker (2003), *passim*. It contains three fragments, which are probably the most ancient German medical texts, if we do not consider the so-called *Basler*

more recent version (probably end of the 12th century; certainly not earlier than the middle of the century)⁴ is to be found on fols. 44va-47rb of Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, Cod. C 58, and is known as *Zürcher Arzneibuch*⁵. Single remedies, going back to the same tradition, are preserved in late medieval medical works⁶.

2. The manuscript Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, C 58

The manuscript C 58, made in the second half of the 12th century, is formed by 185 paginated parchment folios of c. 29,2 x 19,4 cm; some quires and leaves are dispersed. The texts have been copied by a single scribe using a partly archaic, partly personal and modern spelling. The manuscript is a bilingual miscellany, containing both Latin and German texts. It is divided into two thematic sections: the first one is devoted to the *artes liberales* and *mechanicae* (fols. 1r-75r), the second one shows a series of religious writings (fols. 75r-185r), among them a number of sermons and a short prayer in German⁷. The miscellany might have been

Rezepte (8th century) and a series of glosses and vernacular terms recorded in earlier manuscripts. In particular, the *Bamberger Arzeneibuch* witnesses the first German translations of originally Latin medical texts (a fragment of the so-called *Capsula eburnea*, the *incipit* of the pseudo-Galenic *De dynamidiis*) and the first remedy book in German (the *Arzeneibuoch Ypocratis*).

⁴ The epitaphs of Peter Abelard († 1142) and the abbot Suger of St. Denis († 1151) on fol. 12r and 18r respectively show that the manuscript could not have been composed before the 1150s, but “nach Sprache und Schrift zu urtheilen, auch nicht viel später” (Pfeiffer 1863: 111).

⁵ On the genealogical relationship between the Bamberg and the Zurich witnesses, see Di Clemente (2007-2008). The Zurich text has been partially published by Graff (1827: 269-273); other editions are those by Pfeiffer (1863: 118-127 and glossary, does not print the final Latin section), Piper (1882: 466-477, diplomatic edition) and Wilhelm (1914: 53-64, critical edition), with commentary (Wilhelm 1916: 137-153); the text established by Wilhelm is available online at <<http://mhdwb-online.de/volltextanzeige.php?wbsigle=Ipocr&id=1&up=10&down=16#Ende>> [last accessed 15/5/2014]. Italian translation and text study by Di Clemente (2009: 151-186).

⁶ These single remedies are transmitted in Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cpg. 214, dating back to 1321 (*Speyrer Arzneibuch*, see <<http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpg214>> [last accessed 24/02/2014]), and on fol. 203r-216r of the manuscript Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, St. Georgen 73, dating back to the second half of the 15th century, see Miller / Zimmermann (2005: 103-106), Längin (1974: 26-28, 145-146), critical edition by Ott-Voigtländer (1979: 39-50, *passim*).

⁷ For manuscript descriptions, see Hellgardt (1988: no. 194), Mohlberg (1952: 31-33 no. 88), Schneider (1987: Bd. I, 62-63; II, Abb. 26), Steinmeyer / Sievers (1898-1992: Bd. IV, 673-677, no. 658), Werner (1905: 1-151, esp. 99, no. 230). Among the *artes* texts, excerpts of the *Periegesis* by Priscianus, of the so-called *Summarium Heinrici*, and of the Latin metrical herbal *Macer floridus de virtutibus herbarum*; there are also the mnemonic sequences called *Versus de bestiis* and *Versus de piscibus* and some poetry verses. The *Versus* are supplied with a number of German interlinear glosses

composed for personal use by a German cleric who possibly attended the Orléans and Paris schools (on the genesis and composition of the *florilegium*, which seems to follow the principle of analogy, see Tilliette 1995); the content points to a user with a high level of cultural knowledge. Scholars have hypothesized, on the basis of various evidences, that the manuscript might come from St. Gallen, Schaffhausen or the Constance area; see in particular Pfeiffer (1863: 5), Wackernagel (1876: 253), Werner (1905), Wilhelm (1916: 141)⁸.

The *Arzenîbuoch Ypocratis* is the result of a first translation made perhaps between the 11th and the 12th century, but the comparison between the *Zürcher Arzneibuch*, the Bamberg fragment, and the late medieval remedies, allows only the partial reconstruction of a common antecedent. The Zurich witness shows a prescription sequence where remedies are listed according to the *a capite ad calcem* ‘from head to ankle’ order (fols. 44ra-46ra, other remedies on 47ra), followed by an antidotary (fols. 46ra-47ra, instructions for different types of *electuaria*, *emplastra*, *unguenta* and a medical potion) and a series of Latin and German human and veterinary remedies (fol. 47ra-47rb, among them the Latin-German charm *Contra rehin*⁹ and the mostly Latin *Ad frasin*)¹⁰. This segmentation takes into account different sources in the composition of the *Arzneibuch*.

The language of the text is Upper German with Alemannic features, as shown for instance by the typical diminutive suffixes *-lī*, plural *-(i)ū* (*lagilli* ‘small barrel’, *vazzili* ‘small vat’, *huonl(i)u* ‘baby chickens’);

(description and bibliography in Bergmann / Stricker 2005: Bd. 4, 1895-1897, no. 1001; critical edition in Steinmeyer / Sievers 1898-1922: Bd. III, 35, no. DCCCCXXXIVB, Anmerkung 10; 45, no. DCCCCXXXIVDa; 90-111, no. DCCCXXXVIIIA, and Steinmeyer / Sievers 1898-1922: Bd. V, 46-47, no. MCLXXXIVb, and see also Piper 1882: 459, Werner 1905: 100, 200 and Voetz 1985: 124-126); for the *Summarium Heinrici*, see Steinmeyer / Sievers 1898-1922: Bd. III, 58-217, no. DCCCCXXXVII and especially Hildebrandt (1974: 170-207); for the poetry verses, Piper (1882: 477, no. 47). The German sermons and prayer are published in Wackernagel (1876: 3-32 and 216, nos. I-XIII and 75) and Wilhelm (1914: 64, no. XXI, *recte* XXVI; 1916: 153-154, no. XXVI).

⁸ In particular, Pfeiffer attributed the text to Schaffhausen on the basis of the Latin formula “Ego W., Schaphusensis aecclesiae professus, apello te A. in praesentiam domini apostolici in festo Lucae ewangelistae, quod proxime occurrit, de his et aliis obiciendis mihi responsurum”; Wilhelm took Constance into consideration for linguistic reasons.

⁹ The charm is often studied separately, as a text on its own, see Steinhoff (1980: coll. 10-11). Critical edition by Steinmeyer (1916: 372-373, no. LXVI.1); Italian translation, linguistic study and bibliography in Cianci (2004: 67-69). *Contra rehin*, as well as *Ad frasin*, is also published by Piper (1882) and Wilhelm (1914) in their edition of the *Zürcher Arzneibuch*.

¹⁰ Steinmeyer (1916: 384), Cianci (2004: 159-164, 283-284), Di Clemente (2009: 185-186).

single peculiar developments seem to suggest Bavarian influences, like the devoicing (by second consonant shift) of initial [b] (*pocches* < *bockes* ‘of a billy goat’), the Middle High German diphthong [ei] > [ai] < ai >, and the evolution of Middle High German [iu] rendered by the <ev> digraph (e.g. in *aiger* ‘eggs’, *zvai* ‘two’ (neuter), *gevz* ‘pour (imperative)’)¹¹.

3. *The glosses of the Zürcher Arzneibuch. An analysis*

The Zurich *Arzneibuch* also contains three (or four)¹² interlinear glosses¹³, traced in ink by the same hand that wrote the main text. They are regularly recorded in the diplomatic edition by Piper (1882: 466-476)¹⁴; Pfeiffer (1863: 118-127) records the first one in the critical apparatus, integrates the second one into the text and totally ignores the third one¹⁵, while Wilhelm (1914) indicates all three in his apparatus (the second one, represented by a syntagm of two words, is recorded in two subsequent footnotes)¹⁶.

The German glosses to the *Zürcher Arzneibuch* are not included in the collection of Steinmeyer and Sievers nor in the various *Addenda and Corrigenda* to it (Voetz 1985), nor are they present in the Old High German gloss vocabularies by Starck / Wells and Schützeichel. The manuscript description in Bergmann / Stricker (2005: Bd. 4, 1895-1897,

¹¹ Paul (2007: 101, 103).

¹² What I have here considered as being the second gloss, is in fact a syntagm of two words.

¹³ For a general introduction to German glosses, see Thoma (1958); the most recent and detailed work on this subject is Bergmann / Stricker (2009).

¹⁴ Cf. Piper (1882: 471, l. 1; 474, l. 41; 475, l. 12). The editor wrongly attributes the piece to the manuscript Zurich, Stadtbibliothek C 121/162 (now Zentralbibliothek, C 121). Piper’s transcription is faithful, but diverging in some aspects from the manuscript, due partly to the editor’s choices, partly to printing practices. In the diplomatic edition the first gloss has the same dimensions as the main text (it is smaller in the manuscript), the second and the third ones respect the smaller dimensions that are to be found in the manuscript. As far as the second gloss is concerned, Piper normalizes <v> of *vnze* as <u> and does not record the oblique lines put above *ii*; *zo* is placed right above *ii* (it is slightly displaced on the left in the manuscript).

¹⁵ Cf. Pfeiffer (1863: 122), footnote 31: “über daret steht schadit [...]” and *ibid.*: 126, prescription 30 (*Unguentum Jacobi calisticum*): “des oles, des man gemachôt üzer den lörberen, zwô unze gewic” (in the manuscript: *ii v. gewic*, *zo* being written above, between *lorberen* and *ii*, and *vnze* being written above *v.*).

¹⁶ Cf. Wilhelm (1914: 58), footnote 1: “.i. schadet übergeschr. [...]” (but *schadit* in the manuscript); 61, footnotes 3 and 4: “zo übergeschr.”, “vnze übergeschr. [...]”; 62, footnote 2: “ovvm übergeschr.”

no. 1001) does not mention them¹⁷. Apparently, they have not been the subject of specific studies so far.

The passages containing the glosses are printed here according to my own transcription. The graphs (vv), (l), (z) have been reproduced as <w>, <s> and <z>; underlinings and titles in red ink are rendered in black.

3.1. *daret* ~ · *i* · *schadit* ·

Ad difficultatem mingendis ·

Indē ōgwestin so nim des pocches lebere ·
v sulze sie vil wole . v gip dē div ha^snuinde
·i·schadit·

daret · tagiliche eine snitun · z ezenne ·
unze dv gesehest daz ez helfe . Ist ez ōch der
stein · ime wirt baz [...] ¹⁸

(fol. 45vb, l. 10-15; the gloss is positioned on l. 13)

In the prescription *Ad difficultatem mingendi* the verb *daret* ‘damages, afflicts, causes pain’, in the third person singular of indicative present, is explained by *schadit*, in the same grammatical form. The monolingual gloss (German to German) is an interlinear one, the *interpretamentum* being inserted above the interpreted *lemma*; it is traced between two middle dots and preceded by ·i·, an abbreviated form of the introduction equivalence formula *id est* ‘that is’.

Both verbs are already attested in Old High German: the weak verb *tarōn*, *tarēn* means ‘to damage, to hurt, to cheat, to cause discord’; in bilingual sources it renders Latin *decipere* ‘to catch, ensnare, entrap, beguile, elude, deceive, cheat’, *fraudare* ‘to cheat, beguile’, *illudere* ‘to mock, betray’, *impedire* ‘to hinder, prevent’, *laedere* ‘to injure, damage,

¹⁷ According to Bergmann / Stricker (2005: Bd. 4, 1895-1897, esp. 1896): “Insgesamt 296 Glossen. – Sachglossare in Merkversanordnung: 3 Interlinearglossen (f. 2va) zu den Versus de bestiis; je 10 Interlinearglossen (f. 44rb; wiederholt 57va) zu den Versus de piscibus. – Sachglossar: 273 im fortlaufenden Glossartext stehende Glossen (f. 47v-51v) zum Summarium Heinrici (A; IV, 1-11)”. Andreas Nievergelt, whom I asked for up-to-date details, informed me that “seit BstK (Bergmann/Stricker-Katalog) sind aus dem Codex Zürich, ZB Ms. C 58 keine neuen Glossen gemeldet worden” (e-mail communication of 12th May 2014).

¹⁸ Against strangury. In the month of August take a billy goat’s liver, cut it into small pieces and give a slice of it to the person suffering from strangury to eat, until you see it helps. If there is a gallstone, too, the ill person gets well [my translation].

violate, hurt, hit, annoy, importune, harass, offend, outrage, insult', *nocere* 'to to harm, inflict hurt, to do injury', *obesse* 'to be against, to harm/injure, hinder', *officere* 'to hinder, oppose, thwart, obstruct', *percellere* 'to knock down, destroy, annihilate/crush, spoil, hit, smite/strike, hurt etc.', *urere* 'to burn, set fire/set sb. afire, devastate, destroy by burning, to trouble, to harass etc.' and in the locution *den liden tarōn* = *vertere membra* 'to wrest/twist limbs'; the present participle *tarōnti* is used as a translation of Latin *sons* 'guilty, criminal'. *Tarōn*, *-ēn* is continued in the Middle High German weak verb *taren*, *tarn*, *daren* 'to damage, afflict, harm, hurt'; it dies out from the Early Modern German period onwards¹⁹. The verb form comes from Germanic **dar-* 'to damage', from an Indo-European root **dhō-* 'to sharpen'²⁰. The initial <d> attested in the *Zürcher Arzneibuch* could suggest a Central German origin, or a hypercorrectism, or a graphic oversight influenced by the occurrence of the same grapheme and sound in immediately adjacent words (e.g. *ha^snuinde*).

The Old High German weak verb *skadōn*, *skadēn* is attested in the meanings 'to damage, to do harm', and as a gloss to the Latin verb *calumniari* 'to machinate', *damnare* 'to condemn', *fraudare* 'to baffle, to betray', *laedere* 'to harm, to damage etc.', *malitiam parare* 'to betray', *manticulare* 'to act slyly', *molestus esse* 'to annoy', *nocere*, *obnoxius esse* 'to do harm'; it continues in Middle High German *schaden* 'to damage, to harm, hurt, cheat, betray' and Modern German *schaden* 'to damage'. It is a denominal verb, from Germanic **skapān* 'damage' < Indo-European **skēth-*, **skāth-* 'to damage'²¹.

Both verbs originally represent an action predicate, bearing a basic information about dividing, damaging, and are constructed with a dative

¹⁹ Cf. Köbler (1993), s.vv. *tarōn*, *tarēn*; Schützeichel (2004: IX) s.v. <*tarōn*>; Splett (1993: I.2) s.v. *tara*; Starck / Wells (1971-1984), s.vv. *tarēn*, *tarōn*; Lexer s.v. *tarn*; BMZ s.v. *tar*. The Old High German weak verbs (*gi*)*terien* > Middle High German *tern*, the derived verb *gitarōn* > Middle High German *getarn* 'to hurt, damage', bearing the dative of the person or thing damaged. Old High German has also a weak verb of first class *terien* (*firterien*, *giterien*, *mitterien*), Middle High German *ter(e)n*, *terigen*, with the same meaning; see also the Old High German strong feminine substantive *tara* 'damage, wound'. The Old High German weak verbs (*gi*)*terien* > Middle High German *tern*, and the derived verb *gitarōn* > Middle High German *getarn* 'to hurt, damage' bear the dative of the person or thing damaged.

²⁰ Pokorny (1959: I, 272).

²¹ Cf. Köbler (1993) s.vv. *skadōn*, *skadēn*; Schützeichel (2004, Bd. VIII) s.v. <*skadōn*>; Splett (1993, Bd. I.2) s.v. *skado*; Starck / Wells (1971-1984) s.vv. *skadēn*, *skadōn*; Lexer s.v. *schaden*; BMZ s.v. *schade*; DWB s.v. *schaden*. See also *Schaden* (noun), *schaden* (verb) in Kluge / Mitzka (1963), Kluge / Seebold (1995), Pfeifer (1993).

of the person, being, or thing suffering the damage; *tarōn*, *tarēn* can occasionally bear the accusative²². Both *tarn* and *schaden* are constructed in Middle High German with the dative of the person/thing suffering the damage; *tarn* bears the accusative in few cases²³.

The monolingual gloss *daret* ~ *schadit* may be explained as an attempt of suggesting a more common synonym of the verb *daren*, which was perhaps considered to be felt as older, rarer and, therefore, of not common usage.

It is impossible to establish whether in the *Zürcher Arzneibuch* *daren* bears accusative or dative case: the pronoun *dē* has a *linea nasalis* which could imply an abbreviation of <m> [m] as well as <n> [n]; the underlying form might then be a relative pronoun either in the masculine dative singular/plural (*dem*, *den*) or in the masculine accusative singular (*den*). The precise value of *dē* has to be verified: 1) it can be a relative pronoun with ellipsis of the introducing demonstrative pronoun, and in this case all three options are possible; 2) it takes on the double function of demonstrative pronoun (borne by the verb *geben*) in the main clause and of relative pronoun (borne by *daren*) in the secondary clause (*gip dem/den diu harnwinde daret*), and in this case the possibilities are reduced to a masculine dative singular or plural. The fact that *daren* is explained by *schaden*, which is only constructed with the dative of the person, and the prevalence of the dative also for *daren*, might favour the latter hypothesis²⁴.

3.2. *íí · v · ~ zo vnze*

Ungwētū iacobi calisticū · ist uil gōt
 ze allenden swerndeslibis ioch ze -
 allenden geswlstin · vñ ist harte gōt
 podagⁱcis · vñ ist gōt den de^s inzwissenden
 lidirn we ist . Svs sol man machvn diz
vngētū · Nī altes swinis smerwes enir

²² A late 9th century example is to be found in Otfried von Weißenburg's *Liber Evangeliorum*: *in einuigi er nan streuīta, ther richi sinaz darota* 'he submitted in a duel the one who damaged his kingdom' (IV. 12,62).

²³ Cf. *Lexers* s.v. *tar(e)n* and *BMZ* s.v. *tar*.

²⁴ On the syntax of the relative pronoun and clause in Middle High German, see Paul (1966: 254-255) and (2007: 370-371, 408-409).

vnze gewic · wahses zwō vnze . salces ·
zwō vnze · des oles des mangemachotvzir
zo//vnze

den lorberen · ii · v·gewic · Disiv tō zesamine
vnze zirt^p sie uile harte · vñ dems t^{sf}
si · den salbe dirnite [...]²⁵

(fol. 46va, l. 33-34 and 46vb, l. 1-9; the gloss is positioned on l. 7 of 46vb)

The second gloss appears in the prescription describing the preparation of the *unguentum Jacobi calisticum*. In correspondence to the syntagm *vzir den lorberen · ii· v·gewic*, *zo* is traced above the graphic sequence <*n · ii ·*>, while *vnze* is written above <*v – ge*>: both *interpretamenta* are separated by two oblique lines put above *ii*, going from left to right (/ /) and probably functioning as a disambiguating signal of the value of <*ii*> as numeral (two), not as the alphabet letter <*i*> written twice.

Zo ‘two’ (here in the feminine nominative? accusative?) translates the Roman number *ii* inserted in the text, while *vnze* (a strong feminine substantive, singular? plural?) ‘ounce(s)’ explains the abbreviation *v.. Vnz(e)* ‘ounce’ comes from Old High German *unza* (-ō- strong feminine), attested in glosses from the 8th century onwards as a rendering of Latin *uncia*, from which the German term derives as a loanword; only once *unza* glosses *siclus*, a coin type or solid weight unit used by Jews²⁶. In the Roman measurement system *uncia* could indicate a solid weight unit corresponding to a little less than 30 grams, a bronze coin type or a linear measurement unit.

In Middle High German *unz*, *unze* a feminine strong/weak substantive, may indicate both a weight unit of c. 30 grams and, occasionally, a linear measurement²⁷; the word is continued by Modern German *Unze*, feminine substantive, where it indicates a coin type, a solid weight unit or a linear measurement (up to Early Modern German) or a liquid (15th to 19th

²⁵ Jacobus’s emollient salve is really good against all body ulcers and all kinds of tumours, and is very good for those whose limbs ache. This salve has to be prepared as follows: take an ounce of seasoned pig fat, two ounces of salt, two ounces of laurel oil. Mix all this together and grind it in a proper way, and the person who needs it must salve himself/herself with it [my translation].

²⁶ Köbler (1993), s.vv. *unza*, *zwēne*; Schützeichel (2004: X and XI) s.vv. <*unza*>, <*zwēne*>; Splett (1993: I.2), s.v. *zwēne* (1.3.); Starck / Wells (1971-1984), s.vv. *unza* and *zwēne*.

²⁷ Lexer and BMZ s.vv. *unz*, *unze*.

century), a time space (only in the 18th century), from the 15th century onwards, a “small quantity”, and the twelfth part of an inheritance²⁸.

The *-e* ending of *vnze* might suggest a feminine nominative/accusative? singular?plural? (associated or not associated to the preceding *zo*? Morphologically inflected or not inflected in accordance to the main text logical sequence?).

Palaeographically, the <e> in *vnze* is prolonged by the means of a vertical line, down to the letter <g> of *gewic* ‘weight’, which is positioned just below *vnze* in the main text; this minimal graphic solution can be considered as an expedient by the scribe/glossator to visually highlight the relationship between *vnze* and *gewic*.

The gloss, explaining a portion of text which otherwise could not be immediately understandable due to abbreviations in sequence, allows us to correctly interpret: “take a quantity corresponding to two ounces (*nim ... zo vnze gewic*)...”.

3.3. *daz eie ~ ovvm* ·

ovvm ·

Cōt^a m̄b^anū ochi · Nī daz eie daz andē heili
gen zewihennahten geleit werde · v
brenne ez zepulu^{se} · v rîp daz pulu^s · v
rit ez durch ein tōch · v leg in nidir · v ·
saig im īdaz ōge · So daz fel von d^s sehvn
come · so tō daz puluer mit einer spene -
-lun hōbet · an daz fel daz ez die sehvn
niet en rōre [...] ²⁹

(fol. 47ra, l. 12-19; the gloss is positioned on l. 12)

The third gloss appears in the prescription *Contra membranum oculi*, where, in correspondence to the main text passage *nim daz eie*, *ovvm* is written above · *eie* ·, with a high dot on the right, at the end of the gloss.

²⁸ DWB s.v. *unze* (1).

²⁹ Against the cataract. Take an egg that has been laid on the holy Christmas day, burn it until it is pulverised, sieve the powder and put it on a cloth; then, make the ill person lie down and put him/her the powder into the eye. If there is a case of cataract, then put the powder on the film covering the eye, but use a pinhead, so that the eyeball is not damaged [my translation].

It is an interlinear gloss with an unexpected appearance, a common German substantive being interpreted by means of its Latin equivalent.

Using a Latin *interpretamentum* in vernacular texts might be justified by the need to explain an unclear form or syntagm, or to disambiguate a polysemic lexeme, should the resources of German not be sufficient or adequate to achieve the goal: this type of practice presupposes that both the glossator and the reader know (the reader also passively understands) the *interpretamentum* language³⁰.

In this case, it seems that misunderstandings cannot arise: the part of the text that is the focus of our interest is clear, there are no ink stains nor other damage, the writing is flawless, words are accurately separated, the syntactic sequence does not show mistakes. The only plausible explanation to this gloss is the appearance of the word *daz eie* ‘the egg’, here in an accusative singular case: the word is a strong neuter substantive, whose normal form in the singular of direct cases is *ei*³¹; *eie* represents rather a dative singular, showing the regular ending *-e* of strong masculine and neuter substantive class³². At this level, the *interpretamentum* might provide disambiguating information about the lexical meaning and the grammatical case to be attributed to *eie*: i.e., *eie* corresponds to Latin accusative singular *ovum*. There is no objective necessity to make it clear because the function of *eie* results very clearly from the context (even the determinative article is in the accusative case)³³. This allows us to hypothesize that 1) the *Zürcher Arzneibuch*, or almost a part of it, could

³⁰ An example of such practice can be the contextual gloss occurring in the herbal Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Vindob. 1118, fol. 80v-81v: *Citewar st'chet den magen ün u'tribet daz ait'h . i . uenenū* ‘zedearium reinforces the stomach and expels the *aiter*, that is the *uenenum*’ (my transcription, following the manuscript). The High German word *aiter* ‘poison, pus’ is explained by Latin *uenenum* and this may be due to the fact that *aiter*, written in a very unclear way, is per se polysemic and can refer to two different causes or symptoms of alteration of the health condition.

³¹ See Karg-Gasterstädt (1968-, Bd. III) s.v. *ei*, Köbler (1993) s.v. *ei*, Schützeichel (2004, Bd. II) s.v. <*ei*>, Splett (1993, Bd. I.1) s.v. *ei*, Starck-Wells (1971-1984) s.v. *ei*, BMZ and Lexer s.v. *ei*.

³² *eie* in the direct cases of the singular seems not to be a mistake, but rather a secondary form. I found at least an example of it in the Middle High German *Bartholomäus*: *dū solt nemen ein eigerschäl unde leges in einen starchen ezich, unz si sô waich werde sam daz aie in der henne ist* ‘you must take an eggshell and put it into strong vinegar, until it becomes as soft as the egg itself when it is in the hen’ (cf. Pfeiffer 1863: 141), and in the *Deutsches Salernitanisches Arzneibuch*: *da uon wirt ein blater als ein eie* ‘a pustule as big as an egg will grow from it’ (Külz / Külz-Trosse 1908: 31).

³³ The same form of accusative singular *eie* occurs in a preceding prescription of the *Zürcher Arzneibuch*, although it is not highlighted in any way: *Ni daz eie daz an dem dunstage gelege wrde* ‘take an egg that has been laid on a Thursday’ (fol. 45vb, l. 27-28).

have been taken from an antecedent showing the form *eie* in more than a passage; 2) this form might have appeared to be not exactly wrong (in this case it might have been expunged or amended in some way) but at least formally ambiguous to the glossator, so that in the Zurich manuscript, and at least on one occasion (see footnote 33), it is explained by the Latin word *ovvum*; the latter represents thus a formally lexical gloss, but also provides an explanation of logical-grammatical type.

4. *Who wrote the glosses and when*

Since they are all by the same hand that copied the main text, we are not able to establish whether the glosses were copied from an antecedent, whether they are all from the C 58 scribe, or if they were generated on different moments of the text transmission. The comparison with the rest of the tradition is not helpful (no corresponding glosses are attested in the *Bamberger Arzneibuch* and the late medieval remedies). If all or few among the *interpretamenta* are from the C 58 scribe, they could have been inserted immediately after writing down the glossed *loci*, or, more probably, they could have been added on a subsequent re-reading/revision of the text. The evidence identifies, however, the scribe and/or glossator as someone who possessed linguistic and textual sensitivity, having a good knowledge of the lexical and morphological structures of Latin.

5. *Spelling and phonetics of the glosses*

In *schadit* the initial sound [ʃ], evolution of the Old High German sequence [s] + [k], is rendered by the trigraph <sch>; in the ending syllable the grapheme <i> is used to indicate a vowel in unstressed syllable (<Old High German [e:], [o:], *skadēn*, *skadōn*)³⁴. Both spelling practices are common also in the main text³⁵.

Zo < *zwo* 'two' feminine nominative? accusative? plural, has <o> as rendering of the sequence ([v]) + [o:], while *vnze* has <v> for [u]; <v> as

³⁴ The unstressed vowel is rendered as <e> in *daret*, *vnze*.

³⁵ The spelling <sch> prevails in the main text, but in more than one case we can have the older digraph <sc>: *gescribin*, *mennislichem*, *scoz*, *scozwurze* etc.

an allograph of <u> in initial position of a word is very frequent in Middle High German manuscripts and often used in the *Zürcher Arzneibuch*.

Owm shows <w> written as two adjacent <v>'s, almost one on another, as a rendering of the medieval Latin phonetic sequence [v] + [u]³⁶. <w> = [v] + [u] is also used for the German words of the main text (*schellewrz* = *schellewurz*, *wndirliche* = *wunderliche* etc.).

6. Final remarks

The glosses that are to be found in the so-called *Zürcher Arzneibuch* (two German to German and one German to Latin gloss) show three different functions:

- 1) the first one probably offers a *lectio facilior* compared to its *lemma*;
- 2) the second one disambiguates a part of the text rich in abbreviations;
- 3) the third one represents the grammatical explanation of a minority variant.

There is no sure evidence about the identity of the gloss author nor the time when the glosses were added to the main text. The scribe and/or glossator, however, can be viewed as someone who possessed linguistic and textual sensitivity, with a good knowledge of the lexical and morphological structures of Latin.

Valeria Di Clemente
Università degli studi di Catania, sede di Ragusa
Ex convento di Santa Teresa
Via Orfanotrofio, 49
97100 Ragusa Ibla
e-mail: valeria.diclemente@unict.it

³⁶ Norberg (1980), <http://www.orbilat.com/Languages/Latin_Medieval/Dag_Norberg/01.html#A%20BRIEF%20HISTORY%20OF%20MEDIEVAL%20LATIN> [last accessed 8/6/2014].

References

Manuscript: Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, Cod. C 58, fols. 44va-47rb.

Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (hg.), redigiert von Otto Prinz unter der Mitarbeit von Johannes Schneider, 1967-, *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, München, Beck.

Benecke, Georg Friedrich / Müller, Wilhelm / Zarncke, Friedrich, 1990, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 4 Halbbde. und alphabetischer Index, Stuttgart (reprint of the 1834-1854 edition); electronic version <<http://woerterbuchnetz.de/BMZ/>> [last accessed 12.5.2014].

Bergmann, Rolf / Stricker, Stefanie (bearb.), unter Mitarbeit von Yvonne Goldammer und Claudia Wich-Reif, 2005, *Katalog der althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Glossenhandschriften*, 6 Bde., Berlin / New York, de Gruyter.

Bergmann, Rolf / Stricker, Stefanie (hg.), 2009, *Die althochdeutsche und altsächsische Glossographie*, 2 Bde., Berlin / New York, de Gruyter.

BMZ: see Benecke, Georg Friedrich

Cianci, Eleonora, 2004, *Incantesimi e benedizioni nella letteratura tedesca medievale*, Göttingen, Kümmerle.

Codex Palatinus Germanicus 214, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, digitised version <<http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpg214>> [last accessed 24/02/2014].

Di Clemente, Valeria, 2006, "Patologie e medicinali nello *Zürcher Arzneibuch*". *Linguistica e filologia* 22: 19-53.

Di Clemente, Valeria, 2007-2008, "Appunti sulla tradizione dell'Arzneibuch Ypocratis: *Bamberger Arzneibuch* e *Zürcher Arzneibuch* a confronto". *Quaderni della sezione di glottologia e linguistica del dipartimento di Studi Medievali e Moderni dell'Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti XIX-XX, 2007-2008* [2009]: 15-38.

Di Clemente, Valeria, 2009, *Testi medico-farmaceutici tedeschi nell'XI e XII secolo*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Du Fresne Du Cange, Charles, 1884, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, Niort, Favre.

DWB: see Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm

Erdmann, Oskar (hg.), 1973, *Otfrids Evangelienbuch*, sechste Auflage besorgt von Ludwig Wolff, Tübingen, Niemeyer; electronic version <<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/germ/ahd/otfrid/otfri.htm>> [last accessed 22/02/2014].

- Graff, Eberhard G., 1827, *Diutiska. Denkmäler deutscher Sprache und Literatur*, Bd. 2, Stuttgart und Tübingen, Cottaschen Buchhandlung: 269-273.
- Graff, Eberhard G., 1963, *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz oder Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 6 Bde., Hildesheim, Olms (reprint of the edition Berlin, Beim Verfasser und in Commission der Nikolaischen Buchhandlung, 1834-1846).
- Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm, 1854-1971, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 32 Bde. und Registerband, Leipzig, Hirzel; electronic version <<http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/>> [last accessed 24/02/2014].
- Hellgardt, Ernst, 1988, "Die deutschsprachigen Handschriften im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert. Bestand und Charakteristik im chronologischen Aufriß". In: Honemann, Volker / Palmer, Nigel F. (hg.), *Deutsche Handschriften 1100-1400. Oxforder Kolloquium 1986*, Tübingen, Niemeyer: 35-81.
- Hildebrandt, Reiner, 1974, *Summarium Heinrici*. Bd. 1: *Textkritische Ausgabe der ersten Fassung*, Berlin / New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Karg-Gasterstädt, Elisabeth / Frings, Theodor, 1968-, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, auf Grund der von Elias von Steinmeyer hinterlassenen Sammlungen im Auftrag der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Bd. 3: E-F, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.
- Keil, Gundolf, 1967, "Arzenibuooh, Ipocratis". In: Keil, Gundolf / Schmitt, Werner, "Nachträge zum Verfasserlexikon". *Studia Neophilologica* 39: 81-3.
- Keil, Gundolf, 1978, "Arzenibuooh Ipocratis". In: Ruh, Kurt *et al.* (hg.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, Berlin / New York, de Gruyter, Bd. I, col. 505.
- Kluge, Friedrich, 1963, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 19. Auflage bearbeitet von Walther Mitzka Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Kluge, Friedrich, 1995, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23. Auflage bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Köbler, Gerhard, 1993, *Wörterbuch des althochdeutschen Sprachschatzes*, Paderborn *et al.*, Schöningh.
- Külz, C. / Külz-Trosse, E. (hg.), 1908, *Das Breslauer Arzneibuch. R 291 der Stadtbibliothek*, I. Teil: Text, Dresden, Friedrich Marschner.
- Längin, Theodor, 1974, *Deutsche Handschriften-Neudruck mit bibliographischer Nachtrag. Die Handschriften der Badischen Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe, Beil. 2,2*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 26-28, 145-46.
- Leitschuh, Friedrich / Fischer, Hans, 1897, *Katalog der Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg*, Bamberg. Bd. I.2,2: Historische Handschriften (Msc. Hist.): 241-243.

- Lewis, Charlton T. / Short, Charles, *A Latin Dictionary*, electronic version <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059>> [last accessed 12/5/2014].
- Lexer, Matthias, 1874-1878, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, 3 Bde., Leipzig, Hirzel; electronic version <<http://woerterbuchnetz.de/Lexer/>> [last accessed 12/5/2014].
- Miller, Matthias / Zimmermann, Karin (bearb.), 2005, *Die Codices Palatini germanici in der Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg (Cod. Pal. Germ. 182-303)*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Mohlberg, Leo Cunibert, 1952, *Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich. I: Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften*, Zürich: 31-33, no. 88.
- Nievergelt, Andreas, 2013, “Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen (2013)”. *Sprachwissenschaft* 38/4: 383-425.
- Norberg, Dag, 1980, *Manuel pratique de latin médiéval*, Paris, Picard (English translation by R.H. Johnson), <http://www.orbilat.com/Languages/Latin_Medieval/Dag_Norberg/index.html> [last accessed 8/6/2014].
- Ott-Voigtländer, Ulrike, 1979, *Das St. Georgener Rezeptar. Ein alemannisches Arzneibuch des 14. Jahrhunderts aus dem Karlsruher Kodex St. Georgen 73*, Pattensen, Wellm.
- Paul, Hermann, 1966, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 19. Auflage bearbeitet von Walther Mitzka, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Paul, Hermann, 2007, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 25. Auflage neu bearbeitet von Thomas Klein, Hans-Joachim Solms, Klaus-Peter Wegera, mit einer Syntax von Ingeborg Schöbler neu bearbeitet und erweitert von Heinz-Peter Prell, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Pfeifer, Wolfgang, 1993, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*, 2. Auflage durchgesehen und erweitert von Wolfgang Pfeifer, 2 Bde., Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.
- Pfeiffer, Franz, 1863, “Zwei deutsche Arzneibücher aus dem XII. und XIII. Jahrhundert”. *Wiener Sitzungsberichte - Philosophisch-historische Classe* 41/ Heft II: 118-127 (*Zürcher Arzneibuch*), 127-162 (*Bartholomäus*) and 163-200 (glossary).
- Piper, Paul, 1882, “Aus Sanct Galler Handschriften III”. *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* XIII: 459-477.
- Pokorny, Julius, 1959, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2. Bde., Bern, Francke.
- Pribsch, Robert, 1915, “Deutsche Prosafragmente des XII. Jahrhunderts. I.

- Bruchstücke des sog. Züricher Arzneibuchs vermischt mit anderen medicinischen Traktaten". *The Modern Language Review* 10/2: 203-217.
- Riecke, Jörg, 2004, *Die Frühgeschichte der mittelalterlichen medizinischen Fachsprache im Deutschen*, 2 Bde., Berlin / New York, de Gruyter.
- Schneider, Karin, 1987, *Gotische Schriften in deutscher Sprache. I: vom späten XII Jahrhundert bis zum 1300*. I: Textband, II: Tafelband, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Schützeichel, Rudolf, 2004, *Althochdeutscher und altsächsischer Glossenwortschatz*, bearbeitet unter Mitwirkung von zahlreichen Wissenschaftlern des Inlandes und des Auslandes, Bde. I-XII, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Splett, Jochen, 1993, *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Bde. I.1, I.2, II, Berlin / New York, de Gruyter.
- Starck, Taylor / Wells, John C., 1971-1984, *Altdeutsches Glossenwörterbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Steinhoff, Hans-Hugo, 1980, "Contra rehin". In: Ruh, Kurt *et al.* (hg.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, Bd. II, Berlin / New York, de Gruyter: coll. 10-11.
- von Steinmeyer, Elias / Sievers, Eduard, 1898-1922, *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, V Bde., Berlin, Weidmann.
- von Steinmeyer, Elias, 1916, *Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin, Weidmann.
- Stricker, Stefanie, 2003, "Latein und Deutsch in der Rezeptüberlieferung". In: Bergmann, Rolf (hg.), *Volkssprachig-lateinische Mischtexte und Textensembles in der althochdeutschen, altsächsischen und altenglischen Überlieferung. Mediävistisches Kolloquium des Zentrum für Mittelalterstudium der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg am 16. und 17. November 2001*, Heidelberg, Winter: 97-129.
- Thoma, Herbert, 1958, "Glossen, althochdeutsche". In: Kohlschmidt, Werner / Mohr, Wolfgang (hg.), *Realllexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin, de Gruyter, Bd. I: 579-589.
- Tilliette, Jean-Yves, 1995, "Le sens et la composition du florilège de Zurich (Zentralbibliothek ms.C 58). Hypothèses et propositions". In: Stotz, Peter (hg.), unter Mitarbeit von Michele Camillo Ferrari, *Non recedet memoria eius. Beiträge zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters im Gedenken an Jakob Werner (1861-1944)*. Akten der wissenschaftlichen Tagung vom 9./10. September 1994 am Mittellateinischen Seminar der Universität Zürich, Bern *et al.*, Lang: 147-167.
- Voetz, Lothar, 1985, "Vergessene Glossen einer Züricher Handschrift [BV Nr. 1001]". In: Schützeichel, Rudolf (hg.), *Addenda und Corrigenda zu den ahd. Glossensammlung (II)*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 124-126.

Wackernagel, Wilhelm, 1876, *Altdeutsche Predigten*, Basel, Schweighauserische Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Werner, Jakob, 1905, *Über zwei Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich. Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Aarau, Sauerländer.

Wilhelm, Friedrich, 1914-1916, *Denkmäler deutscher Prosa des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts*, München, Callwey, Bd. A: 53-64 (text); B: 137-53 (commentary).

