

(84) **J** ₁ fleſtv̄m londv̄m setia menn a bækr annat tveggia þann froðleik er þar innan landz ₂ hefir giorz çða þann annan ₃ er minnisamligaztr bikkir þo at annars stða[r haf] helldr ₄ giorz çða log sin setia menn a bækr hvert þioð a fina tyngv[.] Enn af því at tvngvra[ar] ₅ erv [v]likar hvert annarri. þær þegar er ór ænni ok hinni sœmv tvngv hafa gengiðz çða græinz þa ₆ þarf vlika stafí i at hafa enn ægi ena sœmv alla i òlvm: Sem ægi rita gríkkir latinv stofvm ₇ girzkvna ok ægi latinv menn girzkvm stofvm latinv ne enn h[e]lldr [e]breskir menn ebreskvna hvar- ₈, kl girzkvm stofvm ne latinv helldr ritar sínvm stofvm hverr þioð fina tv[n]gv.

Hverega ₉ tvngv er maðr [kal ri[t]a annarrar tvngv stofvm þa verðr

84:1. The initial J was never written.

84:1. londv̄m: the second letter of this word, though somewhat resembling an a, is probably an o.

84:1. setia: the scribe seems first to have written m̄n (for menn), which is the immediately following word; that is, the scribe inadvertently started by skipping the verb. He then changed the first two minims of the m and the n to et and a, respectively, leaving the third minim of the m to represent an i; finally, an f was added at the beginning.

84:2. haf: because of a hole in the vellum this word, as well as the final r of stða[r], has entirely disappeared; of the preceding ða (in stða[r]) only the bottom curves are left, and of the following h (in helldr) only the lower half.

84:3. tvngv.: the dot that follows tvngv in the ms. is clearly a later addition, viz., by the same hand (no doubt that of Jón Ólafsson frá Grinnaylki) that wrote the numerous marginal notes (e.g., p. 85, l. 19: um næskvedna radd'stali) and inserted commas in many places (e.g., 84:1 after bækt; 84:2 after giorz, 84:3 after bækr); the brownish color of the ink shows this beyond doubt.

84:3. því: the lower half of the þ has disappeared, because of a hole in the vellum, and the v and i are slightly damaged.

84:3. tvngvra[ar]: the final superscript r (for ar) has disappeared, because of a hole in the vellum, which has also damaged the preceding m̄n; the tv at the beginning are damaged, and so is the preceding a, by the larger hole in l. 2 (see note).

84:4. vlika: because of a hole in the vellum the v has disappeared almost completely; only a very uncertain trace of its lower part is visible. Another hole, between ll. 4 and 5, has slightly damaged the ka, as well as the lik of vlika in l. 5.

84:4. þær þegar er . . .: as pointed out by Dahlerup-F. Jónsson, this is an unusual word order. But it is questionable whether, as they suggest, this phrase should be taken as the equivalent of þegar er þær . . ., i.e., with the relative particle er referring to þegar, and translated 'as soon as they . . .' Instead, the antecedent of the relative particle should be taken to be þær, while þegar is an independent adverb, 'already, previously.'

84:5. enn ægi ena sœmv alla i òlvm: that is, some of the letters, but not all, may be the same in all languages.

[INTRODUCTION]

(84:1) In most countries men record in books either the (historical) lore (relating to events) that have come to pass in that country, or any other (lore) that seems most memorable, even though it (relates to events that) have taken place elsewhere, or men commit their laws to writing, each nation in its own tongue. But because languages differ from each other—which previously parted or branched off from one and the same tongue—(84:5) different letters are needed in each, and not the same in all, just as the Greeks do not write Greek with Latin letters, and Latinists (do) not (write) Latin with Greek letters, nor (do) the Hebrews (write) Hebrew with Greek or Latin letters, but each nation writes its language with letters of its own.

Whatever language one intends to write with the letters of another,

84:6. . . . helldr ebreskir menn ebreskvna . . .: because of three holes in the vellum, the e of helldr has disappeared while the l is damaged; the first e of ebreskir has disappeared and the b is damaged; and the t of ebreskvna is damaged.

84:7. tvngv: the n has disappeared because of a hole in the vellum.

84:7-9. The sentence Hverega tvngv . . ., as it is transmitted in the manuscript, is non-sensical; first there is the question of letters that 'will be lacking' (. . . þa verðr sœmvra stafir vant . . .), but the motivation for this has to do with 'surplus letters' (. . . stafurnir . . . þer er af ganga). After vant, a short passage must have been omitted in copying. Modern editors, not aware of this, have either translated accurately, thus preserving the incoherent text (Dahlerup-F. Jónsson: "... til at mangle nágile bogstaver, fordi den tyd, som de over tilage bogstaver har, ikke findes i sproget!"), or they have rendered the latter half (especially the phrase ganga af) inaccurately, thus obtaining a fairly coherent general meaning (Sv. Egilsson 1852: "... sonus, literis quæ désint proprius, . . ."; Neckel-Niedner: "... da vermischt man gewisse Buchstaben, nämlich die Bezeichnungen von Lauten, welche der Sprache, die das Alphabet ließert, abgehen"; Haugen: "... the sounds of the missing letters . . ."). In the original, the sentence must have run approximately as follows, in translation: 'Whatever language one intends to write with the letters of another language, some letters will be lacking [because each language has sounds that are not to be found in the other language; and likewise some letters are superfluous] because the sound of the surplus letters does not exist in the language.' The copyist, skipping the part enclosed in square brackets, from the first to the second 'because,' made a mistake of a kind which is far from being uncommon. The precise wording of the missing passage is impossible to determine; the reading suggested in the text is, of course, only one of several possibilities. See J. Helgason 1954 pp. 26-27; see also H. Benediktsson 1961 p. 242 n. 10, where a slightly different reading is proposed (in translation).

84:8-10. rita . . . òlvm: because of holes in the vellum, the t of rita has practically disappeared, and the l and a are damaged; the last a of annarrar is damaged; the second

svíra stafa vant [af þi at hverr tvnga hefir hlíoð þav er ægi finnaz í annarri. [va ganga ok svímir stafir af] af þi at æig[i] ¹, finnz þat hlíoð i tvngvni[i] sem stafirnir hafa heir er af ganga. Enn þo rita enskir menn enkv¹⁰ na latinu stófum óllum þeim er retræðir verða i enkvnum. en þar er heir ynnaz ægi til þa hafa ¹¹, heir við aðra stafi sva marga ok þesskonar sem þarf en hina taka heir or er ægi eru ¹² reit ræðir i malí þeira.

Ny eptir þeira daennum allz ver erum ænnar tvngv þo at gjorð hafi miók ¹³ onnvr tveggja þó nækkvað bááðar til þess at hægra verði at rita ok leifa sem nu tibíz ok ¹⁴, a þessv landi þeidi lög ok áttvísí þó þyðingar helgar þó sva þav hin spaklegv fræði er ¹⁵ ari Þorgils son hefir a þekr sett af skýnsamlegv viti þa hefir ek ok ritað off íslendingum ¹⁶ staf rof þeidi latinu stófum óllum þeim er mer þotti gegna til varf mals vel sva at reit ¹⁷ ræðir mætti verða ok þeim óðrvum er mer þotti i þvífa at vera en or vary teknir heir er ægi ¹⁸, gegná atkvæðum værrar tvngv. Or eru teknir farnhlioðendr nokkvir or latinu staf- ¹⁹ rofí enn nokkvrit i gjorsir raddar stafir e[rv] qngvir or teknir enn i gjorsir mióg margir þviat værr ²⁰ tvnga hefir flesta alla hlíoðs þó raddar.

a: of stafa has almost disappeared; the second i of ægi has disappeared; the final i (according to Dahlerup-F. Jónsson) of tvngvni has disappeared, while the preceding i is damaged; and the superscript stroke for m in óllum has practically disappeared.

84:11. sem þarf: the scribe first wrote latinu stófum, then crossed these words out and also put dots under the letters (for deletion), writing þó þarf above. It is of course not inconceivable that the original error had something to do with the occurrence of the phrase latinu (tðóv in 84:10; thus, for instance, if the phrases latinu stófum and þó þarf stood at the beginning of two lines in his exemplar (probably, then, with an interval of one line), the copyist may inadvertently have begun with a wrong line.

84:12-13. þo at gjorð hafi miók onnvr tveggja ...: this passage causes some difficulty; its meaning, in the present context, must be: 'even though one of the two tongues has changed greatly ...' but the phrase gjoraz + adv. is otherwise unknown in this sense. Rask therefore proposed an emendation of gjorð to greinz, but this would imply a copying error that is not readily to be accounted for, nor would the use of the verb greinaz here agree very well, in syntactic construction or lexical meaning, with its occurrence in 84:4. Dahlerup-F. Jónsson hesitatingly suggest the inserting of onnvr after miók (onnvr being left out by mistake in copying because of the immediately following onnvr), thus assuming the phrase gjoraz miók annar: 'to become very different.'

84:13. ny tibíz: 'is now customary' (so also Haugen; cf. Heusler 1937 p. 159: 'kommt in Brauch'); rather than 'is now common' (Dahlerup-F. Jónsson: 'nu er almindeligt'); cf. also Holtsmark 1936 p. 82).

language, some letters will be lacking [because each language has sounds that are not to be found in the other language; and likewise some letters are superfluous] because the sound of the surplus letters does not exist in the language. Thus, Englishmen write English (84:10) with all those Latin letters that can be rightly pronounced in English, but where these do not suffice, they apply other letters, as many and of such a kind as are needed; but they put aside those that cannot be rightly pronounced in their language.

Now, following their example—since we are of one tongue (with them), even though one of the two (tongues) has changed greatly, or both somewhat—in order that it may become easier to write and read, as is now customary in this country as well, both the laws and genealogies, or interpretations of sacred writings, or also that sagacious (historical) lore that (84:15) Ari Þorgilsson has recorded in books with such reasonable understanding—I have composed an alphabet for us Icelanders as well, both of all those Latin letters that seemed to me to fit our language well—(viz.,) in such a way that they could retain their proper pronunciation—and of those others that seemed to me to be needed in (the alphabet), but those were left out that do not suit the sounds of our language. A few consonants are left out of the Latin alphabet, and some put in; no vowels are left out, but a good many put in, because our (84:20) language has almost all sonants or vowels.

84:14. hin: the scribe first wrote hm (i.e., honvum), but then erased the superscript stroke.

84:16-17. sva at reit ræðir mætti verða: the subjunctive (mætti) of the svá at-clause implies that this clause is an explanatory insertion, describing the criterion on which the author's preceding judgment is based; that is, in order to fit the new language, each letter must be able to retain its proper pronunciation; otherwise, it is 'left out.'

84:17. en: the scribe first wrote er, but then corrected this to en.

84:18. Or: x corrected from c.

84:19. ervi ms. til (emend. Rask): the scribe no doubt took the preceding words enn nokkvir i gjorsir raddar stafir ('but a few vowels put in') as belonging together, and therefore continued: enn qngvir or teknir 'but none left out.'

84:20. flesta alla: the scribe seems first to have written flestar allar, but then erased the two r's.

84:20. flesta alla hlíoðs þó raddar (i.e., stafi, not to be inserted, but rather to be understood from the preceding raddar stafir, 84:19): the only possible translation of this phrase is 'almost all vowels.' But this seems to imply the notion—which is hard to bring into line with the author's views elsewhere—of a fixed, universal number of 'vowel letters.'

Nv af þi at Samhlioðendr megv ekkí I_{21} maál ęða atkveði giora minir við sík æðgi sva at þeir megi nafni hafa án raddar stafí. Enn I_{22} að raddar stafnum aðinum sier hverivm ma kveða sem hann heitir ok að honum kveðr í I_{23} hveriv maali ok þeir bera sva tign af Samhlioðondym sem almætti af half mætti. þa he I_{24} sí ek af því fyrí setta þa bæði í staf rofí ok i vnræðv her nv:

Við þa hlíoð stafi. v. I_{25} er æðr vorv i latniv staf rofi. a e i o u. þa hefí ek við giðra þessa stafi fiora er I_{26} her erv ritnir nv. q e ø y. Q hefir lykkiv af æ en bringinn af oe þviat hann er af þeira hlío- I_{27} ði tveggja saman blandinn kveðinn minnr opnvm. mvnni enn a. en meir enn o. E er ritinn I_{28} með lykkiv af enn með ollum vexti ef sem hann er af þeim tveim samfelldr minnr opnvm mny- I_{29} ní en a en meir enn e. Ø hann er af hlíoði ef ok of selldr saman minnr opnvm mvnni kve- I_{30} ðinn en e ok meir enn o. Enda ritinn af því með kvísti e[] ok með osens hríng. Y er af I_{31} roddv if ok us gort at ænni roddv kveðinn minnr opnvm mvnni enn i ok meir enn u. ok [kal I_{32} af því ena fyrí kvísl

out of which each language makes use, as an accidental property, of a certain set. Some modern editors, therefore, have assumed the meaning to be "a great many vowels," thus rendering the phrase flessta alla inaccurately (Sv. Egilsson 1852: "plurima... soni vel vocis elementa"; Haugen: "the greatest number of vowel sounds"); Dahlerup-F. Jónasson and Neckel-Niedner, on the other hand, use the above-mentioned more accurate, but at the same time more problematic, translation ("nästen alle sonanter eller ykaler"; "beinahe alle (möglichen) Vokale oder Selbstlauter").

84:22. Jern hann heitir: written twice, but crossed out the second time, probably by a later hand.

84:23. þeir: i.e., the vowels.

84:25. i: ms. i; u: ms. v.

84:28. af: ms. áf.

84:29. a: ms. á. This spelling, as well as the spelling áf in 84:28, may well be genuine in the sense that the name of the letter a was á, with the long vowel, at this time. However, if this is so, these spellings are probably not the scribe's own, but are rather taken over from his exemplar, for, in the Codex Wormianus, the regular use of the superscript accent mark is limited to the letter i and the ligature aa (and the digraph aa), and such sporadic cases as råða 85:2 or fér 85:19 are therefore also likely to be carried over from the exemplar. On the other hand, these spellings, at least á, are unlikely to derive from the original of the treatise, since the author identified the vowel in this position (the word-final position in monosyllables) with the short and not with the long vowel (see §§2.2.2g above). Therefore, this spelling may be an indication of an intermediate link in the ms. tradition of the treatise (see §2.1 above).

84:30. e: ms. y (emend. Rask).

Now since the consonants can make no (piece of) discourse or pronounceable sequence alone by themselves—not even so (much) that they can have a name without a vowel (in it)—while each vowel can be pronounced alone, just as it is named and (just as) it is pronounced in each (piece of) discourse, and (since) they thus outrank the consonants as the almighty (outranks) the halfmighty, I have placed them first both in the alphabet and in the present discussion.

[THE VOWELS]

To the five vowels (84:25) that were in the Latin alphabet originally, a, e, i, o, u, I have added these four letters that are written here; q, e, ø, y. Q has the loop from a and the circle from o, because it is a blending of the sounds of these two, pronounced with the mouth less open than a, but more than o. E is written with the loop of a, but with the full shape of e, just as it is composed of the two, with the mouth less open than a, but more than e. Ø is composed of the sounds of e and o, pronounced with the mouth less open (84:30) than e, but more than o, and therefore in fact written with the cross-bar of e and the circle of o. Y is made into a single sound from the sounds of i and u, pronounced with the mouth less open than i and more than u, and therefore its

84:30. cf.: ms. er. The scribe, usually changing ef (pres. of vesa or rel. part.) to er, inadvertently made the same change in this case. A later hand (see note to 84:3) has then underlined er and written ss above the line.

84:31. us: ms. vs; i: ms. i; u: ms. v.

84:31-32. ok [kal af] því ena fyrí kvísl af hófði [staf] ve sem aðr er þeim i staf rofí. Skipt: the text is obviously corrupt, but no fully satisfactory emendation has been proposed. Dahlerup-F. Jónasson suggested that after hófði staf ve a short passage had been left out in copying, consisting of two parts: (a) a continuation of the preceding sentence: oc alar um hófðistaffi; the whole sentence should then be translated, approximately, and [it] shall therefore [have] the first branch of capital V [and the full shape of capital J]; (b) an account of the order in which the vowels shall be placed in the alphabet, approximately as follows, in translation: 'Each of my new vowels I place after that of the old ones to which it bears greatest resemblance; besides, the old ones are arranged in the same way as they were formerly placed in the alphabet.'

Holtsmark 1936 pp. 10-21 raised two objections to this emendation. First, the resulting type of y would not be the earliest so-called y₁, with the left-hand stroke as the main stave and with divergent shanks, but rather the somewhat younger y₄, with the right-hand stroke as the main stave and with the right shank turned in (to the left); see H. Benediktsson 1965

[með öllvin vexi hófvð staff] if rita ok þar við hafa ena. [síðarri kvísl] af hófvð staff ue [...] sem aðr er þeim i staf rofi skipat.

Nv ma. | (85) verða at því at nokkurr svari [va ek ma fyll vel leſa danská tvngv þo að la. |, tñv stofvn re[tt]tvm se ritað ma ek þo at likindym ráða hvé kveða [kal þo að æigi se allir |, stafir reit ráðer |, því er ek leſ ræki ek æigi hvart þv ritr q þitt eða a [q] eða e [eða] u. |

pp. 24 and 50. Second, with this emendation, the order in which the two strokes of *y* are described would not be the same as the order in which the author proposed to write them: this would be contrary to the descriptive principle which the author, in Holtsmark's opinion, follows, and therefore the capital *I* must have been mentioned first. Holtsmark therefore proposed the following emendation: ok [kal af því ena fyrir kvísl [vera] af hófvð staff] [i ok ena. síðarri kvísl af hófvð staff] ve 'and therefore the first branch shall [be] from capital [I] and the second branch from capital] V'; the copyist inadvertently skipped the part between the two occurrences of hófvð staff.

The second point, which is concerned with the order in which the strokes were actually written, is of little value, as it is formulated; see §4.2.2 above. Nevertheless, it is likely that the stroke considered to derive from *i* was mentioned before the stroke deriving from *u*. For, in the passages dealing with the three vowels, *o*, *e*, and *u*, the two letters from which each vowel is derived are mentioned in the same order in the description of their shape as of their pronunciation (*a*—*o*, *a*—*e*, *c*—*o*), and for *y* the order is *i*—*u*.

As regards the first point, Haugen 1950 p. 46 thinks that since *y₂* occurs in a manuscript from about 1187, and only two or three manuscripts can be dated much earlier, an argument based on the chronological difference between *y₁* and *y₂* is bound to remain weak. However, the indication is that the author knew two types of *y*: on the one hand, the *y* which was part of the Latin alphabet proper, but which he wanted to dispense with in Icelandic (89.2 and 89.6–11); this was most probably *y₁*; and on the other hand, the *y* which he proposes to introduce into the Icelandic alphabet, but which, it can hardly be doubted, had been used before; this was, very likely, *y₂*; see §3.5.3.3 above. Therefore, any argument that can be based upon the assumption that it is *y₁*, and not *y₂*, that is being described is of some value. A more serious objection, which touches at the core of the argument, is voiced by Haugen, when he says (*ibid.*) that "it seems questionable whether the FG meant to describe the exact relationship of the strokes in the letter by his description"; that is, since the author's main concern was to establish a graphic, as well as a phonetic, relationship between *y* and *i*—*u*, it is by no means certain that his verbal description would at all have been affected by the type of *y* (*y₁* or *y₂*) he was describing; see §4.2.2 above.

For these reasons, the emendation suggested in the printed text of the present edition necessarily remains purely hypothetical; it implies that the copyist skipped the part between the two occurrences of kvísl. Basically, this emendation is not very different from Holtsmark's, which could be improved upon, for instance, in the following way: ok [kal af því ena fyrir kvísl af hófvð staff] [ie gjora ok ena síðarri kvísl af hófvð staff] ve. The main objection to the latter emendation concerns the varying reference of kvísl: while

first branch [is to be written with the full shape of a capital *J*, and to this is to be added the second branch] of capital *V* [...] as they are placed above in the alphabet.

Now it may (85:1) so happen that someone will speak up in this way: 'I can read the Norse language perfectly well even though it be written with the proper Latin letters. I can make out on (the basis of) probability how it is to be spoken, even though some of the letters in what I read cannot be pronounced correctly. I do not care whether you

ena fyrir kvísl refers to the first branch of *y* alone (capital *J* consisting of only one branch), ena síðarri kvísl would have to be taken to refer both to the *y* and the capital *V* (that is, it is not capital *V*, but only its second branch, that serves to form the second branch of *y*). An unattractive aspect of both these emendations, as compared with Dahlerup-F. Jónsson's, is that they imply the omission of two short passages, not just one.

The final passage, sem aðr er þeim i staf rofi skipat, probably refers back to 84:24, where the author introduces the innovation of placing the vowels as a group at the beginning of the alphabet (cf. also 84:25, 85:11, and 85:27–28 about the order of the vowel letters); had this passage referred to the position of the vowel letters in the original Latin alphabet (which the author proposes to adapt to Icelandic), he would have used the term *latinni stafar* and also, probably, the pret. *var*, rather than the pres. *er*, as in 84:25 (... aðr vorv i latinni staf rofi), or in 85:30 (... er aðr vorv i stafrofi).

85:1. danská tvngv: this was the term commonly used for the 'Norse language'; it occurs, for instance, already in eleventh- and twelfth-century scaldic poetry, in the *Grágás*, and in thirteenth-century prose, but was gradually replaced by the term *norræna*.

85:2. reitvum: because of a hole in the vellum (see also note to 86:2) only the upper part of the first four letters is visible, and the first *i* has in fact disappeared completely.

85:3. q þitt eða a e y eða u; ms. a þitt eða a eða y ok u. This passage has been emended by all editors: (a) Rask changed a þitt eða a to q þitt eða a, and has in this been followed by all later editors except Sv. Egilsson, who, in his edition of 1848, emended this to a þitt eða a, q eða a; (b) Rask emended eða q to e eða q, a reading which was adopted by Haugen, while all other editors have changed this to e eða e (Dahlerup-F. Jónsson: e oc e), with the new letter (q) preceding the old one (as in the other pairs in this passage); (c) most editors have left y ok u unchanged (and Dahlerup-F. Jónsson even changed the preceding eða q to e oc e on the analogy of this); but if this passage deals with the choice, in each case, of one of two alternatives, the conj. eða 'or' would seem more appropriate here, too (as assumed by Neckel-Niedner in their translation); if the original had the Latin abbreviation 1 (= vel) for eða, the crossed-Tironian nota for ok 'and' which the ms. has in this place would be easily explained as a misreading of this abbreviation.

However, in view of the great variety of emendations proposed, the question is bound to arise whether an emendation is at all called for; it seems indeed conceivable that by this nonsensical passage the author wanted to indicate his imaginary opponent's failure to grasp the essence of his argument.

Enn ek svara sva. Eigi er þat rvnanna kostr þo at þv lefer vel eða ráðir vel að likindym l, þar sem rvnar vifa o skyr. helldr er það þinn kostr enda er þa ætgi orvænt at þey l, gi lesa ek vel eða minn maki ef sa finn fða ráða ek vel at likindym til hvers ens retta fæ l, ra skal ef flere vega ma fára til rettz enn æinn veg þat sem a ænn veg er þo ritaoð ok ætgi skyr a kveðit. ok skal geta til sem bu letz þat vel kvnna. Enn þo að aller mætte nakkvað l, rett or giora þa er þo vis von at þeygi vill aller til æins fera ef mali skiptir allra he l, lldz i logym enda tel ek þik þa ætgi hafa vel svaraoð er þv lætr ætgi bvrfa i varv mali þer l, sa nly raddar staf. a q e e i o o u y. allra helldz ef ek klyf or þessvin niv sex grei- l, ner ens fiorða tigar þær er sitt mál giori hvert ef glögt eru skildar.

Nv mvin ek þessa l, stafi ðætta. allz ætgi grein er enn [a] i gjör a meðal enna sornv tveggja famhlíða setja l, sitt sinn hvern. enn syna ok dæm gefa hve sitt mal giori hvert þeira við enna sornv stafa l, hvilting i enn fanna stað setti. hvert sem annark ok a þann veg sva gefa dæmi of allan l, þenna bekling a meða[] enna likvzty greina

85:5. það: the scribe first wrote þan, but then corrected n to ð.

85:6-7. til-hvers ens retta fera skal ...: thus, for example, if y is not distinguished from u, bu can be interpreted correctly either as bu (imper.) or as by (ind.); if a and o are not distinguished, þorþe can stand for either þorþe (ind.) or þorþo (subj.); etc.

85:7. flere: er probably corrected from v.

85:9-10. at þeygi vill aller til æins fera ... i logym: the author probably wants to imply that there are likely to be some who, readily and intentionally, will try to use ambiguous spellings to quibble about points of law.

85:13. a: the ms. reading, allz ætgi grein er en i gjör, is retained by most editors, except for a change of i to o if (i.e., the gen. sg. of the name of the letter i, dependent on grein); see ed. 1886 pp. 24 and 70; ed. 1950 p. 15. However, if an emendation is at all needed, it is more likely, as proposed by J. Sigurðsson (ed. 1852 p. 16), that the prep. a should be inserted before the i. For there is no record of the phrase gjöra grein + gen., while the phrase gjöra grein a + dat. is well attested; in the FGT it occurs in 85:16. The copyist probably misunderstood the text, and taking i as a prep., left out the preceding prep. a, see H. Benediktsson 1961 p. 240 n. 8 and §3.4.2.4 above.

The interpretation of this sentence has caused some difficulty, in particular the fact that, as noted by the author himself, the vowel i is not exemplified. As suggested by Haugen (1950 p. 33), the reason for this is no doubt, in part at least, that the author, being principally concerned with an improvement of the orthography, contented himself with

write your q or a, [g] or e, y [or] u. But I reply like this: 'It is not the virtue of the letters if you can read well or make a good guess (in cases) (85:5) where the letters are unclear, but rather it is your virtue; and it is then indeed not beyond expectation that I, or my equal, if such there be, shall not be able to read well or make a good guess about which of the correct (interpretations)—if a correct (interpretation) is possible in more than one way—is to be given to what after all is written in one way only, and not unambiguously, and one then has to guess, as you claimed you can do so well. But even though everyone could put some correct (interpretation) on (it), it is very much to be expected that not all will be willing to put on the same (interpretation), if this changes the discourse, particularly (85:10) in the laws; and so I say that you have not answered well when you maintain that the following nine vowels are not needed in our language: a, q, e, g, i, o, s, u, y, in particular if out of these nine I split thirty-six distinctions, each of which makes a discourse of its own if they are precisely distinguished.'

Now I shall place these eight letters—since no distinction has yet been made for the i—between the same two consonants, each in its turn, and show and give examples how each of them, with the support of the same letters (85:15) (and) placed in the same position, one after another, makes a discourse of its own, and in this way give examples,

establishing the four new vowels by distinguishing each of them from its nearest neighbor, i.e., from the other vowel which, during the earliest, five-symbol, period of the alphabet, was denoted by the same symbol (see H. Benediktsson 1966 p. 410). But in addition it is worth noting that a complete series, with all nine vowels in exactly the same environment, probably did not exist.

Otherwise, it is not quite clear to what the inserted clause refers, for, in the part of the treatise which precedes this passage, the same 'distinction' has been made for the i as for the other vowels; as a matter of fact, in the passage 84:26-32, the author put y in relation to i and u in the same way as he related q to a and o, g to a and e, and s to o and u. Therefore, this clause must refer to something that follows, viz., to the series far, for, fer, etc., or, more accurately, to his inability to produce a more complete series; for this is the only passage where the same distinction is not made for the i as for the other vowels; the em 'yet' of the inserted clause therefore means 'up to and including this passage' (85:12-18). The distinction for the i, though not a minimal one, appears in the next paragraph (85:18-27), which begins: 'But now each of these nine letters ...'

85:15. dæm: written twice, but crossed out the second time by a later hand.

85:16. meðal: ms. meða.

þeira er a stofvnym verða gjorvar. *sar* *sor* *fer* |₁, *fer* *sor* *sor* *fyr*.

Sar veitti maðr mer æitt *sor* morg veitta ek honvm. [...] *Sor* goðinn *fer* |₁, ein *søren*. *Sor* erv avgv *syr* (lik duga beitr en spryngi yr.

En nv elr hverr þessa staða¹⁶ fa niv annan staf vndir fér ef hann verðr i nef kveðinn enda verðr ív græin sva skyr að |₂₀ hon ma ok mali skipta sem ek sýnt her nv eptir ok set[c] pvnct syrir ofan þa er nefr erv |₂₁ kveðnir. *har* *hár* *rō* *rō* *bel* *bel* *fer* *fer* *isa* *isa* *orar* *ora* *óra* *þuat* *þuat* |₂₂ *syna* *sýna*.

Har vex a kvíkendvm enn *hár* er fiskr. *Rō* er æitt tre vr segl viðvm |₂₃

85:16–18. In the list of forms in 85:16–17 all the examples are without the superscript accent mark, and so are the same forms in the illustrative sentences in 85:17–18, except Sár. Although all these words no doubt had long vowels, the accent mark is not added, since the distinction of length in vowels, by means of the accent mark, has not yet been introduced by the author; therefore, also, the accent on Sár is omitted.

85:16–17. *sar*: ms. *Sar*; *sor*: ms. *søren*.

85:17. *sor*: ms. *sor*.

85:17. The sentence illustrating the difference of *fer* and *fer* is lacking; no doubt, it was omitted in copying. J. Helgason (1954 p. 28) suggested a reconstruction of the missing phrase: *Eigi es þeim mikila kurins vón es eigi sér hvar hann sér* 'He cannot expect much corn who does not see (sér) where he sows (sér).' But of course, *fer* could also be the dat. of the reflexive pronoun or the 2nd pers. sg. subj. of *vesa*, and *fer* could be the nom. sg. 'sea.'

85:17–18. The sentence illustrating the pair *sor* vs. *sor* is usually translated 'The priest alone swore (sórt) the oaths (søren)'—an interpretation which implies an emendation of the text. By Sv. Egilsson (ed. 1848 p. 162) and Dahlerup-F. Jónsson (ed. 1886 pp. 25 and 70) the first word, *Sor*, is separated from the rest of the sentence and taken to be a remnant of the preceding sentence illustrating the pair *sor* vs. *sor*, which is missing in the ms. (see preceding note). By Haugen (ed. 1950 p. 15) the *sor* preceding *ein* is considered a "superfluous" form. However, by either of these interpretations, the illustrative pair would be the nonminimal *sor* vs. *sóren*, which would be incompatible with the author's principle of establishing his distinctions ... við enna lógvn stafa svilting ... (85:14–15). Besides, *ein* cannot be the masc. nom. sg. form *einn*, in concord with *goðinn*, *sor*, in this manuscript, consonant length is denoted consistently, not only intervocally, but also in word-final position. Therefore, the pair in question must be represented by the *Sor* at the beginning, i.e., the pret. of *sverja*, and the *sor* preceding *ein*, which must be the neut. pl. of the adj. *sært* 'to be taken, sworn'; that is, the sentence requires no emendation. Of the sentence unemended two interpretations have been proposed.

One is by J. Helgason (1954 pp. 27–29), who took *ein* *søren* as a compound, *einsært* 'a single oath' (i.e., without sámnadarmenn, or compurgators), and translated 'The priest swore that the single oaths could be sworn,' taking *sor* as a predicative. Thus, *einsært*—

throughout this booklet, of the most delicate distinctions that are made between the letters: *sar* : *sor*, *sor* : *sor*, *sor* : *sor*, *sor* : *syr*.

A man inflicted one wound (sar) on me; I inflicted many wounds (sor) on him. [...] The priest swore (sor) the fair (sor) oaths only. Sour (sor) are the sow's (syr) eyes, (but even) such are better than if they popped out.

But now each of these nine letters will produce a new one if it is pronounced through the nose, and this distinction is in fact so clear that (85:20) it can change the discourse, as I shall now show in what follows, and I shall place a dot above those that are pronounced through the nose: *har*: *hár*, *rō*: *rō*, *bel*: *bel*, *fer*: *fer*, *isa*: *isa*, *orar*, *ora*: *óra*, *þuat*: *þuat*, *syna*: *sýna*.

Hair (*har*) grows on living creatures, but the shark (*hár*) is a fish.

which is otherwise unknown in Icelandic, and occurs only once in a late Norwegian source (King Magnus Håkonarson's General Law), and once in the Guttish Law—would be a synonym of *eineiði*, which is well attested in Norwegian legal terminology, but unknown in Icelandic until the late thirteenth century (with the introduction of the Jónsbók). The nonoccurrence of these words in the earliest Icelandic, of course, speaks against this interpretation. At any rate, it is imprudent, from this one example, to infer the existence of this kind of oath in twelfth-century Iceland. For, as J. Helgason himself points out, it is difficult to imagine a case in practice where a godi should swear that an oath of this kind could be taken. Besides, the syntactic construction of object + predicative adjective is unknown with the verb *sviða*.

The other is my own interpretation (see H. Benedicsson 1961 pp. 248–249 n. 27): *ein* is taken to be the neut. pl. of *cinn* 'alone,' in concord with *søren*. The sentence should therefore be translated 'The priest swore the fair oaths only,' cf. the phrase *sært eðr* 'an oath that may be sworn, a fair oath'; using this phrase, the author had to replace the masc. *eðr* by the neut. *sært* in order to obtain the desired minimal pair. For the use of the strong inflection of the adj. of such appositional phrases as *upp bratta brekkuna* (in AM 325 VIII 4 b 4° of the *Sveria Saga*, fol. 1v23), *berin ein* (*Sturlunga Saga* (1878) I p. 249); see also Nygaard 1905 p. 33; Falke-Torp 1900 p. 103.

85:20. *sete*: ms. *sete* (emend. Dahlerup-F. Jónsson).

85:21–22. *rō*: ms. *ro*; *þr*: ms. *fer*; *óra*: In the ms. the dot is over the *r*, possibly for reasons of space; *þuat*: ms. *þvat*; *þuat*: ms. *þvat*; *syna*: the *y* has a superscript dot (ý), as elsewhere in the ms., *sýna*: ms. *sýna*. Although the vowel of most of these forms was no doubt long, the accent mark is absent. Since the distinction of length has not yet been introduced, there is no reason to assume that the accent mark was present in the original of the treatise; therefore, it is not added here in the text (see also note to 85:16–18).

85:22–27. In the illustrative sentences, unlike the preceding word list, there are no superscript dots over the examples (except *y*), and there is no consistent differentiation of

enn *rō* er hyrning hýſſ. *þel* er a hneſa bvnðnvm qða hlvtr felldar enn *þel* er [smiðartól[.]]_{2a} Annat er þat er favðrinn heitir *þer* enn annað þat er hann *þer lamb[.]* *i* *sa* skyia deilld þa er ver *l₂₅* komvn i *sa*. *Orar* ert v ræktir *órar*. Spakt skyldi hið ellzta bárn því at hið elira *l₂₆* ma *óra* hið *óra*. Þar vart *þu at* er fiaðt klæðit [var] *þuat[.]* priggia *syna* avstr mvn ek *l₂₇* þer *syna*.

Nv verðr þetta allt faman raddar stafanna *a* *ā* *q* *q̄* *ē* *ē* *ɛ* *ɛ̄* *i* *o* *ō* *ø* *ø̄* *u* *ū* *y* [.] En þo að ek rita ægi fleiri raddar stafi enn raddirnar fndvz i vorv ma- *l₂₈* li atian giorvar or fimm latinv roddvm þa er þo gott að [v]ita þat að er grein enn *aa* *l₂₉* raddar stofvm bæði heim er fððr vorv i stafrofi ok heim oðrvm er nv ert i giorfir grein *l₃₀* sv er mali [skiptir hvert staf er langr eða skamnr sem gríkkir rita i qðrv likne[ki] *l₃₁* langan staf enn i qðrv skamman. Sva rita þeir e skaman. *ε* en sva langan [86]₁ sem sia staf er *H*[.] þann veg o skamman. [o] Enn þann veg langan *o*[.] *l₂* Pa grain vil ek enn syna þviat hon skiptir mali ok iasfni sem hinur fyri ok merkia ena *l₃* longv með stryki fra hinum [kommum].

the two forms of each pair; Har: ms. hár; hár; ms. haar; rō: ms. rō; þel: ms. þel; þer: ms. þer; i sa: ms. J sa; sa: ms. sa; Orar: ms. Orar; óra: ms. óra; vart þu: ms. vartu; þuat: ms. þuat; syna: ms. syna.

85:23. *þel*: the translation 'woollen nap' is uncertain, and indeed problematic; see §§5.2.2.2a and 5.2.2.2k above.

85:23. a hneſa bvnðnvm; the translation 'on a bandaged fist [i.e., hand]' is in fact conjectural.

85:26. klæðit: ms. kljæðit, with subscript dot indicating deletion.

85:26. var þuat: the meaning and etymology of þuat—and even its morphological identity—have long been unknown; it has been left without translation by all editors. However, as early as 1885, Bugge (1885 pp. 233–234) proposed an interpretation connecting þuat, as a past participle of a weak 6- or 5-verb, with OHG diuhen 'to press', MHG diuhen, etc., which, together with OE þyn, are usually derived from PGerm. *þunhjan—a root-form which accounts for the nasal vowel of the Icelandic verb—cognate with OIcel. þvinga, OHG dwingan, etc. Although this verb is otherwise unknown in Old Icelandic, Bugge's interpretation is confirmed by the existence in Modern Icelandic of its equivalent, þúa, þúaði, þúað, in such phrases as þúa hest 'to mal-treat a horse', þúa snæri 'to pound a rope (with a stone)', örþngurinn var þúaður á heimilinu 'the boy was oppressed, cowed in his home.' The same verb, no doubt occurs in the compounds ogþón 'to scold, ill-use', ofþón 'to abuse'; see A. Bl. Magnússon 1961–62 pp. 52–59. For earlier attempts at an interpretation of this form (e.g., as acc. sg. þvátt, pret. *þvatt), see *ibid.* pp. 56–57; all these attempts, besides the other difficulties they encountered, were basically unsatisfactory because they disregarded the author's principle of supporting his distinctions by means of minimal pairs.

The insertion of the auxiliary var appears to be necessary.

The yard (*rō*) is a wooden pole in the rigging, but *rō* is the corner of the house. Woollen nap (*þel*) is (to be found) on a bandaged fist or as part of a cloak, but a file (*þel*) is an implement. It is one thing that the sheep is called *þer*, and quite another that it conceives (*þer*) a lamb. One could look through (*i sa*) the rift in the clouds, when we (85:25) got into the ice floes (*sa*). Madness (*órar*), (that is what) our (*órar*) neglect is. The oldest child should be gentle, for the older can vex (*óra*) the younger (*óra*). You were present (*þu at*) where the feather bed [was] pressed down (*þuat*). Bilgewater three laps (*syna*) deep I shall show (*syna*) you.

Now, (with this) the total of the vowels becomes as follows: *a*, *ā*, *q*, *q̄*, *e*, *ē*, *ɛ*, *ɛ̄*, *i*, *o*, *ō*, *ø*, *ø̄*, *u*, *ū*, *y*, *ȳ*. But even though I do not write more vowel symbols than the vowels that have been found in our language—eighteen made out of the five Latin vowels—it is well to know that there is yet another distinction in (85:30) the vowels—both in those that were in the alphabet before, and in those that have now been put in—a distinction which changes the discourse, (according to) whether a letter is long or short, just as the Greeks write a long letter with one shape, and a short one with another. Short *e* they write this way: *ε*, but the long one (86:1) like this letter is: *η*; short *o* in this way: *o*, but the long one in this way: *ō*. This distinction, too, I wish to show, because it changes the discourse just like the previous ones, and (I shall) mark the long ones with a stroke (to distinguish them) from the short:

85:27. þer: after writing þ the scribe first abbreviated er by the superscript er-sign, and then wrote er in full (without erasing the er-sign).

85:27. allt faman raddar stafanna: raddar stafanna is most likely to be taken as a kind of partitive genitive (see Nygaard 1905 pp. 140–141), even though such a construction with allt is very rare; cf., however, allt missra 'all the year' in the Norwegian Book of Homilies (Gamal norsk homiliebok (1931) p. 75:12).

85:29. vita: ms. rit (emend. Sv. Egilsson); cf. 86:20.

86:1. o: omitted in ms. (emend. J. Sigurðsson).

86:1. Before En the scribe has written En þatvæg, but then crossed these words out. 86:2. Pa grain vil ek enn syna: the em. goes with Pa grain rather than with ek; that is, it implies; not that the author proposes to imitate the Greeks in marking vowel length (he would then have used ok), but rather that he intends to mark this distinction as well as the two previous ones (viz., the qualitative distinctions between a and ā, etc., and the nasal distinction); cf. the use of ok in 84:13 and 84:15, and of en in 89:20.

86:2. ok merkia: because of a hole in the vellum (see note to 85:2) the Tironian nota representing ok has disappeared almost completely, and only the upper half of the m is visible.

86:3. stryki: i probably corrected from v.

far fár rám̄r q̄l q̄l uōn uōn seþo |, seþo frám̄r frám̄r uér uér uēnesc
uēnesc uil uil minna mīnna: gop̄ gop̄ |, mōna mōna goþrþe goþrþe
mōnde mōnde dura dura rūnar rūnar |, flytr flytr brýnna brýnna.

Far heitir skip enn fár nokkvískonar navð. Rám̄r |, er sterkr maðr
enn rám̄r enn hæse. Q̄l heitir drykkr enn q̄l er band. Tvngan er ma |,
linv uōn enn að tónnvnum er bitzins uōn[.] Seþo hve vel þeir seþo er
sýrir sámsfóriði |, reðv. Miok ert þeir menn frám̄r er æigi skammaz
að taká minna konv frá mér. Sva |, er morg við uér sinn uér at varla of
sér hon af honum ner. Uēnesc æigi goðr maðr |, því þo að vaandr maðr
uēnesc goðvum konvum. Dv̄l vettir ok uil at lina mvnd |, erfiði ok uil.
Hyglan mann vil ek minna hvgðra erenda mīnna[.] Sy kona goðgar |,

86:3-6. In the word list—which, as shown by the following set of illustrative sentences, consists of two pairs of words for each of the nine vowel qualities previously established, one for the oral and one for the nasal vowel—there is usually, in the ms., a dot over the first word of each pair—that is, over every second word instead of every second pair—except for y (in the last two pairs), which always has a dot; the second word of each pair has either an accent or no mark at all; far: ms. Fár; rám̄r: ms. rám̄r; q̄l: ms. q̄l;
uōn: ms. vón; uōn: ms. vón (see following note); seþo: ms. seþv (see note below);
seþo: ms. seðv; frám̄r: ms. frám̄r; frám̄r: ms. fra mér; uér: ms. vér; uér: ms. vér;
uēnesc: ms. vénæz; uēnesc: ms. vénæz; uil: ms. vil; uil: ms. vil; minna: ms. mīnna;
mīnna: ms. mīnna; gop̄: ms. góð; gop̄: ms. góð; mōna: ms. mōna; mōna: ms. mōna;
goþrþe: ms. goðrþði; goþrþe: ms. goðrþði; mōnde: ms. mōndi; mōnde: ms. mōndi;
dura: ms. dýra; dura: ms. dýra; rūnar: ms. rúnar; rūnar: ms. rúnar; brýnna: ms. brýnna;
brýnna: ms. brýnna.

86:3. uōn: ms. vón; because of a hole in the vellum (see note to 86:2) the v and ð are slightly damaged, so that it is not possible to see whether the q had a superscript accent mark.

86:3. seþo: the first three letters are damaged by a hole in the vellum; the probable reading is seþv, with a superscript dot (see note to 86:3-6 above).

86:6-18. In the illustrative sentences some of the examples have superscript dots, but these are irregularly distributed (although there is a certain tendency to use them over every second word as in the word list); length, on the other hand, is frequently distinguished by accents (as well as, in the case of a, by doubling the symbol); fár: ms. fár; Rám̄r: ms. Rám̄r; rám̄r: ms. rám̄r; q̄l: ms. q̄l; uōn: ms. vón; uōn: ms. vón; Seþo: ms. Seþv; seþo: ms. seðv; frám̄r: ms. frám̄r; fra mér: ms. fra mér; uér: ms. vér; uér: ms. vér; Uēnesc: ms. vénæz; Uēnesc: ms. vénæz; uil: ms. vil; uil: ms. vil; minna: ms. mīnna;
mīnna: ms. mīnna; gop̄: ms. góð; gop̄: ms. góð; mōna: ms. mōna; goþrþe: ms.
goðrþði; gop̄ seþo: ms. goðrþði; mōnde: ms. mōndi; mōnde: ms. mōndi (see note below);
dura: ms. dýra; dura: ms. dýra; Rúnar: ms. Rúnar; rúnar: ms. rúnar; flytr: ms. flytr;
brýnna: ms. brýnna; brýnna: ms. brýnna.

86:6. skip: the scribe first wrote heitir, a repetition of the preceding word, and then corrected this to skip; the er-sign is very clear.

far: fár, rám̄r: rám̄r, q̄l: q̄l, uōn: uōn, seþo: seþo, frám̄r: frám̄r,
uér: uér, uēnesc: uēnesc, uil: uil, minna: mīnna, gop̄: góð, (86:5)
mōna: mōna, goþrþe: goðrþði, mōnde: mōndi, dura: dýra, rúnar:
rúnar, flytr: flytr, brýnna: brýnna.

A ship is called a vessel (far), but harm (fár) is a kind of distress. A strong man is mighty (rám̄r), but the hoarse (man is) harsh-voiced (rám̄r). Beer (q̄l) is the name of a drink, but a strap (q̄l) is a cord. The tongue is accustomed (uōn) to speaking, but from the teeth there is a prospect (uōn) of a bite. Look thou (se þo) how well they nailed (seþo) (the boards), those who were in charge of the nailing. Those men are very brazen (frám̄r) who are not ashamed to take my wife from me (frá mér). (86:10) Of her husband (uér) many (a woman) is so fond (uér) that she hardly ever takes her eyes off him. A good man should not get into this habit (uēnesc), even though an evil man is confident of (uēnesc) (being able to obtain the favors of) good women. Self-conceit and wilfulness (uil) expect that labor and misery (uil) will abate. I shall remind (minna) an attentive man of my (minna) cherished concerns.

86:8. sámsfóriði: in the only other recorded occurrence of this word (Biskupa sôgur (1858-78) I p. 390), its meaning is obviously 'the joint of two (overlapping) boards in the side of a ship, together with the row of nails fastening them together'; here, therefore, it must denote the specific act of 'nailing together two joining boards' rather than ship-building in general, as assumed by all modern editors.

86:10. of: see Kuhn 1929 pp. 62 n. 1 and 112 n. 1, Dal 1930 p. 55.

86:11. ... uēnesc goðvum konvum: in the construction with a nominal dat. the verb vñaz has the same sense here as in such phrases as vñaz heimildarmanni, vitnum, etc., viz., 'to hope for, have prospect of, mean to be able to procure for oneself.' Dahlerup-F. Jónsson (followed by Haugen), on the other hand, translated '... boasts of (having seduced) good women'; but in all those instances in which the derived sense 'to boast of' is apparent, the verb is followed by a dependent at-clause, preceded by an anticipatory pronominal dat. því (vñaz því at ...).

86:12. hvgðra: this word has caused modern commentators some difficulty: by J. Sigurðsson it was emended to hvgðar (which need only imply a misinterpretation, on the part of the copyist, of a w-like abbreviation symbol for at in his exemplar) and taken to be the first member of a compound hvgðarendi, a synonym of hvgðarmál 'a matter which one has at heart.' However, no emendation is needed (so Dahlerup-F. Jónsson, Haugen); hvgðra is the gen. pl. of the past part. of hvgðja (or of an adj. corresponding to OS gitugid), cf. hugða drápu 'a servent (laudatory) poem' (Reksstjóra 34, Skjaldedigtning A 1 p. 552).

gōþ er sialf er gōþ. Móna míð móna kveðr barnið við mik gíora yerft híona. Vei l₁₄ likvōv goþrøþe gōþ røþe. Pat ert goðar árar sem skalld qvað[.]

Rétt kann ræði flita.
l₁₅ ræfis herr or verri.

leka mónde hvíst ef æigi mónde smiðrinn[.] Ef gestrinn kveðr dura l₁₆ þa fkyldi ægi bondim díra. Rínar heita gelltir enn rínar maalstafir. Seþv hve flo l₁₇, tinn flytr er sekartinn flytr. Styri maðr þarf byrrenn brýnna enn sa er naðvnum skal l₁₈ brýnna.

Nv ef nokkvr þessa greina vi. ens fiorða tigar ma sva niðr falla at alldre- l₁₉ [gi] þvrfi i værv mæli þa skiotvumz ek yfir sem víf von er eðc sva ef fleitri finnaz l₂₀ i manzens røddv[.] En þat er goðt að vita sem fyrir var getið er sva kveðr að hverivm raddar l₂₁ staf i hveriv mali sem hann heitir i stafrófi nema þa er hann hafnar sínv eðli ok hann ma hielldr l₂₂ þa samhlioðandi heita en raddar stafr. þat verðr þa er hann er stafaðr við annan raddar stafr. l₂₃ sem her erv nokkvr dæmi nv. austr earn eir. eðr eyrer uin. Nv er ægí ðrvæni að l₂₄ sva svarti nokkvr mer. þar er orð at þv ritar þar e er flestir menn rita i þa er

86:13. móna: this is a δπος λεγόμενον; it is quoted also in Blöndal 1920-24 p. 556, but there is no independent authentication for this word in Modern Icelandic.

86:14. goþrøþe: it may well be, of course, that the author had in mind some definite man with this name, but in the absence of an obvious connection it seems pointless to make a guess. On the other hand, in view of the relative rarity of short a, the author may have experienced some difficulty in finding a more suitable example of this distinction (see §5.2.2k above).

86:14. sem skalld qvað: this is the mid-eleventh-century scald Bjóðólfur Arnórsson. The two lines that follow are the first quarter of a strophe which is preserved in its entirety in the *Saga of Hóraldr harðrði Sigurðarson* (in the *Heimskringla*, and elsewhere) and in the *Saga of Hákon Ívarsson*. See *Heimskringla* (1941-51) III pp. 142-143 and §6.2.2 above.

86:15. mónde: the scribē, being used to replacing the earlier pret. subj. mónde (of móna) by the later mundi, changed this form in the same way (see note to 86:6-18), not realizing that this is an entirely different word.

86:17. sekartinn: this is a δπας λεγόμενον, and the translation 'rafisman' is therefore hypothetical.

86:17. brýnna: this word is here, as by all other modern editors, taken to be the acc. sg. masc. comp., in agreement with byrrenn; in fact, the phrase brýnn byrr occurs already in early poetry. But it is also conceivable that brýnna is the neut. comp., used as an

That woman honors God (gōþ) who herself is good (gōþ). My mother (móna), says the child, will not (móna) treat me the worst of her household. Well did Godred (Goprøþe) like gōþ røþe, that is good oars, as the scald said:

The chief's men can pull
(86:15) straight oars (røþe) out of the sea.

The house would (mónde) leak, if the carpenter did not ridge (mónde) (the roof). If the guest knocks at the door (dúra), the master (of the house) should not doze (dúra). Male pigs are called boars (rínar), but letters (are called) runes (rínar). Look how the raft floats (flytr) that the raftsman drives (flytr). The captain needs a sharper (brýnna) breeze than he who is to water (brýnna) the cattle.

Now, if any of these thirty-six distinctions may be omitted, so as never to be needed in our language, then I am mistaken—which may indeed well be the case—and likewise, if more (distinctions) are to be found (86:20) in men's speech. But it is well to know that, as was mentioned earlier, each vowel is so pronounced in each (piece of) discourse as it is named in the alphabet, excepting (only) when it gives up its nature and must then be called a consonant rather than a vowel. This happens when it is joined with another vowel, of which a few examples are now (given) here: austr, earn, eir, eðr, eyrer, uin. Now it is not beyond expectation that someone will say to me: 'There is a word in

adverb, in which case the sentence should be translated: 'The captain needs the breeze more urgently (brýnna) than ...'; this would in fact correspond better to the word order.

86:18-19. alldregi: the ms. has only alldre-, but this form, which would in itself have been sufficient (cf. e.g. 87:24-25, 87:31), has been emended to alldregi (by Dahlerup-F. Jónsson) because of the hyphen, which indicates that the end of the word was accidentally left out at the beginning of 86:19 (cf. alldregi 89:6).

86:20. røddv.: the dot that may be seen in the ms. after røddv. is probably a later addition; it has a brownish color distinctly different from that of the surrounding letters; see note to 86:3(1).

86:20. sem fyrir var getið: see 84:21-23.

86:23. austr: ms. Austr; earn: ms. earn; eir: ms. eir; eðr: ms. eðr; eyrer: ms. eyrer; uin: ms. uin.

86:24. e: ms. e. (that is, written in the same way as the usual abbreviation of eða); i: ms. i.

hann verðr l_{21} fyrir samhlíðanda setti sem nu er skamt fra því er þy ritaðir *earn* þar sem ek mívndi l_{20} *iarn* rita eða sva í mðrgvm stöðvm ðórvim. þa svara ek sva. þy hefir þar rett fvnndit ok l_{22} þó æigi allz getið þess er þer ma ek kynlega þíkkia ritað hafa ok þó hafa ek fyrir qnnkost l_{23} sva ritað i flesfvm stöðvm. Ef ek gerða annat mal sem þar væri fyll þórf ok erek efni til er l_{24} kienska væri of þat til hverra stafa hverr orð hafa eðli eða a hveria lvnnd hverja stafi skyll- l_{25} di saman stafa þa væri sv bok qnnvr qil ok mikklv meiti ok ma ek af því æigi þat mal l_{26} nu mæla innan i þersv en þó mív ek nokkvrvm orðvm svara um þetta hið æina orð er l_{27} þv skoraðir helldz i[.]

Fyrir þi at þat hlíð er samhlíðandinn hefir eða sa raddar staf (87), er i hans stað er setti ok stafaðr við annan raddar staf er æigi avð skilið þvíat litil. verðr ok við l_{28} blandt nér eða groeð við raddar staf þann er við er stafat. þa er þess leitanda hvarr sva fin- l_{29} nem ver kveðit hið sama orð að sa raddar staf se fra oðrvm raddar staf skilinn ok giori l_{30} na sám stöfon hvárr er optaz er við stafaðr sva at æina sam stöfon giora baðir. Skalld e- l_{31} rv hofvndar allrar rynní eða mælis

86:27. fyrir qnnkost: see Johannesson 1971.

86:28–30. mal: see §3.4.2.2 above.

86:28–29. sem þar væri fyll þórf ok erek efni til er kienska væri: lit., 'as there would be a great need and abundant material to [do] [in a place] where [the required] skill were [present]'; that is, the rel. er refers to the adv. þar, and instead of a direct reference to a person of sufficient skill (viz., to the author himself), the author, in his exaggerated modesty, contents himself with an impersonal reference to the skill needed for this larger task.

86:29–30. of þat til hverra stafa ... (skylldi saman stafa; lit., 'about which words are by nature made up of which letters, and which letters should be joined together in which way.'

86:32. Fyrir þi at ...: ms. fyrir þi at ..., without a preceding period; that is, the copyist took the fyrir þi at-clause as subordinate to the preceding, instead of the following sentence (emend. Dahlerup-F. Jónsson).

87:5. allrar rynní eða mælis greinar: the meaning of this phrase is by no means certain. The first term, ms. rynní, is most likely derived from rún 'letter,' probably by inter-mediation of the adj. rýnnim 'versed in runes' (which occurs already in the *Arlamal* as part of the compound fultrýnnim). As regards its form, it may therefore well be different from rynní 'contemplation,' which occurs in Egill's *Sonatorrek* (spelled with one n only, though some editors have changed it to rynní); rynní may be derived from the adj. rýnn (occurring in the compound glöggrýnn). As regards its meaning, the conj. eða (rather than ok) seems to imply that the two words which are connected are equivalent, i.e., that mælisgrein

which you write an e where most men write an i, when it is made (86:25) to stand for a consonant, as just now when you wrote *earn* where I would write *iarn*, and so in many other places.' Then I reply like this: 'In this you have made a true observation, and yet (you have) not mentioned all that I must seem to you to have written in a strange fashion, and still I have deliberately written (it) so in most places. If I were to write another essay—as there would be full reason, and abundant material, to (do) for one possessed of (sufficient) skill—about the letters of which each word is by nature made up, or the way in which each letter should (86:30) be joined with the others, then that would be an entirely different book and a much longer one, and so I cannot take up that subject within the present one. But still I shall say a few words about this one word about which you made your principal remark.

Inasmuch as the sound which a consonant has—or the vowel (87:1) which takes its place and (is) joined with another vowel—is not easy to distinguish, because it becomes short and closely mixed or grown together with the vowel with which it is joined, then one has to search (and try to ascertain) where we find the same word pronounced in such a way that that vowel is separated from the other vowel, and (that) each of them—which is usually joined with (the other), so that together they make one syllable—makes a syllable of its own. The scalds are (87:5) authorities in all (matters touching the art of) writing.

It added by way of further explanation or clarification of the first term. At any rate, there appears to be no reason to regard the two words as complementary, i.e., as referring to written and spoken language, respectively, as implied by Dahlerup-F. Jónsson ('... i ethvert spørsmál om skrivemæld og uttale'; cf. also Haugen: '... in all problems touching the art of writing or speaking'); such a distinction would, indeed, be incompatible with the author's mode of reasoning about language. The example of mælsgrein which probably comes closest to the present one is in the *Snorra Edda* (Háttatal; ed. 1848–87 I p. 594), where this term is explicated as follows: Stafasætning greinir mál alt; stafasætning, 'the placing of letters,' which 'lends the distinctive characteristics to all (poetic) language,' includes, in particular, alliteration. The above phrase may therefore be translated, somewhat freely, '... in all matters touching the art of writing or the distinctions made in discourse,' provided that 'the art of writing' is not taken to contrast with speech, but rather to refer to the analysis of discourse, viewed as a chain of minimal, abstract entities, the letters, each with its three concrete attributes, including pronunciation (§3.4.2.2).

greinar sem smiðir [smiðar] eða lögmann laga. En þess- |₈ sa lvnd kvað
æinn þeira eða þessv likt.

Hofðv hart of krafðir
hildr ox við þat skilldir
gang |, en gamler sprvngv
gvnn þings earn bringar.

Nv þo að kveðandin skyldi hann til at slita |₈ æfna sam |töfvi i svndr
ok glöra tvær yr. til þess at kveðandi halldiz | hætti þa rak hann |₉ þo
æingi navðr til þess at skipta stöfnum ok hafa e. fyrir i of helldr |₁₀ i at vera en e þo |₁₀ at mer litiz æigi at því. En ef nokkyr verðr sva sein
máll eða hia máll at hann mæler a mot sva morgvum |₁₁ monnum
skynfönum sem bæði letyz fialfir kveða þetta orð aðr ek ritaða þat
ok sva hæryra aðra meni |₁₂ kveða sem nv er ritað ok þv lætr i skylv
kveða enn æigi e þo at þat orð se i tvær samstofvr |₁₃ deillt. þa vil
ek hafa ástráð katonis þat er hann reð syni sínvum i versvum.

87:5. smiðar: ms. málf græfna. As pointed out by Dahlerup-F. Jónsson, this is clearly a ditographic error (occasioned by the preceding málf greinar). Therefore the correct form need not have borne any resemblance at all to this word, as implied by Rask's emendation, málungripa (which was taken over by J. Sigurðsson in the form gripa). The emendation smiðar is by Olsen 1937 p. 114.

87:5-6. En þessa lvnd kvað ænn þeira ...: this is the early-eleventh-century scald Óttar svarti; see following note and §6.2.2 above.

87:6-7. Hofðv hart ... bringar: this is the second half of a strophe which is preserved in its entirety only in the *Heimskringla* (while its first half is preserved also in the Great Saga of King Ólafur Haraldsson). Modern commentators have disagreed about the syntactic structure of this part; three interpretations may be distinguished: (a) taking the subject of the verb phrase hofðv gang to be earn bringar, and gamler skilldir as the subject of sprvngv; (b) taking skilldir to be the subject of hofðv gang, and gamler earn bringar the subject of sprvngv; and (c), which, while following (b) as far as the subject-predicate relations are concerned, takes gvnn þings as an attribute to earn bringar, and not as the object of the past part. krafðir. While (c) implies the simplest word order, it has the disadvantage of leaving krafðir without an object; therefore (b) seems most likely (see, e.g., B. Ábalbjarnarson, *Heimskringla* (1941-51) II p. 16; see also E. A. Kock 1923-44 §728).

87:7. earn: ms. éarn, but the accent and the diaeresis are surely later additions.
87:9. i (2): ms. i.

or the distinctions (made in) discourse, just as craftsmen (are) [in their craft] or lawyers in the laws. One of them made a verse somewhat as follows:

The shields, strongly urged
to conflict, made headway;
battle's fury mounted,
but the old iron (earn) swords burst.

Now, even though the (metrical) rhythm forced him to split one syllable and make two out of (it), in order for the rhythm of the meter to be preserved, still no necessity compelled him to change the letters and use e instead of i, if i should (in fact) be (used) rather than e in spite (87:10) of my belief to the contrary. But if anyone becomes so insistent or obstinate as to contradict so many sensible men, who have said, (even) before I wrote this word, that they themselves pronounce it as I have now written (it), and also that they have heard others pronounce it so—and (if) you (still) say that i should be pronounced and not e, even though this word is divided into two syllables—then I shall apply Cato's affectionate advice, which he gave his son in verse:

87:9-10. þo at mer litiz æigi at því: property. "... (if i should in fact be used rather than e) even though I do not believe this (viz., that i should be used)." and litiz is the pres. subj. However, because of an orthographical ambiguity, litiz could also be the pret. subj. Conceivably, therefore, this form is connected with the pret. of the main clause (rak); by this the author possibly wanted to suggest, with a touch of irony, that if e is used rather than i in the strophe, the scald did not do this—and thus possibly do otherwise than should have been done—merely because this was preferred by 'me,' i.e., the author of the FGT (about a century later); in other words, if this interpretation should be correct, the author wanted to emphasize the independent value of the metrical evidence, regardless of his own opinion.

87:12. sem nv er ritað: lit., 'as [it] is now written.' i.e., 'as I have just written it.'

87:12. i: ms. i.

87:13. ástráð: properly, 'advice given out of affection for the recipient.'

87:13-15. ástráð katonis ...: this refers to the so-called *Disticha Catonis*, a collection of Latin sentences, in hexametric verse-form, composed probably in late Antiquity, and a very popular textbook throughout the Middle Ages (§7.2.1). That this work was known early in Iceland appears not only from the reference in the FGT, but also from the fact that a verse translation of it is in existence, the *Hugsvínsmál*, dating probably from the thirteenth century, though preserved only in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century transcripts; it is published in *Skjaldedigtning A II* pp. 167-197.

Contra verbos of no I_{14} li contendere verbis.
Serrmo datvr cunctis animi sapientia paucis.

þat er sva að skilia. hirð aðgi þv að I_{15} þræta við maalroff menn[.]
Malrof er gefit morgvm en speklin faam.

Nv lyk ek her vñ ræðv I_{16} raddar stafanna eni ek lesta við ef gvð
lofar at ræða nakkvat vñ samhlíoðendr.

I_{17} J: nafni samhlíoðanda hvers sem æfn er nokkvir raddar staf
þviat hvarki nefnir þav nöfn I_{18} ne önnvr eingi ef þeir niota ægi raddar
stafa sem fyrr var sagt. Ny þo að þat hlíoð eða I_{19} atkvæði er
samhlíoðendr hafa megi varla ætt saman að kveða enda se þo navr
at skil- I_{20} lia hvat þeir stóða i málinv enda stóði eingi þeira þat allt
imálinv sem nafn hans er til sem rad- I_{21} dar stafirnefri gjóra þa mvn
ek sva haga nafni hvers þeira er aðr hafði ægi sva nafn til at þa
skal I_{22} af nafninv skilia hvat hann [t]oðar i málinv þo að aðr skil
ægi. skal þat at kvæði hvers I_{23} þeira i hveri mali vera sem þa lífr
nafnins eptir er or er tekinn raddar stafir or nafni- I_{24} nv.

b. d. g. h. p[.] t. þeir stafir hafa af því myndang mikil æfnis flaff at

87:18. þeir; that is, the consonants; see 84:21.

87:18. sem fyrr var sagt; see 84:20-23.

87:18-22. Ny þo að þat hlíoð ... aðr skil ægi; this is a single sentence, beginning with a subordinate (concessive) clause (þo að ...), followed by two enda-clauses, and finishing by a principal clause (87:21; ... þa mvn ek ...).

87:18-19. Ny þo að þat hlíoð eða atkvæði er samhlíoðendr hafa megi varla ætt saman að kveða; according to Dahlerup-F. Jónsson, this passage must contain a copying error. They rightly point out that the verb kveða at governs the dat., while its object here, þat hlíoð eða atkvæði, stands in the acc. By way of emendation, they suggest two courses: (a) the prep. að (before kveða) should be omitted (the simple verb kveða governing the acc.); (b) the acc. þat hlíoð eða atkvæði ... ætt ... is a corruption for the dat. því hlíoði eða atkvæði ... ættu ..., the abbreviation þi (=því) having been misinterpreted by a copyist as þ (=þat), after which hlíoði ... ættu was changed accordingly.

However, it is by no means certain that an emendation is called for. It should be observed that, elsewhere in the treatise, whenever this verb is accompanied by an object (in the dat.), the prep. at precedes the object (e.g., að raddar stafnvin ... ma' kveða 84:23). Then, it should also be noted, the phrase in question, þat hlíoð eða atkvæði, is at the same time, through the intermediary of the relative particle er, the object of the relative clause verb hafa (which governs the acc.). In other words, the abnormal surface structure of this sentence may simply be the result of case attraction.

Contra verbosos noli contendere verbis;
sermo datur cunctis, animi sapientia paucis.

That is to say: Do not (87:15) quarrel with loquacious people; loquacity is given to many, but wisdom to few.

Now I shall close the discussion of the vowels, and, God willing, I shall try to say something about the consonants.

[THE CONSONANTS]

In the name of every consonant there is a vowel, for neither these names nor any other (names) can be pronounced, if they are not supported by vowels, as was said earlier. Now, the sound or pronunciation that consonants have can hardly be pronounced by itself; and yet it is necessary to ascertain (87:20) what they stand for in the discourse, and (it must be remembered that) in the discourse none of them stands for all that its name indicates, as the vowels do. So I shall rearrange the name of each of them which did not before have such a name; (in such a way) that one may then ascertain from the name what it stands for in the discourse, even though one could not ascertain (this) before. The sound of each of them in each (piece of) discourse shall be what is left of the name when the vowel has been removed from the name.

b, d, g, h, p, t. These letters have the average-length sound of one

87:20. enda stóði eingi ... nafn hans er til: that is, even though r and l, for instance, are named err and ell, etc., it is not permissible to write hr for herr, hrss for hress, etc.

87:21-22. at þa skal ...: 'that one may then ...,' i.e., after the name has been rearranged.

87:24. b. d. g. h. p. t.: Holtsmark (1936 p. 31), followed by Häugen, inserted the letter c. after b (with a reference to the group enumerated in 88:3). However, this emendation is hardly justified, for so long as the new name, ke (che), had not been proposed for this letter (88:18), it did not, with its traditional name, tse, fit the specification in 87:24-25. At this stage of his exposition the author is concerned only with examining the traditional alphabet with a view to determining the changes that have to be made in order for it to comply with his new guiding principle set forth in 87:22-24; the group enumerated in the passage 87:24-25 simply comprises the letters that could retain all their attributes and thus required no change under the new principle. The reference to the group in 88:3 is irrelevant, since this group comprises only those consonant letters whose names, ending in a vowel, required a change in order to fit the corresponding capitals (thus excluding b).