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Series Preface

This series of five volumes showcases the collective achievement of English lexicographers from the Old English period to the late eighteenth century. These are the pioneering author-scholars who first witnessed, recorded, and analyzed the growth of English vocabulary over nine hundred years. Word-entries that they crafted and handed down to their successors constitute primary historical evidence of what English words meant, and of how their significance changed, well before the growth of the great scholarly historical dictionaries in the Victorian period. Indebted to continental bilingual and polyglot glossaries and dictionaries of Latin, yet tied to the native speech of the mother tongue, early English lexicographers erected the lexicographical structures that we take for granted today. Glossary-like word-entries, at first offering translations or synonyms, gradually acquired explanatory power until, in the post-Johnsonian eighteenth century, the formal lexical definition took shape. To read early dictionaries carefully is to encounter a theory of word-meaning that differs from that which we assume today to be true. To consult these reference books is often also to experience delight in the energetic, rich love of language that they communicate.

After documenting the vocabulary of Latin as taught in schools and universities, Early English lexicographers applied themselves to translate the large vocabularies of living European languages, especially French, Italian, and Spanish. They also documented terms of art such as belonged to lawyers, herbalists, physicians, explorers, mathematicians, architects, and sea-farers. Beginning in the late Tudor period, they assembled and interpreted the strange terminologies of Old and Middle English, distinguished local dialects, and tried to unravel the mysteries of etymology. Their cumulative effects harnessed the impact of printing and translation that doubled and redoubled the known size of the English language; and the resulting, uniquely English hard-word explosion stimulated the creative potential of the language. Far from being uniformly harmless drudges, Early English lexicographers created new ways of bringing words to public account. Sometimes mercilessly humiliated by royalty for writing treasonable word-entries, impoverished, imprisoned, and even drawn and quartered, they fought for livelihood by teaching languages, stoking native ambitions for the English tongue abroad, and turning stints in the New World to good use as opportunities to teach aboriginal tongues to would-be merchants. Early English lexicographers made dictionaries into one of the most lucrative of all language industries.

Each volume in the series is edited by a recognized authority who has surveyed the existing literature and, for the first time, has selected essays that are regarded as significant contributions to an understanding of the historical development of dictionaries during the period. Volumes also include some original essays specially commissioned for this series. Substantial introductions by the editors not only summarize the substance of these essays but contextualize them in an original and thorough overview of lexicographers and their works.
The five chronological volumes of this series will thus assist those engaged in scholarly research by making available the most important contemporary essays on particular topics in English historical lexicography. Reproduced in full with the original pagination for ease of reference and citation, these essays are an indispensable reference resource in the fields of the English language and an invaluable research tool for students of lexicography and English literature, textual history, and bibliography.

IAN LANCASHIRE
Series Editor
Introduction

In the post-Conquest period, lexicographical interests, activities, and approaches changed. Because of this I have chosen to split Volumes 1 and 2 roughly at the Conquest rather than choosing an arbitrary date for the division between Old and Middle English. Old English continued to be copied and glossed for some time after the Conquest (§1), but an Anglo-Norman aristocracy meant that Anglo-Norman, along with Latin, became a language of record, law, administration, and culture, and it remained one through much of this period, even after English began to regain its status in these areas. The coexistence and importance of all three languages will be repeatedly emphasized in this volume, and the teaching and learning of Latin and Anglo-Norman will dominate it. Only a few glossaries which contained English were created before 1200. Before 1300, there was, however, much lexicographical activity, mostly connected with the study of Latin as in the pre-Conquest period. Major, influential new works written in Latin in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries by a few named individuals dominated the rest of the period and introduced new techniques (§2). Latin texts and glossaries attracted both Anglo-Norman and Middle English glosses (§2–3), and trilingual Latin–Anglo-Norman–English glossaries begin to be found in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (§§3–4). Also, starting in the thirteenth century, evidence for the teaching and learning of Anglo-Norman is found, for example in treatises teaching Anglo-Norman vocabulary, Anglo-Norman glossaries, collections of texts for training for careers in business, and conversation models (§4). The number of categories found in class glossaries increases greatly and expands into new areas in this period (§§4 and 5); as well as nominales (collections of nouns), a few verbales (collections of verbs) also appear (§5). Grammatical manuscripts or schoolmasters’ books appear, as well as commonplace books; these reflect the interests of the individuals compiling them (§5). Almost all of the major surviving post-Conquest glossaries containing English date from the fifteenth century (§§5–6). Four large, fifteenth-century alphabetical compilations are usually the first English-produced ones called dictionaries (§6). Two are English with Latin glosses, a format seen for the first time. No English-only dictionaries are found in this period. Glossaries of all types in the later period are badly understudied and in many cases unpublished. Their sources are not well understood, and the proliferation of them in the fifteenth century means that interrelationships between surviving glossaries are often distant and impossible to untangle.

Choosing a small number of essays from the very large number available, as in Volume 1 of this series, has been a challenge. I have whenever possible used ones which discuss identifiable lexicographers (most material is anonymous) or are particularly related to lexicographical questions. I have also given priority to illustrating the range of activities and materials which fall under lexicography. In §1, *Pulsiano,* *Fischer,* *Franzen,* *McNair,* *Berkhout,* and *Skemer* look at aspects of twelfth-century and later use of Old English material. *Weijers,* *Kornexl,*

---

1 An asterisk before a name indicates that the work in question appears in this volume. All page numbers cited for such works refer to the page numbers in this volume and not the original pagination.
and *Lendinara discuss important Latin lexicographers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, their methods, and how the vernaculars were used in teaching Latin in §2. *Howlett and *Sauer look at other very early Latin texts and glossaries with Anglo-Norman and Middle English glosses in §3. Teaching and learning Anglo-Norman and the trilingual society are addressed by *Hunt, *Rothwell (‘Vocabulary’ and ‘Trilingual’), *Richardson, and *Baker in §4. The range of lexicographical material in Latin and English in the fifteenth century (grammatical manuscripts, *nominales* and *verbales*, personal miscellanies, terms of association, noises of birds and animals, and the first English concordance) and the schoolmasters themselves are explored by *Griffiths, *Brother Bonaventure, *Kornexl, *Voigts and Shailor, *Burton, *Benediktson, and *Kuhn in §5. Finally the large alphabetic English–Latin and Latin–English dictionaries of the fifteenth century are treated by *Gneuss, *Stein, and *McCarren in §6. The essays have been interwoven in this Introduction with material taken from other important, usually book-length works, in order to make the connections coherent. These important recurring sources include Dean, Hüllen, Hunt (*TLL*), Keiser (*Manual*), Sharpe, Starnes, Stein (*Dictionary*), Thomson, and W&W; Tremblay (*Bibliotheca*) is an important bibliography. This has enabled me to pull together information now scattered over many publications and to use this introduction as a way to point towards the many areas needing further work.

1. Looking Back to Old English

This section looks back to some important Old English texts and glossaries which continued to be used, copied, updated, and glossed after the Norman Conquest well into the thirteenth century and, occasionally, even into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

1.1 Aldhelm

The study (and imitation) of Aldhelm, so important a figure in Anglo-Saxon lexicography (Volume 1, §§2.6, 3.1.1), whose hermeneutic (that is, unusual and arcane) Latin vocabulary was at least sometimes derived from glossaries and whose works, once glossed, provided entries for new ones, seems to have peaked in the tenth and early eleventh centuries and begun to decline in the late eleventh century. In the twelfth century, William of Malmesbury admonished the Malmesbury monks for neglecting Aldhelm’s works (Gwara 19). The study of Aldhelm’s best-known work, *Prosa de virginitate*, did not stop completely, however; three post-Conquest manuscripts of it survive, including the c. 1200 Hereford Cathedral Libr. MS P. 1. 17, which contains 57 English glosses out of a total of about 3700 (Gwara 20–22). The text and glosses derive ultimately from Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Digby 146, but the question of the origin of the Hereford manuscript seems ‘unsolvable’ (Gwara 28). Wherever it was produced, it indicates, along with a few glosses added to Digby 146 in the twelfth century, that Aldhelm was still being read, at least in one centre, around the year 1200 (Gwara 37–8).²

² Gwara (28) suggests Abingdon, but notes ‘only a paleographical study of the Abingdon house style might pin down the origin of this book’. Other possible Abingdon connections he cites include Æthelwold’s promotion of Aldhelm’s works at Abingdon (and Winchester) and the Abingdon connections of the two most heavily glossed *Prosa de virginitate* manuscripts: Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Digby 146 and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS 1650 (38). See also Volume 1, §§3.1.1 and 4.5, for other views.
1.2 Glossed psalters
Continuous glosses in English to Latin psalters were also very common and important in the pre-Conquest period (Volume 1, §3.2.2), but only one survives from after the Conquest, the Eadwine Psalter (Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS R. 17. 1) of the mid-1160s. The corrupt and much corrected gloss to this beautifully produced volume has been frequently dismissed in the past, for example by Meritt as ‘among the most inaccurate in Old English’ (as quoted by *Pulsiano 3). *Pulsiano, instead, examined the gloss to this ‘remarkable artifact’ (4), for what it ‘reveals about the long history of its own construction’ (22). It is the only surviving example of an early psalter gloss tradition (21), and is also accompanied by an Anglo-Norman continuous interlinear gloss, unlike any other surviving psalter (29; he gives examples of pairings of Old English with Anglo-Norman in other manuscripts, 29–30). He suggests that Anglo-Saxonists have perhaps approached the gloss from the wrong direction, ‘searching...for telltale signs that the language [Old English] was no longer understood with real precision...and not viewing it within its more immediate twelfth-century context’ (27–8).

1.3 Copying and updating Old English in the twelfth century
The desire for English material did not disappear after the Conquest, but few new texts have survived which were written in English between the Conquest and 1150. But at least until the early thirteenth century and in some cases well beyond, Old English texts were copied with the language updated (as in the gloss to the Eadwine Psalter). These include Old English translations of the Gospels, for instance, where most fortunately and unusually an eleventh-century copy survives which became the exemplar of a mid-twelfth-century copy which in turn was used to create a late twelfth-century copy. As is the case in virtually all late copies of Old English texts, the changes are lexical, morphological, phonological, and orthographical. Any scribe copying pre-Conquest English material in the twelfth century had to decide whether and when to revise the vocabulary of the exemplar, replacing apparently obsolescent Old English words with more modern equivalents, be they other English words or French or Norse borrowings. *Fischer (‘Hatton Gospels’) compares changes to a few
words across these three copies, looking at words not attested in the post-Conquest period and ones which seem to have been obsolescent. The copyists, he notes (41), are neither consistent nor completely thorough in their modernization of the lexicon of their exemplars, and rarely introduce new words or meanings, but instead just shift the balance towards the more modern words. It is perhaps stretching the sense of ‘lexicography’ to include within it the updating or modernizing of vocabulary in the process of copying English texts, but in many ways this process differs little from earlier scribes (as seen in Volume 1 of this series) reading a Latin text and glossing selected words into easier Latin or Old English.

Many manuscripts containing Old English were copied in the second half of the eleventh, throughout the twelfth, and into the thirteenth century.9 Only recently have these manuscripts begun to be studied as they deserve. Treharne, for example, shows that manuscripts were put together intelligently with an audience in mind (349). She argues for a monastic context, saying: ‘In practical terms, the production of manuscripts must have depended on available personnel and materials: the institution had to have at least one compiler or supervisor who recognized the need for English texts; there had to be one or more scribes capable of writing English; at least one Old English exemplar from which texts could be copied was required; and facilities to enable the copying to proceed were necessary’ (349). Only Rochester; Christ Church, Canterbury; and Worcester are known to have copied more than one significant vernacular manuscript in the twelfth century (350).

I disagree with one statement of Treharne’s: ‘when reading a language that is either archaic or foreign, one glosses only the words that are not understood or for which clarification is required. Since the glosses in these manuscripts do not in any way predominate, it is logical to assume that the vast majority of the Old English text could be understood without interpretation’ (342, fn 40). Glossators cannot gloss words they do not understand unless they have some way of working out what the words mean. A word last attested in the MED in a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century copy of Old English, for example, may not have been replaced with a more modern equivalent by a copyist either because it was understood or because it was not understood and the copyist had to reproduce it because he could not leave it out or because he did not update his exemplar consistently. Similarly a glossator may leave a word unglossed either because he knew the word, or because he did not know it and had no way of finding out its meaning, or for any number of other reasons. The main difference is that a glossator can pass over a word but a copyist cannot leave a gap. Whether it was because of the unfamiliar script, an increasingly distant orthography and morphology, a changing lexicon, content now dated or replaced by new writings, or a break in the teaching of the necessary skills to read and update such manuscripts or, more likely, a combination of

---

9 Treharne (329) refers to 58 codices produced in this period, cited by Ker xv–xix. See now especially The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan, and Elaine Treharne (University of Leicester 2010), available at http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220. This website contains a very full bibliography and catalogue of manuscripts for this period. See also Swan and Treharne on twelfth-century copies of Old English texts and manuscripts.
some or all of these factors, the evidence suggests to me that by about 1250 the copying and reading of Old English texts had become a pastime for a curious few, rather than a mainline activity supported by teaching.

1.4 The tremulous hand of Worcester

Perhaps close to 1250 and even extending into the third quarter of the thirteenth century, someone with trembling writing but a very clear and methodical lexicographical approach glossed some 20 manuscripts, including several large homiliaries, written in Old English between the ninth and twelfth centuries. The glosses, which may number well over 50,000, are usually Latin but about 3200 are English and a few are Anglo-Norman. He is known as the tremulous hand of Worcester; many of the manuscripts he glossed are Worcester ones. In Volume 1 of this series, Latin was glossed into Old English. The tremulous hand did the opposite, glossing Old English into Latin and creating a glossary with English lemmas and Latin glosses. He could be called the earliest identifiable lexicographer of the English language.

The fortunate survival of a large number of manuscripts containing different aspects of his work makes his methodology clear, and much of it is like that of both his Anglo-Saxon predecessors and the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century antiquarians who studied Old English (*Franzen 55–7). With an Old English text and its Latin source side by side, the tremulous hand cribbed Latin words over the corresponding Old English ones. From these matched pairs he drew Old English–Latin word pairs into the margins or onto worksheets as *glossae collectae*, that is, entries listed in the order they were taken from the text (*Franzen 59–69). From these *glossae collectae* he began to build an *a*-order (arranged alphabetically by first letter) Old English–Latin glossary, of which one tiny section survives (*Franzen 57). Although this method may seem curiously laborious since at least some Latin–Old English glossaries must have survived into the thirteenth century and been available in Worcester (for example BL MS Harley 3376), they would not have been useful as a source of Old English–Latin word pairs for glossing Old English homilies. For one, the Latin–Old English order would make it nearly impossible to locate a particular Old English word. As well, many of the Latin–Old English glossaries consisted largely of hard, often esoteric, hermeneutic Latin vocabulary. One exception, Ælfric’s *Glossary* (and *Grammar*), with its much more basic vocabulary, he used and even made his own copy of. The vocabulary of the Old English homilies he glossed was much closer to the Latin texts (*Pastoral Care* and Gregory’s *Dialogues*) he cribbed. That the tremulous hand used his own newly created glossary when glossing Old English texts which did not have Latin sources is clear because of his occasional consistent error when glossing the same Old English word in different contexts (Franzen, *Tremulous* 147–53). Such non-contextual (and nonsensical) consistent error suggests the error had to arise from something external: a glossary arranged alphabetically by Old English word where the Old English lemma had an incorrect Latin gloss attached to it seems the most obvious place.

---

10 See Franzen, *Tremulous* ch. 2, on the manuscripts, and ‘Tremulous Hand’ on the date.
11 Volume 1, §4.4.
12 *Franzen 49–54 and *Kornexl 139–44, discuss the use of Ælfric’s *Grammar* after the Conquest; see also §2. The tremulous hand’s copy of the *Glossary* was printed in W&W #13, called a Semi-Saxon Vocabulary (of the twelfth century). See also Volume 1, §4.6 on Ælfric.
A number of conclusions can be made about this apparently one-man operation. He must have thought someone would want to read these Old English manuscripts, either in his own time or in the future. The texts must have been at least borderline difficult to read for at least some readers, in order to justify this mammoth effort. The lack of any further significant annotation in them may suggest that few did read them after the middle of the thirteenth century, until some were used by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century antiquarians studying Old English.

1.5 *Expositio vocabulorum* and Stephen Batman, antiquarian

Although the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century antiquarian interest in Old English is beyond the scope of this volume, three short essays on the *Expositio vocabulorum* (*McNair, *Berkhout, and *Skemer) illustrate a number of interesting lexicographical points. The *Expositio vocabulorum* is a short hard-word list intended as a reference tool for reading legal texts, but unusually, as with the tremulous hand (§1.4), the words being defined are Old English. Old English legal texts, and particularly charters, continued to be copied in some cases for centuries after the Conquest because they were needed as proof of ownership and rights. *McNair prints a short list of ‘Saxon’ words related to the law which the sixteenth-century antiquarian Stephen Batman copied into his commonplace book. *Berkhout answers *McNair’s questions: the source is this Old English–Anglo-Norman legal glossary which took its basic form in the early thirteenth century (93). The definitions were originally in Anglo-Norman and the glossary was copied throughout the medieval period. It was intended to help the Normans understand ecclesiastical and manorial charters which had been written in Old English. Unfortunately, as *Berkhout explains, early in the transmission of the glossary, as is very common, errors crept in and from that point on all subsequent copies preserved or increased them. One particularly unfortunate error, confusion of Old English *wite* ‘punishment, fine’ with French *quite* (de) ‘free from, absolved of’ had the effect of reversing the sense of several of the definitions. *Skemer gives a fuller account of the glossary, its uses, and its very wide dissemination, and prints one with Latin definitions: the Latin here has also wrongly taken *wite* as ‘liberty’.

2. Latin Lexicographers, Their Methods and Works, Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries

Much of Volume 1 in this series was dominated by the complicated relationships between early and late Old English glossaries, derived from the ‘original English collection’ and later much augmented with hermeneutic vocabulary, but these cease to be easily traceable in the post-Conquest period. In this volume the works of a few important Latin lexicographers will instead tend to dominate the discussion. *Weijers provides, as well as an introduction to the techniques and terminology of this period, an introduction to some of the most significant of these named lexicographers. Isidore of Seville is repeatedly mentioned as an important

---

13 Much research has been done in this area. Recent collections include Berkhout and Gatch; Bremmer; Damico; and Graham, *Recovery* and ‘Anglo-Saxon Studies’. See also references in Volumes 3 and 4 of this series.

14 See also *T.L.L.* (54–5) and Keiser (*Manual* #552).

15 See, however, comments in §6.2.1.
source throughout this volume and Volume 1, especially his *Etymologiae* (from the beginning of the seventh century), an encyclopedia of the learning of his time, with Book 10 an etymological dictionary in a-order (*Weijers 113; Lindsay). The others are from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries; only Osbern, Adam of Petit Point, Alexander Nequam, and John of Garland are Englishmen, but they spent time in Paris and were authors of important Latin lexicographical material. The works of all of them were widely distributed and influential, and recur throughout this volume as important sources used by other lexicographers.16 Many of their works were much glossed and form the bulk of the material in Tony Hunt’s three-volume *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England (TLL)*, an indispensable resource on lexicography in this period.17 Hunt presents evidence from almost 200 manuscripts written in England, mostly in the thirteenth century, of Latin glossaries and Latin grammatical texts which were glossed in either Anglo-Norman or Middle English.18 His purpose is ‘to show that from the Conquest onwards both French and English were used in the classroom as media of instruction’ (*Hunt 226). The wide range of texts in *TLL* includes ones by all the Latin lexicographers listed below.

*Kornexl uses evidence from TLL to look at the role of English in post-Conquest grammatical instruction, particularly the influence of Ælfric of Eynsham (Volume 1, §4.6) and John of Cornwall (discussed below, §5.5.2), Although no new grammatical works were written in English in this period, *Kornexl believes that English was still used in teaching (137). She cites Ælfric’s *Grammar* (Latin–Old English; Volume 1, §4.6) and its use for almost two hundred years after the Conquest as evidence of vernacular access to Latin (139). Three late copies were glossed in Anglo-Norman, Latin, and English, and the tremulous hand of Worcester made a copy in the first half of the thirteenth century (140, 143–4; §1.4). Much evidence of vernacular access to Latin in the thirteenth century is found in *TLL*, but *Kornexl says it is difficult to assess the evidence of these glosses (138–9), which are predominantly Anglo-Norman, when it seems that Anglo-Norman was largely acquired by teaching by that stage (147; see also §4). It is possible that the numerous French glosses in thirteenth-century Latin manuscripts had some function in the learning of French…though the dearth of material that can help to elucidate the practical aspects of the teaching of French in medieval England

---

16 On their use by the compilers of the four major alphabetical dictionaries of the fifteenth century, see §6. Some sources from the earlier period remain productive, for example the *Liber glossarum* (also known as *Glossarium Ansileubi*) from France at the end of the eighth century (*Weijers 114; see also Volume 1, §1.1).

17 His introduction is an excellent, well-referenced account of glossographical activity in Latin and various vernaculars, noting, for instance, ‘...the most salient fact to emerge from this brief survey of vernacular glossing is the universal neglect of French, both continental and insular’ (*TLL* 10). Hunt lists manuscripts, prints and discusses texts, prints the glosses, and supplies indices. The wealth of material in *TLL* is impossible to illustrate briefly. Rothwell’s comment that ‘...the rich store of new information in *Teaching and Learning Latin* has not so far been fully exploited from the lexicological point of view’ (‘Teaching and Learning of French’ 3) is an understatement. Rothwell used evidence from *TLL* to argue that rejection of gloss material by scholars is unwarranted. These glosses can provide ‘[m]uch of the basic vocabulary of real medieval life [which] is rarely, if ever, found in medieval fiction’ (‘From Latin to Anglo-French’ 585). He also argued through a series of examples (588–92) that the glosses are much more reliable than many have assumed.

18 Texts glossed only in Latin are not included.
does not allow of any safe conclusions' (148–9). She concludes that the teaching of Latin at this time, with or without French as the official language of access, must have included extensive oral support in English (149). See *Kornexl's discussion in §5.5.2 of the fourteenth-century change to the use of English.

Some of the techniques and terms of lexicography remain the same as those in Volume 1 of this series, for example the one *Weijers (120–21) describes as glossography. Interlinear and marginal glosses were collected as *glossae collectae. Then such lists could be added to, combined, and selected from; they could be rearranged alphabetically by first letter, *ab-order, and later more fully. The full range from *a-order to complete alphabetization is found in this volume. Many glossaries in the post-Conquest period are not alphabetical but were instead grouped into related subject categories to teach Latin vocabulary and are called class or subject glossaries.

New methods introduced by Latin lexicographers beginning in the eleventh century are very important in the development of dictionaries. The derivation method, first used by Papias (§2.1) in the middle of the eleventh century, showed relationships between words by grouping them in families (*Weijers 121–3). The method soon became too complicated as *Weijers (123) shows for Hugutio (§2.3). John Balbi (§2.5) made it simpler and easier to use. Hunt attributes the rise of ‘dictionaries’ to this method: ‘[t]he emergence of dictionaries as distinct from *libri glossarum, or collections of glosses, is the result of the increasing use of the derivational principle as a method of extending the lexical knowledge of students whose Latin was relatively elementary’ (TLL 371). Two of John of Garland’s works, *Synonyma and *Equivoca, also use new techniques which soon become popular (§2.8.3–4).

Information from *Weijers (114–19, 122–3, 126) on the first five lexicographers discussed below (§2.1–5) has been supplemented from TLL (371–94). *Brother Bonaventure (especially 363 and 368–9) discusses Papias, Hugutio, Brito, Balbi, and John of Garland in his examination of texts used in the study of grammar in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; see §5.5.1. The three twelfth- and thirteenth-century English scholars, Adam of Petit Point, Alexander Nequam, and John of Garland (§2.6–8), are not in *Weijers, but are discussed in TLL (chs. 7, 8, and 9) and in Hüllem (81–6). Their texts, much glossed in Latin, French, and Middle English, often circulated together and are often discussed together. *Lendinara looks at Adam of Petit Point and Alexander Nequam.

2.1 Papias

Probably from Northern Italy, Papias wrote, in the 1040s, Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum (also known as *Elementarium, *Glossarium, *Alphabetum, *Brevarium, and *Vocabularium). Its main source was the *Liber glossarum (discussed Volume 1, §1.1), but he used a wide variety of classical and Christian writers as well as Priscian and *Abavus maior (TLL 372). He introduced the derivation method into his work, by creating families of terms based on the ‘original’ one from which all the others derived. He gives the first known description of alphabetization and attempts to extend it to two or three letters. He gives genders of nouns and declensions of verbs and uses quotations. His work contains a mixture of simple glosses and

\[^{19}\text{ab-order means alphabetized by the first two letters, etc. See *Weijers, 123–4, on alphabetization.}\]

\[^{20}\text{Ælfric’s Glossary (see Volume 1, §4.6) was an important example of this type; it and Ælfric’s Grammar continued to be used through the thirteenth century (see references in fn 12).}\]
encyclopedic articles. *Brother Bonaventure says it resembles a ‘modern pocket dictionary for schools’ and it contains ‘a large number of geographical and historical names for quick reference’ accounting for its popularity in the later medieval period (369).

2.2 Osbern of Gloucester
Osbern was an English Benedictine, from the mid-twelfth century, and, according to Hunt (TLL 372), he has been much neglected. He wrote Panormia (also known as Panormia siue liber derivationum, Derivationes, and Liber derivationum). ‘Goetz had investigated the sources of the outstandingly rich Panormia, but much further work needs to be done’ (TLL 373). Each letter had a section of derivationes followed by a section of repetitiones which contained difficult words of unknown origin and also repeated less common words from the first section. ‘[T]hrough the use made of it by Hugutio of Pisa [§2.3] in his Derivationes, [it] entered into the main current of European learning’ (TLL 373, quoting R.W. Hunt). ‘The encyclopedic tendency of Papias [§2.1] has completely given way to the philological and grammatical elaboration of derivatio as the informing principle of the work’ (TLL 375).

2.3 Hugutio (also known as Hugo of Pisa and Ugucio)
Hugatio, from Italy, died in 1210 and was ‘perhaps the most famous of medieval lexicographers’ (*Weijers 116). His work, Derivationes, also known as Magnae derivationes and Maiores derivationes, was very popular and the basis of much later lexicographical work; it was often enlarged and modified, but it has still never been printed. His sources, very diverse, include Papias (§2.1), Osbern (§2.2), and Isidore’s Etymologiae. His work became the main source for John Balbi (§2.5). It is an etymological dictionary but also includes collections of words with simple explanations and encyclopedic ones. Organized by the derivation method, it is difficult to use, and from the second half of the thirteenth century on, alphabetical indices were compiled.

2.4 William Brito (also known as Guillelmus Brito)
Probably a Franciscan, between 1248 and 1267 William Brito composed Expositiones vocabulorum biblie (also known as Expositiones difficiliorum verborum de biblia, Summa, and Summa, sive opusculum difficilium vocabulorum biblie): a dictionary of about 2500 of the more difficult words in the Bible, selected from Papias (§2.1), Hugutio (§2.3), and Isidore. It was fully alphabetized and used a more precise referencing system than others.

2.5 John Balbi (also known as John of Genoa, Johannes Januensis de Balbis, Johannes de Janua, Johannes Balbus, and Giovanni Balbi de Genova)
A Dominican, born in Genoa, John Balbi finished his Catholicon (also known as Summa grammaticalis or Summa) in 1286. The fifth part of it was a dictionary. He was not an innovator but ‘an assiduous compiler of the knowledge of his time’ (*Weijers 118). He applied full alphabetical order and left out much obsolete material from his main source, Hugutio (§2.3), creating a very successful and practical encyclopedic dictionary, much used in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and printed by Gutenberg in 1460 (and frequently reprinted); *Weijers (118) says it is still useful. It was a basic and very important source for Promptorium parvulorum (§6.1.1) and ‘for most lexicons, Latin and bilingual, in the second half of the fifteenth century.’ (Starnes 12).
2.6 Adam of Petit Point (also known as Adam of Balsham)

The twelfth-century English scholar Adam of Balsham was known as Adam of Petit Pont because he taught in Paris near Petit Pont. *Lendinara calls his Oratio de utensilibus (also known as De utensilibus) an example of contextualized lexicography, that is, a class glossary turned into continuous discourse, ‘a teaching tool employed by masters since the Late Roman period’ (175). *Lendinara argues that Adam wanted to pay back a certain ‘Anselm’ for reproaching him for using plain language, and did so by replying with long strings of uncommon Latin words in long and at times meaningless sentences (162). Some earlier compositions, such as Book III of the Bella Parisiacae urbis by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés also mocked the penchant for rare words (in particular words of Greek origin)’ (177), and they were also ‘valued as a repository of “exotic” vocabulary’. The words selected by Adam and strung together in jest had the unexpected result of making his letter so popular: the Oratio was copied over and over and supplied with glosses and commentaries, which prove that Adam’s work remained popular for more than two centuries’ (179). His main source was Isidore’s Etymologiae, but he also used a number of others possibly including Latin–Latin glossaries (169–74). A few small sections on contemporary features of the estate have no known sources and may be his own (174–5).

2.7 Alexander Nequam (or Neckam)

Nequam (1157–1217) was a distinguished English scholar, versatile, prolific, and much esteemed. Hunt notes ‘Nequam’s continuing influence, as yet uncharted, in the field of medieval lexicography’ (TLL 393, fn 85). Some have thought Nequam’s De nominibus utensilium was modelled on Adam’s De utensilibus, but *Lendinara believes it is indebted to class glossaries, citing close parallels in the thirteenth-century Latin–Anglo-Norman nominale in Oxf., Bodl. Libr. Douce 88, printed in TLL 420–28 (180–82).24 The expansion in the number and variety of subject fields from pre-Conquest class glossaries, for example the eight of Ælfric’s Glossary, may be attributed to the shift from monastic schools to town schools: the subjects reflect the many more trades, objects, and activities around them (181).25 ‘The lists of words became more mundane, the sections on the house furniture, clothes and ornaments became larger and the objects of everyday life came to include implements peculiar to women, spinning
and weaving tools, etc. This is particularly evident in the Dictionarius of John of Garland (181).

2.8 John of Garland and his works

Garland is the third of the three exceptionally influential English scholars. Hunt emphasizes his importance and the need for more research, for example the ‘crying need for more editions of texts, especially the numerous lexical treatises of John of Garland, and of the commentaries which so frequently accompany them’ (TLL 18). ‘A new era will open in medieval Latin lexicography...when the Dictionarius of John of Garland, in one sense the first of all dictionaries, and his other wordbooks receive the attention of modern scholars which they deserve’ (TLL 195). ‘The derivational principle, imitated largely from Osbem and Hugutio, is at the basis of a lexicographical work by John of Garland entitled Unus omnium. This almost unknown, and completely unstudied, verse treatise...is of fundamental importance to medieval Latin lexicography’ (TLL 395). His works are often found in grammatical manuscripts and were used by compilers of fifteenth-century alphabetical dictionaries; see §6.1.1–2. They are also found in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century grammatical manuscripts studied by *Brother Bonaventure (362–3, 366, 368, 369); see §5.5.1.

2.8.1 Dictionarius was composed c. 1220 in Paris, but not printed until the nineteenth century. Hunt prints and discusses it (TLL 191–203) and stresses its lexicographical importance. It followed the subject-oriented wordbooks of Adam of Petit Pont and Alexander Nequam and was often transmitted with them (TLL 191). The topics cover a wide range from the parts of the body to a vision of Heaven and thoughts of the Last Judgment, including along the way, for example, occupations of women (spinning, weaving, carding, and cleaning), birds, animals, herbs, trees, ships and shipwrecks, and musical instruments (TLL 195). It is ‘not a collection of exotica...but a storehouse...of the names of everyday things...words concerning daily life’ (TLL 194).27

2.8.2 The attribution of Distigium to John of Garland is disputed.28 It was written c. 1200–20, much glossed and frequently given commentaries. Starnes (15) describes it as a series of proverbial sayings followed by topics: names of animals, house and furnishings, parts of the body, mills and associated objects, blacksmith’s shop, instruments of house and farm (including distaff, spindle, plough, and wagon), musical instruments, various artificers (for example, cobbler, tailor, dyer, Tanner, mason, carpenter), trees, dress material, and various classes of people.29 Lendinara, ‘Competing with Abbo’, discusses this poem and its use of rare words.

---

26 See Sharpe #709 for fuller details and references; Keiser, Manual #500 and 551; and Hüllen 85–6. Shaw discusses John of Garland, Equivoca, and early printed editions of it and other grammatical texts.
27 Glosses from BL MS Harley 1002 (fols. 176–81v) are printed in Thomas Wright #8; see also §5.4.
28 See Keiser, Manual #550 and #551. Sharpe #709 includes it. Hunt prints the text (TLL 328–48) and discusses it (323–8): ‘Some...attribute the Distigium to John of Garland, but the text alone hardly justifies the claim’ (323).
29 Printed W&W #16 (col. 621 to halfway down 624) from BL MS Harley 1002, fol. 113. Also found, for example, in Aberystwyth, Natl. Libr. of Wales MS Peniarth 356B (two copies, one partly glossed in English) and in BL MS Addit. 37075 (glossed in Latin and English).
2.8.3 **Synonyma** is a new type of treatise or vocabulary, grouping in metrical form ‘words of similar meaning...perhaps primarily as an aid to the memory, but also as a way of distinguishing differences among words in a closely related group’ (Starnes 20). It is a major source for *Catholicum Anglicum*; see §6.1.2. Hunt discusses it and prints an extract (TLL 136–8). Bursill-Hall lists about 80 copies.30

2.8.4 **Equivoca** (also known as *Liber equivocorum*) distinguishes ‘similar sounding words (not always homonyms) which have different senses. The distinction of such words became something of an industry in the thirteenth century’ (TLL 138; see extract, 138–42). It was often found with *Synonyma*. Bursill-Hall (170) lists about 28 copies. See also Shaw on this text and a printed edition from 1502.

2.8.5 **Unus omnium**. Hunt (TLL 395–9) prints extracts and stresses its importance to lexicologists; it provides much earlier dating of many words in *DMLBS* (398–9). It was based on the derivational principle, imitated from Osbem and Hugutio (§2.2–3).

3. Other Latin Texts and Glossaries with Anglo-Norman and English Glosses, Mainly Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries

This section looks at Latin texts or glossaries from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which have Anglo-Norman and/or English glosses, but it excludes the scholars and texts discussed in §2. The manuscripts cited here are catalogued and described in EM. As in the pre-Conquest period, glossed texts and glossaries are usually linked in some way to teaching or learning. In the pre-Conquest period the language being taught was Latin: the texts being glossed were Latin, and pre-Conquest glossaries usually consisted of Latin words glossed into easier Latin and sometimes also into Old English.31 As in §2, the glosses here are still usually Latin, but also include some Anglo-Norman and English ones. Much of the surviving post-Conquest lexicographical material contains Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English, attesting to the importance and ‘continuing coexistence of the three languages...in the case of written composition’ (*Hunt* 226). This is discussed in more detail in §4.

In both §§3 and 4 of this Introduction, it is difficult to assess the significance of the mixture of languages in the glosses and glossaries.

3.1 Latin texts or glossaries with a few Anglo-Norman or English glosses

The first appearance of Anglo-Norman is in glosses rather than glossaries, as *Hunt* (226) says, ‘[s]ignificantly...in a trilingual context’: three late eleventh-century glosses in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 8092; and early twelfth-century glosses in Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 2. 31 and CCCC MS 23.32 *Pulsiano* (29) also noted the continuous Anglo-Norman

---

30 Including Aberystwyth, Natl. Libr. of Wales Peniarth 356B; CCCC 233 (with Latin and English glosses); Cbg., Gonville & Caius Coll. MS 417/447; Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 5. 4; BL MS Addit. 12195; BL MS Addit. 19046; and BL MS Addit. 37075.

31 *Elfric’s Grammar and Glossary* are exceptions to this; see Volume 1, §4.6.

32 More details are found in *TLL* 9 and 19–20. Porter discusses early French glosses added by a continental scribe. His essay is reproduced in Volume 1 of this series; see Volume 1, §4.5. Porter,
interlinear gloss which accompanies the Old English one to the Latin Eadwine Psalter (Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS R. 17. 1), from the mid-1160s. As well, there are some early and very short trilingual texts: *Pulsiano cites BL MS Cotton Titus D. xxiv, which has on fol. 156 Latin, Old English, and Anglo-Norman versions of formulas for the visitation of the sick (30; he dates it c. 1160-80; see also Ker #201). *Pulsiano (30) also notes Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Rawlinson C. 641, with proverbs in French and Latin, but with two on fols. 13v–18r which are trilingual: Ker #348, s. xii/xiii.

The first few surviving glossaries containing Anglo-Norman glosses are mostly fragments and from the twelfth century. They have the normal pre-Conquest format with Latin glosses to Latin words, but also have a few glosses in Anglo-Norman and English.33

*Howlett gives an example of a very early glossary (twelfth century) which contains Anglo-Norman glosses. This Latin a-order alphabetical glossary (‘A’–‘F’), in Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Norfolk Rolls 81, has a few English and French glosses among its mixture of encyclopedic and lexical glosses, and demonstrates the wide range of interests of its compiler. *Howlett marks entries with parallels in Isidore’s *Etymologies*, Book 20 (a third of the entries), and the Old English CCCC 144, Harley 3376, and Leiden glossaries.34 This glossary is not cited or discussed in *TLL* because it is considered to be Old English (see Ker #347); but the presence of the two French glosses, not noted by Ker, entitles it to a place here. Written on the dorse of a roll of charters from Holme St Benets, ‘a monastic house remote from centres of power and prestige’ (*Howlett 191), it is not copied from any existing glossary. It thus provides an interesting contrast, well worthy of study, to the not-much-earlier late Old English glossaries which survive mainly from a few main centres of scholarship (see Volume 1 of this series).

Other twelfth-century Latin–Latin glossaries containing some Anglo-Norman and English glosses are the following, discussed *TLL* 20–23:35

BL MS Royal 7 D. ii, fols. 18v–19v.36 Ker #258. ‘A’–‘C’ of an alphabetical glossary, with over 220 Latin, 14 Old English, and four Anglo-Norman glosses. The mid-twelfth-century Anglo-Norman glosses are printed in *TLL* 20.

Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 3. 37, fols. 198v–202r. An alphabetical glossary, with some vernacular glosses, printed in *TLL* 21–2.

BL MS Stowe 57, fols. 155v–65r. Second half of the twelfth century. Keiser, *Manual* #553 1; Ker #272: Peterborough or nearby. A Latin class glossary, with some Anglo-Norman and English glosses to sections on animals and birds and many blanks spaces where vernacular glosses were never entered. Vernacular glosses printed in *TLL* 22–3.

‘Earliest Texts’.

33 The English in these twelfth- and early thirteenth-century manuscripts is sometimes classified as Old English and sometimes as Middle English because the boundary between the two is difficult to draw.

34 On these glossaries see Volume 1, §§2.4.2.3, 4.4, and 2.4.1.1 respectively. Old English glosses were printed in Meritt #69.

35 None of these three glossaries is included in Dean.

36 See also Lendinara (‘Glossarial Activity’ 295–9) on this glossary.
From around 1200 or beginning of the thirteenth century:

Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Bodley 730, fols. 144ra–46vc. Dean #307; Ker #317: from Buildwas. Discussed in TLL 26. Fragments of five Latin class glossaries, three of which contain Old English glosses but no Anglo-Norman or Middle English.37 The vernacular glosses only are printed in Hunt, ‘Bodley 730’:38 lines 1–118 in his edition: Latin glossed into Anglo-Norman and occasionally Middle English; lines 306–16: a few scattered Anglo-Norman and Old English?/Middle English? among mainly Latin glosses.

3.2 Latin–Anglo-Norman glossaries
From the thirteenth century, when aids for learning French begin to appear (§4), are the three major surviving Latin–Anglo-Norman glossaries (with ‘considerable similarities’ (TLL 400)). As Rothwell (‘From Latin to Anglo-French’ 588) notes, they are not related to any specific texts. Unlike the preceding glossaries these contain only Anglo-Norman glosses.

Glasgow, UL MS Hunter 292, fols. 18–21. c. 1250. Dean #306; described and printed in TLL 400–19.39 Somewhat disordered and incomplete, on four inserted folios, it contains verbs (Latin–Anglo-Norman), plant names (Latin–Anglo-Norman), Anglo-Norman nouns and adjectives with Latin synonyms below, and other subject fields (Latin–Anglo-Norman).

Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Douce 88, fols. 147va–54vb. Mid-thirteenth century. Dean #305 and #296; described in TLL 401 and printed 420–32.40 A Latin–Anglo-Norman nominale with various subject categories, followed by an alphabetical list of Anglo-Norman verbs (‘A’–‘E’) with Latin synonyms below.

Oxf., St John’s Coll. MS 178, fols. 414va–15vb. About 1300. Extracts printed by Ewart (‘St John’s’), who says it looks like a rough copy. Dean #304; discussed in TLL 401.41 A Latin–Anglo-Norman nominale closely related to that in Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Douce 88, with 360 entries in 11 subject categories.

3.3 Trilingual plant name glossaries: Latin–Anglo-Norman–English
Most glossaries contain plant names, especially class-order ones. But there are also many specialized medical manuscripts containing lists of plant names along with medical treatises. Most of these lists contain Latin and vernacular names, and most of the glossaries themselves have never been printed in full. Although these manuscripts and glossaries cover the entire period, I have put them in this section because the trilingual glossaries which have been printed are thirteenth century.

37 See also Volume 1, §4.1.5.2, for fuller details on these five glossaries.
38 See also Merrilees.
39 Ewart, ‘Glasgow’, printed extracts only.
40 Previously printed, with notes, in Hunt, ‘Anglo-Norman Vocabularies’.
41 Its entries largely overlap with Douce 88, and since Hunt printed variants and unique readings from it in ‘Anglo-Norman Vocabularies’, he does not reprint it in TLL.
Tony Hunt (Plant Names) has done for Middle English what Bierbaumer did for Old English plant names, collecting and identifying over 1800 vernacular names for over 600 plant species (xi); about 400 are ‘of unambiguously French form or else preceded by gallice in the MSS’ (xlviii). Nearly 500 of these plant names are not recorded in the OED and another 89 were recorded first there in the sixteenth century (xlvi–xlviii). This has meant ‘that the debt of the sixteenth-century English herbalists to their medieval predecessors has never been investigated’ (xlvi–xlvi). The manuscripts containing plant names are listed and described (xix–xxxvi); most contain still unprinted glossaries, and most have Latin and vernacular glosses.

Two thirteenth-century trilingual plant name glossaries have been printed:

BL MS Harley 978, fol. 26–27v. c. 1230–60. Dean #312; Keiser #247j. Mentioned in TLL 400. Probably from Reading Abbey. Printed W&W #14, and reproduced in *Sauer. Latin–Anglo-Norman–English, about 150 English plant names, organized into four sections: chaudes herbes, freides herbes, inter frigidum et calidum, and inter frigidum et calidum temperatum. This glossary was not included in Hunt (Plant Names).

*Sauer gives a linguistic analysis of the English names in BL MS Harley 978. He describes the glossary, its structure, and its division into the four sections. The Latin–Anglo-Norman–English format may have arisen from a Latin–Anglo-Norman glossary to which English glosses were added (198). *Sauer uses this format to assign languages to the vernacular glosses, that is, the first plant name after the Latin word is assumed to be French and the second, English. (Unlike some glossaries no anglice or gallice labels are given here (201).) In a few cases this order is not followed or there is only one vernacular name (198). Sauer acknowledges the problems of attempting to assign language labels, and some may feel his method is too rigid: ‘planteine in 558/22 would still be a foreign (French) word because it is followed by an English equivalent (weibrode), whereas plauntein in 559/27 would be a loan-word in English because it is not followed by a native equivalent’ (201). Sauer analyses the etymology, the morphology, and the semantic structure of the names in considerable detail (199–214). He concludes although some plant-names are of unclear or problematic derivation, ‘[m]any plant names were inherited from Old English, but there were also new (Middle English) formations based on the inherited word formation patterns, including a number of loan-formations’ (214).

The important and difficult problem of identifying whether a word is Anglo-Norman or English is further discussed in §§4 and 4.2.

---

42 See Volume 1, §4.2.1–3 on Old English plant names.
43 Other recent work on Middle English plant names includes Taavitsainen and Pahta, and the electronic resources: Voigts and Kurtz; and Taavitsainen, Pahta, and Mäkinen. MacKinney is a very useful survey of medieval dictionaries and glossaries, the terminology used to describe them, and how they are organized. Hunt, Plant Names, also surveys the principal sources of medieval botany, with references (xxxvii–xliii) and a bibliography (li–lvi).
44 Attention has been drawn to a few of these, for example, *Sauer (197): BL MS Sloane 5, fols. 4r–12v, and BL MS Royal 12 G. iv, fols. 134r–36v. Dean #311 lists glossaries of plant names in five manuscripts, and Dean #314 lists short notes of plant names in nine manuscripts. See TLL 50–52 on botanical glosses. See also Keiser, Manual #247.
45 Hunt, ‘Sloane 146’ 289, in 3, corrects some of the readings in W&W.
BL MS Sloane 146, fols. 69v–72r. Dean #313; Keiser #247h; printed and discussed Hunt, ‘Sloane 146’. 286 entries in two sections. The first section has Anglo-Norman and English glosses (marked gall. and angl.) to Latin names in no order, and roughly follows BL MS Harley 978, with additional entries, up to W&W #14, 556/19. The rest is a fragment (‘A’–’C’) of a mostly a-order Latin–English glossary, related to the Old English Durham Herbal Glossary in Durham Cathedral Libr. MS Hunter 100.46

4. Anglo-Norman and the Trilingual Society, from the Thirteenth Century47

Exactly how Anglo-Norman was acquired in England at different points in time and levels of society is not fully understood, but for some period after the Conquest (most scholars agree) some acquired it because they were members of Anglo-Norman families who used Anglo-Norman and taught it to the next generation. A considerable body of literary texts written in Anglo-Norman in England in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries must indicate that there was an audience for such material at that stage. But the survival from the thirteenth century of treatises teaching Anglo-Norman grammar and vocabulary suggests that formal instruction increasingly became the more common way of acquiring it (Rothwell, ‘Teaching and Learning of French’ 6–7). Anglo-Norman remained the language of culture and was used by the landed gentry in the management of their estates, and it was essential for scribes and clerks aspiring to careers in the increasingly important areas of law and administration into the fifteenth century; see §§4.1.3, 4.2, and 4.3. Rothwell has written many important articles on Anglo-Norman and Middle English. In two articles (‘Teaching French’ and ‘Teaching and Learning of French’), he identified three types of manuals of instruction: grammatical treatises, books of conversations, and word lists. Grammars have been treated quite fully: in Rothwell, ‘Teaching French’ 41–5, and especially in ‘Teaching and Learning of French’, as well as in TLL and Dean; see also *Kornexl. The most surprising conclusion to emerge is perhaps that although the approach to teaching French was through Latin, ‘French was in fact acquired without necessarily involving a great deal of Latin’ (Rothwell, ‘Teaching and Learning of French’ 12). Books of conversation have had less treatment; these are discussed in §4.4. The wordlists are of the greatest interest to this volume.

Tony Hunt’s contribution to Anglo-Norman studies in general, and especially in making available glossed texts, glossaries, and plant names, is great. From his many publications I have chosen ‘Anglo-Norman: Past and Future’, which gives an overview of Anglo-Norman studies and is a concise and recent guide to the achievements and the deficiencies of Anglo-Norman studies thus far, for example insufficient attention to non-literary texts and to the study of code-switching and code-mixing (*Hunt 224–5). *Hunt emphasizes the erroneous ‘belief that Anglo-Norman became a true vernacular, and a spoken vernacular, in medieval England, whereas its true significance is as a written language of literature and record and, linguistically speaking, as a contact language’ (224). Future research must acknowledge the continuing coexistence of the three languages (Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English). Their

46 See Volume I, §4.2.1.

47 The main resources used in this section are TLL: Keiser’s section 10, ‘1. The Teaching of French’ (Manual #507–11); Dean; Hüllen; and http://www.anglo-norman.net. I refer to the French used in England in this period as Anglo-Norman to distinguish it from continental French.
shared lexis, for example, is evident from *DMLBS*, *MED*, and *AND* ‘which have thousands of lexical items in common’ (227). ‘For centuries the three languages existed side-by-side and their mutual influence or interference...makes absolutely discrete distinctions impossible and pointless’ (228). This is discussed further in §4.2.

4.1 Three Anglo-Norman verse vocabularies, thirteenth to fifteenth centuries

One has to wonder how the first Anglo-Norman glossaries were compiled; the same question will arise below with first alphabetical English–Latin dictionaries in the fifteenth century (§6.1). Hüllen (89) says they were modelled on treatises in Latin (by Adam of Petit Point, Alexander Nequam, and John of Garland (§2.6–8)), but the mechanics are unexplained. Rothwell (‘Teaching French’ 41) says ‘the *Tretiz* and the *Nominale sive verbale* are not exactly prodigal of information regarding their origin, aims, and uses’.

I have included *Rothwell’s essay on vocabulary in *Femina nova* (‘Vocabulary’) because it discusses all three important and related Anglo-Norman verse vocabularies, the *Tretiz*, the *Nominale sive verbale*, and *Femina nova*. The *Tretiz* (the earliest of the three) has a named author: Walter de Bibbesworth.

4.1.1 The *Tretiz* of Walter de Bibbesworth. Edited by Rothwell (*Le Tretiz*). Described *TLL* 12–13; Keiser, *Manual* #507; Dean #285; Hüllen 89 and 452; Kennedy. Walter of Bibbesworth was a thirteenth-century Englishman whose Anglo-Norman was an acquired language (Rothwell, ‘Teaching French’ 38–9). The *Tretiz* is a rhyming-verse, contextualized vocabulary of Anglo-Norman, with some interlinear English glosses as well as a few Anglo-Norman ones. It is a teaching manual, directly addressed to a woman, Dyonisie de Mountechensi, to enable her to teach her children Anglo-Norman vocabulary. As very early surviving evidence of the teaching of Anglo-Norman, its date is of considerable interest. Early views had put it late in the thirteenth century, but most scholars now date it in the mid-thirteenth century (1240–50), a date which seems to derive from Baugh. But Rothwell (*Le Tretiz*) urges caution: ‘Of Bibbesworth himself and of his patroness nothing is known for certain, in spite of conjectural identifications.’ The *Tretiz* was clearly popular; some 16 manuscripts or fragments survive in two recensions with varying amounts of glossing, dating from the late thirteenth century to the first half of the fifteenth. Rothwell’s edition of the version in CUL MS Gg. 1. 1, from the first half of the fourteenth century, is 1140 lines long; the shorter recension is 850 lines.

Much of the *Tretiz* contains the specialized and even technical terminology of country life and pursuits; it is a wonderful source of both vocabulary and cultural history. As Kennedy notes (132), it goes beyond a normal *nominale* by including the verbs needed in the various
activities: weaving cloth, setting the table, lighting a fire, serving dishes at a feast, etc. It is presented as a loose narrative, for example an infant learns to crawl, walk, and speak. Later the child is taken around the estate to learn names (and sometimes noises) of birds, animals, flowers, trees, etc., country occupations and tools, different kinds of weather, etc. At the end the nominale returns indoors to the preparations for a feast, with the boar’s head carried in at the end. It is full of wordplay and puns, with the narrative interrupted to differentiate homonyms:\[52\] some of the odd ‘classes’ such as ‘red things’ and ‘breaking things’ are accounted for by this. The Tretiz was, at least originally, aimed at the new generations of a now English nobility, but it is written entirely in Anglo-Norman, with glosses in Middle English seemingly only to difficult words. *Rothwell (‘Vocabulary’) argues that Bibbesworth was able to assume that his intended thirteenth-century readers knew some basic Anglo-Norman grammar and vocabulary in order to be able to use the Tretiz; the few Middle English glosses are insufficient help otherwise. Interestingly the English glosses to the Tretiz are overwhelmingly native English words, whereas those to a fifteenth-century version, Femina (§4.1.3), are largely of Anglo-Norman origin (*Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 241–5). No Latin is used in the Tretiz, unlike Nominale sive verbale and Femina (§4.1.2–3). ‘The social environment of the countryside in which Bibbesworth’s patroness and her children lived around the middle of the thirteenth century would not necessarily demand any contact with Latin’ (*Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 240).

4.1.2 Nominale sive verbale (Nsv) was edited by Skeat\[53\] from the single surviving manuscript, CUL MS Ee. 4. 20, fols. 162–164b.\[54\] Dean #308; Keiser, Manual #553a; Hüll 89–90 and 453. Both Keiser and Hüll list the categories, taking them from Skeat 3*.\[55\] *Rothwell (‘Vocabulary’ 256, fn 41) accepts *Richardson’s date of about 1385 (rather than Skeat’s of 1340), as well as *Richardson’s qualification ‘possibly from an older copy of the thirteenth century’ (306).

Like the Tretiz (§4.1.1) though a century later, Nsv is a rhyming vocabulary. Unlike the Tretiz but like Femina (§4.1.3), Nsv is fully translated into English, line by line, possibly an indication that the compiler could not assume the intended user had an even elementary knowledge of Anglo-Norman. Rothwell (‘Problem’ 195) calls it a much abbreviated\[56\] and loose adaptation of the Tretiz, and it lacks the Tretiz’s narrative structure. The largest category in Skeat’s list (ll. 77–422) is ‘Natural noises and Actions of Men and Women’, much of which is verbale-like, for example ‘Homme parle et espire/Man speketh and vndyth’ (ll. 79–80); many of the rest of the categories are nominale-like, for example ‘Egle griffon et gelyne/Erne grip henne/

\[52\] See §2.8.4 on the popularity of this.

\[53\] As with Tretiz (see above fn 48), this edition is now available online at http://www.anglo-norman.net. The full title in the manuscript is: ‘Nominale sive verbale in Gallicis cum expositione eiusdem in Anglicis’.

\[54\] The contents of this manuscript are described below, §4.3.

\[55\] ‘Parts of the body, noises and actions of humans, assemblies, building a house, utensils, winds and storms, breaking things, puns, red things, trees, beasts, noises of beasts, collective terms for beasts, birds, collective terms for birds, noises of birds, parts of plough and cart’ (Keiser, Manual, p. 3724; also Hüll 453). Skeat 3* describes the list as ‘only the principal categories...others [are] included within these’.

\[56\] With 444 Anglo-Norman lines, Nsv is roughly one-third the length of the longer recension of the Tretiz.
Cok iarce et le Cyne/Cok gander and swan' (775–8). The Tretiz and Nsv share some unusual categories, for example collective terms for beasts and birds, noises of beasts and birds, ‘red’ things, and parts of a plough and cart. The only Latin is found in the title and in the rubrics of a few classes. Nsv has some significant differences from Femina, described just below: like the Tretiz, Nsv uses native English words to translate Anglo-Norman far more than Femina, and the Anglo-Norman terms Nsv does use are almost all nouns for concrete objects rather than abstractions as in Femina. See the comparisons, *Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 246–8.

4.1.3 Femina (nova) was edited by Rothwell (Femina) from the sole manuscript, Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS B. 14. 40 (formerly 324), fols. 88r–146v. Dean #286; Keiser, Manual #508, lists categories; Hüllen 90–92 (quotations and discussion), 453 (lists categories). Like Nsv (§4.1.2), Femina was derived from Bibbesworth’s Tretiz (§4.1.1), but considerably later (1415–20). It consists of three sections, the first a shortened and ‘grossly inaccurate’ version of the Tretiz with largely rural and practical vocabulary; the second an extract from a treatise on good manners, Urbain le courtois, along with some proverbs from Bozon’s Proverbes de bon enseignement using vocabulary from a more refined and abstract register; and the third the compiler’s own creation: a guide (roughly alphabetical) in Anglo-Norman and English to the orthography, pronunciation, and meaning of the Anglo-Norman words in the first section (*Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 236–7). Unlike the Tretiz but like Nsv, the Anglo-Norman verse text in Femina is fully translated into Middle English. Again like Nsv, Femina has introductions and rubrics in Latin (238–9) which, along with its early fifteenth-century date, suggests a different context, audience, and purpose from Tretiz, well over a century and a half earlier, as announced in the opening lines: teaching Anglo-Norman to enable the young to speak well in front of wise men (Rothwell, Femina i–ii). The intended audience is not the young country aristocrats of the Tretiz but the growing class of administrators in the early fifteenth century who needed both Anglo-Norman and Latin to deal with the documents of late medieval England. *Rothwell (‘Vocabulary’ 238–40) cites *Richardson’s study of Sampson and other teachers of business in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries (§4.3); this manuscript is an important source of the type of texts used by Sampson.

---

57 See §§5.6.1 and 5.6.2 for a discussion of collective terms and noises.
58 This edition is available online at http://www.anglo-norman.net/texts/Femina. It replaces the earlier edition by William Aldis Wright.
59 ‘...collective terms for assemblies of beasts and birds; sounds made by beasts and birds; the world of the infant; parts of the head [sic]; inside the head; the parts of the body; the clothing of children; red things; homonyms; agriculture; the art of milling; sowing seeds; weaving and spinning; making ale; drunkenness; fishing; weather and seasons; names of plants; names of birds; names of animals; parts of a cart; parts of a plow; building a house; miscellaneous matter; a feast...’.
60 Rothwell, Femina i: the scribe is ‘far from competent in the language’; for example maintenent as ‘hand holdynge’ (iii).
61 See Rothwell, Femina i, for details of the editions.
62 Rothwell, Femina ii: a copy of Tretiz in the Oxf., All Souls Coll. MS 182 which is contemporary with Femina is still only sporadically glossed. See also §4.4 on this manuscript.
63 For these texts, see Dean #288 ‘Latin treatise for learning Anglo-Norman’; #291 ‘Liber Donati’; #293 ‘conjugations from Donatus’; #298 ‘pronoun declensions’; #300 ‘various vocabularies’; #322 ‘Manere de salutation’; and #323 ‘Modus compositionis literarum’ (possibly composed by Thomas Sampson). See also *Richardson 303–4, #9 and #17.
4.2 Trilingual England and its mixed languages

By fully translating his text into English, the compiler of *Femina* may be indicating that he assumes that its users may no longer know basic Anglo-Norman grammar or vocabulary. But by the time *Femina* was written, many originally Anglo-Norman words had been assimilated into English with the result that *Femina* uses words of Anglo-Norman origin in its so-called ‘English’ translation. Its users would be ‘reading French dressed up as English in order to learn French’ (*Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 241; see the examples, 241–5). Although Anglo-Norman died out as an independent language, the vocabulary of the refined life and of the abstract and administrative registers was taken over into written English when English became a language of record: ‘the protracted change-over from French to English shows an “English” vocabulary that is largely French tricked out with English endings and set in a framework of “English” grammar...a mixed language...survives in a host of business documents, accounts, inventories and the like’ (Rothwell, ‘Teaching and Learning of French’ 18). Many trilingual documents survive but ‘it would be rash to pronounce dogmatically on the language to which many words belong’ (*Rothwell, ‘Vocabulary’ 250). *Rothwell* refers to ‘the Anglo-French we now call Modern English’ (‘Vocabulary’ 251).

*Rothwell* (‘Trilingual’) discusses the extent to which the three languages were intertwined. English was increasingly used for records from the later fourteenth century, eventually superseding the others (261). He uses Chaucer as a focus for the trilingual situation in England in the second half of the fourteenth century, since Chaucer’s roles as envoy abroad, senior civil servant, and English poet involved him in using all three languages. The growth in royal administration necessitated the creation of a class of clerks able to keep legal, civic, financial, and commercial records in Latin (262). It is their Latin which characterizes the official documents of the fourteenth century. *Rothwell* (‘Trilingual’) uses Chaucer’s Summoner and Sergeant of the Law to demonstrate the range of knowledge of Latin (262–3). He argues that the Latin used was largely formulaic, and often derived from the Anglo-Norman of record-keeping, in both meaning and word-order (263). English or French words were also commonly inserted into a Latin text: ‘upper-class’ concerns usually in French, while everyday ones are usually in English (264–5). Sometimes a single Latin sentence in the records of the time will contain words from all three languages (265). Until recently this macaronic material received little attention, but there is a great deal of it, and it deserves serious study (266). *Rothwell* (‘Trilingual’ 266) quotes Laura Wright: ‘it is easier today to find macaronic documents from the late Medieval period in Record Offices than it is to find monolingual texts’. Many of the records are written with grammatical endings abbreviated, and editors normally expand these in editions (267). But in the original, the focus is very much on the semantic core of the words and the syntax is generally straightforward, making the records more comprehensible to a wider readership than they might otherwise be (268).

*Rothwell* (‘Trilingual’) argues that the influence of French on English is on three main levels. First, items of vocabulary are found in Middle English, usually via Anglo-Norman. Some of these, however, are simply English words in French disguise (276). Secondly, ‘French linguistic mechanisms are adopted to develop new categories of French-looking terms, which are, however, peculiar to England’ (275); these are often created with -er/-our,

---

64 See also Rothwell, ‘Aspects of Lexical and Morphosyntactical Mixing’.
erie, and -age suffixes (276–8). Thirdly, the coexistence of French and English means the history of a number of words is now difficult to disentangle (275, 278–81). He concludes that two languages in use by one level of society ‘on a daily basis by generations of scribes, officials, and scholars, simply cannot be kept apart’ (282).

4.3 Training for business, fourteenth century: Thomas Sampson

Lexicographical material in Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English is found in collections used for training for a career in business, as seen in *Femina*, §4.1.3.65 Rothwell, ‘Teaching and Learning of French’ 16, describes ‘compilations aimed at teaching the techniques of model letter-writing and model tracts. Their letters, in the main full of polite, not to say highly-coloured and effusive, vocabulary, often present the same text in both French and Latin, while the tracts, usually of a legal kind, are clearly associated with the training of clerks who would ensure that the wheels of administration in its widest sense did not come to a standstill.’ *Richardson gives an interesting account of works written by and used by Thomas Sampson, who taught business methods in Oxford in the second half of the fourteenth century using this sort of compilation.*66 He trained men as managers of agricultural estates who could also look after the personal affairs of the landowners, ‘the humbler legal duties which did not demand the services of a professional lawyer’ (302), in other words, the same men for whom *Nsv* and *Femina* (§4.1.2–3) were intended. Sampson’s texts include treatises and tracts in Latin and Anglo-Norman on letter writing (including model letters), conveyancing, wills, accounting, court-keeping, and heraldry; tracts on the office of a coroner and the office of a clerk in a noble household; precedents for bills and writs, etc.; Latin composition, Anglo-Norman composition, Anglo-Norman usage, tables of conjugations in Anglo-Norman and in Latin, lists of Anglo-Norman parts of speech, days of the week, months and principal feasts of the year, and tables for conversion of currency; and several vocabularies in Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English (296–7).67 The need for both Latin and Anglo-Norman is very clear in the range of texts and vocabularies. We have no way of knowing whether Sampson himself compiled any of the vocabularies. The main ones *Richardson lists (306) are:

BL MS Harley 4971, fols. 7–9. Anglo-Norman–English. Unprinted. Dean #397 (‘A long memorandum for a clerk of a manorial house detailing his numerous areas of responsibility with precise lists of objects and creatures in each of these’). This manuscript also contains other relevant Anglo-Norman texts: Dean #287 (‘Orthographia Gallica’), #293 (‘conjugations from Donatus’), #300 (‘various vocabularies’), and #317 (‘Ars dictaminis’).

---

65 Dionisotti (247; reproduced in Volume 1 of this series) also stresses the importance of this kind of training: ‘beside the teaching of the *grammaticus* there was also the teaching of the *notarius*; and we can at least begin to ask...what sort of training this was, and how it related to that of the *grammaticus*. For certainly both were given to increasing numbers of the young men who went on to administer and govern western Europe for the imperial, the ecclesiastical and in due course the royal power’.

66 *Richardson says ‘we need not doubt that teaching of this kind was established in Oxford in the thirteenth century’ (302). By the end of the fifteenth century, however, it seems to have disappeared from Oxford (300). See *Voigts and Shailor, §5.5.3.*

67 The last four listed under ‘Vocabularies’ (*Richardson 306) are very short and specific lists in Anglo-Norman found in BL MS Harley 4971, Ox., Magdalen Coll. MS 188, and CUL MS Ec. 4. 20. See Dean #300 ‘Various vocabularies’, where similar ones in a few other manuscripts are also cited.
Oxf., Magdalen Coll. MS 188, fols. 5–7b. Latin–Anglo-Norman–English. Fifteenth century. Dean #302 (‘A trilingual glossary of domestic categories’). An extract is printed in Owen 145–6. As with BL MS Harley 4971, this manuscript contains other relevant Anglo-Norman texts: Dean #287, #300, and #317.


CUL MS Ec. 4. 20, fols. 162–164b. Anglo-Norman–English. This is the sole surviving copy of Nsv, §4.1.2. The manuscript also contains an important collection of French grammars, treatises, and glossaries: Dean #287, #291r (‘Tiber Donati’), #293, #298 (“pronoun declensions”), #300, #317, and #318 (‘report on Thomas Sampson’s Ars dictaminis’) as well as #390 (‘tracts on heraldry’; *Richardson 305, #50) and #395 (‘husbandry’).

Another trilingual glossary survives from the fourteenth century, but is not associated with Sampson:

Westminster Abbey MS 34/11, fols. 1r–3r. First half of the fourteenth century. Dean #303. Printed in Hunt, ‘Trilingual Vocabulary’. A fragment of a Latin–Anglo-Norman–English class glossary; the categories include, for example, wooden and metal tools, birds, and animals.

4.4 An Anglo-Norman glossary with Latin glosses, and a French conversation model

The glossary printed in *Baker connects well with other Anglo-Norman texts discussed above. The contents of the manuscript in which it is found are closest to those described by *Skemer, mainly legal texts, including, in one probably fourteenth-century gathering, a copy of Expositio vocabulorum (§1.5). The gathering *Baker discusses seems to be from the first half of the fifteenth century and contains an Anglo-Norman–Latin nominale (Dean #309 and Keiser, Manual #553h) and French model conversation, along with Anglo-Norman and Latin legal material in the same hand, presumably a law student, ‘to judge from the many errors, of indifferent ability’ (308). Anglo-Norman was needed by lawyers but there is no evidence it was taught in inns of court or chancery, ‘and these pieces tend to confirm that it was not’ (308). The nominale has 402 entries separated into parts of the human body, entrails, the four humors, clothing, hall, [bed]-chamber, pantry, buttery, kitchen, horse-trappings, names of beasts, creeping things, names of birds, names of fish, salt fish, names of trees (312–24). More than half of the entries are animals, fish, birds, and trees, and quite a few Anglo-Norman lemmas (especially fish) have no gloss. Comparing this with other published Anglo-Norman nominales and treatises, *Baker notes (308–9) two small groups of words which seem to be
derived indirectly or directly from Tretiz (§4.1.1) while the parts of body section is closer to Nsv (§4.1.2). Eighty of the Anglo-Norman words are not found in any of the nominales and treatises *Baker looked at; fewer than half are found in the Tretiz. None is sufficiently close to establish relationships (309).

This manuscript also contains another type of teaching manual: La maniere de langage (Dean #281). First found in the later fourteenth century, this type consists of imaginary dialogues for a traveller in France, usually without English glosses or translations. Some include coarse insults and encounters with prostitutes, suggesting they were intended for tourists and medieval businessmen rather than school children (Rothwell, ‘Teaching French’ 45). *Baker’s discussion (309–10) can now be updated using Kristol, who identified the ten surviving examples of Les Manièrèrs, grouped them into three distinct versions (dating from 1396, 1399, and 1415) and printed the fullest version of each. The copy here is from the 1399 group and contains only a very few of the sections found in Oxf., All Souls Coll. MS 182, fols. 321va–26va, which is by far the fullest surviving version. *Baker describes it as ‘most elementary’ (310) and designed for a ‘continental traveller’ (308) rather than a lawyer, beginning with a section on ‘how to talk to ladies and pretty girls’ (309).

In this collection of legal texts, neither the nominale nor conversation guide is in any way related to legal terminology, but instead to elementary language learning.

4.5 Caxton’s ‘Vocabulary in French and English’
At the very end of the period covered by this volume, c. 1480, Caxton printed a book which is known as ‘Vocabulary in French and English’ (STC 24865). It consists of French and English verse in parallel columns, covering topics such as greetings and conversational formulae, the house and objects around it, food, etc. Kennedy (131) describes it as a thorough integration of the Tretiz (nominale) and model conversation genres. It is the first printed vocabulary or dictionary including English, and derives from an earlier French–Flemish version on the continent. The French to be learned here is now continental French.

5 Latin and English, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries
Again, much of the material in this section is associated with education, but now with the teaching of Latin rather than Anglo-Norman or French. Many of the manuscripts here are described as ‘grammatical’ or as ‘schoolmasters’ books’. A number of named schoolmasters

Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Douce 88 (his siglum D); and Oxf., St. John’s Coll. MS 178 (his siglum J); and §4.3, the fourteenth-century Westminster Abbey MS 34/11 (his siglum W).

72 Also discussed Hüllen (92–3).

73 CUL MS Li. 6. 17 and Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives Office, Formulary Book MS 23 are also 1399 versions. See Kristol (xxxiv) for the chart comparing the surviving 1399 types; the version in Oxf., All Souls Coll. MS 182 is printed (49–66); it also contains a copy of Tretiz. The categories in CUL MS li. 6. 17 are listed under Keiser, Manual #509: ‘The traveler asks directions; requests a room, food and drink, accommodations and feed for a horse; and bargains with the innkeeper and his wife for the best rates.’ They partially overlap with the sections in *Baker’s manuscript.

74 See Hüllen, 93–104, 453–9, for an extensive discussion. Keiser (Manual #510) says it is similar to ‘A lytell treatysi for to lerne Englysshe and Fresshse’: STC 24866, Westminster, 1497; cited Wilson, Vol. 3, IX, #26; now available on LEME at http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=24.
are found here, especially in §5.5. They put together manuscripts for their own use and in some cases may be responsible for the creation of some lexicographical material, for example a large *nominale* is attributed to Nicholas de Munshulle (§5.1–2). As well as large Latin–English *nominales*, the less common *verbales*, lists of verbs arranged by conjugation, appear (Stein, *Dictionary* 57–9). Bilingual synonym lists are also found; as Stein notes: ‘This aspect of early English bilingual lexicography has so far been totally neglected’ (*Dictionary* 63; see also §2.8.3). Alphabetical lists, used in reading and composing Latin, are much less common in this section, but appear in §6. At the end of this section examples of some less common types of lexicographical material are included, some of which are monolingual: terms of association and the sporting lexicon, noises of birds and animals, and the first English concordance (§5.6).

5.1 Nicholas de Munshulle

A large *nominale* in one manuscript is attributed to Nicholas de Munshulle, about whom nothing is known. Other *nominales* (and *verbales*) have been associated with him by various scholars; see §5.2. Among other things, §§5.1 and 5.2 demonstrate the difficulty of comparing large *nominales*, especially unprinted ones.

Voigts discussed Cbg., Mass., Harvard Law Libr. MS 43 (second half of the fifteenth century), a manuscript with similar contents to those containing works of Sampson (§4.3), but about a century later. It contains a Latin–English *nominale* (Keiser, *Manual* #553k), much longer than those normally found in legal or business collections, written in two columns on 26 folios in a discrete section, and in a hand not found elsewhere in the manuscript. The classes include: ‘common nouns for human beings...ecclesiastical terms...terms for hall, kitchen, and chamber; for brewery, buttery, larder, granary, and stables; for various sorts of clothworking and leatherworking; for agricultural activities, carpentry, and masonry...the responsibilities and leisure activities of the landed – terms for armor and consanguinity, and hunting and musical terms...words for forms of suffering’ (Voigts 575–6). The categories in W&W ##18, 19, and 20 differ from this *nominale*, she says: none contains *nomina dampnorum* or the three sections on book production; nor does it correspond with the alphabetical *Promptorium parvulorum* (§6.1.1).

Gould looked at one class, on book manufacture, in this still unpublished Latin–English *nominale* to determine whether these terms related to contemporary fifteenth-century practices. The Harvard 43 *nominale* was the only one she found with such a full section on book manufacture: 64 terms relating to scribes, illuminators, and binders. A possible source for some terms is Alexander Nequam’s *De nominibus utensilium* (§2.7), which includes a description of the work of a scribe and has 18 of Harvard 43’s items (Gould 83–4). Nequam used Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, and ‘further study on the sources used in Neckam’s treatise would be necessary to determine the degree of originality in Neckam’s description of the scribe’ (Gould 87, fn 28).

*Griffiths brings to attention another unpublished fifteenth-century Latin–English *nominale* of similar length in a manuscript unknown to both Voigts and Gould, Oxf., Trinity Coll. MS

---

75 These three are often cited for comparison because they are the only available printed class glossaries.

76 W&W #19 (BL Addit. MS 34276, formerly Mayer (see §5.4); Keiser (*Manual* #553g)) is the closest, with a chapter on ‘things pertaining to clerks’, which contains 29 entries relating to writing, 11 of which are in Harvard 43 (Gould 86–7).
E 14 (hereafter TC 14). It contains a similar list of book terms, in much the same order, but with a few more items. *Griffiths concludes that the two nominales must, at least in this section, be related in some way; he did not compare the Harvard 43 and TC 14 nominales in general (347). What is most significant about the nominales in TC 14 is that, very unusually, it is attributed to a named individual, Nicholas de Munshulle; see Figure 1: ‘Hic incipit nominale secundum usum Nicholai de Munshulle’. TC 14 contains only two texts: the nominale (fols. 1r–26v) followed by a verbale (fols. 27r–69r).

*Griffiths (349–51) very usefully lists all the main subject headings in TC 14; they start with God and angels, and include very many different crafts and occupations as well as architectural terms, weapons, illnesses, punishments and implements of punishment, and many others along with the more usual categories of birds, fish, animals, etc. They differ considerably from those in W&W #19 (BL MS Addit. 34276; see §5.4), for instance.

5.2 Attribution of texts to Nicholas de Munshulle
*Griffiths (340) cites Tanner as having identified another copy of the Munshulle nominale in Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Bodley 604, fols. 1–73 (second half of the fifteenth century). The close relationship between these two nominales is twice emphasized: ‘The text of the Bodleian manuscript is substantially identical with that of Trinity Coll. MS. E 14’ (348, fn 21) and ‘[i]n the Bodleian manuscript, however, the Nominale, though clearly a copy of the Munshull text, is not attributed to any author’ (340; my italics). It is not clear how completely Tanner compared the Bodley 604 and TC 14 nominales to arrive at this conclusion. *Griffiths says that he himself did not search in any systematic way for other copies of the Munshulle nominale or comparable nominale texts, nor did he compare the Harvard 43 and TC 14 nominales in general, just the book production terms (347). But *Griffiths notes that the Bodley 604 section on book terms is not as closely related to the one in TC 14 as Harvard 43 and TC 14 are to each other (340). The verbale is not specifically attributed to Munshulle in TC 14, but Tanner accepts it as a Munshulle text. (Harvard 43 does not contain the verbale.)

Establishing relationships between large unpublished Latin–English nominales is clearly extremely difficult. Different compilers are almost certain to add, drop, rearrange, and collate terms and sections to some extent. Caution must be used with attributions of nominales to Munshulle, since they may be largely based on comparisons of incipits only; detailed comparisons of unpublished and lengthy nominales (and verbales) are very unlikely to have been undertaken, for example, in Thomson, Sharpe, and Bursill-Hall. For example, even though the verbale in TC 14 is not specifically attributed to Munshulle, Bursill-Hall seemingly attributes the verbale in BL MS Addit. 37075 to Munshulle because its incipit is very similar to that of the verbale in TC 14: ‘Verba prime conjugationis habent B ante O, labo, as, avi, atum in supinis’. Bursill-Hall also attributes the verbale in Lincoln Cathedral MS 88, fols. 88r–119, to Munshulle, presumably for the same reason; the nominale in Lincoln Cathedral MS 88, fols. 78r–87r, also has the same incipit as the nominale in TC 14: ‘Hic deus, Anglice god. Et nota quod deus caret vocatiuo casu’ and Bursill-Hall attributes it to Munshulle as

---

77 This manuscript is sometimes called Oxf., Trinity Coll. MS 14.
78 *Griffiths (345, fn 13) quotes the Tanner entry on Munshulle; note that ‘Ms. in bibl. coll. Trin. Oxon. B. i. 10. Vide MS bibli Bodl. super A. 1. Art 93 [= Bodley 604]’ has been dropped between ‘Gode’ and ‘De conjugationibus’.
well. The *incipit* to BL MS Royal 17 C. xvi, beginning on fol. 28 (‘Hic deus anglice Godde. hoc numen a. godhede’) is similar to the beginning of TC 14’s *incipit*, and Bursill-Hall also attributes this *nominale* to Munshulle. Sharpe’s entry on Nicholas Munshulle (#1103) reads: ‘Nicholas Munshull was presumably a teacher of grammar; the two works [*nominale* and *verbale*] transmitted together, are ascribed only in one manuscript.’ Like Bursill-Hall, Sharpe includes the *nominales* and the *verbales* in Lincoln Cathedral MS 88 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 78r-119r (anon.), the *nominale* in BL MS Royal 17 C. xvii (s.xv), fol. 28r (part), and the *nominale* in TC 14 (s. xv), fol. 1r-(27), where it is attributed to Munshulle in the manuscript. Unlike Bursill-Hall, Sharpe does not include *verbales* in Addit. 37075 or TC 14. The *nominale* in Bodley 604, fols. 1–55v, was attributed to Munshulle by Tanner and *Griffiths*, but Thomson and Bursill-Hall do not do so because the manuscript is not included in their catalogues. Sharpe does not include the *nominale* in Bodley 604, either.

In summary, TC 14 contains the only *nominale* attributed to Munshulle in a manuscript. Harvard 43’s *incipit* is completely different: ‘Hic vir is a man’. The Bodley 604 *nominale*, attributed by Tanner and *Griffiths* to Munshulle, has the same *incipit* as TC 14. The Lincoln Cathedral 88 *nominale* also has the same *incipit*. The *incipit* to the Royal 17 C. xvii *nominale* is similar but not identical. The TC 14 and Lincoln Cathedral 88 *nominales* are followed by *verbales* with similar *incipits*, but the *verbale* is nowhere specifically attributed to Munshulle. The *verbale* in Addit. 37035 has a similar *incipit* to TC 14.

On the whole I feel there is insufficient evidence at this point to attribute any of these to Munshulle, apart from the *nominale* in TC 14. Their attribution to a named individual is certainly less important than their contents and interrelationships. Editions of them (and other unpublished *nominales* of a similar date) and detailed investigations of their contents are needed. Such studies could reveal a considerable amount about lexicographical methods in this period.

### 5.3 Fifteenth-century grammatical manuscripts

Much lexicographical material is found in fifteenth-century manuscripts containing grammatical texts, such as those in Thomson’s and Bursill-Hall’s catalogues; these manuscripts are often called ‘schoolbooks’. Grammar was central to education, and many such manuscripts survive, particularly from the fifteenth century. Very few Anglo-Norman texts are found here; the material is almost all Latin–English. Many grammatical manuscripts contain a wide range of material. As Thomson concluded, ‘we find in nearly all the manuscripts a considerable number of religious and liturgical items. At times, as in [Oxf., Bodl. Libr.] Douce [103] which was probably a parish priest’s book, this material is used as a basis for grammar teaching, but elsewhere the hymns, prayers and confessions which we find intermingled with the school texts remind us of the close connection between the church and elementary education’ (30).

In order to illustrate the range of material found in manuscripts containing lexicographical material and to identify a few manuscripts which need further research (see §5.4), I have used several sources. Thomson catalogued and described very fully 24 manuscripts which contain grammatical texts written in Middle English. Thomson’s introduction (Part One, 1–47) is an essential guide to the texts, their authors, and the educational and grammatical background. Also

---

79 Cruz is a recent survey of the range of activities that fall under education in England from the twelfth century to 1500.
essential are parts of Keiser’s Section 10 on education: ‘II. The Teaching of Latin: Grammar Books, Vulgaria or English Sentences’ (*Manual* #512–45); and ‘III. Glosses, Vocabularies, Dictionaries’ (*Manual* #546–48). Keiser relied heavily on Thomson’s catalogue and notes some of the (now familiar) difficulties in dealing with this kind of material: ‘successive scribes, both students and teachers, revised their exemplars to suit their own particular needs, thus creating special difficulties for the modern editor and bibliographer’ (*Manual*, p. 3714). Although there are numerous glosses and vocabularies in late medieval manuscripts, only ‘a relatively small number have been edited, [and] few have been subjected to study’ (*Manual*, p. 3722). *Brother Bonaventure* looked at 25 manuscripts in his study of the teaching of Latin in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century England; some of these are found in §5.4 and his essay is discussed in §5.5.1. Stein (*Dictionary*, chs. 9 and 10) discussed a number of vocabularies of different types. W&W is still the main source of printed vocabularies for this period.

### 5.4 Fifteenth-century manuscripts containing lexicographical material: a few important examples

Although this is by no means an exhaustive list, important lexicographical material needing attention is found in all the following manuscripts, all of which contains some English:

**BL MS Royal 17 C. xvi** is not only an important source of lexicographical texts, for example, verbale (fols. 4r–17v; Stein, *Dictionary* 58); adjective synonyms (fols. 19r–20v; Stein, *Dictionary* 64); and several nominales (fols. 4v–66), but the last 100 folios contain an important collection of literary texts, mainly prayers and poetry in English.


**BL MS Harley 1002.** Thomson 239–53. *Brother Bonaventure* 359, 360, 361, 364, 370, and 372; extracts from texts: 373–5. This manuscript contains a wide range of grammatical treatises and translation exercises, with a considerable amount of verse. Of lexicographical interest are:

- Latin verse vocabularies with English glosses: *Os, facies, mentum* (Keiser, *Manual* #553e: names of the parts of the body; printed W&W #17, 631–2, from fol. 116v).

---

80 One of these has been attributed by some scholars to Munshulle; see §5.2. The nominale on fols. 21r–7v is printed W&W #18; Keiser (*Manual* #553f: categories listed); discussed Stein, *Dictionary* 55–6: it also contains a small section of verbs (W&W #18, 664–5).
\textit{Liber caballus} or \textit{Bursa latini} (starting \textit{Equus}, \textit{caballus}, \textit{pullus}); printed W&W #16, 624–30, from fols. 114r–16r. On these texts, see also *Brother Bonaventure 362–3. Glosses to John of Garland's \textit{Dictionarius}, fols. 176–81v; printed in Thomas Wright #8. See also §2.8.1.


An unprinted \textit{verbale}, fols. 117v–37r.

Unprinted lists of synonyms: fols. 137v–38v, 164r–65v, and 166r–75v. In the first, which includes all parts of speech, the Latin synonyms are bracketed with the English word by the side. The others are, very unusually, in English–Latin order. The middle one is mainly adverbs and conjunctions, with some reversed from the first list. The final one gives synonyms for nouns, adjectives, and verbs for ‘A’–‘E’ (Stein, \textit{Dictionary} 64–5).

**BL MS Addit. 37075.** Discussed Thomson (219–32); *Brother Bonaventure 358–9, 361, 363, and 372; Keiser, \textit{Manual} #554. This is a school book, probably associated with St Antony’s school in London, written in the second half of the fifteenth century (Thomson 232, 219). This manuscript is very important lexicographically: as well as scattered English glosses to many of its grammatical texts, it contains several of the Latin verse vocabulary types as cited under BL MS Harley 1002, above; two \textit{nominales}: fols. 276–303v and 309r–24r (Keiser, \textit{Manual} #554: categories of the latter listed); a \textit{verbale}, fols. 331–54v (see §5.2); and several miscellaneous vocabularies: fol. 84v, Latin–English vocabulary; fols. 97v–126v \textit{passim}, vocabulary notes, usually in the top margin; fols. 304r–8r, miscellaneous Latin–English vocabulary; fols. 308v and 324rb, names of towns and countries in Latin and English; fols. 327v–28v, lists of numerals (1–100) and their derived forms; fols. 324v–27r, miscellaneous vocabulary; fol. 328v (foot), vocabulary notes; fols. 329r–30v, short vocabulary, classified by parts of speech; fol. 354v, vocabulary.

Ross and Brooks have edited all the English glosses in this manuscript.\textsuperscript{81}

Some grammatical manuscripts are personal miscellanies, for example, Aberystwyth, Natl. Libr. of Wales MS Peniarth 356B, which contains a wide range of material (including notes of payment of school fees), seemingly put together by Thomas Pennant, abbot of Basingwerk (Thomson 114–31, here 130). Among the contents are: fols. 74r–76v, verse vocabulary of words for household objects, with nouns marked for gender; and fols. 109r–11v, a verse \textit{nominale}, glossed in English. See also *Brother Bonaventure 361, 363–4, 366.

\textit{Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 5. 4} (formerly 1285). Thomson 158–68; *Brother Bonaventure 358, 360, 361, 363, 369, and 372; Keiser, \textit{Manual} #553d. Written by one hand, it is ‘unique amongst S.xv’ schoolbooks (Thomson 168); unusually well presented, decorated, and careful and exhaustive in its range of school texts and referencing, mostly elementary and advanced grammatical and related works but also including elementary mathematical and geometric works. It was perhaps a foundation volume, a royal gift to the College of

\textsuperscript{81} Seemingly all Latin glosses have been ignored. Without any headings in their edition it is not always clear whether the glosses are interlinear ones to a Latin grammatical text or are a part of Latin–English glossary. Their edition has to be read with Thomson or the BL MS catalogue entry beside it.
St Mary Magdalen at Battlefield, near Shrewsbury, endowed in 1410. It includes several of the Latin verse vocabularies types noted above under BL MS Harley 1002, and under John of Garland, §2.8. On fols. 96r–275r is found what Thomson (164) calls a ‘Latin dictionary’, which is in fact the alphabetical ‘Latin and English Vocabulary’ printed W&W #15. See also Keiser, Manual #553d; discussed Stein, Dictionary 54–5. Huntsman (‘Caveat Editor’ 276, fn 1) says ‘the decimated selection [printed W&W #15] gives a most erroneous impression of the actual manuscript...an archetype of the medieval English schoolbook...The Dictionary...is a version, containing some 2,600 English glosses, of Johannes Balbus’s monumental Catholicon [§2.5]...Unfortunately, no thorough study exists of the interrelations of these works or their dependence on the standard Latin references like the Catholicon or William Brito’s Summa (manuscript, pre-1300) [§2.4].’ Huntsman (‘Caveat Editor’) gives no further references, and it seems no more work has been done on this important lexicographical text and its sources.82

5.5 Schoolmasters and their books

5.5.1 Teaching Latin

* Brother Bonaventure’s aim was ‘to summarise what can be learned of the Latin programme taught in the educational institutions of later medieval England’ (357), before John Standbridge. He examined 25 grammatical manuscripts in use in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, 12 in some detail (listed 358–9), to see what texts they might have in common. He describes the four principal parts of grammar: orthography, prosody, etymology, and syntax, and the texts he found relating to these areas (360–62); the composition of letters, including business ones, is included (361–2). Numerous vocabularies were found, of at least five different types: nominale, verbale, alphabetical, synonyms, and verse vocabularies (362). Only in verse vocabularies are specific texts identifiable (362–3). Two of these were identified under BL MS Harley 1002 (§5.4); the others are Distigius, Synonyma, and Equivoca (362–3; see John of Garland, §§2.8.2–4). He also discusses readers (363–6): Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 5. 4 (§5.4) has a striking number of verse texts. He summarizes all the various texts he identified as in use (366), and their main sources (367–8); these include many of the Latin lexicographers from the thirteenth-century schools of France and Italy (§2), but they also go back to Donatus, Priscian, and Isidore.

* Brother Bonaventure (370) also lists the nine grammar masters named in the manuscripts he examined, together with their treatises and dates of composition, for example John of Cornwall (Speculum grammaticale, 1346), John Leland (various, early fifteenth century), John Drury (various, c. 1434), and Thomas Syltone (Accentus, fifteenth century?). Most are Oxford men, but some are unknown apart from their identification in one manuscript (see also §§5.5.2–3 on grammar teachers, and §§5.1–2 on Nicholas de Munshulle, who was presumably one). *Brother Bonaventure generalizes Thomas Wright’s statement on the vocabularies used by fifteenth-century schoolmasters to say that there are almost as many treatises as masters (371). They may start with an authoritative tract and add a commentary, a gloss, or tracts of their own. The scribe copying the grammatical manuscript in Beccles in 1434 (CUL MS Addit. 2830) says some of the grammatical excerpts are the compositions of John Drury, the local schoolmaster (371, see also 364); others may be adaptations.

---

82 The English glosses have been edited in an MA thesis by Cannon (‘Dictionarium grammaticum’).
5.5.2 John of Cornwall and the use of English in teaching Latin
*Kornexl also discusses John of Cornwall as part of the debate about when English replaced Anglo-Norman as the language of instruction. As is clear from §4, Anglo-Norman was being taught artificially at least from the thirteenth century, yet ‘didactic practices were apparently characterized by a prolonged adherence to the post-Conquest method of teaching Latin through the oral medium of French’ (147). *Kornexl assumes that the teaching of Latin in thirteenth-century England required extensive support from English (149). Evidence in fourteenth-century statutes that French was to be used so that the language might not be entirely forgotten and that occasional use of English is conceded shows that the position of French was precarious (151–2). *Kornexl (149–50) discusses John Trevisa’s interpolation into Higden’s *Polychronicon* stating that John of Cornwall was the first who taught Latin through English: his *Speculum grammaticale*, 1346, is the first grammatical treatise with Middle English (see also *Brother Bonaventure* 370–71). But John of Cornwall is more likely to have been following the general trend elsewhere; as a teacher at Oxford, the centre of grammar teaching in the thirteenth century, he ‘was probably not really an innovator but rather a pragmatically minded pedagogue who brought Oxford in line with the rest of the country’ (154). The real significance is that when Oxford accepted the change, it (and especially John Leland) began to take a leading role in the production of grammatical treatises using English, of the type described by *Brother Bonaventure* and in Thomson. *Kornexl concludes that English must have been used in the instruction of Latin after the Conquest and before its reappearance in late Middle English grammatical treatises, and we should ‘search for traces of continuity in pre- and post-Conquest vernacular grammar teaching’ (155). ‘Despite Trevisa’s seemingly precise testimony we do not know for certain from where, when, and how English fully reconquered the Latin classrooms of medieval England’ (154).

5.5.3 Schoolmasters’ books: the end of their usefulness
This is clearly seen in *Voigts and Shailor. Fragments of four texts survive in New Haven, Conn., Yale University, Beinecke Library MS 3, no. 34, probably written in the second quarter of the fifteenth century: two and a half leaves from a Latin–English *nominale*, a page of etymological notes on Latin verbs; a folio of translation exercises of Latin and English proverbs; and four folios from an unidentified Latin grammar treatise, in question and answer form, on syntax. The last mentioned includes references to Peter Helias and Alexander de Villa Dei (390), both mentioned as common sources in *Brother Bonaventure* 368–9. *Voigts and Shailor estimate the *nominale* originally contained about 700-950 Latin words (384). The surviving leaves include positive and negative states (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Law Libr. MS 43 (fol. 35r) has some of these items in its ‘*nominia damnumorum*’ section; see §5.1); celestial, meteorological, and aquatic phenomena; and months and seasons (384, with facsimile and transcription on 386–7). English equivalents here often correspond to ones in the Latin–English *nominale* in BL Addit. MS 37075 (§5.4) and *Promptorium parvulorum* and *Catholicon Anglicum* (§6.1). They cite BL MS Arundel 249, a late fifteenth-century manuscript from Magdalen College, Oxford, which has similar short Latin and English sentences, a grammar text, and semantically grouped Latin-English vocabulary (385). The writer was almost certainly a schoolmaster who taught intermediate level Latin at a Lincolnshire school (392–3). They briefly review what is known about fifteenth-century English schoolmasters (393). A number of other schoolmasters’ books are known (394); one particularly close in
text and layout is Thomas Schort’s in Oxf., Lincoln Coll. MS Lat. 129 (described 394–5). The Beinecke manuscript seems to have been scrapped and the fragments used for binding boards by the mid-sixteenth century, when the teaching of Latin grammar changed with the adoption of Italian humanist texts and newly written Latin grammars in English, which rendered obsolete earlier texts (396).

Orme (‘English and Latin Sentences’), in a companion essay to *Voigts and Shailor, discusses more fully and prints the folio of Latin and English translation exercises found in the Beinecke manuscript. Short Latin sentences illustrating points of grammar and syntax, called *latinimates or la*ntina, were commonly used in Latin grammar teaching. John of Cornwall used them in his *Speculum grammaticale* of 1346, where for the first time some of the Latin sentences were followed by English translations (Orme, ‘English and Latin Sentences’ 47). Orme briefly discusses collections by John Leland, John Anwykyl, Robert Londe, John Drury, and three early sixteenth-century schoolmasters (‘English and Latin Sentences’ 48–50).

Collections containing only English sentences were sometimes called *vulgaria*, but the term was also applied to collections of Latin and English sentences from 1483 (Orme, ‘English and Latin Sentences’ 48–49); see Keiser, Manual #533–45, where the Beinecke sentences are #534. In the Beinecke manuscript, the English sentences (‘frequently well-known proverbs or fragments of popular songs’) come before the Latin ones, and the exercise seemingly was to translate them into Latin (Orme, ‘English and Latin Sentences’ 50). Interestingly some exercises include deliberately inaccurate English renderings, presumably to illustrate the dangers of reliance on word order, for example, from John Drury: ‘I saw þe drunkyn while þu were sobere; Ego vidi te ebrius dum fuisti sobrius’ (Orme, ‘English and Latin Sentences’ 50).

5.6 Other types of lexicographical material, monolingual only

5.6.1 The personal miscellany: terms of association and the sporting lexicon

Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Rawlinson D. 328 is an interesting manuscript which includes some lexicographical material which differs from that previously discussed: fols. 16v–17r, words of family relationship in Latin and English; fol. 17r, short Latin–English vocabulary; fols. 22r–v, verses on the calls and cries of birds and animals, with the principal parts of the verbs given in Latin with their English equivalent; fols. 54r–56r, Latin–English vocabulary; fol. 75r, two tables of Latin and English names for varieties of bread and meat, bracketed with ‘Brede’ and ‘Flesch’ on the right; fol. 90r, Latin–English vocabulary; fols. 131v–32r, vocabularies grouped in various ways; fols. 171r–72r, English ‘terms of association’ (for example, ‘A herd of all maner of dere’);83 fols. 172r–73r, various notes on animals in English (for example, ‘The hert sowlys’). It is ‘Walter Pollard’s personal notebook, and its entries reflect his experiences and interests over a substantial period of time’ (Thomson 314). The ‘terms of association’ (collective nouns) and ‘soiling terms’ indicate hunting was one of his interests; both are prominent elements in the treatises on hawking and hunting and other related activities of the leisure classes, as found in The Boke of St Albans84 and the *J. B. Treatise*.85

An example of a collection of ‘terms of association’ is found in *Burton, who prints a list from Cbg., Magdalene Coll. MS Pepys 1047, with notes. Some of these are very familiar,

---

83 See Allen.
85 Scott-Macnab is an excellent study of the *J. B. Treatise* and its 25 known sources, listed 8–9.
'A pride of lyons...A flocke of schepe' (400) while others strike us as more imaginative, 'A vnkyndenes of Ravenys...A superfluite of nonnys ... An vncredibelite of Cukkoldys' (400–401). Some of the other elements or categories in these treatises, like the 'terms of association', are just lists of terms:86 for example, names of wines; hunting terms ('An hert is chased' (Scott-Mcnab 132)); and resting terms ('A hart harborowth' (105)). Others are more discursive: for example, precepts in -ly ('Aryse erlly, And serve god dewoutly' (104)) and hawks' diseases and remedies. Unlike most other practical books and all other English treatises on hawking and hunting, these provide 'information about the terminology of these sports, but...little or no instruction concerning their actual practice...[they are] a lexicon for hawkers and hunters' (Scott-Macnab 87).87 This 'sporting lexicon' contains only English.

The three Anglo-Norman treatises (Tretiz, Nominale sive verbale, and Femina (§§4.1.1–3)) also contained sections of collective nouns. The lists of collective nouns seem to have developed separately but with some 'cross-fertilisation from the Anglo-French lists, Tretiz, Nominale sive verbale, and Femina, by way of texts that have yet to be discovered or identified' (262).88

Elements of the sporting lexicon are frequently found in mid-to-late fifteenth-century commonplace books, miscellanies, or practical books for the "increasingly influential gentry of the later fifteenth century" (Scott-Macnab 50) as well as being a popular type of early printed book.89 Scott-Macnab (1) calls The Boke of St Albans 'England's first off-the-shelf miscellany: a printed version of a type of book that had previously been assembled by commissioned scribes, or by literate individuals compiling their own "commonplace books".'

5.6.2 Noises of birds and animals
Curiously, lists of noises of beasts and birds as seen above (§5.6.1) in Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Rawlinson D. 328 (Latin–English) as well as in the Anglo-Norman texts Tretiz (§4.1.1; Anglo-Norman only) and Nominale sive verbale (§4.1.2; Anglo-Norman–Middle English) are not part of the sporting lexicon, though they have a long history. Lendinara, 'Contextualized Lexicography' 117–18 (reproduced and discussed in Volume 1, §3.3.2), gives a brief survey of this type of text; for example Aldhelm used an alphabetical list in De metris, and there are traces of lists of animal noises in Ælfric's Grammar (see Volume 1, §4.6) and other Anglo-Saxon glossaries. Oxf., Bodl. Libr. MS Bodley 730 (§4.1) has a few on fol. 144v. 8Benediktson discusses in more detail the Latin sources for such catalogues and prints a fourteenth-century example of a Latin-only list of bird and animal noises in CUL MS L.I. 1. 14, derived mainly from an Aldhelm catalogue and a Polemius one, alphabetized as in Aldhelm, and organized into a series of catalogues. This Latin monolingual list is of a more scientific bent than most material presented in this volume.

86 A full list of the categories is found in Scott-Macnab (7).
87 See also Keiser, '8. Hawking, Hunting, and Fishing: I. The Boke of St. Albans' (Manual #448) and IV. 1 The J.B Group (Manual #465).
88 See Scott-Macnab, especially 56–8, 83–5, 262, on the emergence of this category.
89 See Keiser, 'Practical Books' 470–94. Keiser, 'Reconstructing', looks at Robert Thornton's personal miscellany which includes vernacular romances, devotional material, medical recipes, and a prose and verse herbal.
5.6.3 An English concordance

*Kuhn notes that ‘the practical difficulties involved in making a usable concordance led [the unknown compiler] to take a greater interest in the orthography of his own language than that shown by most Englishmen of his era...[and he is the] maker of what is apparently the first concordance to an English book’ (421). The book is the Wyclifite translation of the New Testament, found in BL MS Royal 17 B. i. c. 1425. *Kuhn prints the Preface (425–8) in which the compiler explains that the concordance is alphabetized by all the letters in the words; *Kuhn says Medulla grammatice Stonyhurst MS (= Stonyhurst Coll. Libr. MS XV (A. 1. 10); §6.2.1), Promtorium parvulorum (§6.1.1), Catholicon Anglicum (§6.1.2), and the vocabulary in TC Cam 1285 (= Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS O. 5. 4; §5.4) achieve this, but knows of no pre-fifteenth-century examples in English (423–4). The compiler attempts to explain his terminology and conventions: for example how to use the concordance, what a synonym is (424), that some words have multiple meanings, and that plural nouns are found under the base word (427–8). He explains that words beginning with ‘p’ are listed under ‘th’ (420). He struggles more with ‘h’, where the difference is phonetic: ‘a certain man writes a certain word with an h, which same word another man writes without an h...thus, here, and some thus, eir’ (420). The headword given for the entry is eir but within the entry the only spelling is eir, with no cross references. With ‘yogh’, the compiler recognizes the connection between s and gh: some write ‘doughter’ and others ‘doufrer’, but says because s is shaped like a z, all words beginning with yogh are placed under zed.

*Kuhn lists a number of words used in interesting or unusual senses in the Preface, particularly ones relating to the matter at hand: words, letters, senses, grammar, ordering, quotations, etc. (418–20). The Preface to this concordance is particularly interesting because the compiler has to explain in English how to use this new research tool and in order to do so has had to think about and use English lexicographical terminology.

6. The Fifteenth-Century Alphabetical Dictionaries

Finally, in the fifteenth century, the first English compilations that we might call dictionaries appear: Promtorium parvulorum (PP), Catholicon Anglicum (CA), Medulla grammatice (MG), and Ortus vocabulorum (Ortus). All four are arranged alphabetically and have a large number of entries, ranging from 8000 (CA) to about 27,000 (Ortus). They usually include some grammatical information and even references to sources. Although they seem to have a more modern and systematic approach and are ‘general’, but by no means ‘complete’, they are still dictionaries for learners of Latin. They are all bilingual at least to some extent, but vary in the proportion of Latin to English words (Ortus could be called Latin–Latin, with some English). No English–English dictionaries are created in the medieval period though PP contains a few English–English entries (§6.1.1). Two of these dictionaries are in the familiar Latin–English format for reading written Latin: MG, attested from the beginning of the fifteenth century and Ortus, from the very end, in a printed edition of 1500. The other two are English–Latin, an order previously found only very rarely,91 but needed for composition in Latin: PP, dating from 1430; and CA, not attested before 1483.

90 Concordances and alphabetization are discussed in Rouse and Rouse 221–55, and Daly.
91 See BL MS Harley 1002, fols. 164r–65v and 166r–75v (§5.4); there is Old English–Latin in §1.4.
Their Latin sources are various, complicated, and not completely understood; they are briefly discussed below under the individual dictionaries. With PP and CA, their use of specific earlier medieval Latin lexicographical works (§2) is often stated and confirmable; Ortus also does this but is less trustworthy. As Starnes (37) notes, "Owing to the great body of conventional lexicographic materials in manuscripts and in printed books at the end of the fifteenth century, the problem of establishing exact relationships is extremely difficult, and the conclusions regarding sources necessarily tentative." The sources of the English headwords and how the English–Latin arrangement was achieved in PP and CA, especially given their size, are unstated and unknown. At least some entries must arise from reversing ones in previously existing Latin–English lists, class and alphabetic.

None has received the attention it should. Only MG seems to be undergoing serious study (McCarren). Critical editions and studies of the rest are urgently needed before we can begin to understand how these massive English–Latin and Latin–English dictionaries were compiled in the fifteenth century.

The main sources of information used in §6.1.1–6.2.2 are Starnes; Stein, Dictionary; and Keiser, Manual #555–8; these and others, such as editions and articles, are cited individually below. PP and MG are available on LEME's searchable database; CA is being entered, and Ortus will be.

6.1 English–Latin

6.1.1 Promptorium parvulorum (PP) is the earliest known English–Latin dictionary. The name, ‘Storeroom for young scholars’, indicates it was intended to help schoolboys learning Latin.

Manuscripts: Three are complete: Cbg., King's Coll. MS 8; BL MS Harley 221; and Winchester Cathedral MS 15 (fols. 114–227v). Six are incomplete or fragments: Cbg., Emmanuel Coll. MS 321. 7. 71; Cbg., St. John’s Coll. MS F. 26 (fols. 122–57v); Cbg., Trinity Coll. MS B. 11. 15, fol. i; BL MS Addit. 22556; BL MS Addit. 37789, fols. 1–83 (the Latin–English Medulla grammaticae (§6.2.1) follows); and BL MS Harley 2274 (from *Gneuss 438–9, where there are fuller details).

Modern editions: Mayhew, based on Winchester Cathedral MS 15. (Way, based on BL MS Harley 221, put the entries into one alphabetical order and omitted the grammatical information of Latin words. Way's Preface and Appendix in Volume 3, however, discussing manuscripts, printed editions, sources, and other glossaries and vocabularies, are still useful.) A modern critical edition is needed.

Format: English–Latin (with a few English–English only); with separate nomina (all parts of speech except verbs) and verba categories for each letter, entries are then listed alphabetically within those categories. The English headword is sometimes followed by another English synonym, then the Latin equivalents, grammatical information, and frequently the medieval source or sources for the Latin word, but not for the English (Starnes 10; Stein, Dictionary 94–6).

Number of entries: LEME (Pynson’s 1499 edition): c. 10,500. An earlier estimate was about 12,000, with roughly two Latin equivalents for each English headword, giving a total of about 30,000 English and Latin words (Starnes 10).

92 / and j and u and v are not distinguished; thorn’ and ‘yogh’ follow w.
Date and compiler: Both are stated in the Preambulum (Mayhew, col. 1): in 1440 by a Dominican friar of King’s Lynn, Norfolk (‘per fratem predicatorem reclusum lenne’). The date is generally accepted, but the identification of the compiler as Galfridus Grammaticus is now regarded as unproven or doubtful (Starnes 9; *Gneuss 437).

Early printed editions: Richard Pynson (1499), Julian Notary (1508), and Wynkyn de Worde (several between 1510/11 and 1528): ESTC 20434–20439; described in Starnes 3–7; Stein, Dictionary 101–2, fn 14; *Gneuss 440, fn 26; Keiser, Manual #555.

As Starnes (5–6) notes, some printed editions use Medulla grammatice as an alternative name for Promptorium parvulorum. This should not be confused with the completely unrelated Latin–English dictionary of that name, §6.2.1. On the possibility that the Emmanuel College manuscript may have been the copytext for Pynson’s 1499 printing, see Voigts and Stubbings.

Facsimile: Alston (Promptorium parvulorum); also EEBO.

LEME: Pynson’s 1499 edition is available on LEME at: http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=26

Discussed: Starnes 3–18; Stein, Dictionary 91–106; Way (preface to Vol. 3); *Gneuss; Voigts and Stubbings; Keiser, Manual #555.

Sources and methods: Sources for the Latin words are listed in the Preambulum and are cited in many entries. These are discussed by Starnes (10–18) and Way (preface to Vol. 3), where much fuller details are given. The most important Latin sources are John Balbi, Catholicon (a basic source for PP, and ‘most lexicons, Latin and bilingual, in the second half of the fifteenth century’ (Starnes 12; see §2.5)); Hugutio, Derivationes (§2.3); John of Garland, Dictionarius (§2.8.1) and Distigium (§2.8.2); probably Alexander Neckam, De nominibus utensilium (§2.7); probably Brito, Summa (§2.4); and Thomas Walleys, Campus Florum. The Catholicon and Campus Florum are the sources most frequently named in the entries.

The more interesting and as yet unanswered questions are where the English headwords came from and how the English–Latin arrangement was achieved when the sources cited above are Latin–Latin. No sources for English words are named in the Preambulum. Stein (Dictionary 95 and 98–9) cites entries where the English headword is a phrase or syntactical construction, for example ‘Wyth hyme: Secum, aduerb’, which indicates that in some cases the compiler inverted entries from a Latin–English source. Entries with only English equivalents and those which cite more than one Latin source show that inversion was not the only method used. Starnes notes that the sources probably include English–Latin and Latin–English vocabularies of the fourteenth or fifteenth century of the sort found in W&W, as he demonstrates with 17 entries of 30 taken from W&W #18 (BL MS Royal 17 C. xvii, fols. 21–7v; see §§5.2, 5.4), beginning at 659/19. ‘Lindsay’s edition of the Corpus Glossary and his study of the relationship of the Corpus to the Épinal and Erfurt and Leyden glossaries constitute the best basis for a study of the ultimate sources of the Promptorium’ (Starnes 10–11). On this, see the discussion under ‘Sources’ for MG (§6.2.1).

The compiler’s working methods are described by Stein (Dictionary 96–100). Lengthy encyclopedic entries, Latin pronunciations, and verse illustrations of the use of Latin words are not included. Spelling variants and cross-references for the English words are sometimes given. Unusually, parts of speech are labelled. English headwords sometimes are followed by synonyms in English, presumably obtained by reversing original Latin–English entries. Restrictive words or phrases are sometimes included after the headword to clarify
or disambiguate homonyms or homographs: for example, ‘herbe’, ‘colour’, ‘of –’, and ‘adiective’.

I have included *Gneuss because it has up-to-date references to the manuscripts and fragments and is an interesting account of the use of this dictionary (Cbg., King’s Coll. MS 8) in 1699 by scholars and lexicographers of even earlier English (that is, Old English). It was one of three previously unidentified books borrowed from Cambridge by Humfrey Wanley, who describes it as ‘an antient Lat. Eng. Dictionary containing the words of the Eastern-English, whereby Mr Benson may secure many old words from being buried in the grave of everlasting Oblivion’ (434). As *Gneuss explains, Thomas Benson was compiling *Vocabularium Anglo-Saxonicum (1701) at the time, an abridgement of William Somner’s *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum (1659). Though it is difficult to see how this fifteenth-century dictionary could have helped early compilers of Anglo-Saxon dictionaries, *Gneuss (442) notes that Somner had used a printed copy of *PP and a manuscript copy of *MG (Canterbury Cathedral Libr. MS D. 2).

6.1.2 *Catholicon Anglicum (CA).* The name was seemingly assigned by Way; see Starnes 19. The colophon refers to the dictionary as *Catholicon.*

**Manuscripts:** Lord Monson MS 168 (present location unknown) and BL MS Addit. 15562, fols. 1–143v. Herrtage (xiv) notes that a few pages are missing from Addit. 15562, and it has many more errors than Lord Monson 168; also up to ‘S’, Addit. 15562 has far fewer entries than Monson 168, but from that point Addit. 15562 has more than double the entries in Lord Monson 168. Neither could have been copied from the other.

**Modern edition:** Herrtage, based on Lord Monson 168, with some additions and corrections from Addit. 15562. The edition was intended as a companion volume to Way’s *PP.* Herrtage gives his editorial policies (xvi–xix). Way had Lord Monson 168 when working on his edition of *PP* (x, lxiv–vi) and sometimes cited entries from it, for example, 100, n. 1, “‘A crakane, *cremium,* CATH. ANG’.

**Early printed editions:** none.

**Format:** English–Latin, alphabetical but word families and antonyms are included under the main entry. Herrtage (xix): ‘the words are in a very close approximation to the strict alphabetical order’.

**Number of entries:** c. 7195 (LEME). An earlier estimate was about 8000, of which about 2000 are not in *PP* (Stein, *Dictionary* 110). *CA* contains very many more Latin synonyms than *PP*, and the two were clearly compiled independently of each other (Stein, *Dictionary* 111).

**Date:** Lord Monson MS 168 contains the date 1483 in its *Explicit.* BL MS Addit. 15562 has no internal date but the BL Manuscript Catalogue gives ‘late in the 15th century’ and Herrtage, ?c. 1475. The date of the original is unknown.

**Compiler:** unknown. Way (lxv) and Herrtage (xx–xxi) cite evidence of a northern or northeastern original.

**Discussed:** Starnes 19–23; Way lxiv–lxvi; Herrtage (Preface and Introduction); Stein, *Dictionary* 107–20; *Stein; Keiser, Manual* #556.

**Sources and methods:** See Starnes 20–23 and Way lxv, on the principal sources cited in *CA.* (Herrtage dropped the sources from the entries in his edition.) Starnes says only Hugutio,

---

93 *Gneuss identifies the third manuscript as CUL MS Gg. 5. 35 (the Cambridge Songs manuscript). On this manuscript, see also Volume 1 of this series, §§3.1.3 and 3.2.1.*
Derivationes (§2.3) and John of Garland, Liber equivocorum (§2.8.4) occur frequently, and the large number of verses is probably from ‘some work of John of Garland’ (20). The most obvious debt is to John of Garland, Synonyma (§2.8.3), ‘a major source, ultimate if not direct’ (Starnes 21–2, with comparisons). The principles of synonymy, used here for the first time in English lexicography, and distinctions of meaning and usage are applied throughout CA, resulting in many more Latin synonyms here than in PP (Starnes 22). Because there are only two manuscripts and no early printed editions, it is difficult to assess the influence of CA on later lexicographers (23).

*Stein discusses the principles and methods quite fully, looking at CA from a learner’s point of view, and concluding that it anticipates ‘pedagogical and lexicographical methods that became commonplace...only several centuries later’ (461). Word families are kept together and derivative forms, including antonyms, are often given, with the alphabetical sequence indicated by capitalizing the base word for example, vnClose (451). The compiler gives as many synonyms as possible, carefully distinguished, and illustrations of meaning in mnemonic verses.

6.2 Latin–English

6.2.1 Medulla grammatice (MG) ‘The core of the grammatical (art)’ (McCarren, ‘Toward a Text’ 61). This dictionary should not be confused with some printed editions of PP which use the same title.

**Format:** Latin–Latin/English. Some entries also have transliterated Greek (or even Hebrew) glosses, but rarely French (only in the Gloucester MS (*McCarren 464)). Alphabetical, sometimes perfect, but often with considerable disorder (see *McCarren 466–8; ‘Toward a Text’ 66–8). McCarren says the form of the entry is Latin headword, followed by oblique form, followed by id est, and then the Latin and/or English equivalents. ‘Appropriately, the entries and interpretations are labeled...Ebraice, Grece, Latine’ (McCarren, ‘Form and Meaning’ 112; see also *McCarren 470).

**Manuscripts:** 19 survive, as well as 4 small fragments; others have been lost. They are listed on LEME and in *McCarren (463); fuller details are in McCarren, ‘Bristol Fragment’ (220–24) and McCarren, ‘Gloucester’ (342–5). McCarren (‘Toward a Text’ 62) suggests that copies of MG were ‘in most of the major centres of learning in England. In BL Addit 37789, PP ([English—]Latine) is followed by the MG ([Latin—]English) in the same hand.’

**Number of entries:** Stonyhurst Coll. Libr. MS XV (A. 1. 10), the most complete, has about 20,000; the total of all the manuscripts is estimated between about one-third to one-half a million (*McCarren 465). Cbg., Magdalene College, Pepys Library MS 2002 (available on LEME) has 16,908 entries.

**Date:** the earliest manuscripts are from the early fifteenth century (for example, Lincoln Cathedral Libr. MS 88, perhaps c. 1400; Stonyhurst (before 1425) may be the earliest); most are mid-to-late fifteenth century. Cbg., St. John’s Coll. MS 72 (C 22) is the only one dated internally: 16 December 1468 (McCarren, ‘Form and Meaning’ 112; ‘Bristol Fragment’ 220–24).

**Compiler:** unknown. Earlier views that PP and MG were compiled by the same person are no longer accepted.

**Modern editions:** McCarren is working on a critical edition of Stonyhurst Coll. Libr. MS XV (A. 1. 10), the earliest and most complete. Two critical editions of fragments have already been published. McCarren (‘Bristol Fragment’) edited Bristol University MS DM 1 (465
entries, collated with the other manuscripts and with notes of possible sources, etc.). In this article McCarren refutes Haworth who identified this fragment as being part of the *Ortus* family (§6.2.2). McCarren (‘Gloucester’) edited Gloucestershire Record Office, GDR/Z1/31 (123 entries, collated with the other manuscripts and shown to be very closely related to BL MS Harley 2257).  

**Early printed editions:** none.

**LEME:** Huntman’s 1973 transcription of Cbg., Magdalene College, Pepys Library MS 2002 is available at http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=537.

**Discussed:** Starnes 25–7; Stein, *Dictionary* 74–90 (with *Ortus*); Way xx–xxiii, l–liv; *McCarren* (and ‘Form and Meaning’, ‘Bristol Fragment’, ‘Toward a Text’, and ‘Gloucester’).

**Sources:** The sources are numerous and still only sketchily understood.

*Medulla* contains a vast amount of material, much of it from class-glossaries, and as yet we do not know enough of its immediate sources to tell the complete story. We can only point out ultimate sources; the complete story will only become known when a good many other glossaries of the period have been edited (Meyer, ‘Relation’ 145).

This is still the case 30 years later. As McCarren (‘Bristol Fragment’ 227) puts it: ‘among the discernible sources for the text in [the Bristol] fragment there is the Old Testament, St. Jerome, Hugh of Pisa [§2.3], several volumes of the *CGL* [see Volume 1, §1.1], the Corpus MS 144 of Old English glosses [Volume 1, §2.4.2.3 etc., Paul the Deacon, and Isidore (most referred to) [§2]’. McCarren’s notes also include comparisons with other major Latin–Old English glossaries: Harley 3376 [Volume 1, §4.4] and Épinal-Erfurt [Volume 1, §2.4.2.1, etc.]. Meyer (‘Relation’) also compared some entries in the Stonyhurst manuscript with entries in the Épinal-Erfurt and Corpus [MS 144] glossaries. Starnes (26–7) reviews Meyer’s earlier dissertation (*Sources*): ‘To the *glossae collectae* [Volume 1, §2.2.1–2], the original source of many glossaries, the *Medulla* has many correspondences, as the author [Meyer] demonstrates with respect to the Corpus, the Leyden, the Epinal, and Erfurt collections. The inference is that the *Medulla* drew part of its material from the same source as did these earlier glosses.’ Starnes then asks, ‘What is the process of transmission of the materials of the *glossae collectae* through a period of five hundred years or more?’ (26). *McCarren* (464) describes it as ‘through the Latin, Greek, and Old English glossaries of the 7th, 8th and 9th centuries and on into the 12th and 13th century wordlists and glossaries of Johannes de Janua [that is, John Balbi, §2.5] and Hugutio of Pisa [§2.3]’. But exactly how these very much earlier sources may have been transmitted across all these centuries is still unexplained. Starnes (26–7) notes that Balbi’s *Catholicon* (§2.5) could have been a source of many Latin entries in MG; for other sources and connections with *Ortus* which Starnes notes, see ‘Sources’ under *Ortus* (§6.2.2).

---

94 Florent Tremblay (*Dictionary*) printed BL MS Harley 1738, with additions from BL MSS Harley 2181, 2257, and 2270 and Cbg., St. John’s Coll. MS 72 (C 22), and with spelling variants from *Ortus* noted; this is not a critical edition but is seemingly based on his unpublished dissertation (‘*Medulla Grammaticae*’). Other unpublished dissertations transcribe or edit a single manuscript (cited Huntsman, ‘Caveat Editor’ 277, fn 2; Keiser, *Manual*, p. 3952): Zandt-McCleary; and Huntsman, ‘Pepys’ (now available on LEME).
**Contents:** The contents of the manuscripts of *Medulla* vary considerably, having been much added to and modified in transmission. *McCarren* (and his ‘Form and Meaning’ and ‘Toward a Text’) describes the many textual difficulties in *MG*. One major problem with a glossary is the lack of context, and *McCarren* gives examples of how glosses and glossaries can become garbled as scribes, transcribers, and editors misread or miswrite the text in many different ways. Some erroneous readings and senses have been carried over into *MED*. A full critical edition of the Stonyhurst manuscript, now underway, will add many new words and senses to both Latin and English dictionaries, and alter and remove others. The *OED* did not use any manuscripts of the *Medulla*; *MED* used only Stonyhurst up to the letter ‘R’, and the *DMLBS* only began to use it in 1999 (McCarren, ‘Toward a Text’ 62). On updates on the progress (and especially lack of it) with dictionaries and other ways of making glossarial material available, see *McCarren* (471–3).


**Format:** Latin–Latin, with some English. Many entries are Latin–Latin only, making it look like a Latin–Latin dictionary, with English glosses added (*Stein, ‘15th Century’* 320). Alphabetical, with some irregularities. The entries are often very short, many just one line. The grammatical information on the Latin word, unusually, is at the end and separated from the rest of the entry.95

**Number of entries:** Starnes (29), estimates about 27,000.

**Date:** by 1500.

**Compiler:** unknown.

**Manuscripts:** none. Haworth edited a fragment which he thought was from *Ortus* but McCarren (‘Bristol Fragment’) has shown it is actually a *MG* fragment.

**Early printed editions:** first printed in 1500 by Wynkyn de Worde, with 12 editions between 1500 and 1533: ESTC 13829–37 (listed by Keiser, *Manual*, p. 3952); available on EEBO.

**Facsimile:** Alston, *Ortus vocabulorum*, of the Huntington Library first edition, but with the prologue from the British Library copy.

**Modern editions:** Only an unpublished thesis based on the first Wynkyn de Worde edition (Cannon, ‘Hortus’).96

**Discussed:** Way liv–lxiv; Starnes 28–37; *Stein, Dictionary* 74–90, with *MG*; McCarren, ‘Bristol Fragment’; Keiser, *Manual* #558.

**Sources:** Starnes (31–7) and *Stein (Dictionary)* 81–5) review possible sources. The colophon of the 1509 edition says it contains almost all the things in John Balbi, *Catholicon* (§2.5); Veronensis, *Vocabularius breviloquus*; Perottus, *Cornucopia*; Gemma *vocabulorum*; and *Medulla grammaticae* (Starnes 30–31). Starnes notes that this is ‘absurd’ (31). Way thought *Ortus* was based on *MG*, ‘but with considerable modifications and additions from other sources. Plausible as this theory is, conclusive supporting evidence concerning the

95 *Stein, Dictionary* 80, notes a similar format in a BL copy of the *Catholicon abbreviatum* with a date of 1499 in the Prologus. *Catholicon abbreviatum* is a vocabulary in Latin and French, published in Paris.

Latin element of the Medulla is, because of the large body of conventional materials, most
difficult to find' (Starnes 30–31). Starnes’ comparisons (32–3) of Ortus and MG show a close
kinship, especially in entries with English; he suggests, however, that the two may share
common sources: Catholicon and Vocabularius breviloquus (33–4). There is also evidence of
the possible use of a Latin–German dictionary, Vocabularius Latino–Teutonicus (from which
Gemma vocabulorum was derived); familiarity with Equivoca (§2.8.4) is also evident though
not cited in the colophon (Starnes 34–7).

Contents: Little has been done on this dictionary, and some incorrect information has been
published. Stein (‘15th Century’ 315–18, and Dictionary 74–7) cites Haworth’s edition of the
Bristol fragment of MG, which he thought was Ortus. The date of that fragment was estimated
to be about 1430, far earlier than the 1500 printed edition of Ortus. Stein (‘15th Century’)
used that earlier date to discuss possible connections in authorship between Ortus and PP
(dated 1440). But McCarren (‘Bristol Fragment’) demonstrated that the Bristol fragment is
actually from the MG family, making any possible connection in authorship very unlikely,
with 60 years separating the earliest known versions of PP and Ortus.

Ortus was the first Latin–English dictionary to be printed (1500), only a year after Pynson’s
dition of PP. With 12 editions published in the early sixteenth century, Ortus seems to have
been a popular book. Wynkyn de Worde said in his 1516 edition of PP that he bound PP
(English–Latin) and Ortus (Latin–English) together for the benefit of young scholars (Starnes
29). ‘Popular as the Ortus was for the first quarter of the sixteenth century, there is little
evidence of its influence on subsequent lexicography – a circumstance which might be
explained by the desire of the Humanists to start afresh and to avoid the use of medieval
sources’ (Starnes 37).

7. Conclusion

The quotation from Starnes immediately above is preceded by these words:

Owing to the great body of conventional lexicographic materials in manuscripts and in printed
books at the end of the fifteenth century, the problem of establishing exact relationships is extremely
difficult, and the conclusions regarding sources necessarily tentative. But the study of the Ortus may
at least suggest what are some of the problems in the history of fifteenth-century lexicography and
what rewarding work remains to be done (Starnes 37).

In the course of this introduction I have tried to indicate some of these problems and some of
the areas still requiring work. All are formidable, and even more various than in Volume 1 of
this series. As in Volume 1, many glossaries still require editions, but the numbers involved
here are very much greater. Old English has a relatively small corpus, all available online. In
the post-Conquest period, much material of lexicographical significance is still completely
unpublished and unstudied. The teaching of Latin (and Greek) in the pre-Conquest period is
now complicated by the addition of Anglo-Norman, both as a language of instruction and,
from the thirteenth century onwards, as a language to be learned. Both Anglo-Norman and
Latin were essential to careers in administration, business, and law, among others, and how
the two languages were learned and what the role of the vernaculars was in that study have
been much debated and continue to need work.
There are more identifiable individual lexicographers than in Volume 1, but in many cases we know little or nothing about them. Their interests and activities, as well, can be more wide-ranging and more individualistic than in pre-Conquest times. The tremulous hand of Worcester created an Old English–Latin glossary in the thirteenth century (§1.4). Several well known and influential scholars, some of whom were English by birth, are discussed in §2; all wrote in Latin between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, and their works and techniques were widely distributed and influential. Tony Hunt's *TLL* prints glossaries and glosses to many of their works and points out many areas needing urgent work, for example Nequam (§2.7) and John of Garland's *Dictionarius* and *Unus omnium* (§§2.8, 2.8.1, and 2.8.5). Most of the rest discussed in this volume are individuals whose names are associated with one work or collection. Nicholas de Munshulle wrote a large Latin–English *nominale*, with a wide range of classes and terms, which is still unpublished (§5.1–2); it is attributed to him only in one manuscript. Lacking any further context, it is difficult to generalize as to his intentions, but presumably he was a grammar teacher. Attributions of other *nominales* to him may be premature given the problem of trying to establish relationships between large unpublished lexicographical works. Lexicographical material is also commonly found, as would be expected, in grammatical manuscripts or schoolbooks (§§5.3–5); many of these contain material needing study (a few examples are given in §5.4). Some are known schoolmasters’ books (§5.5) or the increasingly popular personal miscellanies (§5.6.1), and the contents reflect the owners’ interests, for example, Thomas Pennant (§5.4), Thomas Schort (§5.5.3), and Walter Pollard (§5.6.1). Legal collections also contain glossaries (§§1.5 and 4.4); both these examples involve Anglo-Norman, and the later one includes conversational models. One lexicographer aimed at a different type of audience: Walter de Bibbesworth wrote a popular contextualized verse vocabulary of Anglo-Norman country life and activities, directly addressed to a woman, to enable her to teach her children (§4.1.1). Thomas Sampson (§4.3) is an interesting example of a teacher of business methods; both Latin and Anglo-Norman lexicographical material is found with texts and treatises relevant to business studies.

New research tools and advances in techniques are found, for example fully alphabetized glossaries and the first concordance to an English text (§5.6.3). In the latter case the compiler talks about what he is trying to achieve, and how. Others, unfortunately, are silent on their methods: how the first Anglo-Norman and English glossaries were compiled, for instance, is unknown (§§4.1, 6, and 6.1).

The material here ranges from a twelfth-century glossary, with two French glosses, written on the back of a roll of charters at ‘a monastic house remote from centres of power and prestige’ (§3.1) to the large alphabetical fifteenth-century dictionaries, some of which survive in many copies and were clearly very popular: manuscripts and early printed books (*PP*; §6.1.1), manuscripts only (*MG*; §6.2.1), and printed books only (*Ortus*; §6.2.2). Both the twelfth-century glossary and the fifteenth-century dictionaries (and many others) seem to connect in some way with much earlier Old English glossaries such as Corpus, Leiden, and Épinal-Erfurt (§§3.1 and 6.2.1); how this material could have been transmitted across eight centuries is still not understood (see McCarren, §6.2.1, for some possibilities). Sources and interconnections of lexicographical material in general across the period are complicated and problematic; critical editions and source studies are urgently needed.

The lack of publication of much of this material has meant that the dictionaries (*MED*, *OED*, *AND*, and *DMLBS*) do not have as full an account of the lexicons of the languages in
this period as they should. *McCarren, in particular, comments on the problems and progress in this area (§6.2.1). This problem, however, is complicated by the increasing awareness that Latin, Anglo-Norman, and English coexisted and mixed in written texts throughout this period to such an extent that distinctions between them become increasingly difficult: *Rothwell (‘Vocabulary’ 251) refers to ‘the Anglo-French we now call Modern English’ (§4.2). Much more rewarding work here, as on all the problems mentioned above, remains to be done.

**Abbreviations**


**BL** [London,] British Library

**Bodl. Libr.** [Oxford,] Bodleian Library

**c.** *circa*

**CA** *Catholicon Anglicum*

**Cbg.** Cambridge

**CCCC** Cambridge, Corpus Christi College


**coll.** Collated

**Coll.** College

**CUL** [Cambridge,] Cambridge University Library

**CUP** Cambridge University Press


**DMLBS** Latham, R.E. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin From British Sources.* London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1975–.

**EEBO** Early English Books Online

Available online at http://eebo.chadwyck.com

**EETS** Early English Text Society

**EM** Catalogue of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220. Manuscripts with this tag are catalogued and described on this site: http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/catalogue/mss.htm

**ES** Extra Series

**ESTC** English Short Title Catalogue
Available online at http://estc.bl.uk


This is a searchable database of various types of lexicographical material, dating between about 1480 and 1702. It also includes bibliographical details.


Trinity Coll. [Oxford]


Medieval Sources: Manuscripts

The following manuscripts are ones cited in the Introduction, and are listed here in order of city and library. Bibliographical details for the main manuscripts are given within the introduction. Manuscripts with [Thomson] after the entry are in Thomson’s catalogue. Manuscripts with [EM] after the entry are in the online Catalogue of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220: http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/catalogue/mss.htm.

**Aberystwyth**
Natl. Libr. of Wales, Peniarth 356B §§2.8.2 (fn 29), 2.8.3 (fn 30), 5.4 [Thomson]

**Brussels**
Bibliothèque Royale 1650 §1.1 (fn 2)

**Bristol**
University DM 1 §6.2.1

**Cambridge, Mass.**
Harvard Law Library 43 §§5.1, 5.2, 5.5

**Cambridge, England**
CCCC 23 §§3.1 [EM]
CCCC 233 §2.8.3 (fn 30) [Thomson]
Emmanuel Coll. 321.7.71 §6.1.1
Gonville & Caius Coll. 417/447 §2.8.3 (fn 30) [Thomson]
King’s Coll. 8 §6.1.1
Magdalene Coll. Pepys 1047 §5.6.1
St. John’s Coll. E. 17 §4.4 (fn 70)
St. John’s Coll. F. 26 §6.1.1 [Thomson]
St. John’s Coll. 72 (C 22) §§6.2.1, 6.2.1 (fn 94)
Trinity Coll. B. 11. 15 §6.1.1
Trinity Coll. B. 14. 40 §4.1.3
Trinity Coll. O. 2. 31 §3.1 [EM]
Trinity Coll. O. 3. 37 §3.1
Trinity Coll. O. 5. 4 §§2.8.3 (fn 30), 5.4, 5.5.1, 5.6.3 [Thomson]
Trinity Coll. R. 17. 1 §§1.2, 3.1 [EM]
CUL Addit. 2830 §5.5.1 [Thomson]
CUL Addit. 8870 §4.4 (fn 68)
CUL Ee. 4. 20 §§4.1.2, 4.3, 4.3 (fn 67)
CUL Gg. 1. 1 §4.1.1
CUL Gg. 5. 35 §6.1.1 (fn 93)
CUL li. 6. 17 §4.4 (fn 73)
CUL LI. 1. 14 §5.6.2

Canterbury
Cathedral Libr. MS D.2 §6.1.1

Durham
Cathedral Hunter 100 §3.3 [EM]

Glasgow
UL Hunter 292 §§3.2, 4.4 (fn 71)

Gloucestershire
Gloucestershire Record Office, GDR/ZI/31 §6.2.1

Hereford
Hereford Cathedral Libr. P. I. 17 §1.1 [EM]

Lancashire
Stoneyhurst Coll. Libr. XV (A. 1. 10) §§5.6.3, 6.2.1

Lincoln
Lincoln Cathedral 88 §§5.2, 6.2.1 [Thomson]
Lincolnshire Archives Office, Formulary Book MS 23 §4.4 (fn 73)

London
BL Addit. 12195 §2.8.3 (fn 30) [Thomson]
BL Addit. 15562 §6.1.2
BL Addit. 19046 §2.8.3 (fn 30) [Thomson]
BL Addit. 22556 §6.1.1
BL Addit. 34276 §§5.1, 5.1 (fn 76), 5.4
BL Addit. 37075 §§2.8.2 (fn 29), 2.8.3 (fn 30), 5.2, 5.4, 5.5 [Thomson]
BL Addit. 37789 §§6.1.1, 6.2.1
BL Arundel 249 §5.5.3 [Thomson]
BL Cotton Titus D. xxiv §3.1 [EM]
BL Harley 221 §6.1.1
BL Harley 978 §3.3
BL Harley 1002 §§2.8.1 (fn 27), 2.8.2 (fn 29), 5.4, 6 (fn 91) [Thomson]
BL Harley 1738 §6.2.1 (fn 94)
BL Harley 2181 §6.2.1 (fn 94)
BL Harley 2257 §§6.2.1, 6.2.1 (fn 94)
BL Harley 2270 §6.2.1 (fn 94)
BL Harley 2274 §6.1.1
BL Harley 3376 §§1.4, 3.1, 6.2.1
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Section 1
Looking Back to Old English
The Old English gloss entered above the Romanum version of the psalms in the tripartite *de luxe* manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College R. 17. 1, has never found particular favour among glossographers perhaps because it falls outside the traditional chronology of Old English (to c. 1100). The gloss, copied by multiple hands using a number of different models, comprises a hodgepodge of morphological and phonological features. Some of these must be judged to be idiosyncratic, others the result of grappling with a source-gloss that, by the mid-1160s, combined a number of earlier strata and was understood in places with difficulty. Other features are due to evident misreadings of the Latin in the gloss as transmitted, and still others resulted from combining word-for-word glossing with syntactical glossing. There are certainly additional explanations that can be offered for the overall complex and at times peculiar nature of the gloss in this manuscript. Herbert Dean Meritt remarked that the glosses 'are among the most inaccurate in Old English' and that some of the manuscript's glosses 'can be interpreted only in the light of the oddest vagaries in OE glossing'.¹ Sherman M. Kuhn called it 'a remarkable linguistic gallimaufry, containing forms similar to those of several periods and dialects'.² For Kenneth Sisam, the gloss 'defies historical analysis', and he rightly dismisses it 'as useless for the analysis of other glosses', leaving it to historians of education to sort out '[h]ow such a gloss came to be written into a splendid manuscript at the
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scriptorium of Canterbury Cathedral in the twelfth century.\(^3\) In the most recent — and most welcome — study of the entire codex by a number of scholars, Patrick P. O’Neill to some extent echoes earlier judgements of the gloss, although the thrust of his discussion provides a judicious assessment of the gloss: ‘The variety of sources used and their seemingly haphazard distribution suggest that the copying of the English gloss was a project bungled in both planning and execution.’\(^4\)

The Old English gloss in the Eadwine Psalter (E) reflects, indeed, something of a botched affair; but that the psalter’s multiple scribes worked diligently to enter and revise the gloss and that many of the quires seem to have been produced in tandem or simultaneously by a number of main scribes working on the gloss along with multiple correctors (which suggests some haste), seems to have left little impression upon scholars. Its very late date of origin and inclusion of an English gloss at a time when that language was archaic and had lost ground to French and Latin as an official language also make it a remarkable artefact. No incitement toward sympathy or overlooked praise is intended here; rather, the sweeping dismissal of the Eadwine gloss would seem to require a response that examines the various strata of the gloss and its extensive alterations. There also remains the larger issue of what gloss traditions the glossators worked within, and why, if the Regius Psalter was in Canterbury at this time, its gloss was not entered into the Eadwine Psalter in the first place rather than as an afterthought, or why the gloss to the Vespasian or Cambridge psalters was not directly employed. The first of these issues — the gloss traditions reflected in the Eadwine Psalter — was addressed at length by Frank-Günter Berghaus in his book, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der altenglischen Interlinearversionen des Psalters und der Cantica,\(^5\) in which he argues that the Old English glosses reflect an A-type tradition (represented by the Vespasian Psalter) closely related to C (the Cambridge Psalter).\(^6\) This view
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has been recently reiterated by O'Neill, who states that the 'textual cohesiveness' of the gloss 'is shown by general agreement with the A (C) gloss'.\(^7\) In an article published in 1989, I argued, based on a small collation sample using Psalms 3.2–3.3, 4.2–4.7, 5.7–5.10, 22.16, 75, 80, and 98,\(^8\) that the gloss to Part 1 of the psalms (Pss. 1–77) seemed to be allied to the D-type (Regius Psalter) tradition,\(^9\) which was corrected using a D or a D-type exemplar, while Part 2 of the psalms drew upon both A-type and D-type traditions, although showing as well a broad stratum of independent glosses.\(^10\) The conclusion mirrored that of Lindelöf, who wrote 'daß die hs. E trotz ihrer verhältnismäßig großen selbständigkeit dennoch mit D eine gewisse übereinstimmung zeigt unter dieser hs. näher steht als der gruppe ABC, weshalb es nicht unwahrscheinlich ist, daß D oder jedenfalls eine handschrift von dem typus jener hs. schon dem ersten schreiber der glosse zu E 1–77 bekannt geswesen ist'.\(^11\) In both instances the collation sample chosen was much too small to yield valid results that can be applied broadly to the psalter. Having recently completed a full collation, with detailed textual notes, of all the glossed (and unglossed) Anglo-Saxon psalters for Pss. 1–50, I believe the time is appropriate to re-examine the gloss traditions of the Eadwine Psalter (principally Part 1) and to address the related issues of the nature of the independent glosses and the work of the correctors.

THE GLOSS TRADITION

(a) Method

Three verses from Psalm 33 show the arrangement of the glosses in the collation. Glosses that are in the original hand in E are indicated by E\(^3\) (the main scribe responsible for the gloss in this section); those by the corrector are indicated by E\(^x\). An asterisk after a lemma indicates a note on the Old English gloss, and sigla in italics signal a note on the Latin

\(^8\) The samples were not randomly chosen, but were guided by the divisions in the hands, and the accompanying change in gloss, within the psalter.
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text (for which the Romanum is chosen as the base text). Notes on editions and unglossed Latin texts of the psalms have been omitted:

v. 18
Clamauerunt cleopedon AI, clipodon B, clypodon CDJK, clypedon GH, hi clypudon E, clipeø E

iusti rehtwise A, ryhtwise B, rihtwise CDFGHJK, rihtwisan I, ðæ soðfestaen E

et 7 ABCE3FGIJK

dominus drihten E3JK, dryhṭ AB, driht C, driht E, driht GJ

exaudiuit geherde A, gehierde B, gehyrde CDFGHIK, gehirde J, gehirep E3

eos hie A*B, hi CK, hy DGH, hig F, hig IJ, hi E3 (M)

et 7 ABCE3FGHJK

ex of ABCDE3*FGHIJK

omnibus allum A, eallum BDHJ, eallum CFGI, eallum E3, eallan K

tribulationibus geswencednessum A, geswencednessum B, geswencednessum C, geswencednessum J, geswincum DH, geswincum G, gedrefednyssum FI, geswinece K, earfojmessum vel geswincum E3*x

eorum heara A, hira B, hyra C, heora DE3FGHIJK

liberauit gefrede A, gefrode C, aliesde B, he alysde DFGHJ, he alesde E3*x, 7 he alesde I, alysde K (M)

eos hie AB, hi CK, hy DE3*GH, hig FIJ

OE: ðæ soðfestaen (E3) letter (f or s?) eras. after n. hie (A)] i written below the line. gehirep (E3) eras. above gloss, perhaps of underdotting; cf. parallel Hebraicum text. of (E3) f in darker ink of corr. earfoþnessum (E3*x) gloss eras. before earfoþnessum, vel added by corr., geswincum added by different corr., with cum on eras. he alesde (E3*x) a by corr., lies by orig. band, d altered from t, e added (retraced?), eras. after word. hy (E3) on eras.

LT: exaudiuit] eaxudīuit M. liberauit] liberauit K, liberāuit M.

19
luxta nieh AB, nieh C, neah DFGHJK, Neah E3, gehende I

est is ABE3FGIJK, ys C

dominus drihtyn C, drihten E3F, dryhṭ AB, driht G, driht J
his  

\[ \text{di} \text{ssum A, } \text{py} \text{sum B, } \text{bissum J, } \text{d} \text{am CDG, } \text{d} \text{am F, } \text{b} \text{am H, } \text{b} \text{am I, } \text{b} \text{am K, } \text{b} \text{em } E^{*} (M) \]

qui  

\[ \text{da A, } \text{pe CDE}^{*} \text{GHIIK, } \text{de F, } \text{da } \text{de B, } \text{pe J} \]

tribulato  

\[ \text{geswencedre ABDE}^{*}, \text{geswencyde C, } \text{geswencede F, } \text{geswencede G, } \text{geswencendne H, } \text{geswaencede J, } \text{geswente K, gedrefede I} \]

sunt  

\[ \text{sind A, synd CFGHJK, sint B, synt E}^{*} \text{I} \]

corde  

\[ \text{on heortan ACI, heortan BDE}^{*} \text{FGHJK} \]

et  

\[ 7 \text{ ABCE}^{*} \text{FGHJK (I)} \]

humiles  

\[ \text{ea} \text{dmode ABCDE}^{*} \text{HJ, eadmodan F, eadmode GK, } \text{pe } \text{ea} \text{dmodan I} \]

spiritu  

\[ \text{on gaste ABDE}^{*} \text{I, of gaste C, gaste FHK, gast G, gastas J} \]

saluabit  

\[ \text{gehaele} \text{d A, gehael} \text{d B, he gehaeld C, he gehaeled DFH}, \text{he gehelp E}^{3}, \text{hi gehaeled G, he gehaeld IK, beo} \text{d gehaeled J (M)} \]

OE: \[ \text{bem (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. } \text{be (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. geswencedre (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. synt (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. heortan (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. geswencydnyse (E}^{*}) \text{] on } \text{eras. geswencednessa B, geswencendnessa J, geswince D, geswinc GH, swinc K, gedrefedynse F, gedrefedynse I, eæfodeynesse E}^{3} \]


20

Multae  

\[ \text{mong A, monige B}^{*} \text{J, Monigæ E}^{3}, \text{mæning CDGH}, \text{manige FK, fela I (L)} \]

tribulationes  

\[ \text{geswenced A, geswencydnyse C, geswencednessa B, geswencendnessa J, geswince D, geswinc GH, swinc K, gedrefedynse F, gedrefedynse I, eæfodeynesse E}^{3} \]

iustorum  

\[ \text{rehtwisra A, ryhtwisra BD, rihtwisra CFGIJK, rihtwis H, } \text{æere sodfestræ E}^{3} (M) \]

et  

\[ 7 \text{ ABCE}^{3} \text{FGIJK} \]

de  

\[ \text{of ABCDFGHJK, be E}^{3} \]

his*  

\[ \} \text{di} \text{ssum A, } \text{dy} \text{sum B, } \text{bissum C, } \text{py} \text{sum I, } \text{bissum E}^{3}, \text{bissum J, } \text{py} \text{s K, } \text{d} \text{am D, } \text{d} \text{am F, } \text{b} \text{am GH (M)} \]
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omnibus* } allum A, callum BCGI, callum DHJ, eællum E₃*, calle F, eallan K
liberauit gefreað A, gefreð C, aliesde B, alysde JK, alysep DEₓ, alyseoð GH, he aliseð F, 7 alesð I (LM)
eos hie AB, hi CK, hig FIJ, hy G, hem Eₓ*
dominus drihtyn C, drihten EₓxF, driht G, driht J K

OE: monige (B]) right side of o incomplete, but enough of a stroke is made to indicate o and not e. eællum (E₃] gloss eras. after word. alysep (Eₓ] on eras. hem (Eₓ] on eras. drihten (Eₓ]) on eras.


GA: his omnibus] omnibus his FGHIJ.

Berghaus notes that the gloss in E in this section of the psalms is an A-type gloss closest to C. High frequency words, glosses shared by E and both the A- and D-type traditions, and glosses derivative of D can be excluded, since they do not speak to the issue of relations (although any significant agreement between E and any derivative against ACD is noted). In E, glosses that have been entered or corrected from D or a D-type exemplar are those to v. 18: tribulationibus (where uel geswincum was added), liberauit, eos; v. 19: his, qui, tribulatio, sunt, corde, et, humiles, spiritu; v. 20 liberauit, eos, dominus. These can be set aside, although it should be noted that the glosses in E in v. 20 to eos dominus do not have corresponding glosses in D (the lemmata normally yield high frequency glosses; that in E to eos is distinct from other psalters in this instance). The glosses that remain are:

v. 18
Clamauerunt cleopedon AI, clipodon B, clypodon CDJK, clypedon GH, hi clypodon F, clipiaþ E₅
iusti rhehtwize A, ryhtwise B, rihtwise CDFGHJK, þa rihtwisian I, ðæ södfestæn E₅
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exaudiuit  geherde A, gehierde B, gehyrde CDFGHIK, gehirde J, gehirep E

eos  hie AB, hi CK, hy DGH, híg F, hig IJ, hi E

tribulationibus  geswencednissum A, geswencednessum B, gswenced-

nyssum C, geswencednessum I, geswincum DH, 
geswincum G, gedrefedyssum FI, geswince K, 
eærfoşnessum nel geswincum E

v.19  geswenced A, geswencydnys C, geswencednessa B, 
geswencednessa J, geswince D, geswinc GH, swinc K, 
gedrefednysse F, gedrefednessa I, eærfoşnese E

iustorum  rehtwisra A, ryhtwisra BD, rihtwisra CFGJK, riwhis H, 
þæra søðfestæ E

de  of ABCDFGHJK, be E

his  díssum A, ðýssum B, þìssum C, þysum I, þìsum E, 
þìsum, J, þys K, ðam D, ðam F, ðam GH

Glosses in E that are related to D are not in evidence in the sample; 
only one high-frequency gloss is related to AC over D: v. 20 his : þìsum. 
More significant are the independent glosses, which are of two kinds: (1) 
substantive glosses that cannot be derived from an A- or D-type 
tradition, and (2) glosses showing change of tense. In the first group we 
find: iusti: þæc søðfestæ E vs. rebtwise A, ryhtwise B, rihtwise CDFGHJK, 
þa rihtwisæn I; tribulationibus : eærfoşnessum E vs. geswencednissum A, 
geswencednissum B, geswencednissum C, geswencednessum J, geswincum DGH, 
geswince K, gedrefednissum FI; tribulationes : eærfoşnese E vs. geswenced A, 
gesweczydnys C, geswencednessa B, geswencednessa J, geswince D, geswinc GH, 
geswinc K, gedrefednysse F, gedrefednnessa I; and iustorum : þæra søðfestæ E vs. 
rehtwisra A, ryhtwisra BD, rihtwisra CFGJK, rihtwis H. Among the 
second type, we find: Cllamauerunt: clipiæh E vs. cleopedon AI, clipodon B, 
clipodon CDJK, clypedon GH, bi clypadon F (where E gives a present 
indicative where a perfect tense is called for) and exaudiuit : gebirep E vs. 
geberde A, gebierde B, gebyrde CDFGHIK, gebirde J. The inclusion of he in 
the gloss to saluabit, although appearing in D but not A, is of no real
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significance. Of the glosses to thirty-five lemmata, then, E agrees with AC over D once (a high-frequency word), does not show any agreements with D that are original to E, but shows six glosses that are substantively different from ACD. Corrections by E are clearly derived from D or a D-type gloss.

The modest corpus of glosses chosen for this study comprises those to Pss. 24—34. Only substantive agreements and departures will be noted, although any additional significant forms outside these two categories will be treated. Glosses are drawn from ACDE, with glosses from other psalters entered for comparison when necessary. Independent glosses have been checked throughout each psalter to be certain that the gloss is specific to E. Notes are supplied as needed.

(b) Collation of Psalters ACDE, Psalms 24—34

(i) ACE over D
24.4 semitas : stige AC, sīpfatu D, stygæ E
24.4 edoce : lær A, lære D, gelæ C, gelere E
24.5 sustinui : ic arefnde A, ic arefynde C, ic ærefne uel þyldgode E, ic geþyldgode D [also listed in ii below]
24.8 hoc : ðissum A, þissum CE, þam D
24.13 hereditatem : erfeweardnis E, yrfeweardnyss C, yrfeweærdnesse E, erfeweardnap D
24.15 semper: aa A, symle CE, Ø D
24.16 respice : geloca AC, locæ E, uel besoh D
24.17 necessitatibus: nedþearfnissum A, nydþeardnyssum C, neadum D, niedþeærfum E

12 According to Berghaus, scribe d (his E4) wrote Pss. 9.34 cued—25.12; scribe e (his E5) Pss. 26.1—77.2; scribe g (his E7) Pss. 79.7 on—82.19 and 85.1—90.15 earfødnesse. My own study of the hands argues that scribe B wrote Pss. 2.1—25.12, scribe C 26.1—40.4 and 40.10 þæ—7.72, scribe D Pss. 78.1—4, 79.3 Auwece—79.7 us, 83.2—4 megen, 84.13 —84.14, and scribe E Pss. 79.5—79.3 manassæ, 79.7 on—82.19, 83.4 kyning—84.13 estnesse, and 85.1—90.15 earfødnesse. The psalms chosen for the sample collation span a number of hands, their precise determination notwithstanding.

13 uel sīpfatu added by corrector.
14 uel syoh added by corrector; D reads besoh; locæ in E may be original, although rewritten by corrector after the erasure was made; see 24.19 locæ uel besoh.
15 Note G neadþeærfum, j nydþeærfum.
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24.17 eripe: genere ACE, nere D
24.19 respice: geloca AC, locæ E,16 beseoh D
24.21 adheserunt: æfelun A, æfelgon C, efylæb E,17 togeþeoddon D
25.5 odiui : ic fiode E, ic feode C, Ic fiode E,18 ic hatude D
25.5 sedebo : sitto A, sette C, sitte E, ic gesitte D
25.7 enarrem : ic aseew A, ic asege C, ic sege E,19 ic cyþe D
25.8 tabernaculi : getedes A, geardunge C, eardungæ E, Ø D
24.1 leuaui; 24.2 non erubescam : see section iv below.
25.11 miserere: mildsa A, myltsa C, myltsæ E, gemiltsa D
25.12 ecclesiis : cirecum A, ciricean C, cyrcaen E, hal gum D
26.4 hanc : ðas A, þas C, þæs E, þæt D
26.4 requiram : ic soecu A, ic see C, ic see E,20 ic cyþarde D
26.5 malorum : ðaæra yfæla A, þara yfylra C, þæææ yfææ E, yfæla D
26.5 tabernaculi : geteldes A, in getelde C, getældunge E, eardunge D21
26.6 tabernaculo : getelde A,22 getelde C, getældunge E, eardungstowe D
26.6 dicam : ic cweod A, ic cwede C, ic cwiþe E, ic seege D
26.11 semita : stige AC, stigæ E,23 siþfaete D
26.12 testes : geweotan A, gewitan C, gewiten E,24 cyþra D
27.1 descendentibus : þæm niþerstigendum E, niðyrstigyndum C, astigendum A, þam stigendum D
27.4 studiorum : teolunge A, tylynge C, tilengæ E,25 gecneorþnessa D
27.4 retribue : geeldeana AC, geeddænanæ E, agylæ D
27.7 adiutor: fultum ACE, gefylsta D
27.9 saeculum : worulde C, world E,26 ecnisse D, Ø A
28.5 cedros: cederbeamas A, cederbeamys C, þone cedorbeæm E, lange steñas D
28.6 filius : bearn CF, beaern E, sunu ABDGHIJK
29.12 saccum : sec E,27 seæ A, sæææ C, heran D

16 uel besooh added by corrector.
17 It is possible that this gloss should be eliminated from this group, since efylæ is written on erasure by corrector; uel geþeoddon added by corrector.
18 uel hatude added by corrector. 19 uel ic cyþe added by corrector.
20 uel cyþarde added by corrector. 21 Cf 26.5 D tabernaculo: eardunge uel getelde.
22 uel on eardungstowe added by eleventh-century corrector.
23 uel on siþfaete added by corrector. 24 cyþra uel ge added by corrector.
25 gecneorþnaþ uel added by corrector. 26 uel on ecnisse added by corrector.
27 uel heran added by corrector.
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30.1 libera: gefrea A, gefreo C, gefriolsæ E,\(^{28}\) alys D; see also 30.16 libera:
    Gefriolsæ E
30.3 adcelera: hreάa AC, 7 ṭu hredlice E,\(^{29}\) efst D
30.7 odisti: ṭu fiodes A, ṭu feodyst C, ṭu fiodes E,\(^{30}\) ṭu hatudest D
30.8 respexisti: gelocades A, ṭu gelocodyst C, ṭu gelocades E,\(^{31}\) ṭu
    gesawe D
30.8 necessitatibus: nedþearfnissum A, nydþearfnyssum C, minum
    niedþearfnysvm E,\(^{32}\) nedum D
30.8 exultabo: ic winsumie E,\(^{33}\) ic gefie A, ic gefeo BC, ic fægie D [but
    elsewhere in A wynsumian is used]
30.18 confundar: biom ic gescended A, beom ic gescyndyd C, (ic) sie
    gescyd E, ic gescamige D
30.23 deprecationis: boene A, bene CE, halsunga D
30.24 retribuet: geedleanād AC, edlenād E, he agylt D
31.3 dum: mid ṭy A, mid ṭy ṭe C, mid ṭy E,\(^{34}\) bonne D
3.1.5 aduersum: wiǒ AC, wiþ E,\(^{35}\) ongean D
31.9 freno: bridelse A, bridylse C, þæm bridle E, bitole D
31.10 multa: monge A, monige C, Monigo uel fela E, fela D [listed also
    in ii below]
31.11 recti: rehte A, on rihtre E, rihtheorte C, ryhtwise D
32.7 abyssos: neolisse A, nywulnysse C, niwolnesse E,\(^{36}\) grundas D
32.8 habitant: eardiað AC, eãrdigæ þ on E, geondeardiað D
33.11 inquirentes: socende A, soecende B, secynde C, secende E, ða
    secendan D
34.10 egenum: weðlan A, wædlan BC, wed₁an E,\(^{37}\) elþeodigne D
34.26 erubescant: scomien A, scamigen B, scamyn C, Scæmien E,
    ablysigen D
34.28 meditabitur: bið smeagende A, bið smeagende B, bið smeagynede C,
    biþ smeagende J, smeægendæ E, smeæ D

\(^{28}\) uel alys added by corrector.
\(^{29}\) uel efst added by corrector.
\(^{30}\) uel hatudest added by corrector.
\(^{31}\) uel sawe added by corrector (> ṭu gelocedes uel (ge)sawe, as an
    elliptical compound).
\(^{32}\) uel nedum added by corrector.
\(^{33}\) uel fægie added by corrector.
\(^{34}\) bonne added by corrector after ṭy.
\(^{35}\) ongean uel added by corrector.
\(^{36}\) uel grundas added by corrector.
\(^{37}\) uel elþeodigne added by corrector.
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[EB over AC]
24.19 odio : læðdú A, læðde C, feounge B, fioung E, hatunge D
31.5 remisisti : geedleanedas A, geedleanudyst C, forlete BE, forgese D

[CDE over A]
33.2 semper : aa A, simle BE, symle CD
34.15 flagella : ðrea AB, swipæn uel swyngla E, swingylla C, swingella D
[listed also in iv below]
32.2 cithara : citra A, cytran B, eærpingum E, hearpan CD

(ii) DE over AC
24.3 inrideant: bysmrien DE, bismeriað A, gebysmriyn C
24.5 sustinui : ic ærefne uel þylgdode E, ic geþylgdode D, ic arefnde A, ic arefynde C
24.13 possidebit : ægende E, gesiteÔ AB, gesiteÔ uel wealdyð C, D [D typically uses forms of agan 36.9, 36.11, 36.22, 36.29, 43.4, 68.37, 78.11, 82.13]
24.19 iniquo: unryhtre D, unryhta E, unrehtwisre A, unrihtwisre C
25.6 circuibo : ic ymbgange D, ic ymbgonge E, ic ymbgaa A, ic umbgáá C
25.10 muneribus : laecum uel medsceattum E, of medsceattum D, geofum A, gyfum C
28.2 adorate: wearɔiað A, wurðiað C, gebiddæp D, Gebiddæp E
28.10 diluuium : flod DE, cwildefloD AC
29.6 indignatione : æbylgniisse D, ebylnesse E, ebylgðu A, æbylðe C
30.10 uenter : innod DE, womb A, wamb C
30.14 uituperationem : tale DE, telnisse, tælnysse C
30.19 efficiantur : gewerƿen D, Sien gewɔren E, sien gefremed A, syn gefremyde C
30.20 abscondisti : þu behyddest D, þu behiddest E, þu ahydes A, þu ahyddyst C
30.20 perfecisti : ðu fulfremedest D, (þu) fulfremedest E, þu gefremedes A, þu gefremydyst C
31.4 conuersus : gehwyrfed D, gewyrfed E, gecerred A, gecyrryd C

38 uel hatunge added by corrector.
39 In E, un added on erasure by corrector.
40 There is an erasure below the gloss that extends to the end of the line. It is possible that E's gloss was altered from an A-type gloss.
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31.10 multa: monge A, monige C, Monigo uel fela E, fela D [listed also in i above]
31.10 flagella: drea A, ðreaunga C, swingella D, swîpo uel swingella E [listed also in iv below]
32.9 creata: gecwicad A, gecwicode C, gescapen D, gescæpene E
32.12 cuius: ðæs de D, ðæs ðe E, ðære A, ðære C
32.14 habitaculo: eardunge DE, eardunghuse AC
32.20 sustinet: abideð AB, abidyð C, forbyrdigad D, forbyrdigad uel geðolað E41 [listed also in iii below]
34.8 idipsum: ðæt selfe E, ðæt selfe D, ðæt ilce AB, ðæt ylce C
34.28 tota: ælce D, eîce E, alne A, ealne BC
See also 29.12 planctum in iv below.

(iii) Independent glosses
24.7 delicta: Ægyltaes E, scyld ABC, scilde J, scyldas DH, scyldas uel e G, scylde K [also 21.2, 31.5, 50.4, 50.5, 50.7, 58.13]
24.9 mites: æxþmoden E,42 ða mildan AB, ða mildan C, biliwite D, bilewitte K, manþware FG, modþware uel ða manðwaeran I
24.9 mansuetos: ðam softon E,43 ða monðweran A, ða monþwæran B, ða manþwæræn C, ða manswæsan D, ða bylehwitan F, ða mildan G, ðam mildan J, ðam liþum I, geðwaere K [single occurrence of this form, most likely a modernisation of *Ead; E typically uses forms of mansuetudo, mansuetus: gehwaran: 33.3, 36.11, 44.5, 89.10, 131.1, 146.6; found in D at 36.11, 44.5, 131.1; but note also D 89.10 manþwærnis, 146.6 manþwæran]
24.10 testimonia: gewitnesse E, gewitnyssa FI, gewitnesse GJ, cyðnisse A, cyðnysse C, cyðnissa D, cyðnisse H, cyðnes K [also 118.2, 118.24, 118.36, 118.46, 118.88, 118.99, 118.144 and witnes 18.8, 77.5]
24.12 qui: se him E, se ðe ABCF, se ðe GJ, ðe DH, ðe I, ða K
24.12 legem: ewe E,44 ðe A, æe D, æe BC, æe BC, æ æ G, æ HIJK [also 26.11, 39.9, 58.12, 70.4, 77.1, 77.5, 77.10, 83.8, 88.31, 118.1, 118.18, 118.29, 118.34, 118.44, 118.53, 118.55, 118.57, 118.61,

41 Gloss written by corrector.
42 bilewite uel added by corrector.
43 Written on an erasure.
44 æ uel added by corrector before gloss.
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118.70, 118.72, 118.77, 118.97, 118.102, 118.104, 118.109, 118.113, 118.126, 118.136, 118.142, 118.150, 118.153, 118.163, 118.165, 118.174, 129.4; note also the independent lex: lagu 77.1, 118.33


[also 9.10, 9.22, 12.5, 17.7, 22.5, 30.10, 33.5, 33.3, 33.8, 33.20, 36.39, 41.11, 45.2, 49.15, 53.9, 54.4, 55.2, 58.17, 59.13, 63.2, 65.11, 65.14, 68.18, 70.20, 76.3, 77.49, 80.8, 85.7, 90.15, 101.3, 105.11, 105.42, 105.44, 106.6, 106.13, 106.19, 106.28, 106.39, 107.13, 114.3, 117.5, 118.143, 137.7, 141.3, 142.11, 142.12]

24.22 angustiis⁴⁵: angsumnesse E, nearenissum A, nearonessum B, nearunyssum C, nearonissum D

[but see E 118.143 angustia: nearone]

25.2 proba: Gecosta E,⁴⁶ acunna AC, afanda D

[note also probare: costian 80.8, 138.1, 138.23; reprobare 117.22]

25.4 concilio: gemotstowe E,⁴⁷ geðæhte A, geþæhte CD

[also 67.31; but elsewhere forms of geþæht are used]

25.4 iniqua gerentibus: ðæm unrihtberendum uel dondum E,⁴⁸ ða unrehtan ðondum A, þan unriht doendum C, unryhte dondum D [single occurrence of form]

25.7 uocem: stemne E, stefne AD, stæfne C

[also 17.7, 17.14, 18.4, 26.7, 27.6, 27.2, 28.3, 28.4 (2x), 28.5, 28.7, 28.8, 28.9, 30.23, 41.5, 43.17, 54.4, 54.18, 57.6, 101.6; but stefne 41.8, 45.7, 46.3, 46.6. 65.8, 65.19, 67.34 (2x), 76.2 (2x), 76.18, 76.19, 80.12, 85.6, 97.5, 97.6, 102.20, 103.7, 103.12, 105.25, 114.1, 117.5, 118.149, 139.7, 140.1, 141.2; note 73.23 stemfe]

26.3 sperabo: gewene E,⁴⁹ gehyhtu AB, gehihte CGIJ, hyhte DH, hihte K, hopige F

[also 4.6, 15.1, 20.8, 36.3, 27.7, 30.1, 30.15, 30.20, 30.25, 35.8, 36.3, 36.5, 36.40, 39.4, 42.5, 43.7, 51.9, 54.24, 55.4, 55.11, 70.1, 70.14, 70.22, 83.13, 85.2, 90.2, 90.4, 90.14, 111.7, 113.17, 113.18, 113.19, 117.9 (2x), 118.42, 118.43, 118.74, 118.114, 118.147, 128.5, 129.6, 130.3, 142.8, 143.2]

⁴⁵ Glosses to the Gallicanum variant tribulationibus are omitted here.
⁴⁶ uel afanda added by corrector.
⁴⁷ Cf. G geþæhtes uel on gemote, J gemote.
⁴⁸ uel dondum added above -berendum.
⁴⁹ Gehyhtu uel added by corrector.
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26.6 iubilationis\textsuperscript{50} : lofes \textit{uel} dremes \textit{E},\textsuperscript{51} wynsumnisse \textit{A},\textsuperscript{52} wynsumnesse \textit{B}, wynsumnysse \textit{C}, lofes \textit{D}
[also 46.5 \textit{wynsumnisse} \textit{uel} \textit{dreme}]

26.7 clamaui : ic chige \textit{E},\textsuperscript{53} ic cleopede \textit{A}, ic cleopode BD, ic clypode CH, ic clipode \textit{IJ}, ic clypude \textit{F}, ic clypige \textit{K}, ic clyp[ ] \textit{G}
[\textit{clamare} : \textit{ciegan} also 3.5, 17.42, 21.3, 29.3, 68.4, 76.2, 113.15; elsewhere \textit{E} uses \textit{clipian}]

26.9 declines: becyrre \textit{ðu} \textit{E},\textsuperscript{54} ahaeld \textit{ðu} \textit{A}, aheld \textit{ðu} \textit{B}, ahyld \textit{þu} \textit{CI}, ahyld \textit{ðu} \textit{F}, ahyld \textit{ðu} \textit{G}, ahild \textit{þu} \textit{J}, ahyld \textit{þu} \textit{D}, ahyld \textit{þu} \textit{H}
[also 118.21; elsewhere \textit{a}-, \textit{be}-, \textit{on-bildan}]

27.2 dum : mid \textit{gie E}, \textit{ðonne A}, \textit{þonne BCDFGHJK}, \textit{þænne I}

[also 7.10 \textit{þæ betenphysæ}, 36.9, 72.8 \textit{bete} 49.19, 54.16 \textit{bete}; also glosses \textit{malitita} 35.5, 106.54, 139.3. At 51.3 there is an erasure before \textit{nipe}; the gloss likely read \textit{bete nie}p.]

27.7 refloruit: blostmaet \textit{E},\textsuperscript{55} bleow \textit{ABCDGHIJK}, bleów \textit{F}
[also as a gloss on \textit{florere} 71.16, 89.6, 102.15, 131.18]

*27.9 extolle : genim \textit{E},\textsuperscript{56} uphefe ABI, upahefe \textit{GJ}, uppafeše \textit{C}, ahefe \textit{7}
ahfe \textit{D}, ahefe \textit{FHK}
[single occurrence; possibly misread as \textit{tolle}]

28.1 arietum : wejpræs \textit{E},\textsuperscript{57} romma \textit{AB}, ramma \textit{CDFHJK}, [ ] \textit{Ja G}
[also 13.4, 113.6]

*28.3 intonuit : ontynép \textit{E},\textsuperscript{58} hleoðrāð \textit{AB}, hleoðríæ \textit{J}, hleoðrode \textit{C},
swegde \textit{DFHK}, onswegde \textit{uel hleoðræ G}, onswegde \textit{I}
[perhaps orig. \textit{intonuit} : \textit{dynēp} misread as \textit{in tonuit} : \textit{on dynēp} \textit{→} \textit{ontynēp}; see 17.14 \textit{denede uel numerode} (added by corrector)]

28.6 unicornorum\textsuperscript{59} : ænhynnedes diores \textit{E}, ænhyrna \textit{AB}, ænhyrnerāā \textit{C},
anhynnedra \textit{D}
[single occurrence]

\textsuperscript{50}Glosses to the Gallican variant \textit{nacterationis} are omitted.
\textsuperscript{51}Both glosses are on erasure by corrector.
\textsuperscript{52}\textit{uel lofes} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{53}\textit{uel clypie} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{54}\textit{hyld uel} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{55}\textit{uel blow} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{56}\textit{uel ahefe} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{57}\textit{uel romma} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{58}\textit{uel onswegde} added by corrector.
\textsuperscript{59}Glosses to the Gallican variant \textit{unicornum} are omitted here.
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[also 20.8, 32.8, 45.6, 95.10, 111.6, 111.8, 113.7, 124.1; onwendan also glosses mouere and mutare in ACED]
[single occurrence]
29.4 abstraxisti : þu wiðthx E, ðu atuge A, þu atuge BCD62
[single occurrence]
29.6 matutinum : þæm uhtlicum E,63 margentide A, morgentine B, morgytide C, morgen K, degred D, ðægred FHI, ðægred uel on mergen G, to mergen uel on ðægred J
[also 62.7, 64.9, 72.14, 100.8, 129.6; in 48.15 ubttide uel in morgentid all except ubt- by corrector]
29.8 auertisti : þu ðewirfdes E, ðu forcerdes A, þu forcerdes B, þu forcyrdyst C, þu forcirdest J, ðu acuryrest D, þu acurydest GHK, þu awendest F, ðu awendest I
[also 43.24, 50.11, 53.7, 68.18, 84.2, 84.4, 84.5, 88.44, 89.3, 101.3, 103.29, 118.37, 131.10, 142.7]
29.10 numquid : Is þes wén þet E, ah AB, hune uel cwyst ðu C, cwyst ðu D, cwyst ðu HK, cwyst ðu la F, cweþst þu la I, cwyst þu uel ac G, ac cwistu la J
[also 49.13, 76.8, 76.10, 77.19, 77.20, 87.11, 87.12, 87.13]
29.12 conscidisti : þu tocurfe E,64 ðu toslite A, þu toslite BCGHI, þu toslite J, ðu slite D, þu slite FK
[single occurrence]
30.2 iustitia : sopfestnesse E, rehtwisnisse A, rihtwisnyse CFI, ryhtwisnesse BD, rihtwisnesse GJK, unrihtwisnesse H

60 The gloss to commouebit dominus desertum originally read dríhten onwendep wesæt. The corrector added astyreð before dríhten, thus displacing the gloss. E often records its gloss in SV word order.
61 þiccettu uel added by corrector.
62 Glosses to the Gallican variant eduxisti are omitted here.
63 ðægred added by corrector.
64 Stlite uel added by corrector after to (= toslite uel curfe)
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[also 7.9, 10.4, 10.6, 16.5, 21.32, 30.19, 33.16, 33.18, 33.20, etc.] 65

[also 17.3, 45.2, 58.17, 70.3, 89.1, 90.2, 90.9, 103.18, 143.2]

30.6 commendo 66: ic bibiodu A, ic bebeode BCDFGH, ic beode J, ic eteaste uel ic bebeod þe E, 67 ic befaeste uel betaæce [ ] bebeode I, ic betaæce K
{single occurrence}

30.7 superuacue: ofer þæ emettgæn E, 68 idellice AB, ofyr idyllice C, ofer idelllice J, ofer unnytlice DGH, ofer unnyt FK, on idel uel unnyticu I
{single occurrence}

30.10 tribulor: ic iem geeaerfopod E, ic biom geswenced A, ic beom
geswencyd C, ic geswenced [ ] G, ic swenced beo H, ic eom geswenced B, swencende K, ic senged beom D, ic gedrefed beo F, ic
eom gedrefod I, ic eom gesprenced J
[also 9.10, 9.22, 12.5, 17.7, 22.5, 24.17, etc.] 69

{single occurrence}

31.4 spina : hrygcban E 71 I, ðorn A, þorn C, hrycg BDFG, hryrcg H, hricg M, ricg J, hrig K

31.5 iniustitias(1)72: unsodfestnesse E, unrehtwisnisse A, unrihtwisynsse CI, unryhtwisnessa BD, unrihtwisnesse J, on unrihtwisnesse G, unri(h)] [ss]e H, rihtwisysse F, rihtwisnes K
{also 31.5 iniustitias(2)}

65 For full list of occurrences, see Berghaus, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse, p. 59. At pp. 58–9, Berghaus also records the following independent glosses and their occurrences: begun, ciegan, earfohnes, (ge)earfoolian, emlicnes, firenful, forswinian, (ge)freolsian, freolsend, (ge)wenan, betenið, niþete, is ðæs wæn (glossing for sit an), ne cearo, stream, ymbgang.

66 Glosses to the Gallican variant coomendabo are included here.

67 e (3°) added in darker ink, þe added by corrector.

68 uel unnytlice added by corrector. On the gloss, see Meritt, Fact and Lore, p. 192.

69 For occurrences, see Berghaus, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse, p. 58.

70 uel on angniisse added by corrector.

71 Written by corrector.

72 Gallican variant: iniustitiam.
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31.10 flagella: swípo uel swingella E, drea A, ðrea A, þreaunga C, þrean J, swingella uel þrean G, swingella DH, swingla F, swingla I; [listed also in iii above]
[see also 34.15 flagella: swípen uel swynsla E]
31.10 peccatorum: þæra firenfulræ uel synfulra E, synfulra ABCD, synfulra G, synfulles FH, þæs synfullan I, synfullan J, synfulla K
[also 1.5, 3.8, 7.10, 9.18, 9.36, 10.3, 10.7, etc.]74
32.2 psalterio: psalterum E, hearpan ABD, sealmsange C, saltere FIJK, salte[ ] G
[also 48.5 143.9, 149.3, 150.3 (salter, sæltere, pæltere, spæltere E); note D 48.5, 91.3, 107.2 saltere; C 48.2 saltyre, etc. vs. A, consistently uses hearpan]
32.4 fide: lofæ E, gelelan ABCDFGHJK
32.10 populorum: þæra biðdæ E,76 folca ABCDGHJK [although folc is preferred in CD, hæad does not appear; in A it consistently glosses gens]
32.15 singillatim: Sienderlice E, synderlice I, wrixendlice AB, wrixiyndllice C, wrixendlice J, todæledlice DFHK, todælendlice G
[single occurrence]
32.16 gigans: se eten E, entas K, gigent A, gigant BCDGH, ent F, ént J, se ormæta I
[also 18.6]
32.20 sustinet: abideð ABG, abidyð C, abyðeþ J, anbindaþ I, forbyrdigað DFH, forbyrdigað uel geðolað E,78 bewarað K [also listed in ii above]
33.2 omni: egwilc E, alle A, ealle BCJ, eallre F, ælcre DH, ælcre G, eallan K
33.7 liberauit: gefriolsæþ E,80 gefriode A, he gefreode C, aliesde B, he alsyde D

73 Gallican variant: peccatoris.
74 For occurrences, see Berghaus, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse, p. 58.
75 In hand of corrector. 76 uel folca added by corrector.
77 uel menigo added by corrector. 78 Gloss written by corrector.
79 Glosses to the Gallican variant saluauit are omitted here.
80 The gloss now reads alyse þiene he alyse uel gefriolscep all but þiene uel gefriolscep is added by the corrector. For occurrences, see Berghaus, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse, p. 58.
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33.8 circuitu : gænge E, ymbhwyrfte ABCDFGIJ, ymbhwyrfte H, embhwyrfte K
33.22 delinquent : he forlet E, agyltað ABC, 7 agyltað I, he agyltað D, hy agyltað G, hí agyldeþ F, he agyteð H, agytþ J, hi agylt K
34.3 conclude : betiene E, biluc A, beluc BCDFHJKM, belucc G, beluc uel beclys I
34.4 reuereantur : cirrede E, onscunien A, onscunigen B, onscamiyn C, onscuman uel ondrædan J, wandien DHKM, wandian G, aðracian uel 7 syn geunarode F, aðracian I
34.4 auertantur : Sien gewirfede E, sien forcerred A, syn forcyrryd C, sien forcirde B, sin gecyrrede D, syn gecyrrede FGM, syn gecyrrede H, sy gecirred J, sin gecyrred K, syn gehwyrfed uel gecyrran I
34.4 retrorsum : on bæcling E, on bæc A, on bæc BCK, on bæcc J, underbecling D, underbæklincg G, underbæcling H, underbæclinc M, underbæc FI
34.13 molesti : unyðgiende E, hefie AC, hefige BFGHJKM, hefige D, wiðertyme uel hefigtyme I
34.13 sinu : bosm E, bosme FIK, seate A, sceate B, bearme CJ, bearm DH, bearm G
34.17 respices : forelocaest ðu E, gelocas ðu AB, gelocast ðu C, ðu gelocast D, ðu gelocast HK, ðu locast G, locast ðu J, behealts ðu F, ðu beseohst I
34.17 unicam : aennesse E, ða angan AB, ða angan CJ, anlican DGHK, ðenlican F, anlican uel annysse I

(iv) Additional notes on glosses
24.1 leuaui : ic upahof AE, ic ahof D, ic uppahebbe C. In E ahof is written by a corrector on an erasure. It is possible that that gloss originally agreed with C.
24.2 non erubescam : ne scomiu ic A, þæt ic ne sceamige C, ic na scamie D, ic ne scæmige E. The preceding gloss confido : ic getrowe is written by a corrector on erasure. E may have originally agreed with C on the

---

81 ymbhwyrfte uel added by corrector.
82 luc uel be added by corrector.
83 uel wandien added by corrector.
84 uel sin gecyrrede added by corrector.
85 Glosses to the Gallician variant sinum are included here.
86 In the hand of a corrector.
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gloss to *non erubescam*, with *pet* erased when the gloss to *confido* was entered.

24.8 *statuit*: *gesette A, he gesette C, he sette DE*. *E* originally read *he gesettes*.

29.12 *planctum*: *wop AC, heof DE*. The gloss in *E* has been altered, with *o* retraced in darker ink and partly on an erasure.

The ratio of A-type to D-type to independent glosses in this sample is roughly 2:1:4. The ratio does not suggest that *E* is an independent gloss with A-type additions, for the base gloss is common to both A- and D-type psalters, and built onto that are the A-type correspondences. Given that, according to Berghaus’ count, there are 2,343 independent glosses in the psalter, of which he lists but a small number as examples, one might question the suggestion that the independent glosses were added to fill lacunae in the A(C)-type exemplar. As O’Neill remarks, ‘the even spread of this stratum over the whole gloss (excepting the heavily corrected Part I) . . . suggests systematic revision rather than an *ad hoc* mending of a defective exemplar’. That ‘even spread’ can be seen in the small sample collation above. Berghaus dates to around the year 900 this early stratum of glossing (‘Y’ in his stemma, p. 135), which was subsequently entered into the source for *Ea*, namely *CEa* (following Berghaus’s hypothesis that *E* stands closest to an A(C)-type gloss). This early stratum of glosses thus takes on singular importance: it embeds within it a gloss not much younger than that found in the *Vespasian Psalter* and, in separating the gloss from later accretions, it is possible to obtain some sense of this early gloss tradition, of which the twelfth-century *Eadwine Psalter* stands as the only surviving witness (though certainly corrupted in numerous places).

We may never come to understand why the gloss was heavily altered. Perhaps it is that the correctors, like Meritt and others in this century, indeed recognised the gloss originally entered as ‘a remarkable linguistic gallimaufry’ and sought, as best as could be managed under the circumstances (whatever they might be), to correct the gloss using a more up-to-date (although by the twelfth century nevertheless antiquated) version of the psalms, namely a D-type gloss. The gloss in *E* as it has come down to us thus incorporates a number of major revisions, and,
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given its linguistic and lexical changes, thus becomes a complex mirror into the past history of its making. Unlike other psalters, Eadwine, in a sense, wears its glossographical history on its sleeve — and it is a history that spans centuries. In no other psalter can we obtain such a view (though still murky, to be sure) of how an interlinear gloss takes its shape over time through adaptation, accretion, revision, and modernisation. The importance of the psalter, then, lies not in its gloss per se (for it would neither have had much, if any, function in the twelfth century and, to recall Sisam’s words, is ‘useless for the analysis of other glosses’) but in what the gloss reveals about the long history of its own construction.

ALTERATIONS TO THE GLOSS

The extensive alterations to Pss. 1—77 typically take the form of additions to the original gloss, alteration of an existing gloss, or erasure and substitution. Ps. 36.34 and 37 provide examples typical of the changes seen throughout the psalter. Double underlining indicates additions and alterations by the corrector:

[34] GeOnbide drihten, gehæeld his wegaes, he upahefed, be þæt ðu oneaerdige eordan bonne forweorbad synfulle þu gesihst

[37] Geheaeld sodfaestnesse, gesioh efennisse forðæn Sient forletnesse ðel laue mon geSibsummum

With the exception of GeOnbide < *Onbide (abid ABC, geanbida D), drihten < driht, upahefed < uphefe (hefeð up A, he upahefd CD), þu oneaerdige < *þu æærdf] (ǒu inneardie A, þu inneardige C, ðu oneardige D), and geSibsummum < *[ ] Sibsum[ ] (erasure before word; ðæm sibsuman AB, gesybsumum D)] the original gloss cannot be reconstructed. The alterations, however, bring the gloss in line with that in D (although forletnesse E is independent against ABCD here). The question is whether the D-type glosses were supplied directly from the Regius Psalter.

Psalm 30 has been selected here as providing an example of the D-type additions and alterations in the Eadwine Psalter (parentheses mark text in the original hand):

v. 2 sparauí : (ic gewene) ðel hyhte E, ic hyhte D, ic gehyhte AB, ic gehihte C (gefriolsæ) ðel alys E, alys D, alyes B, gefrea A, gefreo C me: me E (1°) [on eras.], me ABCD
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eripe : nere E [on eras.], nere D, genere AB, genery C
v. 3 accelera : (7 þu hredlice) ul efest E, efst D, efest K, hreda AC, hreda B
eripias : nere E, þu nere D [g eras. after ða], þu generege A, þu generige B, þu generige C
me : me E (1°) [on eras.], CD, mec A
refugii : rotnisse DE, geberges A, georges B, geberhynys C
v. 5 de : of ABCDE
laqueo : gryne CDE, gerene A, gyn B
protector : gescyldend DE, gescildend A, gesclynd C
meus : min ABCDE
v. 6 commendendo : (ic etfeste) ul ic bebeode þe E, ic bebeode BCD, ic bibiodu A
v. 7 odisti : (þu fiodes) ul hatudest E, þu hatudest D, þu fiodes A, þu feodes B, þu feodyst C
obseruantes : (þæ) bewarendynde E, bewarendynde D, halnde A, halnde B, halldyn C
superuacae : (ofer þæ emettgæn) ul unnytl E, ofer unnytl D, ofyr idyllice C, idelllice A
sperabo : hyhte DE, ic gehyhtu A, ic gehyht B, ic gehihte C
v. 8 exultabor : (ic winsumie) ul fægnie E, ic fægnie D, ic gefie A, ic gefeo BC
respexisti : (þu gelocedes) ul sawe E, þu gesawe D, gelocates A, þu gelocodyst C
meam : mine ABCDE
necessitatibus : (minum niedþærftnessvm) ul nedum E, nedum D, nedþærftnessum A, nedþærftnessum B, nydþærftnysum C
v. 9 (nec) conclusisti : þu na beluce DE, biluce A, beluce þu B, beluce þu C
me : ABCDE
in : on BCDE, in A
spatioso : rumre ul widgilre E, rumre ul widgilre D, rumre ABC
v. 11 defecit : teorode DE, asprong ABC
paupertate : (þærft)licnisse E, ðearftlicnisse D, ðearfndisse A, ðearfndesse B, ðearfndynysse C
uirtus : maegen BDE, megen A, mægyn C
mea : mine BCDE, min A
sunt : synt DE, sind A, sint B, synd C
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v. 12 factus sum: geworden ic eom BDE, geworden ic eam A, gewordyn ic eom C
opbrobrium: hosp DE, edwit ABC
uicinis: neahgeburum DE, nehgeburum BC, nehgesum A
meis: minum ABCDE
et: 7 ABCDE
timor: ege ABCDE
meis: minum ABCDE
uidebant: gesiowon E, gesawon BCD, gesegun A
fugiebant: (hie fl)ugon E, hie flugon D, flugun A, flugon BC
v. 13 excidi: (7 ic) gefeol E, ic gefeol D, ic gesnerc A, ic geswearc B, ic forcearf C
tamquam: (swæ) swæ E, swa swa BCD, swe swe A
mortuus: dead ABCDE
a: fram DE, from ABC
v. 14 dum: ða E, þa D, ðonne A, þonne BC
congregarentar: hy (gesomnod)on E, hy gæderedon æl somnodon D, bioð gesamnade A, beoð gesomnode B, beoð gesomnude C
aduersum: ongean DE, wið ABC
acciperent: (hie) onfeangen E, by anfengen D, hie onfoon A, hie onfon B, hi onfon C
v. 19 labia: weleras BDE, welyras C, weolere A
dolosa: facenfulle DE, faecne A, faecne BC
quae: þæ DE, ða AB, þa C
aduersus: ongean DE, wið ABC
iustum: ryhtwise DE, ðæm rehtwisan A, þam rihtwisan C, þone ryhtwisan B
iniquitatem: (unriht)wisnesse E, unryhtwisnesse BD, unrihtwisnesse C, unrehtwisan A
in: on BCDE, in A
superbia: ofermodnisse DE, oferhygde AB, ofyrhigde C
contemptu: forseevnisse DE, forhogadnisse A, forhogadnysse C, forhogunge B
v. 21 abditu: dygel(nesse) E, dygelnisse D, degulnisse A, deagolnesse B, degylnysse C
tabernaculo: (eardung)stowe E, eardungstowe D, getelde ABC
v. 22 mirificauit: (wul)drede E, wuldrede D, gemiclade A, gemiclode B, he gemiclode C
But there are a number of places where corrections were made that do not bring the gloss squarely in line with Regius, and these are fairly numerous throughout the ‘corrected’ part of the psalter:

v. 23 in : on ABCDE
dum : [pone CDE, mid ðy A, mid ðy B
v. 24 his : (b)am CDE, ðeossu A, ðissum B
superbiam : (ofer)modinesse E, ofermodnisse D, oferhygd AB, ofyrhygd C

v. 25 speratis : (geweneþ) hyhten E, hyhten D, gehyhtæd AB, gehihtæd C

But there are a number of places where corrections were made that do not bring the gloss squarely in line with Regius, and these are fairly numerous throughout the ‘corrected’ part of the psalter:

v. 2 confundar : sie gescynd [< sie gescynde] E, ic gescend beo D, biom ic gescended A, biom ic gescyndyd C, beo ic gescended B
et : 7 E [on eras.], ABC, ð D
me : me E (2°) [on eras.], ABC, ð D
inclina : Onhyld [< Onhyldel E, onhaeld A, onheld B, onhyld C, ahyld D
me : me E (2°) [on eras.], ABC, ð D
deu : gode E [on eras.], god ABC, ð D

v. 5 es : eart BC, art E, earð A, ð D
v. 10 meus : min ABCE, ð D
v. 12 nimium : to swide E, swide AB, swiðust C, swið D
v. 13 perditum : (bet) forlore E, forloren ABCD
v. 20 sperantibus : (gewenende) uel hyhte E, þam hyhtendum D,

gehyhtendum A, gehytendum B, gehihtendum C

Typically, the alterations were made to bring the gloss in line with D, although the arrangement of the gloss above the lemmata was not of particular concern for the corrector. For example, although at v. 12 uidehant me, the arrangement in all psalters follows the lemmata, in E the verb is placed above me, thus me gesiowon, the verb being written by the corrector. Word choice, not syntax, governed the corrections. In certain instances, glosses were altered so that their tense is brought in line with the gloss in D and the Latin lemmata; at Ps. 33.7 clamauit : clipcede (D clamauit : clopcode) originally read clipceS, and exaudiuit : gehyrde originally read gebireþ: both words were altered by the corrector. The cases are similar to Ps. 33.5 eripuit : generede (D he nerede), where the gloss originally read genered, although here the gloss seems to have been altered in light of
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the lemma and not the gloss in D. At Ps. 34.1, the erased gloss to *nocentes* reads *s:yp l* suggesting that it originally agreed with A *ða scedîndan*, but it has been erased and replaced by *deriende*, thus agreeing with D. In a substantial number of cases, however, the original independent glosses in E were not altered or erased. At Ps. 30.21, for example, *contradictione* is glossed *pae unscylēd* in E (distinct from ABC), but *widereæe* in D; at v. 23 *deprecationis* is glossed *bene* in E (agreeing with ABC), but *balsunge* in D; and at v. 24 *retribuet* is glossed *edleaæed* in E (agreeing with ABC), but *be agylt* in D. Generally, throughout the first part of the psalms, the corrector was meticulous, altering individual letters, parts of words, whole glosses, and even the gloss to entire verses. In many cases, where a gloss comes close to that in D, but does not mirror it precisely, the corrector lets the gloss stand (as at Ps. 24.21 *innocentes : pæ unscylēd* E, where *die* is in the hand of the corrector, vs. *unscyldige* D); examples are numerous. In other instances, the corrector partly alters a gloss, but does not necessarily bring it in line with D; such is the case, for example, at Ps. 21.32 *nascetur : geboren bið* E, where the *n* and *bið* are in the hand of the corrector, but where D reads *accened bid* (similarly in ABC); Ps. 21.24, *qui : ge pe* E, where both words are written by the corrector on an erasure, but where D reads *ge pa* (vs. *ða de* A, *pa pe* BC); Ps. 25.11 *ingressus : iċ ingode* E, where D reads *iċ ineode*. In other instances, a gloss in the hand of a corrector is not drawn from either an A-type or D-type psalter, at Ps. 24.20 *inuocaui : iċ geceopode* E, *iċ gecege* D, *iċ gecege* A. There are also instances in which the work of two correctors can be seen side-by-side. At Ps. 33.23, for example, the gloss to *suorum et non derelinquet omnes* is entered on erasure by one corrector (whose work is mostly clearly evident on fol. 73), while that to *qui sperant in eum* is glossed by a second corrector (whose easily identifiable 'scratchy' hand begins at Ps. 32.18).

The alterations, then, are both carefully executed and selectively made, and, as such, provide some insight (with closer study) into the process of revision, a process, it must be borne in mind, that was undertaken by a number of correctors working in association. In itself, this suggests some sort of programme and an understanding of the text and task that lay before each scribe, and especially so when we consider that specific lexical items in many cases remain unaltered throughout the psalter, even though they are independent: despite the fact that D typically writes *geswencedness* as a gloss on *tribulatio* in virtually all instances, E retains *earfodnes*. That the *Regius Psalter* was the source of the alterations seems certain, for solid
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evidence has been brought forth in support of this claim. A well-known note added in an eleventh-century hand on fol. 198v, written by a Christ Church monk who, upon journeying to western England and being asked if he wished to stay there, remarked that he wished to stay at 'Christes cyrcen þonne þar be westan', clearly localises the psalter.\(^89\) And more recently, O’Neill has identified other notes entered on to the same leaf as fragments of Canterbury (and specifically Christ Church) charters.\(^90\)

It will perhaps never be possible to discover why the gloss from the \textit{Regius Psalter} was not entered into the \textit{Eadwine Psalter} from the start, and any number of explanations can be feasibly sustained. As the psalter reflects a stratum of glosses earlier than those of the \textit{Regius Psalter}, the explanation may be that the \textit{Regius} gloss was overlooked at first precisely for these reasons; in a \textit{de lux}e production such as \textit{Eadwine}, perhaps the initial choice was dictated by age: the older the \textit{Romanum} source-gloss, the more befitting this sumptuous codex. And as to why the \textit{Regius} gloss was selected over the \textit{Vespasian Psalter’s} it may be simply that St Augustine’s held the latter while the former was in the possession of Christ Church. But no matter what explanation is advanced, it must always be counted as conditional and hypothetical. Nevertheless, given the selective and carefully made alterations, given that the scribes allowed many features of the original gloss to stand, and given that there is a consistency in the alterations throughout the first part of the psalter, it is perhaps best to view this latest stratum of changes not as the work of ‘correctors’ (for the original gloss is by no means as foul a production as glossographers have come to believe), but as the work of ‘editors’ updating the psalter before them using a gloss more contemporary (though still old) and more pervasive within the gloss tradition than that originally entered into the psalter.

\textbf{REPOSITIONING THE EADWINE PSALTER}

Perhaps it is the case that Anglo-Saxonists have approached the gloss to the \textit{Eadwine Psalter} from the wrong direction, seaching within it for tell-tale signs that the language was no longer understood with real precision,

Old English gloss of the Eadwine Psalter

or seeing the gloss to the Romanum as an ornamental addition, something to flesh out the columns of this splendid tripartite production, or trying to set the gloss within some sort of relationship (ambiguous at best) with earlier psalter glosses, or viewing the gloss as subordinate to the Anglo-Norman gloss that accompanies the Hebraicum — approaching the psalter, in effect, from the perspective offered by earlier texts and traditions and not viewing it within its more immediate twelfth-century context.

O'Neill points us in the right direction by recalling to our attention the more immediate context of the gloss within the Christ Church community. He cites the copy of the West Saxon Gospels in London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv, produced in the latter part of the twelfth century, and which stood as the exemplar for Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38, of Canterbury origin c. 1200, the Annals of Christ Church in London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. xv, fols. 133–9,\(^\text{91}\) and the translation of Old English charters into Latin during the twelfth century as evidenced by London, Lambeth Palace, 212. The Gospels in particular remind us that interest in Old English at Christ Church was not an anomaly, that the Eadwine Psalter does have a context and continues a long tradition of writing Old English. There is as well a broader context that requires some account, and which provides the impetus for the present collection of articles. Ker identifies over twenty manuscripts that are wholly of, or contain items from, the twelfth century.\(^\text{92}\) The list is both diverse and impressive:\(^\text{93}\) the manuscripts, as a corpus, exhibit not only the process of transmission of earlier texts, but attest to new compositions (most obviously in the Chronicle texts) and new readers. A number of the homilies contained in the twelfth-century manuscript London, British Library, Faustina A. ix, for example, show contemporary alterations by another hand along with scattered Latin interlinear glosses throughout fols. 119v–130v and 162v–164v. The most complete study of Old English texts that show evidence of use after 1200 is that by

\(^{91}\) In Old English until 1109, thereafter in Latin, except for the entry noting the consecration of Christ Church in 1130. See Ker, Catalogue, no. 139, art. r, p. 175.


\(^{93}\) I omit those items dated by Ker to xii/xii. See Ker, Catalogue, pp. xviii–xix, for the complete list. See also the Introduction to this volume.
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Angus F. Cameron, in which he documents a long history of readers through the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{94} He writes:

If the ability to read OE were strong and widespread during the later Middle Ages, then we would not expect to find any interlinear glosses or translations for OE texts. However, surely their presence, along with the quality of the glossing and translation, shows that those who were interested could and did read OE.\textsuperscript{95}

As Franzen rightly points out, 'we do not know what was involved in being interested, and we clearly cannot assume that anyone, anywhere in England, at any time in the Middle English period, could read any type of Old English text without difficulty and without help'.\textsuperscript{96} But when we are speaking about the twelfth century, 'those who were interested' among the book-learned caste were certainly more prepared and readily able than others to understand Old English, for it is not simply a matter of adding glosses, but of transcribing and translating (and also composing) sometimes lengthy texts.

There is also another broad context that can be noted. The \textit{Eadwine Psalter} presents a pairing unique among psalters of a continuous Old English and Anglo-Norman interlinear gloss (the only other example, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 8846, contains a small number of Old English words).\textsuperscript{97} But the pairing of Anglo-Norman/French and Old English occurs in a number of manuscripts. For example, London, British Library, Royal 7. D. ii, a twelfth-century copy of Cassidorus' \textit{De Anima} and other pieces, has added to it on fols. 18v–19v a glossary (A–C) in long lines, primarily in Latin and French, but also recording some fourteen Old English words, not as additions but as integral elements in the composition. At the end of a twelfth-century copy of Cassian's \textit{Collationes} in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730 is added a number of glossaries, the first of which contains Latin, Anglo-Norman, and Old English entries, the latter related to glosses in London, British Library,


\textsuperscript{96} Franzen, \textit{The Tremulous Hand of Worcester}, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{97} The \textit{Eadwine Psalter}'s Anglo-Norman gloss ends after Ps. 97. As Dominique Markey notes, these two manuscripts are the only ones to include an Anglo-Norman version of the Hebraicum (\textit{The Eadwine Psalter}, p. 142).
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Cotton Cleopatra A. iii. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 641 (also twelfth-century) contains on fols. 13v–18r two trilingual proverbs among a collection primarily in French and Latin. And London, British Library, Titus D. xxiv (ca. 1160 x 1180), containing, in the main, a collection of Latin verses, has added to it on fol. 156rv a number of formulas for the visitation of the sick in French, Latin, and Old English versions, each in a different coloured ink. None of these texts, of course, in any degree approaches the extensive glossing in the Eadwine Psalter. The point, rather, is to suggest that linking Old English and Anglo-Norman in the psalter has a broader context and that, while the psalter remains unique and examples elsewhere few and essentially minor, it was not outside the cultural mindset to present such a combination.

CONCLUSION

The Eadwine Psalter has been called 'the last flowering of monastic learning'. It is a manuscript that 'salutes the distant past', as Margaret Gibson recently wrote, 'combining as it does the format of the cycle of illumination characteristic of the Gospels of St. Augustine with the drawings in the Classicizing manner long familiar in [the] Utrecht Psalter'. It is also a manuscript that, from yet another perspective, stood on the cutting-edge as an innovative — perhaps even daring — contemporary production, combining and reshaping traditional elements alongside the new in a tour de force of layout, design, and content that, in many respects, must be judged to be the pinnacle of psalter production in Anglo-Saxon England. The Old English gloss likewise participates in this union of backward glance and more up-to-date regard in its combination of old and newer features, of various strata of glossing reaching back centuries alongside certain elements that show modernisation of the gloss (most clearly seen in Psalm 1) into early Middle English. The importance of the gloss resides in the exposition of its textual development, one that reveals, albeit with limitations, the process of its own construction, both textual and scribal, leaving us a glimpse as well of a lost independent

98 In a number of these examples, it may be more appropriate to use the term 'early Middle English' although it is often the case that no clear distinction obtains between late Old, and early Middle, English.
100 The Eadwine Psalter, p. 212.
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gloss. Important too is the recognition that the *Eadwine Psalter* fits securely within the broader context of copying, modernising, and composing Old English texts in the twelfth century. The mid-twelfth-century homilies in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, for example, may not, by comparison with the lavish tripartite psalter, impress visually but they nevertheless attest to interest in and comprehension of Old English texts, not as dead documents of the past, but as works that continued to have worth in the cathedral and monastic centres of post-Conquest England. We may never discover how well the *Eadwine* scribes understood the gloss, but I am inclined to believe, despite the 'oddest vagaries in OE glossing' that can be found there, that, especially in view of the work of the 'corrector', the glossators did know what they were about and would have registered their inabilities in more ways than are now in evidence had they not, even with faults, had more than passing comprehension of their source material; otherwise, we must assume that so much time, energy, and ink were consumed simply for a visual effect that meant nothing textually. But how fitting to gloss a dated Romanum text, one that has elsewhere been supplanted by the Gallicanum, with an equally dated gloss. While the *Eadwine Psalter*, like many other psalters, had its share of faults and problems, it is not a work so wholly 'bungled' as we might believe. There is method here, particularly in the meticulous care taken to alter the original gloss, and when the gloss is set side-by-side with the other surviving glossed psalters, it is its richness and debt to the gloss tradition that surface foremost, not its failings as a dead letter in the twelfth century.
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