Jane Roberts
Insititute of English Studies
University of London

On the disappearance of Old English

In the inaugural lecture of a series that will in part commemorate the achievements of John Mitchell Kemble it is appropriate to begin with a very few words about his life.[1] An antiquary by inclination, Kemble was from a theatre family. Despite a good singing voice, he went up to Trinity College Cambridge in 1825, where he imperilled his degree, neglecting maths, messing about with 'modern' language studies, and involving himself in radical politics. His future interests were shaped by reading Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, and in the dawn of the new grammarians he apprenticed himself to the scholarly training then to be found in Germany. In England, however, his tactless and intemperate criticism of established scholars ruined any hopes of academic appointments in Cambridge. As a result, he is best described as an independent scholar of determination and energy but not means. His scholarly output was huge and varied, and he is most honoured to-day for his six volumes of Anglo-Saxon charters.[2] This monumental collection remains a major tool that only now is being superseded by the Kemble project in Cambridge.[3] He came to Dublin to report on thoughts prompted by recent archaeological work, reading his last paper, 'On the utility of antiquarian collections', to the Royal Irish Academy in 1857;[4] and he is buried at Mount Jerome.

---

[1] For a brief life of Kemble see J. D. Haigh, 'Kemble, John Mitchell (1807–1857)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford, 2004) [http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/15321].

[2] J. M. Kemble, *Codex diplomaticus aevi saxonici opera*, 6 vols (London, 1839–48), containing over 1400 documents.

[3] http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/chartwww/

[4] *Horæ ferales*: *or studies in the archaeology of the northern nations*, ed. by R.G. Latham and A.W. Franks (London, 1863), reprinted pp. 71ff. from 'a scarce pamphlet' (p. viii).

In the first part of this paper I shall make some generalizations about how and when Old English disappeared, and in the second part I shall look closely at one brief sample in which Old English slithers away, placing it in a wider context of twelfth and early thirteenth-century manuscripts. But, before I get under way, I should like to echo one of Kemble's introductory sentences from his 1857 paper: 'I may justly say that I never rose under feelings of greater embarrassment than at present, to address any academical body.'[5] It gives me great pleasure to return to Trinity to read the first paper in this new series of lectures in honour of Kemble,[6] and I should at the outset like to recall my gratitude to those who taught me here and in particular to Professor Liddell who, with kindly patience, took me through huge swathes of Anglo-Saxon language and literature.

I Old English and its disappearance

The first thing to say is how odd it is that English appeared written down as early as it did, whether on membrane or other surfaces, for the most part in Insular minuscule, the everyday script then of both these islands. Although relatively few examples of Old English remain from before the last decades of the ninth century, their variety is striking. The earliest extant piece of English poetry, made orally by a herdsman, Cædmon, at Whitby late in the seventh century, was written down a generation or so after its composition, almost accidentally. Bede chose only to summarize its content in Latin together with the story of its making, but scribes felt the need to preserve the poem itself. It is to be found in the two earliest Bede manuscripts: written into spare space at the back of the Moore manuscript; and added into the St Petersburg manuscript as an afterthought in the bottom margin of the page where Bede tells Cædmon's story.[7] Cædmon's Hymn is of a piece therefore with the few early stray sentences and verses in English that found there way into the manuscripts extant from the early period. By contrast, there is nothing accidental about the survival of Bede's Death Song, quoted in English in the letter about Bede's death that was read widely throughout Europe. And some striking inscriptions have survived, for example on a little

---

[5] Ibid., p. 71.

[6] When I gave this paper, I drew lavishly on overhead projections, for the most part from my *A Guide to Scripts used in English Writings up to 1500* (London, 2005), which had not then been published, and I shall refer to plates in this book where appropriate.

[7] Respectively, St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, lat. Q. v. I. 18, 107v, and Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16, 128v.

box of whalebone we call the Franks Casket, or on the high crosses at Ruthwell and Bewcastle. Across English-speaking Britain there were monasteries where learned men and women prayed and taught, where the language of the scriptures, Latin, was the language of learning. English as a language of record was clearly in use early in Kent where, of the ninth-century charters extant, a sizeable number of those in the vernacular are concerned with property to be inherited by women, vernacular documents very likely made to be read by them as protection of their interests.[8] Two early Kentish law-codes, seemingly witnesses to Bede's statement that laws were written in English for the early Kentish kings, survive, but in an early-twelfth-century form, in the *Textus Roffensis*, a collection of laws and cartulary still in the ownership of Rochester Cathedral. All in all, little English remains from before the late ninth century.

Before the Vikings came to trouble these islands of saints and scholars, great psalters and gospel books lay safely on cathedral and abbey altars, among them, somewhere in Kent, a manuscript splendidly enriched, now Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, A. 135. In format it is almost square, echoing the proportions of late antique books. The book opens with a series of pages stained purple or otherwise heavily decorated. The first white leaf has on it the book's most elaborate initial, a Chi-Rho monogram, with 'AUTEM' following, intricately embellished, and the rest of the page is made up of decorated display capitals.[9] This may be the first white page, but it contains more gold leaf than is to be found anywhere else in the book. Here there was sufficient space to enter some notices, in English, in script very similar to hands found in mid-ninth century Canterbury charters. The top inscription tells how an ealdorman named Alfred and his wife Werburg bought the manuscript from Vikings in the 850s or 860s, paying with pure gold ('mid clæne golde'). The names of Alfred, his wife and their daughter are displayed to the right of the original text, and at the bottom of the page all three give the book to Christ Church, Canterbury in an inscription which ends with the injunction: 'I, Lord Alfred, and Werburg ask and implore in the name of almighty God and all his saints that no-one be so bold as to give

---

[8] See Nicholas Brooks, 'Latin and Old English in Ninth-Century Canterbury', *Spoken and Written Language: Relations between Latin and the Vernaculars in the Earlier Middle Ages. Papers from the Second Utrecht Symposium on Medieval Literacy, organized by the Pionier Project Verschriftelijking, Utrecht, 24-26 June 1999*, ed. M. Garrison, A. Orbán and M. Mostert, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 4 (Turnhout, forthcoming).

[9] Roberts, *Guide*, plate 3.

or alienate these holy books from Christ Church as long as Christianity may last'.[10] How the book came to leave Canterbury we do not know, whether some time after the late 1530s, when England's monasteries were dissolved or perhaps as late as the early seventeenth century, when mangled extracts from the English inscriptions were written into a small writing book that belonged to the Howard family.[11] By 1690 it was in Madrid, where it was bought for the Swedish royal collections. This manuscript, the Stockholm Codex Aureus, will serve me as a sobering witness to three very obvious reasons for the disappearance of Old English. First, Old English was, as far as we can tell, a main-text language in books for a short time only (and, it is to be noted, after the period in which these inscriptions were written into the Codex Aureus). Second, the inevitability of linguistic change. And third, manuscripts can be lost for a variety of historical reasons, whether lost, plundered, or destroyed, or damaged, say cropped for rebinding, or their membranes recycled. The last of these three topics I put firmly aside: much has been written on the lost literature of medieval England,[12] and on the rates of manuscript loss,[13] but what is lost is not our concern. The other two I find it hard to keep apart, as you will discover.

We forget, when we talk about Old English, that our ideas of it are based for the most part on two centuries of literature, in manuscripts from the last quarter of the ninth century (the writings associated with King Alfred) to the last quarter of the eleventh century (a time when it seems the numbers of copies made of these older writings fell off rapidly). Although there remain some charters but few manuscripts containing English writings of any length from before Alfred's time, what is extraordinary about Alfred's reign is the attention given to

---

[10] 'Ic aelfred .dux. ɔ werburg biddað ɔ halsiað ón godes almaehtiges noman ɔ on allre | his haligra ðæt nænig món seo to ðon gedyrstig ðætte ðas halgan beoc áselle oððe áðeode from cristes circan ða hwile | ðe fulwiht [s]t[on]da[n mote]'

[11] London, British Library, Arundel 504, a small rectangular book, wider than it is long, described in the British Library catalogue as containing 'Moral sentences from various authors and in various languages, written as specimens of penmanship' and dated to the seventeenth century. There are no clues as to its authorship, and it seems to have attracted little discussion.

[12] R. M. Wilson, *The Lost Literature of Medieval England* (London, 1952), remains the standard introduction to this topic.

[13] See the recent arguments put forward by John L. Cisne, 'How Science Survived: Medieval Manuscripts' "Demography" and Classic Texts' Extinction', *Science* 307 (2005), 1305, together with the response by Georges Declerq and his own reply, *Science* 310 (205), 1618.

translating, apparently to the near exclusion of making new works in Latin. Suddenly there's a flurry of books in English, in significant numbers and for widespread distribution.[14] It's not that more people were literate;[15] rather the illiterate, that is those without Latin and the ability to read Latin, were expected to listen to the new books read aloud. This is the earliest hard evidence for English as a book main-text. The king himself was behind this sudden flurry of renewed scribal effort, in English now rather than, as previously, in Latin, and he wrote an account of how it was to be accomplished, 'gif we ða stilnesse habbað' (if we hold on to the peace). In a letter to his bishops (it's the first letter in English) he explained the need to make available 'certain books, those which are most needful for all men to know' ('sumæ bec, ða ðe niedbeðearfosta sien eallum monnum to wiotonne').[16] At first, apparently, the letter accompanied Alfred's translation of Gregory's Pastoral Care. In the earliest extant copy, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20, it is written on a separate leaf and in a different hand, and was placed before the actual beginning of the translation itself.[17] With Alfred's translation of the *Cura Pastoralis* we are at the beginning of bookmaking in English, its alphabet the letter-forms long customary in these islands, and the Hatton scribe shows some fluidity over how to deal with those English sounds the Latin alphabet did not cater for: þ

'thorn', ð 'eth' and ƿ 'wyn'. These three symbols are, as Kemble puts it, the 'only real Saxon characters', and 'all the rest are Latin'.[18] Very properly, Kemble recognized that from the point of view of these islands

---

[14] Even so, only a small number of manuscripts is extant from ninth-century England. See J. Morrish, 'Dated and Datable Manuscripts copied in England during the ninth century: A Preliminary List', *MS* 50 (1988), 512-38.

[15] C. P. Wormald, 'The Uses of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and Its Neighbours', *TRHS* 5th ser. 27 (1977 for 1976), 95-114.

[16] *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H Sweet, 2 vols, EETS o.s. 45, 50 (1871), I. 6-7. On Alfred's educational reforms see J. M. Bately, *The Literary Prose of King Alfred's Reign: Translation or Transformation?* (London, 1980) [rpt. *OEN* Subsidia 10 (Binghamton, NY, 1984); rpt. with addenda in *Old English Prose: Basic* Readings, ed. P. E. Szarmach with the assistance of D. A. Oosterhouse (New York, 2000), pp. 3-27] and 'Old English prose before and during the reign of Alfred', *ASE* 17 (1988), 93-138.

[17] Roberts, *Guide*, plate 6.

[18] J.M. Kemble, 'Letter to M. Francisque Michel', *Anglo-Saxonica*, ed. P. F. de la Renaudière and F. Michel, 2 vols. (Paris, 1836-37) II: *Bibliothéque anglo-saxonne* (1837), p. 35 n. 1.

such distinctively Insular letter forms as ð ꝼ ᵹ ƞ and ꞃ were normal letter-forms, though that didn't stop him from lambasting the use of Insular letter-forms in the texts then being published by the Society of Antiquaries. They are indeed the letter-forms we all handled every day when we used pre-EU coins, and we still see them in the Irish columns of some local newspapers. Scribes, as they settled in to using Insular minuscule for writing books in English, took some time to settle on þ or ð where we use *th* and ƿ for our *w*. The Hatton 20 scribe, in the last decade of the ninth century, uses *u* alongside the ƿ rune that was to become the normal letter form for *w* in Anglo-Saxon books, but the first scribe of the Parker version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle fluctuates between ƿ and *u* and he tends to use þ predominantly, whereas the Hatton 20 scribe seems more at home with ð. These may seem trivial features (a bit like whether or not we need an apostrophe to-day), but within a generation a settled practice had emerged, to be seen in the second scribe's stint in the Parker Chronicle and in the Tollemache Orosius (probably written by the same man), with both þ and ð in use but ƿ only and not *u*.[19] These are the texts that allow us to glimpse the emergence of a more settled way of writing English, for together they provide the evidence for the early West Saxon dialect,[20] a norm long used in the making of dictionaries and grammars.

King Alfred, when announcing his ambition to make available in English the books most necessary for all men to know, reflected sadly on how, earlier, the English had not needed translations, in the glory days when 'ða ciricean giond eall Angelcynn stodon maðma & boca gefyldæ'.[21] In changed times, after the disruptions of a century of Viking attacks, he set his sights lower: catch the young who had time on their hands, those well enough off to be idle in a time of peace, and shackle them 'to liornunga . . . ða hwile ðe hie to nanre oðerre note ne mægen, oð ðone first ðe hie wel cunnen Englisc gewrit arædan'.[22] It was a simple pragmatic decision. After that it was up to the bishops to get on with having those they wanted to appoint to a higher rank ('to hierran

---

[19] Roberts, *Guide* p. 51 and plate 9 respectively.

[20] C. L. Wrenn, 'Standard Old English', *TPS* (1933), 65-88; reprinted as '"Standard" Old English' in C.L. Wrenn, *Word and Symbol. Studies in English Language* (London, 1967), pp. 57-77.

[21] *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version*, ed. Sweet, I. 4-5 'the churches throughout the whole of England stood filled with treasures and books'.

[22] Ibid., I. 6-7 'to learn as long as they are not fit for any other occupation, until that they are well able to read English writing'.

hade') taught Latin. The king's immediate interest was to capitalize on a new phenomenon: the presence in his England of people able to read 'Englisc gewrit' (or writing in English) although unable to read Latin with any understanding. About his carefully worded letter there hovers a sense that even among men in orders an actual understanding of Latin was poor, but that perhaps they had a sufficient literacy to scramble through and read aloud a short document written in English. He planned to supply further reading matter in English, to continue and build on what was there. Already, among the first few books extant from his age, there were texts new made in English, for how else are we to view the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle? Indeed, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was the main source used by Asser, the king's Welsh bishop, when he wrote in Latin a life of the king.

As is well known, we are unable to date when first the most admired Old English poems were composed. We all have our favourites in each of the four codices:[23] say, *Exodus* in Junius 11, or *The Dream of the Rood* from the Vercelli Book, oh so many from the Exeter Book (*Seafarer*, *Wanderer,* the first Guthlac poem*,* the Judgement Day poem that is called *Christ III* or *Christ C*), and from Vitellius A. xv *Beowulf*. The surviving manuscript copies of these poems were read for perhaps a couple of generations. It is telling that the pages containing these poems attracted few later annotations in the middle ages. In the *Beowulf* manuscript, for example, one of its prose texts, the *Marvels of the East*, puzzled and interested readers into the thirteenth century,[24] but *Beowulf* and *Judith* did not. Some of the Vercelli Book homilies resurface in a mix and match fashion in later compilations, but not the poems.[25] One striking exception to this generalization is found in the evidences for the continued memory of verses and phrases (for example*, ricne cyning*; *bær byfigynd-*; *blode bestemed*) spoken by Christ's Cross across four centuries. These are recorded first in runes on the eighth-century high cross still at Ruthwell in Dumfriesshire, they are embedded in *The Dream of the Rood* in the Vercelli Book, and they are incised around the

---

[23] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11; Vercelli, Bibliotheca Capitolare, CXVII; Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. xv.

[24] Roberts, *Guide* p. 63.

[25] The longevity of the Vercelli Book homilies is fully examined in *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, ed. D. G. Scragg, EETS os 300 (Oxford and New York, 1992).

edges of an early eleventh-century metalwork cross now in Brussels.[26] And there are different echoes of the Vercelli Book *Dream* in an eleventh-century homily for Palm Sunday.[27] Yet, we have no way other than speculation for taking account of a lengthy tradition of oral poetry from which the major collections of the late tenth and early eleventh century draw their strengths. The metrical constraints on which the poems depend seem soon to have fallen out of use for anything other than occasional short pieces, as if the ability to compose poetry in this way had gone. Thus, the impetus responsible for the fine poetry of the four codices seems to have petered out early in the eleventh century.

Major ecclesiastical reforms that got properly under way in the middle of the tenth century had brought changes, and Latin writings such as the *Regularis Concordia* and Ælfric's letter to the monks of Evesham point towards a renewed tradition of learning in southern England, now firmly integrating within the heritage of the Carolingian renaissance. There is, however, strong evidence that the reformed communities and newly founded monasteries used the vernacular as a help to reading and understanding Latin. At Winchester, in the first generation of the reformed Benedictine houses, Æthelwold explained in English the Latin books from which he taught,[28] and his pupil Ælfric was to remember from earlier writings in English phrases and passages that can be identified in his homilies.[29] In contrast with Alfred's aim of fostering knowledge and wisdom, the new translations being made were now more directly focused on teaching and learning, but the translations of King Alfred's age continued to be read and copied even as late as the twelfth century, for example the version of Augustine's *Soliloquies* in

---

[26] These materials are well known, and are fully discussed by É. Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the 'Dream of the Rood' Tradition* (London, 2005). See also F. Orton and I. Wood with C. Lees, *Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments* (Manchester and New York, 2007). For a brief overview see J. Roberts, 'Some Relationships between the *Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross', *Stud. in Med. Eng. Lang. and Lit.* 15 (2000), 1-25.

[27] D. M. Horgan, '*The Dream of the Rood* and a Homily for Palm Sunday', *N&Q* ns 29 (1982), 388-912. I owe this reference to Éamonn Ó Carragáin.

[28] This was noted by Wulfstan Cantor (*Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed M. Lapidge and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1991), p. 46.

[29] D. Whitelock, 'The Old English Bede', *PBA* 48 (1962), 57-90 at 59 and n. 18 [rpt. *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England*. ed E. G. Stanley (Oxford, 1990), pp. 227-60]; M. R. Godden, 'The Sources for Ælfric's Homily on St Gregory', *Anglia* 86 (1968), 79-88.

the middle of the century.[30] The West Saxon norms to be glimpsed in manuscripts from around 900 A.D. formed the prototype for the by far more standardized late West Saxon to be found in the manuscripts of writings by Ælfric and his contemporaries around 1000 A.D.[31] Whereas we recognize in Alfred's day two dominant dialects behind the translations made: West Saxon (not just Alfred's own translations but some other texts such as the Orosius) and Mercian (for example, the translations of Bede's *Historia* and of Gregory's *Dialogues*), a century later writers trained in reformed houses such as Winchester had a much firmer idea of how English should look. Such was the prevalence of the late West Saxon norm that older texts, as they were recopied, gradually lost dialect features in accommodating to the newer norms.[32] As a result, from late in the tenth century up to about the middle of the eleventh century most southern manuscripts in English are surprisingly uniform in grammar and vocabulary. The English language was not to develop so well established a feel of a standard again until the early fifteenth century.

Ælfric, both as grammarian and as writer, was central to the spread of standardization. In particular, his two cycles of 'catholic' homilies, which were sent out from Cerne Abbas, commanded a readership far wider than his own community. Homilies by Ælfric were copied late in the twelfth century, though by then with diminished attention to the accustomed spellings and grammatical endings and sometimes showing or marked up for vocabulary substitutions.[33] Figure 1, written at Cerne Abbas *c*. 990, is from the first series of Catholic Homilies. It was very likely Ælfric himself who corrected this copy, and we see him marking out a passage to be cancelled and noting at the side

---

[30] A prose Boethius in the first half of the century (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180) and the version of Augustine's *Soliloquies* attributed to the king in the middle of the century (London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius xv, 4r-59v).
[31] Wrenn, 'Standard Old English'; H. Gneuss, 'The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester', *ASE* 1 (1972), 63-83.
[32] See the three passages of prose examined by A. C. Amos, *Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), pp. 171-96.
[33] See, for example: S. Irvine, 'Linguistic Peculiarities in Late Copies of Ælfric and their Editorial Implications', *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. J. Roberts and J. Nelson, King's College London Medieval Studies 17 (London, 2000), pp. 237-57; A. Fischer, 'The Vocabulary of Very Late Old English,' *Studies in English Language and Literature. 'Doubt Wisely': Papers in honour of E.G. Stanley*, ed. M.J. Toswell and E.M. Tyler (London and New York, 1996), pp. 29-41.

that it was not to be used in further copies because he had put it into another of his homilies.[34] Overall, the lay-out is good, with the distribution of þ and ð indicating a certain amount of calligraphic ambition. The manuscript is more fully punctuated than had previously been the case for English, adopting the system introduced at the Palace School in Aachen, with the *punctus elevatus* (⸵) making its first appearance in an English manuscript. But in the passage signalled as to be cancelled some things are left uncorrected, for example 'm<i⟩d dr<ygu⟩m fotum' line 7, 'farwered' line 12 for 'forwered', and **'dæig'** line 11 where 'dæige' or even 'dæge' might be more usual, showing variant forms of a sort that tended progressively to be screened out of writings in late West Saxon. Yet, their very presence points to a fair degree of linguistic diversity even as standards were being tightened up. The page illustrates both Ælfric's concern for linguistic standards and a degree of variation usually concealed from us by correction.[35] The two series of his Catholic Homilies, for the most part excerpted and translated from the major sermon collections of the western Church,[36] provided orthodox preaching in the vernacular. Masterly compilations, they have come to command the respect accorded original writings, overshadowing the variety and inventiveness of his rhythmical homilies. For them Ælfric invented a new sound, balanced pairs of phrases with a colloquial ring to them, rather than the old verses bounded by accustomed norms.[37] Among these rhythmical writings his narrative retelling of stories from the Old Testament seem to have enjoyed a longer popularity than his lives of saints,[38] as is suggested by their

---

[34] See the discussion by P. Clemoes, 'History of the Manuscript: Origin and Contemporary Correction and Revision' [revision of material in 1966 EEMF volume], *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. M. P. Richards, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 2 (New York, 1994), pp. 345-64.

[35] M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: Punctuation in the West* (Aldershot, 1992), draws attention to Ælfric's correction of punctuation in the manuscript.

[36] For a recent overview, see J. Hill, 'Ælfric's Authorities', *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg,* ed. E. Treharne and S. Rosser, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252 (Tempe, AZ, 2002), pp. 51-65.

[37] An excellent introduction to the intricacies of Old English meter is provided by C. McCully, 'OE Metrics', in *The Earliest English. An Introduction to Old English Language*, ed. C. McCully and S. Hilles (Harlow, 2005), pp. 143-85.

[38] Note that Mary Swan, 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the Twelfth Century', *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. M. Swan and E. M. Treharne, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30 (Cambridge and New York,

representation in a compilation from the latter part of the twelfth-century, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303: (68) *De oratione moysi in media quadragesima*, (70) *Quomodo Acitofel ꝼ multi alii laqueo se suspenderunt*, (71) *Kł Augusti Passio Sanctorum Machabeorum* and (73) *Incipit iudith quomodo interfecit olofernem*. At this point the collection ends imperfectly. Perhaps *Be Hester*,[39] an Ælfrician text extant only in Lisle's seventeenth-century transcript and containing linguistic pointers of a late Old English exemplar, was on folios that strayed from the end of this manuscript?

There were, alongside the prose writings of men such as Ælfric and Wulfstan, new translations of rules by which the religious life should be lived, penitentials, hymnals, and other more narrowly pedagogical books. Some of these had pages more varied in layout, evidencing the attention given to the vernacular as a language of instruction. Three books containing English in use in the second quarter or towards the middle of the eleventh century will serve as examples to show both how very different these new books could look and how the emphasis is on the target language, with English a means to the end of improving understanding of Latin. In the first (figure 2),[40] English follows Latin, chapter by chapter, in a translation that had been in use for three-quarters of a century or more**.** London, British Library, Cotton Titus A. iv is not the earliest extant copy of the bilingual Benedictine Rule, but this manuscript may approach most closely to Æthelwold's original translation.[41] Copied perhaps at Winchester, its contents indicate links with four other manuscripts of the Benedictine Rule, most closely with Cotton Tiberius A. iii. In the upper part of the page, the Latin looks tidier, its script baseline cleaner than in the lower passage. The training in Caroline script is dominant, and some inconsistency is found in the English version, for example in the straight *d* of 'standende' line 24, the long *s* of 'his' line 15, and the tendency of *a* to develop a head. On the whole the scribe remembers to use Insular letter-forms in the vernacular version, together with the Tironian sign for *and*,

---

making do with space and the low point for punctuation, whereas in Latin he draws on an elaborated punctuation system. Further differences worth comment suggest other ways in which the conventions used for writing English may diverge: in English the scribe has æ (already with a sense of uncertainty as to its role) whereas ę is favored in Latin; and although the three special letter forms used customarily in Old English, þ, ð and ƿ, are still in use, there are hints from their distribution that ð will disappear before þ.

The second sample (figure 3) is London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, 60v.[42] A copy of the Benedictine Rule stood originally at the outset of what is essentially a Latin compilation,[43] preceded by an illustration in which three monks are seen presenting a copy of his rule to the saint. Similarly, another illustration precedes the manuscript's second major text, the *Regularis concordia Anglicae nationis,* the agreement of *c*. 973 designed to establish uniform practices in liturgy and monastic life throughout England. In a second picture King Edgar, a palm of peace in his hand, is seated between St Æthelwold and St Dunstan, the two main leaders of the Benedictine reform movement in England. Line-spacing in Tiberius A. iii is generous, and many of the Latin texts are supplied with near-continuous English glossing that sits neatly between the lines. In figure 3 the five lines of prayer at the top of the page show main text uncluttered by glossing, by contrast with the following text, Ælfric's *Colloquy*. In modern times the gloss is better known than the Colloquy;[44] ironically, a drill for speaking about a range of simple topics in Latin has often been tidied up and used on its own for teaching Old English.[45] This copy of

---

[42] *Guide*, plate 20. The illustrations mentioned are on pp. 91 and 95.

[43] H. Gneuss, 'Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: the Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III', *Of the Making of Books. Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers. Essays presented to M.B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and R. Zim (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 13-48.

[44] See J. Hill, 'Winchester Pedagogy and the *Colloquy* of Ælfric', *Leeds Studies in English* ns 29 (1998), 137-52 at 146.

[45] Excerpts remain a popular component of introductory Readers. See, for example, B. Mitchell and F. C. Robinson, *A Guide to Old English*, 5th ed. (Oxford, 1992), who point out (p. 182) that their 'text is normalized throughout', being adapted from the version made by Henry Sweet for his 1897 *First Steps in Anglo-Saxon*. Alternatively, R. Marsden, *The Cambridge Old English Reader* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 3, reports that he retains the 'orthographical variation' of the Tiberius A. iii glosses although correcting 'clear errors' (for which, see p. 345).

the Colloquy with its English crib is from Christ Church Canterbury, where both Ælfric's pupil Ælfric Bata (from evidence on 117r) and the famous scribe Eadui Basan ('Eadwi' is written on 164r) made use of it. We don't know who made the crib: some think Ælfric himself;[46] others ascribe it to Ælfric Bata. Whoever it was, one would hope a student of Ælfric of Eynsham might have managed better late West Saxon than we see copied here. Inflexions are hit and miss; the use of -*k*- is slipping in ('weorkes' line 12, 'geiukodan' line 22) although *k* was not fully established in words like *king* and *keen* until the thirteenth century;[47] speech assimilations creep in ('mit þære' line 23); and a couple of mistakes suggest that the scribe didn't always understand his exemplar ('behese' line 9 shows him having trouble with recognizing Insular *s*; 'æþer' line 23 for *æcer* looks like a hypercorrection).

Near-continuous interlinear glossing of Latin by English is evidenced from as early as the ninth century in English manuscripts, but attempts at more complex mise-en-page are to be found among the teaching materials of the mid-eleventh century.[48] The third mid-eleventh-century sample is from London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii (figure 4), a monastic hymnal that integrates Latin paraphrases into the succession of hymns, which are written continuously and without glosses. At the top of the page illustrated is the abbreviated doxology 'Præsta pater',[49] following the text of 'Rector potens', a hymn sung daily at Sext except in Lent and at Pentecost.[50] Below the doxology the *ad sextam* hymn is explained by a Latin paraphrase ('O potens rector . . .'), which is written on alternate lines to give space for its English gloss in distinctively spindly writing. Next comes the text of the 'Rerum deus' on lines 16-21, [51] sung daily at Nones except during Lent and at Pentecost, followed in its turn by

[46] P. Lendinara, 'The *Colloquy* of Ælfric and the *Colloquy* of Ælfric Bata' [1983], in her *Anglo-Saxon Glosses and Glossaries* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 207-87 at 236; see also Hill, 'Winchester Pedagogy'.

[47] D. G. Scragg, *A History of English Spelling* (Manchester, 1974), p. 45.

[48] Some idea of the range of page design can be had from examining the plates discussed by R. Stanton, *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 2002). Of folio 12v of this manuscript Stanton, p. 37, notes that the gloss 'is in the same hand and same size as the main text, but in red ink', without further discussion.

[49] 'Grant, most loving Father'. See I. B. Milfull, *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 17 (Cambridge, 1996), p. 117, for the full doxology.

[50] Ibid., hymn 9.

[51] Ibid., hymn 10.

abbreviated doxology and by its explication, in both languages, beginning on the last four lines on the page. Latin was central to education in the monastic reform,[52] and the incorporation of the *Expositio hymnorum* into the New Hymnal has been carefully implemented.[53] The scribe seems better at managing the letter-forms customary for writing English than the Tiberius A. iii glossator, but this may be because English, although a prop to understanding Latin, is planned for equally with the Latin main-texts in spacing. The Latin paraphrase presented in this manuscript should remind us that Latin glossing of Latin was at this time gaining importance in classroom books; so, for example, the first layer of glosses in Cleopatra *Psychomachia* (London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra C. viii) is Latin, with the later addition of comparatively few English words.[54] The Latin glosses of the 'classbooks' used in tenth- and eleventh-century England seem on the whole to have travelled from the continent together with the Latin texts for which they were designed.[55]

By contrast with these three examples of glossed texts, where the understanding of Latin was paramount, Ælfric's Latin Grammar, in English, was the first European grammar written in a vernacular. There are sixteen or so copies of Ælfric's Grammar,[56] with or without its

---

[52] Lendinara, 'The *Colloquy* of Ælfric', p. 217.

[53] The compiler of Vespasian D. xii may have taken the *Expositio hymnorum* from London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. vi and the hymn texts from an exemplar like Durham, Cathedral B. III. 32, Part B. See further Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 270, M. Korhammer, *Die monastischen Cantica im Mittelalter und ihre altenglischen Interlinearversionen: Studien und Textausgabe*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften,Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 6 (Munich, 1976), esp. ch. 4; Milfull, *Hymns*, pp. 52-55, 66-67.

[54] See Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 145. The frontispiece in Roberts, *Guide*, from Cleopatra C. viii, shows Latin glosses, with English seen only in the translations of the titles alongside illustrations.

[55] M. Lapidge, 'The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England. The Evidence of Latin Glosses', *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. N. Brooks (Leicester and London, 1982), pp. 99-140 at 125.

[56] Vivien Law, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages* (London and New York, 1997), pp. 200-23, places Ælfric's Grammar in its wider medieval context. For a recent overview of the various manifestations of the grammar, see J. Hill, 'Ælfric's Grammatical Triad', *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. P. Lendinara, L. Lazzari and M. A. D'Aronco, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 39 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 285-307.

attached glossary, some fragmentary; as late as the first half of the thirteenth century it was still in use for teaching elementary Latin in Worcester, where the scribe recognized by his distinctive Tremulous Hand made a new revision, an updating in vocabulary and inflections that turned it into what we categorize as early Middle English.[57] Seven copies are from the early part of the eleventh century and three from the middle of the century, making ten from the half-century that gives us most manuscripts containing Old English. Four of the later copies reveal interesting changes in twelfth-century use of the Grammar. For example, the scribe of the Royal manuscript (London, British Library, Royal 15 B xxii) leaves out Ælfric's English explanations for Latin phrases (someone else added them in above the Latin), an organizational feature shared with the Cambridge, Trinity College R. 9. 17. Even more interestingly, three of these late copies of the Grammar contain Anglo-Norman glosses.[58] One, Cambridge, University Library, Hh.1. 10, is glossed extensively in Latin and Anglo-Norman as well as having some English glosses, and Melinda Menzer has recently suggested that behind some of its glosses lies 'a Latin teacher, glossing the text in preparation for later explication to students' and showing an interest in the meanings of French words. She argues further that a speaker of Norman French wanting to learn English may have been among those who added glosses to London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, a copy also modified, perhaps even to teach French as a second language to non-native speakers. The intrusion of Anglo-Norman into three late copies of Ælfric's Grammar leads Menzer to conclude that 'the linguistic and social boundaries among the three languages of post-Conquest England were porous and fluid'.[59] Kornexl also argues that the addition of Anglo-Norman glosses and French paradigms are evidence for French replacing English in elementary teaching after the Norman Conquest.[60]

---

[57] See C. Franzen, *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 70-71.

[58] See M. Menzer, 'Multilingual Glosses, Bilingual Text: English, Anglo-Norman, and Latin in Three Manuscripts of Ælfric's Grammar', *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons, Medieval European Studies 5 (Morgantown, WV, 2004), pp. 95-119.

[59] Menzer, 'Multilingual Glosses', 119

[60] L. Kornexl, 'From Ælfric to John of Cornwall: Evidence for Vernacular Grammar Teaching in Pre- and Post-Conquest England', *Bookmarks from the Past: Studies in Early English Language and Literature in Honour of Helmut Gneuss*, ed. L. Kornexl and U. Lenker (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), pp. 229-59 at 241.

We have arrived at the inevitable question I have no intention of attempting to answer. When does Middle English begin?[61] Major research projects under way have at last shaken loose from the old habits of compartmentalizing Old and Middle English. This is certainly the case with the Historical Thesaurus of English project (directed by Christian Kay in Glasgow), which will for the first time make it possible to take a fresh look at early Middle English vocabulary alongside Old English, closing the artificial divide at 1150 institutionalized in the major dictionaries.[62] Following on from the focus on written English across the century 1350-1450 in McIntosh and Samuels's *Linguistic Atlas*,[63] Margaret Laing (Edinburgh) is coordinating examination of written English from 1150 to 1300. Already Laing's *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval England*,[64] presenting an overview of this key century and a half, makes it possible to see clearly the coexistence of texts we too glibly separate into Old English and Middle English compartments. Moreover, her *Catalogue* includes cartularies, valuable sources too often left unexplored by language historians.[65] Then, Elaine Treharne (Leicester and now Florida State) and Mary Swan (Leeds) are exploring the 'conservation of a tradition of written composition in the [English] vernacular' between 1060 and 1220,[66] a project complemented by the examination of script categories and spellings in eleventh-century English manuscripts under way in Manchester.[67] Rather than address the issue of when Middle English

---

[61] Famously, this question is the title of a paper by Kemp Malone, in which from an examination of the four poetry codices he suggests that the beginning of the Middle English period must be put at *c*. 1000 A.D.: 'When Did Middle English Begin?', *Language* 6. 4, Language Monograph No. 7: Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies (Dec., 1930), pp. 110-117.

[62] For the HT project see
http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/SESLl/EngLang/thesaur/homepage.htm

[63] A. McIntosh, M.L. Samuels and M. Benskin, with the assistance of M. Laing and K. Williamson, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English,* 4 vols (Aberdeen, 1986) [LALME]

[64] M. Laing, *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1993).

[65] Kathryn Lowe (Glasgow) is leading the way with new linguistic work in this area, as is the LangScape project (King's College London), for which see
http://www.langscape.org.uk/content/about/about.html.

[66] *Rewriting Old English*, ed. Swan and Treharne, p. 2. For the project's website see http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220/index.htm

[67] See http://ahds.ac.uk/ictguides/projects/project.jsp?projectId=188

begins, it may well be more revealing to take a closer look at disappearing Old English.[68]

II a sample of Old English

To display disappearing Old English I look to the West Saxon translation of the Gospels.[69] I choose the Gospels not just for their intrinsic interest but also because it seems to have dropped out of sight that Kemble first recognized the importance of the copies of this translation for historians of the English language. Kemble planned to edit the Old English Gospels with Benjamin Thorpe from as early as 1833, and in 1835 reporting in a letter to Grimm 'the Gospels also get on fast',[70] but, for whatever reason, Thorpe produced his own compact edition in 1842. According to Bruce Dickins, Kemble left 'Old English prose, including the Laws' to Thorpe, reserving the charters to himself.[71] In 1858, however, Cambridge University Press issued *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian versions, synoptically arranged: with collations of the best manuscripts, etc.*, seen through press by Charles Hardwick.[72] Hardwick's brief preface makes interesting reading. He tells how the edition 'as transmitted to us in the leading dialects of ancient England, was designed and partly executed several years ago by one of our accomplished Anglo-Saxon scholars, John M. Kemble' but 'soon suspended for various reasons . . . and at the time of Mr Kemble's death, in the spring of 1857, the portion of it completed did not reach beyond the opening verses of the twenty-fifth chapter of St Matthew'. As there are twenty-eight chapters in Matthew,

---

[68] R. M. Thomson explores similar territory in the first of his Lyell lectures of 2000-2001: *Books and Learning in Twelfth-Century England: The Ending of 'Alter Orbis'* (Walkern, Herts., 2006), pp. 1-18.

[69] The now standard edition is by R. M. Liuzza, *The Old English Version of the Gospels, I: Text and Introduction* and *The Old English Version of the Gospels, II: Notes and Glossary,* EETS os 304, 314 (Oxford and New York, 1994, 2000). See also his contribution to R. M. Liuzza and A. N. Doane, *Anglo-Saxon Gospels*, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 3 (Tempe, AZ, 1995).

[70] *Gospels*, ed. Liuzza, I. xiv n. 8.

[71] B. Dickins, 'John Mitchell Kemble and Old English Scholarship (with a bibliography of his writings), *PBA* 25 (1939), 51-84 at 66. Dickins includes the posthumous 1858 *Gospel according to St. Matthew* in his list of Kemble's publications, apparently without reflecting on its significance.

[72] *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions, synoptically arranged: with collations of the best manuscripts, etc.*, ed. J. M. Kemble and C. Hardwick (Cambridge, 1858).

the edition was therefore substantially complete, and Hardwick goes on to point out: 'Although the labour thus imposed on the new Editor has been comparatively slight, it would have proved less onerous still, if Mr Kemble had left behind him any notes or memoranda to specify the manuscripts he was consulting both in the construction of his text and in his choice of various readings.' The edition was superseded by Skeat's four fascicules published across the years 1871 to 1887 and later collected into a single large volume.[73] So fully is the edition of the four gospels considered one of Skeat's many achievements that it is important to remember that the ground-plan is Kemble's: the familiar openings that present in two columns on the left-hand page an early text, Corpus Christi College Cambridge 140, and the last manuscript, Hatton 38, of the West Saxon Gospels, with variant readings from other manuscripts below; and on the right-hand page the Lindisfarne Gospels with Aldred's gloss and, below, variants from the Rushworth Gospels. Skeat grumbled about Kemble as an editor, re-editing Matthew,[74] but he points out that in all essentials Kemble was responsible for 'the general plan of the work and the arrangement and size of the pages'.[75] With Kemble's great editorial design in mind, and with a few verses from the St Matthew's Gospel in focus, we are in a position to look at an example of good Old English and two later pieces of evidence for its disappearance.[76]

---

[73] *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and old Mercian versions: synoptically arranged, with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the mss together with the early Latin version as contained in the Lindisfarne ms., collated with the Latin version in the Rushworth ms.*, ed. W. W. Skeat (Cambridge, 1871-87; rpt. Darmstadt, 1970).

[74] *Gospels*, ed. Liuzza, I. xv, where Liuzza points out that despite Skeat's new work on Matthew, it even so has more mistakes than the other gospels.

[75] Skeat censures Kemble's practice in relation to capitals, punctuation, the spellings *v* and *j* 'for consonantal values' in editing the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss and his carelessness with contractions, accents and the recording of *þ* and *ð*: *Holy Gospels*, pp. viii-ix.

[76] Aspects of the modernization of the West Saxon Gospels are discussed by A. Fischer, 'The Hatton MS. of the West Saxon Gospels: The Preservation and Transmission of Old English', *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture: Selected Papers from the 1991 Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*, ed. P. E. Szarmach and J. Rosenthal, Studies in Medieval Culture 40 (Kalamazoo, 1997), pp. 353-67. See also S. Nevanlinna, 'Lexical Variation in the Old English Gospel Manuscripts and a Note on Continuation', *To Explain the Present. Studies in the Changing English Language in Honour of Matti Rissanen*, ed. T. Nevalainen and L. Kahlas-

We shall look first at a not untypical piece of late West Saxon, copied early in the eleventh century (figure 5). The sample is not from the manuscript used for the Kemble edition, but from the other extant early eleventh-century manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441, the principal source for the first printed edition of the Old English gospels in modern times by John Foxe in 1571, prepared under the direction of Matthew Parker.[77] Bodley 441, if not itself the exemplar for the second of our three samples, closely reflects the exemplar available to the scribe of London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv,[78] thus giving access to added materials present in the later version.

\Apparuit angel[-] | d*omi*ni in so*m*nis iose[-] | dicens Accipe p[-]| ru*m* & matre*m* e[-]/

    Ðys godspel sceal on cylda mæsse dæg :

Þa hi þa ferdon þa ætywde drihtnes eng<->

 el iosepe o swefnu*m* . ꝸ þus cwæð ; aris ꝸ ni*m*   5

þ*æt* cild . ꝸ his modor . ꝸ fleoh on egypta land .

ꝸ beo þær oð þ*æt* ic ðe secge ; Towerd ys þ*æt* he-

rodes secð þ*æt* cild to forspillenne ; He á-

ras þá ꝸ na*m* þ*æt* cild ꝸ his modor on niht. ꝸ fer-

de on egyptum . ꝸ wæs þær oð herodes forð<->   10

sið . þ*æt* wære gefylled . þ*æt* ðe fram dryhtne

gecweden wæs þurh þone witegan ⁊ of

egyptu*m* ic minne sunu geclypode ; Þa

wæs herodes swyþe gebolgen .

Gospels, Matthew 2: 11-19, from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441, 3r4-14

This is the largest of the three Old English Gospels manuscripts under examination. In the right-hand margin someone near in time to the writing of the main text has inserted a Latin heading in Caroline minuscule script. The Latin pericopes, which do not appear in the earliest manuscripts of the Old English Gospels, may have been

---

Tarkka, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 52 (Helsinki, 1997), pp. 135-48.

[77] *The Gospels of the Fower Euangelistes* (London, 1571).

[78] Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 312 at p. 375.

introduced as 'reference points to allow the Old English to be read in parallel with the Latin',[79] and the passages marked could well have been read aloud 'instead of or as part of a homily'.[80] A much later hand, late in the sixteenth century, has added in the Old English rubric 'Ðys godspel sceal on cylda mæsse dæg : ' (This gospel is to be read on Holy Innocents' day [28th December]) to be found in Cambridge, University Library, Ii.2.11.[81] The loss of letters from the outer margin shows that the manuscript has been heavily cropped, but it must once have been a handsome volume. Here we have good late West Saxon, conventionally spelled. So, it has the normal past participle 'gecweden' of *cweþan* 'to say' line 12, the form 'þone' line 12 has the conventional single -*n*- of late West Saxon and the possessive 'minne' line 13 double -*n*-. The firm round hand is well used to writing English and is on the whole in control of the usual Insular letter-forms, although his *a* sometimes has a strongly Caroline appearance, as in 'egypta' towards the end of line 5; and occasionally the second limb of *h* tucks in rather than turning to the right, as in 'niht' line 9. Note also the careful punctuation, by far more elaborated than is general in the Old English gospels manuscripts, but also augmented late in the sixteenth century.[82] In addition to the simple point the scribe is using more specific stops, the punctus elevatus to indicate a rise in voice and the punctus versus to mark completion.

It is a sociolinguistic truism that a written standard conceals change, and so it is with late West Saxon. Most of the extant writings accommodate fairly successfully to the grammatical norms we derive from them. If the prose seems to do so more successfully than such of the poetry as is thought to be West Saxon, is that not what we should expect? The principal manuscripts 'containing Anglo-Saxon' were, as Neil Ker made it very clear, overwhelmingly 'written about 1000 and in the eleventh century'.[83] Yet there is good evidence both that dialects had

---

[79] R. M. Liuzza, 'Who Read the Gospels in Old English?', *Words and Works: Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson,* ed. N. Howe and P. S. Baker, Toronto Old English series 10 (Toronto, 1998), pp. 3-24 at 12.

[80] U. Lenker, 'The West Saxon Gospels and the Gospel-Lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England: Manuscript Evidence and Liturgical Practice', *ASE* 28 (1999), 141-78 at 174.

[81] *Gospels*, ed. Liuzza, I. xxi. This Exeter manuscript, into which the Latin pericopes were first introduced, was given to Parker by the Dean of Exeter in 1566, and given by Parker to Cambridge University in 1574.

[82] For example, the hyphens at the ends of lines 7, 8 and 9 are suspect.

[83] Ker, *Catalogue*, xv-xviii.

already diverged markedly and that English was changing rapidly. Kemble's design for his edition of the Old English New Testament versions highlights dialectal difference by positioning the Lindisfarne Gospels together with Aldred's glosses on the page facing texts drawn from two manuscripts of the West Saxon Gospels, with the glosses to the Rushworth Gospels below.[84] It is to Aldred's gloss we now turn for evidence of dialect divergence in the tenth century:[85]

	heonu engel drihtnes	
IIII	Ecce angelus d*omi*ni	
	aetdeaude in soefn[-um/e]	
	apparuit in somnio	
	ioseph cuoeð	
	ioseph dicens	
	aris ꝛ onfoh ꝉ genim ðone cnaeht	
	Surge et accipe pueru*m*	
	ꝛ moder his	10
	et matrem eius	
	ꝛ fleh in ægypt	
	Et fuge in aegyptum	
	ꝛ wæs ðu ðer wið ðon	
	Et esto ibi usque	
	mið ðy ic ðe cuoeðo ꝉ saego ðe	
	dum dicam tibi	
ꝉ woen	gewo[-e]rden wæs for*ð*on ꝥ	
is	Futurum est enim ut	
	heroðes soecas	
	herodes quaerat	15
	ðone cnæht to for*ð*oanne ꝉ to \for/losanne	
	puerum ad perden<->	
	hine	
	dum eum	
	ðe aras onfeng	

[84] The corresponding passage in the Rushworth Gospels is glossed by Farman, whose Old English equivalences would furnish us with early evidence for the Mercian dialect. See the useful overview by J. Smith, *An Historical Study of English. Function, Form and Change* (London, 1996), pp. 18-19, 26-29.

[85] Lindisfarne Gospels and Aldred's gloss, 30vb and 31ra. The transcription includes the marking to the left of 30v6, for reading aloud.

QUI CONSURGENS ACCEPIT

  ðone cnæht ⁊ moder

PUERUM ET MATREM

  his *in* næht ⁊ eft gewoende   20

EIUS NOCTE ET RECESSIT

  in ægypt

IN AEG*YP*TUM

  ⁊ wæs ðer wið

ET ERAT IBI USQUE

  to geliornisse herodes

AD OBITUM HERODIS

  þ were gefylled

UT ADIMPLERETUR

  þ gecueden wæs   31r

QUOD DICTUM EST

  from drihtne ðerh ðone witgo

A D*OMI* N*O* PER PROPHETA*M*

  cuoeðende

DICENTEM

from ægipt Ic ceigde

EX AEG*YP*TO UOCAUI

  s`u´ona   min

FILIUM MEUM   5

ða herodes gesægh

TUNC HERODES UIDENS

  for ðon bisuicen ł bilyrtet

QUONIAM INLUSUS

  wæs fro*m* dryu*m* ł tungulcræftgu*m*

ESSET A MAGIS

  urað wæs suiðe

IRATUS EST UALDE

Aldred's gloss was a labour of great love. Unusually, we know who he was: Aldred, a priest, and member of the Lindisfarne community at

---

[87] Recent discussions of Aldred include: M. P. Brown, *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe* (London, 2003), esp. ch. 2; L. Nees, 'Reading Aldred's Colophon for the Lindisfarne Gospels', *Speculum* 78 (2003), 333–77; 'Aldred Signs Off from Glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels',

Chester-le-Street in County Durham, in the north of England, in the tenth century.[87] We know even that he visited Oakley in Wessex in 970, by then 'profast' of the community. I shall make only a few general observations about some of the words and phrases he uses in his distinctively northern form of English. For example, he has words by then unusual or discarded in the south of England, e.g. *geleornes* 'death' (30v23) rather than *forðsið* (Bodley line 10), *cigan* 'to summon, call' (31r4) rather than *(ge)clipian* (Bodley line 13). Or where the south had the *be* form for the imperative ('beo' Bodley line 7) the north did not use this root (compare 'wæs ðu' / *esto* f. 30v, line 11). Late West Saxon usually has -*e* as ending in the first person singular of the present indicative, as in 'secge' Bodley line 7, where Aldred chooses a back vowel in 'cuoeðo l saego' / *dicam* f. 30v, line 12. Even in so short a passage some of the grammatical differences of Aldred's English are apparent. The earlier loss of final nasal consonants in the north is seen in 'ðerh ðone witgo' / *per prophetam* 31r2 (compare 'þurh ðone witegan' Bodley line 12) and there are signs also of the break-down of inflexions in noun and adjective paradigms in 's`u´ona min' / *filium meum* 31r5, where the possessive adjective lacks the accusative singular masculine ending (compare 'minne sunu', Bodley line 13), and 'from ægipt' / *ex aegypto* 31r4, where the noun lacks a dative ending (compare 'of egyptu*m*', Bodley line 12). The lack of endings in these last two examples of Aldred's English might be put down to convenience in glossing, were it not that the break-down of grammatical gender is so well evidenced elsewhere in his gloss. Even the emergence of final -*s* as a verb inflection can be illustrated by 'soecas' / *quaerat* 30v15 (contrast the southern 'secð' line 8). Without looking at Aldred's spelling and what it has to tell us, on the evidence of grammar and vocabulary he does not hold to the West Saxon norms that were widely followed in the last quarter of the tenth century and the early part of the eleventh century.

Even when copying good late West Saxon, scribes were inclined to diverge from its norms, as, late in the twelfth century, the Royal manuscript of the Gospels, from Canterbury (figure 6), shows:

Scribes and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England', ed. A. Rumble (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 28-43.

ferdon . Apparuit angelus d*omi*ni in sompnis
Ioseph dicens . accipe pueru*m* & matre*m* eius . .
ða hy þ[o>a] ferd<u>en</u> þa <u>ætyrde</u> drihtnes

&ae;ngel iosepu*m* on swefnum . ꝛ þus cwæð .

Aris ꝛ nim þ*æt* cild . ꝛ his modor ꝛ fleog on egypte   5
land ꝛ beo þær oð þ*æt* ic þe segge . Toward is þ*æt* he<->
rodes secð þ*æt* cyld to forspillenne . He aras þa ꝛ
nam þ*æt* cyld ꝛ his modor on nyht ꝛ ferde on
egyptum . ꝛ wæs þær oð herodes forðsyð . þ*æt*
ware <u>gef[e>y]ld</u> þ*æt* þe from drihtne gecweðen wæs   10
þurh þonne witegan . Of egypte ic mine sune
geclypode . Ða was herodes swyðe gebolgen

Gospels, Matthew 2: 12-19, from London, British Library, Royal
1 A. xiv, 35r1-12

Here, the pericopes seen in the outer margin of the Bodley copy have
found their way into the actual page layout, and they are written in what
looks like an attempt at reverting to the scribe's more usual Caroline-
derived letter-forms. They are therefore underlined in the passage
transcribed above, to indicate the suggested difference. Ker's
description, 'a rough untidy hand', is well deserved.[88] There are signs of
frequent corrections and of a fair amount of erasure. Although the scribe
seems to be copying doggedly word by word, he is prone to spell as he
speaks (two corrections are revealing: 'þ[o>a]' line 3 with southern
English rounding;[89] and the Kentish 'gef[e>y]ld' line 10). He has
trouble sometimes in recognizing the old letter-forms (in 'ætyrde' line 3
he confuses *w* with *r*). Clearly his hold on the norms of late West Saxon
are faltering, as a quick glance at 'gecweðen' line 10, 'þonne' line 11
and 'mine' line 11 reveals.[90] This scribe is not comfortable with
traditional spellings for inflexions ('ferden' line 3, where according to
late West Saxon norms *-on* might be expected), and it could be that his

---

[88] Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 245.
[89] But compare *Gospels*, ed. Liuzza, II, 177, where Liuzza notes that evidence
for /aː/ > /oː/ is rare.
[90] Ibid., II, 174, where Liuzza observes that 'a number of non-standard spellings
point to the collapse of the standard lWS *Schriftsprache* and the emergence of
local orthographic patterns.'

immediate exemplar did not have the elaborated punctuation of the Bodley text.[91]

 There is a greater air of confidence in the last of the Old English Gospels manuscripts, not least in its stately and deliberate script and the attention given lay-out.[92] This is Hatton 38, also from Canterbury, written at the very end of the twelfth century or early in the thirteenth century (figure 7):

> <u>Apparuit angelus d*omi*ni in sompnis ioseph dice*N*s</u>[93].
> <u>accipe puerum & matrem eius</u> .
> Þᴀ hyo þa ferd<u>en</u> þa atewede drihtnes en-   5
> gel iosepe on swefne. ꞽ þus cwæð . Aris ꞽ
> nym þæt child . ꞽ his modor ꞽ fleoȝ on egyp-
> te land ꞽ beo þær oð þæt ic þe segge . Toward
> ís þæt herodes secð þæt child to forspillene.
> He aras þa ꞽ nam þæt chyld ꞽ his moder o*N*   10
> niht . ꞽ ferde in to egypte. ꞽ wæs þær oðða hero-
> des forðsið . þæt wære <u>ȝefeld</u> þæt þe fram
> drihtne ȝecweðen wæs . þurh þanne witeȝan. Of
> egypte ích minne su<u>n</u>e ȝeclypede . Ða wæs he-
> rodes swiðe ȝebolȝen   15

> Gospels, Matthew 2: 12-18, from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38, 80r3-15

Here the Latin verses begin on a new line, with an opening red capital for each, and they are displayed in a more formal and better differentiated script, establishing a firmer sense of hierarchy between the two languages. The straight-backed *d* (look at the third line: *domini*, *dicens*) suggests formality at a time when the round-backed form was generally in use; note for example the short *r* of Caroline script, the ampersand, and on the last line of the page the *f* of 'Defuncto'. In the main text in English there is little use of abbreviation apart from the

---

[91] He does have two examples of the *punctus elevatus*, in lines 19 (compare Bodley line 22) and 24 (but not Bodley line 25).
[92] For a colour reproduction, which gives a better idea of the effectiveness of layout, see Roberts, *Guide*, C4.
[93] Note space-saving *N*, sharing second vertical stroke with long *s*.

Tironian sign for *and*. Two new spelling practices are worth note, both purposeful changes: a somewhat inconsistent attempt to give different phonetic values to the Caroline and Anglo-Saxon *g* forms (the latter may be thought of as signaling the emergence of 'yogh', as in 'ȝecweðen' and 'witeȝan' line 13); and the rather more successfully carried through use of *ch*, for example in 'child' line 7, an orthographic change that generalized quickly.[94] Note late Old English inflexional levelling (*-en* is pervasive), the pronoun forms 'hyo' lines 1 and 5 and 'hye' line 23 for 'they' and the Kentish look to 'ȝefeld' line 12 (compare 'ȝefylled' line 20). Linguistically, this version of the Old English Gospels is an interesting mix of conservatism and innovation, a context in which not only the possessive adjective 'minne' line 14 has double *n*, but the article 'þanne' line 13 also, where once single *n* was customary. The form 'befæht' line 15 suggests that the scribe did not immediately understand 'bepæht' in his exemplar. The only distinctive Insular letter-forms used consistently are *f* and *r*. Students with whom I've read passages from this last manuscript of the Old English gospels identify it as Middle English, until they stop to think of its more conservative features.

It is interesting to look at these three pages from the West Saxon Gospels within a wider context and I shall therefore place them within a selection of hands from the late eleventh century to the early thirteenth century:[95]

date	text		from	*Guide*
s. xi[1]	Bodley 441 (Gospels)	OE	?	-
s. xi ex.	Liddington charter	OE	Worcester	p. 103
1130s	ASC 'E' 1st continuation	ME	Peterborough	pl. 23
1155	ASC 'E' hand 2	ME	Peterborough	pl. 23
s. xii[1]	Hatton 116 (Chad homily)	OE	Worcester	pl. 24
s. xii med.	Vesp D. xiv hand 1	OE	Kent	pl. 25
s. xii med.	Vesp D. xiv hands 3	OE	Kent	p. 117

---

[94] R. M. Liuzza, 'Scribal habit: the evidence of the Old English Gospels', *Rewriting Old English*, ed. Swan and Treharne, pp. 143-65 at 162, points out that alterations in, for example, the presentation of /g/ and /k/ 'do not reflect changing phonology but only changing orthography'.

[95] Images were projected when I gave this lecture. The table summarizes the succession of hands then shown.

	and 2			
s. xii ex.	Orm	ME	E Midlands	pl. 27
s. xii^2	Royal 1 A. xiv (Gospels))	OE	Canterbury	pl. 28
s. xii / xiii	Hatton 38 (Gospels)	?OE	Canterbury	pl. 29
s. xiii in.	*St Iuliene*	ME	W Midlands	pl. 30
s. xiii in.	Wintney Rule	>ME	Wintney, Hamps.	p. 123
c. 1225	*Ancrene Riwle* 'T'	ME	S. Cheshire	pl. 31

First, I begin with Bodley 441, observing that on circumstantial evidence this manuscript is thought to originate from Canterbury but that in truth we do not know its origins. This led to a reminder that manuscripts in late West Saxon are not easily placed. Like so much written in this standardized form, it cannot be localized on internal evidence. Next, with the Liddington charter, London, British Library, Harley Ch. 83 A 3 (S 1421), we are, to my mind, at the end of Old English. This is the last generation that seems to manage new writing in a decent approximation to the norms of late West Saxon.[96] The charter details a three-year lease of land at Liddington in Warwickshire by the community at Worcester to someone named Folder. The scribe was at work in the last decades of the eleventh century, writing charters, pulling together a cartulary, making new copies of anything from the Old English Bede to collections of homilies. In the charter shown the hand has a comfortable forward tilt,[97] and he manages the full run of diagnostic Insular letter-forms as if proper to the writing of good English.[98] On this showing, here is a scribe able to write decent Old English – much better than either of the Peterborough Chronicle scribes whose hands were shown next. The Old English literary tradition did not so much disappear as submerge even as Middle English got going. After all, the English didn't stop talking in English, even if for a time they found it politic in some circumstances to speak French. To state the obvious, both vernaculars were in the shadow of Latin, the language of the Church and scholarship. Two hands writing English in the Anglo-

---

[96] Compare the supply leaves inserted in the 1070s or 1080s into London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, beginning on 68r (see Roberts, *Guide*, plate 21).

[97] In his Bede, where he attempts a more upright aspect, aping the appearance of Anglo-Saxon square minuscule, the hand looks strained (see Roberts, *Guide*, plate 22).

[98] Note that he takes great pains with the *æ* digraph, by this time uncommon in Latin and therefore rapidly becoming a letter specific to the writing of English.

Saxon Chronicle of Peterborough Abbey, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636, 88v, display a change-over between generations on this one page. The first scribe was working in the 1120s and 1130s, the second in 1154-55. The first, imitating Anglo-Saxon minuscule in some details, has trouble writing Old English grammatically, and the second, essentially a Caroline hand, is out of touch with the old norms. Incidentally, the marginal chronicle added late in the thirteenth century, *Le Livere de Reis de Bretanie e le Livere de Reis de Engletere*, much of its space nearly sliced away ahead of a new binding, turns the Peterborough Chronicle into a trilingual book, just as do the Anglo-Norman additions to the later manuscripts of Ælfric's Grammar discussed above.

The page from the Chad homily, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116,[99] again from Worcester, marks a fairly radical departure from writings in English looked at so far. The tidy base-line is surprising: the descender of *p* drops below it, as does the bow of *g* (just one *g* shape, the Caroline letter-form), and the descender of Anglo-Saxon *þ* also disturbs the uncluttered appearance of this page. Give or take *þ*, *ð*, *w* and *æ* (the latter somewhat haphazardly perhaps reflecting an anterior West Mercian copy-text),[100] the letter-forms would not look out of place in a twelfth-century Latin manuscript; for Rodney Thomson it is 'a typical Worcester hand of the first half of the century and with initials in the local style'.[101] So with this rather handsome hand, large, upright, round, is purposeful experimentation in the air for the writing of English? Whoever this scribe was, he felt no need to draw on the few Insular letter-forms others still aped. By contrast, the next two pages, from London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv,[102] although dated to the middle of the twelfth century, reflect the muddled inheritance from the past. Three contemporary hands contributed to this homiletic compilation. The prickly effect given by the manuscript's main hand (137r) is found for this time in Rochester and Canterbury

---

[99] Roberts, *Guide*, plate 24.

[100] *The Life of St. Chad: An Old English Homily*, ed. R. Vleeskruyer (Amsterdam, 1953), pp. 38-71.

[101] R. M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library* with a contribution on the bindings by M. Gullick (Cambridge, 2001), p. xxiv.

[102] R. Handley, 'British Museum MS. Cotton Vespasian D. xiv', *N&Q* 219 (1974), 243-50; E. Treharne, 'The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century', *Rewriting Old* English, ed. Swan and Treharne, pp. 11-40

manuscripts; this hand consistently employs the Insular letter-forms *f* and *r*, and he moves between Caroline *s* and a longer form that drops below the script baseline. His *g* is Caroline, with all the tails filled in obsessively. Like the Hatton 116 scribe he makes do with one *g* form, but his fellow scribes, seen in Vespasian D. xiv, 166r, both apparently feeling the need to make distinctions between /g/ and /j/ sounds, call on the Insular shape as well as the Caroline. Clearly, the Insular shape is settling into use as a special letter-form for the writing of English,[103] though as yet it generally retains a firm cross-stroke as its head. As is the case with other twelfth-century compilations, there are scattered among the copies of Old English texts newer pieces, some demonstrably of recent composition.

The last few pages shown served as a final reminder that alongside the last recopying and refurbishing of Old English writings, more recognizably new writing was under way, not just occasional homilies, or short pieces written into spaces, or lyrics, but works of ambition and substance.[104] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 1, fol. 71, is a small scrap from Orm's *Ormulum*, showing lines 9035-62 on its recto and verso. This little scrap is part of a careful insertion, to be made into folio 72r. This manuscript is very long, in overall size similar to the handsome Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 8824), but its crammed pages are often sub-standard rather than good pieces of prepared membrane. Nevertheless the labour-intensive hand is surprisingly easy to read, although it takes a little time to get to grips with this splendid attempt to reform written English, a spelling system in which consonants are doubled to signal a preceding short vowel but not when the vowel is in an open syllable.[105] Orm, at work at much the same time as or a little later than the second of the two Peterborough Chronicle scribes,[106] is a writer in touch with the vernacular homiletic tradition of Anglo-Saxon England, but fired to begin anew, developing a

---

[103] Though not yet settled into its *h* shape, for which see P. J. Frankis, 'Layamon and the Fortunes of Yogh', *MÆ* 73 (2004), 1-9 at 3.

[104] In particular, it should be noted that imposing collections of law and charters are omitted in this brief overview.

[105] The best introduction to Orm's text remains R. Burchfield, 'The Language and Orthography of the Ormulum MS', *TPS* (1956), 56–87.

[106] M. B. Parkes, 'On the Presumed Date and Possible Origin of the Manuscript of the "Ormulum": Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 1', *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, ed. E.G. Stanley and D. Gray (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 115–27; reprinted in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (London and Rio Grande, 1991), pp. 187-200.

series of homilies keyed to a harmonization of the gospels.[107] Others still busied themselves about making new copies of the West Saxon Gospels, as we saw with Royal 1 A. xiv from the late twelfth-century and the last copy Hatton 38.[108] Early in the thirteenth century, over in the west of England, near Hereford, new writers were providing works in English, for example the *Ancrene Riwle*, for anchoresses who were probably well accustomed to reading Anglo-Norman for relaxation and meditative materials. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 34, 42r, a page from the *St Juliene* life,[109] showed a small manuscript, in the sort of hand found typically in biblical annotation or relatively informal collections of medical information, presenting a huge contrast with the careful layout and spaciousness of London, British Library, Cotton Claudius D. iii, 78r,[110] the old dual-language Benedictine Rule now recast for the nuns of Wintney, in Hampshire, in what we can only call Middle English. The quick series of illustrations to this part of the lecture ended with an example of Gothic book-hand, London, British Library, Cotton MS Titus D. xviii, 33v-34r.[111] This *Ancrene Riwle* manuscript is very near in time to its composition for those three west-country anchoresses, yet the text has acquired northern features and has even been modified for use by men as well as women. Not all the new writing stayed localized to the area in which composed.

The Bodley Gospels manuscript comes from the heyday of late West Saxon, its standard forms and spellings revealing very little about its origins. Some could manage to write decent Old English late in the eleventh century, as we have seen from the Liddington charter written by a Worcester scribe, but generally that skill had vanished. For the century that follows Ker lists a few manuscripts that recycle Old English, under thirty.[112] This is hardly surprising. Later Anglo-Saxon

---

[107] S. Morrison, 'Continuité et innovation littéraire en Angleterre au XIIᵉ siècle: la prédication de la *militia Christi*', *CCM* 44 (2001), 139–157.

[108] See above, pp. 000-000.

[109] Roberts, *Guide*, plate 30.

[110] Ibid., p. 123.

[111] C. E. Wright, *English Vernacular Hands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1960), plate 5. See Roberts, *Guide*, plate 31, for folio 23r from this manuscript.

[112] Ker, *Catalogue*, 1957, pp. xviii-xix, provides the definitive list of 'Manuscripts written about 1100 or later'. See also E. Treharne, 'The Dates and Origins of Three Twelfth-Century Old English Manuscripts', *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and their Heritage*, ed. P. Pulsiano and E. M. Treharne (Aldershot, Brookfield USA, Singapore, Sydney, 1998), pp. 227-53 at 227.

England was unusual in the emphasis placed upon the vernacular for teaching and preaching, for charters, wills and laws, but even in the century before the Norman Conquest far more manuscripts were being written in Latin than in English, and the proportions of works written and transcribed in Latin and English respectively continued to draw steadily apart.[113] By the twelfth century books containing English were, as Gameson has observed, 'marginal to the main thrust of scribal activity',[114] and he has calculated that for each extant early twelfth-century book containing Old English there are seventy-seven in Latin. After the eleventh century, scribes were prone to improve and update older texts when copying them, indeed to modernize them, as we have seen in following through some of the changes made to a small sample from the Old English Gospels. There was experiment too and innovation, not just by new writers like Orm and the *Ancrene Riwle* group, but by scribes seeking to make old texts more accessible and to build them into new compilations and adaptations. Generally, when writing English, scribes used the Caroline-derived repertoire of letter-forms, drawing on a few special characters (þ, ð, w, together with æ, which had become a special letter-form) and a diminishing number of the insular letter-forms, and developing new conventions (for example, the adoption of new sequences of letters *ch* and *wh*, the increasing use of *k*, the differentiation of /j/ (yogh) from /g/). But Kemble was right: so far as Old English is concerned there were no Saxon characters apart from þ, ð and *w*. You could say that at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period there were two more letter-forms specific to the writing of English, *æ* (because the digraph was no longer used in writing Latin) and the yogh *h* (from Insular *g*), but they are not Saxon characters.

Finally, my principal aim in this paper has been to demonstrate Kemble's far-sightedness in embarking on his edition of the *Gospels in*

---

[113] For the continued use of the vernacular in legal and administrative documents see D. A. E. Pelteret, *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge, 1990).

[114] R. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (*c. *1066-1130)* (Oxford, New York, 1999), p. 25, suggests Old English was at its strongest, hardly surprisingly given his opening date, in the later eleventh century: twenty-four of the volumes under examination date from this period, representing about a third of contemporary book production (two examples are reproduced as plates 1 and 2); it then dwindles, with what he describes as a very discreet swansong in the early twelfth century (the period, incidentally, to which the one and only French text in his corpus belongs). There are seven manuscripts containing Old English for the early twelfth century in his corpus.

Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian versions, for we have been looking at the sweep of texts he first brought together as 'highly interesting to comparative philologers as well as to the critical student of the Sacred Text'.[115] The edition he designed and got under way remains a major edition for twenty-first century scholarship. The recent EETS edition of the West Saxon Gospels, based on the eight surviving manuscripts, has given us a new text of the Corpus manuscript,[116] but Liuzza's treatment of variants, constrained by editorial demands,[117] means that the old edition is still a valuable printed text for the Hatton manuscript and can provide a fuller (if not always accurate) conspectus of readings from other major manuscripts. Most impressive of all, the ambitious edition Kemble set in motion remains the standard printed text of the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss and of the Rushworth Gospel gloss.[118] Therefore, let us applaud the good judgement of John Mitchell Kemble and this one of his many achievements.[119]

---

[115] Hardwick's preface to *Gospel according to Saint* Matthew, ed. Kemble and Hardwick, p. iv.

[116] Gospels, ed. Liuzza.

[117] Ibid., I. lxxvi and n. 4.

[118] *Holy Gospels*, ed. Skeat, remains the source for the Lindisfarne Gospels text, its gloss and the Rushworth Gospels gloss in the Toronto Dictionary of Old English database.

[119] I should like to thank Janet Bately, Michelle Brown, Alun Ford, Alice Jorgensen and Pamela Robinson for helping me to rid this paper of mistakes and anomalies.

Illustrations

1. London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, 64r (formerly 60). Ælfric, *Dominica in media quadragesima*

2. London, British Library, Cotton Titus A. iv, 32r. Rule of St Benedict (*Regula sancti Benedicti*), with Æthelwold's translation, s. xi med.

3 London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, 60v. End of office prayer; opening of Ælfric's *Colloquy*, s. xi med.

4. London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xii, 11r. Hymns accompanied by glossed explication, s. xi med.

5. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 441, 3r. Gospels, Matthew 2: 11-19

6. London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv, 35r. Gospels, Matthew, 2: 12-19

7. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38, 80r. Gospels, Matthew 2: 12-18