INTRODUCTION

The last twenty or thirty years have produced a veritable flood of publications in the field of linguistic studies. How many of these will last remains to be seen. Among the developments I personally welcome here is a widening interest in the history of linguistic scholarship. But what seems striking is that, although English is unquestionably the language to which the greater part of linguistic research has been devoted, as well as being the lingua franca of this field of studies, a comprehensive history of English philology still waits to be written. There is no dearth of literature on the grammatical and lexicographical study of English (to name the two major areas), particularly for the period from the early sixteenth to the late eighteenth century. The nineteenth century, by contrast, has enjoyed scant regard, while, until recently, the Middle Ages had been all but ignored. Thus to read the traditional handbooks on the history of English and the history of linguistics is to conclude that linguistic studies were pioneered in England by men like John Hart, William Bullokar and Robert Cawdrey. It is high time, I feel, that the balance be set straight, particularly since the last few years have seen the publication of a number of distinguished works on the English Middle Ages – suffice it to name Vivien Law’s work on grammar in the Anglo-Saxon period² and David Thomson’s books on the late Middle English grammarians.³

This paper is intended to provide a brief survey of the linguistic knowledge and interests of the Anglo-Saxons and to make a small contribution to some future history of English philology. It seems tempting, also, instead of asking what we know of the language of the Anglo-Saxons (as we have been diligently doing for generations), to
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¹ The T. Northcote Toller Memorial Lecture delivered in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester on 6 March 1989. Thanks are due to Dr Sonia Brough who translated an earlier, German draft of this paper into English.
² See notes 11, 15, 18 and 27 below.
³ David Thomson, A Descriptive Catalogue of Middle English Grammatical Texts (New York, 1979); An Edition of the Middle English Grammatical Texts (New York, 1984).
wonder what the Anglo-Saxons themselves knew and thought of their mother tongue, and of other languages. A few preliminary remarks are called for here.

It may be taken as read that the Anglo-Saxons had given some consideration to language even before the introduction of Christianity and the written word – we need only recall the adaptation of the runic alphabet to the phonological system of Old English, or traditional alliterative verse with its rules based on accent and quantity. Not until Anglo-Saxons began to read, speak and write Latin, however, did any kind of formal linguistic scholarship, and grammar studies in particular, evolve. Thus Latin was the main object of study in the grammars and textbooks available to the Anglo-Saxons as well as being the language in which nearly all of them were written. There is no doubt in my mind, however, that the system and the categories of Latin grammar to which the Anglo-Saxons were thus exposed were also applied by them to their own language. They must have done this whenever they were glossing and translating Latin texts, and it is demonstrated quite clearly in Ælfric’s contrastive Grammar. Abbo of Fleury, too – though himself not an Anglo-Saxon – had answered questions from the monks of Ramsey on Latin pronunciation by referring to Old English speech sounds.

By ‘Anglo-Saxons’ I refer of course to those who could read (and for the most part write?), and generally had a more or less sound command of Latin. First and foremost these were the clergy, priests, monks and possibly nuns. That literacy was not entirely absent among royalty and the aristocracy is a well-known fact, and it is now also assumed that from the tenth century onwards (King Alfred’s educational plans evidently not having materialized) pupils who were later to take on secular offices were being admitted to monastic schools.

The late Roman grammarians with whom the Anglo-Saxons were familiar had stated the general purpose of studying grammar. First it was seen to fulfil the practical aim of teaching its students the ratio recte scribendi et loquendi. Secondly, as scientia interpretandi, grammar served a higher purpose in opening the doors to literary criticism and, later, to biblical exegesis; this is a tradition that goes back ultimately to Dionysius Thrax. I will focus here on its more pragmatic objective and thus what seems also to have been the main purpose behind the

---

teaching of grammar and Latin in early England, namely to enable pupils to read intelligently both English and Latin works, particularly the Bible, but also patristic writings, historical works, literature and Fachliteratur, and to equip them for active participation in Mass and Office. For all this a knowledge of the terminology and categories of Latin grammar was indispensable.

The Anglo-Saxon age spans almost five centuries from the introduction of Christianity, and requires of the historian of language and philology as discriminating an approach as of any historian. It seems helpful, not only for the present purpose, to distinguish three periods, though I am aware that this implies a drastic simplification and that a strict demarcation of the periods is not possible: (1) the seventh century (in particular the second half) and the eighth century, which in England are marked by a high standard of education and learning – one need only think of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury, of Aldhelm, Bede or Alcuin; (2) the ninth century – a period signalled by a general decline in culture and education, and with it a deterioration of Latin scholarship, a development which cannot be put down to the Scandinavian invasions and later settlement alone since it was clearly in progress before these events; (3) the tenth and eleventh centuries – from the time of King Alfred, and especially from the Benedictine Reform onwards, the revival of Latin scholarship was vigorously pursued, and this is also the period that produced the great Old English prose works.

It goes without saying that, within the constraints of a paper such as this, no more than a fleeting sketch can be drawn of the vast area of study covering language and philology in Anglo-Saxon times. A more thorough treatment would demand more space and time, while a great deal of work on our subject still has to be done. Nor must we forget that the evidence at our disposal is of a fragmentary nature. One cannot but recall here Dorothy Whitelock’s reminiscence about her student days in her inaugural lecture at Cambridge in 1958: ‘... how, when Professor Chadwick suggested that I should undertake research, I was afraid that before I could get going there would be nothing left to do.’ Sixty years later this is still an ungrounded fear on the part of anyone contemplating active participation in our field of studies, a field which is also closely linked with the research project Fontes Anglo-Saxonici now in progress. Much still waits to be done, and not a few discoveries will no doubt be made.

As an indication of what still calls for scholarly attention we may note the comment of Michael Lapidge, in his report on ‘The Present
State of Anglo-Latin Studies’, that ‘For the later period, there are numerous Latin-Latin glossaries and glossae collectae preserved in pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and these, by and large, have never been printed or studied.’ \(^{10}\) Grammatical texts tell a similar tale. In a number of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries there are pertinent anonymous texts which have as yet been neither edited nor identified. \(^{11}\) Such is also the case with a text in a Paris manuscript (BN lat. 7561, fos. 1–11, s.xi) which is followed by a distich that even links it to Ælfric:

\[ Ælfrico monacho opus hoc super astra coruscet, \]
\[ Qui studuit templi sic decus hoc fieri. \] \(^{12}\)

Almost all of Priscian’s grammatical writings were known in Anglo-Saxon England. The only work of which this could not be said with certainty is the *Partitiones XII versuum Aeneidos*, a grammatical and metrical commentary on the first verse of each of the twelve books of the *Aeneid*. A copy of this school textbook, written in England around the turn of the millennium, however, has recently come to light in a manuscript now in the Bibliothèque Municipale in Rheims (1097). \(^{13}\) Similarly, only a number of continental manuscripts from the eighth century onwards were known to contain a glossary listing Greek grammatical, metrical and literary terms with Latin translations, but a copy of this glossary in an English manuscript – perhaps from Abingdon – has now been identified. \(^{14}\)


\(^{12}\) See Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, II (München, 1923), 680 n.5.

\(^{13}\) See Helmut Gneuss, ‘Eine angelsächsische Konigsliste’, *Scire litteras: Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen N.F. 99, München, 1988), 201–9, at 201–3. The discovery was made by Dr Colette Jeudy.

\(^{14}\) BL Harley 3826, fos. 150r–152v, s.xi. Eighth-century copies of this glossary are in MSS Paris BN lat. 7530 (from Monte Cassino); Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Weissenburg 86 (from Tours); Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preuss. Kulturbesitz, Diez. B Sant.66 (from the court of Charlemagne). The Harley copy, of which I am preparing an edition, was mentioned by Georg Goetz, *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*, 1 (Leipzig, 1923), 102, who, however, says nothing about its date or provenance. About a third of the entries in Harley 3826 occur in the so-called first Corpus Glossary, MS CCCC 144, fos. 1–3v (s.ix\(^{1}\)), from St Augustine’s, Canterbury).
GRAMMAR

The term *grammatica* as used in Antiquity and the Middle Ages goes beyond what we understand by grammar, coming close to our use of 'philology' or 'linguistics'. To begin with, I will here use 'grammar' to refer to a work that describes the phonology, morphology and syntax of a language. A considerable number of such grammatical works from the late Roman period were available in the early Middle Ages, and most of them seem to have been known to the Anglo-Saxons in the first period. Among them were (1) grammar books *per se*, from Donatus's short elementary grammar, the *Ars minor*, to Priscian's comprehensive *Institutiones grammaticae*; (2) grammatical commentaries such as those on Donatus by Servius and Sergius; (3) treatises on specific areas of grammar such as orthography and accent, and on prosody; and finally (4) treatments of grammar within the framework of encyclopaedic works – among them Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (Book III), Cassiodorus's brief introduction in his *Institutiones* (Book II, ch.i) and, most importantly, the first book of the *Etymologica* by Isidore of Seville. Quintilian's chapters on grammar in his *Institutio oratoria* – which may not have been accessible in Anglo-Saxon England – deserve a special position in this group; they might today be described as an introduction to the problems of linguistic studies.\(^{15}\)

Anglo-Saxon libraries from the late seventh century onwards are known to have been exceedingly well-stocked, and this applies not only to collections such as those at Canterbury, Jarrow, Wearmouth and York.\(^{16}\) This is clearly attested by what we know of the scope of grammatical writings available to the monasteries and cathedrals. Our sources for this are not contemporary manuscripts, however, almost all of which were lost without trace in the turmoil of the ninth century. Our evidence is derived indirectly from the early glossaries (which


drew on Donatus's *Ars maior* and on the *Ars* by Phocas), and in large part from the sources cited by Anglo-Latin authors who were themselves concerned with language and prosody: Aldhelm in *De metris* and *De pedum regulis* (in the *Epistola ad Acirciuni*); Bede in *De orthographia, De schematibus et tropis* and *De arte metrica*; and the grammarians Boniface and Tatwine. Whether Alcuin's works should be included here is a moot point, since his move to the Continent gained him access to the libraries of the Frankish Kingdom. His grammatical schooling, however, certainly goes back to York, and his catalogue in verse form of the authors to be found in the library there includes the names of eight grammarians:

*artis grammaticae vel quid scripsere magistri,*

*quid Probus atque Focas, Donatus Priscianusve,*

*Servius, Euticius, Pompeius, Cominianus.*

A detailed investigation of the textual history of the late Roman grammars, particularly with regard to possible English antecedents of their Continental transmission, may shed more light on the grammar sources to be found in the early Anglo-Saxon period, as will a thorough examination of the question about which of the early Irish grammarians were known and used in England.

The matter of which grammatical sources were available in the first period in England has been admirably treated by Vivien Law,
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22 For some cases of Irish influence on Anglo-Saxon grammarians see Holtz, *Donat*, 319 and n.25, 497–8; Bengt Löfdstedt, *Der hibernolatéinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala, 1965), 24 n.4; Law, *Insular Latin Grammarians*, 48–9. That the commentary on Donatus by the Anonymus ad Cuimnanum, perserved in MS St Paul in Carinhia, Stiftsbibliothek, 2/1 (cf. Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature*, 400–1200 [Dublin, 1985], no. 331) was known to Anglo-Saxons has now been established beyond doubt: Professor Bischoff has kindly informed me that he has discovered two scratched Old English glosses in the text. The same manuscript, written s.viii1 in Northern England, contains copies of the commentaries on Donatus by Pompeius and Sergius.
especially in *The Insular Latin Grammarians* and ‘The Study of Latin Grammar in Eighth-Century Southumbria’. I shall merely name the works for whose acquaintance and use in the seventh and eighth centuries there is multiple evidence. These are the grammars of Audax, Charisius, Consentius, Diomedes, Donatus (both *Artes*), Eutyches, Phocas and Priscian, the commentaries on Donatus of Pompeius, Servius and Sergius, and Isidore’s *Etymologiae*. Of the other encyclopaedic works, those of Martianus Capella and Cassiodorus were probably also available; in the case of Quintilian’s encyclopaedia this is doubtful. Naturally one has to allow for different times and places; but, if I might indulge in a brief anachronism, I should suggest that, had a copy of Keil’s *Grammatici Latini* reached England in the eighth century, it would not have contained a great deal that was not already known somewhere on English soil.

The Anglo-Saxons had to learn Latin as a foreign language. Vivien Law has rightly stressed how unsuited the late Roman grammatical works were to this task, since they had been written for native speakers. Historians of English do not always seem to stress the fact that the original Old English inflexional endings had been considerably reduced at an early stage by the laws affecting unstressed final syllables in the Germanic languages, and that the transition from a synthetic to an analytic language had already begun as the earliest Old English glosses and texts were being recorded. This was presumably one of several reasons why the Latin inflexional system with its numerous forms, categories (such as tenses and moods) and inflexional types presented such difficulties to the Anglo-Saxon learning Latin. Phonology and syntax, by contrast, were far less problematic, at least as far as a passive knowledge of the language was concerned. As the Roman grammarians had obviously not been guided by such considerations, the Anglo-Saxons very early produced grammars which, though laying no claim to originality, devoted considerable space to inflexional morphology when compared with their predecessors. Examples are the grammars of Tatwine, priest at the monastery of Breedon-on-the-Hill in Leicestershire and Archbishop of Canterbury from 731 to 734, and of Boniface, who almost certainly wrote his grammar in Nhutscelle Monastery (probably Nursling in Hampshire) before his missionary period. In Bede’s *De orthographia*, a handbook
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24 Vivien Law, *Insular Latin Grammarians*, ch.V.

on language with a title that is quite misleading today, inflexional morphology similarly played a key role.

The grammars of Tatwine and Boniface were both written in Latin and date back to the late seventh or early eighth century. Their impact in England seems to have been short-lived, and they were thus probably among the many texts to disappear in the ninth century. The reform movement of the tenth century, at any rate, no longer had recourse to them. Some Old English glosses in the archetype of the surviving manuscripts of Tatwine's grammar might indicate that in the early eighth century questions of grammar and translation were dealt with in English; J.D. Pheifer came to a similar conclusion for the late seventh century on the basis of English glosses to Orosius's Historiae adversus paganos which found their way into the Épinal and Erfurt glossaries.

If early grammar instruction in England was conducted in English, then the Latin grammatical terms and categories might also have been applied to English. We know what grammatical terms and categories were taught: *vox* and *littera*, the division of letters into vowels and consonants, and of consonants into semivowels and *mutae*; syllable, metre, accent and punctuation. The most detailed attention was given to the parts of speech with their categories of case, number, gender, mood, tense and so on. Elements of syntax – a discipline as yet at a rudimentary stage of development – were also treated, as were concepts which would today be assigned to semantics and lexicography, such as *corporalia* and *incorporalia*. Basic concepts relating to word-formation were discussed, too – *figura simplex*, *figura composita* and *nomen derivativum*, for example.

It has to be admitted, however, that there is no written evidence for the application of grammatical knowledge to the vernacular in the first Anglo-Saxon period. One point of contact might have been early English orthography. It is generally assumed that the Anglo-Saxons adopted not only the handwriting used for their vernacular texts – insular minuscule – from the Irish, but their orthographic usage as well. It is conceivable, though, that on matters of spelling they may
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26 The few surviving manuscripts of Tatwine's and Boniface's grammars were written on the Continent, in the eighth and ninth centuries, with the exception of eighth-century fragments of the Ars Grammatica by Boniface, now at Marburg, which come from Southern England; see Gebauer and Löfstedt's edition, vi.


29 For these categories see J.J. Baebler, Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der lateinischen Grammatik im Mittelalter (Halle, 1885), ch.II, and any of the late Roman or early medieval grammars, including that of Ælfric; cf. also Ian Michael, English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800 (Cambridge, 1970).

also have consulted the Latin grammarians. Some of these grammatical writings clearly show the beginnings of articulatory descriptions of speech sounds, and it is possibly here that the origins of English phonetics are to be found. The use of \( b \) and \( f \) in the early Anglo-Saxon glossaries for labial fricatives traceable to originally different sounds is generally taken as an indication that a distinction was still made between the articulation of a bilabial \(<b>\) and a labiodental \(<f>\) consonant. It is interesting to note that Martianus Capella, in his albeit far from perfect description of Latin vowels and consonants, expressly points out this same difference in the articulation of Latin \( b \) and \( f \). This alone, of course, is not enough to suggest any certain link between Anglo-Saxon orthography and Latin grammar.

Whilst nothing definitive can be said about grammar and its teaching in the second Anglo-Saxon period, the ninth century, there is a great deal of evidence available for the third period, particularly from the Benedictine Reform in the tenth century onwards. Which texts were known at this time can be deduced from manuscripts and booklists which have come down to us, as well as from an examination of the sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin writings. What emerges is that some of the Roman grammar texts available in the early period appear to have been lost or discarded in the ninth century. The most important sources are now the writings of Priscian and Donatus; besides these, the grammars of Eutyches and Phocas are also in evidence. Of the encyclopaedic works, Isidore’s *Etymologiae* were in


Martianus Capella, ed. Willis, 68–9, III.261; cf. Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts, vol. II: *The Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, trans. William Harris Stahl and Richard Johnson (New York, 1977), 75. See also Abbo’s *Quaestiones grammaticales*, § 22, for a reference to the articulation of the plosive consonants. Roman grammarians with a specific interest in phonetics were Terentianus Maurus and Marius Victorinus, but there is no certain evidence that their pertinent works were known in Anglo-Saxon England.

See Helmut Gneuss, ‘A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100’, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 9 (1980), 1–60 (a supplement to this list is in preparation), and Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’ (above, note 21).

Tenth- and eleventh-century copies of English provenance are: For Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae*: MSS Jesus College, Cambridge, 28 (s.xi 2, from Durham); Trinity College, Cambridge, O.2.51 part ii (s.xi ex., from Canterbury); Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys 2981(8) (s.xi 2, a fragment); Canterbury Cathedral Add. 12719, with Kent County Archives, Maidstone. PRC 49 la and b (s.ix/x, fragments, probably written in France). For Priscian’s *Institutio de nomine*: MSS Worcester Cathedral Q.5 (s.x ex., from Canterbury); Leningrad Public Library O.v XVI.1 (s.x). For Priscian’s *Partitio*: Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1097 (s.x). For Donatus, *Ars maior*: BL Cotton Cleopatra A vi (s.x 2), and cf. note 39, below. For Eutyches, *Ars de verbo*: Oxford, Bodleian Library Auct. 1 4.32 (s.x, continental, but by s.x at
widespread use, and Martianus Capella was almost certainly accessible as well. To these can be added Bede’s *De orthographia* and Alcuin’s work of the same name. Of the works produced on the Continent during the Carolingian period, the commentaries by Remigius of Auxerre on Donatus, Priscian and Martianus Capella had certainly reached England, together with at least one of the commentaries by Sedulius Scottus. There is no evidence, however, for the availability of the grammars of Alcuin, Hrabanus Maurus and Smaragdus.

A remark on the problems arising from the manuscript transmission of these texts will not be amiss here. Though far more manuscripts have come down to us from the third Anglo-Saxon period than from the first, the survival or chance absence of any manuscripts should not lead us to hasty conclusions. An example will indicate how misleading these could be: if we take Donatus’s *Artes*, there is not a single English manuscript of the *Ars minor* from the tenth and eleventh centuries and only one of the *Ars maior*. From this one could draw entirely false conclusions regarding Donatus’s role in language instruction during the third period.

There can be no doubt that the teaching of Latin and grammar in the Anglo-Saxon monasteries was of paramount importance from the Benedictine Reform onwards. Four of those who taught grammar at abbeys and cathedral priories in the tenth and eleventh centuries are known to us by name: Æthelwold, Abbot of Abingdon until 963 and Bishop of Winchester until 984; his pupil Ælfric, teacher at Cerne Glastonbury). For Phocas, *Ars de nomine et verbo*: Oxford, Bodleian Library Auct. F.2.14 (s.xi, from Sherborne).

36 Manuscripts of the *Etymologiae* of English provenance: Trinity College, Cambridge, B.15.33 (s.x in., from Winchester); BL Royal 6.C.i (s.xi); Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 239 (s.xii/xiii, from Exeter); Oxford, Queen’s College 320 (s.x med., from Northumbria?); Salisbury Cathedral Library 112 (s.xii ex., from Salisbury); Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek K.15: Nr. 28 (s.xi, fragments, from Northumbria?); Paris, BN lat. 4871 (s.xii/xiii, a fragment, written in Northumbria?); Paris, BN lat. 7585 (s.x, written in France). Copies of Martianus Capella are in MSS CCCC 153 (s.xi/xii, written in Wales) and CCCC 330 part i (s.xi/xii, from Malmesbury?); BL Harley 3826 (s.x/xi, from Abingdon?) and CCCC 206 (s.x). Cf. Parkes, ‘A Fragment of an Early-Tenth-Century Manuscript’, 137–40, and note 37 below. For Bede and Alcuin see notes 99 and 102 below; for Cassiodorus’s *Institutiones* see note 106.

37 Remigius on Donatus is an addition (s.xi) in MS Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 47 (from Abingdon); Remigius on Priscian’s *Institutio de nomine* is in BL Cotton Domitian i (s.xi, from St Augustine’s, Canterbury). The commentary on Martianus Capella by Remigius is found in BL Royal 15 A.xxxiii (written at Rheims, s.x in., later at Worcester; this MS also includes a fragment of the commentary on *De nuptiis* by Martinus of Laon), and Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys 2981(5) (s.x in., probably from Winchester; a fragment). Another collection of glosses on Martianus Capella appears in MSS CCCC 330 part ii (written on the Continent, s.x ex.; in England – Malmesbury? – by s.x ex.) and CCCC 153 (s.xii, written in England); for this collection see T.A.M. Bishop, ‘The Corpus Martianus Capella’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1967), 257–75, at 257 n.1. A *Commentum Martianum* was given to Peterborough by Æthelwold, see Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 54–5.

38 See Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 70 and 73.

39 MS BL Cotton Cleopatra A.vi. It is unfortunate that this copy – in which Book II of the *Ars maior* precedes Book I – has not been described or used in Holtz, *Donat*. For copies of Donatus recorded in tenth- and eleventh-century booklists, see Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 51–2 and 75–6.
Abbey from 987 and Abbot of Eynsham from 1005; Abbo of Fleury, who taught at Ramsey Abbey in 985–87 – having gone there not entirely of his own free will, it would seem – and who wrote his *Quaestiones grammaticales* for English readers; and, finally, Byrhtferth, Abbo's pupil in the same abbey, whose largely computistical *Handboc* bears witness to his interest in grammar and rhetoric.⁴⁰

Seen in the context of his contemporaries, and judging by the number of surviving manuscripts, Ælfric and his *Grammar*, together with other textbooks, his *Glossary* and *Colloquy*, must be ascribed an outstanding role. Professor Bullough, however, has rightly observed that 'Students of Old English language and literature . . . have been surprisingly slow to admit the importance and merits of what is, after all, the first grammar in any vernacular'.⁴¹ Ælfric’s work seems indeed to have been born under an unlucky star: Julius Zupitza died before being able to embark on a planned commentary to his critical edition published in 1880.⁴² Since then no such commentary nor any new edition of the work has appeared.⁴³

Of the two prefaces in Ælfric’s *Grammar*, the first – in Latin – is of particular interest to us. Though addressed to the *pueruli tenelli* of the monastery, the ‘tender boys’, it is clearly directed at the ‘experts’, in contrast to the second preface in Old English with its didactic and moralizing tone. Ælfric here follows his practice of prefacing his works with two differently conceived forewords, as in the *Catholic Homilies* and the *Lives of Saints*.

In the Latin *Praefatio* to his *Grammar*, Ælfric begins by announcing his intention: his purpose in writing this book (which he calls ‘has excerptiones de Prisciano minore vel maiore’) is ‘quatinus perfectis

⁴⁰ For Æthelwold, see now Michael Lapidge, ‘Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher’, *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence*, ed. Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1988), 89–117. Both Ælfric and Wulfstan record that Æthelwold had studied grammar and metrics while he was a monk at Glastonbury, and it seems reasonable to assume that Dunstan was his teacher, or one of his teachers in these subjects there; see *Three Lives of English Saints*, ed. Michael Winterbottom (Toronto, 1972), 19 and 39. For Abbo, see the introduction to the edition by Guerreau-Jalabert (above, note 5); for Byrhtferth, *Byrhtferth’s Manual*, ed. S.J. Crawford, EETS O.S. 177 (London, 1929), and Cyril Hart, ‘Byrhtferth and his Manual’, *Medium Ævum*, 41 (1972), 95–109.


octo partibus Donati in isto libello potes testim utramque linguam, videlicet Latinam et Anglicam, vestrae teneritundini inserere interim, usque quo ad perfectiora perveniatis studia.\textsuperscript{44} The pupils are thus evidently already familiar with the elementary concepts of grammar—probably from Donatus’s \textit{Ars minor}; by the \textit{perfectiora studia} Ælfric presumably refers to the study of Priscian’s more demanding \textit{Institutiones grammaticae}. What the Anglo-Saxon pupil now needed was something to bridge the gap, namely a grammar for purely practical purposes which would initiate him into the complex field of Latin morphology among other things. The situation is thus similar to that in the first period, when Tatwine and Boniface wrote their books, and it determines the content of Ælfric’s \textit{Grammar}, dealing as it does on 280 of its 296 pages (in the printed edition) with the eight parts of speech. 215 of these pages are devoted to the noun (which still includes the adjective), the pronoun and the verb (excluding the participle). A few pages on \textit{vox, littera, sillaba} and \textit{dyptongus} precede this major section, while the book is rounded off by brief definitions of thirty terms from grammar, prosody and style mainly taken from Book I of Isidore’s \textit{Etymologiae}.

What is significant about Ælfric’s \textit{Grammar} is that his Latin definitions, examples and quotations have largely been translated into English, or indeed the explanations are given only in English. But is this an effective means of learning Old English, as Ælfric seems to imply in his Latin preface? His \textit{Grammar} offers no systematic treatment of the morphology of Old English nor of its grammatical peculiarities. By \textit{utramque linguam} Ælfric seems to have been referring to something else, namely that with the help of this grammar a pupil could at the same time acquire the ability to describe his own language in precise grammatical terms, drawing on the categories used for Latin; thus he expressly notes elsewhere that English too has eight parts of speech (\textit{Grammar}, 11.5–7).

Ælfric’s Latin preface continues with a justification of his decision to offer English translations in his grammar, as well as clear and simple explanations (\textit{simplicem interpretationem}), following the example of his teacher Æthelwold. He explains his failure to treat prosody on grounds of the difficulty in translating the terminology, though this will not have been the only reason; Ælfric’s principal aim was, after

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Grammar}, 1.5–8 ‘so that when you have gone through Donatus on the Parts of Speech, you may be able to instil both languages, Latin and English, into your youthful minds, by this little book, until you reach more advanced studies’; from the translation of Ælfric’s Latin preface by Arthur F. Leach, \textit{Educational Charters and Documents, 598 to 1909} (Cambridge, 1909), 49. The passage has been misunderstood because the phrase ‘in isto libello’ has been variously misconstrued in translations by Lawrence Kennedy Shook, ‘Ælfric’s Latin Grammar: A Study in Old English Grammatical Terminology’ (Harvard University Ph.D. thesis, 1939), 17, James Hurt, \textit{Ælfric} (New York, 1972), 107–8 (from Shook), and Pierre Riché, ‘L’
all, to impart a sound knowledge of the language as a preliminary step towards the *perfectiora studia*.

A final remark in the preface which appears at first glance incidental may well have been of fundamental importance to Ælfric. He criticizes the fact that words like the Latin *pater* with a short initial syllable in verse are pronounced by many in the same way – 'brittonice' – in prose, despite the fact that by his time the vowels of open syllables in Latin disyllabic works had become lengthened: 'mihi tamen videtur melius invocare deum patrem honorifice producta sillaba, quam brittonice corripere, quia nec deus arti grammaticae subiciendus est.'45 A similar remark is to be found elsewhere in the *Grammar* (242.6–8): 'de intus wiðinnan, de foris wiðutan forbead Donatus to cwėdennæ, ac hi standað þeah on halgum bocum.'46 Ælfric was thus obviously conversant with the debate on the relationship between grammar and the language of the Scriptures. His comment in the *Praefatio* may well go back to the much-cited remark of Gregory the Great in a letter to Bishop Leander of Seville which accompanied his *Moralia*: '... quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati'.47 Ælfric clearly was able to unite reverence for the work of God with the patent necessity of Latin instruction.

As already mentioned, Ælfric’s *Grammar* concentrates on inflectional morphology. Thus it distinguishes eight types of perfect in the third conjugation (164.15–182.2) and seventy-eight endings in the third declension (32.13–75.18). A number of his example sentences and words are Christianized (cf. 12.1, 29.12–13, 30.13, 32.5–6, 43.9–11, 96.12–13, 201.8–11, 273.13–15) and anglicized (8.10–11, 8.14, 11.17, 13.5, 15.3–4). The contrastive nature of the grammar is reflected not only in the English definitions but also in repeated references to Old English usage (as in 5.14–16, 99.3, 134.18, 279.12–280.14).48

It is of particular interest that, in translating the Latin grammatical terms into English, Ælfric has created – with the help of loan-words and above all loan-formations and semantic loans – a

45 *Grammar*, 2.9–11: ‘But in my opinion it is better to invoke God the Father “Deus pater”, giving Him honour by making the syllable long than by making it short like the Britons, for God ought not to be subject to the rules of grammar’; Leach, *Educational Charters*, 49. On the quantity of this Latin syllable as pronounced by Ælfric see Otto Funke, *Die gelehrten lateinischen Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der altenglischen Literatur* (Halle, 1914), 51–3, and Alien, *Vox Latina*, 102.


complete system of linguistic terminology.\textsuperscript{49} One might ask whether he provided the English terms merely to facilitate instruction, as if supplying interlinear glosses for this purpose, but otherwise adhering to the Latin terminology. We must try to find out, therefore, whether these English terms won widespread acknowledgement. There is indeed some evidence to support this. Ælfric himself may be using \textit{dael} in the sense of ‘pars orationis’, in the preface to his translation of Genesis\textsuperscript{50} just as in his \textit{Grammar}. The translation of \textit{vocalium as para fif clipiendra stafa} in the Old English version of the Rule of Chrodegag of Metz is similarly consistent with Ælfric’s practice, if this is not in fact an indication that his vernacular terminology goes back to the school of Æthelwold in Winchester.\textsuperscript{51}

Byrhtferth, too, refers to certain grammatical concepts in his \textit{Handboc}\textsuperscript{52} by English terms, not all of which, however, correspond with Ælfric’s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin term</th>
<th>Ælfric’s Grammar</th>
<th>Byrhtferth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>declinatio</td>
<td>declinung, gebigednyss</td>
<td>declinung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>nama</td>
<td>nama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronomen</td>
<td>naman speiend</td>
<td>binama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbum</td>
<td>word</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbium</td>
<td>wordes gefera</td>
<td>biword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participium</td>
<td>dælnimend</td>
<td>nymend dæl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conunctio</td>
<td>gebeodonys, feging</td>
<td>gefegnyss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cf. figura]</td>
<td>gefegednyss, hiw]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syllaba</td>
<td>stægefeg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It therefore seems feasible that, with Ælfric’s \textit{Grammar}, his terminology might also have come to Ramsey, where Byrhtferth attempted to develop it by adding to it terms like \textit{binama} and \textit{biword}. Byrhtferth


\textsuperscript{50} \textit{The Old English Version of the Heptateuch}, ed. S.J. Crawford, EETS O.S. 160 (London, 1922, repr. with addenda by N.R. Ker, 1969), 76.13. This is the well-known passage in which Ælfric recounts that a priest who once taught him ‘cude be daele Lyden understandan’; it is translated as ‘[he] was able to understand Latin by part of speech’ by Jeannine M. Bender-Davis, ‘Ælfric’s Techniques of Translation and Adaptation as Seen in the Composition of his Old English \textit{Latin Grammar}’ (Pennsylvania State University Ph.D. thesis, 1985), 25, but \textit{be dael} in this passage is usually taken to mean ‘partly, in part’.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegag together with the Latin Original}, ed. Arthur S. Napier, EETS O.S. 150 (London, 1916), 48.11. That this Old English translation was produced by a member of the community of the Old Minster, Winchester, around 1000, has been conclusively shown by Max Förster, ‘Lokalisierung und Datierung der althochdeutschen Version der Chrodegag-Regel’, \textit{Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist.Abt.}, Jahrgang 1933, Schlussheft, 7–8. See also Walter Hofstetter, \textit{Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch: Untersuchungen zur geographischen und zeitlichen Verbreitung altenglischer Synonyme} (München, 1987), 94–100.

\textsuperscript{52} Byrhtferth’s \textit{Manual}, 94.
indeed goes further than this in creating Old English terms for six of the seventeen figures of speech he discusses; also, like Ælfric (Grammar, 295.4), he uses Old English hiw with the loan-meaning of 'schema' or 'figura', i.e. 'figure of speech'.

One would like to assume that Ælfric was familiar with the writings of Priscian and Donatus, and of other Latin grammarians as well. As has now been established, the main source of his Grammar, however, was the Excerptiones de Prisciano, a Latin work extant in three eleventh-century manuscripts and which is still unpublished. These Excerptiones may have originated on the Continent; they are based on Priscian's writings (Institutiones grammaticae, Instituto de nomine, Partitiones, De accentibus) and on the grammars of Donatus; also, the commentary by Sergius and Isidore's Etymologiae have been used. Ælfric adapted and supplemented the Excerptiones for his specific purpose.

The standard of Latin among the Anglo-Saxons after the Benedictine Reform has recently come in for some rather disparaging criticism, but the skill and precision alone with which Ælfric analysed and taught Latin, and the extent to which his Grammar is known to have been used, would seem to belie such negative judgements. It would be equally mistaken to conclude from Ælfric's Grammar that language instruction at the time did not go beyond the basics and the teaching of morphology. This is shown beyond any doubt by Abbo of Fleury's Quaestiones grammaticales, which offer us a glimpse of his teaching methods at Ramsey Abbey. The Quaestiones, which arose from his classes there, were possibly meant for a wider circle of readers in England and even on the Continent; several copies were at any rate made at Fleury. The book, which was not meant to be a systematic grammar, deals with selected difficult points of accent and vowel quantity, the pronunciation of consonants, inflexion, Greek loanwords in Latin, and matters of syntax.

54 For the Excerptiones de Prisciano and their adaptation by Ælfric, see Law, 'Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric's "Excerptiones . . ."'; and Bender-Davis, 'Ælfric's Techniques'. The most thorough study of Ælfric's sources (still based on the assumption that Ælfric used Priscian, Donatus and other late Latin authors directly) is Teresa Paroli, 'Le opere grammaticali di Ælfric', Istituto Orientale di Napoli: Annali, Sezione Germanica, 10 (1967), 5–43, and 11 (1968), 35–133.
55 For critical views of Anglo-Saxon learning in the late period, see Gneuss, 'Anglo-Saxon Libraries' (note 6, above), 680–1 and n.115; for the popularity and the manuscript transmission of Ælfric's Grammar, ibid., 668, and Law, 'Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric's "Excerptiones . . ."', 63–4. A Donatus anglice, listed in the library catalogue of Christ Church, Canterbury, about 1170, and similar entries in other medieval library catalogues may well refer to Ælfric's textbook; see R.M. Wilson, The Lost Literature of Medieval England, second edition (London, 1970), 77–9 and 83. There is no evidence for the claim that this Donatus anglice was the first English translation of the Ars minor: see Erika Ising, Die Herausbildung der Grammatik der Volkssprachen in Mittel- und Osteuropa: Studien über den Einfluss der lateinischen Elementargrammatik des Aelius Donatus (Berlin, 1970), 29.
56 For the manuscript transmission of Abbo's Quaestiones, see the edition by Guerreau-Jalabert, 199–200, and Bullough, 'The Educational Tradition'. 484.
Ælfric concludes his Grammar (289–96) with a section entitled Triginta divisiones grammaticae artis, in which he still follows the Excerptiones de Prisciano, here based mainly on Isidore (cf. Etymologiae I.v.4), in giving concise definitions of thirty concepts. Some of these belong to grammar in our narrower sense of the word (littera, vox, sillaba, octo partes orationis, orthographia), some are metrical terms (pedes, accentus), and others describe stylistic faults (barbarismus, soloecismus, vitia) or literary genres (fabula, historia). Those of interest from our point of view are the concepts which today belong to distinct linguistic disciplines: glossa, ethimologia, differentia, and schemata and tropi. It is these to which I should like to turn my attention now.

GLOSSA
The early Middle Ages possessed no dictionary of Latin or of any vernacular in our sense of a comprehensive, alphabetical compilation of the vocabulary of a language. For Latin, Isidore’s Etymologiae filled the gap to a certain extent, but they were arranged according to subject. Nonius Marcellus’s De compendiosa doctrina may have been accessible in the first Anglo-Saxon period, but there is no evidence that Paul the Deacon’s epitome of De verborum significatione, the dictionary by Sextus Pompeius Festus, was available in England. The Latin scholar in Anglo-Saxon times was evidently expected to have a very broad vocabulary at his fingertips. Glosses and glossaries were available only for difficult or obscure words, and in this bore out Ælfric’s definition: ‘glossa, þæt is glesing, þonne man glesd þa earfodan word mid eðran ledene’ – ‘when one glosses the difficult words with easier words in Latin’.

Quite early on glosses in the vernacular began to appear beside the Latin glosses. ‘The Anglo-Saxon glosses are part of the Anglo-Saxon literary heritage,’ Professor Eric Stanley has aptly remarked. More is the pity that the Anglo-Saxon glossaries have been passed over in literary histories and even in bibliographies of Old English literature, though one has to admit that they are among the more taxing subjects of English philology. This is partly due to the type of words they contain and partly to the way in which they were compiled. Unlike a copyist of prose or poetry, the compiler of a glossary was

57 For knowledge of Nonius Marcellus in early Anglo-Saxon England, see Manitius, ‘Zu Aldhelm und Baeda’, 599–600; W.M. Lindsay, The Corpus, Épinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries (London, 1921), 85–6; Pheifer, Old English Glosses, lvi. For the manuscript transmission of Paul the Deacon’s Epitome, see Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli Epitome, ed. Wallace M. Lindsay (Leipzig, 1913), xix–xxi; Gernot R. Wieland, The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.5.35 (Toronto, 1983), 172, considers it possible that the Epitome was used by an eleventh-century English glossator. See also J. Tolkiehn, ‘Lexikographie’, RE, 23 (1924), 2432–82, at 2479–82, for Roman lexicography.

58 Grammar, 293.13–17; cf. Isidore, Etymologiae, I.xxx, who does not speak of ‘difficult’ or ‘easier’ words.

entirely free to adapt his source or sources, adding and deleting at will. This renders the investigation of the sources and interrelationships of the Anglo-Saxon glossaries a laborious task; even experts on Old English literature must occasionally be tempted to believe that we are here grappling with some esoteric science. Another problem involved has already been mentioned: so far only the predominantly bilingual glossaries from the Anglo-Saxon period have been examined in any detail, and we are sadly lacking in editions of Latin–Latin and Greek–Latin glossaries of English provenance.60

The glossaries can be divided into two types: subject-based or alphabetical. Those arranged according to subject (‘class glossaries’) were designed largely for teaching and self-instruction, and drew on Isidore’s Etymologiae as their main source. The best example available is the Glossary which Ælfric appended to his Grammar.61 The development of alphabetical glossaries, clearly meant for reference purposes, like dictionaries, has been repeatedly described.62 At first lemmata and glosses are excerpted from glossed texts. In this first stage they are listed separately in ‘batches’ from each text and in order of their appearance in the text (i.e. not alphabetically and often in varying inflexional forms). This stage we refer to as glossae collectae. It is followed by the alphabetized stages, beginning with glossaries arranged according to the first letter (a-order), which still contain many ‘batches’ of glosses from the individual text sources; then come glossaries in ab-order, and finally those in abc-order.

A detailed treatment of the Anglo-Saxon glossaries would be misplaced here. I shall restrict myself to a few points which are directly relevant to the topic at hand, and to glossaries in which the Latin lemmata are consistently or selectively provided with English glosses.63 It is notable here that the compilation of glosses and glossaries in England, and the interpretation of lemmata with the aid of Old English words, goes back as far as the seventh century and the

60 For manuscripts with Latin–Latin and Greek–Latin glossaries, see Lapidge, ‘The Present State of Anglo–Latin Studies’, n.141. It should also be noted here that several existing editions of Latin–Old English glossaries are incomplete as they omit the lemmata that have only been glossed in Latin; cf. note 72 below.


school of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury. Here is the home of what Dr Lapidge, in a seminal essay, has called the ‘original English collection of glosses’. Comprehensive selections of this material are to be found among the glossae collectae in the Leiden manuscript Voss. lat. Q.69 (written around 800 in St Gall), as well as in other manuscripts, mostly from the Continent. The earliest English glossaries also drew on this source – the Épinal glossary, written in England in the late seventh century (and closely related to the Erfurt glossary compiled in Cologne in the late eighth or early ninth century), and the Corpus glossary, written in Canterbury in the first half of the ninth century. All three have very recently been published in an excellent facsimile edition. For these glossaries other sources besides the ‘original English collection’ were used, too, among them certainly material that had come to England from the Continent. The sources and interrelationships of the early Anglo-Saxon glossaries have been treated in a number of authoritative studies.

We come to the bilingual glossaries of the third period. They are mainly preserved in five manuscripts written between the mid-tenth and early eleventh centuries, and in two twelfth-century manuscripts containing herbal glossaries. From these we may conclude that all or most English libraries were equipped with glossaries not only in the early period, but in the tenth and eleventh centuries as well. It is unlikely, however, that there was one ‘standard glossary’, or several such, since – with one exception – the collections of glosses in the later manuscripts vary considerably. What is significant, though, is that almost all the glossaries in these manuscripts – including the lists of herbs – contain materials traceable to early English glossography and related to the Épinal, Erfurt and Corpus glossaries. This would indicate that, among the books from the early period which had

64 Lapidge, ‘The School of Theodore and Hadrian’, 57.
65 A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary Preserved in the Library of the Leiden University, ed. Hessels; Lapidge, ‘The School of Theodore and Hadrian’, 54–72, which includes a list and bibliography of all relevant continental manuscripts.
67 Most recently by Pfeifer, ‘Early Anglo-Saxon Glossaries’ (see note 28, above), with references to earlier literature on the subject, and by the same author in the facsimile edition (quoted in note 66, above), 49–63.
68 Tenth- and eleventh-century glossaries: The manuscripts listed in note 61 above; MS BL Cotton Otho E.i (a fragmentary copy of the first glossary in Cleopatra A.iii); MS BL Harley 3376. The plant glossaries: MSS Durham Cathedral Library Hunter 100 and Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud misc. 567; for the latter, there is now the printed edition by J. Richard Stracke, The Laud Herbal Glossary (Amsterdam, 1974).
69 For the sources and relationships of the later Anglo-Saxon glossaries see the editions listed by Cameron; H. Lübke, ‘Über verwandtschaftliche Beziehungen einiger altenglischer Glossare’, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 85 (1890), 383–410; Old English Glosses, ed. Pfeifer, xxxi–xxix.
survived into the third period, there were other manuscripts besides Épinal and Corpus that contained glossaries and could be put to practical use from the time of the Benedictine Reform onwards. If these books survived the ninth century, then so might many more texts than we have hitherto been led to believe.

The tradition of general bilingual glossaries comes to an end in the early Middle English period. They are replaced by the great Latin dictionaries of Papias, Osbern of Gloucester, Hugutio and Johannes Balbus. Could the glossaries of the Old English period also have served as dictionaries, at least of hard words? Leaving aside the herbal lists, a typical English glossary manuscript at this time looked rather unlike a dictionary; it resembled a more or less haphazard collection of individual glossaries or elements of such, as is the case with MSS BL Cotton Cleopatra A.iii, Brussels 1828–30, and with the collection now divided between Antwerp Plantin-Moretus 47 and London BL Add.MS 32246. A very different picture emerges from BL Harley 3376, on which J.D. Pheifer has this to say: ‘Harley is the fullest and most elaborate of the Old English glossaries, and the only one that treats its material at all intelligently, but its textual value is limited by the lack of coherent batches and the practice of combining material from different sources in a single interpretation.’

This brings me to an important point. Questions concerning a glossary’s textual value, its sources and relationships to other glossaries are of course perfectly legitimate. But should we not also be asking about the practical purpose and use of a glossary? What were the principles guiding the choice of lemmata? Does it contain only rare or difficult words, or common vocabulary as well? Was it designed for the reader of demanding texts, such as Aldhelm’s poetry and prose (which played an important role in the glossaries of the third period), or for the less ambitious user? Are there any developments which could point to the possible, later evolution of a full-fledged dictionary? I believe this last question can be answered in the positive, particularly when one considers the Harley glossary. Its ‘limited textual value’ in fact constitutes its merit: for the contemporary user it was of little concern whether the sources of a particular glossary were evident – he was primarily interested in the lexical information it provided. The Harley glossary – or rather what remains of it – gives 5,563 entries in abc-order for words beginning with the letters A–F. Extrapolating from this figure, the complete glossary would have contained roughly 12–14,000 entries, thus approaching the format of a dictionary. About a third of the surviving lemmata have English glosses, many have several Latin and Old English equivalents. Regrettably, the only complete edition is unsatisfactory. I think we should welcome an

70 *Old English Glosses*, ed. Pheifer, xxxvi.
71 Especially in the first and third glossaries in MSS BL Cleopatra A iii, and in Harley 3376
investigation of the Anglo-Saxon glossaries from the point of view of their value and use as practical linguistic handbooks.

ETYMOLOGY
Since the nineteenth century etymological research has been determined by sound laws and the principles of semantic probability. Antiquity, the Middle Ages and subsequent eras up to the eighteenth century had to make do without such precise criteria, and have earned themselves enough reproaches on this count. But contemporaries of these eras, from Quintilian to Samuel Johnson, had themselves already expressed scepticism of this 'old-style' etymology. Only recently has it begun to be viewed with more sympathetic eyes again.

The Anglo-Saxons were naturally familiar with the etymological methods of Roman Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, which sought to disclose the true meaning of a word by tracing it back to its origins. This could be achieved (1) by analysis of a compound or derivative (which we would see as belonging to the study of word-formation – indeed, since the late Middle Ages the term 'etymology' could be used to refer to the morphological section of a grammar); (2) by explaining a word in terms of onomatopoeia or sound symbolism; and, perhaps most frequently, (3) by association with one or more other words, usually similar-sounding, which were felt to shed light on the meaning of the word in question, such as when Cassiodorus (Institutiones, II.ii.17) writes 'disciplina enim dicta est, quia discitur plena'. The last technique was applied with a liberality that was to earn this style of etymology its less than positive reputation: letters were omitted, added and substituted as it suited the purposes of establishing relationships between various words. In the Middle Ages it then became an important aim to imbue words – particularly from the Bible – with a spiritual and allegorical dimension by means of etymological interpretation. This was frequently pursued where biblical names were concerned. It should also be mentioned here that this traditional etymological interest in proper names went back to reviews by René Derolez, *English Studies*, 51 (1970), 149–51, and Hans Schabram, *Angha*, 86 (1968), 495–500. The edition in Thomas Wright and Richard Paul Wulcker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies* (London, 1884), I, 192–247, covers only the lemmata glossed in Old English and therefore just about a third of the whole glossary.


75 For an instructive collection of examples see Wölflin, ‘Die Etymologien’. 
Classical Antiquity. The etymological knowledge and practice of the Anglo-Saxons can thus be traced to several sources: on the one hand there is the Classical grammatical tradition which had evolved from the times of Plato and the Stoa, and on the other the interpretation of biblical names. To this must be added a tradition that goes back to the discipline of rhetoric: etymology could serve as an argument in an oration.

For the Anglo-Saxon reader there was no lack of etymologies; they were of course generously represented in Isidore's encyclopaedia and – for the biblical-onomastic tradition – in Jerome's Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum. As far as the methodological principles of etymology were concerned, the Anglo-Saxons knew Varro's name, but not his De lingua Latina. They could find, however, brief definitions of etymologia in Cassiodorus's Institutiones (II.i.2) or in his commentary on the Psalms. More importantly, they could read the detailed treatment in Isidore's Etymologiae (I.xxix) and in De dialec-tica, a work ascribed to St Augustine, which was available to them by the third period at the latest. Ælfric, too, in his Grammar (293.5–12), follows Isidore. Anglo-Saxon authors were not slow to take up the etymological method themselves. Many, though by no means all, of the etymologies in their Old English and Anglo-Latin writings naturally went back to the Early Fathers. A comprehensive inventory and analysis of the etymological activities of the Anglo-Saxons has yet to be

77 This tradition is discussed by de Porck, 'Etymologia et Origo'
78 Sanctus Hieronymus, Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum, ed. Paul de Lagarde, in S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera. I: Opera exegetica, CCSL 72 (Turnhout, 1959); the date of this edition is misleading; it is taken over from de Lagarde's Onomastica sacra, second edition (Göttingen, 1887), 57–161. This was no doubt a standard work of reference in Anglo-Saxon libraries. For the early period see J.D.A. Ogilvie, Books Known to the English, 597–1066 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 179; for the late period see the studies cited in note 81, below. A copy written in France (s.ix) came to Malmesbury in the tenth century; it is now MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Marshall 19. When the abbey of Peterborough had been restored (c.966), Bishop Æthelwold supplied it with a number of books which included an Expositio Hebreorum nominum, probably Jerome's work; see Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists', 53–4. Late eleventh-century English copies of the work are in MSS Durham Cathedral B ii.11 (from Durham) and Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 808 (from Exeter).
79 Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Expositio Psalmorum, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 97–98 (Turnhout, 1958), I.30. This work also contains numerous etymological explanations; it appears to have been well-known throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. Cf. Ogilvie, Books Known to the English, 108, and Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists', 47 and 73. Fragments from two eighth-century Anglo-Saxon copies are St John's College, Cambridge, Aa.5.1., fo. 67, and Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek s.n.; an eighth-century abbreviated version, written in Northumbria (from York?), survives in MS Durham Cathedral B ii.30. For the possible use of Cassiodorus's commentary in Old English interlinear versions of the psalter, see Helmut Gneuss, Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenenglischen (Berlin, 1955), passim.
80 Augustine, De dialectica, ed. Jan Pinborg, translated with introduction and notes by B. Darrell Jackson (Dordrecht, 1975), ch.VI. A tenth-century copy of the 'textus receptus' of this work is in MS CCC 206; this was written on the Continent, according to T.A.M. Bishop, English Caroline Minuscule (Oxford, 1971), xii n.2, but Professor Bernhard Bischoff informs me that he considers it to be written in an English hand. For the terminology and etymological method of Isidore of Seville, see Joseph Engels. 'La portée de l’etymologie isidorienne', Studi Medievali, 3rd ser., 3 (1962), 99–128.
undertaken, and I offer here only a few remarks on this subject.

Interpretations of biblical names seem to have been the most popular. Their role in Old English poetry and in Ælfric’s homilies has been the subject of stimulating essays by Fred Robinson and Joyce Hill. Ælfric also explains foreign words like Genesis and the relationship between Messias, Christus, ‘unctus on Leden’, translating them as gesmyrod. Similarly, explanations of names, and of words of Greek (and Latin) origin are provided in ‘etymological glosses’.

It is questionable, though, whether such interpretations of names and foreign words can be regarded as etymologies in the strict sense rather than simply as translations.

English authors also explain Latin words by means of other Latin words: Ælfric, following Isidore, derives rex ‘a regendo’ and homo ‘frum humo’, while Byrhtferth, following Bede, discusses the source of Latin autumnum. Long before Ælfric and Byrhtferth, Aldhelm had employed the etymological method in his Latin Enigmata, while Bede even tried his hand at Greek etymology. But it is the etymologies of Old English words that are of prime interest to us. Here, too, proper names were given attention. Felix, in his life of St Guthlac, interprets the saint’s name, and Goscelin of Canterbury in the late eleventh century translates the Abbess of Barking’s name, Ælfgifu (latinized as Alviva), as Dei gratia or gratia cara, the latter etymology at least being obviously false.

Etymologies of Old English common nouns are of key interest to us, but they are evidently few and far between. It is possible that the Old English prose version of Solomon and Saturn contains an attempt to find an English parallel to the traditional Latin etymology of caelum (from celare) in the explanation of Old English heofon as ‘forþon he behelað eall ðæt gehofan byð’ – ‘because it conceals everything that


83 Geometry, 293.5–12; Byrhtferth’s Manual, 92.9–13; see also Wieland, The Latin Glosses, 172–80.


is above it'. In Ælfric’s homilies the word family *hælend – hælan – hæl* is discussed as well as the origin and meaning of the Old English *godspell*: ‘Sume menn nyton gewiss, for heora nytenyssse, hwi godspell is gecweden, objec hwæt godspell gemæne. Godspell is witodlice Godes sylfes lar . . . ’ – ‘gospel is certainly God’s own teaching’, clearly a ‘false’ etymology from a modern standpoint; but it is taken up again three lines further on by a play on words that provides the ‘correct’ explanation: ‘and þæt is swyðe gód spell’ – ‘and that is a very good message’ – where the stress mark on *gód*, added by the scribe, leaves us in no doubt.

The increasing unreliability of etymologies of English words must also be seen as a result of language development. In the so-called *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* (32.1), which probably go back to the second half of the twelfth century, the word *gerefa* (spelt *greve* here) is explained as a compound of English *grith* (‘quod est pax Latine’) and Latin *ue* (= *vae*): ‘scilicet quod debet facere grith i.e. pacem ex illis qui inferunt in terram ue, i.e. miseriam uel dolorem’ – ‘who must make peace with those who cause the land grief’. It should be mentioned, finally, that it is not always certain whether Anglo-Saxon authors intended simply a play on words or an actual etymology, as Roberta Frank has very effectively shown for Old English biblical poetry.

**DIFFERENTIA**

Semantics is today regarded as a relatively young discipline, though clearly the meaning of words has always played an essential role in any concern with language. Thus in Anglo-Saxon England, grammar, etymology, glossing and glossaries were closely tied up with the study of meaning. One of the main tasks and problems in this field was the differentiation and choice of synonyms – under which term I include word pairs or groups of words that are not strict semantic equivalents, i.e. ‘homoionyms’ as well as genuine synonyms. Their correct use had to be mastered as part of learning a foreign language such as Latin, but it also played a role in Old English: certain words, for example, were confined to prose or poetry, and individual ‘schools’ such as that at

---

89 *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. Pope, I.357.1–6; cf. also Ælfric’s Glossary, 304.6: ‘evangelium, id est bonum nuntium, godspell’ (omitted in the late manuscript from Worcester), and Isidor. *Etymologiae*, VI.ii.43. The shortening of *o* in *godspell* must have occurred early, as can be seen from the form in which it was adopted in Old High German, *gotspel*; see Hans Eggers, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, I (Reinbek, 1963), 166; Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, § 204.1, and Campbell. *Old English Grammar*, § 285.
91 Roberta Frank, ‘Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse’, *Speculum*, 47 (1972), 207–26; see also Opelt, ‘Etymologie’, 842–3, on ‘Zweckfreies Etymologisieren. Wortspiele’
Winchester in the tenth century evidently taught certain principles of word selection. Synonyms could of course also serve stylistic ends; one example may be the use of doublets in Old English prose translation, when two or more Old English equivalents were provided as translations or glosses of Latin words.

For this area of study, too, the Anglo-Saxons could draw on collections and systematic treatises by Latin authors – the *differentiarum scriptores* and their successors in the early Middle Ages in particular, and also the authors of works about *orthographia*. Differentia, however, covered not only synonyms in our sense, but included homonyms and similar-sounding words as well. Two works by Isidore of Seville are of particular note here, both of which – as the surviving manuscripts indicate – must have been in widespread use in England very early on. They were the handbook entitled *Libri differentiarum* (whose first part is directly relevant to our topic), and the *Synonyma de lamentatione animae peccatoris*, in which the literary uses of synonyms are demonstrated by means of a dialogue between Man and Reason. The *Synonyma* were already known to Aldhelm; they served as a source for two of the Vercelli Homilies. Ælfric’s definition of *differentia* in his


95 The first book, *De differentiis verborum*, is printed in *PL* 83, 9–70; cf. Manitius, *Geschichte*, I,67–9. Eighth-century English manuscripts of Isidore’s work are Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.iii.151; Leningrad Q.v.1.15; St Omer, Bibl. munici. 279 (fragments). A treatise based on *De differentiis rerum* (the second book of the work) and the *Etymologiae* is in MS BL Royal S.E.xvi, from Salisbury, s.xi ex. Among the books given by Æthelwold to Peterborough is a Liber *differentiarum*, and two copies with the same title are in a booklist probably from Peterborough, s.xi/xii; see Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 54–5 and 78–81. A Liber *de differentiis* in MS Salisbury 125 (s.xi ex., from Salisbury) has not been identified. Apparently it is not the work by Isidore.

96 Isidore’s *Synonyma* are printed in *PL* 83, 825–68. Surviving English manuscripts of the *Synonyma* are Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.p.th.f.79 and Leningrad Q.v.1.15, both s.viii, from Southern England; Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, fos. 170–224, written in France s.ix, but in England by s.xvi; Salisbury 173, written on the Continent s.x and in England by s.xi med.; BL Harley 110, written probably at Christ Church, Canterbury, s.x ex; Royal S.E.xix, from Salisbury, s.xi ex. A copy of the work was among the books given by Æthelwold to Peterborough, cf. Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 53–4.

Grammar (293.18-294.3) also goes back to Isidore's *Etymologiae* (I.xxxi). In addition, a collection of synonyms attributed to Cicero was known in England by the third period at the latest.98 The most important source for the Anglo-Saxon concern with *differentiae* is Bede's *De orthographia*, a work designed for both formal instruction and reference purposes that has been compared, not inappropriately, with Fowler's *Modern English Usage*.99 It treats in alphabetical order a large selection of synonyms and near-homonyms, besides dealing with other questions of grammar. Bede draws largely on Latin grammarians, among them the works on *orthographia* by Pseudo-Caper and Agroecius.100 It might be a rewarding task to examine whether the selection Bede has made is guided by the particular problems that Latin presented to the Anglo-Saxons.101 The role of Anglo-Saxon glossaries - and of Latin interlinear glosses - for the study of synonyms in this period has also still to be investigated. The demand for a handbook such as Bede's *De orthographia* is underlined by the fact that Alcuin produced a work by the same title which was largely based on Bede's book, and came to England in the third Anglo-Saxon period.102

98 For this collection see Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I, fourth edition (1927), 548–9; two versions have been edited by W.L. Mahne, *M. Tullii Cicercis Synonyma ad Luctum Veterrum* (Leyden, 1850 and 1851). A copy written s.x on the Continent is in MS Oxford, Bodleian Library Barlow 35, which reached England by the early eleventh century; this is a version which differs from both printed by Mahne, see F. Liebermann, 'Aus Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen*, 92 (1894), 413–4. Ogilvie, *Books Known to the English*, 114, mentions a copy of the *Synonyma*, now lost, in MS Cambridge University Library Gg.5.35, but what the old contents list of this manuscript records is *Orationes Ciceronis*; see A.G. Rigg and G.R. Wieland, 'A Canterbury Classbook of the Mid-Eleventh Century (the “Cambridge Songs” Manuscript)', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 113–30, at 118, and cf. plate II.

99 Bede's *De orthographia* was edited by C.W. Jones in *Bedae Venerabilis Opera. Pars I: Opera didascalica*, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975), 1–57. The most important study of this work is by Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, 'On Bede, Grammars and Greek', *Revue Bénédictine*, 92 (1982), 111–41. Surviving English manuscripts from the later period are: CCCC 221, fos. 1–24, usually dated s.ix and considered continental, cf. Dionisotti, 137, and Rodney Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1987), 61 n.140, but Professor Bischoff thinks it is English and dates it as probably s.x; BL Harley 3826, s.x/xi, from Abingdon? Both manuscripts combine Bede's work with Alcuin's *De orthographia*. On Old English glossary material as the source of Bede's *De orthographia*, see Brown, 'The Epinal Glossary', 71. The entry in Lowell Kindschi, 'The Latin–Old English Glossaries in Plantin-Moretus MS 32 and British Museum Additional 32,246' (Stanford University Ph.D. thesis, 1955), 201 on *iuuentas, iuentas, iuuentas* – related to Bede, *De orthographia*, ed. Jones, 569–70 – is an example of an Anglo-Saxon glossator's interest in *differentiae*.

100 Such works appear to have been of interest in the later Anglo-Saxon period, too; an English manuscript written s.x/xi, CCCC 221, fos. 25–64, contains copies of the treatises headed *De orthographia* by Cassiodorus, Pseudo-Caper and Agroecius. These were bound together with copies of Bede's and Alcuin's works, see preceding footnote. An attempt to link certain entries in Bede's book with the phonology of Old English has been made by Zaffagnino, see note 5, above.

RHETORIC

No discussion of grammar can ignore rhetoric – these two artes liberales go hand in hand. It is generally assumed today that the Anglo-Saxons were familiar with the principles of classical rhetoric and applied them in practice. What is certain at any rate is that they had no objection to the use of rhetorical devices; St Augustine in Book IV of De doctrina Christiana and Cassiodorus in his commentary on the Psalms103 had paved the way for their employment in Christian writings. But what precisely did the Anglo-Saxons know of rhetoric, and what did they teach and learn about it?104

For the early Middle Ages we must distinguish between two rhetorical traditions which, for reasons of simplicity, I shall refer to as the ‘classical’ and the ‘grammatical’ traditions. The ‘classical’ tradition covers the whole of rhetorical teaching as it had been passed down from the Roman period. It includes the three genres of oratory (demonstrativum, deliberativum, iudiciale); the five stages in the composition of a speech (inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio); the structuring of a speech according to its parts, which varied in number and name (the Rhetorica ad Herennium, I.iii.4, has six: exordium, narratio, divisio, confirmatio, confutatio, conclusio – Isidore, Etymologiae, II.vii, has only four: exordium, narratio, argumentum, conclusio); detailed instructions on the line of argument and presentation of evidence; and, finally, the use of tropes and figures of speech and the theory of the three types of style (genera dicendi: grande, medium, subtile).105

Since the early period the Anglo-Saxons could learn about all this


from the encyclopaedists; Cassiodorus (Institutiones, II.ii) and Isidore (Etymologiae, Book II) had treated rhetoric in condensed form, Martianus Capella in greater detail in Book V of his Nuptiae, which was available in England by the third period at the latest. For a detailed knowledge of classical rhetoric, however, the Middle Ages drew on three Roman sources: Cicero’s De inventione, the anonymous Rhetorica ad Herennium, and Quintilian’s Institutio oratoria. These three texts are known to have been available in English libraries from the twelfth century onwards, and it has been conjectured or asserted that one or more of them was accessible from a very early stage in Anglo-Saxon England. There is, however, no conclusive evidence that writers like Bede or Wulfstan were acquainted with Cicero’s rhetorical writings, and Lupus of Ferrières’s well-known letter to Abbot Ealdsige of York requesting him to send Quintilian’s Institutiones, though testifying to the international repute of the library at York in the ninth century, does not prove that it had this work. It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions on such questions; one concrete clue may be the fact that Alcuin includes among the authors represented at York the ‘rhetor quoque Tullius ingens’—though which of Cicero’s works were present is not known. From Alcuin’s Dialogus de rhetorica et de virtutibus and from his grammar we may deduce that he was familiar with Cicero’s rhetorical writings, but it is to be assumed that he did not have access to them until his time in France, possibly through Charlemagne’s court library. The existence of other

106 For the Anglo-Saxon manuscript transmission of Isidore’s Etymologiae and Martianus Capella, see notes 23 and 36. A valuable new critical and annotated edition is: Isidore of Seville, Etymologies. Book II: Rhetoric, ed. Peter K. Marshall (Paris, 1983). Surviving English manuscripts of Cassiodorus’s Institutiones are all late and contain only Book I: MSS Hereford Cathedral O.iii.2 (from France, s.ix); Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 391 and Salisbury Cathedral 88 (both s.xi ex.); see also Ogilvie, Books Known to the English, 107. They are listed in the library catalogues of Durham Cathedral Priory (s.xii ex.) and Bury St Edmunds (s.xii/xiii); eight copies of Rhetorica are recorded at Christ Church, Canterbury, c.1170. For the catalogues see N.R. Ker, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books, second edition (London, 1964). Cf. also Paul Lehmann, ‘Die Institutio oratoria des Quintilianus im Mittelalter’, Philologus, 89 (1934), 349–83.


111 For Alcuin’s sources, see The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne, ed. and trans. Wilbur Samuel Howell (Princeton, 1941), 22–33. There is no extant Anglo-Saxon manuscript of this work by Alcuin.
rhetorical handbooks in Anglo-Saxon England, such as Priscian’s Praeexercitamina, similarly remains a matter of conjecture.

The picture looks different when we examine the ‘grammatical’ tradition of rhetoric, represented above all by Donatus – who included a section on tropes and figures of speech in Book III of his Ars maior, following the treatment of stylistic faults – and by other Latin grammarians, among them Diomedes and Charisius.112 This extension of grammar was to have its effect on one of the encyclopaedias too; Isidore discusses the tropes and figures of speech in his Etymologiae, both in the book on grammar (I.xxxvi–xxxvii) and in the book on rhetoric (II.xxi). There are several reasons why the tropes and figures of speech in particular, which belonged to the field of elocutio, should have become part of elementary grammar instruction. This is after all the area of rhetoric that comes closest to grammar, which is itself concerned with the meaning of words and with sentence structure; above all, the tropes and figures of speech were stylistic devices found throughout oral and written usage and thus were not uniquely bound to the genres of oratory which, moreover, had by this time largely lost their significance. A great part of ‘classical’ rhetoric, on the other hand, would have been of little relevance to the Anglo-Saxon author of homilies, chronicles or other texts.

The ‘grammatical’ tradition of rhetoric was adopted by the Anglo-Saxons early on, as can be seen in Bede’s De schematibus et tropis, which drew primarily on Donatus’s Ars maior.113 Bede, however, put a thoroughly Christian stamp on the tradition, taking all his examples from the Bible and stating at the outset that the tropes and figures of speech could not have been invented by the Greeks since they are to be found much earlier than this in the Scriptures. Cassiodorus had already made this point in his commentary on the Psalms, which contains numerous references to and explanations of figures of speech, and Bede certainly used this commentary as one of his sources.114 In the third Anglo-Saxon period the ‘grammatical’ tradition continued to flourish, as can be seen in the Triginta divisiones adapted from Isidore and appended to Ælfric’s Grammar, and in Byrhtferth’s Handboc, which gives seventeen figures of speech with


114 Cf. note 79, above.
Latin examples and Old English explanations, and for which Bede's *De schematibus et tropis* had served as a model.\textsuperscript{115}

To what extent were such stylistic devices applied by Anglo-Saxon poets and prose authors? Much research has been devoted to this matter, the results of which cannot be discussed in detail here. A fundamental problem is that tropes and figures of speech will occur everywhere in human speech and are frequently used unconsciously or at least by speakers and writers who had never had any formal tuition in style or rhetoric. There can be no doubt that the authors of Old English and Anglo-Latin poetry and prose consciously and skilfully employed tropes and figures of speech to great effect; Wulfstan's homilies and the later Alfredian annals in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles (from 892 onwards) are just two examples.\textsuperscript{116} Not everything that has the appearance of a rhetorical device, however, may be meant as such; the many doublets in the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* or in Wærferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* may be seen as examples of *amplificatio* or *hendiadys*, but at the same time as attempts at providing a semantically closer translation than a single word might offer.\textsuperscript{117} On the other hand, we must ask whether certain stylistic devices in Old English literature conventionally regarded as part of an ancient Germanic tradition did not partly owe their popularity to Latin models and possibly also to the formal teaching of rhetoric. That this is not an unrealistic suggestion was shown many years ago for the kenning, in the wider sense of 'a two-membered substitution for a substantive of ordinary prose', by James W. Rankin, and subsequently – more methodically – by Thomas Gardner.\textsuperscript{118} I would be generally sceptical, however, of any attempt to apply categories of 'classical' rhetoric – apart from those covering tropes and figures, and perhaps the *genera dicendi* – to Old English texts which had little or nothing to do with the ancient genres of oratory. I am thinking here of the use of terms such as *exordium*, *narratio* and so on to describe the structure of certain of Ælfric's homilies or even the...


\textsuperscript{116} See Bethurum, *Homilies of Wulfstan*, 87–92; Cecily Clark, 'The Narrative Mode of The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles before the Conquest', *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), 215–35, at 222. Many more examples have been discussed by Knappe, 'Klassische Rhetorik und altenglische Literatur'.

\textsuperscript{117} See James M. Hart, 'Rhetoric in the Translation of Bede', *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford, 1901), 150–4, and Kuhn, 'Synonyms in the Old English Bede' (note 93, above).

speeches in Beowulf. How carefully one must tread in this field has been demonstrated by Sherman Kuhn in his essay on the alleged use of rhythmic cadences at the ends of sentences in Old English according to the classical principles of Cursus.

When I set out to write this paper, it was in the happy illusion that I could offer a concise but comprehensive survey of the subject I had chosen. This soon proved to be an impossible task. In conclusion I can do no more than simply name some areas which have had to be left aside, and which strike me as being all the more important for the fact that there were no rules or handbooks on them available to the Anglo-Saxons for guidance: I refer to translation, interlinear and syntactical glossing, linguistic borrowing (including loan-translation, semantic loans and loan-syntax), the knowledge of foreign languages generally among the Anglo-Saxons, the origins and development of Standard Old English, and, finally, the impact of the English missionaries' language on early German. The discussion of these subjects must be reserved for another occasion. For the present, I hope that I have at least been able to show that the point of departure for the history of linguistics in England should not be sought in the works of John Hart, William Bullokar and Robert Cawdrey – much as we may admire or study these men’s work – but goes back much further than this to Theodore of Tarsus, Bede and Ælfric.

120 Sherman M. Kuhn, ‘Cursus in Old English: Rhetorical Ornament or Linguistic Phenomenon?’ Speculum, 47 (1972), 188–206.
122 One might consider the following quotation, from a work by a distinguished linguist, as representative of views that are commonly held: ‘Anglo-Saxon glossaries cannot be considered philological work, not even Ælfric’s Latin grammar, as their object was purely practical and little thought was devoted to the intrinsic values of form or meaning of Latin and Anglo-Saxon expressions’; Ivan Poldauf, On the History of some Problems of English Grammar before 1800 (Prague, 1948), 52.