Proceedings of the British Academy, **82**, 107–148

SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ MEMORIAL LECTURE

Anglicae linguae interpretatio: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England

HELMUT GNEUSS
University of Munich
Fellow of the Academy

LANGUAGE CONTACT, language interference, borrowing and bilingualism have been among the favourite subjects in linguistic work of recent years. Much of this tends to stress theoretical aspects of the interaction of languages upon each other, and it does not seem inappropriate to remind ourselves that important work on such aspects had already been done much earlier by Hermann Paul, Hugo Schuchardt, Leonard Bloomfield and more recently by Uriel Weinreich, to mention only some of those whose thoughts and insights have greatly advanced our subject.[1]

Read at the Academy 10 November 1992. © The British Academy 1993.

[1] Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, fifth ed. (Halle, 1920), ch. 22; this chapter was first included in the second ed. (1886); *Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier. Ein Vademecum der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*, ed. Leo Spitzer, second ed. (Halle, 1928), cf. also the studies of Schuchardt's work listed by Wolfgang Viereck in *Anglia*, 105 (1987), 27; Ernst Windisch, *Zur Theorie der Mischsprachen und Lehnwörter*, Berichte der phil.-hist. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 49 (1897), 101–26; Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*, rev. ed. (London, 1935), chs. 25 and 26; Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems* (New York, 1953). Comprehensive bibliographies of the field are provided by Weinreich (pp. 123–46) and Louis Deroy, *L'emprunt linguistique*, second ed. (Paris, 1980), pp. 348–425. Of the numerous more recent publications I mention only *Sprachliche Interferenz. Festschrift für Werner Betz zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Herbert Kolb and Hartmut Lauffer (Tübingen, 1977); Gerd Tesch, *Linguale Interferenz: Theoretische, terminologische und methodische Grundlagen zu ihrer Erforschung* (Tübingen, 1978); Sarah Grey Thomason and Terrence Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley, California, 1988).

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

The study of language contact in Anglo-Saxon England, and of such contact during the prehistoric, continental period of English has an even longer history. Antiquarians, historians and philologists have shown an interest in the subject since the early seventeenth century, and so also a medieval author long before them: In his *Descriptio Kambriae*, written towards the end of the twelfth century and revised somewhat later, Giraldus Cambrensis notes that the speech of the northern English regions has been greatly corrupted by the frequent Danish and Norwegian invasions—'borealibus insulae partibus per crebras Dacorum et Norwagiensium irruptiones valde corruptis'.[2] In a sense we may then consider Giraldus a forerunner of George Hickes, who described the phonological and morphological characteristics of the Old English interlinear glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Rushworth Gospels as those of a 'Dialectus Dano-Saxonica'.[3]

The antiquarians, grammarians and lexicographers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were working in what from our point of view may be classed as a pre-scientific age of language study, and this is reflected in remarks such as those made by Alexander Gill and John Wallis, two of the most respectable early English linguists. Wallis claims that the Anglo-Saxon language, apart from borrowing some Welsh words, remained virtually pure and unadulterated until Norman times—'Et fere pura mansit in Anglia, seu impermixta, usque ad Normannorum tempora',[4] while Gill even maintains that up to the late fourteenth century foreign words were unheard of in the English language.[5]

There is a similar tendency—to stress the virtue and purity of English in Anglo-Saxon times—in the work of two antiquarians writing at about the same time as Gill; they were aware, however, of the linguistic problem posed by the introduction of Christianity into Anglo-Saxon England, and of the way in which this was largely solved. 'Great, verily, was the glory of our tongue before the Norman Conquest, in this', says William Camden, 'that the olde *English* could expresse most aptly, all the conceiptes of the

[2] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Descriptio Kambriae*, ed. James F. Dimock, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Rolls Series 21, vol. VI (London, 1868), pp. 177–8, cf. H. Gneuss, 'Giraldus Cambrensis und die Geschichte der englischen Sprachwissenschaft im Mittelalter', in *Language and Civilization: Essays and Studies in Honour of Otto Hietsch* (Frankfurt-on-Main, 1992), I.164–72.

[3] George Hickes, 'Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae, et Moeso-Gothicae', chs. xix and xx, in *Linguarum Vett. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* (Oxford, 1703–1705).

[4] John Wallis, *Grammar of the English Language*, ed. and trans. J. A. Kemp (London, 1972), p. 96; sig. A5^{v} in the first edition of 1653.

[5] Alexander Gil, *Logonomia Anglica (1619)*, ed. and trans. Bror Danielsson and Arvid Gabrielson, Stockholm Studies in English XXVI–XXVII (Stockholm, 1972), pt. I, p. [ix].

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

minde in their owne tongue, without borrowing from any', and he then gives examples like *Godspell* for *Evangelion*, *Haelend* for *Salvator*, *Leorning Cnihtas* for the Disciples, and others.[6] This practice of borrowing by translating is also observed by William Lisle, who exclaims:

> what Englishman of understanding is there, but may be delighted, to see the prety shifts our tongue made with her owne store, in all parts of learning, when they scorned to borrow words of another? . . . It hath words for Trinity, Unity, Deity and Persons thereof; for Coæqual, Coæternall, Inuisible, Incomprehensible; Yea for Incarnation, for Ascension, Descension, Resurrection, for Catholicke and all such forraine words as we are now faine to use, because we have forgot better of our owne.[7]

One might even say then that the study of borrowing in Old English began with loan-formations and semantic loans, and not with loanwords. These, however, did not go unnoticed; the two leading etymologists of seventeenth-century England, Franciscus Junius and Stephen Skinner, and their eighteenth-century successor, Nathan Bailey, although hampered by the methodical shortcomings of their discipline as it then was, were clearly capable of correctly identifying the origin of Latin loanwords in Old English, words that had survived into modern times, such as *minster*, *monk*, *shrive*, *street*, *mill*, *kitchen*, *tile*, *inch*, *pound*, *pear*, *plum*, *cheese* and *butter*. But there were a few words that they could not explain, such as *cheap*, and they were remarkably helpless when it came to Scandinavian words like *law*, *fellow* and *take*.[8]

The scientific study of language contact in Anglo-Saxon England could begin only after the methods of historical linguistics had been established in the nineteenth century, when, above all, phonological criteria became available that provided a sound footing for all etymological research. Two of the pioneers who utilized the new methods in our field of enquiry were Robert Gordon Latham, the first holder of the Chair of English at University College, London, and Edwin Guest, one of the founders of the Philological Society and Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, from 1852 to 1880. Latham, in his book on the English language (first published in 1841), made the first attempt at a periodization of Latin loanwords in Old English;[9] Guest read a paper at two sessions of

[6] William Camden, *Remains Concerning Britain*, ed. R. D. Dunn (Toronto, 1984), pp. 27–9; text here as in the first edition of 1605.

[7] William L'Isle, *A Saxon Treatise Concerning the Old and New Testament* (London, 1623), Preface, sig. f3^{r}.

[8] Stephen Skinner, *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (London, 1671); Franciscus Junius, *Etymologicum Anglicanum*, ed. Edward Lye (Oxford, 1743); Nathan Bailey, *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (London, 1721).

[9] Robert Gordon Latham, *The English Language* (London, 1841), pp. 31, 41–2 and 47.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

the Philological Society in May 1852 under the title 'On certain Foreign Terms, adopted by our Ancestors, prior to their settlement in the British Islands'.[10] Neither Latham nor Guest, however, aimed at a strictly systematic and comprehensive treatment of their subject.

Such a treatment followed more than thirty years afterwards, when inventories of Greek, Latin, Old Norse and Celtic loanwords in Old English were produced, and when exact criteria for identifying and approximately dating such loans were developed. We have reached the stage of the seminal work in our field, published within the space of twenty-six years, from 1887 to 1913, in books by Walter William Skeat, Alois Pogatscher, Friedrich Kluge, Emil Björkman, H. S. MacGillivray and Otto Funke.[11] It seems significant that the work of these authors is contemporary with the appearance of most of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (which had reached the entry for *speech* in 1913), and that even until today it largely provides the basis on which our handbooks on the history of English rely.

During the past eighty years a great deal of further work has been done in Old English loanword studies. This includes standard monographs such as Max Förster's study of Celtic loanwords and Dietrich Hofmann's treatment of early Scandinavian loans, as well as Alistair Campbell's excellent chapter in his *Old English Grammar*.[12] There are also numerous special investigations, often dealing with individual words, in scattered places, sometimes concealed in books and articles on other Germanic dialects. In the study of lexical borrowing in Old English, all these have to be taken into account.[13] Here, however, I shall try to outline the present

[10] *Proceedings of the Philological Society* for 1850–1852, vol. V (London, 1854), pp. 169–74 and 185–9.

[11] Walter W. Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology. First Series* (Oxford, 1887; second ed. 1892), chs. xxi–xxiv; Alois Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen* (Strassburg, 1888); Friedrich Kluge, 'Geschichte der englischen Sprache', in *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, ed. Hermann Paul (Strassburg, 1891–93), I.782–7, supplemented by his list of Latin loanwords in Early Germanic, ibid. pp. 309–12; cf. the expanded versions in Kluge's contributions to the second edition of the *Grundriss* (1899); Erik Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English* (Halle, 1900–1902); H. S. MacGillivray, *The Influence of Christianity on the Vocabulary of Old English* (Halle, 1902); Otto Funke, *Die gelehrten lateinischen Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der altenglischen Literatur von der Mitte des X. Jahrhunderts bis um das Jahr 1066* (Halle, 1914).

[12] Max Förster, 'Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen', in *Texte und Forschungen zur englischen Kulturgeschichte. Festgabe für Felix Liebermann*, ed. Max Förster and Karl Wildhagen (Halle, 1921), pp. 119–242; Dietrich Hofmann, *Nordisch-englische Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit* (Copenhagen, 1955); A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), ch. x.

[13] Two comprehensive studies are Mary S. Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English* (London, 1935) and Dieter Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Volume I: *The Beginnings to 1066*, ed. Richard M. Hogg (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 299–338.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

state and the problems of our subject, to show how far the work from Skeat to Funke and that of their successors have stood the test of time, to ask whether we may have to revise or rewrite what until now has been regarded as established fact.

In order to do so, we need to consider the progress made in recent years in scholarly disciplines that are directly relevant to our subject: historical linguistics, manuscript studies, history and archaeology. Nobody with an interest in loanwords can afford to ignore the results of such progress. Any study of a particular word must be based on the full textual evidence for this, which is now conveniently available in the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English*.[14] Any such study will also have to take into account the date and provenance of the manuscripts in which a particular loanword occurs; here again, we are fortunate in having a reliable and convenient reference work for this purpose in Neil Ker's great *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*.[15] It goes without saying that language contact should never be seen as an isolated, linguistic phenomenon; it should be seen in relation to historical developments, to changes and innovations affecting the lives of those who use the newly adopted words. In many cases, I feel, it is now the historian and the archaeologist who could help to answer our questions, rather than the linguist. I am thinking —to give only two examples—of studies of Old English architectural terms, or of terms for plants and fruits by archaeologists or botanists, who might be able to tell us exactly why a particular word was borrowed. But I am also thinking of historical studies that still seem to be needed, not only by the historian of language;[16] thus, comprehensive treatments of Anglo-French and Anglo-German relations before 1066 could throw light on borrowing processes that so far we may understand only imperfectly.

In what follows, I shall at first deal with contact between Old English and specific languages; after this I want to discuss briefly the different types of lexical borrowing and their relation to the practice of glossing in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

The notion of the seventy-two languages of the world as found in

[14] Antonette diPaolo Healey and Richard L. Venezky, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English* (Toronto, 1980).

[15] (Oxford, 1957); a Supplement by Dr Ker was printed in *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5 (1976), 121–31.

[16] This was noted long ago by D. A. Bullough in 'The Continental Background of the Reform', in *Tenth-Century Studies. Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, ed. David Parsons (London, 1975), p. 20. For the later Anglo-Saxon period, a large gap has now been filled by Veronica Ortenberg, *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Cultural, Spiritual and Artistic Exchanges* (Oxford, 1992). See also notes 89 and 101, below.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

patristic tradition and in Isidore's *Etymologiae* was well-known to the Anglo-Saxons; it is referred to by Bede, King Alfred and Ælfric, and the number seventy-two may have seemed quite realistic in view of the limitations of geographical knowledge in the early Middle Ages.[17] But only a handful of these languages were actually known to the Anglo-Saxons.

Of these, Latin was of prime importance, being the language of the immediate neighbours—or of the occupying forces—of the Germanic tribes and territories on the Continent, the international language of the early Middle Ages and, especially, the language of the Christian Church. As a consequence it also became, after the sixth century, the acquired, second language of Anglo-Saxon monks and clerics, and thus the language of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, of literary productions by English authors and of administrative records.

Several hundred Latin words—including a considerable number of originally Greek words, to which I shall return—are recorded as loanwords in Old English texts, glosses and glossaries. The question when, through which channels of transmission and under what circumstances these words were received into the Anglo-Saxons' vernacular is one of the most complicated, controversial and often confusing problems in the history of English; it is an issue that has occupied philologists and historians for over 150 years now. Here I can only try to present this issue in a rather brief and simplified form.[18]

Both Latham and Guest had indicated that a periodization of Latin loans in Old English seemed possible, Accordingly, when Walter William Skeat published the first really comprehensive list of such loans,[19] he divided them into two periods, regarding the Christianization of England as the boundary and pointing out that loans of the 'First Period' could have been acquired very early on the Continent, or from Latin as spoken by the Celtic inhabitants of Britain. What was clearly needed in order to arrive at a more precise description of the borrowing process was a set of reliable criteria for the dating of loanwords. Skeat and his contemporaries certainly

[17] See Hans Sauer, 'Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Ein mittelalterlicher Topos in der englischen Literatur', *Anglia*, 101 (1983), 29–48, and 'Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Einige Ergänzungen', *Anglia*, 107 (1989), 61–4; Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker* (Stuttgart, 1957–63), II.1, 544–51. On the situation in multilingual Britain see now René Derolez, 'Language Problems in Anglo-Saxon England: *barbara loquella* and *barbarismus*', in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 285–92.

[18] A comprehensive survey of the history of scholarship is now available in Alfred Wollmann, *Untersuchungen zu den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen* (Munich, 1990), pp. 2–90.

[19] *Principles of English Etymology. First Series*, pp. 432–42.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

saw that the first occurrence of a word in a dated Old English text could not, in many cases, yield the desired result, as there were obviously numerous words that had been taken over into the vernacular long before its written transmission began. Other criteria may have seemed more useful, like those provided by historical disciplines—the history of Christianity in Britain, the history of culture and civilization. But the most reliable method was then (and remains today) the one based on the principles and achievements of historical phonology in the nineteenth century: the dating of sound changes, including changes in quantity and accentuation, in the source language (Latin and Romance) and in the receiving language (Old English and its prehistoric stages). In addition, the occurrence of the same Latin loanword in more than one of the West Germanic languages and also the dating of such a word in relation to the second High German shift of consonants could offer valuable clues.

The first scholar who systematically applied such philological tests to Old English loanword studies was Alois Pogatscher, Professor of English in Prague (1889–1908) and Graz (1908–11). His book, a *Habilitationsschrift*, published in 1888, was no doubt the most thorough and, until recently, the most influential work in the field.[20] It was Pogatscher who introduced the distinction between 'popular' and 'learned' loanwords: According to this, popular loanwords were adopted in their spoken, Vulgar Latin form and were then subject to the sound changes of Old English, while learned loanwords were taken over with their classical Latin spelling, although with certain changes in quantity, accent and pronunciation. This distinction is linked with what I shall call Pogatscher's three-period model which places Latin loanwords in Old English in a chronological sequence and which, incidentally, resembles a model proposed briefly by Henry Sweet somewhat earlier.[21] Pogatscher thus distinguishes:

i. Continental loanwords borrowed before *c.* 450 AD;
ii. Early insular loanwords, taken over from the spoken Latin of Romanized Britons in the period from *c.* 450 until *c.* 600 AD;
iii. Later loanwords, adopted after *c.* 600.

Words taken over in periods i. and ii. are always popular loans, whereas those of the third period are mostly, but not exclusively, learned. How influential this model has been can be gathered from the fact that nearly all later authors who have dealt with the subject are following Pogatscher, including Mary S. Serjeantson, whose *A History of Foreign Words in*

[20] See note 11, above.
[21] Henry Sweet, 'Dialects and Prehistoric Forms of Old English', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1875–76, 543–69, at pp. 544–5.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

English[22] contains the most comprehensive inventory of loanwords in Old English so far, and including very recent handbooks. However, Pogatscher's model has met with criticism on account of obvious shortcomings, and modifications have been suggested. Let us look at three essential arguments that need to be considered.

Pogatscher assumed that Latin was widely spoken in Roman Britain, and that it survived into the fifth and sixth centuries, so that the loanwords in his second period were due to language contact between Britons and Anglo-Saxons. This view was opposed by Joseph Loth in a book published shortly after Pogatscher's work had appeared.[23] Loth may have gone too far in his claims that in Britain Latin was mainly the speech of the Roman army and that once the army had departed, Latin was no longer a spoken language there. But opinions as to the role of spoken Latin in Britain, especially after the Anglo-Saxon invasion, remain divided, and not all scholars would now agree with the view of Professor Kenneth Jackson 'that during the period of Pogatscher's insular borrowings, *c.* 450–600, the possibility of contact between Latin-speaking Britons and the English cannot be excluded, though it is not likely to have been more than trifling'.[24]

Secondly, there are other difficulties when we consider the claim of extensive insular borrowing of Latin words. Those that have been suggested as belonging to this group show the phonological characteristics of Vulgar Latin, and it does not seem possible to distinguish loans in this form imported from Gaul from the corresponding words that might have been adopted from British speakers.[25] Moreover, a number of words that are clearly part of the vocabulary of the early Anglo-Saxon Church like

[22] See note 13, above. For other scholars who took over Pogatscher's model see Wollmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 41–90.

[23] Joseph Loth, *Les mots latins dans les langues brittoniques (Gallois, armoricain, cornique)* (Paris, 1892), pp. 9–59. For earlier views on this question see Wollmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 8–11.

[24] Kenneth Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages First to Twelfth Century A.D.*, (Edinburgh, 1953), p. 249. For the survival of Roman civilization in Britain in the fifth century see now Stephen Johnson, *Later Roman Britain* (London, 1980), ch. 6. For recent views on the Romanization of Britain see Edgar C. Polomé and O. Ellis Evans in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 29 pt. 2, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin, 1983), at pp. 533–4 and 967.

[25] For the controversial question of the characteristics of spoken und written Latin in Celtic Britain see Jackson, *Language and History*, pp. 107–12 and *passim*; A. S. Gratwick, 'Latinitas Britannica: Was British Latin Archaic?', in *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. Nicholas Brooks (Leicester, 1982), pp. 1–79; Damian McManus, '*Linguarum Diversitas*: Latin and the Vernaculars in Early Medieval Britain', *Peritia*, 3 (1984), 151–88; C. C. Smith, 'Vulgar Latin in Roman Britain: Epigraphic and Other Evidence', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 29 pt. 2, pp. 893–948.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

abbod, *antefn* and *cugele*—and so could hardly have been borrowed before the seventh century—also show the sound developments of Vulgar Latin and are evidently imports from the Continent; some very early ones may even owe their introduction to St. Augustine's Frankish interpreters[26] or to those whom they taught.

Finally, there is the problem of the chronological boundaries within the three-period model, *c.* 450 and *c.* 600. It seems obvious that they were chosen on the basis not of linguistic developments, but of historical events: the assumed date of the first Anglo-Saxon settlements in Britain, and the beginning of Christianization. Neither of these boundaries, however, coincides with the beginning or end of phonological processes in Vulgar Latin, processes whose exact dating is extremely difficult anyhow; some of these, for instance the voicing of intervocalic stops, appear to range over more than one of the three periods.

This was first critically noted, as far as I can see, by Professor Jackson,[27] and it is no doubt the reason why Professor Campbell in his chapter on the phonology of loanwords in Old English[28] wisely decided not to distinguish between words of the first and second period; instead, he divided the Latin loanwords into early, or popular, and late, or learned, words. A thorough investigation of the issue was long overdue; it has now been carried out in a Ph.D. thesis by Alfred Wollmann, published in 1990,[29] in which the author, concentrating on the so-called insular loans, is able to demonstrate that the assumption of a kind of linguistic borderline about the middle of the fifth century is untenable, and that the dating of each loanword can only be determined by applying all available individual criteria, criteria that take into account phonological developments in Latin and incipient Romance as well as in English, while possible links with cultural, religious and historical developments must not be neglected.

[26] Beda, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I.xxv.

[27] *Language and History*, pp. 250–6; for earlier doubts about the periodization of Pogatscher cf. Max Förster, *Der Flussname Themse und seine Sippe*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akademie der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt. Jahrg. 1941, vol. I (Munich, 1941), p. 573, n. 1.

[28] See note 13, above. Theo Vennemann even argues that the 'age' of a loanword cannot be determined on the basis of a datable sound change: 'Betrachtung zum Alter der Hochgermanischen Lautverschiebung', in *Althochdeutsch*, ed. Rolf Bergmann *et al.* (Heidelberg, 1987), I.29–53, at p. 33.

[29] See note 18, above; a critical review of this thesis by Klaus Dietz has appeared in *Kratylos*, 37 (1992), 142–51. Supplementary studies by Dr Wollmann are: 'Lateinisch-Altenglische Lehnbeziehungen im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert', in *Britain 400–600: Language and History*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger and Alfred Wollmann (Heidelberg, 1990), pp. 373–96; 'Ae. *butere* < lat. *butyrum*: Lautchronologie und Lehnwortdatierung', *Anglia*, 109 (1991), 290–318; 'Zur Datierung christlicher Lehnwörter im Altenglischen: Ae. *antefn*', in *Language and Civilization* (cf. note 2, above), I.124–38.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

The channels of transmission for the Latin loanwords seemed fairly clear in Pogatscher's theory: those of the first period were acquired on the Continent before the migration, although it was difficult to say where and how individual words had been borrowed; for the second period (*c.* 450–600), direct contact between Latin-speaking Celts and Anglo-Saxons was the obvious explanation, while words of the third period were predominantly 'learned'; how exactly these were adopted, Pogatscher does not tell us; their introduction would at any rate presuppose bilingual Anglo-Saxons, or bilingual foreign teachers.

In the meantime, however, other channels and areas of contact have been suggested and have made our picture even more complex. In a book devoted to the forest trees and cultivated plants in Germanic antiquity,[30] Johannes Hoops asserted that the Angles and Saxons, while still in their original homes in Schleswig-Holstein and west of the river Elbe, could have acquired only a very limited number of loanwords connected with trade and traded goods, such as *ceap*, *mynet* and *pipor*. Only when, in the course of the fourth century, they had moved further west, to the *Litus Saxonicum* of northern Gaul and Flanders, did they become acquainted with the terminology of building in stone and of road construction, and with various names of fruits and plants, in fact with the bulk of their continental loanwords, including even a few Christian terms. This has remained a theory for which we have no definite linguistic or historical evidence; it is interesting to see, however, that it was accepted by Karl Luick.[31]

Another possible area and period of language contact would complicate our picture if we accept the hypothesis of Dr J. N. L. Myres, based upon archaeological evidence, that as early as the second half of the fourth century Saxons had settled as Roman *laeti* in Eastern Britain.[32] As a consequence, we should have to assume that linguistic interference involving Saxons and native speakers of Latin did actually occur in Britain, and that the concomitant process of borrowing overlapped with what has so far been considered the 'Continental period'. However, Dr Myres's findings do not seem to have found general acceptance among archaeologists and historians.[33]

[30] Johannes Hoops, *Waldbäume und Kulturpflanzen im germanischen Altertum* (Strassburg, 1905), pp. 566–89.

[31] Karl Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1914–40), pp. 10–11, 63–4. Again, Max Förster pointed out the weakness of Hoops's hypothesis: *Der Flussname Themse*, p. 573, n. 1.

[32] J. N. L. Myres, *The English Settlements*, The Oxford History of England, IB (Oxford, 1989), ch. 4; cf. Wollmann, 'Lateinisch-Altenglische Lehnbeziehungen', pp. 377–80.

[33] Catherine Hills, 'The archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England in the pagan period: a review', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 8 (1979), 297–329, and Wollmann, 'Lateinisch-Altenglische Lehnbeziehungen', pp. 379–80.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

From what has been said so far, it will have become clear that attempts at a classification and periodization of lexical borrowing from Latin remain problematic, and this is also true of the suggestion made first by Eduard Sievers and then, in greater detail, by Otto Funke, that in the field of learned loans in Old English we should distinguish between genuine loanwords—which might well become part of the spoken language, at least in certain social groups—and foreign words that exist only in a written form.[34]

In spite of all such problems, however, the distinction between earlier, popular loans and later ones—for which 'learned' seems a misnomer—remains valid, with a boundary between the two probably at some time in the seventh century.[35] For the earlier group, the date of borrowing will have to be determined individually, for each word, also taking into account the possibility of later analogical developments in the form of sound substitution, a process to which I will return.

As to the geographical area of early linguistic interference, we seem to be on safer ground now. Scholars had early noticed that the West Germanic languages shared a considerable number of loanwords from Latin—a fact documented for example in Kluge's basic list of loanwords in the Germanic languages, first published in 1891[36]—, and this seemed to point to a centre, or rather central area of contact and radiation. Pogatscher, Hoops and Kluge a hundred years ago realized that such an area had to be sought somewhere along the Rhine, particularly in the region of the lower Rhine. The full evidence for what earlier scholars had only suggested was presented half a century later in a monumental work that among historians of English does not seem to have found the attention and recognition that it deserves: in his *Germania Romana*,[37] based on a most thorough analysis of the Latin loanwords in the Germanic north-west, Theodor Frings was able to establish beyond any doubt an 'Einheitsgebiet' —a common sphere of Latin use and influence—comprising Gaul, Britain, the Netherlands and the lower Rhine area as far south as Cologne and Trier. It is, I think, in this sphere, particularly in northern Gaul, that we

[34] Eduard Sievers, *Zum angelsächsischen Vokalismus* (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 2–14; Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, pp. 42–3 and *passim*.

[35] Whether such a boundary has anything to do with the controversial theories of Roger Wright seems doubtful. Cf. Roger Wright, 'Speaking, Reading and Writing Late Latin and Early Romance', *Neophilologus*, 60 (1976), 178–89; *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, 1982); *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Roger Wright (London, 1991).

[36] Cf. note 11, above.

[37] Theodor Frings, *Germania Romana* I, second ed., prepared by Gertraud Müller; G. Müller and Th. Frings, *Germania Romana* II, second ed. (Halle, 1966–68).

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

have to look for our key to the study of early loanwords in Old English in a period of mutual contact that certainly did not end with the migration to Britain.

May we expect direct influence of Greek on Old English? In order to answer this, it seems advisable to look briefly at what we know about the teaching and knowledge of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England. Fortunately, important work has recently been done in this field, so that we can hope to have a fairly reliable picture before us. Let me just add that by 'knowledge' of Greek I mean the ability to read and understand a text in Greek on the basis of a satisfactory command of Greek inflexional morphology and syntax.

There is no longer any reason to doubt Bede's statement that students of Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian, among them Tobias, bishop of Rochester and Albinus, Hadrian's successor, were competent in Latin *and* Greek.[38] The evidence for Theodore's activities as a teacher, evidence that has now come to light, has fully substantiated Bede's claim.[39] Bede himself seems to have acquired a knowledge of Greek 'by intensive study of the Bible in Greek and Latin, word by word',[40] but apparently without access to a grammar or dictionary of Greek. Beyond this, and throughout the centuries after Bede, there is no certain trace of a genuine knowledge of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England. Aldhelm and Alcuin may have known some Greek, but this remains uncertain.[41]

A few liturgical texts in Greek are found in English or imported manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries, but apart from the *Kyrie eleison*, and from the *Agios o Theos* on Good Friday, it is doubtful if any Greek had a place in the liturgy of the secular or the monastic churches.[42]

[38] *Historia ecclesiastica*, IV.ii, V.viii and xx.

[39] See Michael Lapidge, 'The School of Theodore and Hadrian', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 15 (1986), 45–72; idem, 'The Study of Greek at the School of Canterbury in the Seventh Century', in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown, King's College London Medieval Studies II (London, 1988), pp. 169–94; Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, trans. Jerold C. Frakes (Washington, D.C., 1988), pp. 122–5.

[40] Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, 'On Bede, Grammars, and Greek', *Revue Bénédictine*, 92 (1982), 111–41; the quotation is from p. 128.

[41] For Aldhelm see *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*, trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Herren (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 8–9; Peter Godman states that Alcuin's first-hand acquaintance with Greek was negligible: *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York*, ed. P. Godman (Oxford, 1982), p. 122. For knowledge of Greek in Ireland and the legend that Greek was studied there in the Dark Ages see Berschin, *Greek Letters*, pp. 95–8.

[42] For Greek in the Latin liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church see Berschin, *Greek Letters*, pp. 20–6; *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints*, ed. Michael Lapidge, Henry Bradshaw Soc. 106 (London, 1991), pp. 14–16; Mary Catherine Bodden, 'Evidence for knowledge of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17 (1988), 217–46, at 228–9.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

While we cannot assume a knowledge of Greek grammar in England after the days of Bede, it is clear that throughout the Anglo-Saxon period those able to read could have learned an appreciable amount of Greek words from a variety of sources: from Greek-Latin glossaries, from Isidore's *Etymologiae*, from Latin patristic writings, from glossed copies of Aldhelm's works and other Anglo-Latin writings in the so-called hermeneutic style, to mention only the more important texts.[43]

As a consequence, Anglo-Saxons were capable of creating loan-formations modelled on Greek compounds and derivatives. The well-known example of OE *godspell* for *evangelium* hardly needs to be mentioned here; another interesting instance is the rendering of *parasceve* by *(ge)gearcungdæg* in the West-Saxon Gospels and by *gearwungdæg* or *foregearwung* in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels.[44] The Greek word is not explained in Isidore's *Etymologiae*, but is interpreted as *preparatio cibi* in the early ninth-century first Corpus Glossary and as *preparatio* (also added as an alternative gloss in Lindisfarne John 19.14) in a tenth-century glossary in MS. B. L. Cotton Cleopatra A. iii.[45] We may find more examples of such English formations; at this point it seems appropriate to remind us how badly we need editions of the unpublished glossary materials in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

But where do the Greek loanwords in Old English come from? Our Old English dictionaries list about 120 words of Greek origin.[46] They have never been studied as a separate group, and what I can say about them will have to remain somewhat tentative. The large majority of these

[43] See Bodden, 'Evidence'; Michael Lapidge, 'The hermeneutic style in tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 67–111; *Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1991), pp. xc–xci. For contact of Anglo-Saxons with native speakers of Greek and Greek scholars in the tenth and eleventh centuries see Ortenberg, *The English Church*, pp. 200–201; Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 2 (Cambridge, 1990), p. 44; Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, pp. 14–15, and idem, 'Israel the Grammarian in Anglo-Saxon England', in *From Athens to Chartres: Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought. Studies in Honour of Edouard Jeauneau*, ed. Haijo Jan Westra (Leiden, 1992), pp. 97–114.

[44] See the Old English renderings of Matthew 27.62, Mark 15.42, Luke 23.54 and John 19.14, 31 and 42 in these versions (ed. W. W. Skeat, 1871–87). Another loan-formation based on Greek is OE *cyþere* for *martyr*; cf. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VII.xi.1. For loan-formations from Greek among Anglo-Saxon plant names see Hans Sauer, 'Towards a Linguistic Description and Classification of the Old English Plant Names', in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts* (cf. note 17, above), pp. 381–408, at 390.

[45] *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, ed. J. H. Hessels (Cambridge, 1890), p. 6, line 247; Thomas Wright, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, second ed., ed. Richard Paul Wülcker (London, 1884), I.484, line 8.

[46] For a fairly complete list see Mary S. Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English*, pp. 271–88.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

loanwords owes its adoption not to direct contact between speakers of English and Greek, or to the study of Greek texts in England. They were taken over as part of the vocabulary borrowed from Latin, and are treated accordingly in our modern handbooks. Most or all of them must have been current in classical or medieval Latin, not a few in the special languages of religion, or of botany and zoology. It seems likely that many of these words may not have been recognized as being of Greek extraction by Anglo-Saxons and even by speakers of Latin and the incipient Romance languages. But whether these words were current in Latin *and* as English loanwords still needs to be investigated.

A small group of words believed to have found their way directly from Greek to the Germanic languages constitutes a more controversial subject and should be examined here because handbooks of the history of English have been giving them some prominence. In 1909, Friedrich Kluge[47] published an article in which he suggested that a number of early loanwords and loan-formations in the West Germanic languages should be considered as Gothic borrowings from Greek which had been introduced into Southern German by Gothic missionaries travelling upstream along the river Danube. From Southern Germany this Christian vocabulary would then have spread further north until it had finally reached the Anglo-Saxons. The words that concern us here—those that appear in Old English—are the terms for church, angel, bishop and devil (Mary Serjeantson adds that for the priest), and the loan-formations signifying 'to baptize', 'to pity', 'to fast' and 'the heathen'. Each of the pertinent Old English words has its own history; it would be impossible to deal with them adequately in a lecture, and it would also be impracticable to review the numerous studies,[48] critical or not, that in the past eighty years have discussed Kluge's hypothesis of a Danubian mission ('Donaumission') and its linguistic implications. Since it appears, however, that the idea of a Gothic tradition in the vocabulary of early English persists in recent

[47] Friedrich Kluge, 'Gotische Lehnworte im Althochdeutschen', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 35 (1909), 124–60. Kluge was preceded by Rudolf von Raumer, 'Über den geschichtlichen Zusammenhang des gothischen Christenthums mit dem Althochdeutschen: Anfragen und Vermutungen', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, 6 (1848), 401–12.

[48] An excellent review of research in this controversial field is provided by Elfriede Stutz, 'Die germanistische These vom "Donauweg" gotisch-arianischer Missionare im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert', in *Die Völker an der mittleren und unteren Donau im fünften und sechsten Jahrhundert*, ed. Herwig Wolfram and Falko Daim, Österreichische Akademie der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften, 145. Band (Wien, 1980), pp. 207–23.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

publications,[49] it seems useful to point out some of the problems involved.

First of all, there is no historical evidence for a Gothic mission approaching Bavaria from somewhere in southeastern Europe. It has therefore been suggested as an alternative that some of Kluge's key words were passed on from Visigoths, settled in Southern France or possibly Spain, and from Merovingian Franks, and that these words then found their way further north and east.[50] Moreover, as far as OE *engel*, *bisceop* and *deofol* are concerned, and likewise their West Germanic cognates, there do not seem to be any phonological problems in deriving them from a form of Latin spoken in Gaul, just like so many of the early Latin loanwords.[51] Whether they were adopted while the Anglo-Saxons were still on the Continent is an open question. A problem of a different kind is posed by OE *cirice*, a representative of the common West Germanic term for the house of God. It is not a word of the Latin Church; on the other hand, there is no corresponding loanword in Gothic. Theodor Frings and others before and after him have offered a plausible explanation for the borrowing of this word, although not supported by as much factual evidence as one could wish. According to them, Greek *kyrikón* was in use in Southern Gaul, in the area around Lyon, from where it may have reached Trier by the fourth century, afterwards spreading from there as a loanword.[52]

The migration of Gothic loan-formations up the Danube and down the Rhine seems even more unlikely. Of the four words mentioned above, I leave aside OE *hæðen* 'heathen', whose etymology remains as obscure as it was when its entry for the *Oxford English Dictionary* was written; apart

[49] Cf. Barbara M. H. Strang, *A History of English* (London, 1970), pp. 374 and 391; Bruce Mitchell and Fred C. Robinson, *A Guide to Old English*, fifth ed. (Oxford, 1992), p. 134, and the cautious treatment of the matter in Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, p. 199. Apparently, the pertinent section in Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English*, pp. 51–3, remains influential.

[50] See Johann Knobloch, 'Recherches sur le vocabulaire de la mission mérovingienne', *Orbis*, 9 (1960), 427–37; idem, 'Mondo latino e neolatino e mondo germanico', in *Le lingue dell' Europa* (Brescia, 1972), pp. 43–54, and Stutz, 'Die germanistische These', pp. 210–13.

[51] Cf. Johann Knobloch, 'Ein weiteres Wortzeugnis für die merowingische Mission in England und im oberdeutschen Raum', in *Festschrift Karl Pivec*, ed. A. Haidacher and H. E. Mayer (Innsbruck, 1966), pp. 221–2; Müller and Frings, *Germania Romana* II. 228–32, 235–8 and 414–15; Marie-Louise Rotsaert, 'Vieux-haut-allem. *biscof* / Gallo-roman. **(e)bẹscobo*, **(e)bẹscobə*/Lat. *episcopus*', *Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 (1977), 181–216.

[52] See Achim Masser, *Die Bezeichnungen für das christliche Gotteshaus in der deutschen Sprache des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1966), especially pp. 17–25; Müller and Frings, *Germania Romana* II.117–18; Knut Schäferdiek, 'Kirihha—*cyrica—κυριακόν: Zum geschichtlichen Hintergrund einer Etymologie', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 106 (1984), 46–50.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

from this, the corresponding word in Gothic—occurring only once—cannot be shown to have served as the standard expression for 'pagan' in that language.[53] OE *fæstan* 'to fast' seems remarkable in that we find etymologically corresponding words in the other Germanic dialects, including Gothic, but here we must ask if the word and its basic meaning, 'to fast', could not go back to pre-Christian times.[54]

The two remaining words stand for *baptizare* and *misereri*, and those who try to link them to Gothic antecedents simply ignore lexicographical evidence and the manuscript tradition. The common Old English word for 'baptize' is *fulwian*, as opposed to the choice of Gothic *daupjan*, Old High German *toufen* etc. A corresponding OE *dēpan* does occur six times (three times with an alternative gloss *fulwian* or *dyppan*)—and the related *dyppan* alone once—with the Christian meaning. But all these occurrences are found exclusively in Farman's gloss to the Gospel of Matthew in the Rushworth manuscript,[55] and one may well ask if it is probable that a tenth-century Mercian glossator could be produced as a witness of continental German or Gothic usage when a look at Isidore's *Etymologiae*—or elsewhere—would have suggested Farman's more literal translation of *baptizare*: 'Baptismum Graece, Latine tinctio interpretatur' is Isidore's explanation (VI.xix.43).

The case of the words for *misereri* and *misericors* is similarly instructive. The Old English equivalents are almost always *miltsian* and *mildheort*, and therefore represent an independent choice of translation words, as opposed to Gothic *arman*, *armahairts*, and Old High German *irbarmên*, *armherz*. Frings and others believed that the Anglo-Saxons came to know and imitated the continental words which, according to Knobloch, they may have heard from St. Augustine's Frankish interpreters.[56] Their evidence is shaky enough, as one could already have seen from a look at

[53] For reviews of research and of the linguistic problems involved see Willy Krogmann, 'Got. *haiþno*', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 59 (1934), 209–29, and Elmar Seebold, 'Das germanische Wort für den Heiden', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 93 (1971), 29–45.

[54] For the semantic problem see Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, twenty-second ed., completely revised by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, 1989), s.v.

[55] OE *depan*: Matthew 3.6, 13, 16; *depan ł dyppan*: Matthew 3.11 (twice); *depan ł fulwian*: Matthew 3.14; *dyppan*: Matthew 28.19. An incomplete gloss *dy* for *baptisma* in a tenth-century text of Sedulius may be an instance of the verbs, *dypan* or *dyppan*, or rather of a related noun: H. D. Meritt, *Old English Glosses: A Collection* (New York, 1945), no. 30, 92. Cf. Helmut Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen* (Berlin, 1955), p. 86; Knobloch, 'Recherches', pp. 435–6; Stutz, 'Die germanistische These', pp. 212–13; Frings, *Germania Romana* I.30, and see the entry for *Depe* in the *OED*.

[56] Frings, *Germania Romana* I.28–9; Knobloch, 'Recherches', p. 436; Stutz, 'Die germanistische These', p. 212.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Bosworth-Toller's *Dictionary*, and as is confirmed by the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English*: OE *earmheort* in the sense of *misericors* occurs only once, as a variant reading in Wærferth's translation of Pope Gregory's *Dialogi*;[57] OE *ofearmian* and *misereri*—with a prefix that does *not* correspond to that of OHG *ir-barmên*—turns up twice in the Royal Psalter and eight times in other psalter glosses that are, however, closely dependent on the Royal Psalter; one further occurrence is recorded in the gloss to the *Regularis Concordia*.[58] Are we seriously to believe that a glossator, possibly at Winchester, about the middle of the tenth century (and a few other glossators who followed his lead there) should have miraculously revealed an instance of the linguistic practice of St. Augustine's interpreters or of the early English Church?

Hebrew was one of the three sacred languages; it was common knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England that the Old Testament had been written *on Ebreiscgeðiode*.[59] The more learned among the early English theologians must have been well aware of the importance of the knowledge of Hebrew for a true understanding of the Bible. But nobody in England before the days of Roger Bacon appears to have been capable of translating a Hebrew text.[60] All references to knowledge of Hebrew in Anglo-Saxon times are of a doubtful character. Bede certainly used the works of Jerome for biblical interpretation on the basis of the Hebrew text, and for Hebrew etymologies, but the *Interpretationes nominum Hebraicorum* ascribed to Bede are a much later compilation.[61] Alcuin in

[57] *Bischof Wærferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*, ed. Hans Hecht (Hamburg, 1900), p. 18, line 13 (MS. H).

[58] Psalm 36.21(MSS. DEF), psalm 36.26 (MSS. GH), psalm 76.10 (MSS. DFGHJ); *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, ed. Lucia Kornexl (Munich, 1993), line 592. To these may be added three occurrences of *ofearmung* in the psalters, and two cases of the simplex verb *earmian*. Cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, p. 56. It should be noted that the regular translation word for Latin *misereri* in all the glossed psalters (including MSS. DEFGHJ) is OE *(ge)miltsian*. For the origin of the Royal Psalter, MS. B.L.Royal 2.B.v, see now David Dumville, *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar* (Woodbridge, 1992), p. 77, n. 99.

[59] *King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. Henry Sweet, EETS 45 and 50 (London, 1871), p. 7; Max Förster, *Zur Geschichte des Reliquienkultus in Altengland*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akademie der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., Jahrg. 1943, Heft 8 (Munich, 1943), p. 76, no. 73.

[60] S. A. Hirsch, 'Early English Hebraists. Roger Bacon and his Predecessors', *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 12 (1900), 34–88, especially pp. 37–41; Matthias Thiel, *Grundlagen und Gestalt der Hebräischkenntnisse des frühen Mittelalters*, Dissertation, Munich University, 1961, printed in *Studi Medievali*, 10.3 (1969).

[61] E. F. Sutcliffe, 'The Venerable Bede's Knowledge of Hebrew', *Biblica*, 16 (1935), 300–306; Thiel, *Grundlagen*, pp. 182–4, and 159–75 for the pseudo-Bedan *Interpretationes*. For Aldhelm's alleged knowledge of Hebrew see *Aldhelm: The Prose Works*, trans. Lapidge and Herren, p. 9.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

his well-known catalogue of authors available in the library at York was thought to be referring to the Hebrew Bible: 'Hebraicus vel quod populus bibit imbre superno', but this may simply mean the Latin translation.[62] John Bale and after him John Pits and others claimed that King Athelstan had the Old Testament translated 'ex Hebraeo in sermonem Anglicum', yet there is not the slightest proof of this, and if Bale actually relies on William of Malmesbury in this—as he asserts—, it seems likely that a copy of the Old English Heptateuch had misled either William or somebody before him.[63]

Nevertheless, as in the case of Greek, there must have been a genuine interest in whatever information with regard to Hebrew was available in early medieval England, mainly in glossaries and patristic commentaries. Their use by authors of Old English prose and poetry for etymological explanations of Hebrew names has been amply demonstrated by Professor Fred Robinson.[64] One of the earliest Anglo-Saxon glossaries, the so-called first Corpus Glossary, written at Canterbury in the early ninth century, is headed *Interpretatio nominum ebraicorum et grecorum* and has been compiled largely from Jerome's *Liber de nominibus Hebraicis* and the *Instructiones* of Eucherius of Lyon.[65] A copy of Jerome's book that appears to have found its way from France to England in the tenth century is still extant (MS. Bodleian Library Marshall 19). Several Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, including that of Byrhtferth's *Handboc*, contain Hebrew alphabets, often in combination with Greek, Latin and runic alphabets. The names of the Hebrew letters are there given in Latin transcription, together with an explanation of the etymology or meaning of the names. In one manuscript, even the Hebrew letter-forms are supplied.[66] The

[62] *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York*, ed. Godman, p. 122, line 1539.

[63] John Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium maioris Brytannię Catalogus* (Basel, 1557), p. 127; this is obviously the source of later references by John Pits, Thomas Tanner, John Foxe and others to such a translation; Leland does not seem to know of it. For a similar claim, made by William Tyndale, see R. M. Wilson, *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*, second ed. (London, 1970), p. 84.

[64] 'The Significance of Names in Old English Literature', *Anglia*, 86 (1968), 14–58. For the Hebrew vocabulary of the 'Hisperic' poems known in Anglo-Saxon England see *The Hisperica Famina: II. Related Poems*, ed. Michael W. Herren (Toronto, 1987), pp. 65–7 and 195; see also Thiel, *Grundlagen*, pp. 191–204 on these poems and on the grammarian Virgilius Maro.

[65] MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 144, fols. 1–3^{v}, printed in Hessels, *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, pp. 3–8; cf. *The Épinal, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff *et al.*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile XXII (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 62–3.

[66] MSS. B. L. Cotton Domitian A.ix, fol. 8^{r}; Cotton Vitellius A.xii, fol. 45^{r}; Exeter Cathedral 3507, fol. 65^{r} (with Hebrew letters); Vatican, Reg. lat. 338 (English?), fol. 91^{v}. For these alphabets see René Derolez, *Runica Manuscripta: The English Tradition* (Brugge, 1954). Other Hebrew alphabets are in MS. Bodleian Ashmole 328 (Byrhtferth's *Handboc*), p. 204, and in MS. CCCC 356, fol. 42^{r}. The types and sources of these alphabets are treated by Thiel, *Grundlagen*, pp. 85–119, who at p. 125 also reproduces the Hebrew letters in Exeter MS. 3507.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

names of those letters can also be found as headings to the sections of psalm 118, usually together with their explanation, in a number of Anglo-Saxon psalter manuscripts.[67]

Borrowing from Hebrew into Old English is hardly to be expected, except where a word has passed through the medium of Latin, like OE *sabbat* from *sabbatum*. But this loanword occurs only five times (in the Lindisfarne Gospels), while one of the common translation words for *sabbatum* in Old English is *restedæg*, or *restendæg*, a term still known to the author of the *Orrmulum*. This is a loan-formation on a Hebrew basis that does not occur in the other Germanic dialects, and it can only be explained if we assume that the Anglo-Saxon who coined it had recourse to a biblical commentary, especially on Exodus 20,8–10, or to a glossary. He may well have looked at Isidore's *Etymologiae*, where we find the link between the Hebrew root and the Old English word (VI.xviii.17): 'Sabbatum ab Hebraeis ex interpretatione vocabuli sui requies nominatur, quod Deus in ipso, perfecto mundo, requievisset.'[68]

To deal with the lexical evidence for language contact between Anglo-Saxons and Celtic speakers should be left to the competent Celticist. Here it may not be out of place, however, to point out that early Anglo-Celtic relations afford an excellent example of how our views on particular developments of language change may well depend on history and the historian.

The serious study of Old English loans from British and Irish began a hundred years ago with the work of Skeat and Kluge; thirty years later, Max Förster wrote what is still the standard treatment of the field.[69] He considered only ten common nouns in Old English (plus four doubtful ones) as loanwords from Brittonic, and another seven as having been borrowed from Irish. Later on, a few more were added, some by Förster

[67] These include MSS. B. L. Cotton Vespasian A.i (with an additional list of these headings on fol. 6^{v}), Cotton Vitellius E.xviii, Stowe 2, and Lambeth Palace Library 427; Bodleian Junius 27 and Salisbury Cathedral Library 150 have no explanations. For the textual tradition of these headings see Thiel, *Grundlagen*, pp. 117–19.—It has recently been shown that a copy of the Theodulfian recension of the Psalterium Hebraicum, containing glosses by a continental scholar familiar with Hebrew, became available in Wessex or Kent by the mid tenth century: Sarah Larratt Keefer and David A. Burrows, 'Hebrew and the *Hebraicum* in late Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 19 (1990), 67–80.

[68] Other renderings are *symbel* (especially in Anglian texts), *symbeldæg* and *Sæternes dæg*; OE *reste(n)dæg* is especially frequent in the West-Saxon Gospels, but it is also used by Ælfric and elsewhere. Cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 86–7; the Old English terms for *sabbatum* deserve to be studied in greater detail.

[69] Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology. First Series*, pp. 451–2; Kluge, 'Geschichte der englischen Sprache', first ed., pp. 782–3; Förster, 'Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen' (see notes 11 and 12, above).

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

himself, some by others.[70] The extremely small number of these words must have seemed astonishing when one thinks of the Anglo-Saxons settling in a Celtic-speaking country. But as long as the grim picture of the conquest painted by Gildas and, after him, by Bede[71] was taken at its face value, it may not have appeared surprising that there could hardly be any loans from a native population that had been largely exterminated or expelled by the conquerors.

Things began to look different, however, when a more realistic assessment of the historical facts, based on all the available evidence, was put forward. I must leave it to a historian to trace the change of attitude on this point in the course of the twentieth century. Among philologists, R. E. Zachrisson seems to have been the first who saw the historical events in a different light. He was followed by Otto Jespersen and Max Förster;[72] the prevailing present-day view is most emphatically stated in Professor Jackson's magisterial *Language and History in Early Britain*: 'The whole picture is, at any rate, totally incompatible with the old theory of the complete extermination of the British inhabitants'.[73]

As a consequence, historians and linguists have felt obliged to offer explanations for the scarcity of British loanwords in Old English. It is impossible here to discuss all such explanations; they range from that by Otto Jespersen, who adduced Ernst Windisch's theory of mixed languages (according to which people who acquire a second, foreign language do not intermix this with words of their native speech) to a recent suggestion by Wolfgang Meid that the romanized Celts in southern and southeastern

[70] Max Förster, 'Englisch-Keltisches', *Englische Studien*, 56 (1922), 204–39, at 204–209; idem, 'Altenglisch *stör*, ein altirisches Lehnwort', *Englische Studien*, 70 (1935–36), 49–54; J. Vendryes, 'Un mot irlandais dans l'évangéliaire de Lindisfarne', *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, 43 (1946), 27–31; P. L. Henry, *The Early English and Celtic Lyric* (London, 1966), pp. 195–208; A. R. Duckert, '*Erce* and Other Possibly Keltic Elements in the Old English Charm for Unfruitful Land', *Names*, 20 (1972), 83–90; Sherman M. Kuhn, *Studies in the Language and Poetics of Anglo-Saxon England* (Ann Arbor, 1984), pp. 213–30, but see Bammesberger, *Anglia*, 99 (1981), 406–407; Alfred Bammesberger, 'Vieil Irlandais *Sacart* et Vieil Anglais *Sacerd*', *Études Celtiques*, 16 (1979), 187–9; idem, *Beiträge zu einem etymologischen Wörterbuch des Altenglischen* (Heidelberg, 1979). This footnote does not aim at completeness.

[71] Gildas, *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*, chs. 24 and 25; Beda, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I.xv.

[72] R. E. Zachrisson, *Romans Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain. An Investigation into the Two Dark Centuries (400–600) of English History* (Uppsala, 1927); Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, ninth ed. (Leipzig, 1938), pp. 34–7; Förster, *Der Flussname Themse*, p. 697, n. 1; Jackson, *Language and History*, pt. I, ch. vi. See now H. R. Loyn, *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest*, second ed. (London, 1991), pp. 6–15.

[73] Jackson, *Language and History*, p. 246.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

England had largely adopted Latin even as a spoken language and so were unlikely to transmit more than a few British words to their Saxon neighbours.[74]

Additions to Förster's list of 1921 have mainly been suggested in the field of Irish loanwords. I should hesitate to relate this development to recent progress in historical research in the widest sense, including the history of Old English literature and especially, church history. However, it may be useful to remember that we now have ample evidence for the activities of Irish churchmen and scholars in Anglo-Saxon England, evidence that geographically and chronologically reaches far beyond the limits of the Irish mission in seventh-century Northumbria; it is clear that the Synod of Whitby can no longer be considered as the great divide.[75] On the other hand, the limitations of Irish-Old English language contacts are obvious; the two languages must have seemed utterly different to their speakers, so that an Irishman in England either would have had to learn English, or would have needed an interpreter, like Bishop Aidan, who 'was not completely at home in the English tongue' ('qui Anglorum linguam perfecte non nouerat') and whose preaching was therefore, at first, translated by King Oswald who—no doubt like other Anglo-Saxons who had lived in Scotland or Ireland—had become bilingual.[76]

Language contact between Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians is among

[74] Jespersen, *Growth and Structure*, pp. 36–7; Wolfgang Meid, 'Englisch und sein britischer Hintergrund', in *Britain 400–600: Language and History* (see note 29, above), pp. 97–119, at 113–14. See also Jackson, *Language and History*, pp. 242–5, and Henry Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, third ed. (London, 1991), p. 31.—Examples of British influence in Aldred's tenth-century Northumbrian glosses are recorded by R. L. Thomson, 'Aldrediana V: Celtica', *English and Germanic Studies*, 7 (1961), 20–36.

[75] Kathleen Hughes, 'Evidence for the contact between the churches of the Irish and English from the Synod of Whitby to the Viking Age', in *England before the Conquest. Studies in primary sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 49–67; Joseph F. Kelly, 'Irish Influence in England after the Synod of Whitby: Some New Literary Evidence', *Éire-Ireland*, 10 (1975), 35–47; contributions by Donald A. Bullough, Michael Richter and Karl Reichl in *Die Iren und Europa im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982); James Campbell, 'The debt of the early English Church to Ireland', in *Irland und die Christenheit—Ireland and Christendom*, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 332–46; James P. Carley and Ann Dooley, 'An Early Irish Fragment of Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*', in *The Archaeology and History of Glastonbury Abbey. Essays in Honour of C. Ralegh Radford*, ed. Lesley Abrams and James P. Carley (Woodbridge, 1991), pp. 136–61, at 150–2; David Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 111–12. See also Aubrey Gwynn, 'Ireland and Rome in the Eleventh Century', *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 57 (1941), 213–32, at 215.

[76] Beda, *Historia ecclesiastica*, III.iii, and III.xxv for the bilingual Bishop Cedd. See D. Dumville, 'Beowulf and the Celtic World: The Uses of Evidence', *Traditio*, 37 (1981), 109–60, at 110–20.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

the most interesting and most complex phenomena in the context of my chosen subject. Its effect and especially the conditions under which it occurred have been studied more thoroughly than the influence of any other language on Old English, from the *Thesaurus* of George Hickes and a lecture given to the Philological Society by Herbert Coleridge in 1859 to the work of numerous philologists, place-name scholars and historians since the late nineteenth century.[77] Here I cannot do justice to all these, nor do I want to deal with the doubtful recent hypothesis of an Anglo-Scandinavian 'Creole' in tenth-century England, especially the East Midlands.[78] Let me, instead, point to three basic problems that remain.

The first concerns lexical loans: We have to rely on our written sources when we attempt to date their introduction, and it is usually on this basis that they are treated in histories of English. But for a more realistic view, we have to consider the old question of how long spoken Scandinavian survived in England, at least in certain dialectal areas. Professor Samuels has recently been able to show that 'spoken Scandinavian survived, in closed communities, till the twelfth century' in what he has established as the 'focal area' of Norse influence in England, 'a belt stretching from Cumberland and Westmorland in the west to the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire in the east, often including part of Lincolnshire but excluding the old kingdom of Bernicia in Durham and Northumberland'.[79] Elsewhere in England, spoken Norse may have died out rather earlier, and this could mean that borrowing from Norse into *Old* English, at least into a dialectal variety, was rather more extensive than we should be inclined

[77] For Hickes see J. A. W. Bennett, 'The History of Old English and Old Norse Studies in England from the Time of Francis Junius till the End of the Eighteenth Century' (D.Phil. Dissertation, Oxford University, 1938; unpublished), ch. iii; Herbert Coleridge, 'On the Scandinavian Element in the English Language', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1859, 18–31. For a note on the later history of scholarship see Hofmann, *Nordisch-englische Lehnbeziehungen*, pp. 17–18. The most recent survey of the field is provided by Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 320–36.

[78] Patricia Poussa, 'The Evolution of Early Standard English: The Creolization Hypothesis', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 14 (1982), 69–85; Bente Hyldegaard Hansen, 'The Historical Implications of the Scandinavian Linguistic Element in English: A Theoretical Evaluation', *NOWELE*, 4 (1984), 53–95, especially 75–7; Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact*, pp. 282–304; John Hines, 'Scandinavian English: A Creole in Context', in *Language Contact in the British Isles*, ed. P. Sture Ureland and George Broderick (Tübingen, 1991), pp. 403–27. Early warnings against the misuse of the term 'Creole' (cf. *Sprachkontakte im Nordseegebiet*, ed. P. Sture Ureland, Tübingen, 1978, pp. 6 and 93) have unfortunately been ignored.

[79] M. L. Samuels, 'The Great Scandinavian Belt', in *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems*, ed. Margaret Laing (Aberdeen, 1989), pp. 106–15; quotations from pp. 113 and 106.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

to think from looking at the written evidence as recorded in the work of Mary Serjeantson, Dietrich Hofmann and Hans Peters.[80]

Rather more controversial is the claim, first made by Professor Sawyer over thirty years ago and then developed in his books and articles, that the number of Scandinavian invaders and settlers in England was comparatively small, and that the density of their settlements had been exaggerated or overestimated by earlier historians.[81] This theory, however, has not won general acceptance, for several reasons. What concerns us here, of course, is the extent and character of lexical and morphological borrowing as a consequence of these settlements. Even if we are prepared to believe with Uriel Weinreich (to whom Peter Sawyer refers) that the relative size of the language groups involved in extensive word transferring 'is not necessarily a factor',[82] it would seem difficult to account for what we know about the obvious impact of Norse on Old English from the tenth century onwards.

My third problem has to do with what is usually called 'mutual intelligibility' between Anglo-Saxons and Norse speakers, which means speakers who were not bilingual. Opinions on this have differed greatly; let me quote two recent examples: 'To an East Anglian speaker, Danish could hardly have seemed stranger than the West Saxon literary standard',[83]

[80] See Eilert Ekwall, 'How Long did the Scandinavian Language Survive in England?', in *A Grammatical Miscellany Offered to Otto Jespersen on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. N. Bøgholm, Aage Brusendorff and C. A. Bodelsen (Copenhagen, 1930), pp. 17–30; R. I. Page, 'How long did the Scandinavian language survive in England? The epigraphical evidence', in *England before the Conquest* (see note 75, above), pp. 165–81; Hansen, 'The Historical Implications', pp. 80–7. Inventories of pre-Conquest Norse loanwords are provided by Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English*, pp. 64–74, and Hofmann, *Nordisch-englische Lehnbeziehungen*, supplemented by Hans Peters, 'Zum skandinavischen Lehngut im Altenglischen', *Sprachwissenschaft*, 6 (1981), 85–124. Some of Peters's new items seem doubtful; OE *wæð* 'ford' (Peters, p. 98) occurs long before Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1073 D, cf. the discussion of *Martinwaeth* by Veronica Ortenberg in *Anglo-Saxon England*, 19 (1990), 243. Max Förster's claim that the pronoun OE *þæge* is a Scandinavian loanword has been finally disproved by Walter Hofstetter, *Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch* (Munich, 1987), pp. 563–7.

[81] At first in 'The Density of the Danish Settlement in England', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 6 (1957–58), 1–17; see also 'The Two Viking Ages of Britain: A Discussion', *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 2 (1969), 207, and Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings*, second ed. (London, 1971), especially pp. 167–8 and 209. For critical assessments of the question see Gillian Fellows Jensen, 'The Vikings in England: a review', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 181–206, Hansen, 'The Historical Implications', Loyn, *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest*, pp. 57–65, and Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 323–4.

[82] For this argument see Fellows Jensen, 'The Vikings in England', pp. 200–203.

[83] Manfred Markus, *Mittelenglisches Studienbuch* (Tübingen, 1990), p. 315. It is not possible here to discuss what various authorities have had to say about the problem. A recent treatment, too optimistic in my view, is by William G. Moulton, 'Mutual Intelligibility among Speakers of Early Germanic Dialects', in *Germania: Comparative Studies in the Old Germanic Languages and Literatures*, ed. Daniel G. Calder and T. Craig Christy (Woodbridge, 1988), pp. 9–28.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

and 'it is hardly likely that the ninth-century Northumbrians, speaking a West Germanic language, would easily be able to understand Danes and Norwegians speaking a North Germanic one'.[84] In order to judge this issue, we must of course define what we mean by 'mutual intelligibility', a point that appears to have been ignored by most of those who have written about this question. By mutual intelligibility I do not mean the ability to understand individual words whose utterance, moreover, may have been accompanied by gestures or even by pointing to the denoted object. I am thinking of whether a speaker of Old English or Old Norse would have been in a position to follow coherent sentences in the foreign language. When one considers the marked differences between English and Norse that must have obtained very early, when one thinks of differences in vocabulary, of various sound changes, and especially of the inflexional endings, the pronominal system and the suffixed article in Norse, then it must seem difficult to believe that an Anglo-Saxon could have carried on a conversation with a Scandinavian speaker.

Evidence for mutual intelligibility has been repeatedly produced, but it is of the kind that cannot be considered factual proof. Nobody knows exactly what the messages were like that were shouted across the River Blackwater in August 991.[85] It is possible that both Egill and Gunnlaugr ormstunga recited Norse poetry before Anglo-Saxon kings—if we can trust the thirteenth-century saga authors[86]—, but this is no proof that such poetry (difficult enough on stylistic grounds) was understood by a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon audience. Again, the thirteenth-century writer of the *Gunnlaugs saga* who tells us that in the days of King Æthelred and up to the Norman Conquest *one* language was spoken in England, Norway and Denmark is a rather untrustworthy historical linguist. An admirably competent Norse scholar of the twelfth century, however, the author of the so-called *First Grammatical Treatise*, states that Icelanders and the

[84] Fellows Jensen, 'The Vikings in England', p. 201. This view is shared by not a few scholars, including Peter Sawyer (*The Age of the Vikings*, p. 170); see also Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 327–9.

[85] See *The Battle of Maldon*, lines 25–61. For the significance of Scandinavianisms in the Viking's message to Byrhtnoth see Fred C. Robinson, 'Some Aspects of the *Maldon* Poet's Artistry', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 75 (1976), 25–40, at 25–8. The problems of a bilingual Norse speaker (Ohthere) in England are illustrated by Christine E. Fell, 'Some questions of language', in *Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred*, ed. Niels Lund (York, 1984), pp. 56–63.

[86] *Egils saga*, ch. 55; *Gunnlaugs saga ormstungu*, ch. 9. See Gwyn Jones, 'Egill Skallagrímsson in England', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1952, pp. 127–44; Margaret Ashdown, *English and Norse Documents Relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 190 and 237; Gillian Fellows Jensen in *Selskab for Nordisk Filologi. Årsberetning for 1971–1973* (Copenhagen, 1975), p. 8.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

English 'are of the same tongue, although there has been much change in one of them or some in both',[87] and this, I think, can be considered a rather more realistic description of the linguistic situation one or two hundred years earlier in Britain.

Old English was one of the West Germanic languages, and it is in this family that we should expect mutual intelligibility of varying degrees between English and West Frankish (spoken in Francia), the dialects of Old High German, and especially the languages spoken in Flanders, Frisia and Northern Germany (Old Saxon). Contacts between Anglo-Saxons, after their migration to Britain, and speakers of these languages throughout the early Middle Ages must have been the frequent and natural result of trade and travel, pilgrimages and links between religious communities and political and dynastic relations.

Contemporary sources provide only an incomplete picture of such contacts, but some of the major events and developments that they record can give us an idea of the linguistic significance of Anglo-continental relations, such as St. Augustine's Frankish interpreters, the Anglo-Saxon mission to the Continent,[88] King Alfred's amanuenses from Flanders and Saxony, the marriage of Otto I. to Athelstan's half-sister Edith, the relations between the Continent and the English leaders of the Benedictine Reform, and much else. Twentieth-century historians have made us aware of the real extent of the contacts between England and France, Flanders and Germany.[89]

I have spoken of the 'varying degrees' of intelligibility within the West Germanic language group, because we have to consider the different

[87] *First Grammatical Treatise*, ed. and trans. Einar Haugen, second ed. (London, 1972), p. 12.

[88] For the Frankish interpreters see André Crépin, 'Bede and the Vernacular', in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Gerald Bonner (London, 1976), 170–92, at 176–7, and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Historical Commentary* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 33–4. A useful survey of the linguistic impact of the Anglo-Saxon mission on Old High German and Old Saxon, and of its study, is provided by Wolfgang Haubrichs, 'Die Angelsachsen und die germanischen Stämme des Kontinents im frühen Mittelalter: Sprachliche und literarische Beziehungen', in *Irland und die Christenheit*, pp. 387–412.

[89] Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946); Philip Grierson, 'The Relations between England and Flanders before the Norman Conquest', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Ser., 23 (1941), 71–112; Karl Leyser, 'Die Ottonen und Wessex', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 17 (1983), 73–97; Simon Keynes, 'King Athelstan's Books', in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies presented to Peter Clemoes on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 143–201; Ortenberg, *The English Church and the Continent*, chs. 2 and 3; Ute Schwab, *Einige Beziehungen zwischen altsächsischer und angelsächsischer Dichtung* (Spoleto, 1988).

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

development of the individual languages and dialects in phonology, morphology and vocabulary. The dialects of central and southern Germany, which had undergone the second shift of consonants, must have been rather more difficult to understand than those of the North to travellers like Bishop Cenwald of Worcester and his companions, who in 929 visited all the monasteries 'per totam Germaniam'.[90] West Frankish—when this was still a living language in France—may have been less troublesome to Anglo-Saxon ears; unfortunately, we know very little about this variety of West Germanic. But we learn from Bede that a West Frankish speaker by the name of Agilbert came to Wessex in 650 and there 'voluntarily undertook the task of preaching'.[91] Apparently, then, his West-Saxon audience could understand him somehow; it is in any case certain that he had not properly learned Old English, for Bede reports that the West-Saxon King Cenwealh, who had even invited Agilbert to become bishop of Wessex, later on grew tired of Agilbert's barbarous speech ('pertaesus barbarae loquellae'), and Bede also makes it clear that the king knew only the Anglo-Saxon language.

Old Saxon and the language spoken further west, in Flanders, must have been easily intelligible to Anglo-Saxons, as seems evident from a comparison of texts in Old English and Old Saxon and of their grammars, and one would be inclined to think that neither John the Old Saxon nor Grimbald of St. Bertin had to have a perfect command of Old English when they carried out their duties, or when they helped King Alfred to translate Pope Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis*.[92] At about the same time, an Anglo-Saxon writer was able to create the *Later Genesis*, an adaptation—not a translation—of an Old Saxon poem,[93] and somewhat later an English scribe produced a copy of the *Heliand* in the original language;[94] it would appear then that there was a readership for such poetry, a readership that had no difficulty in understanding Old Saxon. A recent scholar has even claimed that it is likely that the *Later Genesis* 'represents

[90] Keynes, 'King Athelstan's Books', pp. 198–201.

[91] *Historica ecclesiastica*, III.vii and xxv. For Agilbert and his native language see Derolez, 'Language Problems', pp. 287–8, and Peter Hunter Blair, 'The Career of Agilbert', in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England* (see note 89), pp. 30–2.

[92] *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources*, trans. Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge (Harmondsworth, 1983), pp. 26–8.

[93] The most recent edition is *The Saxon Genesis*, ed. A. N. Doane (Madison, Wisconsin, 1991). For the background of the poem's transmission see Barbara Raw, 'The probable derivation of most of the illustrations in Junius 11 from an illustrated Old Saxon *Genesis*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5 (1976), 133–48, and Schwab, *Beziehungen*.

[94] MS. B. L. Cotton Caligula A.vii; for the nationality of the scribe see *Heliand und Genesis*, ed. Otto Behaghel and Burkhard Taeger, ninth ed. (Tübingen, 1984), pp. xvi and xxxi.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

just a visible ripple in a ceaseless two-way flow of books between England and Germany'.[95]

What about lexical or semantic borrowing from one of the West Germanic dialects? In view of the close affinity of these dialects and Old English it will not always be easy to produce conclusive proof of such borrowing. The *Later Genesis* contains a considerable number of 'Saxonisms' that do not occur elsewhere in Old English texts.[96] We do not know why the adaptor did not remove them; he may have wanted to preserve as much of the art of the original poem as possible, assuming at the same time that an Anglo-Saxon audience would not misunderstand his version. At any rate, his Saxonisms cannot be considered as loanwords or semantic loans, and lexicographers of Old English need to observe this. There is, however, one word which was apparently borrowed, at least as a poetic term, as it occurs in the *Later Genesis* and in three other late Old English poems. This is OE *hearra*, *heorra*, denoting God as lord, and also a secular lord.[97] It seems somewhat strange that just this word should have been adopted, considering the range of synonyms for 'lord' already available to Anglo-Saxon poets.

Here as elsewhere it is important to avoid simplification. Linguistic interference between the West Germanic dialects and Old English may have been far more complex than would appear at first sight, as can be seen from a few examples. An Old English poem on Judgment Day includes two Old High German nouns.[98] They occur nowhere else in Old English; was the poet familiar with German religious verse? In two early Old English prose texts, we find German (i.e. Old High German and Old Saxon) *Ost-* instead of OE *East-* in compounds denoting the Baltic and the

[95] Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, p. 52.

[96] *The Later Genesis*, ed. B. J. Timmer, revised ed. (Oxford, 1954), pp. 27–38; Doane, *The Saxon Genesis*, pp. 47–53. An instructive study is Hans Schabram, 'Die Bedeutung von *ȝāl* und *ȝālscipe* in der ae. Genesis B', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 82 (1960), 265–74. See especially Schwab, *Beziehungen*, pp. 90–132.

[97] See D. H. Green, *The Carolingian Lord* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 417–19, and, for an uncertain instance of *he(a)rra*, *Daniel and Azarias*, ed. R. T. Farrell (London, 1974), p. 136. Another Old English loan from Old Saxon (or Old High German?) appears to be OE *geongra*, *gingra* 'follower, servant, pupil, disciple', cf. Green, *The Carolingian Lord*, pp. 440–3. Sherman Kuhn has claimed that OE *(ge)macian* was a loan from Old Saxon and eventually from Old High German: 'Old English *macian*. Its Origin and Dissemination', *Journal of English Linguistics*, 19 (1986), 49–93. For a number of other doubtful loans from Old High German (as suggested by Werner Betz) see Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 160–1.

[98] *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ed. Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, The Anglo Saxon Poetic Records VI (New York, 1942), p. 66, lines 292–3, and pp. 182–3; L. Whitbread, 'Old English and Old High German: A Note on *Judgement Day II*, 292–293', *Studies in Philology*, 60 (1963), 514–24.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Ostrogoths. Could this go back to written, continental sources?[99] In Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis*, OE *sicor* occurs once; it is no doubt a loanword from Latin (*securus*), but on account of its phonology it may have to be explained as a secondary loan from Old Saxon.[100] Could this be a result of King Alfred's cooperation with helpers from the Continent?

Language contact between French and English began long before the Norman Conquest, though it left only few traces in Old English as far as borrowing is concerned. French is usually said to have come into its own, as a spoken and written language, from the ninth century onwards, but there is no certain manuscript evidence for French loanwards in English before the late tenth century. A comprehensive study of the relations between the Churches of England and France in the tenth and eleventh centuries has now appeared,[101] and it seems clear from this and from earlier work in the field that the historical conditions in this period were favourable to contacts that must have resulted in some knowledge of French especially among the Anglo-Saxon clergy. Close links had been established between the Benedictine communities of England and France, particularly between the English reformers and Fleury, during the Reform period of the tenth century. English monks had studied at Fleury, English scribes are found in the Fleury scriptorium, while French scholars like Abbo of Fleury taught in England.[102] The import of books from France into England on a large scale at this time is another certain sign of cooperation and mutual contact.[103] As for the political side, we need only remember the exile of King Æthelred in Normandy with its consequences.

The scarcity of French loans in England prior to the Norman Conquest need not surprise us. There was not as yet a French literature, and there may have been few objects or ideas named in French that the Anglo-Saxons could not have expressed in their own words, apart from the fact

[99] Cf. '*Ostsæ*', in *The Old English Orosius*, ed. Janet Bately, EETS, SS 6 (London, 1980), p. 13, lines 16 and 20, and p. 176; '*Þeodoric, Ostgotona cyning*', in *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, ed. Günter Kotzor, Bayer. Akademie der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen N.F. 88/1–2 (Munich, 1981), II.105.15–16 and II.314.

[100] See Bammesberger, *Beiträge zu einem etymologischen Wörterbuch*, p. 114, and Wollmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 164.

[101] Ortenberg, *The English Church and the Continent*, ch. 7.

[102] *Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. Lapidge and Winterbottom, p. lix; J. Campbell, 'England, France, Flanders and Germany: Some Comparisons and Connections', in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. David Hill, BAR British Series 59 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 255–70, at 267–8, n. 37; Marco Mostert, 'Le séjour d'Abbon de Fleury à Ramsey', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 144 (1987), 199–208. But see Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 148–9.

[103] Helmut Gneuss, 'Anglo-Saxon Libraries from the Conversion to the Benedictine Reform', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* XXXII (Spoleto, 1986), 643–88, at 678–9.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

that for those who knew enough Latin this language could always serve as a convenient means of communication.

In what follows, I will only consider language contact and borrowing before 1066, since the conditions after the Conquest were radically different, even though at first, in the later eleventh century, the number of French loans was still comparatively small. The study of French loanwords in the pre-Conquest period began with an article by Friedrich Kluge, [104] published in 1895, in which he maintained that he could produce evidence of a 'reichhaltige Lehnwörterschicht in England um 1000 herum' —an extensive stratum of (French) loanwords in England around the year 1000—, and he then lists twenty-three words which according to him belong in this stratum, promising further work on this subject. Other scholars have followed Kluge with similar lists, sometimes adding more words thought to be early French loans, but often with only very few of the items Kluge had suggested.[105] If, however, we add up all the individual words in these lists, we arrive at a number of about forty.[106] But we shall soon find that most of them have no legitimate claim to a place among early French loans, for two reasons. One is that their etymology was not properly examined; more than a dozen can be explained without difficulty as Latin loanwords and so should be classed with the numerous later Latin loans in Old English.[107] A few others are of uncertain etymology or go back to Germanic roots.[108] The other reason is that several authors dealing with our subject paid no attention whatever to what is known about the manuscript transmission and therefore about the date of the first provable occurrence of a loanword. It has to be admitted that such dating was often difficult if not impossible before the appearance of Dr Ker's *Catalogue*,

[104] Friedrich Kluge, 'Ne. *Proud-Pride*', *Englische Studien*, 21 (1895), 334–5; cf. the report by Walter W. Skeat in *The Academy*, Sept. 28, 1895, p. 252.

[105] Among the more important are Hans Remus, *Die kirchlichen und spezial-wissenschaftlichen romanischen Lehnworte Chaucers* (Halle, 1906), pp. 19–21; Robert Mettig, 'Die französischen Elemente im Alt- und Mittelenglischen', *Englische Studien*, 41 (1910), 177–252, at 186–9; Otto Funke, 'Zur Wortgeschichte der französischen Elemente im Englischen', *Englische Studien*, 55 (1921), 1–25; Serjeantson, *A History of Foreign Words in English*, pp. 105–107; Hermann Flasdieck, 'Studien zur Laut- und Wortgeschichte', *Anglia*, 70 (1951), 240–71; Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, p. 221.

[106] These include: *bacun*, *bastard*, *bat*, *burse*, *cancelere*, *cancre*, *capun*, *castel*, *cat*, *cæcepol*, *clerc*, *cuffie*, *cumin*, *cule*, *don*, *fals*, *flanc*, *fræpgan*, *iugelere*, *gingifer*, *leowe*, *mantel*, *market*, *muntgeow*, *orgel*, *paper*, *prut* and *pryte*, *purs*, *rocc*, *salair*, *seruian*, *sot*, *spice*, *targa*, *tresor*, *træglian*, *tumbian*, *tur*, *turnian*, and derivations and compounds of these words. A detailed treatment of their occurrence and etymology is needed.

[107] These may include OE *cancre*, *capun*(?), *castel* (see below), *cæcepol*(?), *cuffie*, *cumin*, *fals*, *gemme*, *gingifer*, *muntgeow*, *paper*(?), *purs*, *træglian*(?), *tur*, *turnian*, *spice*, and the form *sott*.

[108] *bat*, *cat*, *fræpgan*, *orgel*, *tumbian*.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

but at least in the case of words first recorded in the Peterborough Chronicle one might have expected a more critical attitude.[109]

Only very few words can be said to be genuine pre-Conquest loans from French, although even here doubts remain. They occur rarely more than once or twice in glosses or glossaries and may not have become current: for instance, *capun* (if it does not come from Vulgar Latin),[110] *castel* (only once before 1066 with the meaning 'castle', as opposed to an earlier Latin loan denoting 'town' or 'village'),[111] perhaps *flanc* 'flank', *iugelere* 'magician', *leowe* 'league', *paper*, *rocc*; *salair* (if not a late additional gloss), and more certainly *sot* 'foolish'.[112]

Only two words are at all frequent. One is *cule*, for a monk's cowl, which in the eleventh century may have replaced the much earlier loanword *cugle* (from *cuculla*)—if the later form cannot after all be explained as due to phonological development in English.[113] The second word is the ancestor of Modern English *proud* which, together with its word-family, occurs more than fifty times.[114]

When we examine OE *prut* and the noun *pryte* (rarely *pryt*, *pryto*) as well as the words derived from these or compounded with them, we notice a few problems. The etymological derivation from French, first suggested

[109] I can only give examples. For *cancelere*, *cancheler*, see the *Peterborough Chronicle* AD 1093, and *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, ed. F. E. Harmer (Manchester, 1952), no. 112 and especially p. 59; for *market*, the *Peterborough Chronicle* AD 963 (written *c.* 1125), and the spurious writ ed. Harmer no. 61, and Miss Harmer's note pp. 476–7; no manuscript of this writ is earlier than s.xiv. Funke (*Englische Studien*, 55, p. 9) misdates the glossary recording *paper*, and Flasdieck (*Anglia*, 70, p. 255) dates *capun* in the Antwerp-London Glossary far too late. The uncritical attitude to early French loans in English persists, cf. *The Middle English Physiologus*, ed. Hanneke Wirtjes, EETS 299 (Oxford, 1991), p. xxxii.

[110] For *capun* see Funke, 'Zur Wortgeschichte', p. 10, Wollmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 180, and note 107, above. The two occurrences in the Antwerp-London Glossary (Wright-Wülcker 132.32 and 34) certainly predate the Conquest.

[111] See Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, pp. 120–1, and for the historical background R. Allen Brown. 'An Historian's Approach to the Origins of the Castle in England', *The Archaeological Journal*, 126 for 1969 (1970), 131–48.

[112] For *sot*, *sott* cf. Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, pp. 43 and 52; for a possible Germanic etymology of *iugelere* see Louis Goossens, *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm's De laudibus virginitatis)* (Brussels, 1974), p. 407, n. 3974, but cf. *geogeleras* in *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien*, ed. Arthur Napier, with appendix by Klaus Ostheeren (Dublin, 1967), p. 98, line 9. A French loanword that seems to have gone unnoticed is *scoliere*; Byrhtferth of Ramsey (in whose *Handboc* it occurs five times) may have learned it from Abbo of Fleury. See Derolez, 'Language Problems', pp. 291–2, and Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, p. 130.

[113] See Flasdieck, 'Studien', pp. 240–53, and Wollmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 469–83.

[114] For OE *prut*, *pryte* and related words see Flasdieck, 'Studien', pp. 257–71, and Hans Schabram, *Superbia: Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz*, I (Munich, 1965), especially pp. 14–16; both do not consider the Latin equivalents of the individual occurrences of the OE words.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

by Kluge, seems to have been generally accepted now. The earliest occurrence of any word of the family in English was thought to be a Kentish gloss of the middle of the tenth century which, however, has turned out to be a misreading;[115] no occurrence of any form of *prut*, *pryte* etc. is recorded in a manuscript written before the early eleventh century. The phonological explanation of the noun, obviously derived from the adjective *prut*, is difficult enough, as its formation implies a sound-change analogous to one operative four centuries earlier. But the main problem as I see it is the choice of a French word for one of the basic concepts of religious thought, adopted at a time when Old English had a fully developed vocabulary for such concepts and for the Christian religion in general.

Above all, why should a foreign word be newly introduced at a time when there were two well-established terms for *superbia* current in the West-Saxon dialect (apart from Anglian *oferhygd* and its relatives), one of them, *ofermod* and related words, being perfectly unambiguous, the other, *modig* and its family, having been chosen by Æthelwold's influential Winchester school?[116] Close contacts with the French Benedictines must have played a role in this; the polysemy of *modig*—which could also mean 'bold, brave, magnanimous'—may have been another factor. Is it even conceivable that *modig* had been considered as unsatisfactory, and that the choice of *prut* was already being considered an unequivocal alternative in Æthelwold's circle? The frequent use of the *prut* family in the Old English version of the Rule of Chrodegang, and the occurrence of *pryte* in Ælfric's second series of the *Catholic Homilies* might speak for this, and might explain the exceptional success story of a French word before the Norman Conquest. But Hans Käsmann and Walter Hofstetter[117] have shown that this story was more complex, and that *prut* und *pryte* only gradually took over the role of translation words for *superbus* and *superbia*, while in late Old English texts (including Ælfric and the Rule of Chrodegang) they more often than not render only related concepts like *arrogantia*, *elatio*, *fastus*, etc. Let us also remember that it was Ælfric who in the Latin preface to his *Grammar* noted that words could be translated in several ways: 'Scio multimodis verba posse interpretari.'

As I mentioned at the beginning, we now have an extensive literature

[115] Walter Hofstetter, 'Der Erstbeleg von ae. *pryte/pryde*', *Anglia*, 97 (1979), 172–5.

[116] See Schabram, *Superbia*; Hofstetter, *Winchester;* Helmut Gneuss, 'The origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's school at Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), 63–83.

[117] Hans Käsmann, *Studien zum kirchlichen Wortschatz des Mittelenglischen 1100–1350* (Tübingen, 1961), pp. 274–81; Hofstetter, *Winchester*, pp. 53–5. I owe the suggestion that the introduction of the *prut*-family may have been considered in Æthelwold's circle to Mechthild Gretsch.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

on the theoretical aspects of linguistic change due to language contact and bilingualism. It would be tempting to examine how the linguists' findings relate to our present knowledge of developments in Old English. This cannot be my task now, but I must draw your attention to one important point. I have restricted myself in this lecture—as you will have seen from its title—to *lexical* borrowing. Yet we know very well that linguistic borrowing is not limited to the vocabulary; there is plentiful evidence from a large variety of languages that any element—ranging from sounds and accents to style—may be subject to a process of adoption.

Accordingly, we should have to look for foreign linguistic interference outside the sphere of the lexicon in Old English in order to provide a balanced view of our subject. We should have to investigate such influence in particular in phonology, inflexional morphology, word-formation and syntax, influence which has been subsumed by linguists under the name 'structural borrowing'.[118] Unfortunately, however, this field has not yet been treated systematically as far as Old English and its contact languages are concerned; also, it has to be admitted that it is far more difficult to establish reliable criteria for proving cases of structural loan as opposed to lexical borrowing. For my purpose here, a few remarks on structural borrowing in Old English will have to suffice.

As far as I can see, the sound system of Old English was nowhere seriously disturbed or changed under the influence of foreign languages, perhaps with the exception of a newly introduced initial /sk-/ in Scandinavian loanwords.[119] Sound-substitution seems to have been the general practice, as in *Crecas* (= *Graeci*), *fers* (= *versus*); *sealm* (= *psalmus*), and the accent in Latin loans was usually moved to the first syllable.[120] The whole matter is, however, far more complicated, and each loanword needs to be examined individually, as can be seen from the examples just given: *Crecas* has been explained as a form taken over from West Germanic and possibly Gothic (other Latin loanwords with initial *g-* have retained this in their Old English spelling, but probably with the pronunciation [γ] in the early period);[121] the orthography of *fers* has been thought to be influenced from

[118] For the theoretical aspects of the distinction between lexical and structural borrowing see Thomason and Kaufmann, *Language Contact* (note 1, above).

[119] See Karl Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik nach der Angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers*, third ed. (Tübingen, 1965), § 206, n. 10. For a case of sound substitution by a Norse bilingual speaker (or an Anglo-Saxon author?) see Fell, 'Some questions of language', p. 62, and Derolez, 'Language Problems', p. 289.

[120] On accent, see Thomas Pyles, 'The Pronunciation of Latin Learned Words and Foreign Words in Old English', *PMLA*, 58 (1943), 891–910, at 893–5.

[121] See Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, § 211 n., and Manfred Schulz, *Untersuchungen zum anlautenden velaren /g/ im Altenglischen* (Dissertation, Göttingen University, 1978), ch. v and pp. 130–1.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Old Irish;[122] the diphthong in *sealm* may represent sound-substitution or, rather less likely, a genuine case of breaking.

The only instance of the introduction of a new phoneme under Latin influence may be seen in twenty-nine occurrences of the spelling *uers* (as opposed to 127 cases of *fers*) in late Old English texts and glosses. This may mean that the voiced labial fricative is no longer to be considered an allophone of /f/ in medial position. It may also be explained as early evidence for the southern English voicing of initial voiceless fricatives; but with eighteen occurrences of *uers* in Byrhtferth's *Handboc* this is rather doubtful, and we should perhaps not put too much reliance on scribes whose spelling habits in writing what was after all a borrowed technical term may have been influenced by the Latin original.[123]

There seems to be general agreement that Anglo-Norse language contact contributed to the levelling and rapid decay of the English inflexional system; whether innovations in the present indicative inflexion of the English verb, beginning in the tenth century in Northern England, were due to Scandinavian influence has not been proved conclusively.[124] Apart from this, there is no indication of outside influence on the system. Otto Funke considered a number of loans that had retained their Latin case endings as 'foreign words',[125] but such a retention of foreign endings usually marks only a temporary stage in the history of a word or is characteristic of certain types of 'Fachtexte'.

A comprehensive treatment of Old English word-formation is badly needed. Until this becomes available, it would be unwise to try to speak about foreign elements in a language which had a fully developed system of composition and derivation. Moreover, Professor Campbell has been able to show that in quite a number of loanwords from Latin, Old English suffixes have been substituted for part of the Latin words.[126] One or two suffixes used with native elements of the vocabulary may have been borrowed; another, highly productive, suffix for agent nouns, *-ere* in words such as *bæcere* and *fiscere* is traditionally believed to be an early Germanic loan from Latin.[127]

[122] Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, § 192, n. 2; Max Förster in *Anglia*, 66 (1942), 41, n. 1; Pyles, 'The Pronunciation', pp. 901–902.

[123] Most of the other occurrences of OE *uers* appear in interlinear versions. For voicing of initial *f* in late Old English see now Kornexl, *Die Regularis Concordia*, note on line 306.

[124] See Karl Brunner, *Die englische Sprache*, second ed. (Tübingen, 1960–62), II.177–8; Samuels, 'The Great Scandinavian Belt', pp. 111–12; Angelika Lutz, *Phonotaktisch gesteuerte Konsonantenveränderungen in der Geschichte des Englischen* (Tübingen, 1991), pp. 105–13.

[125] Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, pp. 44–5; cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 17–19.

[126] *Old English Grammar*, §§ 518 and 564.

[127] For the diminutive suffix *-incel* see Herbert Koziol, *Handbuch der englischen Wortbildungslehre*, second ed. (Heidelberg, 1972); for a rare suffix *-ern* see Kornexl, *Die*

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

A critical record of Latin influence on the syntax of Old English prose has now been provided in Dr Mitchell's monumental *Old English Syntax*,[128] where the methodical problems that beset the study of this rewarding field are amply demonstrated, and its importance for the analysis of the theory and practice of translation into Old English can be seen. These subjects I must here leave aside, yet I cannot refrain from warning future students against using evidence from Old English interlinear versions for their purpose, because I believe that (in spite of what I have to say about these versions later on) such evidence is unsafe and therefore inadmissible in the study of syntax.

After what has been said just now, it may appear that the study of lexical borrowing in Old English is a fairly straightforward matter as compared with that of the various aspects of structural borrowing. However, this is not so. The list of loanwords in our handbooks and the entries in our dictionaries may easily mislead us, because they rarely supply satisfactory information on what I should like to call the status of a loanword: its currency and distribution in particular texts, its role in a field of synonyms and its significance for our knowledge of cultural history in the widest sense.[129] Moreover, in spite of the degree of perfection and reliability that etymological research has attained in the past 150 years, there are still quite a number of words whose origin scholars have not been able to establish beyond doubt as being native or foreign.[130] This is not, however, to deny the value of a number of special studies covering certain groups of terms or particular linguistic aspects,[131] and the great progress made in Old English lexicography.[132]

Regularis Concordia, notes on lines 257 and 359; for *-ere* see Wolfgang Meid, *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft III: Wortbildungslehre* (Berlin, 1967), pp. 81–4, and Dieter Kastovsky, 'The Old English Suffix *-er(e)*', *Anglia*, 89 (1971), 285–325.

[128] (Oxford, 1985); see II.1033–4: 'Latin influence'; see also Manfred Scheler, *Altenglische Lehnsyntax: Die syntaktischen Latinismen im Altenglischen* (Dissertation, Free University of Berlin, 1961). For possible Norse influence on Old English syntax see Mitchell, II.1047.

[129] For an example see Helmut Gneuss, 'Some Problems and Principles of the Lexicography of Old English', in *Festschrift für Karl Schneider*, ed. Kurt R. Jankowsky and Ernst S. Dick (Amsterdam, 1982), pp. 153–68, at 154–5.

[130] Examples of possible but uncertain loans from Latin are OE *cweartern*, *dihtan*, *syfre*, *symbel*, *syn*; possible but doubtful loans or semantic loans from Old Norse may be the antecedents of Modern English *call*, *die*, *dream*, *dwell*, *plough* and *seem*, cf. Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 335–6. We expect the solution of these puzzles from Alfred Bammesberger's forthcoming Etymological Dictionary of Old English.

[131] Such work is conveniently listed in Angus Cameron, Allison Kingsmill and Ashley Crandell Amos, *Old English Word Studies: A Preliminary Author and Word Index* (Toronto, 1983).

[132] See Hans Sauer, 'The New *Dictionary of Old English* (*DOE*)', *Mitteilungen des Verbandes deutscher Anglisten*, 3 (1992), 41–52.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Another important aspect of loanword studies ought to be mentioned. Borrowed words do not only tell us about the effect of language contact; they can provide valuable evidence for developments in the receiving language: the vitality and productivity of certain inflexional classes and types of word-formation. In two recent but unpublished theses,[133] more than 400 Latin (and Greek) loanwords in Old English have been examined as to the inflexional classes in which they appear. As was to be expected, a number of nouns could not be attributed safely to any class, whereas not a few nouns—and some verbs—were found in more than one class. Also, change of gender in nouns was to be observed quite frequently.[134] If we leave such changes aside, and if we take into consideration all cases in which words appear in more than one inflexional type, we arrive at very interesting results: Three quarters of all borrowed verbs and of Old English verbs derived from Latin loanwords belong to the second class of weak verbs, and a few more show forms of the first *and* the second weak class, while only the rest show inflected forms of the first weak class. Of the nouns taken over from Latin (and Greek) nearly 49 per cent appear as masculine or neuter in the *a*-declension or the subclass in *-ja*; 34.4 per cent are in the weak declension including the *jōn*-class, mostly with feminine gender, and another 16.7 per cent have found their way into the (feminine) *ō*-declension. Of the nouns in the *a*-declension, two thirds (66.3 per cent) are masculine, 14.3 per cent are neuter and another 19.4 per cent cannot be specifically placed in either one of these categories, although it seems safe to assume that about five-sixths of these were masculine, too. This means that more than 40 per cent of the borrowed nouns are found in the most common inflexional type of Old English which, in a sense, has survived to our own days, while none of the loanwords was inflected according to any of the 'smaller' classes. What seems even more important is the fact that early and late loanwords show the same distribution, with the exception that the percentage of words taken over into the *ō*-declension is markedly lower towards the end of the Old English period. This may well indicate that certain tendencies in the reduction of the inflexional system as well as the levelling of the endings had their beginning much earlier than our textbooks may suggest.

[133] Astrid Jessler, 'Die lateinischen Lehnverben im Altenglischen' (M.A. Thesis, Munich University, 1983); Elisabeth Körber, 'Die Übernahme der lateinischen Substantiva in das altenglische Deklinationssystem unter Berücksichtigung des Genus' (Examination Thesis, Munich University, 1982). This work was preceded by Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre*, pp. 155–65, Funke, *Lehn- und Fremdwörter*, pp. 131–4, and Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, § 559. See also Friedrich Kluge, *Urgermanisch*, third ed. (Strassburg, 1913), pp. 27–9.

[134] See Jerzy Wełna, 'Complex Gender in Old English Loanwords', *Acta Philologica* (Warsaw), 1978, pp. 143–64; idem, 'On gender change in linguistic borrowing (Old English)', in *Historical Morphology*, ed. Jacek Fisiak (The Hague, 1980), pp. 399–420.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Until now, I have only occasionally mentioned an important aspect of lexical borrowing, and this is the rendering of foreign terms and concepts on the basis of the native, receiving language, either by giving a native word a new, additional meaning, or by forming new words from native elements (or from a combination of foreign and native elements); these new words are then modelled more or less closely on the morphological structure of the foreign word that they are meant to reproduce.

That this transfer of sense, or of sense and structure, plays a significant role in language contact was noticed long ago, as I pointed out at the beginning in my quotations from William Camden and William Lisle. For a systematic study of borrowing on a native basis, however, we have had to wait for nearly three hundred years after these early writers. Otto Jespersen and H. S. MacGillivray[135] were among those who paved the way for this study in English philology, but it was Werner Betz who, in his work on Old High German glosses, laid the methodological foundation for all future work in this field.[136] Almost exactly forty years ago, my teacher in Berlin, Bogislav von Lindheim, suggested to me that the vocabulary of Old English could and should be examined on the lines of Betz's investigation, and the result was my study based on the Old English psalter glosses,[137] a study with the obvious limitations of a time when computers were as yet unknown and nobody would even dream of a work like the *Microfiche Concordance of Old English*. In the meantime, more work in this field has been done, particularly in Old High German, but also in Old English[138] (and for Anglo-German language contact in the twentieth century). I have learned a great deal from this work, as well as from my own findings. Here I can only mention a few important points.

Betz's classification of loan-shifts ('Lehnprägungen') as based on semantic and morphological criteria appears essentially sound and practical, at least as far as the relations between Indo-European languages are concerned,

[135] Jespersen, *Growth and Structure*, pp. 39–46; MacGillivray, *The Influence of Christianity*, pp. 151–6; cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 5–15.

[136] Werner Betz, *Deutsch und Lateinisch: Die Lehnbildungen der althochdeutschen Benediktinerregel* (Bonn, 1949); idem, 'Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen im Vor- und Frühdeutschen', in *Deutsche Wortgeschichte*, ed. Friedrich Maurer and Heinz Rupp (Berlin, 1974), I.135–63.

[137] See above, note 55, and the review by Einar Haugen, *Language*, 32 (1956), 761–6.

[138] For Old High German see Betz, 'Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen', and Karl Toth, *Der Lehnwortschatz der althochdeutschen Tatian-Übersetzung*, Dissertation, Munich University (Würzburg, 1980), and their references. Recent studies on Old English are Evert Wiesenekker, *Word be worde, andgit of andgite: Translation performance in the Old English interlinear glosses of the Vespasian, Regius and Lambeth psalters*, Dissertation, Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit (privately printed, 1991); Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 309–17; Sauer, 'Towards a Linguistic Description', pp. 385–91.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

and it is somewhat disappointing to see that Uriel Weinreich's English renderings of Betz's terms[139] have not found their way into the splendid *Supplement* to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. The distinction between semantic loans (i.e., native words with new, additional meanings) and loan-formations (i.e., newly formed words on a native basis) is and remains essential. As to the subcategories of loan-formations, it may not always be possible to classify a word as a loan-translation—where each morpheme corresponds more or less exactly to a morpheme of the foreign tongue—, or as a loan-adaptation (or loan-rendition)—in which the morphemic and semantic correspondence is only partial—, while loan-creations, without semantic correspondence to the elements of their model, are more clearly definable.

One of the main problems in this field is to establish safe criteria for distinguishing newly-formed compounds and derivatives from formations that do not owe their existence to foreign models; very often, this means to distinguish between a loan-formation and a semantic loan.[140] Another problem is represented by apparent semantic loans, such as words with meanings adopted from Old Norse lexemes, when such meanings may already have existed in Old English, but may not have been recorded in our surviving texts and glosses.[141]

Here I wish to draw attention to a further important issue. For Old High German and Old English lexical loans of all types, the survival rate and the proportion of loans to the total number of recorded words (i.e., lexemes) in particular texts—and in Old High German as a whole—have been calculated or estimated. It will hardly seem surprising that the survival rate in German is much higher than in English, when one considers the revolutionary developments in the English vocabulary during the Middle English period. As to the share of lexical loans in Old High German, Betz[142] has estimated that about 18 per cent of the total vocabulary are such loans, consisting of *c.* 3 per cent of loanwords, 10 per cent of loan-formations, and roughly 5 per cent of semantic loans. When we consider these figures with regard to the currency of the individual

[139] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, pp. 48–52; see also the terms employed by Einar Haugen, 'The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing', *Language*, 26 (1950), 210–31 and in *Language*, 32 (1956), 761–6, and the terminology of Wiesenekker, Kastovsky and Sauer (cf. note 138). John Algeo employs this terminology in a rather unusual way: 'Borrowing', in *Research Guide on Language Change*, ed. Edgar C. Polomé (Berlin, 1990), pp. 409–13.

[140] For some problematic cases see Gneuss, 'Some Problems and Principles', p. 155, and idem, 'Linguistic Borrowing and Old English Lexicography: Old English terms for the Books of the Liturgy', in *Problems of Old English Lexicography. Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger (Regensburg, 1985), pp. 107–29, at 118–20.

[141] See note 130, above.

[142] 'Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen', p. 145, and see the figures given on pp. 146–58.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

words, however, we shall have to remember that a large proportion of these loans comes from translations and especially from glosses, like the Old High German interlinear version of the Rule of St. Benedict, which was the textual basis of Betz's pioneering study.

For Old English, to my knowledge we only have corresponding figures for three interlinear versions of the psalter, and for the eleventh-century gloss to a hymnal.[143] These figures should, however, be viewed with extreme caution, because they do not include a large number of compounds and derivatives that cannot definitely be classed as loans. Apart from this, it turns out that they do not differ greatly from those given by Betz: Thus, in the Vespasian Psalter and the Durham Hymnal, we find that about 22 per cent of all lexemes are loans; in both versions, loanwords make up about 3 per cent, while the proportion of loan-formations and semantic loans is slightly different. But what do such figures really tell us? This brings me to my last subject, interlinear glossing in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

While the theory of translation, i.e., of prose translation, in Anglo-Saxon England has been examined in a number of studies, we do not as yet have a comprehensive investigation of glossing in the vernacular, in particular in what Dr Ker aptly called 'continuous glosses'. It is obvious that what St. Jerome had to say about translation is echoed several times by Alfred and Ælfric and can perfectly well serve as a basis for our understanding of Old English prose versions of Latin texts.[144] But what about interlinear glosses, their methods, aims and function?

There is one characteristic that we find more or less regularly in continuous Old English glosses: the frequent employment of loan-formations, especially loan-translations, and of semantic loans. At this point let us have a look at the preface to what in my view was and remains a remarkable lexicographical achievement, Henry Sweet's *A Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*, first published in 1896, where we read:

> Unnatural words.—As the Old-English literature consists largely of translations, we may expect to find in it a certain number of words which are contrary to the genius of the language, some of them being positive monstrosities, the result of over-literal rendering of Latin words. I often warn the reader against them by adding (!). These unnatural words are not confined to interlinear translations. The translator of Bede's History is a great offender, and I have had constantly to add the warning Bd. Among

[143] Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 156–7; Wiesenekker, *Word be worde*, p. 255; Christiane Wetzel, 'Das Lehngut im Durhamer Hymnar' (Examination Thesis, Munich University, 1978; unpublished).

[144] For translation theory in early England see now Richard Marsden, 'Ælfric as Translator: The Old English Prose *Genesis*', *Anglia*, 109 (1991), 319–58.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

> the poetical texts the Psalms are especially remarkable for the number of unmeaning compounds they contain, evidently manufactured for the sake of the alliteration; this text also contains many other unnatural words and word-meanings; hence the frequent addition of Ps.[145]

The views of one of our greatest linguists should not be set aside lightly. He placed the exclamation mark against more than 230 of his entries. Quite a number of these, however, do not represent 'unnatural' words, but simply translation errors. Yet the majority of the words thus marked are loan-translations,[146] very often found in interlinear versions, glossaries or translation texts, like *inwriting* for Latin *inscriptio*, *ontimbran* for *instruere*, *toþegnung* for *administratio*, etc. How are we to account for such formations? Sweet's judgment was obviously well-founded, for many of these words are rare, often found in only a single text or gloss; often they are *hapax legomena*, and hardly any of them survived into Middle English. Are they then the outcome of clumsy translating or incompetent glossing?

There appears to have been a general assumption that interlinear continuous glosses in Old English were mechanical word-for-word translations, produced without regard to the Latin context and to English usage.[147] Recent studies of this subject, however, usually devoted to individual glossed texts or manuscripts, have come to rather different conclusions, and these conclusions might even be strengthened if we knew more about the purpose and the users of interlinear glosses, a question that appears to be intimately connected with the controversial concept of the 'class-book'.[148]

[145] Henry Sweet, *A Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1896), p. viii.

[146] Numerous similar formations, however, are not so marked by Sweet.

[147] Einar Haugen's characterization of interlinear glosses is an example; they are 'word-by-word cribs of a text which the glossers' abject reverence tempted them to render all too literally' (*Language*, 32, 1956, 761).

[148] Important recent studies of the method of interlinear glossing in Old English are Sarah Sovereign Getty, 'An Edition, with Commentary, of the Latin/Anglo-Saxon *Liber Scintillarum*' (Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1970; unpublished), pp. xvii–xlix; Wiesenekker, *Word be worde*, passim; Kornexl, *Die Regularis Concordia*, pp. ccxiii–ccxxxi. See also the contributions by Michael Lapidge and R. I. Page to *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. Nicholas Brooks (Leicester, 1982); Gernot Rudolf Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg.5.35* (Toronto, 1983), and Nancy Porter Stork, *Through a Gloss Darkly: Aldhelm's Riddles in the British Library MS Royal 12.C.xxiii* (Toronto, 1990). Heinrich Götz, 'Zur Bedeutungsanalyse und Darstellung althochdeutscher Glossen', *Sitzungsberichte der Sächs. Akademie der Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Bd.118, Heft 1 (Berlin, 1977), pp. 53–208, is an essential guide to the method of glossing. For the term 'class-book', see Michael Lapidge, 'The Study of Latin Texts in late Anglo-Saxon England [1]: The Evidence of Latin Glosses', in Brooks, *Latin and the Vernacular Languages*, pp. 99–127; Gernot Wieland, 'The glossed manuscript: classbook or library book?', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 14 (1985), 153–73.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

Two prerequisites to our discussion ought to be mentioned first of all. We are dealing here with 'continuous' glosses, not with occasional scattered glosses, which are often, it would seem, applied rather unsystematically in a text; nor are we dealing with the numerous glosses for hard words, found especially in manuscripts of Aldhelm's *De Virginitate* with its unusual and arcane vocabulary. Our enquiry is confined to continuously glossed texts, especially the gospels (in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth manuscripts), the psalters with their canticles, the hymnals with monastic canticles, the Rule of St. Benedict, the *Regularis Concordia* and the *Liber Scintillarum*. And what we want to examine is the work of the actual glossator, not that of some copyist whose understanding of the exemplar before him may have been of a rather limited nature.[149]

When we look at what we can safely consider as the original work of the Anglo-Saxon glossators, we shall find that this is, on the whole, intelligently done, with the needs of the user kept in mind, so that the gloss can be used for teaching at elementary *and* intermediate levels, but also with due regard to the meaning and structure of the lemma. As far as the lexical side of their work is concerned, we need to remember that no dictionaries in our sense were available before the twelfth century, and that the interlinear versions had to play an important role in a programme to teach Latin vocabulary, and possibly even native vocabulary with its synonyms, judging by the frequent double glosses in the Lindisfarne Gospels and elsewhere.

The most striking evidence of the fact that our glossators were as knowledgeable and skilled as one could have wished in their days comes from the psalter versions. It has now been established beyond any doubt that in the three basic versions—or in the earliest manuscripts we have of them—the glossators made extensive use of patristic exegesis, including the typological interpretation of Old Testament texts; the *Expositio Psalmorum* by Cassiodorus appears to have been of particular importance in their work.[150]

Another important aspect of Old English interlinear glossing is the glossators' concern for inflexion and syntax. They do not reproduce the Latin forms slavishly; instead, they choose the case, tense or mood appropriate in Old English; they supply prepositions in order to indicate

[149] For an example of such a copyist see *The Salisbury Psalter*, ed. Celia and Kenneth Sisam, EETS 242 (London, 1959), pp. 17–21.

[150] See Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, p. 63 and *passim*; J. R. Stracke, 'Studies in the Vocabulary of the Lambeth Psalter Glosses' (Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1970; unpublished); W. Davey, 'The Commentary of the Regius Psalter: Its Main Source and Influence on the Old English Gloss', *Medieval Studies*, 49 (1987), 335–51; Wiesenekker, *Word be worde*, p. 19 and *passim*.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

the function of the Latin ablative, or another Latin case form; they add the definite article to nouns where English grammar requires this, and they insert personal pronouns in the appropriate position, so as to complete the finite forms of English verbs as well as the sentence.[151] Latin explanatory glosses, and English merographs may serve similar purposes.[152] Sometimes we find that word order in the Old English gloss does not correspond to that in the Latin text, and it has been shown in the recent studies by Fred Robinson and Michael Korhammer dealing with the so-called syntactic glosses (i.e., marks and symbols indicating word order) that Anglo-Saxon glossators knew very well how to cope with problems of what would today be called contrastive syntax.[153] This was even carried one step further by two (or more) Anglo-Saxon scholars and teachers who provided prose versions of difficult Latin poetry, of the hymnal, the monastic canticles and of the third book of the *Bella Parisiacae urbis* by Abbo of St. Germain.[154]

What, then, about compounds and derivatives that look like mechanically produced loan-translations or, as Henry Sweet would say, like 'unnatural words'? We should not deny that even a highly competent translator may occasionally fail in his job. But for the majority of these words, a better explanation may at least be attempted.[155]

If we remember that interlinear glosses were no doubt meant to serve the needs of readers with a more or rather less advanced knowledge of Latin, if we remember that the function of such glossed versions was to a certain extent even that of a dictionary, and if we also consider the important role of etymology in Anglo-Saxon language teaching and textual interpretation, and the fact that etymological analysis very often meant the analysis of word-formation,[156] if we consider all this, then it may well be that a glossator—or a translator—would aim at an explanation of the morphological structure of a complex foreign word such as *consubstantialis*,

[151] For details see the studies listed in note 148 above, especially those by Getty, Wiesenekker and Kornexl.

[152] For merographs see Kornexl, *Die Regularis Concordia*, pp. ccxx–ccxxi.

[153] Fred C. Robinson, 'Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance', *Speculum*, 48 (1973), 443–75; Michael Korhammer, 'Mittelalterliche Konstruktionshilfen und altenglische Wortstellung', *Scriptorium*, 34 (1980), 18–58.

[154] Helmut Gneuss, *Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1968); Michael Korhammer, *Die monastischen Cantica im Mittelalter und ihre altenglischen Interlinearversionen: Studien und Textausgabe* (Munich, 1976), especially pp. 128–38. Patrizia Lendinara, 'The third book of the *Bella Parisiacae Urbis* by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and its Old English gloss', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 15 (1986), 73–89.

[155] For a different explanation concerning formations with prefixes see Kastovsky, 'Semantics and Vocabulary', pp. 313–14.

[156] Helmut Gneuss, 'The Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 72 (1990), 3–32, at 22–5.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved

for which he puts *efenspedelic*, as is done by the translator of the Old English Bede;[157] the result is not, perhaps, what we may like to call an 'idiomatic translation', but it is one that helps a reader with the Latin text before him to comprehend the structure *and* the sense of a Latin word, and no doubt this was also Ælfric's aim in his *Grammar*, when he explains, for instance, *interiectio* by means of OE *betwuxaworpennyss* and *betwuxa-legednys*; he would have known that what is true of grammar is also true of other subjects and sciences: 'Sciendum tamen, quod ars grammatica multis in locis non facile Anglicae linguae capit interpretationem.'[158]

Note. I am grateful to Peter Clemoes, Mechthild Gretsch and Lucia Kornexl, who read a draft of this lecture and made helpful suggestions concerning points of style and argument.

[157] *Historia ecclesiastica*, IV.xvii; *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Thomas Miller, EETS 95–96 (London, 1890–91), I.302, lines 4 and 6.
[158] *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. Julius Zupitza, second ed. (Berlin, 1966), pp. 11–12; p. 278, line 2; p. 2.

Copyright © The British Academy 1993 – all rights reserved