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Abstract: English vocabulary owes an enormous debt to the other languages of medieval Britain. Arguably, nowhere is this debt more significant than in the 12th century—a complex and fascinating period of ‘transition’, when (amongst many other things) influence from both Norse and French is increasingly apparent in writing. This lecture explores the etymologies, semantics and textual contexts of some key words from this crucial time, as a way to think about the evidence for contact and change at the boundary of Old and Middle English, and to illustrate how rich, diverse, challenging and surprising its voices can be. It concludes with a case study of words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in Old and early Middle English, concentrating on the vocabulary of the manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343.
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The Middle Ages are full of surprises. In a manuscript probably from Kent, from the very end of the 12th century, nestling in a series of otherwise French proverbs with Latin verse equivalents,1 there are two small passages of English. One of these is a

1 The manuscript is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 641. For descriptions see esp. Ker (1990: 426–7, no. 348) (summarised for The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 (hereafter EMSS) by Swan & Roberson (2010)), Laing (1993: 140), Early English Laws (hereafter EEL) at http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/manuscripts/rl/; Ker dates the main part of the manuscript (containing legal texts) to s. xii2, and the hand of the proverbs (ff. 13v–18r) to s. xii/xiii. Kentish origin is implied by the script of ff. 7v–10 and the fact that the English glosses on ff. 32r–40v are shared with the copy of Instituta Cnuti in the Textus Roffensis (Ker 1990: 427); see also Richards (1988: 47), Wormald (1999: 252), O'Brien (2003: 180 n. 17). It may be added that the dialect of the two English proverbs resembles very closely that of the so-called ‘Kentish Sermons’ in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 471, on which see Bennett & Smithers (1968: 390–3). The manuscript contains two collections of vernacular proverbs, 364 in total, all except the two discussed here being in Anglo-French; 48 of the proverbs in the first set are accompanied by (one or more) translations into Latin hexameters. (Ker (1990: 427) states that the two proverbs containing English versions ‘are trilingual’, a claim repeated by some subsequent
reflection on the suddenness of change: ‘On dai bringd þet al iar ne mai’ (‘one day brings what a whole year cannot’). For medievalists, there are indeed times when everything seems to happen at once, never more so than during the 12th century. This is a period so often characterised as a frantic cultural ‘renaissance’—in literary modes, in the law, in religious thinking, in architecture—and also one which witnessed significant linguistic change. This manuscript, with its English and French and Latin, exemplifies just one of a long series of multilingual interactions which had taken place in medieval England, including, if we trace them back through the Norman Conquest, relations between English speakers and those of Scandinavian and Celtic languages, amongst many others. Sometimes the meetings of these languages are dramatised on the manuscript

commentators, e.g. Pulsiano (2000: 193), Swan & Roberson (2010); but these two proverbs in fact appear only in English and Latin versions in this manuscript.) All the proverbs in Rawlinson are edited by Stengel (1899), with the English material reprinted by Förster (1900). The proverbs with Latin equivalents are extant in several further manuscripts, the Latin texts being attributed to or associated with the 12th-century Anglo-Latin poet Serlo (or Serlon) of Wilton; for critical editions see Friend (1954) and Öberg (1965: 113–20, 144–57). The French material is furthermore associated with the corpus of proverbs known as *Li proverbe au vilain* (many of the proverbs in Rawlinson being versions of the concluding ‘morals’ which circulated with the longer stanzas of that tradition; the classic edition and account is Tobler (1895)).

Rawlinson C. 641, f. 13v, col. 1 l. 16, with abbreviations expanded in italics; unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this lecture are my own. The Latin version (which follows at ll. 17–18) reads: ‘Quod donare mora nequt amua dat brevis hora. Anno cura datur tamen unus dies operatur’ (‘what the space of a year cannot give, a short hour gives; concern is given to a year, nonetheless one day performs it’). There are variants of the same English proverb in Dublin, Trinity College, B.3.5 (‘Oft yift o dai yat alle yeir ne mai’), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 52 (‘Oft bryngeth on day þat all þe Zere ne mai’) and Manchester, John Rylands Library, Lat. 394 (‘Ofte bryngeth o day þat after alle þe Zere ne mai’; see Pantin 1930: 95). None of the editions and handbooks I have consulted seems to know all these versions: see variously Friend (1954: 189, who records only the Rawlinson and Rylands variants), Öberg (1965: 115, Rawlinson and Dublin only), Whiting & Whiting (1968: 119, no. D56), Boffey & Edwards (2005: 174, no. 2668.5) and DIMEV (record 4244, http://www.dimev.net/record.php?recID=4244) (the last three record only Rawlinson, Douce and Rylands). For comparable sayings see further Smith (1970: 169).


As recent studies have compellingly demonstrated, the Norman Conquest only compounded the already rich and complex linguistic situation in early medieval England. The bibliography on this subject is very large, but for important recent accounts of language contact and multilingual textual culture in the period see notably O’Brien (2011: esp. 69–121), O’Donnell, Tonnend & Tyler (2013), and the essays in Trotter (2000), Kennedy & Meecham-Jones (2006), Tyler (2011), and Jefferson & Putter (2013); and for further discussion of some of the literary, documentary and historiographical contexts see inter alia Ashe (2007), Treharne (2011), Clanchy (2013), Harris (2013). In addition to these (and to the various studies of specific issues cited in what follows), for discussion and further references regarding Anglo-French (a.k.a. Anglo-Norman) and its contexts see e.g. Crane (1999), Short (2007), Wogan-Browne et al. (2009), Ingham (2010) and the introduction to the online AND (at http://www.anglo-norman.net/sitedocs/main-intro.shtml?session=SAB15757T1396452066); on Anglo-Scandinavian bilingualism see especially Townend (2000), Parsons (2001), Townend (2002); and on contact with the Celtic languages and some of its (possible) effects consult e.g. Higham (2007: esp. 165–244), Filppula & Klemola (2009).
page, occasionally in a very grand manner, as in the famous trilingual enterprise of the Eadwine Psalter (Cambridge, Trinity College, R.17.1). But far more often the contacts happened off-stage; sometimes their circumstances can only be hypothesised, and sometimes their most visible consequences reside in their effects on the languages concerned. In this lecture I would like to examine just one aspect of these linguistic exchanges, that is how they affected the vocabulary of medieval English; and to look at some of the evidence for this in texts from the 12th century. This era is not, of course, the only one when English words show influence from other languages; but it is perhaps uniquely interesting as the period not only when French loanwords appear in quantity in English texts for the first time, but also when words of Old Norse origin start to become really widely attested. And moreover these changes in vocabulary are happening in the context of one of the most notoriously difficult stages in the history of English, and one which we still do not understand as well as we might, the ‘transition’ from Old English to Middle English. Here, while I shall be interested to some extent in these ‘big’ changes, the grand historical narratives, I would like to concentrate instead on some of the little stories which underlie them, and which more often go untold. Drawing on some important research tools which have opened up early medieval text and language studies in the last few years, I shall focus on a small number of particular words, chasing their etymologies and their semantic contexts, and culminating in a case-study of expressions for one related group of concepts in writings from late Old to early Middle English. I hope to show that words like these, and the evidence for their usage, are significant not just for the part they play in the larger accounts of contact and transition, but that what they have to say is compelling and important in its own right.

TWELFTH-CENTURY ENGLISH: PIGGY IN THE MIDDLE?

Let us begin by thinking about the written evidence and some perspectives on it, and return to the manuscript we started with. Rawlinson C. 641 sits intriguingly at the

---

5On the Eadwine Psalter see especially Harsley (1889), Verfaillie-Markey (1989), Ker (1990: 135–6, no. 91), Gibson, Heslop & Pfaff (1992), Puliano (2000), Treharne (2010c), Treharne (2012: 167–87), Harris (2013: 50–61); digital images of the entire manuscript may be viewed at http://sites.trin.cam.ac.uk/james/show.php?index=1229. There are few other 12th-century manuscripts in which a single text is designed to display the same content in all three languages; for a notable example see the formulas for the visitation of the sick from Rufford Abbey, Nottinghamshire, preserved in London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xxiv (Ker 1990: 263–4, Swan & Kato 2010; for facsimile and remarks see O’Brien 2011: 99). It is more common to find texts in one (or two) original languages annotated in one or more others; for some discussion see Da Rold & Swan (2011, esp. p. 260 n. 14, for a helpful list of relevant manuscripts), Swan (2012), and for an important case study of Anglo-French annotations in manuscripts of Ælfric’s Grammar see Menzer (2004).

6For general accounts of lexical borrowing in English, see now esp. Miller (2012) and Durkin (2014).
cross-roads of Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Scandinavian and Anglo-Norman textual cultures. By the time the proverbs were added in about 1200, its contents already included Latin translations of Old English law-codes including Cnut’s, the recent Latin text known as the ‘Laws of Edward the Confessor’, and an extract from Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence’s Anglo-French Life of Thomas Becket. (And as if all that wasn’t emblematic enough a mixture, a few years later someone inserted a copy of Magna Carta.) The English-language material in this manuscript is not quite so epoch-making. Apart from a few glosses, it is limited to the ‘on dai’ proverb and one other saying, whose subject is nothing if not earthy: ‘Si stille suge fret þere grunninde mete’ (‘The quiet sow devours the grunting one’s food’).

7 These texts are respectively: the so-called Instituta Cnuti, printed by Liebermann (1903–16: I.612–17) as Instituta Cnuti aliorumque regum Anglorum (for an important discussion see O’Brien (2003), who is preparing a new edition for EEL; the second version of Leges Edvardi Confessoris (Liebermann (1903–16: I 627–70), O’Brien (1999), with a digital edition and introduction by O’Brien in EEL at http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/ecf2/); Guerne’s Vie de saint Thomas le Martyr (Walberg (1922), and see O’Donnell (2011) and the description at EEL at http://www.earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/con-clar-fr/). For some recent discussion of 12th-century responses to Anglo-Saxon legal and administrative culture see further Gobbitt (2013), Harris (2013: 104–30).

8 See Ker (1990: 427) (‘The text of Magna Carta, ff. 21v–29, is an early addition.’)

9 Six interlinear glosses to the Instituta Cnuti on ff. 32r, 33r, 34v, 40v; see Ker (1990: 426), Laing (1993: 140).

10 Rawlinson C. 641, f. 13v, col. 1 l. 13. The Latin version (ll. 14–15) reads ‘Sus taciturna uorat dum garrulla uoce laborat. Sus dape fraudatur clamosa. tacens saciatur.’ (‘the quiet sow eats greedily, while the noisy one labours with her voice; the loud sow is cheated of her feast, the silent one is sated’). There are close variants of Rawlinson’s English proverb in the collections in Dublin, Trinity College, B.3.5 (‘pe stille suwe het þene grunende mete’) and Cambridge, Trinity College, O.II.45 (a.k.a. 1149) (‘pe stille soghhe het þare gruniendo mete’); the text in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 53 (‘pe stille sue æt gruniendo hire mete’) is also close, but has been recast to feature just the one sow. As with the ‘one day’ proverb above, none of the editions and handbooks records all English variants: see Förster (1900: 6; notes Rawlinson, Digby and Cambridge only), Friend (1954: 204–5; Rawlinson, Dublin, Digby), Öberg (1965: 150; Rawlinson, Dublin, Digby), Whiting & Whiting (1968: 536, no. S535; Rawlinson and Digby); Friend and the Whitings notice later similar proverbs, to boot. I follow DOE (s.v. grunian (1)) in parsing Rawlinson þere gruninde as def. art. plus pres. ptp. (used substantivally) in the fem. gen. sg., i.e. ‘the grunting one’s’ (contra Förster (1900: 19) who takes þare in the Cambridge text as a form of OE þær and punctuates so as to imply a meaning ‘while grunting’; Förster has seemingly been misled by the reading in Digby 53, itself probably a misunderstanding of the original construction). (The proverb is on f. 16 in Digby 53, not f. 53 as claimed by Ker (1990: 427); Ker’s error seems in turn to have misled Laing (1993: 128).)

Richard Dance
challenged simplistic assumptions of this century as a ‘gap’ in English literary history.\textsuperscript{11} What is more, despite the abiding impression that 12th-century evidence for developments in the English language is more equivocal and harder won than it is in the centuries on either side, there have nonetheless been massive advances in its study, particularly the period from about 1150, which is covered in glorious detail now by the \textit{Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English}.\textsuperscript{12} All the same, the vocabulary of 12th-century English remains relatively underexplored. The main focus of research has tended, understandably, to fall on the most important ‘new’ compositions, especially those hailing from the East Midlands and which most clearly illustrate linguistic features identifiably en route to mainstream modern (standard English) usage—the additions to the \textit{Peterborough Chronicle}, and the extraordinary \textit{Orrmulum} (from Lincolnshire), have in particular long been textbook staples.\textsuperscript{13} But there are many other surviving pieces of English from this period whose vocabulary, while it has been the subject of some pioneering and important research, has not yet been investigated in the detail it deserves.\textsuperscript{14} This comparative dearth of attention has to do at least partly, I think, with the awkward relationship that 12th-century texts often seem to have with the major period divisions we apply to medieval English. To pose a question which I have avoided so far, is their language Old English, or Middle English, or neither? The names we give to varieties of English from this century have, of course, long been subject to debate.\textsuperscript{15} Since the end of the 19th century, we have been fairly clear


\textsuperscript{12}For \textit{LAEME} see the website at http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html, and see also the important associated \textit{Corpus of Narrative Etymologies} project at http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/CoNE/CoNE.html. For the period 1000–1150, the fullest account of orthography and phonology is Schlemilch (1914). For some recent work on particular texts/manuscripts, in addition to the work on vocabulary cited below, see e.g. Liuzza (2000), Traxel (2004), Roberts (2009: esp. 27–42).

\textsuperscript{13}The Peterborough text of the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle} in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636 (MS E) is edited and its language discussed by Irvine (2004); on the manuscript and the language especially of the 12th-century interpolations and continuations see further Clark (1952–3), Clark (1970), Da Rold (2010) and the essays in Bergs & Skaffari (2007). \textit{The Orrmulum} in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 1 is edited by Holt (1878); on manuscript, date and language see \textit{inter alia} Burchfield (1956), Parkes (1983), Laing (1993: 135–6), Laing (2008: 161–3), Faulkner (2010).

\textsuperscript{14}Notable studies are Pelteret (1978), Stanley (1985), Fischer (1996; 1997), Nevanlinna (1997), Skaffari (2009), Faulkner (2012a), Pons-Sanz (2013: 469–502), beside the work specifically on Bodley 343 (see below, n. 87); see also the important investigation of the early 13th-century Worcester ‘tremulous hand’ in Franzen (1991), and further Dance (2011).

about what we mean by ‘Old English’ and ‘Middle English’, at least as prototypical stages in the history of English grammar—Henry Sweet defined them as the periods with ‘full’ and ‘levelled’ inflections, respectively. But drawing a definitive line somewhere in the continuum of developments in between these two stages (what Sweet called ‘transition Old English’) has always seemed a much more difficult proposition; and those authorities which for practical purposes have needed to draw such a line have never completely agreed on which texts to count on which side. This issue has special consequences when it comes to the lexicon, divided as it is nowadays between separate period dictionaries of Old and Middle English. Our two Rawlinson proverbs are a good example of this contested territory, since they are claimed by both the Dictionary of Old English and the Middle English Dictionary. So, are they Old English, or are they Middle English? At a fundamental level, one might think, it doesn’t really matter what we call them—it won’t alter their contents, their actual linguistic features. What’s in a name? But in reality, these texts are a very good example of how the perspective we take, the period vantage point from which we view them, can have serious consequences for our contexts of interpretation, and hence for how we perceive their vocabulary.

Let us take one word from our ‘quiet sow’ proverb, the verb grunnin, and think about its linguistic relationships and historical connotations. From an etymological point of view, it is natural to begin with the Old English form grunian (whose suffixed counterpart grunnettan is the ancestor of modern grunt), and to think our way backwards and outwards to its broader Germanic setting, and perhaps beyond. Most etymological authorities explain it as an ‘echoic’ (or ideophonic) formation, whose nearest parallels are to be found in High German verbs with closely related meanings (notably the early modern HG grunnen); elsewhere in the Indo-European family we meet forms like Latin grunniō, which may ultimately share an origin with our Old

---

16 Sweet’s fullest discussion is in Sweet (1873–4: 617–21). His later categorisation of periods for the medieval stages of English, as set out at Sweet (1892: §594), is: ‘Early Old English’, 700–900; ‘Late Old English’, 900–1100; ‘Transition Old English’, 1100–1200; ‘Early Middle English’, 1200–1300; ‘Late Middle English’, 1300–1400; ‘Transition Middle English’, 1400–1500.

17 Sweet himself recognised this difficulty perfectly well; see for instance his remarks at Sweet (1873–4: 619) (‘if we take the intermediate stages into consideration, we find it simply impossible to draw a definite line’). Before Sweet, when pre-Conquest English was distinguished as something nominally quite separate from what came later (‘Anglo-Saxon’) and ‘English’ was felt to be identifiable as such only from the 13th century, the transition between these two stages was sometimes labelled still more awkwardly as ‘Semi-Saxon’ (see Matthews (1999), Lass (2000: 14), Momma (2013: 128 n. 29)). Since Sweet, the most significant attempts to readdress the boundary between Old and Middle English on morpho(phono)logical grounds are Malone (1930) and Kitson (1997).

18 DOE groups both proverbs under the heading ‘Prov 4 (Förster)’; in MED they are ‘On dai bringd (Rwl C.641)’ and ‘Þi stille suge (Rwl C.641)’ (both mis-dated in the stencil as ‘a1300’).

19 See DOE s.vv. grunian (1), grunnian and grunung, grunnung, and grunnettan.
English verb or may be simply analogous. If we focus on the Old English word itself, then inevitably we look backwards to its Anglo-Saxon literary contexts, vernacular and Latin. In the Old English corpus, grunian is only used of animals, especially (though not only) of pigs. Sometimes it occurs as a direct translation equivalent of Latin grunnio, in fact, as in Ælfric’s catalogue of animal noises in his Grammar:

\[
\text{canis latrat hund byrcð, lupus ululat wulf δytt, equus hinnit hors hnægð, bos mugit oxa hlewð, ouis balat scep blæt, sus grunnit swin grunað et similia}
\]

Amongst other things, this frequent bilingual partnering of grunian with Latin grunnio opens up the possibility that Latinate writers in this period equated the two words, and perhaps even that the form of the Latin (with its double /n/) influenced some variants of the English one. But if instead we come at this word in our Rawlinson proverb c.1200 from a Middle English perspective, we get quite a different impression. The relevant entry in MED is for its verb groinen. We seem now to be in a different (and possibly more barbarous) age, where our verb is used not only of pigs (sense (b), ‘of a sow: to grunt’) and other animals (sense (c), ‘of a dog: to growl, snarl’; sense (d), ‘of a bull: to bellow’), but also of people (sense (a), ‘to murmur, mutter, grumble’). More importantly, the linguistic context now draws in early French comparanda. MED derives groinen jointly from ‘OF groigner, gro(n)gier & OE grunian, grunian’, making no attempt to separate words of Old English and early French (including Anglo-French) etymological heritage. Indeed, it is often quite hard to do so: some

20 See OED s.v. grunt (v.) (‘an echoic formation parallel with Latin grunniere’), Lloyd & Lühr (2009: s.v. grunzen), Pokorny (1959: I.406, s.v. gru-). Lat grunnio ‘I grunt’ descends from an earlier grundio, with which cp. further Grk gruizó ‘I grunt’ (see de Vaan (2008: s.v. grundiō, -ire), Beekes (2010: s.v. γρϊδω)). Holthausen’s (1934: s.v. grun(n)ian) attempt to connect OE gruniani instead with the noun OE gryn (grynn) ‘sorrow, misfortune’ and its OHG cognate grun(n)ī ‘undoing, misfortune, misery, wailing’ seems to me implausible, and has not been followed in more recent work; compare notably Lloyd & Lühr (2009: s.v. grun, and (with respect to another of Holthausen’s rather remote comparanda) s.v. gränō).

21 DOE records four attestations of forms of the verb per se, and six of the verbal noun. Apart from the Rawlinson proverb cited above, and the instance in Ælfric’s Grammar given below, these are (with DOE’s title abbreviations): AldV 1 4219 <grunian> and AldV 13.1 4337 <grunnian>, glossing grunnire; AldV 1 4257 and AldV 13.1 4378 <grunnunge>, glossing rugitus; AldV 1 2344 <grunung>, <grunung> and AldV 13.1 2387 <grunnunga>, glossing barritus; GD 3 (C) 4.184.29 <grununge> (translating Gregory’s stridores). Notice that, while the instances in Ælfric, GD 3 (C) and at AldV 1 4219 (AldV 13.1 4337) refer to the sounds made by pigs, the other Aldhelm glosses have to do with altogether more fearsome creatures: lions at AldV 1 4257 (AldV 13.1 4378) and elephants at AldV 1 2344 (AldV 13.1 2387).


23 Old English spellings in <nn> occur only in the Aldhelm glosses, at AldV 13.1 4337, AldV 1 4257 and AldV 13.1 4378, and AldV 13.1 2387 (not all of which however gloss forms of Lat grunnio); see above, n. 21.

24 MED s.v. groinen (v.). OED moreover gives only French derivation s.v. groin (v.1), and its grunny (v.) is described simply as a variant of this. The French verb is a descendant of Lat grunnio, via the VL variant *gruniare; see DEAF s.v. groignier, FEW s.v. gründire (3. grogner).
spellings look more like Old English, and the vocalism of others (indicating /ɔi/) must show French input; but forms of both origin are used with the ‘grumble’ sense, and it is possible this meaning developed first in French (where it is found from the late 12th century onwards). So how far we think of this verb’s etymological inputs as Germanic or English, and how far as French (and even Latin) is a moot point, and depends to some extent on the perspective we take.

Now, you might well be thinking that we can expect this sort of problem with words like this one, which at some level imitate or represent noises; that is that they are always liable to end up sounding similar in different languages. And to a certain extent that is true. But words for animal noises are actually a famous example of the conventionality of linguistic signs, since they can be startlingly different in different languages. (English dogs go bow-wow or woof, but in French they say ouah ouah, and in Greek ghav ghav.) All this is not to say that medieval authors could not and did not think about the noises animals actually made, and could not represent and perhaps even pun on them. I suspect I am not the only person, for instance, ever to wonder whether it is deliberate that the first word spoken by the Owl in the Middle English poem The Owl and the Nightingale is ‘Hu’ (i.e. /hu/, in ‘Hu þincþe nu bi mine songe?’, ‘How does my song seem to you now?’). But conventional, lexical items describing animal noises do not really have less ‘proper’ or ‘normal’ a history in English than do any other words. One only has to look at the set of animal noise verbs in Ælfric’s list (cited above) to see how instantly recognisable (apart from that for the wolf) these words still are. Far from being spontaneously generated or regenerated, they are a very good indication of the continuity that there can be, not just across the murky Old and Middle English divide, but right up to the present; and moreover that change to vocabulary (to form, to sense, or whatever), as to any received linguistic feature, is not just random or capricious, it is a process that we can at least try to explain—in the context both of what has changed, and what has not.

---

25 Compare for instance (following MED’s title stencils) (1340) Ayenb. (Arun 57) 67/8 <grunny> (on the Ayenbite’s -y infinitive ending see Gradon (1979: 99–101)) with (a1382) WBible(1) (Dc 369(1)) Is29.4 <groyne>, both under sense (a).

26 See AND s.v. groigner, where the second sense (‘(of people) to grunt, grumble’) is attested in Guerne’s Life of Thomas Becket; and see further AFW s.v. groignier, DEAF s.v. groignier, DMF s.v. gographer.

27 For discussion see Durkin (2009: 126).

28 Cartlidge (2001), l. 46 from London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. ix. I have been unable to find anyone who is willing to own up in print to wondering this; but for evidence of a homophone denoting an owl-call in Middle English see MED s.v. hou (interj.2) sense (c) ‘used to represent the hooting of an owl’ (one attestation from a1475 Holy berith beris (Hrl 5396) p. 94).
There are many interesting words which occur in 12th-century texts, and which one could choose to explore further. By way of a few highlights from amongst those first attested in English in the 12th century, I present in Table 1 sixty or so which are usually recognised as borrowings from other languages and which are still in common use today.\footnote{I include amongst 12th-century attestations words occurring in the \textit{Lambeth} and \textit{Trinity Homilies}, on which see below, n. 71.} Taken together, these words are an arresting bunch. At least impressionistically, they give a powerful sense of how much the development of vocabulary in this period, especially its expansion from ‘foreign’ sources, contributed to the evolution of the English language—lending us our modern words for everything from the noblest of accoutrements (\textit{grace}, \textit{justice}, \textit{mercy}, \textit{skill}) to the most quotidian (\textit{custom}, \textit{fruit}, \textit{root}, \textit{seat}), not to mention some key small ‘grammatical’ items (\textit{both}, \textit{though}, \textit{they/their/them}), and the word we use to describe this whole category of imported vocabulary, \textit{loan} itself. In etymological terms, all these words have been argued to come either from French (and/or Latin; it isn’t always easy to tell the difference)\footnote{Clearly derived from a variety of early French (including Anglo-French, a.k.a. Anglo-Norman) are: accord (early Fr acorder; see \textit{OED} s.v. accord v., \textit{MED} s.v. accörden v.), clerk (early Fr clerç; \textit{OED} s.v. clerk n., \textit{MED} s.v. clerk n.), council (early Fr cuncile; \textit{OED} s.v. council n., \textit{MED} s.v. còunsel n.), court (early Fr curt; \textit{OED} s.v. court n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. court n.1), custom (early Fr custume; \textit{OED} s.v. custom n., \textit{MED} s.v. custème(e n.), easy (early Fr aisiè; \textit{OED} s.v. easy adj., adv. and n., \textit{MED} s.v. esè adj.), ermine (early Fr \textit{(h)ermìne}; \textit{OED} s.v. ermine n., \textit{MED} s.v. ermin n.), feeble (early Fr feble; \textit{OED} s.v. feeble adj. and n., \textit{MED} s.v. feble adj.), fruit (early Fr fruit; \textit{OED} s.v. fruit n., \textit{MED} s.v. fruit n.), grace (early Fr grace; \textit{OED} s.v. grace n., \textit{MED} s.v. grâce n.), honour (early Fr \textit{(h)oun}er; \textit{OED} s.v. honour, honor n., \textit{MED} s.v. hounour n.), justice (early Fr jùstis; \textit{OED} s.v. justice n., \textit{MED} s.v. justice n.), large (early Fr large (fem.)); \textit{OED} s.v. large adj., adv. and n., \textit{MED} s.v. lârge adj.), lecher (early Fr lecheur; \textit{OED} s.v. lecher n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. lechôur n.), marble (early Fr marbre; \textit{OED} s.v. marble n. and adj., \textit{MED} s.v. marble n.), mercy (early Fr merci; \textit{OED} s.v. merci n. and int., \textit{MED} s.v. merci n.1), miracle (early Fr miracle; \textit{OED} s.v. miracle n., \textit{MED} s.v. mirâcle n.), peace (early Fr pès, pais; \textit{OED} s.v. peace n., \textit{MED} s.v. pês n.), poor (early Fr pover, pore; \textit{OED} s.v. poor adj. and n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. povre adj.), rhyme (early Fr rime; \textit{OED} s.v. rhyme n., \textit{MED} s.v. rim(e n.3), robber (early Fr rob(b)er(e); \textit{OED} s.v. robber n., \textit{MED} s.v. robber(e n.), scorn (early Fr escarnir; \textit{OED} s.v. scorn v., \textit{MED} s.v. scôrnen v.), spouse (early Fr spus(e); \textit{OED} s.v. spouse n., \textit{MED} s.v. spous(e) n.), treasure (early Fr tresor; \textit{OED} s.v. treasure n., \textit{MED} s.v. trèsoûr n.), war (early (northern) Fr warre; \textit{OED} s.v. war n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. war(e n.). Of possible French or Latin origin (or both, with the one reinforcing the other) are: advent (early Fr advent or Lat adventus; \textit{OED} s.v. advent n., \textit{MED} s.v. advent n.), bar (early Fr barre or late Lat barrâ; \textit{OED} s.v. bar n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. barre n.), duke (early Fr duc or Lat duc-; \textit{OED} s.v. duke n., \textit{MED} s.v. dük n.), feast (early Fr feste or Lat festum; \textit{OED} s.v. feast n., \textit{MED} s.v. fêste n.), rent (early Fr rent(e) or medieval Lat vent; \textit{OED} s.v. rent n.1, \textit{MED} s.v. rent(e n.), sermon (early Fr sermun or Lat sermôn-; \textit{OED} s.v. sermon n., \textit{MED} s.v. sermôûn n.), serve (early Fr servir or Lat servire; \textit{OED} s.v. serv(e) v.1, \textit{MED} s.v. serven v.1). For discussion of the French (and/or Latin) influence on the medieval English lexicon, and for further references, see most recently Skaffari (2009), Miller (2012: 148–91), Skaffari (2012) and Durkin (2014: 223–80).} or from Old Norse.\footnote{I use the term ‘Old Norse’ (ON) here in its traditional Anglophone philological sense to refer to any}
we go no further, this is extremely potent information: these words are living witnesses to medieval contact situations, actual cultural artefacts from the Normans or the Vikings (and how often can we say that about items we use on a daily basis in the 21st century?). Nevertheless, and inevitably, there are difficulties lurking in lists like this.

Scandinavian language variety down to about 1500 AD. The words in question are: bank (cp. ODan banke; see OED s.v. bank n.1, MED s.v. bank(e n.1), bond (cp. Olcel band; see OED s.v. bond n.1, MED s.v. bōnd n.), boon (cp. Olcel bōn; see OED s.v. boon n.1, MED s.v. bōn n. 2), both (cp. Olcel báðir; see OED s.v. both adj. and adv., MED s.v. bóthe num. (as n., adj., and conj.).), cast (cp. Olcel kasta; see OED s.v. cast v., MED s.v. casten v.), club (cp. Olcel klubba; see OED s.v. club n., MED s.v. club( be n.), crooked (cp. Olcel krókr ‘hook’; see OED s.v. crooked adj., MED s.v. crðked ppl.), die (cp. Olcel deyja; see OED s.v. die v.1, MED s.v. dien v.), flit (cp. Olcel flytja; see OED s.v. flit v., MED s.v. flitten v.), get (cp. Olcel geta; see OED s.v. get v., MED s.v. gēten v.1), ill (cp. Olcel illr; see OED s.v. ill adj. and n., MED s.v. il(le adj.).), kid (cp. Olcel kið, Sw, Dan kið; see OED s.v. kid n.1, MED s.v. kide n.), loan (cp. Olcel lón; see OED s.v. loan n.1, MED s.v. lón(e n.1), low (cp. Olcel lágr; see OED s.v. low adj. and n., MED s.v. lowe adj.), meek (cp. Olcel mjúkr; see OED s.v. meek adj. and n., MED s.v. měk adj.), nay (cp. Olcel nei; see OED s.v. nay adv.1 and n., MED s.v. nai interj.), raise (cp. Olcel reisa; see OED s.v. raise v.1, MED s.v. reisen v.1), root (cp. Olcel rót; see OED s.v. root n.1, MED s.v. róte n.4), same (cp. Olcel same; see OED s.v. same adj. (pron., adv.).), scathe (cp. Olcel skádat; see OED s.v. scathe v., MED s.v. scáthen v.), seem (cp. Olcel sama; see OED s.v. seem v.2, MED s.v. sēmen v.2), skill (cp. Olcel skil, see OED s.v. skill n.1, MED s.v. skil n.), sly (cp. Olcel slægr; see OED s.v. sly adj., adv. and n., MED s.v. sleigh adj.), they, their, them (cp. Olcel þeir, þeira, þeim; see OED s.vv. they pron., adj., adv. and n., their poss. pron., them pron., adj. and n., MED s.vv. thei pron., their(e pron., them pron.).), though (cp. Olcel þó (earlier *þóð); see OED s.v. though adj., conj. and n., MED s.v. though conj.), want (cp. Olcel vanta; see OED s.v. want v., MED s.v. wanten v.), wrong (cp. Olcel (v)rangr; see OED s.v. wrong adj. and adv., MED s.v. wrong adj.). For studies of the Old Norse influence on English and Scots lexis see most notably Björkman (1900–2), Rynell (1948), Hofmann (1955), Townend (2002), Dance (2003a), Kries (2003), Skaffari (2009), Pons-Sanz (2013) and references there cited, and for recent survey accounts see esp. Miller (2012: 91–147), Dance (2012a), Durkin (2014: 171–221).
As we saw with *grunnin*, identifying the extent and type of foreign input in a word’s history can be challenging, and this is true not only of words for noises. Lists of loanwords from Old Norse, in particular, always conceal a great deal of etymological complexity. Large-scale contact between speakers of Old English and the early Scandinavian languages goes back to the late 9th century, principally in the North and East of England, and the great majority of loans had probably already entered English by 1066, even though many only appear in writing in the 12th century and later. As we might expect, many of these newly recorded words surface first in texts from the old Danelaw, especially the *Peterborough Chronicle* continuations and *The Ormulum*—but by no means all do so, something which is symptomatic of the amount of time they had already been circulating in spoken English before this. By the major texts of the early 13th century a great many Norse loans are well established throughout England. The 12th century, then, is likely to be a crucial period if we want to understand the diffusion of originally ‘Viking words’ into English at large; but to do so we first need to work out what is Viking about them. Old English and the Old Norse of the Viking Age were of course closely related and very similar languages. Sometimes this can be a help in tracing the genealogy of words which are first attested in English

32 Of the words in Table 1, *bond, both* and *though* are first attested in the 12th-century additions to the *Peterborough Chronicle* (the latest of which were made in 1155; on Norse-derived lexis in this text see in particular Clark (1970: lxii, lxix), Kniezsa (1994), Skaffari (2009), Pons-Sanz (2013: Appendix IV)). Words for which *The Ormulum* (dated c.1160–80 by Parkes (1983)) provides clear earliest witnesses are *bank, flit, get, ill, kid, low, meek, nay, raise, same, scathe, seat, seem, skill, sly, they, their, them, and want* (and see further esp. Brate (1885), Townend (2002: 208–10), Skaffari (2009), Dance (2012b: 166–8)). For *boon, die* and *root*, *Orrm* competes with the approximately contemporary main section of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (on which see further below), which attests them in (using **DOE** short titles) *LS 18.1 (NatMaryAss 10N)* (Pons-Sanz 2013: 488), *LS 5 (InventCrossNap)* (see Dance (2000), Pons-Sanz (2013: 493–4)) and *HomU 4 (Belf 13)* and *LS 5 (InventCrossNap)* (see Pons-Sanz (2013: 485)) respectively. Uncontested in its first appearance in Bodley 343 is *loan* in *ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2)* (see Pons-Sanz (2013: 489), and further below). (Note that I include *low* as first clearly attested in *Orrm*; it also occurs in the short poetic fragment known as ‘The Grave’ in Bodley 343, but despite **MED**’s date stencil (c1175 **Body & S. (1)** (Bod 343)), this piece is in a later hand, dated by Ker (1990: 374) to s. xii/xiii.) Other first attestations of the Norse-derived words in the list are (with **MED** or **DOE** short titles): *cast* in the *Lambeth* and *Trinity Homilies* (a1225(?OE) *Lamb.Hom.* (Lamb 487); a1225(?a1200) *Trin.Hom.* (Trin-C B.14.52); on these manuscripts see below, n. 71); *club* as a surname in (1166) in *Pipe R.Soc.9; crooked* in *LS 9 (Giles)* (Pons-Sanz 2013: 109, 287, 386); *wrong* (adj.) in a place-name form in (a1153) *Coucher Bk.Kirkestall.*

33 Of those in Table 1, occurring frequently in early 13th-century texts from the South-West Midlands and further south are *bond, boon, both, cast, die, flit, loan, low, meek, nay, root, seat, seem, skill, sly* and *want*. See the **MED** entries for each cited above, n. 31, and on the South-West Midland texts see esp. Dance (2003a).

34 For discussion and references see notably Townend (2002), including a comparison of the linguistic systems of the two languages (pp. 19–41) and an important argument for their mutual intelligibility. On the etymological evidence for Norse influence on the English lexicon, the foundational work is Björkman (1900–2); for recent discussion of the issues see Dance (2011; 2012a), Pons-Sanz (2013), Durkin (2014: 190–213).
during or after the period of contact. Take for instance ME thei, PDE (Present-Day English) they (earliest recorded in The Orosmulum), whose vocalism is an absolutely secure sign that it descends via the Old Norse branch of the Germanic tree, and that it cannot come from Old English (which gives ME þā, þō ‘those’ instead) (see Figure 1). But, at least equally often, this genetic similarity is a source of uncertainty, since there are many proposed Norse loans whose form might have been the offspring of

Figure 1. The etymology of ME þei (PDE they).

Figure 2. The etymology of early ME lān (PDE loan).

either sibling. The word loan itself is one of these. On the face of it, OE lēn and ON lán are again formally distinct reflexes of their Germanic parent form (a PGmc *laix-(w)-n-). But closer investigation of their etymology (see Figure 2) shows that this case is not quite analogous to they. Here, it is not the evolution of the Germanic root syllable per se which results in the different outputs, but the type of derivational suffix added in each case: Old English has (the disarmingly Pythonesque) -ni, and Old Norse the -na type, and there is nothing characteristically Scandinavian about the latter; the other West Germanic languages all show it too. In principle, then, an unrecorded Old English cognate with this ending type is perfectly possible, and would have given Middle English lân, modern loan in just the same way as borrowing from Norse would. So how do we choose between these alternative possible accounts? Once again, it is at least partly a matter of perspective. If we look at this word only in the context of other probable loans, it certainly seems like one. The possibility of native origin is usually (at least tacitly) downplayed, with the lack of any record of an Old English lân being regarded as significant counter-evidence. But we could put it next to other items of medieval vocabulary which would give a different impression. Figure 3, for instance, shows the two variants of the Germanic root for a word meaning ‘voice’, respectively *rezð- and *razð-. One English descendant of these, even though it surfaces only belatedly as a rare South-Eastern dialect form (ge)reard in Middle English, must have come down the right-hand branch (< PGmc *razð-), and must be native (in this case it is phonologically impossible to get it from Norse)—it is just as much a native word, in fact, as the alternative from the left-hand branch (< PGmc *rezð-), which happens to be recorded in Old English (as OE (ge)reord). Words of this latter type, where there is secure evidence for Old English descent of a form first attested in Middle

---


37 On the etymologies of these forms see OED s.v. reird (n.), Pokorny (1959: I.852), Torp (1909: 340), Orel (2003: 299–300, s.v. *razðo-), Kroonen (2013: 407, s.v. *razðo-), Lehmann (1986: 283, s.v. razda), Holthausen (1934: s.v. reord (1)), de Vries (1977: s.v. roðd), Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon (1989: s.v. roðd). The Old Norse word has undergone assimilation of /zd/ > /ðð/ (> /dd/), on which change see e.g. Noreen (1970: §224.2), Brondum-Nielsen (1968: §254.1). The ME <ea> forms occur in: (1) the London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. xxi version (c.1200, probably from Rochester) of Ælfric’s De Initio Creaturæ (Morris (1868: 225/35); on the manuscript and its language see Richards (1978), Laing (1993: 82–3) and Dance (2012b: 169–70) and references there cited); and (2) in the Ayenbite of Inwyt (Morris (1965: 24/6, 60/34, 210/32, 265/10); on the language see Gradon (1979: 14–107)).
English, are relatively rare, it is true; but they are also virtually never mentioned when we discuss the case for borrowings from Norse, and this is partly at least, I suspect, because the motivation for finding Vikings in our vocab, the echoes of big cultural collisions from the medieval past, is so powerful, and perennially more exciting than the alternative.

I’m not about to be so controversial as to suggest that we expunge words like loan from our received lists of Norse borrowings. But arguments like this are an important indicator that those lists can never be definitive. Over the last few years, I have investigated several hundred proposed Norse loans in Middle English, and the wide range of types of evidence we call on when we identify them as such. About 45 per cent of the stems in my data from Sir Gawain and the Green Knight turn out to be of the same broad type as loan; that is when a word first attested in late Old or Middle English continues a Germanic root already present in Old English, and when the case for Norse input turns on some more or less remarkable novelty in form or sense or usage.

For general discussion of words not attested in Old English but (perhaps) able to be reconstructed see Hoad (1985). A classic example is PDE trust, which it is now usually agreed cannot be explained as a loan from ON (cp. Olcel traustr ‘trusty’, treysta ‘to make trusty, trust’) but must be referred to a zero-grade derivation on the same PGmc root, which happens not to be recorded in OE; see e.g. OED s.v. trust adj., d’Ardenne (1961: glossary s.v. trusten), Hoad (1985: 139–40). As Patrick Stiles points out to me (pers. comm.), another good analogue is PDE Wednesday, which is attested in OE only in the variant with non-mutated stem vowel (OE wōðnes-); the alternative in OE *wēðnes- must have existed (cp. OFris wednesdei, MDu wenesdach), but is not recorded until early ME (see e.g. OED s.v. Wednesday n. and adv.).

For some further remarks on the allure of ‘the Scandinavian element’ see Dance (2013: 51–2). On the comparable phenomenon of ‘Nornomania’ see Melchers (2012); and for the activities more generally of those he dubs ‘contact romantics’ see Lass (1997: esp. 201–9).
which is taken to be nearer to Norse, but which could in practice have come about in the native language.\textsuperscript{40} Of the 28 examples of very commonly cited Norse loans in Figure 1 above, eleven are moreover of this type. Some of these, notably \textit{both}, \textit{die} and \textit{wrong}, have often been rejected as originally Norse altogether.\textsuperscript{41} All in all, this ‘grey zone’ adds up significantly, resulting in a sizeable discrepancy between the most generous possible lists of Norse borrowings in English on the one hand and the thriftiest on the other. This is a particularly telling instance of how paying attention to the small details, the fine grain of the image as it were, makes an enormous difference to the big picture. It is very important that, wherever possible, we do not present sets of words labelled merely by ‘origin’ and leave it at that, but that we concern ourselves with the evidence for lexical genealogy and what it means, in other words that we take a properly, analytically etymological approach to our loans.

Such an approach brings other advantages. It is obvious enough to say that a word’s history does not stop with identifying its origin; but more than that, it is often the case (especially with a possible borrowing from Norse, though as we shall see not only there) that appreciating its etymological background, the family of words to which it belongs at the level of the Germanic root, can play a fruitful part in understanding its early use in English. \textit{Loan} is again an important example, since it was perhaps its recognisable relationship with the network of words formed on the same root which not only facilitated its integration into English vocabulary in the first place, but which also enabled its take-up and spread by subsequent generations of English

\textsuperscript{40} A full etymological analysis of the words derived from Old Norse in \textit{Sir Gawain} will appear in a future publication. For the categories of evidence I have employed in this work, see the discussions in Dance (2011) and (2013); \textit{loan} belongs to my ‘type C’.

\textsuperscript{41} Besides \textit{loan}, these words are: \textit{bank} (cp. ODan \textit{banke}, a formation on the same PGmc root *\textit{bank}- as OE \textit{benc} ‘bench’ (with different suffix) and \textit{höbanca} ‘couch’; see OED s.v. \textit{bank} n.1, Björkman (1900–2: 230)); \textit{bond} (cp. Olcel \textit{band}, formed on the same PGmc root *\textit{band}- as OE \textit{bend} ‘bond’ but with a different suffix; see OED s.v. \textit{band} n.1, Björkman (1900–2: 229)); \textit{boon} (cp. OIcel \textit{bón}, formed on the same PGmc root *\textit{bón}- as OE \textit{bén} ‘prayer, petition’ but with a different suffix; see OED s.v. \textit{boon} n.1.1, Björkman (1900–2: 205, 282)); \textit{both} (cp. Olcel \textit{báðir}, originally a compound of an adj. meaning ‘both’ and a demonstrative pronoun, which could have arisen independently in English as a combination of OE \textit{bā} + \textit{þā}, and which is sometimes explained in just this way; see OED s.v. \textit{both} (adj. and adv.), Björkman (1900–2: 108), Pons-Sanz (2013: 89–90)); \textit{die} (cp. Olcel \textit{devja}, a verbal formation on the same PGmc root *\textit{dau}- as the adj. OE \textit{dæd} ‘dead’ and the noun OE \textit{děap} ‘death’; see OED s.v. \textit{die} v.1, Björkman (1900–2: 66, 285), Dance (2000)); \textit{flit} (cp. Olcel \textit{flytja}, a verbal formation on the same PGmc root *\textit{flut}- as OE words like \textit{flota} ‘boat, sailor’; OED s.v. \textit{flit} v., Björkman (1900–2: 210)); \textit{same} (cp. Olcel \textit{samr}, a formation on the same PGmc root *\textit{sam}- as OE words like \textit{same} (adv.) ‘in the same way’; see OED s.v. \textit{same} adj. (pron., adv.), Björkman (1900–2: 218–19)); \textit{seem} (cp. Olcel \textit{sama}, cognate with OE \textit{(ge)sēman} which had a different sense (‘to smooth over, settle, reconcile’); see OED s.v. \textit{seem} v.2, Björkman (1900–2: 219)); \textit{sly} (cp. Olcel \textit{slegr}, an adj. formation on the pret. stem of the verb PGmc \textit{*slaxan}- as found in OE \textit{sēlan} ‘to strike’; see OED s.v. \textit{sly} adj., adv. and n., Björkman (1900–2: 219)); \textit{wrong} (cp. Olcel \textit{(v) rangr}, a formation on the same PGmc root *\textit{wrang}- as OE \textit{wrang} ‘rough, uneven’; see OED s.v. \textit{wrong} adj. and adv., Björkman (1900–2: 225, 285), Pons-Sanz (2013: 466–7)).
speakers. Before the later 12th century the main lexical item expressing the concept 'loan' in English texts is the word we encountered above, OE læn. But, from that point on, our new form lån (PDE loan) rapidly took over this territory, and was arguably regarded as filling the same space in this etymological word family as læn had previously occupied. See, for example, its usage in the early 13th-century Sawles Warde, where it is the noun corresponding to the related verb leanan (‘se riche lane . . . þet he haueð ileanet him’, ‘so rich a loan which he had lent him’). It is hard to be sure quite why læn caught on in this way at the expense of læn. But it is worth noticing that, by this period, the form læn (probably pronounced /lɛn/) had become somewhat ambiguous in what it could denote—as well as ‘a loan’, it could now also mean ‘a reward’ or ‘a gift’, representing the regular descendant not just of OE læn but also of the unrelated noun OE lean.

42 For OE læn see BT s.v. (with additions in BTS s.v.), and for other expressions in the same sense area see TOE 15.04.01, HTOED 02.07.12.04|01 n.

43 It is first recorded in Bodley 343, in the Ælfric homily called by Irvine (1993) ‘The Servant’s Failure to Forgive’, which is found only in this manuscript. The two instances of lan(e) appear in close succession at lines 10–14: ‘Da næfde þe þe þæm þæt he þam laforde his lane forylde; ac þe laford het þa lædon ðone þægen mid wife 7 mid alle his cildrum 7 syllæn wið feo, þæt hure his læn wurde him forolden’ (‘Then the thegn had no ability to repay to the lord his loan; but the lord ordered then the thegn with his wife and all his children to be led away and sold for money, so that indeed his loan might be repaid to him.’). For the word’s widespread distribution from the early 13th century see MED s.v. lån(e n.1, OED s.v. loan n.1.

44 Bennett & Smithers (1968: 254, ll. 227–9), based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 34. The South-West Midland language of this text is very close dialectally to that found in Bodley 343; see notably Kitson (1992: esp. 33–4).

45 For OE lean see BT s.v. (with additions in BTS s.v.), and on its etymology OED, s.v. lean n.1, Pokorny (1959: I.655), Torp (1909: 371), Orel (2003: 239, s.v. *launan), Bammesberger (1990: 73, s.v. *law-na-°), Kroonen (2013: 329, s.v. *launa-°), Lehmann (1986: 228–9, s.v. laun), Holthausen (1934: s.v. leân (1)). On the monophthongisation of OE ææ and its merger with the reflex of late OE ææ, usually dated to c.1000, see e.g. Schlemilch (1914: 35–6), Campbell (1959: §329.2), Luick (1964: §§355, 356.2 and Anm. 1), Jordan (rev. Crook) (1974: §81), Hogg (1992: §§5.210, 212, 214), Fulk, Bjork & Niles (2008: cxxiv §7.1), though for an alternative account see Bliss (1949–50). An early instance of the scribal confusion of OE læn and leân has been argued to lie behind Beowulf l. 1809b (‘sægde him þæs leanes þanc’), a famous crux which has sometimes been resolved by substituting a form of læn to give the (more plausible) sense ‘for that loan’. See Fulk, Bjork & Niles (2008: cxxiv §7.1, 217–18 (note on ll. 1807–12) and apparatus to l. 1809b) and references there cited; Crépin (1991: 765) goes further and suggests that there is a deliberate play on words by the poet. There is a similar, and less well known, instance of MS <leanes> perhaps for lænes at Genesis B 258a; see Vickrey (1968), but also Doane (1991: 259). In any event, a word spelt <læn> could evidently be understood in senses traditionally associated with OE leân by the early 11th century; notice in particular the use of <læn> to gloss Lat commodum ‘profit, reward’ and lucrum ‘gain, riches’ at HlGl 1061 (Oliphant 1966: 84, gloss 1181), i.e. the ‘Harley Glossary’ in London, British Library, Harley 3376, dated s. x/xi by Ker (1990: 312–13) and localised to Worcester by Cooke (1997: 445–6). The confusion (or merger?) of læn and leân was presumably facilitated by their semantic contiguity, the basic idea of giving being common to the senses ‘loan’ and ‘gift, reward’; in this connection notice also Rosier (1962: 6 n. 47) (and on lexical merger see Durkin (2009: 79–83)).
work out that not being able clearly to specify whether something was a loan or a gift might have given rise to one or two arguments (‘When am I getting my cow back?’ ‘Oh, but you said it was a /læːn/.’)\(^{46}\) The availability of the new variant lān (/læːn/) could have helped to resolve this problem, since if one uses it for the sense ‘loan’, and prefers the form /læːn/ to mean ‘reward’ or ‘gift’ (and MED records this form-type in no other sense), then any potential for confusion is neatly resolved.\(^{47}\) If lān is originally a borrowing from Old Norse, then paying attention to its etymological context in this way gives us an important insight into how it might have caught on in English, how it might have been perceived as a useful, less ambiguous formation on the same root as næn. And this is hardly surprising: an important corollary of the close genetic similarity of Norse and English is of course the ease with which lexical material from the one could be slotted into the other, and rapidly treated as if it had always been there.\(^{48}\) But then the same arguments about the early spread of lān are true even if we take it as an entirely native variant which was only now coming to prominence. What at one level of etymological discourse is a problem in the identification of origins (is this form

\(^{46}\) For a good example of such ambiguity, notice the Bodley 343 form <læna> at Irvine (1993: 200, text VII.95–7) ‘Ne þearf us na tweoænan þæt he us næle eft þære læna muneþæn þæs þe he us her on weorlde to forlæt’ (‘We need not doubt that he will not remind us of those læna which he allowed us here in the world’), which can plausibly be interpreted either as ‘loans’ (as it is by Irvine (1993: 222, glossary s.v. læn)) or ‘rewards’ (as it is by MED s.v. læn n., second quotation).

\(^{47}\) MED s.v. læn n. The adoption of ON lán as a means to alleviate the confusion of OE næn and læn is suggested in passing by Crépin (1991: 765). It may be possible to think of this chain of events as an instance of ‘homonymic clash’, followed by a therapeutic reaction to it; for careful remarks on this phenomenon see more generally Durkin (2009: 88–93), with references, and for the controversy it can generate notice the debate in Samuels (1987) vs. Lass (1987). In any event, the reality in 12th- and early 13th-century usage was evidently somewhat more complex than a clean division between /læːn/ ‘reward’ vs. /læːn/ (læːn/) ‘loan’. Notice in particular the instances of lān forms being used to mean ‘reward, payment’ (MED s.v. lón (e n.1. sense l(c)), viz. a1225(‘c1175) PMor (Lamb 487) 64 and c1225(‘c1200) St. Kath. (1) (Einenkel) 805, both in the phrase ‘swinkes lan’ (the first of which is in fact misleadingly cited by OED s.v. lean (n.1) (third quotation) as if < OE læan). This is another interesting indication that lān was understood as belonging to the same ‘family’ of words as OE læan, since it is here being slotted into a formulaic collocation formerly occupied by læan or edlæan; such a phrase occurs several times in late Old English writers including Ælfric (e.g. Catholic Homilies II.31 l. 99 ‘ures geswinces edlæan’; Godden 1979: 271), and for a similar idiom using early ME læn compare The Orrmulum Dedication l. 333 (‘forr hiss swinne to læn’; Holt 1878).

\(^{48}\) For some of the consequences of this similarity during the period of contact see Townend (2002: esp. 43–68). It is worth noticing in this connection that borrowings from Old Norse, far from disrupting the ‘associative’ (or ‘consociated’) character of the Old English lexical system, as one normally assumes loanwords to do, would in many cases conceivably have reinforced and added to the networks of words formed recognisably on the same roots. This is true of all the words listed above, n. 41, which (it will be recalled, and for the very same reasons) are also amongst those most liable to have their identification as borrowings debated. For some discussion of ‘consociated’ and ‘dissociated’ lexis and the effects of borrowing see Durkin (2014: 6), with references; and for a good overview of the characteristics of early English word formation and its development see Kastovsky (2006).
from Old Norse or not?), at another is an opportunity to understand the dynamics of change in the systems of related words in early English, something which seems to me at least as interesting and worthwhile an exercise. In other words, from the point of view of tracing this aspect of its early history, at least, it does not necessarily matter whether loan is a loan or not.

**A CASE STUDY: ‘RICH’ AND ‘POOR’**

Bald lists of Modern English words like that in Table 1 are, of course, simplifying in both these respects: they elide etymological complexities, and they tell us nothing about the contexts within the medieval English lexicon upon which so much of our evidence for the early usage and transmission of words depends. If we try to draw conclusions about the history of these words without any of these details, then the results are likely to be superficial, sometimes transparently so. It might momentarily be tempting, for instance, to find in many of the words in our Table (notably bar, clerk, council, court, custom, duke, ermine, feast, feeble, honour, justice, lecher, mercy, poor, rent, robber, scorn, serve, treasure, war) evidence for Norman rulers lording it over and oppressing the Anglo-Saxon masses, imposing feebleness, violence, imprisonment and poverty, and introducing them to the horrors of servitude and administration; but such selective readings of the loan-record can in practice be used to serve any sociocultural stereotype we like, and are best avoided. There are some cognate arguments which, on the face of it, seem more sophisticated, but which proceed from similarly one-dimensional takes on a word’s language of origin and modern meanings, and as such are equally insubstantial. The most famous example is the claim popularised by Walter Scott in *Ivanhoe*, namely that animal and meat word-pairs in Modern English with originally French vs. native constituents, like *beef*/*cow*, *pork*/*pig* and *mutton*/*sheep*, derive directly from the fact that it was the Norman lords who feasted on the cooked product in their hall, while the (doubtless thoroughly Pythonesque) Anglo-Saxon peasants tended the beast in the field.\(^49\) This theory seems eminently plausible, precisely because it rings so true, at least to popular stereotypes. But when we examine the actual usage of the corresponding items in Middle English it turns out to be a massive simplification; as Kornexl and Lenker have recently shown, a clear specialisation of meat vs. animal terms did not develop in English until much later, with the French-derived words being used to refer to living animals until well into the early Modern period.\(^50\)


\(^50\) Kornexl & Lenker (2011); see also Durkin (2014: 423).
The fact is that loanwords do not inevitably or quite so obviously bear the stamp of their originary situation on them, and in order to get beyond the impressionistic and try to understand how such words were adopted and used by medieval speakers and writers of English we need to look in as much detail as possible at their occurrences in the extant texts. In interpreting their contexts within these documents, we have to reckon not only with date and geography, but with the effects of other, complex variables like the transmission of manuscript texts through successive strata of scribal copying. When it comes to vocabulary, we also have to deal with that array of factors in word choice which come together loosely under the heading ‘semantic’. We rightly now think of language as a ‘population of variants moving through time’ (in Roger Lass’s famous formulation), and this is as true of the contents of semantic fields as it is of systems like phonology and morphology; there will normally be a variety of possible ways of expressing roughly the same idea, with their occurrence motivated by more or less fine nuances not just of denotative meaning but also of connotation, style and idiom. Historically, when we attempt to track the emergence of a new word, we need ideally to consider what this semantic context was like beforehand, how our new word fits in, and how the range of choices and therefore meanings within this system might have changed. Research in this area has been transformed by the completion in 2009, after forty-four years, of the peerless Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary—one of the most impressive research projects ever undertaken in the humanities, and one which has helped nurture and develop the whole field of study to which this lecture belongs.

In order to exemplify all these factors, let us look at some changing words and meanings in just one particular corner of English vocabulary in our period. The entry of foreign material into a recipient language is so often conceptualised, as we have seen, in pseudo-economic terms, as cultural capital which can be ‘loaned’ or ‘borrowed’; and it therefore seemed appropriate here to explore some expressions

51 For key discussions of these variables in the context of medieval English dialectology see Benskin & Laing (1981), Laing (2004), Laing & Lass (2006) and the LAEME website (especially the ‘Introduction’ accessible at http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1_frames.html).
52 See e.g. Lass (1997: 377).
53 For a case-study of some early ME loans in these respects see Dance (2003a: 200–84). For helpful introductions to lexical systems and semantic change see e.g. Smith (1996: 112–40), Durkin (2009: 222–65).
54 The contents of the full printed HTOED are searchable online at http://historicalthesaurus.arts.gla.ac.uk, and are also accessible via the online OED (in a slightly revised format, giving dates of first attestation according to OED3 and omitting words attested only in Old English; it is this latter version on which I base Tables 2 and 3). For accounts of its history and principles see HTOED I.xiii–xx, and references there cited.
55 For introductions to this and related terminology see e.g. Durkin (2009: 132–40), Durkin (2014: 3, 8–11), and see further Fischer (2001).
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Table 2. English expressions for ‘rich or wealthy’ since c.1150 (from HTOED 02.07.05 adj.); dates of first attestation in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rich (eOE)</td>
<td>strong (1622)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eadi (OE)</td>
<td>fortuned (1632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richful (c.1300)</td>
<td>affluent (1652)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealthy (13..)</td>
<td>rhinocerical (1688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plenteous (c.1350)</td>
<td>rough (1721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealthy (c.1380)</td>
<td>rowthy (1792)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big (?a.1400)</td>
<td>strong-handed (1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wluω (a.1400)</td>
<td>wealth-encumbered (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well (c.1405)</td>
<td>nabobish (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golded (c.1450)</td>
<td>rhinoceral (1860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantial (1490)</td>
<td>ingoted (1864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opulent (?1518)</td>
<td>tinny (1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantive (1543)</td>
<td>pocket-filled (1886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fat (1611)</td>
<td>oofy (1896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juicy (1621)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. English expressions for ‘poor’ since c.1150 (from HTOED 02.07.06 | 01 adj.); dates of first attestation in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm (c.1000)</td>
<td>indigent (c.1400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haveless (c.1000)</td>
<td>starveling (1638)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waedle (c.1000)</td>
<td>necessitated (1646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naked (OE)</td>
<td>inopious (1656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needful (OE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpless (c.1175)</td>
<td>down at heel (1732)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wantsum (?c.1200)</td>
<td>parsimonious (1782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare (c.1220)</td>
<td>lacking (1805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor (a.1225)</td>
<td>unopulent (1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misease (?c.1225)</td>
<td>starved (1559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwealy (a.1300)</td>
<td>bushed (1819)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needy (c.1325)</td>
<td>oboleary (1823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeble (c.1330)</td>
<td>ill-to-do (1853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poorful (1372)</td>
<td>needsome (1870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mischievous (c.1390)</td>
<td>unrich (1875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misaseased (c.1390)</td>
<td>rocky (1921)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

describing the distribution of wealth, and to look at words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. Using the Historical Thesaurus, we can see at a stroke all the words and phrases which have lexicalised the broad concept of ‘rich or wealthy’ from about 1150; see Table 2 (dates of first attestation follow OED). These make for a very colourful bunch, especially in the 16th and 17th centuries, which gives us expressive terms like fat, juicy and rhinocerical; more recent highlights include oofy (from 1896). But if anything the HTOED entry for ‘poor’ (Table 3) is more varied still, including the likes of naughty, necessitous, inopious, bushed and rocky—demonstrating perhaps that the only thing

56 Note that in Tables 2 and 3 I cite the Thesaurus entry as accessed via the online OED (at http://www.oed.com/view/th/class/144948 and http://www.oed.com/view/th/class/145099 respectively).
people have always been obsessed with more than money is not having it. Turning to the *Thesaurus of Old English*, a major off-shoot of the main *Thesaurus* project published in 1995, we can explore in greater detail the most common and productive word families for our two broad concepts in Old English; these are set out in Table 4. Their use and their focal meanings naturally varied according to date, dialect and author, but they can all properly be grouped together as specifically denoting wealth and poverty in at least some texts. Leaving aside developments from the later 10th century onwards (dealt with below), the key Old English adjectives which could mean ‘wealthy’ were ādīg, gesǣlig, spēdig and welig. The idea of poverty was expressed primarily

---

**Table 4.** Principal words denoting ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in Old English (not including developments from the 10th century onwards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘rich’</th>
<th>‘poor’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ādīg</td>
<td>earm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesǣlig</td>
<td>hēan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spēdig</td>
<td>hearfende (pearfa ‘a poor person’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welig (weliga ‘a rich person’)</td>
<td>wēdla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

57 *TOE*, searchable online at http://oldenglishthesaurus.arts.gla.ac.uk. On its principles see *TOE* I.xv–xxxv.

58 See the words listed under *TOE* 15.01.05, especially the sub-category ‘rich’ and its various sub-sub-categories (‘rich in (worldly) goods’, ‘very rich, opulent’, ‘rich in . . .’). Some (perforce impressionistic) remarks on these four adjectives and their attested uses: (1) The basic sense of OE ādīg, derived on the root of PGmc *auðazl*/auðan ‘wealth’, appears to have been ‘fortunate, blessed’. In homiletic and devotional literature it is most frequently encountered with religious connotations, viz. in *DOE*’s senses 2 (‘blessed by God, favoured with divine blessing’) or 3 (‘worthy of reverence or adoration, blessed, revered’); but it was clearly also used to specify material prosperity (*DOE*’s sense 1.b ‘referring to good fortune in material possessions’), and it is often found as the formulaic antonym of *earm*, especially but not only in legal texts (including in six out of seven of the citations at *DOE* sense 1.b.i.a ‘adjective used as substantive: the rich, the prosperous’; for some remarks on this collocation see Weisweiler (1923: 318–20)). See esp. *OED* s.v. *eadi* adj., *DOE* s.v. ādīg, Bammesberger (1990: 54, s.v. *auð-a-z*), Orel (2003: 28, s.v. *auðaþægaz ~ *auðaþæzaz*, Kroonen (2013: 40, s.v. *auða*–), Holthausen (1934: 1934: s.v. ādīg). (2) OE gesǣlig, formed on the PGmc adj. stem *sēli- ‘kind, happy’, could likewise be used to describe the effects of good fortune in a variety of guises, often spiritual but sometimes specifically material; see esp. *BTS* sense IIa. ‘having a fortune, wealthy’, and notice also the compound cornsǣlig. See esp. *OED* s.v. *seely* adj., *BT* and *BTS* s.vv. gesǣlig, Heidermanns (1993: 476–7), Orel (2003: 327, s.v. *sēliz*), Holthausen (1934: s.v. sǣlig). (3) OE spēdig derives from the noun PGmc *spōdī- ‘success, speed’, but its literal meaning ‘successful’ is found alongside numerous instances where it denotes success in material things, i.e. wealth (see *BT*’s sense II ‘having means, wealthy, opulent, rich in material wealth’), and it is very frequently found compounded in this sense (e.g. OE goldspēdig, woruldspēdig). See esp. *BT* and *BTS* s.vv. spēdig, Bammesberger (1990: 146, s.v. *spōði-*, Kroonen (2013: 469, s.v. *spōði-*), Holthausen (1934: s.v. *spēd*). (4) OE welig is formed ultimately on the same root as the adv. wel and the verb willan. Like the related noun OE wela (‘prosperity, happiness, riches’) it is very frequently used to refer to material riches, but could also denote welfare and well-being more generally. See esp. *OED* s.v. *wealy* adj.1, *BT* and *BTS* s.vv. welig, Orel (2003: 453, s.v. *wel(j)an*, Kroonen (2013: 578, s.v. *weljan-*) (1), Holthausen (1934: s.v. *weleg* (2)). The remaining uncompounded adj. forms listed by *TOE* under these categories are gifig, maga and weleþig, but each of these is rare and/or only obliquely to be associated with this sense area; see respectively *DOE* s.v. gyfig, gifig, BTS s.v. maga (‘able’), BTSC s.v. weleþig.
with *earm* or *hēan*, or a derivative of *pearf*, or with *wēdl*. All of these words seem to have been reasonably well established ways of describing wealth and its absence, and are sometimes found in variation with one another. For instance, here is an example of Ælfric using a couple of different synonyms for ‘rich’ and ‘poor’, for stylistic variety in the same passage:60

> Se welega is gewort for ðan þearfan and se þearfa for ðam welegan. Þam spedigum gedafenaþ þæt he spende and dæle; þam wædlan gedafenaþ þæt he gebidde for ðam dælere.

But by early Middle English things have changed considerably, at least to judge by this passage from an early 13th-century life of Saint Katherine, where the rich/poor binary is expressed by the ancestors of precisely our words, *riche* and *poure*:61

> sende heaste ant bode ... þet poure ba ant riche comen þer biuoren him to þe temple i þe tun [of] his heāðene godes, euchan wið his lac forte wurðgin ham wið ... þe riche reðeren ant scheþ—ant bule, hwase mahte—brohte[n] to lake, þe poure cwike briddes

59 See TOE 15.01.06, notably the sub-categories ‘a poor person’ and ‘poor, needy, indigent’ and their several sub-sub-categories. On these forms notice: (1) OE *earm* (< PGmc *arma* - ‘wretched, miserable’, of obscure ulterior etymology) is a very common adj. describing misery and wretchedness, often specifically that of material poverty, see esp. BT and BTS sense (2) ‘poor, destitute’. See esp. OED s.v. *arm* adj., BT and BTS s.vv. *earm* adj., Heidermanns (1993: 104–5), Orel (2003: 24, s.v. *armac* II), Kroonen (2013: 35, s.v. *arma*– 2), Weisweiler (1923: 304–25), Holthausen (1934: s.v. *earm* (2)). (2) OE *hēan* (< PGmc *hauna* - ‘shameful’) could refer to the condition of being humble, low and/or ignoble in a wide range of circumstances, but often implies or specifies a lack of wealth; see esp. BTS sense I.1 (‘of low degree, of humble condition, low, poor, as opposed to *rice*, *weligious*, *wanlic*’). See esp. OED s.v. *hean*, *hene* adj., BT, BTS and BTSC s.vv. *hēan*, Heidermanns (1993: 286–7), Orel (2003: 166, s.v. *xanaez*), Kroonen (2013: 216, s.v. *hauna*–), Holthausen (1934: s.v. *hean* (1)). (3) OE *pearfa*, *pearfende* are formed on the (pres. 3 sg. ind. stem of the) preterite-present verb PGmc *purfan* - ‘to need’, hence literally ‘a needy person’, but are usually attested with reference to material poverty. See esp. OED s.v. *tharfa*, *thar* v., BT, BTS and BTSC s.vv. *pearfa*, *pearfan*, Seebold (1970: 509–10), Orel (2003: 417, s.v. *parfa*), Kroonen (2013: 552, s.v. *purfan*–), Holthausen (1934: s.vv. *pearfa*, *pearfian*). (4) OE *wēdl*a (< PGmc *wēpla*-) is the adj. derived on OE *wēdl* ‘poverty, want’, and generally refers to one lacking material wealth, sometimes specifically a beggar (translating Lat *mendicus*). See esp. OED s.v. *waedle* adj. and n.2, BT s.v. *wēdl*a, Pokorny (1959: I.84), Holthausen (1934: s.v. *wēdl*a, wēðla*). The other synonyms in these categories in TOE are mainly compounds, either expressing a lack of possessions (e.g. *naftig*, *unāga*, *wanhafa*, *wanhafo*), or qualifying one of the words for ‘wealthy’ given above (e.g. medspēdig, wanspēdig, unosga); see the respective entries in BT, BTS, BTSC.

60 Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies* I.18, ll. 205–7, ed. Clemoes (1997: 324), based on London, British Library, Royal 7 C.xii (I have modernised the punctuation and capitalisation and expanded the abbreviations). ‘The wealthy person is made for the needy, and the needy for the wealthy. It is fitting for the successful person that he spend and distribute [his goods]; for the impoverished one it is fitting that he pray for the distributor.’

61 *Seinte Katherine* ll. 17–22, ed. d’Ardenne & Dobson (1981: 4), critical text based on Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 34. ‘He sent an order and command that both poor and rich should come before him at the temple of his heathen gods in the town, each one with his offering to honour them with . . . the rich brought cattle and sheep—and bulls, if they could—as offerings, the poor brought live birds.’
The easy assumption at this point is to put this change down to contact with medieval French: *pour* is indisputably a French loan, and *rique* has sometimes been assumed to be one too. Again, could this be an example of the oppressed English masses having words for economic status imposed on them by the people who held the purse-strings, their Norman overlords? To claim a straight rupture between the pre- and post-Conquest vocabularies of wealth is once more, however, to make too much of Old and Middle English as distinct language states, to look backwards from one and forwards from the other. Things get far more complicated, and far more interesting, when we see the fuller picture, and look at the bit in between.

This of course involves us noticing the Old English adjective *rīce*, the history of which is delightfully knotty. As illustrated by the family tree in Figure 4, Old English *rīce* and its siblings elsewhere in the early Germanic languages come from a Proto-Germanic adjective whose stem we can reconstruct as *rīkja-. But the vowel /iː/ indicates that this stem did not descend straightforwardly via the Germanic line from the Proto-Indo-European word for ruler; instead we have a borrowing here into Germanic from the Celtic family, which must have happened when the two groups were in contact at a very early period in continental Europe.\(^{62}\) I have given the sense of Old English *rīce* both as ‘powerful’ and ‘wealthy’, because (as Malcolm Godden has shown), while ‘powerful’ was the original sense of the adjective, it had come to be used to denote a particular facet of power, economic wealth, already by the 10th century; it is Ælfric’s favourite word for ‘wealthy’, in fact.\(^ {63}\) The reasons for this semantic shift are potentially complex, but they can very plausibly be linked to socio-cultural developments well before the Norman Conquest. Robin Fleming in particular has written compellingly of the growth of a commercialised, cash economy in later Anglo-Saxon England, and of the extravagant displays of wealth by elite families, including in dress and fine dining—and, as both Fleming and Godden suggest, it seems entirely fitting that an adjective meaning ‘powerful’ came in this very period increasingly to denote economic riches.\(^ {64}\) As summarised in Figure 4, there were parallel developments in most of the


\(^{63}\) Godden (1990), with some reference to the earlier discussion in Mincoff (1933: 149–53). The earliest instances of *rice* clearly denoting material wealth are in the Vercelli and Blickling homilies, argues Godden (1990: 48–50).

\(^{64}\) Fleming (2001), Godden (1990: esp. 41–2, 53–4). For a different interpretation of the underlying economic phenomena see Sawyer (2013: 106–8), who prefers to explain the semantic shift as symptomatic of the fact that, by the later 10th century, wealth was no longer simply ‘an attribute of power’ but was now the province also of merchants, traders and others who could be wealthy without also necessarily being powerful.
Germanic cognates of *rıce, and also in the early French word riche—which, just to complicate the pedigree of these words still further, is itself a borrowing from Germanic.65 Now, all this of course makes it difficult for us to label the immediate etymological source of early Middle English riche, since we have formally and semantically near-identical words in both Old English and French. Some etymologists, notably Skeat, have derived the Middle English word purely from Old English.66 But we probably need to allow for at least some influence from the sense range of medieval French riche in explaining the meanings ‘precious, splendid’ in Middle English; and

65 OHG rîhi is recorded meaning ‘wealthy’ (translating Lat dives) from the late 9th century, and OS rîki translates dives once in The Heliand; see Ris (1971: 37–53). (Ris (1971: 53–8) argues that the new meaning developed as a semantic loan from Lat dives, though as far as I can see his evidence for this is purely circumstantial, i.e. that the sense ‘wealthy’ is first attested in literature translated from Latin.) For the senses of early Fr riche see AND s.v. riche, DEAF s.v. riche adj., AFW s.v. riche adj., DMF s.v. riche, Venckeleer (1975: 413–51). Sawyer (2013: 107–8) regards the semantic developments of the English and German words as directly connected, both being products of the economic growth shared by England and Germany in this period (including important trading links between the two; Sawyer (2013: 98–101, 104–5)). Note that the sense ‘wealthy’ is attested relatively late for OIcel ríkr (‘about the end of the 13th century’, according to Cleasby-Vigfusson s.v.), and in this respect Old Norse as a whole probably shows influence from the use of the cognate word in Low German (so e.g. Falk & Torp (1960: s.v. Ríg)).

66 Skeat (1887: 61–2) (‘To these we must add rıce, rich, not borrowed from French, though existing as riche in that language . . . ’). For some discussion of etymological authorities’ differing attitudes in this respect see further Kniezsa (1992: 508, 510).
there are closely related derivatives like Middle English richesse which are much more obviously French in form.\textsuperscript{67} All in all, we can certainly identify change as going on in the usage of early English rice from late Old English to early Middle English; but the Norman Conquest certainly is not the pre-eminent engine of that change that we might have anticipated, and how much in the end we label this word ‘native’ and how much ‘foreign’ is another nice problem in etymological hermeneutics. If we do think of Middle English riche as effectively a ‘blend’, a combination of English and French inputs, then this only adds to the complex sequence of to-and-fro between major European language families which characterises this word’s history over more than a millennium. Moveable wealth indeed.

If we examine our other words for ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in the period from the early 12th to the early 13th centuries, we find a similarly complex mixture of continuity and change. To recap on our starting point, Table 5 once again shows the key Old English words in these fields, updated now to include rice in the first column. To the words for ‘poor’ we can moreover add wrecce, which began life in Old English meaning ‘exiled’, but which increasingly in late Old English came to signify ‘wretched, unfortunate’ and by the 12th century was very clearly being used to mean ‘poor’ in the sense ‘financially impoverished’.\textsuperscript{68} In Table 6 are some of the major (wholly or predominantly) ‘new’ texts of the 12th and early 13th centuries: the interpolations and continuations to the Peterborough Chronicle made mainly in the 1120s and 1150s;\textsuperscript{69} the Orrmulum,

\textsuperscript{67}For the sense ‘precious, splendid’ see MED s.v. riche adj., senses (2) and (3), OED s.v. rich adj., n, and adv., sense (5), and compare AND s.v. riche sense (a) (sub-senses inc. ‘costly; splendid, magnificent; precious’), Venckeleer (1975: 413–51). For richesse see MED s.v. riches(se n., OED s.v. richesse n., and compare AND s.v. richesse, DEAF s.v. riche f., AFW s.v. richece f., DMF s.v. richesse subst. fem., Venckeleer (1975: 437–42).

\textsuperscript{68}The OE adj. wrecce, wrecca is a derivative of the noun wrecca, wræcca ‘exile, adventurer, wretch’, formed on the pret. 1/3 sg. ind. stem of the PGmc verb *wrekan- (original meaning probably ‘to pursue’). For etymological discussion see OED s.v. wretch n. and adj., Pokorny (1959: I.1181), Torp (1909: 415–16), Lehmann (1986: 410, s.v. *wrikjan), Seebold (1970: 568–70), Orel (2003: 471–2, s.v. wrekanan), Kroonen (2013: 594, s.v. *wrakjan-), Holthausen (1934: s.v. wrecca). For attested senses of the noun and adj. in OE and ME see further BT, BTS, BTSC s.vv. wrecc(e), wrecca and MED s.vv. wrecche adj., wreche n., and for a discussion of the semantic developments in the context of the broader lexical field see Rumball (2008: 7–22). The earliest witness to the adj. unambiguously denoting ‘impoverished’ (i.e. MED’s sense 1(c)) is plausibly the Life of St Nicholas in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303, Treherne (1997) (DOE’s LS 29 (Nicholas)) esp. ll. 88 and 109, where it refers to the poor man enriched by the saint. The manuscript is dated s. xii\textsuperscript{e} or s. xii\textsuperscript{m}, but this text is likely to have been composed in the late 11th century (see Ker (1990: 99–105, no. 57), Laing (1993: 23), Treherne (1997: 19–21, 72–8), Treherne (2010a), Rumball (2008: 21 n. 91), Pons-Sanz (2013: 386)).

\textsuperscript{69}For references see above, n. 13. I have searched for words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in this text using the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (OEC, at http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/), and cite references by annal and line number from Irvine (2004). Rice is frequent (I count 15 examples in the interpolations and continuations), and often refers unambiguously to material wealth, e.g. s.a. 1137 ll. 40–1, ‘Wrecce men sturuen of hunger; sume ieden on ælmes þe weren sum wile rice men’, in contrast
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Table 5. Principal words denoting ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in Old English (including developments from the 10th century onwards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘rich’</th>
<th>‘poor’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ēadig</td>
<td>earm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>hēan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesēlig</td>
<td>þearfende (þearfa ‘a poor person’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spēdig</td>
<td>wēdlæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welig (weliga ‘a rich person’)</td>
<td>wrecce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Words denoting ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in major English texts from the 12th and early 13th centuries (unmarked choices in bold face).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>‘rich’</th>
<th>‘poor’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough Chronicle</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>wrecc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12th-century additions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(haueleste, ærm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orrmulum</td>
<td>riche</td>
<td>wrecch-, usell, wædle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sel, sellpe)</td>
<td>(wanntsumm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lambeth Homilies</td>
<td>riche</td>
<td>wrec(c)h-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eadi; iselhðe)</td>
<td>(erm, henðe, hauele(te), þaru(a; pouerte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trinity Homilies</td>
<td>riche</td>
<td>wrech-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AB Language</td>
<td>riche</td>
<td>(hau(n)nes, poure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(weolie, weoleful)</td>
<td>(wreich-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laçoam’s Brut (Caligula MS)</td>
<td>riche</td>
<td>wrecc-, hæn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(weoli, eadi, weorld-seli)</td>
<td>(wædle, pouere)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

written in Lincolnshire between about 1160 and 1180;\(^{70}\) the Lambeth and Trinity Homilies, copied c.1200 in the South-West and South-East Midlands respectively;\(^{71}\)

with wreccce. I count 6 occurrences of wreccce- as a simplex, plus one of the derivative wreccehed, the majority of which seem to refer to worldly poverty and its attendant misery (as in the example cited above). There is also one instance of hauleste ‘poverty’ s.a. 675 l. 25. OE earm is represented in these annals only once as a simplex, and it is not clear that poverty is what is mainly being denoted by the adj. (‘þet ærme folc’ referred to s.a. 1124 l. 47 have indeed been deprived of their property, but this is not the only hardship they have suffered, and their pitiableness is more likely to be what is at issue; cp. the adv. earmlice s.a. 1127 l. 51 and s.a. 1128 l. 26, which has no evident connection with material poverty and which is best translated ‘miserably’ or ‘grievously’).

\(^{70}\)For references see above, n. 13. My data for The Orrmulum is derived from searches of the electronic version of the text in the Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse (CMEPV, at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/), with citations by line from Holt (1878). Riche appears 14 times, often unambiguously referring to earthly wealth, as e.g. 12084 ‘riche off ahhte’; the nouns se(o)llþe and negative unse(o)llþe (unse(o)llþe) are numerous, but alongside sel (twice) usually indicate a non-specific ‘happiness’ and only occasionally might imply material riches, e.g. 14304 ‘All middellærdess sellþe & sel’. Wrecch- (I count 17 instances of the simplex, plus one each of wreccelîg and wreccelîke) does not often seem to denote material poverty per se, but notice e.g. 5638, ‘All wreche & wædle & usell mann’, where wrecc- is found in sequence with the otherwise rarer adjectives usell (7 occurrences as a simplex, and once in the nominal derivative uselldomm) and the less ambiguous wædle (4 occurrences); wanntsumm is found once only (14824). (Despite the gloss ‘happiness, prosperity’ at OED s.v. eadi adj., O orm’s ædīleg, ædīleg does not seem in context to refer to material prosperity; MED s.v. ēdīleg(e n. translates more persuasively as ‘One of the virtues blessed in the Beatitudes, a blessing’.)

\(^{71}\)The Lambeth Homilies are found in London, Lambeth Palace Library 487, edited by Morris (1868;
and the texts in the AB Language and the earlier version of Lažamon’s Brut, all South-West Midland compositions probably datable to the first half of the 13th century. In each case I have highlighted (in bold face) what seem to be the unmarked

2–159) and in part also by O’Brien (1985); on the manuscript and its language see esp. O’Brien (1985: 12–113), Laing (1993: 111), Laing (2008: 2–3, 125–30), Swan (2010), plus Dance (2011: 82–5) and references there cited. I have searched these texts via CMEPV, and cite them by homily number, page and line from Morris (1868). Riche occurs 14 times, including 5 times in Homily X, a revised version of a composite Ælfric homily (3 of these 5 occurrences continue Ælfric’s rica but the remaining 2 replace OE welega; cp. the earlier version in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178, printed in Morris (1868: Appendix II) and in parallel with the Lambeth text in O’Brien (1985: 203–50), and see also Dance (2011: 84)); eadi only once refers to material prosperity, in the doublet ‘ne ermne ne eadine’ at X. 115/19, retained from the Ælfrician version (‘ne earmne ne eadigene’); formations on the sel- root generally also have a spiritual connotation, with the exception of iselhðe at X. 109/30 ‘þe sïtære þe þurh his iselhðe leoseð’ (cp. Corpus 178 geselhæ). Wrec(c)h is very common (I count 42 instances of the simplex, plus 3 of wrecchede), usually referring to non-specific wretchedness, but several instances unambiguously indicate worldly poverty, e.g. III. 39/31 ‘Nis nan mon swa rich. ne swa wrecche’; in Homily X, comparison with the earlier version in Corpus 178 reveals that the Lambeth redactor has consistently replaced OE þearfa (10×) and weðla (once) with wrec(c)h (the only exception comes in a pair of synonyms at X. 115/7–8, where OE ‘ic eom wældla & þearfa’ is updated to ‘Ic em þarua and wrecche’, thereby giving the only instance of þarua in the manuscript); e(a)rm occurs 4 times as a simplex (plus 4 e(a)rming, 1 ermðe, 1 errlic), mainly once more denoting unspecified misery, but material poverty is clearly implied at X. 115/19 in the pair ‘ne ermne ne eadine’ (noticed above); hauleste ‘poor’ appears at X. 111/7 (cp. Corpus 178 hafenleasan) and in the phrase ‘hæfelesen monne’ (translating Lat pauperibus) at XIII. 135/26, and hauleste ‘poverty’ (alongside henðe, probably generic misfortune, loss) at X. 115/3–4 ‘þe hauleste þe þurh his iselhðe leoseð’ (cp. Corpus 178 ‘seo hafenleast þe þurh his iselhðe leoseð’); pouerte also appears once only, at XIV. 143/36. The Trinity Homilies are in Cambridge, Trinity College B.14.52, edited by Morris (1873: 2–219); see notably Laing (1993: 37–8), Laing & McIntosh (1995), Laing (2008: 31–34), Treharme (2010b). Again, my data is based on a search of CMEPV, with references by homily, page and line from Morris (1873). Riche occurs 8 times in these texts, including in the sense ‘expensive, splendid’ which likely shows French influence (e.g. the reference to ‘riche weden’ at VI. 33/21, 29); there is also the derivative riches(e)s(e), clearly a French loan, 7 times. Wrec(c)h is found 28 times as a simplex (plus one occurrence each of wrecchede and wrecheliche), as ever only sometimes specifying material poverty, e.g. at VI. 37/7–8 ‘doð gladliche . . . elmesse wreche men”; haulelese appears at II. 9/11 (translating Lat non habenti), and hauenlese at XXVI. 157/10 (’hauenlese men’ translating pauperibus, as in the equivalent passage in the version of this homily in Lambeth (XIIII. 135/26, noted above)); poure is attested once at VIII. 47/18 (as the opposite of riche). (Arme (< OE eard) occurs only once (at XXV. 149/6, ‘tis arme lif’), and only in a generic reference to misery/wretchedness, hence its omission from the table.)

72 Texts extant in the so-called ‘AB Language’ are Ancrene Wisse in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 402 (or ‘A’), edited by Tolkien (1962) and Millett (2005–6), and the ‘Katherine Group’ (Sancte Katherine, Seinte Margarete, Seinte Iuliene, Hali Meiðhad and Sawesle Warde) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 34 (or ‘B’), edited respectively by d’Ardenne & Dobson (1981), Mack (1934), d’Ardenne (1961), Millett (1982) and Bennett & Smithers (1968: 246–61), and as a whole by d’Ardenne (1977). On the texts and their language see further esp. Tolkien (1929), Zettersten (1965), Laing (1993: 24, 124–5), Millett (1996: esp. 17–21 by G.B. Jack), Dance (2003a: 39–43, 49–50; 2003b), Laing (2008: 6–9, 143–6) and references there cited. I have obtained data on ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ words by searching the printed concordances in Potts, Stevenson & Wogan-Browne (1993) and Stevenson & Wogan-Browne (2000), and cite instances by manuscript (A or B), folio and line. In the two manuscripts I count 23 instances of riche, and two each of the derivatives richesce and richedom; weolie and weoleful are much less frequent, found once and 4 times
word choices meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’, followed by their near-synonyms and some key derivatives in approximately descending order of frequency (very occasional expressions are in brackets).73 Needless to say, there is a great deal of complexity skulking in the shadows of this list, including when it comes to the broader semantic ranges of the words involved; many of them are polysemous, and ambiguous at least some of the time (it is sometimes hard to tell in a given instance of wrecc- or earm-whether the focus is on poverty in particular or pitiableness more broadly, for

respectively, and always either in alliterative phrases (e.g. A 107b/9 ‘nam ich weole wisest’) or in close conjunction with the noun weole ‘riches’ (thus B 63v/19). (Seli and ēdi mean only ‘blessed’ in spiritual or non-specific usage.) There are 31 occurrences of poure (plus 7 pouerte, one poureliche), and this is clearly the favoured way to denote material poverty in these texts. Compare the 23 cases of wrecc- (and 2 of wrecchedom, one wrecchehead), which is less strongly associated with this sense area in AB; it refers to those in a condition of misery which is often associated with poverty and destitution but which does not necessarily seem to imply it, as becomes evident in the phrase ‘wrecche poure poeddere’ (A 16a/25–6, contrasted with ‘riche mercer’), where wrecche was apparently not felt sufficient on its own to indicate that the peddler was lacking in material prosperity. (Formations on earm are relatively frequent, and are favoured especially in Halí Meiðhad, but again denote generic wretchedness only.) For fuller information on the senses of these words, see the glossaries to the editions cited above. The earlier version of Laȝamon’s Brut is that in London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. ix (part I), as edited by Brook & Leslie (1963–78); on its language and for further references see esp. Laing (1993: 69–70), Dance (2003a: 56–60), Laing (2008: 60–5). I have searched for words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in this text via CMEPV, and cite instances by line from Brook & Leslie (1963–78). Riche and its derivatives are extremely commonplace, running to many hundreds of occurrences, and this was clearly Laȝamon’s favourite word-family with which to refer to material wealth. By contrast I have found forms of weolī (<weolegen, weoli>) only twice (215, 6939), both alliterating and only the first denoting material wealth (in the antonymous pair ‘þa weolēgen & þa weāðlēn’); just four occurrences of eadi (ēdi, ēdi), only one of which might refer to material splendour (‘an eorð-hus. eadi & feier’, 1181, glossed ‘of a building: costly, splendid’ by MED s.v. ēdi sense 1.(a); the other cases of eadi in the poem all denote blessedness or happiness more generally); and just the one instance of weold-iseli (5509, with the /s/ of -iseli probably alliterating on the /sl/ of to-somne earlier in the line) (other cases of seli in the poem mean only ‘happy, blessed’). Much the most frequent indicator of poverty is wrecc(ence)-h-. I count 32 instances, plus two of wrecchelich(e), a large proportion of which seem to me to specify the absence of material wealth (a number are in collocation with riche; see below, n. 97). Hæn (< OE hēan) is another common way of expressing the same idea, running to 14 occurrences as an adj., the majority of which again refer unambiguously to worldly poverty (and again, several appear as direct antonyms for riche, as e.g. ‘riche men & hēne’, 4899; I count 6 examples of this pairing in the poem). Forms of wædle appear only 3 times (two of them alliterating), and pouere just once (‘riche men and pouere’, 11336). (Ærm (< OE earm) and its frequent derivatives armpfe 8×, armlicht(e) 5×, arming 1× are generally used in this text to foreground the emotional consequences of loss (including military defeat) and hardship (clearly in e.g. ‘ærms on his mode. seorhful on heorte’, 3295–6), and material poverty does not seem a necessary concomitant.)

73 In all cases I incorporate adjectives and any substantival equivalents (e.g. riche ‘wealthy’ and riche ‘wealthy person’) under the same head. For some remarks on the data for each text, see above, nn. 69–72, and on the usage of the words concerned in Middle English at large consult MED s.vv. arm adj., ēdi adj., hævenlēss adj. (2), hāve-lēste n., hēn adj., henthe n., isēlthe n., povertē n., poure adj., riche adj., riches(se)n., sēl(e)n.1, sēlth(e)n., tharf adj. (b), ēsel adj., wantsum adj., wēdle adj., wēleful adj., wēlī adj., wrecche adj., wrecche n.
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example). But we can draw some preliminary conclusions. It is evident, for one thing, that riche is very well established in all these texts as the core word for ‘wealthy’. There is nevertheless a certain amount of variation across texts and traditions amongst its near-synonyms and derivatives; the AB texts and the Brut are alone in retaining a form of OE welig, for example. For ‘lacking in wealth’, there is a still greater range. There is some continuity from earlier Old English usage, in different ways in the different texts (we meet wedle only in The Ormulum and Laȝamon’s Brut, for instance).

There is wrecch-, an old word with a developed sense which is now the principal choice to mean ‘poor’ in most of these works. And there are also some brand new items, especially poure, which OED first records clearly in English as a simplex from the Trinity Homilies, but which has already become the dominant adjective in this field by the AB texts; plus in The Ormulum notice the striking usell and wanntsumm, both clearly containing material derived from Old Norse.

But these famous works are only a part of the English literature produced in this period. Another important category, which until recently was somewhat neglected, consists of versions of pre-Conquest writings copied between the end of the 11th and the turn of the 13th centuries. More than 25 manuscripts survive from this time whose contents are mainly what are sometimes called ‘updated’ Old English texts; the most significant (though by no means the only type of text represented) are homilies, variously copied, recopied, excerpted, recontextualised, rewritten. In the last couple

---

74 Notice for instance these two passages from The Peterborough Chronicle, where the conditions described respectively by wrecce and earm certainly include the notion of material destitution (note the contrast with rice in the first quotation, and the deprivation of property in the second), but where a broader (hypernymous) sense of wretchedness and misery is also highly relevant: ‘Wrecce men sturuen of hungær; sume ieden on elmes þe waren sum wile rice men’ (‘wrecce people died from hunger; some relied upon alms who were once rich people’; s.a. 1137 40–1); ‘man læt þet ærme folc mid ealle unrihte: ærost man hem beræfoð her eahte and siþðon man hem ofslæþ’ (‘that ærme people are treated entirely unjustly: first they are deprived of their property and afterwards they are killed’; s.a. 1124 47–8).

75 As will be seen from n. 71 above, much of the variety apparent in this field in The Lambeth Homilies depends upon retentions of the varied vocabulary of the Old English original of Homily X.

76 See OED s.v. poor adj. and n.1, sense A.1.a., first quotation. As OED remarks in its etymological discussion, there are attestations of (what is probably) this word as a byname or surname as early as c.1100–30, but in each case these appear with a French article (le Poer, le Poure) and so it is unclear whether these are to be interpreted as reflecting the Middle English or the Anglo-Norman word.

77 Usell descends from the Old Norse compound represented by Olcel ússel ‘wretched’, and for the first element of wanntsumm compare Olcel van-t (nom. or acc. sg. neut.) ‘lacking, wanting’. See esp. MED s.vv. úsel adj., wantsum adj., OED s.vv. usell adj., wantsum adj., Björkman (1900–2: 224–5).

78 See for instance Conti (2007a: 367 and n. 13), who refers to ‘twenty-seven surviving manuscripts containing predominately Old English material that were written about 1100 or later’, drawing on the list in Ker (1990: xviii–xix). For useful and still more extensive lists of manuscripts containing Old English from this period see also Thomson (2006: 10–18), Treharne (2012: 124–6) and the project catalogue of EMSS (at http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/catalogue/mss.htm).
of decades, early medieval scholarship (led by the groundbreaking work of Elaine Treharne and Mary Swan) has embraced this material in a serious and imaginative way, putting it in its proper contexts in the multilingual textual environments of the long 12th century and comprehensively dismantling the old assumption that, in the face of the cultural explosion engineered by French and Latin writers in this early medieval ‘renaissance’, the English decided (in time-honoured fashion) simply to keep calm and carry on copying Ælfric. There is space here to look in detail at only one of these manuscripts, which I have chosen owing to the especially interesting contribution I think it makes to our understanding of lexical history in this period. It is Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343, which was produced in the second half of the 12th century, near Worcester or Hereford. It contains more than 80 English texts, most by Ælfric. Despite some trail-blazing work especially by Susan Irvine, Peter Kitson and Aidan Conti, most of these texts have been relatively little examined linguistically. This is at least partly attributable to the fact that the great majority have never been printed in their Bodley 343 versions, only in their original pre-Conquest forms. That these texts did begin life in an earlier period is an important reason why their incarnations in this manuscript have sometimes been regarded with disappointment by language historians—not because they are lacking in interest, but simply because they are not unambiguously ‘contemporary’ documents. As such, as well as all the usual dialectological variables that we have to deal with when we examine a medieval manuscript, we have in cases like this also to reckon with the reactions of

79 For the key scholarship see above, n. 11.
80 On the manuscript, and for further references, see notably Ker (1990: 368–75, no. 310), Irvine (1993: xviii–liv), Clemoes (1997: 1–5), Irvine (2000a: 55–60), Conti (2007a: 370–2), Wilcox (2008: booklet 71–101), Conti & Da Rold (2010), Conti (2012). In what follows I refer to the contents according to the article numbers given by Ker (this is the system most commonly cited in previous scholarship; for a revised article numbering, keyed to Ker’s, see Conti & Da Rold (2010)).
82 The best known exceptions are the homilies edited by Irvine (1993) (arts. 9, 10, 54, 61, 78, 79, 80), Napier (1894) (art. 12, the so-called ‘History of the Holy Rood Tree’) and Belfour (1909) (as well as those ed. by Irvine, these are arts. 7, 8, 28, 29, 77, 82, 83), most of which survive only in this manuscript; and for an important recent edition of the composite Wulfstan homily at art. 70 see moreover Conti (2007b). For a guide to all available editions of and collations of variant readings from the texts in the manuscript, consult the EMSS entry by Conti & Da Rold (2010) alongside Ker (1990: 368–75). For an important collection of (major) variant readings, especially helpful in giving an impression of the sorts of lexical changes made in the Bodley 343 versions of Ælfric texts, see Appendix C in Clemoes (1997: 543–55).
83 As Kitson (1992: 28) observes, the relative lack of attention paid to the language of Bodley 343 may stem at least partly from Napier’s (1894: lvii) somewhat dismissive (and misleading) characterisation of it as not much different from late West Saxon.
scribes to an earlier variety of English (the so-called late West Saxon ‘standard’) which had longstanding prestige as a written medium. But provided that we allow for these factors, the versions of earlier texts found in this manuscript can and do offer us some important insights into language usage in the 12th century, including some brand new evidence for its vocabulary.

Altogether, in the whole of the English contents of Bodley 343, I count about 215 instances of words denoting ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. Allowing for differences in spelling, most of the texts in the manuscript use precisely the same words for these concepts as do the pre-Conquest original versions to which almost all can be compared. This seems at least a little disappointing, although it is worth adding that these same Bodley texts often do show changes elsewhere in their vocabulary, and so the retention of ‘rich’/’poor’ expressions could indicate that these remained acceptable words to 12th-century revisers, at least as part of their passive competence. But there are exceptions to this rule. In two Bodley texts in particular, there is significant alteration of the words for ‘rich’ and ‘poor’; and, since these texts are versions of two Ælfric First Series homilies which take wealth and poverty as central themes, these changes begin to look like deliberate, meaningful acts of revision on the part of whichever redactor introduced them. Let us focus on one of these texts, the Bodley 343 version (article 40 in the manuscript) of an Ælfric homily for Rogationtide, a very important occasion for public preaching and for almsgiving. In Table 7, the relevant readings of an early copy of Ælfric’s original are on the left. Ælfric’s favoured word for ‘wealthy’ in this text is rǐce (which he uses sixteen times), with welig and spēdig also putting in appearances; for ‘poor’, he prefers þearfa (fifteen times), next to several uses

---

85 For what I have counted and how see Appendix I.
86 Differences can be found only in articles 13, 26, 28, 40, 49 and 62, and those in arts. 26 and 28 do not represent substitutions of one word meaning ‘rich’ or ‘poor’ for another; see Appendix I. For the changes to arts. 40 and 49 see further the discussion below.
87 For discussion of lexical changes in Bodley 343, see esp. Kitson (1992: 29 n. 8, with special attention to art. 77), Conti (2012: esp. 267–70), Dance (2012b: 158–66, 174–82). As Conti demonstrates, these revisions are most apparent in the texts copied by the second scribe (art. 6 onwards), and I have suggested elsewhere (Dance 2012b: 161) that ‘the likelihood is therefore that a copyist of this part of the Bodley 343 collection essentially as it now stands was the person responsible for these lexical changes—perhaps scribe 2 himself’.
89 This is London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii, probably copied at Cerne Abbas in ‘the first half’ of 990’ (Clemoes 1997: 1; Ker 1990: 324–9, no. 257).
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of **earm** and one of **wædla**. The Bodley version reduces the variety of words for ‘wealthy’, changing Ælfric’s **welig** twice to **rice**, but retaining **spediʒ**. Arguably, this is in keeping with the broader historical trends in this field which we have already noticed in the 12th century, with **riche** gradually becoming still more dominant (see above, Table 6). The same is true for words meaning ‘poor’: **þearfa** and **earm** both give way to **wrecc-**, eleven times altogether; and, most interestingly of all, these two Ælfric words are both also replaced by what we can now recognise as the earliest known attestations anywhere in English of the French loanword **poure**. Finding **poure** in Bodley 343 is a small but important antedating of the dictionaries (which first record the adjective from *The Trinity Homilies*, from a different part of the country), and an example of the new evidence for lexical history which is still open to discovery if we look outside the ‘big name’ texts of this period.

At one level, then, such substitutions are an important confirmation of the place of Bodley 343 in the history of English words. If we interpret them as examples of what is often called ‘lexical updating’, evidence for certain words coming to be felt old-fashioned, and being sporadically replaced in revision, then they present us reassuringly with what we would expect to see in South-West Midland usage a little before better-known texts like *The Lambeth Homilies* and the AB group. And these historical trends are undeniably interesting. But from that point of view things are still disappointingly inconsistent. If this redactor simply didn’t like **earm** or **þearfa**, why didn’t he replace them every time? and why sometimes change them to **wrecc-**, and sometimes to **poure**? The answer, of course, is that an awareness of lexical fashions, of which items no longer seem ‘current’, is only one of the things that motivates a writer when he or she chooses words, especially in a rhetorically sensitive text like a homily; and to really understand what might be motivating the choices in this case we have to read the text.

---

**Table 7.** Words denoting ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in the Bodley 343 copy of Ælfric’s ‘In Letania Maiore’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ælfric</th>
<th>Bodley 343 (revisions highlighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rice 16×</td>
<td>rice 16×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welig 2×</td>
<td>rice 2×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spêdig 1×</td>
<td>spediʒ 1×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þearfa 15×</td>
<td>wrecc- 9×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poure 3×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þearfa 2×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[omitted 1×]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earm 6×</td>
<td>earm 3×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wrecc- 2×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poure 1×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wædla 1×</td>
<td>wædla 1× (with 1× added in expansion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 See above, n. 76.
There is space here to examine only a small extract, from the very end of the piece. Here is Ælfric’s version, showing the climax of his argument about the role of poverty in securing eternal life (the words denoting rich and poor are highlighted in bold):

Se *rica* and se *þearfa* sind him betwynan nydbehefe. Se *welega* is geworht for ðan *þearfan* and se *þearfa* for ðam *welegan*. ðam *spedigum* gedafenaþ þet he spende *and* dæle; þam *wædlan* gedafenað þet he gebidde for ðam dælere. Se *earma* is se weig þe læt us to godes rice. Mare sylþ se *þearfa* þam *rican* þonne he æt him nime: se *rica* him sylð þone hlaf þe bið to meoxe awend, *and* se *þearfa* sylð þam *rican* þet ece lif. Na he swa þeah ac crist, se þe þus cwæð: ‘þet ðæt ge doð anum *þearfan* on minum naman, þet ge doð me sylfum’.

Ælfric opts for an elegant variety of ways of referring to the rich and the poor in this passage (part of which was cited earlier). He begins with a straight binary of *rica* and *þearfa* (literally ‘the rich and the needy’), before switching to *welega* versus *þearfa* for their chiastic conjunction in the second sentence (‘se welega is geworht for ðan *þearfan* and se *þearfa* for ðam *welegan*’). He then expands on the contrast by introducing *spêdig* and *wœ ¯dla* (usually much less common in his writings), describing what it is fitting for first the rich (literally the ‘successful person’) and then the poor (the *wœ ¯dla*) to do. Then he inserts a new word, *earma* (‘Se earma is se weig þe læt us to godes rice’), before finally returning to the terms he began with, *rica* and *þearfa*, which he pairs consistently as he explains the relative values of their roles in the present and eternal lives.

Now compare the version in Bodley 343:

Se *rica* *ant* þe *poure* beoð heom betweonan nydbehefe. Se *rica* is iwroht for þam *poure*, *ant* þe *poure* for þam *rica*. þam *spediþe* dafenað þet he spene *ant* dæle þam *wædlan*, *ant* þam *wædlan* dafenað þet heo bidden for þam delere. Se *wrecce* is þe wæþ þe led up to Godes rice. Mare sylþ þe *wrecce* þam *rica* þonne he æt him nime: se *rica* him sylð þone

---

91 Clemoes (1997: 324, ll. 205–12); I have modernised punctuation and capitalisation and expanded the abbreviations. ‘The rich person and the needy person are necessary to each other. The wealthy person is made for the needy, and the needy for the wealthy. It is fitting for the successful person that he spend and distribute [his goods]; for the impoverished one it is fitting that he pray for the distributor. The poor person is the way which leads us to God’s kingdom. The needy person gives more to the rich one than he takes from him: the rich person gives him the bread which will turn into manure, and the needy person gives to the rich eternal life. However it is not he but Christ [who does this], who says thus: “What you do for one needy person in my name, you do for me myself”.’

92 f. 80v, ll. 10–15, excerpted from the full text of the homily printed below as Appendix II (ll. 193–200 there), with modernised punctuation and capitalisation. ‘The rich person and the poor person are necessary to each other. The rich person is made for the poor, and the poor person are necessary to each other. The rich person is made for the poor, and the poor for the rich. It is fitting for the successful person that he spend and distribute [his goods] to the impoverished one, and for the impoverished one it is fitting that he pray for the distributor. The wretched person is the way which leads up to God’s kingdom. The wretched person gives more to the rich one than he takes from him: the rich person gives him the bread which will turn into manure, and the wretched person gives to the rich eternal life. However it is not he [who does this], but the one who says thus: “What you do for one wretched person in my name, you do for me myself’.”
hlaf ðe bið to meoxe awend, ant þe wrecce sylð þam rice þet ece lif. Na he swa þeah, ac þe ðe þus cwæð: ‘þet ðet Ze doð ane wrecce on mine nome, þet Ze doð me sylfum’.

Alongside a host of other changes reflecting differences in phonology, morphology and other aspects of its language, the Bodley text substantially recasts Ælfric’s rich and poor vocabulary, maintaining some of the variety and interest Ælfric gave it, but regularising and reinforcing the parallels and adding some effects of its own. So in the first two sentences Ælfric’s contrast of rica or weliga versus þearfa is tightened to a single binary, rice versus poure. In the third, the Bodley version retains Ælfric’s variation to spediza and wædlæ, but it expands the wording to add an extra wædlæ (a word for ‘poor’ it never otherwise introduces, but is evidently happy to co-opt), conceivably in order to enforce a syntactic parallel between what the rich and poor do by giving the actions of both some recipients (‘spene and dæle þam wædlæ … bidden for þam delere’, ‘distribute to the poor person … pray for the distributor’). The second part of the passage changes tack, and brings in a new word wrecce as antonym to rice, which it employs again slightly more regularly than Ælfric does his pair—and in doing so introduces some sound-play as a bonus, not only highlighting the parallelism of rice and its binary wrecce (‘the rich and the wretch’), but also perhaps punningly exploiting the apparent irony that it is the wrecca who is the way to God’s rice, his kingdom.

The euphonious pairing of ‘the rich and the wretch’ makes for a very effective rhetorical doublet, and if we look a little further afield it seems in fact to have been a popular contemporary collocation, used a number of times especially in homiletic discourse in that short period of English in which wretch- flourished as a common antonym for rich. It is hard to resist the temptation to see this doublet being played

93 Amongst other changes in this passage, notice for example the following (with references following the lineation of Appendix II). Orthography: the use of <Z> to represent palatal /j/ (e.g. spediZæ, 193), and <g> for velar /g/ (e.g. godes, 195). Phonology: Ælfric ðæt > Bodley ðet (198), Ælfric naman > Bodley nome (198), both probably representing West Midland dialect forms (second fronting of /æ/, rounding of /a/ before a nasal; see e.g. Jordan (rev. Crook) (1974: §§32, 30)); Ælfric prefix ge- > Bodley i- (e.g. geworht > iwroht, 193; a commonplace early ME development). Morphology: Ælfric se > Bodley þe as the nom. sg. masc. definite article (throughout, though not consistently); Ælfric dat. sg. wk.-an and dat. sg. masc. str. adj. -um both > Bodley -e (e.g. ‘anum þearfan on minum naman’ next to ‘ane wrecce on mine nome’, 198). Lexical variants: notice in particular the Bodley form spene ‘spend’ (194), which appears to have developed from OE spendan (cp. Ælfric’s spende) by reinterpretation of the -d- in pret. spende (etc.) as the dental preterite suffix and creation of a new present stem spen-; notice that this Bodley occurrence is earlier than any of those cited by MED s.v. spēnen v. and OED s.v. spene v., neither of which gives examples before the Lambeth or Trinity Homilies. Rephrasing: the Bodley version takes ‘þam wædlæ’ as pl., and hence alters Ælfric’s sg. ‘he gebidde’ to pl. ‘heo bidden’ in the following clause (194); Bodley alters Ælfric’s ‘læt us’ (‘leads us’) to ‘led up’ (‘leads up’, 195).

94 A search of OEC brings up very few possible attempts by earlier English writers to exploit the two words as a contrasting pair; the nearest I have found is one in the Old English Boethius, viz. ‘ealle þa ofermodan rican bion swiðe ummithte and swiðe earme wreccan’ (Godden & Irvine 2009: 340, B.36 ll. 62–3). For that matter there are also very few instances where forms of rich and wretch collocate later in
for similar effect in article 49 in Bodley 343, the other main homily in which ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ words are changed. For example:

Bodley 343: ‘ne nemde þe helend þone ricæ ac þone wrecchæ’
(Ælfric: ‘ne nemde se helend þone welegan ac þone wædan’) 95

Bodley 343: ‘þæ wrecce nære fullice iwrecen on þam rican’
(Ælfric: ‘se þearfa nære fullice gewrecen on þam rican’) 96

In the first instance here it is Ælfric’s welega and wædana which are reworked to give ricæ versus wrecce (exchanging alliteration for part-rhyme); and in the second the change of þearfa to wrecce extends the sound-play still more pulpit-thumpingly (‘þæ wrecce nære fullice iwrecen on þam rican’). The wretch-rich pair is found several times in the Lambeth and Trinity Homilies and in Laȝamon’s Brut, can be seen in The Ormulum, and is perhaps operative too as a figure of sound in the Worcester Fragments Soul’s Address to the Body. 97 Ultimately, of course, ‘the rich and the wretch’ lost out to the alternative binary, ‘the rich and the poor’, riche and poure, which are attested as antonyms in 12th-century Anglo-French texts and arguably came into English directly from French as a phrasal pair like this, on the coat-tails of riche (which, as we have seen, led a double life in both languages). 98 But there is no indication that, even though

---

95 Bodley 343, f. 97v l. 7. The Ælfric text is homily XXIII in the first series of Catholic Homilies (‘Dominica secunda post Pentecosten’), cited from the Royal 7 C. xii text edited by Clemoes (1997: 47). Bodley 343: ‘the saviour did not name the rich person but the wretched one’; Ælfric: ‘the saviour did not name the wealthy person but the impoverished one’.

96 Bodley 343, f. 98r l. 9; Clemoes (1997: 368, ll. 100–1). Bodley 343: ‘the wretched person would not have been fully avenged on the rich one’; Ælfric: ‘the needy person would not have been fully avenged on the rich one’.

97 I count 3 instances in the Lambeth Homilies (e.g. ‘Nis nan mon swa riche. ne swa wrecche þet he ne mei sum þing iforðian’, Morris 1868: homily III, 39 ll. 31–2); 4 in the Trinity Homilies (e.g. ‘Swo heneð. and astruþæð þe riche men þe wrecches’, Morris 1873: homily XXXIII, 211 ll. 4–5); and 8 in the Brut (e.g. ‘Al his cun he wurðede; richen & wrecchen. þa richen hefden heore wille.’, Brook & Leslie 1963–78: ll. 1308–9). There is only one example in The Ormulum (‘& off þatt he warþ þe wrecches mann | Forr uss to makenn riche’, Holt 1878: ll. 3884–5), and one in the Soul’s Address (‘Sone cumeþ þet riche wif þe forhoweþ þene earueþsiþ, | for ufel is þeo wrecche lufe’, Moffat 1987: 64, A.41–2).

it took off slightly later, ‘rich and poor’ is a chronologically much newer arrival in English; both phrases were evidently available to the reviser of Bodley 343 article 40, and arguably it was simply a desire for variety, that is a stylistic effect in the course of his refurbished homiletic rhetoric, to which we owe our first occurrence of this idiom, and thus our first attestation of the word *poure*, in the history of English.

I hope that this whistle-stop tour of words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ has been illuminating. At the broader level of word history, I think it highlights the range and types of complications there can be in mapping lexical and semantic change in this period. Change is not all about foreign input, which is sometimes hard to quantify (as we saw with the etymology of *rich*), and when borrowings do appear we have to bear in mind that they are entering systems of words which are already complex and dynamic. On the smaller scale, the contexts of these words in individual works and manuscripts reveal the roles played in the formation of our evidence by textual transmission, literary traditions and the preferences of different writers. And even potentially unpromising books like Bodley 343 are valuable, both for the witness to change that they provide in a period whose record is so patchy, and on their own terms, for their independent and distinctly contemporary stylistic vitality, a literary cultural ‘oofiness’ which we ignore to our detriment.

**CLOSING REMARKS**

Throughout this article, I have been arguing for the value of the little stories, that the evidence for vocabulary in the 12th century, and all the fine grain of detail which makes it up, is important in its own right—and not just because it points the way to something more momentous outside of itself. This is true whichever direction we look in, and for that matter whichever metaphors we use to conceive of it. So, the language of this period repays our interest not only by dint of being in ‘transition’, a suburban milepost on the road to downtown Middle English; and far from simply noticing novelty, studying it is about reading the very various and often complex relationships between old and new. By the same token, knowing where borrowed words came from does have a powerful resonance, since in important ways it connects us to famous cultural encounters of distant ages; but to think of these words only as ‘loans’ is to privilege a debt to the past, to put too much weight on their origins, and their differentness. To my mind, one of the great pleasures of studying medieval words is that it does not have to stop with either where they came from or where they ended up, but can extend to how they were adopted, used and spread, how they found and made their meanings as part of living systems of language; how these elements, whatever their ultimate alterity, whatever their glorious diversity, came and lived together. By
using the research resources now to hand, and taking an approach to evidence from the 12th century which is philological in all the best senses of that word, we join big stories and little details, language and literature, Old English and Middle English. And we give the language users of this most surprising of ages the chance properly to have their say. Thank you for listening.
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APPENDIX I

Words for ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ in Bodley 343

All articles in the manuscript were searched for occurrences of words meaning ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ and their derivatives.\(^99\) Instances are listed by article, with spellings normalised to a representative Bodley 343 spelling in each case in order to facilitate comparison. All readings may be assumed to correspond (allowing for changes in spelling) to those of earlier manuscript witnesses to the same text, unless revisions are given in the ‘Changes’ column.\(^100\)

\(^99\) I have included in the main table only those words appearing in Table 5 above and synonymous derivatives on the same stems, plus poure. Relevant compounds and derivatives are noticed in footnotes. Note that forms of eadiz are very numerous in the manuscript, but (with the single possible exception in art. 80) they refer only to spiritual blessedness, and have not been recorded here. Similarly, I have counted only those cases of earm which might (or which clearly do) imply material poverty in context. The text of articles 12, 16, 28, 29, 65, 79 and 80 is included in OEC; these texts have been searched electronically and, where earlier manuscript witnesses to the same texts are available for comparison, I have indicated in footnotes my sources for the readings in (one or more of) those earlier witnesses. For the other articles, I searched the corresponding Old English copies via OEC and compared their readings with the microfiche facsimile of Bodley 343 available in Wilcox (2008); I checked these against the apparatus criticus of the standard editions and in the case of art. 68 against the text of the Bodley version printed in Fehr (1966).

\(^100\) Article numbers follow Ker (1990: 368–75, no. 310) (and see also above, n. 80). The figures cited for the results of revisions in the ‘Changes’ column are included in the total for each stem under ‘Readings’; e.g. ric- 6× in art. 13 includes the instance of ric- revised from welig.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>OEC short title</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 29</td>
<td>ric- 1×, weliz 1×; þearf- 1×</td>
<td>(unique text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 17</td>
<td>ric- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 35</td>
<td>þearf- 4×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LS 5 (InventCrossNap)</td>
<td>weliz 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 19</td>
<td>ric- 6×; þearf- 1×, earm 2×, hean 1×</td>
<td>ric- 1× &lt; welig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 29</td>
<td>þearf- 2×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 31</td>
<td>ric- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LS 18.1 (NatMaryAss 10N)</td>
<td>þearf- 2×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 37</td>
<td>þearf- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ÆLS (Martin)</td>
<td>weliz- 1×; þearf- 6×, earm 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 33</td>
<td>þearf- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 34</td>
<td>þearf- 2×, earm 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 8</td>
<td>ric- 8×; þearf- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ÆLS (Peter's Chair)</td>
<td>þearf- 1×, earm 1×, wandl- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 13</td>
<td>ric-7×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 6</td>
<td>ric- 1×, weliz 2×; þearf- 2×, wandl- 2×</td>
<td>(1× welig omitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>HomS 11.1 (Belf 5)</td>
<td>wandl- 2×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>HomS 15 (Belf 6)</td>
<td>þearf- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 38</td>
<td>ric- 5×, weliz 1×; þearf- 2×, earm 3×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ÆLS (Edmund)</td>
<td>ric- 1×; earm 1×, wandl- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ÆCHom II, 3</td>
<td>ric- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 9</td>
<td>ric- 1×; þearf- 1×, earm 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 18</td>
<td>ric- 18×, spediž 1×; þearf- 2×, earm 3×, wandl- 2×, wrecc- 11×, poure 4×</td>
<td>ric- 2× &lt; welig; wrecc- 9× &lt; þearf-, 2× &lt; earm; poure 3× &lt; þearf-, 1× &lt; earm; þearf- 1× omitted; wandl- once added in expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 21</td>
<td>ric- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 22</td>
<td>wandl- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 26</td>
<td>ric- 1×; þearf- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>ÆCHom I, 27</td>
<td>ric- 1×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101 And hafenleas ‘poor’ 1×.
102 Compared with the earlier version (from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114) printed in parallel with the Bodley 343 text in Assmann (1889: 117–37).
103 And wanspediž ‘poor’ 1×, hafenleast ‘poverty’ 1×.
104 And wanhafel ‘needy’ 1×.
105 And hafenleast ‘poverty’ 1×.
106 By omission of a phrase corresponding to ‘and welig on geearnungum’ (Godden 1979: 58, l. 170).
109 And wanspediž ‘poor’ 1×.
110 See further Table 7 and the discussion above.
111 And hafenleast ‘poverty’ 1×.
**APPENDIX II**

An edition of Bodley 343 article 40, ‘In Letania maiore’  
(f. 78v 1. 15—f. 80v 1. 16)

*Editorial principles*

This is a version of Ælfric Catholic Homilies I.XVIII. For a text based on London, British Library, Royal 7 C. xii with major variants given in the *apparatus* see Clemoes (1997: 317–24), and the Notes in Godden (2000: 145–53).

---

112 And *hafenleast* ‘poverty’ 2×. Retained *weliȝ* is once glossed ‘l. diues’; notice also the retained pret. *welgode*. Retained *wædl* is once glossed ‘l. pauper’; notice also the retained *wædlihun*. Retained *þearf-* is once glossed ‘pauper’ and once ‘wrecces’.

113 Including *wreccedlice < wædligende* 1×.

114 Both in the phrase ‘þe wæl Z a rice’ at Irvine (1993: 70, III.255). In her notes Irvine (1993: 76) suggests that Ælfric has used both words here in order to avoid any possible ambiguity as to the sense of *rice*, and perhaps also to alliterate *wæl* on *walde* three words later. But it is also tempting to explain this unique construction as the product of more recent revision, perhaps as the result of a scribe copying an interlinear gloss *rice* into a text which originally read simply ‘se welelega’ (a much more typical Ælfrician noun phrase).

115 *Wædl-* occurs in the pres. ptcp. form *wædliende* ‘begging’.

116 And *hafenleast* ‘poverty’ 5×.


118 *Eadīȝ* carries at least an implication of material comfort, in contrast with *earm* at Irvine (1993: 202, VII.151).

119 A composite homily, whose second part (from Irvine (1993: 200, VII.94) onwards) occurs in other, earlier witnesses; for readings see Scragg (1992: 208–13) and his apparatus. The readings which continue those present in earlier copies are *ric* 3×, *eadīȝ* 1×, *earm* 1×.
I have edited the text from digital photographs of the manuscript (for which I am grateful to the Bodleian Library). To facilitate comparison with Clemoes’ text I have followed his paragraph divisions wherever possible. I have regularised the word division, and supplied modern capitalisation and punctuation. I have expanded all abbreviations (in italics). I have in each case expanded to the form most commonly used by the scribe when he writes out the given word in full in this text: hence the Tironian nota (<7>) is expanded to <ant> (always so written in full); the barred thorn is expanded to <þet> (the same word is written out <ðet> four times, though also <ðæt> and <þæt> once each); <cw> + suspension mark has been expanded to <cwð> (always so written in full, and the <e> vowel is the only one appropriate to both the frequent pret. forms and to the pres. at ll. 47, 49 etc., both of which are spelt using the same abbreviation); <þa> + suspension mark is expanded to <þam>, except in the phrase <for þan ðæ> (since the scribe always makes this distinction when writing out the forms in full); and <þon> plus suspension mark is expanded to <þone>, whether standing for the reflex of the OE adv. þonne or the OE acc. sg. masc. demonstr. þone (the scribe always writes both words out in full as <þone>, and only once uses a different form for the adv., viz. l. 52 <þöne> which I have expanded as <þonne>). Scribal revisions and other additions are recorded in the Notes. Editorial emendations are marked with square brackets. I have replaced ‘wynn’ (<p>) with <w>, but in all other respects I have retained the original spellings, including the scribe’s (mildly inconsistent) use of <ʒ>, <ʒ>, and <g>. (Notice that the scribe has no separate upper case form of <ʒ>, and always uses <G> when an upper case <ʒ> might have appeared, as in ll. 59, 104 etc.).

IN LETANIA MAIORE

Das daʒas beoð ihatene Letanie, þet beoð Beddaʒas. On þisse daʒum we sceolon biddan ure orðlicræ wæstmæ nihtsumnesse, ant us syndfulnesse ant sibbe, ant—þet ʒit mare is—ure sunnæ forʒifenesse. We rædæð on bocum þet þeos hældsumnesse wæro arered on ðone timan þe ilamp on ane buriʒ þe Uigen is ihaten micel orðsturung; ant feollon hus ant cirican, ant comon wilde boren ant wulfæs ant abiton þæs folces micelne dæl; ant ðæs kynge botle wearð mid heofenlice fyre forbernd. Þa bead þe bisceop Mamertus dreoðra daʒen fæsten, ant þeo drecednesse swac; ant þe wuna ðæs þæs fæstenes ðurhwunað þehwær on leaffulre laðunge. Heo naman þa bysene [ð]æs fæstenes æt þam Ninuueniscan folce. Þet folc wæs swið fyrenful. Þa walde God heom fordon, ac heo gladedon hine mid heora bereowsunge. God speæc to ane witeʒæ, þe ðæs Ionas
ihaten: ‘Far to dære buriʒ Ninuïen, ant bode ðer þa word þe ic ðe secge.’ ða wearð þe witega afyrht ant wolde fleon Godes sihðe, ac he ne mihte. Ferde ða to sæ ant astah to scipe. ða ða þa scipmen comon ut on sæ, þa sende God heom to micelne wind ant hreownnesse, swa ðet heo wærön orwene heoræ lifes. Heo ða wurpon heora waru ofer bord, ant þe witega læʒ slep. Heo wurpan ða tan betwyx heom, ant beden þet God sceolde swutelian heom hwanon þet unlimp heom become. ða com þæs witegen ta up. Heo axodon þa hine hwæt he wre, oððe hu he faron wolde. He cwæð þet he were Godes ðeow þe ðe sceop sæ ant land, ant þet he fleon wolde of Godes sihðe. Heo cwæðon, ‘Hu do we embe ðe?’ He andswærrede, ‘Wurpað me ofer bord; þone swicað þeos drecednesse.’ Heo ða swa dydon, ant þeo hreohnes wearð astillod; ant heo offfodon Gode heora lac ant tugon ford.

God þa ðearcode ænne hwæl, ant he forswealh þone witegan ant aber hine to ðam lande þe he to sceolde, ant hine þær ut aspaw. ða com eft Godes engel ant his word to þam witege ant cwæð, ‘Aris nu ant ga to dære micelan buriʒ Ninuïen, ant bodæ swa swa ic þe sæde ær.’ He ferde þa ant bodade þet heom wæs Godes gramae onsiʒende | 3if heo to Gode bugon noldon. ða aras þe kyng of his kynesetle, ant aewarp his deorwurðe reaf ant dyde hærôn to his lice ant axan uppan his hæfod, ant bed þet ælc man swa don sceolde. And æðer ze ða men ze ða sukenden cild ant eac þa nytenu ne onbrucedon nanes þinges binnen ðreom daʒum. ða þurh þa ʒecyrrednesse þet heo yfeles swicon, ant þurð þet strange fæsten, heom milsode God, ant nold heom fordon swa swa he ær þa twa burhwaræ Sodomam ant Gomorram for heora leahtræ mid heofenlican fyre forbernde.

We sceolon eac on þisse daʒum began ure bedu ant fylizan ure halydome, ut ant æc in, ant þone almihtiʒa God mid ʒeornfulnesse heriʒan. We willað nu þis godspel eow reccen, þe her nu ired wæs, eowre leafan to trymmingge: Dixit Iesus discipulcis suis, quis uestrum habebit amicum et ibit ad illum media nocte et dicet illi (et reliqua).

**IN LETANIA MAIORE**

De hælend cwæð to his leorningenhtas: ‘Hwylc eower is þe hafað sumne freond, ant gæð to him on midre nihte ant cwæð, “Ðu freond, læn me ðri hlafas, forðan þe me sohte sum cumæ ant ic nabbe nan þing ʒearlices him to beodenne.” ðone andswyrð þe hiredes al dor of his bedde ant cwæð,
“Ne drece þu me nu on þisse time. Min duræ is beloken, ant mine cildræn beod on heora reste. Íc ne mæþ nu arisen ant þe ðæs tiðan.” Ðone zif þe oþer þurhwunæð mid reame ant cnuzunge, he arised þome for his onrope, ant na for freondscipe, ant tiðaf him ðet þe he bid.’ Ða sæde eft þe hælend: ‘Biddæð ant eow bið iseald; secað ant ze ifindæð; cnukiað ant eow bið iopenæð. Ælc mon þe bit he underfed; ant þe de secæð he ifind; ant þe de cnucað him bið iopenod. Hwicl eower bit his fæder hlafes, hu sæist þu, sylð he him stan for hlafe? Oððe zif he bit fisces, sylð he him naïddran? Oððe zif he bit æges, sylð he him þone wyrn þe is ithætan ðrowend? Gif [3]e cunnon, þa de yfelæ beod, sallon þa godnessæ eowræ bearnum, hu micle swider wile eower heofenlica fæder zifan godne gast him biddende?’

Ðe halþa Augustinus trahtnode þis godspel, ant cweø þet ðeo niht tacnode ða nytennesse þissere weorde. Þeos weord is ifylled mid nytenesse. Nu sceal for ði gehwa arisan of ðere nytennesse ant gan to his freond, þet is ðet he sceal þuson to Criste mid alre geornfulnesse, ant biddan þære ðora hlafæ, þet is leafan þære halþan ðrimnesse. Ðe almihtiga fæder is God, ant his sunæ is almihtiga God, ant þe halþa gast is almihtiga God: na ðry Godes, ac heo alle an almihtiga God untodæledlic.

Þone þu becymst to þisse ðrym hlafæ, þet is to andþite þære halþan ðrymnesse, þone hæfst þu on þam leafan lif ant fodæn þinre sawle, ant miht eac oðerne cuman mid þam fedan, þet is ðæt þu miht tæcan þone leafan oðre freond þe de ðæs bit. He cweð ‘cuma’, for þan þe we alle beod cuman on ðisses lif; ant ure eard nis na her, ac we beod her swilce wæsferinde men. An cymð, oðer ferð: þe bið acenned, þe oðer forð ferð ant rymd þem setl. Nu sceal gehwa for ði wilnian þæs leafan þære halþa ðrymnesse, for ðan þe de leafan hine bringað to ðam ece life.

We willad eft embe þone zeleafan swidor specan, for þan de þisses godspelles traht hafað godne tyþe. Ðe hiredes aldor de wæs on his reste ibroht mid his cildræn is Crist, | de sit on heofenum mid his apostolos ant mid martyros ant mid alle þe halþum þe he on ðisses life fætte. We sceolon eac clypion to Criste ant biddan þara þoræ hlafæ. Ðeæ hælæ us ðerrihþe ne tyðiþe, ne sceole we for ði þæra bene swican; he ældð ant wile þæahwædere forþifan. Ði he elcað þet we sceolon beon oflyste ant deorwurðlice halden Godes zife. Swa hwæt swa mon æðelice þegot, þet ne bið na swa deorwundaið þe þe bið æðforderlice þeþiten. Ðe hælend sæde, zif þe purðwunað cnucieþende, þone arised þe hriedes aldor for þes oðres onrope, ant him tyðað þæs de he bit; na for his freondscipe, ac for his unstilnesse. Ði he cweð ‘na for freondraddene’ for þan de nan man nere
wurðe ne ðæs leafan, ne ðæs ecen lifes, zif Godes mildheortnesse nære þe mare ofer mancynne. Nu scele we cnucian ant hryman to Criste, for da[ñ] þe he wile us tyðian swa he sylf cwewed: ‘biddað ant eow bið ȝisfen; secad ant ze ifindæð; cnuciað ant eow bið iopenod.’ Ælc þæra þe ȝeornlice bit ant ðære benac ne swicað, þam tyðað God ðæs ecan lifes.

He sède þa oðer bispel: hwuile fæder wyle syllan his cilde stan zif hit hlafæs bit? oððe neddran zif hit fiscœs bit? oððe þone wyrm ðrowend zif hit æþes bit? God is ure fæder þurð his mildheordnesse, ant þe fisc tacnað þe ileafan, ant ðet æþ done halþan hiht, ðe hlaf ða sóðæn lufe. ðæs ðreþ þing zifð God his icorenum, for þan ðe nan man ne mæþ habbað Godes rice buton zif he habbe þas ðro þing. He sceal rihtlice lefan, ant habban hiht to Gode, ant sóðe lufe to Gode ant to manne, zif he wile to Godes rice becuman. Ðe fisc tacnað beleafan, for þan ðe his icunde is swa hine swiðor þa yða wealcað, swa he strengræ bið ant swiðor batað. Swa eac þe leaulfæl man, swa he swiðor bið iswented for his ileafan, swa ðe ileafa strengra bið þer ðer he ælteowe bið. Gif he abryð on þære ehtnesse, he ne bið þone ileafa ac bið hiwung. ðæt æþ tacnað hiht, for ði ðe þa ðuþelas ne tynað swa swa oðer nytene; ac ærest hit bið æþiþ, ant þeo moder syðdan mid hihte bryt þet æþ to bridde. Swa eac ure hiht ne becom na ȝyt to ðam ðe he hopad, ac is swilce he beo æþiþ; done he hafað þet him behaten is, he bið ðuþel. Hlaf betacnað þa sóðan lufe, þeo is alræ mægne mæst swa swa þe hlaf bið alra meta fyrmost. Micel mæþen is ælæfe, ant micel is sóða hiht, þeawæðere sóðe lufe heom ofercumð, for þan ðe heo bið a on ecnesse ant ða ðroþe twa endiaþ. We ileadþ nu on Gode, ant we hopiað to him. Eft þone we becumað on his rice swa he us behet, þone bið þa ileafa iendod, for þan ðe wæ beoð habbenþe þæs ðe we ær hopodan. Ac þeo lufe ne ateoriað nefre; nu is heo for ði heora selost.

Ðeo neddræ is iset on ðam godspelle onþæan ðam fisce. On neddræn hwiwe beswac þe deoful Adam, ant efre he winð nu onþæan ure ileaðan; ac ðeo iscyldinesses ys ðet ure fæder ilang. Ðe wyrm ðrowend þe is iset onþæan þet æþiþ is attren, ant sleahð mid ðam þægæle to ðaðe. Þa ðing ðe we iseod on þisse life, þa beoð atesorizendlice; þa ðe we ne seod, ant us beoð behatene, heo beoð ece. Streece þæerto þinne hiht, ant abid a þet þu heom habbe; ne loca þu under bæc. Ondred ðe þone ðrowend, þe iattræð mid ðam þægæle. Ðe mon locað under bæc þe ortruwað on Godes mildheortnesse; þone bið his hiht iættrod mid þæs ðrowendes þægæle. Ac we scelon æþder on earforðnesse ant on ilime ant on unlimpe cwæðon swa þe witeþa cwewed: ‘Ic heriþe mine drihne on ælcne time.’ Getimiþa us tela on licomon, getimiþa us untæke, simble we sceolon þæs Gode þanciþa ant his.
namæn blescian; þone bið ure | hiht ihalden wið ðes wurmes slege.

Stan is iset onzean þam hlæfe for þan ðe heardmodnesse is widerade soðre lufe. Heardheort bið mon þe nyle þurh lufe ødre fremiæ þær ðer he mæs. Þet godspel cwæð: ‘zif þe cunnon, þa ðe yfele boð, sylæn þa godnesse owre cildren, hu mycelæ swìðor wule eower heofenlicæ fæder zifen godne gast him biddende?’ Hwæt boð þa god þe men syllað heoræ cildren? Hwilwendlicæ godnesseæ, wilæcæ swæ ðet godspel repede hlæfe ant fisc ant æiʒ. Gode boð þas ðing be heora mæde, for þan þe de eordlice lìcame behoðæ þæs foden. Nu ȝe zlæwe men nellað sylæn owre cildren neddræn forn fisce; nele eac ure heofenlicæ fæder us sylæn þæs deofles lelfæste ȝif we hine biddæ þet hu us sylæn soðne zeleafan. Ant þu selle nylt þine cilde þrowend forn æiʒ; nele eac God us sylæn orwennesse for hihte. Ant þu nylt þine cilde sylæn stan for hlæfe; nele eac God us sylæn heardhortsnesse for soðre lufe. Ac þe goda heofenlicæ fæder zifð us ileafan ant hiht ant þa soða lufe, ant deð þet we habbað godne gast, þet is gode willan.

Us is to smææne þet word þe he cwæð: ‘zif þe boð yfele’. Yfele we boð, ac we habbað godne fæder. We habbað ure nameæ ‘zif þe boð yfele’. Ac hwa is ure fæder? þa almihtiʒa God. Ant hwilcæræ mænæ fæder is he? Swutelice hit is iset, yfelræ mænæ. Ant hwylc is þe fæder? Be þam þe is icwæden, ‘nis nan mon god buton God ane’. þe þe effre is god, he bringað us yfele to gode mannum, zif we buðað fram yfele ant doð god. God wæs þe mon isceapen Adam, ac þurh his ægæne cyre ant deofles tihtinge he wareð yfel, ant al is ofsprung. þe þa synful þið he bið yfel, ant nan man nis on life buton summere synææ. Ac ure goda fæder us clensað ant hæled, swa swa þe witega cwæð: ‘Drihten hel me, ant ic beo ihæled. Gehald þu me, ant ic beo ihalden.’

þæ de god beon wile, clypiʒe to þam de effre is god, þet he hine godne wurce. De man hæf[d] gold; þet is god be is mæde. He hæfð land ant welæn; þa boð gode. Ac ne bið þe man na god þurh þas þing, buton he mid þam god wurce. Swa swa þe witega cwæð: ‘He spende his þing ant delde wrecceæ, ant his rihtwisnesse wunað ha on weorlde.’ He wanode his feoh ant ehte his rihtwisnesse. He wanode þet he forleæn sceal, ant þet bið ieht þet þet he habbaæn sceal on ecnesse. Du herest þone man þe þægæ beæt gold mid leade, ant nylt heriʒan þone þe þægæ rihtwisnesse ant heofena rice mid brosnįʒendlice feo. De rica ant þe wrecce boða wæʒferinde on þissere weorlde. Nu berð þe rice swære burðene his þestreææ, ant þe þærfe ðæþæ emtiʒ. De rica berðæ mare þone he hofiʒe to his formentum, þe oðer berð emtiʒe puræn. For Ȝi sceal þe rīce ðælæn his burðene wið þam wrecce;
þone wanoð he þa byrðene his synnæ ant þam wrecce helpað. Ealle we beoð Godes wrecce; uton we for ði cnawan þa de us bid[da]ð, þet God icnawæ us þone we hine bid[da]ð ure neodæ. Hwæt beoð þa de us bid[da]ð? Earmæ men ant tyddre ant dædlice. Æt hwam biddað heo? Æt earne mannum ant tyddre ant dædlicum. Buton þam æhtum, ilice beoð þeo de þær biddað ant ða þe heo æt biddað. Hu miht du for sceame ænizes þinges æt Gode biddan, 3if du forwyrnst þine ilice þæs de þu ful ædelice him týðise miht? Ac de ricæ besið on his pellene gyrlum ant cweð: ‘Nis de loddon mid his teattucen min ilica.’ Ac þe apostol Paulus hine nebenð mid þissum worde: ‘Ne brohte we nan þing to þisse middaneard, ne we nan þing heonen mid us lædon ne magon.’

Ant 3if rice wif ant poure accenned togeæedere, gangon | heo awæ, 180
175
nast du hwaðer bid þære rican wifes cild, hwaðer þæs armen. Eft 3if mon openað deadra manne burizene, nast þu hwaðer beoð þæs rice monnes ban, hwaðer þæs wrecce. Ac þeo zitsung is alra yfelra þingæ wytryme, ant ða þe fyliað þære zitsunga heo dwæliað fra Godes elefan, ant heo befallað on mislice costnunge ant deriændlicum lustum þe heom besencað on forwyrde. Oder is 3if hwa rice beo þet his aldran him eahta becwædon; oder is 3if hwa þurd zitsunge rice wurde. Pisses mannes zitsung is iwreht wið Gode; na þæs oðeres eaht, 3if his heorte ne bið onpend mid þære zitsunge. Swylce manne bead þe apostol Paulus: ‘Beodað þa ricæ þet heo ne modeʒian, ne heo ne hopiʒan on heora unwisful welu. Ac beon heo rice on gode weorce, ant syllan Godes ðearfum mid cystige mode, ant God hit heom 3ylt mid hundfealdum swa hwæt swa he deð þam wrecce for his lufon.’

Se rica ant þe poure beoð heom betweonan nydbehefe. Se rice is iwroht for þam poure, ant de poure for þam rice. Þam spedige dafenað þet he spene ant dæle þam wædlan, ant þam wædlan dafenað þet heo bidden for þam delere. Se wrecce is þe wæʒ þe led up to Godes rice. Mare sylð þe wrecce þam rice þone he æt him nime: se rice him sylð þone hlaf ðe bið to moxe awend, ant þe wrecce sylð þam rice þet ece lif. Na he swa þeah, ac þe de þus cweð: ‘þet ðet 3e doð ane wrecce on mine nome, þet 3e doð me sylfum’, þe þe leofað ant rixað mid ðæder ant mid halʒe gaste, a buton ende. Amen.

Notes
1 IN LETANIA MAIORE] in red, written in the space left at the end of the final line of the previous article in the MS
2 Ðas] a large initial <Ð> ornamented with red, two lines high, with the decorated tail of the cross-bar trailing into the left margin
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