Leeds Studies in English

Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse

Ælfric's Errors: The Evidence

Richard Marsden

All Bible translations are hostages to fortune. The source text, in whichever scriptural language it may be, continues to coexist with the target version and demands periodically a re-assessment exercise, in which it endures a rigorous interrogation by the latest generation of scholars in respect of its ideology, its style and, especially, its perceived accuracy. The Old Testament translation known as the *Old English Hexateuch* or *Heptateuch*, depending on which of the two main manuscript witnesses draws our attention, is no exception.[1] As the first attempt to make a substantial part of the Old Testament available in the English vernacular, the *Heptateuch* (as I shall call it for convenience) is a seminal document in the history both of biblical translation and of the English language.[2] It is viewed nowadays as a hybrid text: partly the work of Ælfric, partly that of 'Anonymous', the latter being in fact at least two translators, to judge by variation in translation style and other factors.[3] To Ælfric we now assign Genesis 1-24. 26, Numbers 13-end and all of Joshua; to Anonymous, the rest. The *Heptateuch* has never received the full scholarly attention which its importance warrants, but there have been several assessments of the translation errors to be found in it. The most thorough was by Karl Jost, during his pioneering work to distinguish between the contributions of Ælfric and Anonymous, and he was particularly severe in regard to the performance of the latter.[4] Peter Clemoes took a kinder view, which was important if his theory that Anonymous was Byrhtferth of Ramsey were to be accepted, though in the event it was not.[5] My own brief previous foray into this area offered some mediation between Jost and Clemoes but conceded most of the failings of Anonymous.[6]

It is indeed quite easy to arraign the anonymous translators on charges of incompetence (though it is only fair to affirm, in mitigation, the general soundness of their work). Amid a regular trickle of awkward renderings and

minor misunderstandings of the Latin, they make several real howlers, such as translating *moratus*, 'delayed', as though it were *mortuus*, 'dead' (in Deuteronomy 23. 21), and *fui*, 'was', as though it were *fugi*, 'fled' (in Genesis 32. 4), and showing their ignorance of the embalming process in their clumsy versions of Genesis 50. 2-3 and 25 (about which, however, we should perhaps not be too judgemental).[7] But are the Ælfrician parts of the *Heptateuch* without blemish? The fact is that, as presented to us in the main manuscript witnesses, they have significant translation errors as well. Because their alleged perpetrator was the most erudite scholar of his generation, a competent latinist and a superb English stylist, and knew his Bible inside out, we are instinctively more circumspect and defensive in our approach to them (Jost and Clemoes certainly were); yet they require investigation.

There are great difficulties, however, in distinguishing between translation error and transmission error in the *Heptateuch*, for we must negotiate a situation of double textual instability. To begin with, the OE text itself has come down to us in imperfect copies, with some puzzling variation between them; we must be careful to blame neither Ælfric nor Anonymous for the mistakes of careless Anglo-Saxon copyists – a problem of which Ælfric himself was of course acutely aware.[8] But the Latin source-text, the Vulgate, may be just as problematical. Deliberate emendation and accidental textual corruption were characteristic of the Latin Bible in the medieval period,[9] and so we must also avoid blaming our Anglo-Saxon translators for the faults and foibles of Latin copyists.

The veritable cottage industry of error-making in the monasteries of the early medieval period would indeed make for a fascinating study in itself. One aspect of the problem is that not all the mistakes in biblical manuscripts, in whatever language, are as immediately obvious as was (or should have been) the example of the delay/death confusion noted above. Surprisingly often, the new reading seems happily apt and, without the irritation of an 'original' to insist otherwise, we might never know the difference. An aural or visual error in the early transmission of the Latin Judith, for instance, gave us *onustati*, 'laden', for *honestati*, 'ennobled' or 'enriched', in 15. 7. Yet, far from undermining the sense of the passage, the new reading seemed so appropriate, and became so widespread, that it was eventually adopted in the sixteenth century by the Clementine revisers and became 'official' in the Vulgate.[10] I have noted many other such muddles in the manuscripts, such as *uirorum* replaced by *uiuorum* (Wisdom 1. 13), *in uita* by *in uia* (Sirach 30. 5), *mors* by *sors* (Sirach 41. 12) – and in each of these cases the substitutions produce a possible, if not always entirely satisfactory, alternative

reading.[11] In a copy of Job 2. 7, there is confusion between *uertex* ('top of the head') and *ceruix* ('neck'), the correct word, which reduces but does not quite destroy the effectiveness of the rhetoric.[12] It is interesting to compare a similar problem in the anonymous part of the *Heptateuch*, in Deuteronomy 28. 35, where *uerticem* is rendered as *hneccan*, 'neck'. We are likely to blame the OE translator here, for he has committed several other errors in this part of the translation, yet it is entirely possible that the mistake was in his copy of the Vulgate (that is, *ceruicem* for *uerticem*) and that he dutifully rendered his Latin as found. Other confusions in the *Heptateuch*, unrelated to the Latin original, include simple consonant transposition, as in the writing of *tugon*, 'pulled out', for *guton*, 'poured out', in Genesis 42. 35, where the mistake, in context, is barely noticeable, and *geferan* for *gerefan* in Genesis 43. 17, where 'companion' is in fact quite wrong (the Latin has *dispensatori*, identifying Pharaoh's 'steward' or 'reeve').[13] The move from handwritten copies to printing at the end of the fifteenth century reduced but did not eliminate such problems of biblical transmission. Several editions of the Geneva Bible confused 'Jesus' and 'Judas' in John 6. 67; omission of the negative from the commandment 'thou shalt not commit adultery' in a 1631 edition of the King James Bible, in Exodus 20. 14, landed the printer with a £300 fine; and the injunction in an eighteenth-century edition that children be 'killed' instead of 'filled', in Mark 7. 27, caused understandable embarrassment.[14]

THE ERRORS IN THE ÆLFRICIAN HEPTATEUCH

In what follows, I examine fourteen errors, or apparent errors, in Ælfric's *Heptateuch*. Twelve are from Genesis 1-24. 26 and two from Joshua; there is none of significance in Numbers 13-26.[15] My primary OE text is that of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 509 (hereafter L), dating from the second half of the eleventh century. The text is substantially the same in London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv (the 'illustrated Hexateuch', hereafter B), copied a little earlier in the eleventh century but more remote from the archetype, in my view, than L.[16] For several of the passages from Genesis, I introduce also the version in Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 1. 33 (hereafter 'C'), dating from the later twelfth century. Although the textual relationships between the extant versions of the *Heptateuch* are not yet fully understood, we can accept that L and B represent a compilation put together probably during the first two decades of the eleventh century and using, for Genesis 1-24. 26, Numbers 13-26 and Joshua,

pre-existing translations by Ælfric. Ælfric's text of Genesis survives also in the late C, though this has been subject to some corruption (mainly by omission). While in general the texts of LBC coincide closely, there are three extended sections where LB offers a revised version; it is based on the close translation given in C but is much shortened, uses different vocabulary, and is often paraphrased.[17] Some passages from these revised sections will be discussed below. Where 'LBC' is cited as a single version, it is given in L's spelling. OE quotations are normalised to the extent of providing initial capital letters for names, and abbreviations have been expanded silently, but the manuscript punctuation is reproduced, where there is any. The Vulgate text with which I start each analysis may be assumed to be 'standard', with no recorded variants of relevance, unless otherwise indicated. It is the 'Hieronymian' text of the Rome *Biblia Sacra*, the authoritative critical edition;[18] I cite it without punctuation but with colon separation indicated by a forward slash. Where significant alternative Old Latin or Septuagint versions are known, I introduce these to my analysis also.[19]

Genesis errors only in 'LB' or only in 'C'

I start with a few errors which are not consistently reproduced in the manuscripts, being either in LB or in C but not in both. Given that the errors involved are the sort which it is most unlikely that Ælfric would have made, it is reasonable to suppose that the correct reading (wherever it is) in his. I deal separately with errors that occur only in LB and those that occur only in C.

(i) 'LB' errors

The text of the compilation in LB cannot always be trusted to deliver Ælfric's text accurately; despite its own textual problems, C is often the better witness. This becomes clear when variant readings which are not obvious errors are compared; in some eighty per cent of cases, C's variant is more accurate in relation to the Vulgate and, given the generally faithful nature of Ælfric's translation, we need not doubt that such readings are his.[20] Several problems in the main textual tradition, then (i.e. LB), may be attributed to mistakes made in the 'sub-archetype' stage of transmission, after LB's branch diverged from that

which led to C, and thus we can look to C for Ælfric's intended translation. A prominent example occurs in the narrative of Noah's inebriation and self-exposure:

Genesis 9. 24

euigilans autem Noe ex uino
[but when Noah awoke from the wine]

LB   Noe soðlice ða ða he awoc of ðam slæpe
C   Noe soðlice ða ða onwoc on ðam wine

As Ælfric translates the episode fully and closely, there is no reason to doubt that C transmits correctly his version. This has Noah waking from 'wine', as in the Vulgate, not 'sleep'. Jerome is close to the Hebrew here; Old Latin versions, following the Septuagint, add some definition: 'et sobrius factus est Noe a uino' [Noah sobered up after the wine]. Nevertheless, it will be seen that there are some small problems in C: the loss of a necessary pronoun before the verb and the use of *on* for *of* (a fairly frequent error in late manuscripts of OE). We cannot know whether LB's substitution began as a conscious 'improvement' (though in fact sleeping is nowhere mentioned in the narrative) or an unconscious slip. There is a problem of a slightly different sort later in the same passage, as I discuss below.

Other errors occur in LB in the sections where its text is a revision, usually a paraphrase, of that from which C derives (see above), and they do much to confirm the integrity of C as 'Ælfrician'.

Genesis 5. 7

uixitque Seth postquam genuit Enos octingentis septem annis / genuit que filios et filias
[Seth lived 807 years after he fathered Enoch, and he fathered sons and daughters]

LB   ymb seofan 7 hundeahtatigwintre æfter ðam he gestrynde suna 7 dohtra
C   He lyfede seðen he gestrinde enos .viii. hund geare 7 seofon gear 7 gestrynde sunu 7 dohtra

As well as getting the years wrong (87 for 807), the version in LB has conflated the two main elements of the verse, with odd results ('87 years later, he fathered

sons and daughters'). Misunderstanding of the OE text, which a reviser was trying to paraphrase at the compilation stage, seems to be the explanation, rather than subsequent copying error.

Genesis 5. 20

    nongenti sexaginta duo anni
    [962 years]

    LB   nigonhundwintre 7 fif 7 sixtigwintre
    C   .ix. hund geara 7 twa 7 syxti

The correct figure (for the age of Iared at death) is C's 962, not LB's 965. Again, this seems likely to be a revision error, due perhaps to the influence of *fif 7 sixtigwintre* in the following colon (i.e. in 5. 21).

Genesis 11. 31

    de Ur Chaldaeorum
    [from Ur of the Chaldeans]

    LB   to Ur Chaldea
    C   of þære chaldeisre Hur

LB's preposition, *to*, is obviously wrong when the phrase is read in context. It occurs in a passage from one of the sections of Genesis where the text in C varies substantially from that of LB. It will be noted that, in its rendering of rest of the phrase, C is nearer to the Latin.[21]

(ii) 'C' errors

    Having insisted on the value of C as a guide to the translation produced by Ælfric, before later copyists or compilers corrupted his work, we must now risk an accusation of special pleading by noting two cases where the opposite seems to be the case, where C itself has errors which are not in LB. They are again errors which it is very unlikely that Ælfric (or any other translator) would have made, and therefore we may assume that they were not in the LBC 'archetype' but were

the product of corruption in the transmission of that text to C. The first case occurs earlier in the passage just cited.

Genesis 11. 31

> tulit itaque Thare Abram filium suum et Loth filium Aran filium filii sui / et Sarai nurum suam uxorem Abram filii sui / et eduxit eos
> [and Terah took Abram his son and Lot the son of Aran (his son's son) and Sarah his daughter-in-law (the wife of Abram his son) and brought them]

> LB   witodlice Thare nam Abram. his sunu 7 Loth his suna sunu 7 gelædde hig
> C   hwæt þa Thare genam his tweigen sunu mid heora twam wifum. 7 Loth his sune suna 7 lædde hig

The two OE versions are not far apart, except in the crucial question of how many sons Terah takes with him. The Vulgate is not easy to follow, and both OE versions have simplified the passage, but C alone has made an erroneous emendation ('two sons', instead of simply one, i.e. Abraham). The mistake may have been made because, in 11. 29 (rendered in both LB and C, though less fully in the former), we have learned that Terah's other surviving son, Nahor, has married at the same time as his brother, Abraham. A translator (though not, one would expect, Ælfric) might be forgiven for assuming that Nahor and his wife would automatically be with Terah's party of emigrants, even though the Vulgate narrative does not mention them. In fact, it is an essential element of the story that Nahor does not migrate with the others from Ur, for when Abraham eventually sends his son Isaac back to his (Abraham's) native land (to 'the city of Nahor') to seek a wife, it is Nahor's granddaughter, Rebecca, whom he finds there (see Genesis 24. 10 and 15). The fact that the LB version of this passage gets the detail right does not mean that the reviser of its text must have returned to the Latin, possible though that is. It is more likely that the difference between the two versions arose through a mistake by a copyist of Ælfric's text during the long transmission to C. There are problems with the earlier part of this narrative in C also.[22]

Genesis 16. 15

> peperitque (Agar) Abrae filum qui uocauit nomen eius
> Ismahel
> [and she/Hagar bore a son to Abram, who called his name
> Ishmael]

> LB   Agar þa acende sunu Abrame. 7 he het hys naman
> Ysmahel
> C   Agar þa acende sunu 7 het his naman Ismael

I have bracketed *Agar* in the Latin citation because, although inclusion of the name is not judged to be Hieronymian, it occurs in many Vulgate manuscripts, including presumably that used by Ælfric. Without it, we can make do with the pronoun 'she', for it is quite clear from the previous cola that Agar (Sarah's serving-woman) is the subject. C's version of the passage omits both *Abrame* and *he*, so that the naming is done by Agar, not by Abraham. Almost certainly, this mistake has occurred accidentally in transmission. However, it is interesting to note that, almost 1000 years after Ælfric, another scholar, Ronald Knox, made the same error in his own well-received translation of the Vulgate.[23]

Genesis errors which are in all manuscripts

The Genesis errors which remain to be dealt with are in L, B and C. Thus they were either there from the start, made by Ælfric, or were introduced inadvertently into an LBC archetypal manuscript which must have preceded both the sub-archetypal ancestor of the copy used for the *Heptateuch* compilation (i.e. LB) and that which began the separate textual line which led to C.

Genesis 7. 10-11

> cumque transissent septem dies aquae diluuii inundauerunt
> super terram / anno sescentesimo uitae Noe mense secundo
> septimodecimo die mensis / rupti sunt omnes fontes abyssi
> magnae
> [When seven days had passed, the waters of the flood
> drowned the earth. In the six-hundredth year of the life of

Noah, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the
month, all the great fountains of the deep ruptured]

LBC Ða on ðam eahtogan dæge [. . .] þa yþode þæt flod
ofer eorðan on þam oþrum monðe on ðone seofenteoðan
dæg þæs monðes. Ða asprungon ealle wyllspringas þære
micclan niwelnisse [24]

The second part of this passage is an incremental repetition of the first, adding
both graphic detail about the mechanics of the flood (the rupturing of the
fountains of the deep) and the information that it occurs, not only a week after
Noah and family entered the ark, but also on what is the seventeenth day of the
second month of the year in which Noah is 600. Without the first clause of 7. 11
('anno [. . .] Noe'), a rendering of which the OE version omits, the reference to the
month and day can only be attached logically to the previous clause, and hence
the punctuation of the scribe of L (presumably following his exemplar); but it
makes no sense. A later reference, in Genesis 8. 13, to the flood drying up in the
second month of the year in which Noah is 601 (showing that the whole
adventure lasts one year) is omitted completely in the OE translation, deliberately,
I assume; but it is hard to believe that Ælfric would have half-translated the
reference in 7. 11. This is likely, then, to be an early transmission error.

Genesis 9. 24
> cum didicisset quae fecerat ei filius suus minor
> [when he learned what his younger son had done to him]
>
> LBC 7 he ofaxode hwæt his suna him didon [25]

This is the clause which follows the one discussed above, from the passage which
describes Noah's waking from his wine-induced stupor. He becomes aware of the
antics of just one of his sons, Ham, the youngest, who has drawn attention to his
father's nakedness. Noah has no argument with the other two, who have behaved
with exemplary diffidence. Thus the plural used by each OE manuscript here ('his
suna [. . .] didon') is quite wrong. The preceding cola have been about the actions
of Sem and Iapeth, so that a superficial reading might encourage the expectation
in a copyist of a continuing plural subject; furthermore, *suna* is a form often used
for the singular as well as plural in late OE. However, the logic of the narrative is

perfectly clear and it is hard to believe that Ælfric himself would have made such an error.[26]

Genesis 13. 1–5

> ascendit ergo Abram de Aegypto / ipse et uxor eius et omnia quae habebat / et Loth cum eo ad australem plagam / erat autem diues ualde in possessione argenti et auri / reuersusque est per iter quo uenerat a meridie in Bethel / usque ad locum ubi prius fixerat tabernaculum inter Bethel et Ai / in loco altaris quod fecerat prius / et inuocauit ibi nomen domini / sed et Loth qui erat cum Abram fuerunt greges ouium et armenta et tabernacula
> [[1] Thus Abram went up out of Egypt, he and his wife and all that he had, and Lot with him, into the northern region. [2] Moreover, he (Abram) was very rich in his possession of silver and gold. [3] And he returned by the way that he had come, from the south to Bethel, to the place where before he had pitched his tent between Bethel and Hai, [4] in the place of the altar which he had made before; and there he called on the name of the Lord. [5] But Lot also, who was with Abram, had flocks of sheep and herds of cattle and tents.]

> LBC [1]Abram þa ferde of egipta lande mid ealre his fare [. . .] 7 Loth ferde forð mid him [3] oð þæt hig comon to suþdæle betwux Bethel 7 Hai [4] to þære stowe þe he þæt weofod ær arærde. 7 gebæd hine þær to gode [5] 7 Loth samod mid him. Abram soþlice wæs swiþe welig on golde 7 on seolfre 7 on orfe. 7 on geteldum[27]

Although I have quoted this passage at length in order to show the context, it is the last part of the OE rendering which is our concern: 'truly Abram was very rich in gold and silver and cattle and tents'.[28] It looks as though the assumption has been made by the translator that the references to wealth in the Vulgate's 13. 2 ('erat autem diues ualde') and 5 ('fuerunt greges ouium') are repetitive, both referring to Abram, and so they have been conflated and placed at the end of the passage. This has necessitated, or at least resulted in, the linking of the initial

element of 13. 5 ('sed et Lot') with the previous verse about devotion at the altar (with the adversative conjunction replaced by 'and'). But the new version is wrong. The point of the Vulgate account (and it follows the Hebrew closely) is that Lot is wealthy in his own right as well as Abram: it is thus impossible for the families of both men to live together, for wealth means big flocks and herds and the need for extensive grazing land. It is the solution to this problem which occupies the rest of the chapter.

Clearly, one difficulty with the Latin is that *Loth* has no dative marker: its grammatical case (lit. 'to-Lot there were flocks [. . .]') can only be deduced retrospectively as we read the rest of the sentence. Yet that cannot be the whole explanation for the error. Clutching at straws, Jost suggested that Ælfric's Latin source had a second *Abram* before *fuerunt* and that, in appending 'sed et Lot' to v. 4, he was influenced by remarks by Bede in his 'Hexameron' (i.e. his commentary *In Genesim*).[29] But that is unlikely; indeed, if Ælfric had referred to Bede here, he could hardly have failed to get the translation just right, for Bede's citation (using Jerome's version) of the second part of the passage, starting at 'Sed et Loth', is separated from the earlier part by a section of commentary, so that it is impossible to misunderstand. My own view (another clutching at straws, perhaps) is that, if we are not to concede error by Ælfric, a Latin text which had been corrupted under Old Latin influence may be the explanation. The Vulgate's *sed et* ('However, [. . .]') unequivocally marks a syntactical separation between what has preceded ('Abram offered to the Lord') and what follows ('Lot was wealthy'), and Jerome here renders the Hebrew accurately. The Septuagint stayed close, and, in its use of a dative phrase apposed to the proper noun to express Lot's being with Abram, left no possibility of doubt that Lot is the possessor of the wealth alluded to: 'to-Lot-journeying-with-Abram were [. . .]'.[30] Old Latin witnesses are rare, but in rendering the Greek, at least one tradition used the dative preposition *ei* in the second part of the passage (reasonably enough) but also added at extra conjunction before it: 'et Loth qui comitabatur cum Abram et erant ei oues et boues et tabernacula'.[31] Thus the clause 'et Lot [. . .] Abram' is separated from, rather connected with, what follows: 'and Lot who was with Abram (made his devotions also); and to-him were sheep and cattle and tents'. The dative pronoun *ei* could now refer either to Lot or to Abraham; the (wrong) choice of the latter, as the most recently named subject, is likely. Although there is no evidence that the intrusive extra *et* reached any Vulgate manuscripts, several do have the added *ei*, and there is at least a possibility that Ælfric was faced with a text which had become corrupt in some way. Normal copying errors in the OE transmission

could not, I think, have produced the LBC version. What is absent from it is any indication of just why Abraham's being rich should in itself prevent his living alongside Lot. Perhaps Ælfric was aware of a problem; he added the phrase 'he 7 Loth', without Vulgate authority, in the next sentence of the OE, and this could have been his way of making up for a deficiency, by confirming the competitive nature of the relationship of Abraham and Lot, which will now be developed as the narrative continues.

Genesis 16. 4
> at illa concepisse se uidens despexit dominam suam
> [and seeing herself conceive, she despised her mistress]

> LBC   7 Agar þa geeacnode. 7 eac forseah hire hlæfdian

The OE's coordinate syntax with *eac* quite fails to render the dynamic of cause and effect which is explicit in the Vulgate (and the Hebrew).[32] Sarah has let Abraham sleep with her servant Agar, who now, as a consequence of finding herself pregnant, begins to despise her mistress. Sarah herself spells this out in 16. 5, in diction very close to that of 16. 4: 'qui uidens quod conceperit despectui me habet'. Ælfric again translates this with coordination, but crucially he does not use *eac*, and so cause and effect are implicit: 'nu wat heo þæt heo ys eacniende 7 forsihð me', 'now she knows that she is pregnant and despises me'. The probability is that *eac* was added carelessly in 16. 4 early in transmission, possibly in a reflex triggered by the first main element in *geeacnode*. The style of the sentence seems to me very un-Ælfrician.

Genesis 16. 12
> et e regione uniuersorum fratrum suorum figet tabernacula
> [and he shall pitch his tents away from all his brethren]

> LBC   7 he gewislice arærð æfre his geteld onemn his gebroþra

The OE preposition *onemn* ('alongside/by/near') conveys a sense of continuing intimacy which seems to be at odds with the tenor of God's address to Hagar, of which this clause is a part. He declares that Hagar's son Ishmael, universally shunned, will separate himself from his kin, pitching his tent in the opposite

direction to them (*e regione*; 'over against' is a popular modern rendering). The Old Latin versions, following the Septuagint, are more pointed, using *ante faciem* or *contra faciem* to express the separation. In the OE, the supplied adverb *gewislice* ('prudently'), for which there is no Vulgate authority, renders the suggestion that Ishmael will simply settle alongside his antagonistic kin even more odd. It could be that Ælfric translated *e regione* originally with OE *ongean*, 'opposite/against', and that this became corrupted to *onemn* subsequently. Conceivably, however, Ælfric considered that to have Ishmael living *near* is sufficient indication that he is not living *with*. In this connection, is it interesting to note that although the prepositional phrase used in the Hebrew of this passage might be translated literally as 'upon the face of' or 'against the face of' (hence Old Latin *ante* or *contra* and Jerome's *e regione*), or 'at odds with', and even 'to the east of', yet another possibility is 'alongside', which is of course the sense of OE *onemn*.[33] Although such an interpretation contradicts the idea of hostility which is accepted as being the point of this passage by most commentators on Genesis, it has been championed by at least one of them.[34]

Genesis 17. 12

> tam uernaculus quam empticius circumcidetur / et quicumque non fuerit de stirpe uestra
> [the home-born slave as well as the bought slave shall be circumcised, and whoever is not of your stock]

> LBC 7 inbyrdlingum 7 geboht þeowa. beo ymsniden þeah he ne beo eowres cynnes

This passage is from the 'covenant of circumcision' which God makes with Abraham; this is to involve every male of his household, without distinction. Ælfric's concessive clause, using *þeah*, does not translate the perfectly lucid Latin clause beginning *et quicumque*, 'and (also) whoever [. . .]'. Although there is no evidence of any significant variation here in the collated Vulgate manuscripts or the Old Latin versions, we might still offer the defense of corruption in Ælfric's Vulgate exemplar, with the conjunction and pronoun *et quicumque* perhaps becoming altered to something nearer a concessive word or phrase – *etiamsi* or simply *et cumque*. The interesting thing about the OE version, however, is that it does convey the sense of the Hebrew text here, which Jerome missed. In the Hebrew, the reference to 'those not of your stock' simply amplifies 'those bought

with money from a foreigner'. The Septuagint makes this clear, and Old Latin versions – such as those of Augustine, in *De ciuitate Dei* (16, 26), and Rufinus, in his translation of Origen's commentary on the epistle *Ad Romanos* (2, 12) – follow.[35] So it may be that Ælfric, rather than making an error or being confused by an ambiguous Vulgate text, was influenced by his familiarity with some patristic discussion of the passage, which enabled him quietly (and perhaps unconsciously) to correct Jerome. Alternately, it was simply an intuitive emendation.[36]

Genesis 18. 15

> negauit Sarra dicens non risi timore perterrita
> [Sara denied it, saying, 'I did not laugh', for she was afraid]
>
> LBC þa ætsoc Sarra. ne hloh ic na ac ic wæs afirht

If this is Ælfric's translation, he is in error, though not disastrously so. The context makes it clear that the Vulgate's 'timore perterrita' is not a continuation of Sarah's words ('non risi') but is a return to the narrative mode. This is more obvious in the Old Latin 'non risi timuit enim', which closely follows the Septuagint. Conceivably, Ælfric's Vulgate exemplar had an erroneous *timui*. This variation has not been noted in any collated Vulgate manuscript, but in one copy of Augustine's *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, where the passage is cited, the final *t* of *timuit* has been marked for deletion, and this echoes a similar variation in Greek manuscripts.[37] It is difficult to see how transmissional corruption might have produced the OE error. We may note that the Latin ablative absolute construction causes problems elsewhere in the *Heptateuch*, though not in Ælfric's portion.[38]

Genesis 18. 28

> quid si minus quinquaginta iustis quinque fuerint / delebis
> propter quinque uniuersam urbem
> [what if there should be five fewer than fifty just persons:
> will you destroy the whole city on account of five?]
>
> LBC la leof hwæt dest þu gyf ðær beoð fif 7 feowertig
> rihtwisra. wylt þu adilegian ealle þa burh

The context of this passage is God's revelation to Abraham of his intention to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah. Abraham is struck by the potential injustice of the innocent being killed alongside sinners, and so he tests God by asking if he will not spare Sodom if fifty just men are found; God affirms that he will. Abraham then asks the question cited above: what if a mere five fewer than the required number of fifty were lacking? He then reinforces his question by resolving the subtraction: forty-five hypothetical just men. By conflating the two parts of the question, the OE translation ignores the point of the Vulgate way of putting it, which is to stress the trivial number of people involved. In what is otherwise a very full and close translation of this key episode, the skipping over of such a crucial point, if deliberate, would be surprising. However, it is likely that Ælfric was faced with a corrupt Vulgate text here. Although the Hieronymian version cited above correctly renders the Hebrew, more than half of the Vulgate manuscripts have, in the second colon, 'propter quadraginta quinque', instead of 'propter quinque'. No Old Latin citations of these cola have been traced, but the error is in some Greek witnesses. Among the Vulgate manuscripts carrying it are most in the Theodulfian tradition and two late Alcuinian Bibles; it reached the Clementine edition and thus became 'official'.[39]

Errors in Joshua

Two apparent problems in Ælfric's translation of Joshua are notable; the first is of especial interest.

Joshua 7. 21

> uidi enim inter spolia pallium coccineum ualde bonum / et ducentos siclos argenti / regulamque auream quinquaginta siclorum
> [for I saw among the spoils a very fine scarlet robe, and two hundred shekels of silver, and a golden rule of fifty shekels]

> LB   ic geseah betwux þam herereafum wurmreadne basing. 7 twa hund entsena hwites seolfres. 7 sumne gildene dalc. on fiftigum entsum

This is part of the confession of Achan, who has broken Joshua's anathema on the spoils left after the destruction of the city of Jericho, resulting in the defeat of the Israelites in battle. Achan is found out, and among the valuables he now admits to looting is what Jerome renders as 'regulam auream quinquaginta siclorum', 'a golden rule of fifty shekels'. It is clear that he uses *regula*, 'rule', in the sense of a measuring instrument, so it is what we might call a 'bar' of gold. The Hebrew rendered by Jerome is *lishan*, 'tongue', but it is usually translated as 'wedge' in English; 'gold' is a noun, not an adjective.[40] Ælfric would certainly have understood the sense of *regula* as an artefact, not simply a 'regulation', for his own *Glossary* interprets it as *regolsticca*, 'measuring stick/ruler'.[41] In rendering *regulam auream*, nevertheless, as a 'golden *dalc*', he uses a word which is rare in the OE corpus, with only five other occurrences, all as late glosses (see below).[42] What did Ælfric understand by it? In his *Excerptiones de arte grammatica anglice* (his 'Grammar'), he gives Latin *spinther* as an example of a word of neuter gender and then translates it as *dalc*; and in his *Glossary*, the lemma *spinther* is interpreted as 'dalc oððe preon'.[43] Common meanings of *preon* are 'pin' or 'fastening'. Although in Classical use, according to Lewis and Short, *spinther* (or *spinter*) was used specifically for 'a kind of bracelet [. . .] kept in place by its own elasticity',[44] a collection of glosses copied probably at Canterbury during the first half of the eleventh century confirms a rather wider contemporary understanding of the word. As an OE interpretation, Ælfric's *preon* is given again, and then there are two Latin equivalents, 'fibula uel armilla', the first meaning 'buckle', 'clasp' or 'pin', the second 'bracelet'.[45] Each of these words features in the section of Ælfric's *Glossary* where *spinther* occurs; they constitute an extended Anglo-Latin family of words denoting bodily ornament:

> *anulus* hring. *armilla* beah. *diadema* kynehelm. *capitium*
> hæt. *monile* myne oððe swurbeah. *spinther* dalc oððe preon.
> *fibula* oferfeng, *uitta* snod. *inauris* earpreon [46]

A full survey of the suspiciously incestuous relationships between the members of this family (and between the glossaries which record them) cannot be attempted here, but we can see that senses such as 'bracelet', 'fastening' or 'brooch' are all possible for *dalc*, and any of these would suit the context of the Joshua passage well. The word, which has Celtic cognates, is more frequent in Old Norse, as *dálkr*, where its meaning is usually 'a pin to fasten a cloak with' (and sometimes 'a dagger'), and, given the absence of any trace of *dalc* in the earlier OE corpus, the

influence of this may be conjectured.[47] It survived into Middle English as *dalk*, signifying 'pin', 'brooch', 'clasp' or 'buckle'.[48]

So far, so good. But the plot thickens when we look at the three other occurrences of OE *dalc* as a gloss; the lemmata are given in italics:

> *fibula* oferfeng uel dalc
> *legulam* .i. fibulam oferfenc dalc
> *legulam* .i. oferfeng dalc

The first interpretation is in the eleventh-century collection of glosses from which we have already cited.[49] Latin *fibula* featured also among Ælfric's family of ornament-words, of course, along with OE *oferfeng*, 'buckle' or 'clasp'. The other interpretations, however, are derived from two copies of Aldhelm's prose *De uirginitate* which were glossed in OE in the earlier part of the eleventh century, both of them associated with Canterbury: and it transpires that the lemma *legulam* occurs in Aldhelm's quotation of the very passage from Joshua which is the subject of our enquiry.[50] In ch. 55, the example of Achan is given to illustrate the disastrous consequences of the lust for outer finery, and Aldhelm goes on to contrast this with the desire for inner chastity which should adorn the pious virgin.

> Nonne Achan [. . .] qui de anathemate municipii [. . .] pallium coccineum et legulam auri sibi usurpans contra decretum ducis claudistina fraude surripuit [. . .] horrendum mortis spectaculum Ebreorum falangibus praebuit.[51]
> [Did not Achan [. . .], who with secret treachery had taken from the anathema of the city [. . .], against the command of his leader, a cloak of scarlet and a wedge of gold, keeping them for himself, provide a horrendous spectacle of death for the crowds of Hebrews [. . .]?]?[52]

Now in using *legulam* where Jerome has *regulam*, Aldhelm follows the Old Latin textual tradition. The form of the word there is in fact usually *ligulam*, but *legulam* is standard in all the manuscripts of *De uirginitate* collated by Ehwald, and indeed in the many Anglo-Saxon glossary entries in which it occurs (on which see more below).[53] Lewis and Short maintain a distinction between the two forms, but in dictionaries of later Latin and Insular Latin, they are conflated.[54] The Septuagint rendered the Hebrew's 'tongue' of gold literally with γλῶσσα, and

the Old Latin translators were of course simply following this with their *ligula* (or occasionally *lingula*), a diminutive of *lingua*, 'tongue', which is extended to mean anything tongue-shaped, such as a shoe-latchet or strap, or a ladle or part of a lever. In his homily on Joshua, Origen made productive use of the word, equating the 'tongue of gold' hoarded in his tent by Achan with the seductive golden tongue of the philosopher or poet who spouts perverse doctrines which, if we hoard them in our hearts, pollute the church.[55]

Glosses added to copies of *De uirginitate* in the early eleventh century cannot of course tell us how Aldhelm interpreted *legula* when he was writing in the later seventh.[56] However, the fact that he omits mention of Achan's two hundred shekels of silver from his citation of Joshua 7. 21, so that the richly dyed *pallium* and the *legula* are juxtaposed, and then a few lines later he develops his interpretation of the symbolism of the episode with a warning from the first Epsitle of Peter about the wearing of gold,[57] persuades me that he probably understood *legulam auri* as a gold ornament, perhaps holding in place a fine robe. That possibility seems to be strengthened by the almost contemporary evidence of the Épinal Glossary, copied during the first half of the eighth century, where *legula* is interpreted as *gyrdislhringae*, the 'buckle' which fastens a girdle or belt.[58] The interpretation is repeated in glossaries derived from Épinal, such as the eighth- or ninth-century Corpus Glossary and the mid-tenth-century Cleopatra Glossary.[59] It is worth noting also that, in his *Etymologiae*, Isidore picks up the word *fibula*, which we saw closely associated with *legula* in the eleventh-century glossaries, and defines it as something which adorns a woman's breast or holds a cloak (*pallium*) at the shoulders or a girdle at the waist.[60]

It cannot be coincidence that Ælfric translated Jerome's *regula* as though it were instead the Old Latin *legula* or *ligula*, in its well attested sense of a costume accessory of some sort. Possibly Ælfric actually knew the usage of *legula* from Aldhelm's work. It is tempting to assume that, in using *dalc* he had in mind a large ornamental brooch used to fix a cloak at the shoulders (as in Old Norse usage), but here we must be more cautious. In his translation of Joshua he retained the reference to the silver in Achan's hoard, so that a direct connection between the gold object and the *pallium* is not a necessity. Is it possible that Ælfric's copy of the Vulgate actually had *legula* instead of *regula*? There is no evidence for the variant as an original reading in the collated Bibles, but it is of great interest to note that in the single late Anglo-Saxon witness to the Latin text of Joshua, the two-volume Bible which is now London, British Library, Royal 1. E. VII–VIII (copied late in the tenth century), *legulam* is to be found in Joshua 7.

21 as a correction.[61] The original copyist wrote *regulam*, and the *r* was later overwritten with an *l*, apparently by the corrector who made many other emendations to the text of this Bible in the immediate post-Conquest period. It may of significance that he was working at Canterbury, where the glossing of Aldhelm's *De uirginitate* in the two manuscripts noted above is thought to have taken place.[62]

A final twist to the tale emerges when we look for direct evidence of what Ælfric would have understood by *legula*. Once again, conveniently enough, it is in his *Glossary*, but the interpretation rather distances us from the world of fine dressing. Intriguingly, the entry forms a pair with that for *regula*, noted above:[63]

> *legula* sticca. *regula* regolsticca.

The humble *sticca* is a 'stick', 'peg' or 'pointer' (of a dial), or a 'spoon' or 'spoonful' (mostly in medical recipes).[64] The juxtaposition of the two entries rather suggests some sort of deliberate word-play here, in which case it may have been important to use *sticca*, and nothing more. It could be, too, that the *Glossary* was compiled some years before the translation of Joshua, when Ælfric was perhaps as yet unfamiliar with the extended use of *legula*.[65]

Thus far, the exact process by which Ælfric came to render *regula* in Joshua 7. 21 as *dalc* remains unclear – if indeed he was responsible. It is entirely possible that he provided a literal translation (though *regolsticca* might have seemed a little odd in the context) and that someone at the stage of the compilation of the *Heptateuch* decided to substitute the more colourful word.

Joshua 11. 19
> non fuit ciuitas quae se traderet filiis Israhel / praeter Eueum
> qui habitabat in Gabaon
> [There was not a city that delivered itself to the children of
> Israel, except the Hevite, who lived in Gabaon]
>
> LB   7 ælc burhwaru wæs bugende to him. buton Eueum
> ana. þe eardode on Gabaon

The OE statement that 'the inhabitants of every town submitted to them' is clearly at odds with the given Latin. God has hardened the hearts of all the rulers of the north of Canaan, so that the pugnacious leader of the Israelites, Joshua, can crush

their cities in punishment. Only one city in fact makes peace – Gabaon, where the Hevites live. The reason for the apparent error of translation by Ælfric has a simple explanation. A majority of medieval Vulgate manuscripts have a double negative version of the passage: 'non fuit ciuitas quae se *non* traderet filiis Israhela'; that is, all capitulated without a fight. This is quite wrong, but in the immediate context, it is not perhaps apparent, for we might simply assume that the Hevites were exceptional because they would *not* surrender. The next clause in the Vulgate, 'omnes enim bellando cepit' ('for he [Joshua] took all through fighting', not translated by Ælfric) does then seem rather disconnected, but a following reference to God hardening 'their hearts' ('corda eorum'), could conceivably be applicable to an intransigent Gabaon (the OE has 'drihten hi gehyrde', 'the Lord hardened them'). After that, however, the logic falls apart, for we are taken through a list of all the cities destroyed one after the other by Joshua. It seems very probable, then, that Ælfric here translated correctly an incorrect Vulgate text and did not detect (or decided to overlook) the narrative problem.

CONCLUSION

We have been able to return 'not guilty', or at the very least 'not proven', verdicts on most of the potential charges against Ælfric, in respect of translation errors in 'his' parts of the *Heptateuch*. There has even been one case (in Genesis 16. 12) where Ælfric quite possibly put right a Hieronymian error. The demonstrable instability of the OE text offers a clear explanation for many textual problems in the main manuscripts, L and B, and also in C, even though the latter is in some ways the most reliable transmitter of Ælfric's text. Whoever created these errors, it was not Ælfric. Where errors in Genesis are shared both by LB and by C, it is still likely in some cases that very early transmissional problems are to blame (as in Genesis 7. 11, 9. 24 and 16. 4); and when there is *prima facie* (but never of course incontrovertible) evidence that the errors were in Ælfric's autograph translation, instability in the other party to the translational transaction, the Vulgate text, may be the explanation. Thus in Genesis 18. 28 and Joshua 11. 19, at least, Ælfric may have been translating accurately what his exemplar presented to him, or simply making the best he could of a corrupt Latin text. In the intriguing case of *dalc* for *regula* (if that was indeed the word he read), in Joshua 7. 21, the choice must have been deliberate, not a mistranslation – though whether it was made by Ælfric himself, perhaps echoing an established tradition known to

him from old sources, or by an emender, is open to question. In the latter case, the possible Canterbury connection may be of significance in any effort to locate the work of compilation of the *Heptateuch*.

Our positive judgement of Ælfric's works must, however, be balanced with some reservations. Doubt remains about several readings, among them the mistake with the ablative absolute in Genesis 18. 15. And we are entitled to wonder why, in cases such as those in Genesis 13. 1-5 (where an important point is lost in the OE version) and Joshua 11. 19 (where an error causes a breakdown in the sense of the narrative), Ælfric did not see the problems and do something about them. The explanation may be a perfectly ordinary one – that, when working at speed on less familiar biblical passages, he was not always as scrupulous as he might have been. Perhaps, on occasions, even Ælfric nodded.

NOTES

[1] The manuscripts are identified below.

[2] It was last edited by S. J. Crawford, *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch: Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis*, EETS, 160 (London: Oxford University Press, 1922; repr. with the text of two additional manuscripts transcribed by N. R. Ker, 1969). My own new edition for EETS is in the press.

[3] See my 'Translation by Committee?: The "Anonymous" Old English Heptateuch', in *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. by R. Barnhouse and B. C. Withers (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000), pp. 41-89. At the time of writing, both the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the British Library still attribute the whole work to Ælfric.

[4] 'Unechte Ælfrictexte', *Anglia*, 51 (1927), 82-103 and 177-219.

[5] 'The Composition of the Old English Text', in *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch: British Museum Cotton Claudius B. IV*, ed. by C. R. Dodwell and P. A. M. Clemoes, EEMF, 18 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1974), pp. 42-53; cf. P. S. Baker, 'The Old English Canon of Byrhtferth of Ramsey', *Speculum*, 55 (1980), 22-37 (pp. 23-32).

[6] 'Translation by Committee?', pp. 63-67.

[7] See previous footnote.

[8] See the prefaces to his translation of Genesis and his collections of *Lives of Saints* and *Catholic Homilies* (both series); *Ælfric's Prefaces*, ed. by Jonathan Wilcox (Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, 1994), pp. 110, 112, 119 and 121.

[9] See my *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 57-58.

[10] Judith 15. 7: *et praedam quam fugientes Assyrii reliquerant abstulerunt et honestati sunt ualde*, 'and they took away the spoils which the Assyrians had left behind when fleeing, and they were greatly honoured/laden'. The Vatican's revised *Nova Vulgata* (1979) restores the original sense with *locupletati*.

[11] See my *Text of the Old Testament*, pp. 161 and 164.

[12] *Text of the Old Testament*, p. 251.

[13] Correct *gerefan* in a third OE witness to this part of Genesis, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, pp. 1-178, confirms that this is a transmission, not a translation, error.

[14] See *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, ed. by B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 143.

[15] I pass over obvious scribal errors such as *ceaste* for *ceastre* in Numbers 16. 49.

[16] Crawford's edition (see n. 2) is based on B, except for the abbreviated Ælfrician version of Judges, which only L carries. My own forthcoming edition is based on L.

[17] The revised passages are Genesis 4. 23-4, 5. 1-4; 10. 3-31, 11. 10-26; and 22. 20-24, 23. 14-15, 24. 11-14, 16-22. They are discussed in the introduction to my forthcoming edition.

[18] *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem, cura et studio monachorum Abbatiae pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in Urbe O. S. B. edita*, ed. by H. Quentin and others, 18 vols (Rome: Typis polyglottis vaticanis, 1926–95): I *Liber Genesis* (1926), IV *Libri Iosue–Iudicum–Ruth* (1939). Modern translations of Latin biblical texts are my own.

[19] My Old Latin sources are, for Genesis, *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron* (Freiburg: Herder, 1949-): II *Genesis*, ed. by B. Fischer (1951-54); for Joshua, P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum latinae uersiones antiquae seu uetus Italica*, 3 vols (Rheims: Franciscum Didot, 1743-79): I. If I cite directly from specific patristic writers, they are referenced separately. My Greek source is *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. by A. Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Privilegierte württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

[20] There is no substantial evidence that the text as it reached C had been subject to any revision process with reference to a Vulgate text.

[21] LB's *Chaldea* is presumably in apposition with Ur, signifying 'in Chaldea'; C renders, as in the Vulgate, with a genitive noun: 'of the Chaldeans'.

[22] Jost, too, envisaged transmissional corruption, on the grounds that Abraham, being of far more importance than Lot, would certainly have been named in 11.31 in Ælfric's original version; 'Unechte Ælfrictexte', pp. 195-96.

[23] 'Agar, then, bore a son to Abram, and called him Ismael'; *The Old Testament Newly Translated from the Latin Vulgate by Mgr Ronald A. Knox at the Request of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, I, Genesis–Esther* (London: Burns and Oates, 1949).

[24] At the ellipsis, the OE amplifies with a reference to God's having closed the door of the ark.

[25] C omits 7 and has *diden* for *didon*.

[26] Vulgate corruption of the passage is rare but not unheard of; one eighth-century Vulgate manuscript had plural *filios suos* originally, before correction to the singular. *Biblia Sacra* I, s.v.

[27] The ellipsis in 13.1 shows where I have, for convenience, omitted the clause *7 farao se cyning him funde ladmen*, which the translator has incorporated from the last verse of the previous chapter. The OE versions are more or less the same, except that C omits *soðlice*.

[28] The OE order 'gold and silver' occurs occasionally in Vulgate manuscripts.

[29] 'Unechte Ælfrictexte', p. 198. See *In Genesim*, III, ed. by C. W. Jones, CCSL, 118A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), p. 178.

[30] 'Καὶ Λὼτ τῷ συμπορευομένῳ μετὰ "Αβραμ ἦν πρόβατα, καὶ βόες, καὶ σκηναί.'

[31] The citation is from a fifth-century palimpsest; see *Genesis*, ed. by Fischer, p. 159. Ambrose, in his *De Abraham*, II, has simply 'et Loth qui ambulabat cum Abraham erant oues et boues et tabernacula' (ed. by C. Schenkl, CSEL, 32.1 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1896), p. 581). Each renders the Septuagint's simple conjunction at the start of the clause as *et*, where Jerome would use a pointed *sed et*.

[32] I have traced no Old Latin citations of the full passage. The Septuagint is less explicit than the Hebrew, but cause and effect are still implicit.

[33] See R. Davidson, *Genesis 12–50* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 52-53.

[34] Harry M. Orlinsky, *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969), p. 90.

[35] Respectively, ed. by B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL, 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), p. 530 ('ab omni filio alieno qui non est de semine tuo'), and ed. by J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 12 (Paris: 1862), 903C ('ab omnibus filiis alienigenarum qui non est ex semine tuo').

[36] The *Nova Vulgata* restores the Hebrew sense.

[37] *Aurelii Augustini Opera V*, ed. by I. Fraipont, CCSL, 33 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), p. 15.

[38] In Genesis 47. 10, Latin 'benedicto rege' is wrongly translated as '7 se cining hine bletsode'. The subject is indeed *rege* but *benedicto* is a passive perfect infinitive, giving us 'the king having been blessed'. Jacob blesses the king, Pharaoh, before leaving him; for Pharaoh to bless Jacob would be odd indeed.

[39] Jerome's version is restored, however, in the *Nova Vulgata*.

[40] F. Brown and others, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906; corr. repr. 1951), s.v. 'Shekel', like OE *entse* or *yndse* (ultimately from Latin *uncia*), can in fact be used to denote a piece of money, as well as a measurement of weight.

[41] Julius Zupitza, *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar: Erste Abteilung: Text und Varianten*, Sammlung englischer Denkmäler, 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1880; repr. with intro. by H. Gneuss, 1966), 314.6-7.

[42] The conjectured early form is **doluc*; F. Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: 1934), s.v. There is an Old Irish cognate, *delg*, 'thorn', 'shoulder clasp', and various modern Celtic equivalents.

[43] Zupitza, *Grammatik*, 44.3 and 303.16.

[44] C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), s.v.

[45] The first is in the part of the glossary (in fact, a collection of glossaries) which is in British Library, Additional 32246, on fol. 15v; the second is in the part now in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 32. The glosses are ed. by L. Kindschi, 'The Latin-Old English Glossaries in Plantin-Moretus 32 and British Museum Ms. Additional 32246' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Stanford, 1956).

[46] Zupitza, *Grammatik*, 303.14-17.

[47] R. Cleasby and G. Vigfusson, *An Icelandic–English Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), s.v. See also n. 42.

[48] *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. by H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1954-2001), s.v. The last use noted by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), is in 1488. The Toronto OE *Corpus* records one occurrence of *dalc* in a compound, *steordalce*, 'steering-pin/helm', in a glossary where the Latin lemma is *clauo*.

[49] Additional 32246, fol. 15v. It is in a batch of ornament-words which is clearly related to that in Ælfric's *Glossary*. Of interest also is *fibula. preon. uel oferfeng*, on fol. 13r.

[50] The manuscripts are Brussels, Royal Library 1650, with Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 190 (Salle, iii.55), with text and gloss contemporary, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 146, with text copied at the end of the tenth century. On the Canterbury connection, see Scott Gwara, *Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de Virginitate cum glosa latina atque anglosaxonica*, 2 vols, CCSL, 124-124A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), I, 94-101.

[51] Cited from *Prosa de Virginitate*, II, 714-16; see also Rudolf Ehwald, *Aldhelmi Opera*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auct. Antiq., 15 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919), pp. 313-14. Two other manuscripts have glosses to *legulam*, with *7 bulan* and *.i. fibulam oferfeng*; *Prosa de Virginitate*, II, 716. OE *bul* or *bula* is another OE word meaning 'bracelet/necklace/brooch' (from Latin *bulla*).

[52] Translation based on M. Lapidge and M. Herren, *Aldhelm: The Prose Works* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1979), p. 124.

[53] In one of those used by Gwara, from twelfth-century Northumbria, is it corrected (presumably after reference to a Vulgate text) to *regulam*; see *Prosa de Virginitate*, II, 717. Some eighty manuscripts of the work survive, but Ehwald used only sixteen for his edition (see n. 51).

[54] Lewis and Short define *legula* as 'flap' or 'ear-flap'. In *A Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, Vol. 1 A–L*, ed. by R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975-97), definitions of *legula* (or *ligula*) include 'buckle', 'strap', 'lace', 'garter' and 'metal band'.

[55] *In Jesu Naue*, 7, 7, where the treasure is *lingua aurea*; *Patrologia Graeca*, 12, ed. by J. P. Migne (Paris: 1862), 863B.

[56] On the dating of the work, see Gwara, *Prosa de Virginitate*, I, 47-55.

[57] Gwara, *Prosa de Virginitate*, II, 719.

[58] *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*, ed. by J. D. Pheiffer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 582, and note.

[59] Pheiffer, *Épinal-Erfurt*, 582n; see also note, p. 97. Part of the Cleopatra Glossary transmits more glosses from Aldhelm's *De uirginitate*, and here *legulam* in interpreted simply as *hringan*.

[60] 'Fibulae sunt quibus pectus feminarum ornatur uel pallium tenetur a uiris in humeris seu cingulum in lumbis'; *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum siue Originum Libri XX*, 2 vols, ed. by W. M. Lindsay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), II, 19.31.17.

[61] On the Royal Bible, see my *Text of the Old Testament*, pp. 321-78. There is no evidence that it was used by Ælfric, or by other contributors to the *Heptateuch*. The Codex Amiatinus (c. 700) is the only other Anglo-Saxon witness to the Latin text of Joshua; it has *regula*.

[62] In a repetition of the reference in Joshua 7. 24, however (not rendered in the OE), *regulam* has not been altered. On the corrector of Royal, see Teresa Webber, 'Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066–1109*, ed. by R. Eales and R. Sharpe (London: Hambledon, 1995), pp. 145-58 (pp. 155-56), and my *Text of the Old Testament*, p. 326.

[63] Zupitza, *Grammatik*, 314.6–7.

[64] In a glossary in Additional 32246 (fol. 7r), *legula* is interpreted thus: *uel coclea* ['snail/snail-shell/spiral'] *uel cocle* [?] *metesticca* ['spoon'].

[65] According to the chronology of Ælfric's works suggested by Peter Clemoes, the maximum distance between the two texts would be ten years; he assigns both to the period 992 x 1002, with Joshua among the last to be composed; 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by P. A. M. Clemoes (London: Bowes & Bowes, 1959), pp. 212-47; corrected reprint in *Old English Newsletter, Subsidia 5* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York Press, 1980), at pp. 16, 32 and 33-34.