Introduction

M. J. Toswell

In November 2009, The Dictionary of Old English Project housed at the University of Toronto in Ontario marked a significant milestone, making available a new online version of its highly useful Corpus of Old English produced in and disseminated from Toronto. The *DOE Corpus* joined the *DOE: A to G* in being available online from the Robarts Library at the University of Toronto, at home in Canada. Having both the first eight letters of the *Dictionary* proper, available since 2007, and also now the easily searchable Corpus, which is the database from which the Dictionary entries are developed, means that the Dictionary project has achieved a level of transparency and accessibility still rare in the scholarly world.[1] Since there are but twenty-two letters in the Old English alphabet, the Dictionary has, even by the rawest of reckonings, published about one-third of its entries. In truth, the Project is rapidly closing in on the halfway point, and given the efficiency and foresight of its organizers, work has already been done that will make future entries less onerous. For example, headwords have already been lemmatized (lemmatization is the assignment of spellings to a headword) through to the letter *R*. Entries have also been drafted for many words occurring later in the alphabet, mostly for compounds formed on words already published or in draft. Entries are far advanced for the massive letter *H*, the second largest letter in the Old English alphabet (*S* is the largest), and are equally well in hand for

---

[1] The Project's website at <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca> provides access to additional research tools as well as further details on other aspects, including subscriptions.

Florilegium, vol. 26 (2009): 1-14. © *Florilegium*

the vexed vowels *I/Y* and for *L*. In fact, fully sixty percent of the writing of headwords in the dictionary is complete, a remarkable accomplishment. For confirmed Dictionary-watchers such as I, this means that the prospect is good of having the *DOE* suddenly arrive at what we would all recognize as the halfway point — the letter *M* — with a sudden leap and bound through the intervening letters. That will be a truly intoxicating lexicographical moment.

Admittedly, the project has not always had such smooth lexicographical sailing. The first fascicle of the Dictionary published was the letter *D*, chosen because it was not a vowel, did not have prefixed forms, and did not have a high proportion of terms borrowed from Latin. The project rolled along from there in reverse, moving through *C*, *B*, *Æ*, and *A*, but for a decade now it has been steaming directly ahead, updating not just each new release of a tool or ancillary document, but actually overhauling and revising entries in every letter published so far every time a new letter emerges. The process is necessarily laborious, but it means that each iteration of the Dictionary is a substantial step forward from the last, and the final step is unlikely to need — as most Dictionary projects do — shifting the engine back into reverse to clear up and correct past entries. When *The Dictionary of Old English* publishes its last fascicle, its work will genuinely be complete, and its architects and artisans will genuinely be able to pull away from their computer screens and manuscript facsimiles and books and enjoy the well-deserved plaudits.

Much has been made of the efficiency and perspicacity of the organizers and researchers at The Dictionary of Old English Project, and deservedly so. E. G. Stanley offers a brief recapitulation of the most important early event in his foreword to this collection. Moreover, several essay collections and individual papers over the years have responded to and worked with the *DOE Corpus* and with the fascicles available to date in order to put into context the accomplishments and possibilities of the new meanings, new organizations of meanings for well-known words, new words, new syntactic analyses, and even occasionally an old word that is discarded as no longer part of the corpus.[2] Some of these essays have been critical of the new dictionary's particular choices in approach and in detail, which is as it should be: scholarship should never be easy or unquestioned. Nonetheless, even the papers critical of the Dictionary on a particular point laud its remarkable inclusivity, its direct links to the *Oxford English Dictionary* and its astounding accomplishment in keeping ahead of the startling shifts in internet technology so that it remains perhaps the easiest dictionary to access and use intuitively, requiring almost no checking about how to find a particular entry or conduct a particular boolean search. Moreover, no one who has worked with a dictionary entry and sent in a query, or visited at the Dictionary project in Toronto, can possibly come away less than awed by the learning and clarity of exposition possessed by those researching and writing this Dictionary, and cheered by their good nature and absolute willingness to help other scholars in every possible way.[3] This is an accomplishment for the ages; and yet we are still slow to dig into the riches that the Dictionary project is making available to us. Scholars still refer to the arcane richnesses of the Bosworth-Toller Dictionary (and our students are especially fond of its recent online incarnation)[4] rather than search for the latest and most up-to-date analysis of a particular word in Old English. This includes scholars of literature, language, and lexicography, that is, the Anglo-Saxonists who know best what the new project can offer to them.[5] Nonetheless, in many cases, that latest and most thoughtful analysis is genuinely available and offers untapped new richnesses because of all the many new editions of Old English texts it can draw on, together with the first editions of previously unknown or unedited materials. The *DOE* entries also clarify or correct or warn about some views traditionally held and, with additional evidence, confirm others.

---

[2] See, for example, the collections by Bammesberger, ed., *Problems of Old English Lexicography*; Toswell, ed., *The Dictionary of Old English: Retrospects and Prospects*; and Healey and Kiernan, eds., *Making Sense: Constructing Meaning in Early English*. The Dictionary project has been transparent about its decision-making and goals: see Cameron et al., eds., *Computers and Old English Concordances*; Frank and Cameron, eds., *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*; and the annual reports of the Dictionary circulated to all scholars in the field. Among these in particular is the clarity and spare elegance of Helmut Gneuss's advice in "Guide to the Editing and Preparation of Texts."

It is to be hoped that we are now arriving at what the Canadian scholar Malcolm Gladwell would call a "tipping point," the point at which the scattered uses of the Dictionary to be found in the work of those who have discovered this wonderful tool and started to use it ahead of the curve will suddenly coalesce into a joyous embrace of this material and a new bringing together of the possibilities in all fields of the subject.[6] This is to be hoped for. If the papers in this volume can bring that tipping point any closer, that would be all to the good. The scholars contributing to this collection were given a very vague rubric to engage with The Dictionary of Old English Project, either to address completed fascicles or materials such as the *Corpus* or to offer advice on future entries, either to comment on how the Dictionary materials change and alter our perception of features of the Anglo-Saxon world or to use the Dictionary materials to explore some aspect of that material, either to consider the Dictionary itself as a digital project or an entity grounded in lexicographical history or to analyse a field of vocabulary or syntax and consider how it had been treated in the various lexicographical tools now available. They responded to these open-ended instructions with very useful and very varied papers.

---

[3] One recent article which demonstrates this point is Shea, "Violent but Charming," published in the house journal of the National Endowment for the Humanities, from which the Dictionary has obtained grants every two years since 1991 (with one grant for three years mixed in).

[4] See the downloadable Bosworth-Toller application developed by Ondrej Tichy at <http://bosworth toller-dictionary-application.ondrej-tichy.downloadsoftware4free.com/>.

[5] See, perhaps in one of its final appearances in annotation, Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1898); Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Supplement* (1921); and Campbell, *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda* (1972).

The first three papers in this volume (by Robert Fulk, Peter Stokes, and Michiko Ogura) consider the terrain, the background against which some of the ideological and practical decisions of the Dictionary project were made, and assess their continuing impact. Most people pick up a dictionary to look up a word and its possible meanings; this remains true even for a dictionary which addresses a language as far removed from the modern day as Old English. However, dictionaries contain extensive further information, some of it coded in the way in which the word is presented (its spelling, the existence or non-existence of nonce words or artificial words created by scholars as root forms that seem the most likely) and in what some might call the technical details of the entry — and what others might well term the most important background information. Although dictionaries purport to address only semantics, they also have little choice but to analyse the syntax and usage of many of the words they include. Robert Fulk addresses some of these questions for issues of morphology in Old English from two points of view: one as the scholar finishing a book for linguists and philologists on the details of Old English grammar, and the other as an interested and engaged user of the Dictionary, both for the glossary in the new edition of Klaeber's *Beowulf* and for other, more general considerations of Old English language issues. As a learned philologist, Fulk finds the modern separation of philology from linguistics steadily more disturbing and uses examples from the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* to examine the effects of this continuing continental drift. While completing the second volume of Richard Hogg's *Grammar of Old English* (which is now at press, Hogg having published the first volume on phonology in

---

[6] Gladwell, *The Tipping Point*.

1992 and begun the work on the second volume, on morphology), Fulk encountered both the lack of etymological information provided in the entries and also the decision, taken early and firmly held by the Dictionary editors and their advisors, to use late West Saxon, preferably Ælfrician, spellings for headwords. The choice of late West Saxon as embodying some kind of general standard of practical usage means that the more transparent spellings of early West Saxon, spellings which allow deductions as to earlier spellings, and later ones, are gone. Moreover, as Fulk points out, the choice of late West Saxon obscures the ways in which Anglian spellings appear, particularly in anonymous texts. In short, he suggests, the decision to use a late West Saxon standard, which can lead to unattested or lightly attested spellings being chosen as headwords, springs from a belief that this version of the language, the one used by Ælfric, is somehow more authentic. As to etymology, Fulk argues that including it is not simply necessary for semantic purposes but also for morphology and syntax, offering examples of particular words for which a greater sense of the historical roots of the etymon would have disambiguated the senses, and noting that the Dictionary in fact maintains a historical classification of nouns, somewhat masked by a numbering system. He concludes that the Dictionary, like many other modern tools for language study, has moved so far towards linguistic approaches, which broadly speaking are synchronic, that it has in some places lost the clarity, in syntax, semantics, and morphology, that would derive from a knowledge of philology, the diachronic approach.

Peter Stokes picks up a point made by Fulk near the end of his article and addresses the pioneering work of the Dictionary as a digital entity. His paper assesses each stage of the Dictionary's engagement with computer technology, from the first decision proposed by Angus Cameron that the work begin not at the beginning of the alphabet, but with the exhausting work of creating a complete corpus (today some three thousand items comprising about four million words), through the many stages of computer technology to the present day. Stokes's concerns are in some ways as broad as Fulk's use of the Dictionary to engage with the gulf between philology and linguistics, in that he uses the Dictionary to assess how large digital projects in general can function and must structure themselves in order to achieve longevity. Working both from the published accounts and proposals and from the results of some discreet interrogation, Stokes tells the fascinating story of how the Dictionary project developed and re-developed its workstations, its corpus, the computer interfaces, and the materials it needed for its work. The story is an intriguing historiography, told by someone who understands the precise limitations of the computer technologies and explains them lucidly. Stokes then considers other major dictionary projects and their accomplishments with respect to digitization, before turning to the ways in which scholars are taking the Dictionary materials and reworking them for unforeseen (and sometimes foreseen) purposes. Here, his analysis focuses on the Corpus rather than the Dictionary itself and considers the remarkable longevity occasioned by the constant upgrades and good early decisions, comments briefly that the Dictionary itself is currently not in compliance with TEI-P5 (Text Encoding Initiative) standards,[7] and considers how the Corpus can be used to reconstruct a manuscript or to investigate a correspondence of ideas or expressions in two texts. The absence of complete lemmatization of the Corpus remains a difficulty in his view, but one completely comprehensible given the problems of disambiguating variant spellings, different editorial practices, scribal usages, and homonyms. In other words, Stokes recognizes the same difficulties of usage and practice highlighted by Fulk from the point of view of a philologist, but comes to them as a computer-savvy Old English specialist who wants to investigate manuscripts and find parallel usages.

Comparing the Dictionary's accomplishments to those of other digital corpora is part of Stokes's project; comparing some entries with corresponding ones in other corpora and historical dictionaries which allow her both to determine the strengths and weakness of the syntactic approach of the *DOE* and to study a particular word over time and compare its presentation in several different research tools is the project of Michiko Ogura's investigation of the syntactic implications of a group of verbs for the emotions taken from the published fascicles of the *Dictionary*. Like Fulk and Stokes, Ogura explores the limitations of the Dictionary's materials, and endeavours to determine how much scholars of historical syntax can trust the presentation of these issues. However, where Fulk finds limitations and difficulties, Ogura often discovers that the *Dictionary* has a particularly felicitous layout or has chosen exactly the right quotation to demonstrate a particularly fine gradation of sense — always of special importance when it comes to verbs referring to the emotions. By engaging the Dictionary material with other dictionaries of English and looking at the slippages and changes in meaning, Ogura places Old English words in the wider context of language change and historical linguistics. Interestingly, she also finds at least one case in which she searches for manuscript variants not available in the Dictionary or the Corpus, demonstrating — as do both Stokes and Fulk — that scholarly knowledge (and a nose for further checking) remains a necessary feature of research, even in the digital age of these high-quality tools. As someone who has published extensively on the syntax of Old and Early Middle English, and recently on verbs of emotion in particular, Ogura is extremely well placed to assess the merits of the Dictionary's presentation of this material and demonstrate the ways in which it can interact and be compared with the products of other major scholarly initiatives in the fields of historical syntax and lexicography.

---

[7] To be clearer, the Dictionary is not in compliance with the TEI-P5 standards simply because those standards are insufficiently refined, but the Corpus is in compliance.

Similar scholarly acumen is demonstrated by Christopher A. Jones, with whose paper the collection shifts into a different mode — that of advice to the Dictionary with respect to future entries, in Jones's case by way of developing a new approach to the field of ecclesiastical vocabulary which refers to the cult of saints. In some ways his paper demonstrates the work that the Dictionary editors must do in order to determine the relevant links and analogues for a particular term or group of terms. Jones begins with a detailed consideration of the Latin context of saints' cults, clarifying some of the more complex issues of the attitudes to relics in the early medieval period and the vocabulary used for them. Relics could be corporeal or non-corporeal, the relics themselves or the vessels holding them, with access holes for people to reach in and touch the body or object or closed receptacles (more common in the earlier period, since the practice of showing the relics was a later one). The Old English terms for relics are varied; Jones deals initially with some rather special instances, including a new way of thinking about *mundbyrd* in *Dream of the Rood* line 130, before turning to the more common terms and organizing them both in lexicographical and historical/archaeological patterns of usage. Along the way, Jones essentially demonstrates the kind of work that the Dictionary editors engage in every day (although they sometimes cannot complete their analysis of a single word, simply because they can advance understanding of a given lexeme only so far before duty obliges them to turn to the next one). Jones here traces loanwords and loan-translations, considers the possible confusion of the relics being generalized simply as holy objects, and enunciates the precise distinctions in meaning of *haligdom*. He sorts and distinguishes the attestations from the more general sense of "holiness" to a more specific reference to relics, especially a relic-collection or a relic treasury in its place, a holy place or sanctuary. Along the way, all previous attempts at defining the term are corrected and clarified (more the former than the latter). The paper ranges broadly over ecclesiastical and even architectural history, with an excursus into oath-swearing over relic collections and a discussion of relics as treasure for kings and nobles (and worth searching for and obtaining by fair means or foul) and of the way in which relics functioned as treasure — something which became a source of disease at its treatment of relics as a social and fiscal good rather than a spiritual one. Thus, having begun with crosses and relics as markers of a kind of tactile spirituality, Jones finishes the paper with King Harold burying a relic-collection with words that suggest his understanding of the relics themselves as both literal and metaphorical treasure, as container and contained.

Although the content is very different, a similar trajectory marks Michael Fox's consideration of objects carried by the devil in a very wide range of early medieval texts, all returning home to the question of the meaning of two tricky Old English words: *feðerhama* and *hæleðhelm* from that equally tricky and fascinating poem, *Genesis B*. Where Jones moves from history and ecclesiastical history to social history and liturgy, Fox traverses the textual history of the Old Saxon predecessor to *Genesis B* and its close relationship to *The Heliand*, flying Norse gods, devils and incantations, early Christian Latin texts, classical mythology, commentaries on astronomy, iconographic analysis, and more. He starts with the *DOE* entry on *feðerhama*, noting that it provides a range of quotations and the crucial indicator that the relevant Latin word is *talaria*, but offers additional references and connections; for *hæleðhelm*, he works out the relevant range of quotations and discovers that the referents carry the analysis not into the classical mythology of the feather-cloak but into biblical stories of figures travelling encloaked in darkness. Fox demonstrates how the clues in an existing entry can serve as a starting-point; the endpoint (or at least a longer stop on the way) can be one of the manuscript copies of Hyginus's commentary on astronomy found in England, a copy made in the second quarter of the ninth century in Lotharingia which has an illustration that may be the closest we will ever come to seeing a picture of the feather-cloak of shape-changing and the helmet of invisibility.

Words and their meanings in the thorny world of poetry also interest Murray McGillivray, with whose paper the volume shifts into a final mode of assessment of the Dictionary and its contributions: how does the work produced so far by the Dictionary project, including all of its research tools but especially the central component of the *Dictionary* fascicles, change previous thinking about various aspects of Anglo-Saxon England? That is, how is the Dictionary's work affecting some of our cherished assumptions and how can it be deployed to aid scholars in their work? The authors of the final four papers in this volume all address aspects of this issue — Murray McGillivray in terms of some of the cruces in *Genesis A*; Jane Roberts with respect to how two different prose versions of the Guthlac story are connected to each other and to a common source, deploying the Dictionary to aid in textual recension and manuscript study; Sally Crawford concerning the ways in which Old English vocabulary usage can aid archaeologists as they decode graves and mortuary rituals in Anglo-Saxon England; and Inge Milfull for the healthy and productive interactions between The Dictionary of Old English Project and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, based on the exchanges of information and approach that have already taken place between the two projects.

McGillivray begins his paper with an original and telling observation, that the break-point between *G* and *H* has a long and essentially unpleasant history in Old English studies and that the Dictionary project's successful navigation of that difficult shoal will be an important moment in lexicography. He offers a more personal consideration of how an individual scholar was once obliged to search with different criteria in mind depending on which scholar's work was being used, and how research into word meanings and usages now has a wholly different valence. More specifically, he considers seven interesting and much-disputed words in *Genesis A*, part of a longer-term project for web editions that he is engaged in, as elucidated in the fascicles of the *Dictionary* already published. His assessment of the work that he has done himself as against the Dictionary conclusions for each of these seven words reveals that in some cases McGillivray found additional pieces of information that might inflect the Dictionary's revisions, in some cases the Dictionary had provided clues that McGillivray could follow, and in some cases the two authorities disagreed on a particular interpretation or approach. Thus, McGillivray's engagement with the *Dictionary* fascicles was productive and wholly scholarly, a successful enterprise that demonstrated how scholars — particularly editors — will be making use of this resource and engaging with it.

In the next contribution, Jane Roberts, like McGillivray, Fox, and Jones, is also interested primarily in determining the semantic range and meaning for a particular word in a particular context, making use of the Dictionary and other research tools — although in her case with the added purpose of using this consideration to determine the relationship between two Old English prose texts. Like McGillivray, she also constructs her methodology in more general terms, approaching from yet another angle the question of the Dictionary's history and development. Roberts begins her article by discussing how one of the earlier publications of the Dictionary, the *Corpus*, provided her own massive scholarly project, *A Thesaurus of Old English*, an opportunity to upgrade its referencing system and, in ways reminiscent of Stokes's analysis of the Dictionary project, she recalls how that project developed and functioned. She then turns to texts telling the well-known story of Guthlac, an earlier scholarly concern of hers as editor of the two Guthlac poems in Old English, but this time her concern is with two prose versions which both derive from the same source: the longer version of the Old English prose life of Guthlac and Vercelli Homily XXIII, which parallels the long version for its central section, the two texts being clearly different recensions of the same original translation. By looking at the *hapax legomena*, the unique vocabulary, in the two texts and also considering the Anglian words and non-West Saxon features of the texts, Roberts is able to compare and contrast the two late West Saxon versions of the prose Guthlac and determine the relationship between them, separated by a century in time but both translated from a ninth-century original with affinities to Worcester. She is even able to identify, as a side note, a new source for the Harley Glossary, based on a clue from the quantity of Latin references provided by the Dictionary.

The ways in which those in the field of archaeology might be able to make use of the Dictionary, or might find some of their conclusions revised or revisited, is the remit of Sally Crawford, who reviews the functions of mortuary ritual in Anglo-Saxon England and explores how the surviving vocabulary of status and of material culture can cast light on these semiotically charged rituals. She describes the burial ritual as itself invested with social meaning, since the level of investment of time, energy, and wealth reveals attitudes both to death and to the individual in the society; mortuary ritual is, she notes anthropologically, a set of performances in and around the body. The Dictionary offers very useful insights; if one were tempted to see an old or broken object in a grave either as a significant personal possession or as something no longer valuable, then the connotations of *eald* with respect to material culture would show less respect for age, for example. Similarly, although the burial muniments do not offer items exclusive to children, which might give rise to the question whether the concept of childhood existed, the surviving vocabulary suggests otherwise. Old age is more clearly differentiated in the graves, but in ways that accord with surviving textual evidence. The location of graves within the landscape also reflects the extensive but precise language of landscape in Old English, reflecting recent scholarship on how topographical features gain particular cultural value.

Crawford notes the ways in which archaeologists will be able to use, unusually for them, lexical evidence to buttress conclusions about whether a given landscape feature such as a hill or spring might suggest a sacred site, for example.

Finally, Inge Milfull offers the perspective of an Old English specialist who is an entry-writer for the revisions to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. She compares the approaches and preconceptions of the two projects from that point of view, before turning to some specific examples illustrating how completion of the two projects will permit scholars a comprehensive picture of word history and usage in English. She clarifies the amount of overlap between the letters of the alphabet that the two projects are currently focusing on and notes that what had been a relatively small amount of overlap is now steadily increasing. She also compares the amount and presentation of etymological and morphological information in the entries of the two dictionaries, reflecting Fulk in her comments on the specifically synchronic nature of the *DOE* presentation and its preference for late West Saxon spellings. The comparison of entries also encompasses occurrences and usage. For her detailed consideration of the ways in which the *DOE* has been a resource to the *OED*, she focuses on the fascinating terms “British” and “English,” much discussed by historians but still not fully understood, and elucidates how the *DOE* entry inspired the *OED3* editors to rework theirs though the two entries maintain their quite different but complementary approaches. Along the way, Milfull notes the prescience of the *DOE* in choosing to base itself systematically on a complete corpus, a practice which is vindicated by the dependence of linguistics in the present day on corpus-linguistic methods, and to provide an extensive listing of attested spellings, given that graphemics is itself now a fully developed field of language study. With her paper the collection in some ways comes full circle, since — as do McGillivray, Roberts, Fulk, and Stokes — Milfull engages with the structural and historiographical issues of the dictionary but also — as do Fox, Jones, Crawford, and Ogura — with semantic and philological details and their interpretation.

In speeches and presentations to Canadian audiences, Antonette diPaolo Healey commonly describes The Dictionary of Old English Project as “Canada’s contribution to the history of the English language.” She notes that the United Kingdom produced and continues to produce the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which is explicitly built upon historical principles, and that the United States completed the *Middle English Dictionary* about a decade ago. As the longtime director of the Dictionary, she is obliged to somehow balance very short perspectives — today’s word, or lexical element, or lemmatization — with very long perspectives about the steady progress of the Dictionary towards completion and the need constantly to update technology so as not to fall behind in the interest of just finishing the project. She handles those extremely disparate perspectives with consummate ease and somehow also manages the delicate touch for fundraising as well. We are lucky, in Canada and the world, to have Antonette diPaolo Healey at the helm of the Dictionary. Toni Healey was also an early and vocal promoter of the Canadian Society of Medievalists / Société canadienne des médiévistes, giving one of the three plenaries at the Society's first meeting during the Learneds Congress at Carleton University in May/June 1993 and attending its meetings when possible ever since. Now that *Florilegium* is well established as the home journal of Canadian medievalists, it seems particularly appropriate that these papers appear in this journal, reminding Canadian scholars of medieval studies and their colleagues around the globe that the riches to be mined in this country include intellectual knowledge as well as the resources of the Canadian Shield and of the waters of the Arctic. Moreover, the riches offered by the *Dictionary of Old English* will be the more easily discovered and appreciated than the apparently more concrete wealth of the Alberta oil sands or Labrador hydro — within a few years, I predict, scholars who do not use the *Dictionary* for their research will be the object of scorn and ridicule, rather like the poor Mermedonians in *Andreas* who are so blinkered by past custom and practice that they cannot fathom any change in their diet, so when they lose the prisoners who were to provide dinner, they draw lots among themselves.[8] Those of us who do begin our research with the *Dictionary* will, of course, be *heofonenglas* and true *boceras*.

The most striking feature of a dictionary's progress, unlike that of many other scholarly projects (even in the present day of funding applications and progress reports and evaluations), is that it can be measured with startling exactitude. A fixed number of words can be lemmatized, entries drafted, entries reviewed and revised, pages copy-edited and in final layout, and so forth. The fascicles can march onto the computer screen in an orderly and straightforward way, so that to the eye of the onlooker, a dictionary is a curiously bloodless performance given the clarity and absolute precision of its presentation. And yet this is not at all true. A dictionary reaches for the very highest possible scholarly standards, sifting every previous comment or decision on a particular word and its usage, searching for cognates and analogues, reaching for new interpretations and discarding them as fanciful or not wholly convincing, and rediscovering past interpretations which continue to have merit and may have been discarded improperly. It is patient and deeply difficult work, and the scholars of Anglo-Saxon England need to remember the names of the editors, past and present, who are so carefully and exigently bringing the *Dictionary of Old English* into being:[9] Angus Cameron†, Ashley Crandell Amos†, Antonette diPaolo Healey, Joan Holland, Sharon Butler†, David McDougall, Ian McDougall, Nancy Speirs, Pauline Thompson, Christine Franzen, Nancy Porter (Stork), Brenda Cornell, Robert Millar, Alex Nicholls, and Dorothy Haines.

---

[8] *Andreas*, ll. 1067-1134, in Brooks, ed., *Andreas and The Fates of the Apostles*.

University of Western Ontario

---

[9] Left out here is the remarkable administrative staff of the Dictionary, the computer programmers who were guided by Richard Venezky in keeping the Dictionary wholly *au courant* with every change in relevant technology and internet thinking, and the international editors who read and commented on every entry. Their contribution is integral, but sometimes lost in the urge to be inclusive is the recognition of the stalwart few who have faced the unknown mysteries of each word in turn, burrowing in carrels and digging through manuscript facsimiles and building patterns of meaning (and then tearing the structure apart and rebuilding).

Bibliography

Bammesberger, Alfred, ed. *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1985.

Bosworth, Joseph, and T. Northcote Toller. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* [. . .] *Edited and Enlarged by T. Northcote Toller*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1898.

Bosworth-Toller Dictionary Application. Developed by Ondrej Tichy. Downloadable at <http://bosworthtoller-dictionary-application.ondrej-tichy.downloadsoftware4free.com/>.

Brooks, Kenneth R., ed. *Andreas and The Fates of the Apostles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Cameron, Angus, Roberta Frank, and John Leyerle, eds. *Computers and Old English Concordances*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1970.

Campbell, Alistair. *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement by T. Northcote Toller. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* [. . .]. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.

Frank, Roberta, and Angus Cameron, eds. *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973.

Fulk, R. D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Corrected repr. of the 4th ed. (2008). Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2009.

Gladwell, Malcolm. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown, 2000.

Gneuss, Helmut. "Guide to the Editing and Preparation of Texts for the Dictionary of Old English." In *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, edited by Roberta Frank and Angus Cameron, 9-24. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973. Repr. in *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, edited by D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach, 7-26. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994.

Healey, Antonette diPaolo, and Kevin Kiernan, eds. *Making Sense: Constructing Meaning in Early English*. Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 7. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2007.

Hogg, Richard M. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 1, *Phonology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

——— and R. D. Fulk. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 2, *Morphology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Shea, Ammon. "Violent but Charming: The *Dictionary of Old English* Explores the Brutality and Elegance of Our Ancestral Tongue." *Humanities: A Magazine of the National Endowment for the Humanities* 31, no. 1 (2010): 1-6. Available at <http://www.neh.gov/news/humanities/2010-01/OldEnglish.html>, accessed 1 March 2010.

Toswell, M. J., ed. *The Dictionary of Old English: Retrospects and Prospects*. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 26. Kalamazoo, Mich.: The Medieval Institute, 1998.