Like all responsible Anglo-Saxonists, I use Toronto Dictionary of Old English (DOE) materials heavily. Indeed, as long ago as 1989 Ashley Amos and Toni Healey sent me a CD-ROM version of their files, some years ahead of the first public release of the Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form database, which we now take so much for granted; thus, I have benefited from access to their electronic files for a long time now. The arrival of the CD led to a decision that delayed publication of the Thesaurus of Old English, a pilot-study for the Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary.\textsuperscript{1} With the possibility of running checks on the words and meanings taken from standard dictionaries of Old English, it also became possible to supply the thesaurus entries with a minimal flagging system: superscript o for hapax legomena, p for words found only in poetry, g for glosses, and q for dubious words. Checking for even these four flags was a time-consuming and problematic process, as we indicated in the Introduction to the \textit{TOE}.\textsuperscript{2} We toyed with adding various indications to this small group of flags to mark, for example, single forms found in multiple manuscripts, relative trustworthiness among types of glosses, or everyday elements within poetic compounds. Most compelling of all arguments against a more elaborated system of flagging was the state of the available dictionary resources. Except for the letters of the alphabet already edited by the DOE team, D (1986) and C (1988), the


\textsuperscript{2} Roberts and Kay, Introduction, \textit{TOE}, 1:xviii.
dictionaries were insufficient even for this level of detail, but with the help of the editorial materials of The Dictionary of Old English Project it was feasible to test for and apply the minimal flagging I proposed. Before the arrival of the CD-ROM files, use of the two sets of DOE microfiches (1980, 1985) was a cumbersome process suited only to the investigation of small amounts of data.

The checking had to be undertaken at King’s College, where the contents of the CD-ROM were installed on my desk computer. It rapidly became a hot desk, used not only by Lynne Grundy and myself but also by graduate students who queued up to consult the CD in odd moments when the room just happened to be empty.3 (That wasn’t often, given that the desk could not be used by others whenever I happened to have tutorials or be seeing students.) It was essential to have at hand, alongside the electronic files, the 1973 collection A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English, now unfortunately out of print, in order to identify the texts more rapidly than by trawling through the list of texts and editions supplied with the 1980 Microfiche Concordance — on the CD, texts were identified by their Cameron numbers unaccompanied by short titles.4 The database first released publicly in 2000 was a more sophisticated piece of software by far. Also invaluable was the Old English Word Studies volume,5 which so often yields useful bibliography for particularly intractable words. This panoply of tools was pressed into constant use alongside the older lexicographical resources that I had used in assembling the archive of Old English slips

3 Among the numerous King’s College London graduate students for whom the CD-ROM was an essential research tool over the next few years were Julie Coleman, Taro Ishiguro, Stuart Lee, Hiizu Moriyama, Edward Pettit, and Louise Sylvester. The DOE preface to F (2004) reports that Moriyama, now at Waseda University, did preliminary work on the form word-family, and Ishiguro, now at Meiji University, wrote a preliminary draft of forsan. Some of their dissertations and other publications resulting from their work on this project are listed in the bibliography below.

Lynne Grundy held research appointments in the Department of English at King’s (1989-1993), working with Christian Kay and me on the TOE alongside teaching Old English in Queen Mary College and Royal Holloway College. From 1993 to her early death in 1997, she worked in the Centre for Computing in the Humanities at King’s.

My thanks go to Janet Bately, then as now, for years of collaboration and illuminating discussion.


5 Cameron, Kingsmill, and Amos, Old English Word Studies (1983).
for the Historical Thesaurus project.⁶ There was a special field in the TOE database, in which we made notes on difficulties encountered and oddities spotted. Much of this material is available in the comments field of TOE Online (2005), which records information about sources and other discussion points. Its sporadic contents show that, of the four flags, o to identify nonce words was by far the most problematic to apply. For p we more or less followed the Toronto A category (poetry), and for g the C and D categories (glosses), i.e., the letters at the beginning of each Cameron number. We resorted to q to mark a dubious form only when unconvinced of its actual existence. With o, it was not just a matter of thinking up and checking for every possible spelling but of making quick decisions. If, for example, a putative nonce word looked suspiciously like the metaphoric extension of a form separately categorized in the dictionaries, we chose, for the most part, to follow authority. For example, since the older dictionaries gave us sceacga in the sense ‘hair’ as a separate word, we flagged og, although it may be no more than a figurative extension of sceacga ‘copse.’⁷ As we wrestled with the many instances where the need to decide on a flag or combination of flags made a decision necessary, we often wished for the chance to slow down, but all the time speculations popped up without time to pursue them. Was the first element of granwisc ‘chaff’ to be compared with granu ‘beard/whisker’? Were there really two separate roots for a storm lexical group (hryþig⁶, hweolripig, riscripig, (ge)rip(e), ripig) and for a fever lexical group (hriþ, hriþadl, hriþian, hriþing)? Or indeed why is the storm group assigned long vowels? And how satisfying that sharp points should be the focus of some of the words for pain (for example, two words more usually found with the meaning ‘spear,’ gar and spere, and the nonce word hildescur ‘shafts of pain’) as well perhaps of flah ‘treacherous, deceitful,’ or that smoothness then as now should be a questionable quality, accounting for glid(d)er in the sense “lascivious.”⁸

Most often, we longed to track words back to where they belong, in texts — which is why I have chosen, for this paper, to turn to the hapax legomena of two texts I worked on long ago, the Old English prose life of Guthlac and Vercelli Homily XXIII,⁹ in an attempt to discover what evidence they hold for the original translation from which they derive. I shall argue that the revisers whose work is seen in

---

⁶ Roberts, “On the Thesaurus of Old English” and “Towards an Old English Thesaurus.”
⁷ Roberts and Kay, A Thesaurus of Old English, 1:xxv.
⁸ See further Peters, “The Vocabulary of Pain,” 203-204.
⁹ Crawford [Roberts], “Guthlac: An Edition.”
the Old English prose life of St. Guthlac had a good sense of everyday words in their revisions of a translation made perhaps as early as the end of the ninth century. The remaining problems mainly concern the structuring of sentences. The longer of the two extant texts, a late West-Saxon copy dating from the late eleventh century, reflects an originally fuller version of Felix’s *Vita Guthlaci* that has undergone considerable revision and modernization. Preserved in London, British Library, Cotton MS Vespasian D. xxi, ff. 18-40, it has been edited twice: first, by Charles Wycliffe Goodwin, as long ago as 1848, with a facing translation; and second, by Paul Gonser, in 1909 (the edition presented in the *DOE Corpus*). Gonser was able to include the short tenth-century Vercelli Book homily XXIII that runs parallel with the central part of the Vespasian life, and he also supplies interesting editorial material he had published a year earlier as a separate monograph and a selection of comparative passages from the *Vita* in parallel with the text. Some eight or nine years later, Ida Geisel published a glossary keyed to Gonser’s edition, but it was not included in the 1966 reprint of Gonser’s text. Vercelli Homily XXIII has been edited separately three times, by Paul E. Szarmach, Herbert Pilch, and Donald Scragg. An identifiable strand of Anglian vocabulary runs through both the Guthlac life and homily, important evidence for the dialect affiliation of the original translation. My discussion of the Anglian words and other non-West Saxon features of the Guthlac life and homily, complementing the discussion of their hapax legomena, takes into account Robert D. Fulk’s new assessment of the non-West Saxon dialect features present in Old English homiletic writings. In my concluding comments, I shall also point to one of the less obvious benefits of the *DOE* database, namely, that in its sizeable amount of Latin material there resides information which can prompt serendipitous discoveries.

---

13 Fulk, “Anglian Dialect Features in Old English Anonymous Homiletic Literature.”
Hapax legomena in the Vespasian life of Guthlac and Vercelli Homily XXIII

Although the most striking non-West Saxon features of the Vespasian life of Guthlac and Vercelli Homily XXIII are lexical, the hapax legomena they contain also hold evidence for the original translation from which they derive. It is important, therefore, to examine them as a group and to seek out the differing clues they give both for the original making of the translation and for its transmission. The hapax legomena of the Vespasian life are discussed first (in the order nouns, adjectives, verbs), followed by those of the Vercelli homily.

For all Old English words beginning with A through G we now have the authoritative ruling of the DOE team (2007). That is the case with the noun *cnihtwise*, deployed once only, in an adverbial phrase to represent “pueriliter” (VitG xii):14

> LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.20 Mid þam þe seo yld com, þæt hit sprecan mihte æfter cnihtwisan, þonne wes he nawiht hefeg, ne unhyrsum his yldrum on wor-dum ne þam, þe hine feddon, nænigum oþþe yldran oþþe gingran.

> [LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.20 When the time came that he could talk as a little boy, he wasn’t at all rough or disobedient to his elders in speech or to any of those who cared for him, not to anyone, whether older or younger.]

So, too, we can be certain that the adjective *cnihtlic* occurs only in the Vespasian life, and that, because it appears twice in a single sentence, it is not technically a nonce word. The adjective is first pressed into service in translating the phrase “puerorum lascivias” (the naughtiness of boys) and soon afterwards to stand in for the backward-referring deictic of “illa aetas” (that age; VitG xii):

> LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.23 Ne he cnihtlice galnysse næs begangende, ne idele spellunge foliclicra manna, ne ungeliclice olæcunge, ne leaslicetunge; ne he mistlice <fugela> sangas ne wurþode, swa oft swa cnihtlicu yldo begæð, ac on his scearpnysse þæt he weox, and weard glæd on his ansyne, and hluttor and clæne on his mode, and bi­l­wite on his þeawum.

14 Throughout I cite Old English texts from the Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form, using the short titles employed in publications of The Dictionary of Old English Project; full bibliographical details may be found on the website of the Project, at <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/st/index.html>. The DOE Corpus draws on Gonser, ed., Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac, for the texts of both the Vercelli Homily XXIII and the Vespasian life, LS 10 (Guth) and LS 10.1 (Guth), respectively. Citations from Felix’s *Vita Guthlaci* (VitG) are taken from Colgrave, ed., Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
[LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.23 And he didn’t go in for childish temper tantrums or the idle chatter of common people or inappropriate flattery or lying and he didn’t imitate the various songs of birds (as is so often the practice at a childish age), but he grew in intelligence and became happy in face and transparent and pure in heart and innocent in his ways.]

Both words draw on elements still commonly used in forming English words. The adjective form was to appear again late in the fourteenth century, not with the meaning “boyish” but with all the connotations of chivalrousness that knight had by then acquired, and alongside it an adverb knightly. Otherwise, a single-form rendering of the concept boyish occurs only in the singleton gloss “hysewise” against hircitallo (CIGI 1 (Stryker) “Hircitallo hysewise”), an unusual Aldhelm word explained by the adjective beardleas in other glosses. Although cnihtwise remains unrecorded in later English, it points to the usefulness of -wise as a formative. Apparently then as now, -wise had the facility of forming parasynthetic compounds at will. Comparable adverbial phrases are on beagwisan ‘ring-wise, in rings,’ on hringwisan ‘ring-wise, in rings,’ on scipwisan ‘in form of a ship,’ on leodwisan ‘in verse, rhythmically,’ on munucwisan ‘monastically,’ on wilewisan ‘like a basket in texture.’

Felix’s heady description of the fenlands sparks off two nonce words in quick succession:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 3.3 hwilon sweart wætersteal, and hwilon fule earlipas yrnde.
(VitG xxiv: nunc stagnis, nunc flactris, interdum nigris fusi.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 3.3 sometimes dark standing water and sometimes foetid running streams of water.
(VitG xxiv: now with swamps, now with pools, sometimes with black mist-covered waters.])

The phrase “nunc flactris” is omitted by the DOE editors in citing phrases from Felix for comparison in their entry for ǣa-rīþ; I shall return to “flactris” at the end of this paper. The DOE hyphenated headword ǣa-rīþ ‘stream, rivulet’ prompts speculation that this word hovers uneasily between phrase (ea as a feminine noun could be possessive rather than attributive) and compound. With wætersteal ‘standing water, pool’ the constraints of Old English grammar require that it, too, be regarded as a compound, though again it could be said to hover between phrase and compound. Its make-up is transparent, and semantically it closely resembles a nonce formation meresteall that occurs in one of the Vercelli homilies: HomU 11 (ScraggVerc 7) 111
“on meresteallum wyrmas tyddað” (worms breed in standing pools). Stagnant waters help create the nightmarish locale haunted by demons. The passage also lists “and swylce eac manige ealand, and hreod, and beorhgas, and treowgewrido” (and many islands also and reeds and hills and thickets of trees) (VitG xxiv: “necon et crebbris insularum nemorumque” [and with thickly scattered islands and woods as well and intervening circuitous windings of river courses]), introducing reeds and hills alongside yet another hapax legomenon, treowgewrid ‘thicket of trees.’ (In introducing “beorhgas,” the passage resembles the Guthlac A poem.) Again, it is a compound transparent in make-up, its base-element wrid lasting into regional forms of later English (see OED under wride), and it is paralleled by a compound hæselwrid recorded in mid-tenth-century charter bounds: Ch 495 (Birch 792) 42 “to þam miclan hæsl wride” (to the big hazel thicket); Ch 495 (Birch 792) 43 “Of þam hæsl wride adun on þa blacan rixa” (From the hazel thicket down into the black rushes).

Also transparent in make-up is tintrehstow ‘place of torture’:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.178 and hi þa sona ealle þone halgan wer gelæddon to þam sweartum tintrehstowum, helleduru hi hine gebrohton.

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.178 and then straightaway they all took the holy man to the black torture-chambers of hell, they carried him to the doors of hell.]

This compound may not, however, have originated with the translator. Rather, it seems to reflect revision of earlier wording better preserved in the homily’s phrasing, where “gomum” answers more closely to Felix’s “fauces”:

LS 10 (Guth) 5.178 hie ða sona þone halgan wer gelæddon to ðam sweartum tintreges gomum helledures.

(VitG xxxi: supra memoratum Christi famulum Guthlac ad nefandas tartari fauces usque perducunt.)

[LS 10 (Guth) 5.178 then straightaway they took the holy man to the dark jaws of torture of the door of hell.

(VitG xxxi: they took the above-commemorated servant of Christ Guthlac right up to the hateful jaws of Tartarus.)]

Over time, the two reflexes of the translation have diverged considerably. For the use of goms in the figurative sense ‘the jaws of death, hell, etc.,’ see DOE, under gòma 2.a. All the examples illustrated are from the latter part of the tenth century: HomM 13 (ScraggVerc 21) 87 “of gomum þes ecen deaðes” (from the jaws of everlasting death), with Pembr. 25 34.41 “ab aeternè mortis faucibus” (from the jaws of everlasting death).
cited as the likely underlying Latin; Whale 71 “þa grimman goman” (the cruel jaws); and in a poetic compound at ChristC 1544 “frecnum feorhomun” (with terrible fatal jaws). There appear to be no later instances of this figurative usage, and it may already have felt strange to the Vespasian reviser, which could explain why he resorts here to an unusual compound.

The Vespasian scribe, faced with a form that began with six minims, could well have miscounted them to produce the otherwise unrecorded unmann, its prefix marked for stressing by an apex sign in the manuscript:

\[LS 10.1 \text{(Guth)} 2.32 \text{þa gemunde he þa strangan ðæda þara }<\text{iumann}>\text{a and þara woruldrumena.} \]

\[(VitG xvi: tunc valida pristinorum heroum facta reminiscens).\]

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.32 when he thought upon the mighty deeds of men of days gone by and of heroes.
(VitG xvi: then remembering the doughty deeds done by heroes of former days.)]

Tempting though it is to opt for this manuscript form as the more difficult reading and to argue for its retention of un- ‘very,’ as I have suggested elsewhere, the prefixed geo- element is to be set against pristinus. The linked woruldfruma ‘a great man,’ also a hapax legomenon, is made up from well-attested elements and is easily understood in context. The DOE editors note seven instances of the compound geomann. In addition to the form emended into LS 10.1 (Guth), they list two instances from poetry, one from the fragmentary “History of the Kentish Royal Saints” and three from glosses (see DOE under geo- mann: Met 1.22; Beo 3051; and MtGl (Ru) 5.21, 5.27, and 5.33). Their seventh instance is, they point out, disputed:

\[LS 27.2 \text{(SeaxburghFörst) 19 ða gelicode ðære halgan cwene Seaxburge, þæt heo ðærbinnan . . . ðær mynster getimbrode & gestadelode, swa }\text{geomen} \text{cwædon, þæt ðrættigum gearum ne gestilde næfre stefen cearciendes wænes ne ceoriendes wæles.} \]

[LS 27.2 (SeaxburghFörst) 19 it then pleased that holy queen Seaxburg to build and establish a monastery in that place, so that, as men of old said, for thirty years the noise of a creaking wagon or a complaining servant did not cease.]

15 Roberts, “Old English un- ‘very’ and Unferth.”
The DOE editors report that this instance has alternatively been taken as two words, with the phrase translated “as men said of old,” an attractive reading. An eighth instance is embedded in Thomas Miller’s notes to the Old English Bede for 480.20-22, where his printed text (from C; T fails here) runs,

Bede 5 22.480.20 Þas þing by stære Ongelþiode cirican on Brytene, swa swa geo of manna gewritum oððe of ealdra gesegene oððe of minre sylfre cyþeþe ic gewitan mihte, mid Dryhtnes fultume gedyde ic Beda Cristes þiow & mæsepereost þes minstres þara eadigra apostola Petrus & Paulus, þæt is æt Wiramuþon & on Gyrwum.16

[Bede 5 22.480.20 These things concerning the history of the church of England in Britain, as far as I could formerly learn it from the writings of men of old, or from the tradition of elder men or from my own knowledge, with the help of the Lord, I Bede have written, who am servant of Christ and priest in the monastery of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, that is at Wearmouth and in Jarrow.]

Here the clause containing “geo” corresponds to the Latin “prout uel ex litteris antiquorum uel ex traditione maiorum uel ex mea ipse cognitione” (either from ancient documents or from tradition or from my own knowledge).17 The readings of manuscripts B and Ca, “of íu manna” and “of iu manna” respectively, retain an older form apparently rationalized out of C.18 The LS 10.1 (Guth) emendation, proposed first by Klaeber, is accepted by Gonser, I now think rightly. Klaeber suggests the word is Anglian.19

Adjectives form the limiting element in the two unusual nouns efenhæfdling and heahþeod. In efenhæfdling the prefixed efen-, commonly used in the way in which English was later to employ the Scandinavian borrowing fellow- or the Latin-derived prefix co-, joins with the word heafolding:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.34 and he gesomnode miccel scole and wered his geþoftena and hys efenhæfdlingas.

(VitG xvi: aggregatis satellitum turmis.)

16 Text and translation from Miller, ed., The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History, 2:591; see also Wülfing, Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen, 2:§607.
17 Latin text and translation from Colgrave and Mynors, eds. and trans., Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People, 566-67 [v. 24].
[LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.34 and he gathered a great following and host of his com-
rades and equals.
(ViTG xvi: having drawn together crowds of followers.]

The form *heafodling* is otherwise recorded in Old English twice only, in Lindisfarne
glosses to Matthew, at MtGl (Li) 11.16 and MtGl (Li) 24.49. Yet it appears once in
Middle English as “heuedling,” where apparently summoned up by the Otho redac-
tor of Laȝamon’s *Brut* in order to avoid the obsolescent word “here-toȝe” (used
in the Caligula text, l. 4980).20 Here the -ling suffix is still used in much the same sense
as in Old English, rather than with the diminutive force later adopted from Old Norse.
The second of these unusual compounds with an adjective as limiting element may
appear twice. One of the two instances of *heahþeod* is secure, supported by Felix’s
wording:

> LS 10.1 (Guth) 1.1 sum æþela man on þære hehþeode Myrcnarice.
> (VitG i: quidam vir de egregia stirpe Merciorum.)

But J. H. Kern suggests the need for emendation to “nehþeode” for the second
instance:21

> LS 10.1 (Guth) 15.18 And nalæs þæt an þæt hine men soþton of þære hehþeode
Mercnarice, ac eac swylce ealle þa, þe on Bretonæ wæron, þe þisne eadigan
wer hyrdon, þæt hi æghwonon to him eftston and scyndon.
(ViTG xlv: non solum de proximis Merciorum finibus, verum etiam de remo-
tis Britanniae partibus, fama nimirum virtutum eius acciti, confluebant.)

from Laȝamon, reporting no later instances. In all, I have found four examples of this word in the
Caligula version of Laȝamon’s *Brut* but none in the Otho text (“hertoȝe” C 2932 / “cheueteine” O;
“here-toȝe” C 4980 / “heuedling” O; “hære-toȝe” C 5121 / no direct equivalent in O; “here-toȝe”
C 5146 / “kine-louerd” O).

(VitG xliv: They flocked together not only from the neighbouring territories of the Mercians, but also indeed from faraway parts of Britain, attracted by the fame of his miraculous powers.)

Kern’s emendation to “nehþeode” is clearly related to the Latin and is more appropriate contextually. The scribe had already met hehþeod in conjunction with a phrase for the kingdom of Mercia, whereas he might not previously have come across neahþeod, a word recorded twice only in the Old English Orosius (Or 1 10.30.12, Or 3 1.53.25), and it is likely therefore that he mistakenly repeated the form he had already met in transcribing the life of Guthlac. Thus, hehþeod is to be regarded as a hapax legomenon.

Six unusual nominal forms are easily understood when compared with the attested cognates. The use within Old English both of the adjective heardlic (10 occurrences) and the adverb heardlice (about 55 occurrences) supports easy understanding of the sole appearance of heardlicnes in LS 10.1 (Guth) 17.13 “þa heardlicynsse his lifes” (VitG xlvi: “asperitatem vitae ipsius” [the austerity of his way of life]). The iterative noun of LS 10.1 (Guth) 8.7 “hræfena cræcetung” (the croaking of ravens) (VitG xxxvi: “corvus crocitum” [a raven croaking]) is supported in form and meaning by another infrequent word, an infinitive, recorded at the same place in all three Old English versions of Gregory’s Dialogues, GD 2 (H) 8.118.22 “crakettan” (C “cræcetta,” O “cræcetan”) and translating “crocitare” (see DOE under cra¯cettung and cra¯cettan). Similarly, the noun leaslicetung ‘dissimulation’ in LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.23 ‘ne ungeliclice olæcunge, ne leaslicetunge” (neither inappropriate flattery nor lying) (VitG xii: “non falsidicas parasitorum tribulas” [not the lying fantasies of spongers]), is paralleled by a verb, in this case found once in a gloss: ClGl 1 (Stryker) 1888 “Dissimulari leaslicettan.” A noun “taking, seizure” seems involved in the phrase “on gerisne”:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 19.18 Ac beo þu geþyldig, forþon ne begitest þu na þæt rice on gerisne wøruldlicra þinga, ac mid drihtnes fultume þu þin rice begytest.

(VitG xlix: patiens esto, ne declines in consilium quod non potest stabiliri. Non in praedae nec in rapina regnum tibi dabitur, sed de manu Domini obtinebis.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 19.18 But be patient, for you will not obtain your kingdom by seizing worldly possessions, but with the Lord’s help you shall obtain your kingdom.
Its trigger must lie in the Latin phrase “in rapina,” and it is best explained by reference to the verb (ge)risan ‘seize, take,’ cognate to rasion and ræs. Holthausen assumes a feminine noun ge-risen.22 Again, geþeot ‘howling’ in LS 10.1 (Guth) 8.7 “wulfa geþeot” (VitG xxxvi: “lupus ululatum”) is explained by reference to a cognate verb peotan ‘to howl.’

The curious neuter plural “þa unablinnu” has all the appearance of a nonce formation, as if the translator were aiming at conveying the idea of “incenssaries” in coping with flagitosus: LS 10.1 (Guth) 7.24 “þa unablinnu þæs yfelan geþohtes” (the persistence of that evil intent) (VitG xxxv: “flagiasas meditationes” [vile thoughts]); cognate forms can be found under the DOE entry for -blinnan. The suggestion found in the Bosworth-Toller entry, that the form could have resulted from a reviser’s shortening of an otherwise unrecorded *unablinnunge, is attractive, but if emendation on these grounds be thought necessary it would be as easy to put forward some such reconstruction as *unablinn(n)nesse. A solitary use of the form yldend ‘delay,’ translating the phrase “Nec mora,” looks like a relict from the original translation process:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.135 Næs þa nænig yldend.
LS 10 (Guth) 5.135 Næs þa nænig ylding.

(VitG xxxi: Nec mora.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.135 / LS 10 (Guth) 5.135 There was no delay then.
(VitG xxxi: Without delay.])

Bosworth-Toller, under ildend and citing Goodwin’s edition, translate the form as “one who delays,” an interpretation in accordance with the suffix’s usual use in nouns for agents. The Vercelli homily at this point has the normal noun form in -ing. The common use of -licnes with adjectives for constructing abstract nouns is found in the object phrase LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.83 “þa hlutorlicnysse his modes and þa clænnysse his lifes” (the clarity of his mind and the purity of his life) (VitG xxi: “vitae illius sinceritatem et serenae mentis modestiam” [the integrity of his way of life and the unassuming nature of his joyous heart]). The concept “sincerity” is elsewhere expressed by the less cumbersome hlutornes.

22 Holthausen, Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 261.
It is noteworthy that the nonce words in the Vespasian life of Guthlac are predominantly nouns. There are only a few adjectives without parallel. The unusual ongryrlic ‘horrible’ occurs in a passage considerably abbreviated by comparison with Felix:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.165 Da æfter þan þa awerigedan gastas hine genamon and hine swungon mid isenum swipum, and þa æfter þon hi hine læddon on þam ongryrlican fiðerum betwux þa cealdan faca þære lyfte. (VitG xxxi: Dein iterum adsumentes, flagellis velut ferreis eum verberare coeperunt. Cum autem, post innumerabilia tormentorum genera, post flagellorum ferreorum verbera, illum innota mente, robusta fide in eo quod incoeperat, perstare viderent, horridis alarum stridoribus inter nubifera gelidi aeris spatia illum subvectare coeperunt.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.165 Then after that the accursed spirits took and whipped him with iron whips, and after that they carried him on their terrible wings in among the cold stretches of the sky.

(VitG xxxi: Next taking up whips that seemed made of iron they proceeded to flog him again. Nevertheless, when they saw him persist in what he had undertaken with steadfast heart, with sturdy faith after countless sorts of torments, after the strokes of those iron whips, with the horrible clashing of their wings they started to carry him amidst the cloud-bringing spaces of the icy air.)]

The DOE editors describe the form as “a blend of angrislic and gryre” (DOE, under an-gryrelc), noting that alternatively a mistaken reading of ongryslican has been suggested. The Vercelli homily, here sharing in a similar truncation of Felix’s original, reads LS 10 (Guth) 5.165 “in þam andrysenlicum fiðerum” (on those terrible wings), one of its four occurrences of the adjective ondryslic, employing a word not found in the Vespasian life and indeed seemingly more typical of earlier than later Old English; see also LS 10 (Guth) 5.111 “ondryslic muðas” (terrible mouths), LS 10 (Guth) 5.119 “ondryslic on stefne” (horrible in voice), LS 10 (Guth) 5.178 “ða ondrysenlican fiðeru” (those terrible wings). Surprisingly, gewitfæst ‘sane,’ a transparent compound adjective, is recorded only once in Old English:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 15.24 næs nænig untrum, þæt he ungelacnod fram him ferde; nænig deofolseoc, þæt he eft wel gewitfæst ne were. (VitG xlv: nullus ab illo egrotus sine remedio, nullus vexatus sine salute.)
[LS 10.1 (Guth) 15.24 there was no-one sick that went away from him unhealed, no-one possessed by the devil that was not truly sane again. (VitG xlv: no-one sick [was sent away] by him without a cure, no-one injured without sound health, no-one sorrowful without happiness.)]

The same elements occur in ungewitfæstnes ‘insanity,’ a hapax legomenon in Bald’s Leechbook: Lch II (2) 27.2.1 “brægenes adl & ungewitfæstnes” (disease of the brain and insanity). Two words make use of the privative prefix un-, then as now, a customary way of forming adjectives for the nonce, reversing the force of their base element. The first of these, unhyrsum ‘disobedient,’ happens not to have its usual infixed -ge- element: LS 10.1 (Guth) 2.20 “nawiht hefig, ne unhyrsum his yldrum on wordum” (he wasn’t at all rough or disobedient to his elders in speech). The second occurs in a passage which suggests simplification of the original translation:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 17.45 Pa hi ṣa hæfdon ṣa þenunge gefyllede, and he wæs gehalgod, swa ic ær sæde, he ṣa se bispoc bæd ṣone halgan wer, ṣæt he scoldo to gereorde fon mid him; and he ṣa swa dyde, þeah hit his life ungeþeawe were.

(VitG xlvii: Peractis ergo consecrationum obsequiis, rogatu summi pontificis contra rem solitam vir Dei illo die ad prandium venire cogitur.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 17.45 When they’d completed the service and, as I’ve said, he was consecrated, he, the bishop, asked the holy man to have a meal with him, and he did so, although it was not customary for his way of life. (VitG xlvii: Once the rites of consecration were completed, at the entreaty of the bishop, the man of God was urged contrary to his usual practice to eat a meal that day.)]

Yet, this unusual-looking adjective form is paralleled by geþeawe ‘customary’ in the Old English translation of Gregory’s Dialogues GD 2 (C) 19.142.30 “swa him geþeawe wæs” (as was customary with him).

One form, gebliþe ‘happy’ (or ‘happily’ if taken as an adverb) is remarkable only for its ge- prefix:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 20.8 and he swyþe gebliþe hine het gyrwan to þam ingange þæs heofonlican rices.

(VitG l: Tunc se ovante spiritu ad perennis regni gaudia praeparare coepit.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 20.8 and filled with joy he ordered that he should be made ready for entrance into the heavenly kingdom.
Perhaps a reviser, avoiding the obsolescent *gefeonde* of his exemplar, retained *ge*- by mistake? That this is a likely hypothesis emerges when three Vercelli homily passages containing the participial adjective (*ge*)feonde are placed side by side with parallel Vespasian passages. In the first, the Vespasian *bliþe* may be the simple substitution for an obsolescent form:

**LS 10.1 (Guth) 4.95** And he þa sona se eadiga wer Guðlac swiþe *bliþe* wæs þæs heofonlican cuman; and him sona his heorte and his geþanc eall wæs onlihtod.

**LS 10 (Guth) 4.95** And he wæs þa sona se eadiga wer swiðe *feonde* þæs heofonlican <cuman>.

(VitG xxix: Igitur vir praefatus, veluti miles inter densas acies dimicans, cum caeleste adiutorium angelicae lucis adventasse persensisset, extemplo discussis nefandarum cogitationum nebulis, inluminato turbulenti pectoris gremio, velut triumphali voce psallebat aiens: *Dominus mihi adiutor est, et ego videbo inimicos meos.*)

The Vercelli homily is shorter even than the Vespasian representation of Felix’s involved sentence, though clearly descended from the same original translation: its *feonde* is unusual, for otherwise this adjectival participle has *ge*- prefixed. In the second instance, the simple clause of the Vespasian redaction has no need for an adjective:

**LS 10.1 (Guth) 4.110** þa wæs he mid gastlicre blisse gefylled.

**LS 10 (Guth) 4.110** ða wæs he on gastlicre blisse and heofoncundre gife swiðe *gefeonde*.

(VitG xxix: spirituali gaudio repletus.)
By contrast, the Vercelli homily contains the sort of heavy phrase often found in the Old English versions of Bede and the Dialogues, an attempt to tease out the meaning of the Latin more fully than in a simpler equivalence. It is worth noting that the Vercelli scribe first wrote “feonde” here, later adding ġ above the last letter of the preceding word. The third passage has bliþe in the Vespasian life, but the “swiðe gefeonde” of the homily is closer to the Latin in phrasing:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.247 Þa se eadiga wer Guthlac his þone getreowan freond geseah, þa wæs he mid gastlicre blisse and mid heofonlice gefean swiðe bliþe.
LS 10 (Guth) 5.247 Þa <he> ða se eadiga wer his þone getrywan freond geseah, ða wæs he mid gastlicre gefeannesse and on heofoncundre blisse swiðe gefeonde.
(VitG xxxii: Sanctus vero Guthlac adventum fidelissimi auxiliatoris sui persentiens, spiritali laetitia repletus, gavisus est.)

It would seem that bliþe is again a replacement form and that the unusual ge- prefix at LS 10.1 (Guth) 20.8 materialized in the process of updating an earlier exemplar. Noteworthy, too, is the homily’s gefeannesse with its unparalleled abstract ending; the suffix may appear otiose, but contextually this hapax legomenon is easily understood.

One further adjective should be noted, witedomlic ‘prophetic,’ because its four occurrences are restricted to the Old English versions of the Vita Guthlaci. The first instance, translating the adjective propheticus, is in that part of the life paralleled in the Vercelli homily; thus, the form can be said to be separately validated by two witnesses: LS 10.1 (Guth) 4.74 “efne swa witedomlice muþe” (as from a prophet’s mouth) and LS 10 (Guth) 4.74 “eft swa he witedomlice muðe” (and so afterwards he [sang]
with prophesying mouth) \((\text{VitG} xxix: \text{velut prophetico spiritu})\) [as if through the spirit of prophecy]. In both later examples in the Vespasian life, the adjective occurs where the Latin has a descriptive genitive. At LS 10.1 (Guth) 11.1 “witedomlice wundor” (a miraculous prophecy) \((\text{VitG} xl: \text{providentiae miraculum})\) [a miracle of foreknowledge], both Goodwin and Gonser regularize the form to \text{witedomlic}, an inappropriate change in a text that displays evidence of the breakdown of gender congruence and the non-West Saxon move towards a case-marking system.23 The last occurrence is in an instrumental phrase: LS 10.1 (Guth) 13.10 “witedomlice gaste” (in prophetic spirit) \((\text{VitG} xliii: \text{prophetiae spiritu})\) [in a spirit of prophecy]).

The first appearance of \text{miscrooked} in English occurs in the Vespasian life:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.121 hi he̱fdon wo̱ sceancan, and mycele cnewo̱ and hindan greate, and \text{miscroccetan} and hasrunigendum stefnum.

LS 10 (Guth) 5.123 And hie he̱fdon wo̱ sceancan, and micle cnewo̱ and hindan greate, and miscrence tan, and hashrumedon on heora cleopunge. \((\text{VitG} xxxi: \text{genibus nodatis, cruribus uncis, talo tumido, plantis aversis, ore patulo, clamoribus raucisonis.})\)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.121 they had twisted legs and big knees, and huge at the back, and crooked toes, and with raucous voices.

LS 10 (Guth) 5.123 and they had twisted legs and big knees, and huge at the back, and withered toes, and they shrieked hoarsely in their outcry. \((\text{VitG} xxxi: \text{knotted knees, legs twisted, bloated ankles, splay feet, spreading mouth, hoarse yowlings.})\)]]

An interesting parallel to the \text{miscrocet tan} of the demons is the phrase “miscrokid lymes” (crooked limbs) from Trevisa, cited in both the \text{OED} and the \text{MED}. The Bosworth-Toller nonce word \text{miscroectan} ‘to make a horrible noise’ is a ghost word based on the reading “míscrocetton” reported by Goodwin; and Henry Sweet puts forward an invented form \text{mis-краccettan} ‘to croak horribly’ in his \text{Student’s Dictionary}. Both Goodwin and Gonser emend the homily’s “miscrence tani” into their editions of the life. The \text{DOE} editors, in their entry for \text{ge-crócod}, make a firm cross-reference to \text{miscrócod}. The Vercelli homily also has an unusual adjective here: its \text{miscrence} ‘shrivelled, withered’ is based on the well-attested Old English \text{(ge)scrence}.24 Scragg regards the form as “not a literal but an acceptable translation of the Latin.”25

---

23 Roberts, “Traces of Unhistorical Gender Congruence.”
25 Scragg, ed., \text{The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts}, 394.
compound *hasrunigende* of the Vespasian text, directly related to Felix’s adjective, must have come through from the original act of translation, whereas the homily’s freer interpretation lends itself to analysis as endingless adverb *has* and verb, as in Pilch’s translation; some adjectives allowed the adverbial use of the accusative singular neuter. Both Goodwin and Gonser present the emendation *fægere* in LS 10.1 (Guth) 0.17 “fæger and glæwlice gesette” (beautifully and wisely composed), but the DOE editors give the manuscript form.

Two verb forms unusual in Old English and each found once in the Vespasian life need comment. One, a present participle with the meaning “stretching” or maybe “heaving a deep sigh,” is the earliest instance recorded of the verb *rax* or *rask* (the OED headwords): LS 10.1 (Guth) 12.44 “swa he of hefegum slæpe raxende awoce” (as if he awoke from a heavy sleep sighing deeply). In Middle English the verb is commonest in midland alliterative texts, and it is also found in both Older and Modern Scots. The second is the earliest recorded instance of the verb *sleve* (see OED †sleve, v.): LS 10.1 (Guth) 16.20 “he <hit> slefe on þone foresprecenan man” (he slipped <it> on the aforementioned man). The other OED instances are mainly from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The verb is used transitively for “To cause to slip (on, down, over, or into something)” and intransitively with over in the sense “slip past.” Joseph Wright, under *slive* v.2 and sc.3, suggests that in modern English dialects the word is restricted to midland and northern counties. Both verbs are unusual only within the context of Old English. Worth mentioning is the unusual use of *astellan* to express outwards movement: LS 10.1 (Guth) 16.24 “efne swa swa strel of bogan astelleþ” (just as an arrow leaps from a bow). The DOE editors, under *a*-*styllan, a*-*stellan*, record a second instance in GD 1 (C) 2.21.25, of leaping up from a place. This use of *a*- ‘away from’ with *styllan* need therefore have caused no difficulty to readers.

One further verb should be noted for having given rise to discussion, *bigleofian*, for Kern a ghost word: LS 10.1 (Guth) 4.24 “þonne þigede he þæs andlyfene, þe he bigleofode” (then he ate the food on which he lived); LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.81 “ac þa feng medmycclan bigleoman, þæt wæs to þam berenan hlafæ, and þone þigede and his lif bi leofode” (but he took then a moderate amount of food, that was barley bread, and ate it, and gave sustenance to his life). It is a well attested separable verb, and now clearly described by the DOE editors (see DOE under *be*, *big*, prep., conj., and adv., I.E.4 and

---

27 Campbell, Old English Grammar, § 668.
III.D). By contrast, the parallel Vercelli homily reading for the second of these Vespasian passages has an awkward feel to it: LS 10 (Guth) 5.81 “ac þa feng to þære teala myclan andleofone, þæt wæs to þam berenan hlafe, and þone geþygde and his feorh big ferede” (but he then took just such a big [piece of] food, that was barley bread, and ate it, and gave sustenance to his life). In his edition, Scragg gives an emended form “fer[ç]ede” (line 83), but the DOE editors, under ferian 5, where this is the sole entry, retain the manuscript reading, comparing fercian.29

The few hapax legomena of the brief Vercelli homily are odder, qualitatively different from those of the Vespasian life. Two, gefeannes 'joyfulness' and misscrence 'shriveled, withered,' have already been discussed above. The adjective leglic ‘fiery’ is transparent, describing the flame-filled waves of hell in a passage without parallel in the Vespasian life: LS 10 (Guth) 5.194 “þa leglican hyðe ðæs fyres” (the flamelike waves of that fire). A preterite form onþræc ‘grew frightened’ for a strong verb not otherwise attested is worth noting:

LS 10 (Guth) 5.205 Þa he se eadiga wer Guðlac geseah þa micelnesse þara wita, and hine for þæra egsan swyðe afyrht.

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.205 Da se eadiga Guthlac þa micelnysse geseah þara witu, þa wæs he for þæra egsan swyðe afyrht.

(VitG xxxi: Igitur vir Dei Guthlac, cum innumerabiles tormentorum species horresceret . . .)

[LS 10 (Guth) 5.205 Then he, the blessed man Guthlac, saw the enormity of those punishments, and he trembled greatly because of the horror.
LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.205 When the blessed Guthlac saw the enormity of those punishments, he was very frightened because of the horror.
(VitG xxxi: So when the man of God Guthlac began to shudder at the countless sorts of torture . . .)]

Cognates for this verb, very likely an older form discarded by the redactor responsible for the Vespasian text, include onpræcing ‘fear,’ onpræclíc ‘horrible,’ geonpracian ‘to be afraid of.’

More troublesome is the adjective earhwinnende, designated a crux by the DOE editors, who place it under the headword earg-winnende. The form occurs in a passage that seems to lose its way:

29 For a fuller discussion of this passage, see Roberts, “Two Readings in the Guthlac Homily,” 203-206.
LS 10 (Guth) 4.33 Þa gelamp hit sume dæge, mid þy þe he þy gewunelican þeowdome his sealmas sang and his gebedum ætfealh, þa se ealda feond mancynnes engde geond þet græswang swa grymetende leo, þæt he his costunga attor wide geond stregde. 4.42 Mid þy he þa yfelnes mægen and his grimnesse attor teldað, þæt he mid þy atre þa menniscean heortan wundað, þa semninga swa he of bendum & of brogan wæs his costunge ða he ða þam earhwinnendan stræle on þam mode gefæstnode þæs Cristes cempan.

(VitG xxix: cum quodam die adsueta consuetudine psalmis canticisque incumberet, tunc antiquus hostis prolis humanae, ceu leo rugiens, per vasti aetheris spatia tetra numina commutans novas artes novo pectore versat. Cum enim omnes nequitiae suae vires versuta mente temptaret, tum veluti ab extenso arcu venenifluam desperationis sagittam totis viribus iaculavit, quousque in Christi militis mentis umbone defixa pependit.)

[LS 10 (Guth) 4.33 It happened one day, when according to the usual ritual he sang his psalms and fell [to his knees] in prayer, the old enemy of mankind, like a raging lion, roamed through the grassland, to scatter his poisonous temptations far and wide. 4.42 (In that way he spreads his evil power and bitter poison in order to wound human hearts with his poison.) Then he, suddenly, as if his temptation was from bonds and terrors,30 he fixed his intimidating arrow in the mind of that soldier of Christ.

(VitG xxix: when one day according to his usual custom he was engaged in psalms and canticles, then the old enemy of the human race, like a lion raging through the spaces of the boundless sky, setting his foul powers in motion, ponders in his heart new deceits, new schemes.31 For when in his deceitful mind he tested all the powers of his wickedness, then with his whole strength he hurled a poisonous arrow of despair, as if from a drawn bow, so that it hung fixed in the shield of Christ’s soldier.)]

30 I have done my best here to translate the text as it has come down to us, although some such phrase as "of gebendum bogan" is perhaps being reinterpreted.

31 The translation depends upon recognition of Vergil, Aeneid, 1:657-58, "At Cytherea novas artes, nova pectore versat / consilia . . . " (But the Cytherean revolves in her breast new wiles, new schemes . . . [Fairclough’s translation]) as lying behind Felix’s wording here. (This Vergilian echo seems not to have been noticed previously.)

32 Both English texts relate directly to "mentis"; very likely originally a gloss to "umbone," it is accepted by Colgrave into his text.
Pilch, who sees in the homily “a mixture of syntactic and asyntactic modes of cohesion,” suggests that minimal emendation is needed (“yfelnes[se]”). Instead of looking for complete sentences, he finds his way through these clauses, arguing for the following reading:

- Then it happened some day
- — as he was singing his psalms in the habitual liturgy, and observing the routine of his prayers —
- at that moment the old fiend of mankind was walking the grassy plain
- — like a raging lion, so that he was spraying far and wide the poison of his temptation
- — he spreads the power of evil and the poison of his range, in order therewith to wound the human heart —
- at that very moment as he was free of his bondage and of the horrors (of hell).
- His temptation — as he was fastening it on the mind of Christ’s champion with the poisonous arrow —

The homily passage as edited by Gonser (the edition on the DOE database for this homily) is here understood as a succession of elements identified without recourse to Felix’s Latin source-text. Pilch’s careful separation of the larger units of this homily deserves fuller consideration than attempted here: bullet points substitute for element numbers within units; capitals signal the beginning of a unit, and full stops the end. In this reading of the Old English translation, the poisoned arrow has a place, just as does the “venenifluam desperationis sagittam” in Felix’s heady sentence. The orderliness of the parallel Vespasian text with its “costunge streale” indicates a greater degree of reshaping of what must have been the original translation:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 4.33 þa gelamp hit sume dæge, mid þan gewunelican þeawe his sealm sang and his gebedum befeal, þa se elda feond mancynnnes efne swa grymetigende leo, þæt he his costunga attor wide todæleð. 4.43 Mid þy he þa his yfelnesse mægen and grymnyssse attor þæt he mid þan þa menniscan heortan wundode, þa semninga swa he of gebendum bogan his costunge streale on þam mode gefæstnode þæs Cristes cempan.

It happened one day, when in the usual way he sang his psalm and fell [to his knees] in prayer, that the old enemy of mankind, like a raging lion, is scattering his poisonous temptations far and wide. While he [was spreading] his evil power and bitter poison in order to wound human hearts, suddenly, as if from a drawn bow, he fixed his arrow of temptation in the mind of Christ’s soldier.

As Scragg points out in his edition, “it is very unlikely that the unique earhwinnen-dan is a scribal addition.” The DOE editors provide a marvellously succinct explanation of interpretations advanced for earg-winnende; my own choice here is for “intimidating” or “coward-conquering,” taking into account that this poisoned arrow is despair-inducing, rather than for identification of the first element of this compound as earh ‘arrow.’

Non-West Saxon elements in the Vespasian life of Guthlac and Vercelli Homily XXIII

By their nature, hapax legomena yield little about their dialect origins. Two of the forms discussed above may, because of the evidence for their use in later English, suggest a non-West Saxon context: raxende and slefде. Others, such as ondrysenlic and (ge)feon, have been discussed above in relation to the replacement of obsolescent words with late West Saxon equivalents. Among the corpus of anonymous homiletic texts surveyed by Fulk, the Guthlac life and homily score quite high for Anglian features. Although I shall focus here on Fulk’s categories 29-30, which relate to vocabulary choice, his phonological and morphological categories (numbers 1-28) must be summarized as providing valuable evidence for the non-West Saxon features contained in these texts. The first column gives Fulk’s descriptions (sometimes abbreviated):

36 Scragg, ed., The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, 393.
According to Fulk, there are fewer examples overall for categories 1-28 in the Vercelli homily than in the life, but it must be remembered that it is a very much shorter text. Its one instance of a distinctive accusative personal pronoun, “mec,” requiring emendation to the second person, is a form that could have slipped through in part, because

| 1. o for a before nasal consonants | LS 10 | LS 10.1 |
| 2. e for EWS ē, LWS ŋ as front mutation of ēa | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3. failure of initial diphthongization by initial palatal consonants | ✓ | ✓ |
| 4. non-WS examples of back mutation | ✓ |
| 7. retraction of prehistoric āe before covered l | ✓ |
| 8. front mutation of the vowel produced under no. 7 as āe or ē, e.g., onheld ‘inclined,’ welde ‘boiled’ | ✓ |
| 12. absence of syncope (and usually of front mutation) in the present tense, 2nd and 3rd persons sing., of strong verbs and long-stemmed verbs of the 1st weak class, as well as in the passive participles of weak verbs of the 1st class with stems that end in a dental stop | ✓ |
| 13. Anglian hafaþ, nafaþ, hafast, nafast ‘(not) have’ | ✓ |
| 15. distinctive accusative personal pronouns pec, mec, ǣsic | ✓ |
| 16. use of the accusative case with mid | ✓ |
| 17. forms of lifigan ‘live’ (WS libban), except in formulas (þām lifigendan Gode, ðone lifiende Gāst etc.) | ✓ | ✓ |
| 24. possessive pronoun ðis(s)- ‘our’ rather than ùr- | ✓ |
| 25. inceptive prefix in- = WS on- | ✓ |
| 26. co-occurrence of a demonstrative and a possessive pronoun, e.g., his þām hālgum ‘his the saints’ | ✓ |
| 28. ac = Lat. nonne? | ✓ |
of some sense of awkwardness about it. The Vercelli Book scribe has no other instances of these older forms. The Vercelli homily may retain traces of ē for WS ē as the reflex of Gmc. ē (Fulk category 6) in the manuscript forms weceean, wecest, and wececest — all appear in emended form in the DOE database, as LS 10 (Guth) 5.36 “wecean” and 5.41 “wecest and wecest.” In addition, the Vespasian life has one instance of the non-West Saxon preterite form of seeon ‘to see’ (Fulk category 7): LS 10.1 (Guth) 11.5 “gesegon.”

Fulk’s Anglian words are divided into two categories: 28 “words not normally found in West Saxon”; and 29 “words not normally found in Late West Saxon though they occur in Early West Saxon”: 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglian words surveyed in Fulk’s corpus</th>
<th>LS 10</th>
<th>LS 10.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 (h) unstressed in (WS on)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (j) nēnig ‘no, none’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (a) semninga, sammunga ‘suddenly’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (r) werig ‘accursed’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (c) (ge)feon ‘rejoice’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (d) frignan ‘ask’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (e) infinitive gangan ‘go’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (f) snyttru ‘wisdom’ (LWS wīsdōm)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He also notes for LS 10 (Guth) the words rèc ‘smoke,’ ondrysenlic ‘terrible,’ smīcan ‘reek,’ and ofergeotol ‘forgetful.’ 41 An additional two of the diagnostic Anglian words listed by Fulk also occur in the prose Guthlac texts: 29 (s) ymbsellan ‘surround’ in LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.172, 15.21, and 20.96 “ymbseald”; and 29 (i) iren ‘iron’ in LS 10.1 (Guth) 12.2 “irene.” The Vespasian life is not entirely free of 30 (c) (ge)feon ‘rejoice, for one

39 LS 10 (Guth) 5.11 “þær we þin cunedon and costedon, þæt we mid manigfealdum créfte ussa weepna stræla wið mec sendan” (we tested and made trial of you there, launching our weapons, arrows, against [you] with manifold skill). Szarmach puts forward the emendation “þe”; Szarmach, ed., Vercelli Homilies IX-XXIII, 98, line 39. Scragg gives “[ð]ec”; Scragg, ed., The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, 386, line 53.
40 Fulk, “Anglian Dialect Features in Old English Anonymous Homiletic Literature,” App. A.
instance is apparently overlooked by Fulk. A finite form occurs once where the parallel Vercelli reading makes no sense:

LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.40 and swa myccle swa þu on þisum andweardan life ma earfoða drigast, swa myccle þu eft on toweardnysse gefehst.
LS 10 (Guth) 5.46 And swa micle swiðor swa þu on þyssan andweardan life ma earfeða dreogest, swa micle þu eft in towyrndesne forgifest.

(VitG xxx: et quanto in praesenti adfligeris, tanto in futuro gaudebis.)

[LS 10.1 (Guth) 5.40 and as much as you suffer more hardships in this present life, so much will you rejoice afterwards in time to come.
LS 10 (Guth) 5.46 And as much as you suffer more strongly more hardships in this present life, so much will you rejoice afterwards in time to come.
(VitG xxx: and to the degree that you are scourged in the present, so you will rejoice in the future.)]

The homily’s “forgifest,” perhaps a misreading of some such form as *gefist, is emended to gefehst by Gonser.42 The Vercelli homily’s three other instances of (ge)féon were cited in the discussion of the unusual adjective gebliþe above, and this is very likely a fourth. Yet Vleeskruyer, too, points out that the Vespasian life of Guthlac should be numbered among those texts recognized by Jordan as avoiding this verb.43

Concluding comments

Having the run of the DOE database can sometimes lead in surprising directions. The oddity of *fleotham, reconstructed by Herbert Dean Meritt from a curious form in the Harley Glossary, caught my eye when flagging it og for the TOE: HGl (Oliphant) F429 “Flactris .i. pontibus vel fleoþomum.” I knew flactris from Felix’s description of the fens (VitG xxiv, cited above in the discussion of “eariþas” on p. 180), and I remembered that Colgrave includes it among his list of nearly fifty words for which “the only authority quoted by Du Cange is Felix.”44 The DOE editors include this Harley Glossary reference under the hypothetical headword *fleot-hamm ‘a watery place, marsh,’ comparing a place-name element flodhamm. Meritt, in the supplement to

44 Colgrave, ed., Felix’s Life of Saint Guthlac, 17, n. 1.
Clark Hall’s dictionary, also suggests that the glossary form is to be understood as a dative plural of “flēotham ?watery place,” and compares flōdham (the charter reference is accorded the status of a common noun in Clark Hall). Now, if one rare word from Felix had, I speculated, made it into the Harley Glossary, could any others have done so, too? To my surprise I was lucky with two further words in Colgrave’s list: HlGl (Oliphant) F71 “Falsi uomis leas portantibus,” paralleled in the phrase VitG xxxi “falsivomis pectoribus” (from your lie-spewing breasts); and HlGl (Oliphant) F105 “Fauillantium yslendra,” paralleled in VitG xxxi “inter favillantium voraginum atras cavernas” (amidst the black caves of the fire-spattering depths). These three unusual Latin words, which do not appear anywhere else in the Toronto database, may well have been newly incorporated into the Harley Glossary, a Worcester manuscript. It would seem possible, therefore, that I had stumbled on a previously unidentified source used by the maker of the Harley Glossary, for Felix is not among the sources identified by Jessica Cooke.45

But I stray far from the central purpose of this paper, an examination of the hapax legomena of Vercelli Homily XXIII and of the Vespasian D. xxi life of Guthlac. With the aid of the DOE lexicographical tools, it has become very clear that these two texts, although separated from one another by a century or more, were both uneasily adapted into late West Saxon from a translation made some time before. That original translation must have been very different. Linguistically, it is to be aligned rather with the Old English Bede and Wærferth’s version of Gregory’s Dialogues than with the early West Saxon evidenced in the Hatton Cura pastoralis, the Lauderdale Orosius, and the stints of the first and second scribes of the Parker Chronicle. Worcester connections are advanced for the two earliest extant manuscripts of Felix’s Vita Guthlaci, London, British Library, Royal MS 4 A. xiv, ff. 1-2, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 307, ff. 1-52,46 and these are followed most closely in time by two tenth-century manuscripts, London, British Library, Royal MS 13 A. xv and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 389.47 The former, dated to the middle of the tenth century, is again thought to be from Worcester, the latter, from St. Augustine’s Canterbury and dated to the second part of the century and probably more closely to its last quarter. The make-up of Royal 13 A. xv, a small single-text volume, would repay closer investigation. Part Anglo-Saxon minuscule, part Caroline, it is

46 Gneuss, Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, nos. 454, 88.
47 Gneuss, Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, nos. 484, 103.
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marked up as a copy-text by a layer of interlineations made in the first half of the eleventh century. Coincidentally, the Harley Glossary, another Worcester manuscript, bears witness to interest in the *Vita Guthlaci* at Worcester. The pointers are tenuous. Yet together they point to the availability of the *Vita Guthlaci* in the Alfredian period at Worcester as well as to a continuing interest in the saint at that centre in the tenth century. It would seem therefore that not only are Vercelli Homily XXIII and the Vespasian life of Guthlac witnesses to an early translation, but that the original translation had close affinities with the translation work undertaken at Worcester in Alfred’s day.

*I nd u ct of E n glish S tudies, U n i v e rs ity o f L on do n*

---

48 Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, no. 266.
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