

Mutual Illumination: The *Dictionary of Old English* and the Ongoing Revision of the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED3)*

Inge Milfull

In a volume of papers on the *Dictionary of Old English (DOE)*, it will not seem out of place for the perspective of the new edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED3)* to be represented, as both are major current projects in the historical lexicography of English which are now progressing simultaneously and often in close collaboration.¹ The aim of this article is to illustrate how ongoing work on the *DOE* informs and complements work on *OED3* and vice versa. Once both works have covered the whole range of the alphabet, together they will, on the one hand, make it possible to obtain a more up-to-date and comprehensive account of the Old English lexicon than was previously available and, on the other hand, relate that lexicon to the overall development of the English vocabulary from its pre-history to the present day, while the etymological coverage in *OED3* will help to place it even more comprehensively in context. As the online preface states, the ultimate aim of *DOE* is to complement “the *Middle English Dictionary* (which covers the period C.E. 1100-1500) and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the three together providing a full description of the vocabulary of English.”²

1 I wish to thank my colleagues Philip Durkin and Anthony Esposito for their invaluable assistance in writing this paper. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the *DOE* staff in general, but in particular Antonette diPaolo Healey and Joan Holland, for the unfailing generosity with which they have been ready to share information and advice with *OED3* editors concerning issues relevant to Old English lexicography.

2 “About the Dictionary of Old English” at <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/about.html>>; accessed June 2010. The aim to make such a full description of the vocabulary of English accessible to the reader in practice is already being furthered by the ongoing efforts to link entries in the online version of *DOE* not only with the corresponding *OED* entries, but also with the *Middle English Dictionary (MED)*.

DOE and *OED* have different remits, and work progresses in different ways. Publication of *DOE*, which began in 1986,³ proceeds by initial letter, covering the Old English vocabulary lemma by lemma in alphabetical order. Since 1996,⁴ publication has also been proceeding straightforwardly through the alphabet so that the published range, as of 2010, spans A to G (eight letters, about a third of the twenty-two letters of the Old English alphabet, although a few of the heftier letters are still outstanding). The stated intention is to cover all of the “vocabulary of the first six centuries (C.E. 600–1150) of the English language,” working primarily from a “computerized Corpus comprising at least one copy of each text surviving in Old English,”⁵ that is, the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus (DOE Corpus)*, first published in 1980 on microfiche and re-published online in its latest revised form in 2009. Thus, *DOE* aims at comprehensiveness; since 1996 it has been presenting an alphabetically coherent section of the Old English lexicon.

DOE also starts out with a clean slate in so far as the aim is to re-analyse the entirety of the vocabulary of the extant documents in Old English rather than revise any of the previously influential dictionaries of Old English, either Bosworth and Toller’s *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* or Clark Hall’s *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (although that cannot and does not mean that *DOE* editors ignore the opinions of previous lexicographers of Old English, as that obviously would be a self-defeating exercise). To some extent, in fact, this new departure is related to the raising of the standards for historical lexicography by the first edition of *OED* and by the *Middle English Dictionary (MED)*.

Unlike historical dictionaries such as *DOST (A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue)* and *MED*, which partly draw on corpora but began integrating the use of corpora at a later stage in their publication and used them to a much more limited extent, *DOE* is systematically based on a corpus. This decision was made possible by the relatively limited size of the extant corpus of Old English writings, but was somewhat radical and forward-looking at the time when the work on *DOE* was begun, for it is only since then that the use of corpora has become current in historical linguistics and in lexicography more generally.

3 This is the date of the publication of the fascicle on the letter D on microfiche. The first publication relating to the Dictionary of Old English Project goes back to 1973: Frank and Cameron, eds., *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*.

4 Previously, publication had been proceeding in reverse order, working backwards from D (1986) to A (1994).

5 “About the Dictionary of Old English” at <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/about.html>>; accessed June 2010.

OED3, on the other hand, is the revision of a previously existing dictionary whose first fascicle was published in 1884. The third edition of *OED* constitutes a complete and comprehensive revision of all the incorporated material both from the original edition and the succession of supplements and additions.⁶ Although there are a great many changes to editorial policy and approach in the new edition, there are also important continuities. One is that the first edition's policy with regard to inclusion of Old English material is being broadly maintained, albeit not without some reinterpretation of its finer points. Work on Old English in *OED3*, as in the first edition, which follows the editorial principles established by James Murray, primarily covers lemmas with a history in Middle English (post-1150) and modern English that go back to Old English.⁷ This would exclude words well-attested in Old English but obsolete by 1150, for example, such a well-known Old English word as *bēag-gyfa* 'giver of treasure, lord,' which, as a word with poetic connotations, is attested only in Old English verse.⁸ On the other hand, *OED3* does occasionally include items that are only marginally attested in Old English, but survive beyond 1150 (for instance, *APPLE LEAF n.*, *BRITANNIC n.*); very occasionally these may even turn out to be items of the modern

6 *OED3* is accessible to the reader as part of *OED Online*. The *OED Online* site <<http://oed.com/>> contains (as of 24 March 2011): (a) completely revised material, including the range M to RYVITA and selected revised entries across the alphabet, in addition to many new words and senses added across the alphabet during the period since 2000 that *OED* has been online (*OED3*); (b) for other parts of the alphabet, the text of *OED2* (1989), which brought together in a single sequence the largely unchanged text of the first edition (originally entitled *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (= *NED*), published 1884-1928) and the supplementary material added in the Supplements of 1933 and 1972-1986, as well as making some further additions; in the online version, the material from the three volumes of the *OED Additions* series (1993-1997) is also integrated in the same sequence. Since the re-launch of the *OED* website in November 2010, some changes (mostly relatively minor, and many of them bibliographical) have also been made in otherwise unrevised entries.

The new words and senses added to otherwise unrevised sections since 1933 include some older words, which had been omitted in the first edition, but mainly they are literally new words and senses, i.e., innovations since the 1880s. Unrevised entries containing Old English are therefore likely to have been first published between 1884 and 1928. This also entails that as far as the coverage of Old English is concerned, in most cases the treatment in *OED2* is derived with little or no alteration from *NED*. (*NED* was republished in 1933 with its first Supplement under the title of *Oxford English Dictionary*; it will hereafter be cited as *OED1*.)

7 For a discussion of general principles of the treatment of Old English in *OED1* and especially the theoretical and linguistic attitudes underpinning them, see Stanley, "Old English in *The Oxford English Dictionary*" and "OED and the Earlier History of English."

8 OE *bēag*, on the other hand, is covered at *BEE n./2* (*OED Online*; unrevised text of *OED2*).

English core vocabulary, like *DOG n./1*. However, *OED3* also includes Old English material that appears relevant to the history of *OED* lemmas in other ways, chiefly through discussion in the etymology sections.⁹ Thus, coverage of Old English material is determined by criteria that are not intrinsic properties of the Old English words as such but to some extent coincidental, although vital to their later history. Publication of revised *OED3* entries began in 2000, and the published range of *OED3* currently covers M to R¹⁰ (normally alphabetized by current spelling or latest attestation) and, since March 2008, selected entries across the whole alphabetical range.

With regard to the relation of the work of *DOE* and *OED3* to each other, it is important to note the fact that the majority of the revised entries of *OED3* is still concentrated in M to R. This means that so far the editing ranges between the two dictionaries have only overlapped to a very limited extent, although there is a significant minority of lemmas which are now covered by both dictionaries. Currently the main areas of overlap include the following: *DOE* lemmas with initial long *ā* which show initial *o* in later English due to rounding in early Middle English south of the Humber (for instance, OE *āc*, covered at *OAK n.* and *adj.* in *OED3*) and *DOE* lemmas with initial *cw-* spelled in later English with initial *qu-* (such as OE *cwellan*, covered at *QUELL v./1* in *OED3*). There are also a number of lemmas published within the *OED3* range R to Rg which show Old English initial *hr-* (where *h* was regularly lost in Middle English); for some of these the editors of *OED3* were able to consult the *DOE* editors currently working on H, although the *DOE* section on H has not been published yet.¹¹ Moreover, there is a steadily increasing amount of overlap between *DOE* entries and *OED3* in A, as the selection of individual entries for early revision

9 Compare, for instance, the discussion of the formation of OE *migōþa* in the etymology of *MIG n./1* and the discussion of *miriada*, used by Byrhtferth, in the etymology of *MYRIAD n.* and *adj.* For further examples, see below, pp. 257-58. In exceptional cases, an entry containing only Old English material may be drafted in order to clarify etymological or morphological relationships (cp. *POUGHED adj.*, mentioned below, note 16).

10 Publication is online by quarterly instalments. On 24 March 2011, the newly revised alphabetical range *ROTO* to *RYVITA* was added.

11 Although the section on H has not yet been published as a part of *DOE* or as a whole, individual *DOE* entries in H, such as *HEOFONLEOHT* and *HĒAFODGIMM*, have been available to the public as *DOE* Word of the Week on the *DOE* website <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/wofw/wofw.html>>.

in *OED3* has included a disproportionately high number of entries in A.¹² However, on the whole, the selection of out-of-sequence entries for early revision has by no means focused exclusively or even particularly on the range A to G, as the criteria for early revision involve a number of complex considerations, among which the availability of *DOE* is only one though not usually a decisive one.

In the following I will show how fundamental the content of *DOE* entries has been to work on *OED3* entries where editors were in a position to consult published *DOE* entries, however much they might need to condense, adapt, or supplement that information for the requirements of *OED3*. It must, however, be stressed that there are various important ways in which *DOE* pre-editorial work informs *OED3* procedures in entries for which there is no *DOE* entry as yet, especially, but not by any means exclusively, with regard to regular and systematic consultation of the *DOE Corpus* and the *DOE* bibliography. In my discussion of cases in which corresponding entries have been published in both *DOE* and *OED3*, I will focus in particular on *BRITISH adj. and n.* (OE *bryttisc*), for the treatment of formal and grammatical issues, and *ENGLISH adj. and n.* (OE *englisc*), for the treatment of semantic issues, and also on a cluster of etymologically and semantically related *OED* and *DOE* entries. Both *BRITISH adj. and n.* and *ENGLISH adj. and n.* belong to a set of key terms outside the main alphabetical sequence, related to *Britishness* and *Englishness* and drawing in all of the words starting with *Anglo-*, which were selected for early revision and published in September 2008.¹³ I have selected this group among the recently revised entries because together they contain an unusually thorough coverage of the history of concepts of nationality and identity in Anglo-Saxon England as well as other historical and semantic issues, and that discussion is particularly concentrated in the entry *ENGLISH adj. and n.* As *BRITISH* and *ENGLISH* are in some respects unusual entries, being originally adjectives derived from ethnonyms, I will supplement the discussion of formal and grammatical issues by referring to other revised entries that in some ways are closer

12 The reason for this is not only that these entries were the earliest to be published in *OED1* and thus are particularly likely to be out of date, but also that standard procedures for later *OED* entries were not entirely established yet for entries in A so that they show some anomalies, even compared with entries that were published only slightly later.

13 This second set of such key terms followed on from the revision of a set including *AMERICAN* in March 2008. Cp. Simpson, "Keywords updated: round two," <<http://www.oed.com/public/update0809/september-2008-update#rev>>.

to what might be considered a standard *OED3* entry, such as *APPLE n.* (OE *æppel*) and *FOOD n.* (OE *fōda*).¹⁴

Comparing and contrasting these entries will permit making a number of significant points both about congruence and difference in the treatment of such aspects as spellings, dating, etymology, grammar, semantics, selection of quotations, and references and also in the respective coverage of material such as place names and ethnonyms. Generally speaking, it will be seen that *DOE* provides more thorough treatment of details of attestation within Old English, while the corresponding *OED3* entry serves to contextualize the Old English evidence more widely, with regard to both its later history and its antecedents in Germanic, Latin, or Celtic.

A short comparison of the treatment of grammar and spellings in *DOE* and *OED3*

In the comparison of the treatment of grammar and spellings in the *DOE* and *OED3* entries, a few points will turn out to be very specific to particular entries while others reflect on more general issues of procedure. It is a truism that every word has its own history, and, thus, few entries in the dictionaries can be said to be entirely standard, showing only typical features.

Both *DOE* and *OED3* entries begin with a Headword section and a Part of Speech section, following standard dictionary practice. As noted above, in *OED3* the headword usually represents either the current or, if the word is obsolete, the latest attested spelling; these would, as a matter of course, never be Old English. As for the choice of headword form in *DOE*, it may be remarked that, compared to earlier Old English dictionaries — especially the work of Clark Hall, who was influenced by grammatical traditions going back to Eduard Sievers and the neogrammarians¹⁵ — *DOE* is innovative, systematically preferring Late West Saxon (rather than Early West Saxon) forms, as Late West Saxon is both the best-documented and the most standardized variety of Old English. This is in line with a more general reluctance shown by both

14 *APPLE n.* was first published in revised form in March 2008, *FOOD n.* in September 2008.

15 Clark Hall, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 3rd edition (1960). Normalization of headword forms was introduced in the 2nd edition (1916), as the preface of that edition states. Rigorous West-Saxonization had previously been a feature of Sweet's *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1896).

DOE and *OED3* to cite reconstructed unattested forms, unless there are compelling reasons to do so.¹⁶

DOE practice with regard to headwords affects *OED3* practice in etymologies, albeit in a comparatively unobtrusive way, for discussions in *OED3* etymologies will usually cite Old English words in the *DOE* headword form when *DOE* is available but cite Clark Hall's headword when *DOE* is not.¹⁷ In the case of "British," both Clark Hall and *DOE* have chosen *bryttisc* rather than *brittisc* as the headword form because it is the more frequent one, unlike Toller in his Supplement, who opted for *brittisc*, presumably following etymological considerations.¹⁸

The Grammatical Information or Part of Speech section in *DOE* usually gives not only the part of speech but also, where applicable, gender and grammatical class. Because of the collapse of grammatical gender and dissolution of the grammatical classes early in Middle English, this information is often only of very limited relevance for the later history of the word. *OED3* chiefly comments on such features when they are relevant to understanding the etymology or the phonology of the forms of the word, when they continue to affect the morphology of the word in Middle English or later, or when they show variation within Old English, for instance, when they show different grammatical genders. When *OED3* does comment on these issues, it does so in the etymology, that is, the discussion of gender and grammatical class is embedded in the overall discussion of the word's history (see below for an example from the entry *FOOD n.*). In the case of adjectives such as *bryttisc* and *englisc*, there is, in fact, no divergence between *DOE* and *OED3* here, as *DOE* does not explicitly state that these adjectives follow the standard paradigm for Old English adjectives in the Part of Speech section either. In the case

16 Both *DOE* and *OED3* will occasionally cite reconstructed headword forms in order to keep the connection between morphological groups transparent. For example, *DOE* reconstructs *æppel-berende*, *æppel-lēaf* on the basis of attested spellings *æppilberende*, *appellef* to maintain coherence with the other compounds of *æppel* (for *appellef*, cp. the *OED3* entry *APPLE LEAF n.*). In *OED3* the headword form *POUGHED adj.* is reconstructed for late OE *pohhede* (isolated attestation, acc. pl.). Unusually, this entry contains only the one Old English quotation and has been drafted only because it sheds light on the history *POUGH v.* and its relationship to *POUGH n.*

17 This largely refers to citation of Old English words which are not themselves forms of the *OED3* headword, for with regard to the latter the etymological discussion in *OED3* would usually directly refer to the attested forms listed in the Forms section of the *OED* entry itself (cp. discussion below).

18 Clark Hall gives a cross-reference at *brittisc*. The original volume of Bosworth-Toller had separate entries for both spellings. OE *brytt-* apparently shows a development of *i* in *britt-* after *r* (see discussion at *BRETT n.* and *adj.* (*OED3*)).

of noun entries such as *æppel* (APPLE *n.*) and *fōda* (FOOD *n.*), the difference of treatment appears more clearly. Thus, the relevant section of the *DOE* entry for *fōda* reads, “Noun, m., wk.” (‘noun, masculine, weak’). The Part of Speech section of the *OED3* entry FOOD *n.*, on the other hand, merely contains “*n.*” (‘noun’), and it is the small-type note in the etymology that comments on the gender and grammatical class. Characteristically, it does so in the context of a comparison with other Germanic languages, explaining why comparable nouns in other Germanic languages such as Old Icelandic (*fæða*, weak feminine) and Gothic (*fōdeins*, strong feminine) are less closely related to OE *fōda* than might appear at first sight. As they are of different grammatical classes, the Old Icelandic and Gothic nouns are probably derived independently of each other and of the Old English word, even though ultimately these deverbal nouns all stem from the same verbal base, and therefore the etymological note points out that

The morphological type (weak masculine) of the English noun is not paralleled in other Germanic languages. [...]

Similarly, the Part of Speech section in *DOE* for *æppel* reads:

Noun, m., orig. cl. 4 assim. to cl. 1; 1x wk.

Even more than the abbreviations *m.* for ‘masculine’ and *wk.* for ‘weak,’ this description presupposes considerable prior knowledge of Old English grammar on the part of the reader. What is stated here is that this noun was historically a Germanic *u*-stem and forms typical for *u*-stems are found in Old English, but within Old English the inherited inflection was assimilated to the most frequent type of masculine nouns, the *a*-stems;¹⁹ this is quite a common development for masculine *u*-stems. (An isolated weak form is also mentioned; this is further discussed below.) Admittedly, in interpreting the statement, readers are also able to draw on additional information given in the Attested Spellings section of the *DOE* entry.

Compared to earlier dictionaries of Old English, *DOE*’s coverage of spelling variation is very comprehensive; in this the editors are taking their cue from the spellings sections of *OED* and *MED*, but differ from both in that they do not rely on reconstructed base forms (nominative singulars or infinitives), but instead systematically offer parsed lists of spellings throughout.²⁰ These include all forms retrieved from the

¹⁹ Cp. Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, §§ 611-14.

²⁰ *DOE* and *OED3* also differ from *MED* in that the forms list of *MED* entries standardizes certain spellings (among other things, it regularly standardizes *i/y*-variation).

DOE Corpus as well as a selection of variant spellings from parallel manuscripts not included in the corpus. The declared aim of this extensive coverage is to provide “evidence for testing the statements of OE grammars,” that is, to provide the raw data on which conclusions about Old English phonology and morphology should be based.²¹ Such comprehensiveness is also timely in light of the increasing interest in graphemics as a subject in itself rather than simply as an aid to historical phonology, as witnessed for Middle English by the linguistic atlases of early and late Middle English (*LAEME* and *LALME*) and, for Old English, by the *C11 Database Project*, which covers scribal variation within manuscripts of the same work to a greater extent than *DOE* but within a more limited period.²² Given the limited size of the extant corpus, thorough coverage is easier to achieve for Old English than for later periods, although the increasing size of corpora and the increasing sophistication of search engines are now beginning to make it easier to analyse later spelling variation more thoroughly by computerized means, too.

DOE offers parsed lists of spellings (see further on this below, p. 245) and in its section of spelling on *æppel* labels clearly those inflectional forms identifiable as “class 4,” that is, nominative and accusative plurals in *-a* (distinct from *a*-stem plurals in *-as*) and also the single attested weak form (a genitive plural) and the source in which it occurs (the Lambeth Psalter gloss):

Unambig. cl. 4, nom. and acc.pl.: æppla; æpla | appla, apla.
Wk.: æplena (PsGII).

In referring to classes of nouns by number rather than by their traditional neogrammarian designations, which rely on reconstructed Germanic proto-forms, the description here is deliberately synchronic. This is arguably more realistic since, for instance, nouns of the *a*-stems which are not inherited as *a*-stems from Germanic (that is, later formations and words subsequently assimilated to the class) would not have shown an **a* as thematic vowel at the time of their formation and synchronically do not show *a* in the majority of inflectional forms. For those readers of *DOE* who are used to consulting the standard historical grammars of Old English, however, this system takes some getting used to.

21 “The Content and Format of the Entries” at <<http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/sample/sample.html>>; accessed June 2010.

22 For details of these projects, see Laing and Lass, *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English*; McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*; and Scragg et al., *MANCASS C11 Database Project*.

The *OED3* entry, on the other hand, takes a deliberately diachronic approach and states, again in a small-type note in the etymology,

In Old English originally a strong masculine *u*-stem, it shows (already in early texts) attraction to the more common *a*-stem declension (compare nominative plural *æppla* beside rare *æpplas*; see further A. Campbell *Old Eng. Gram.* (1959) §613); the existence of a weak by-form is perhaps also suggested by the genitive plural form *æpplena* (for expected *æppla*) in an isolated attestation from the first half of the 11th cent.

This kind of comment is usually found where different inflectional classes are attested for a noun in Old English; it also serves to elucidate the forms listed in *OED3*'s Forms or Spellings section (discussed more fully below). The note integrates the information given in *DOE* in the Part of Speech section with some of the information given by *DOE* in the Attested Spellings section. Unlike *DOE*, *OED3* here uses the traditional terminology: “*u*-stem,” referring to the reconstructed Germanic thematic vowel, rather than “cl. 4,” although in general these terms are used only sparingly in *OED3*. Arguably, use of these terms is more appropriate in *OED*, where they figure within a treatment that is explicitly diachronic and etymological. “Class 1” or “*a*-stem” is assumed to be the default for strong masculine nouns in such notes in *OED3* and therefore usually not explicitly mentioned. Abbreviations such as *wk.* for ‘weak’ are avoided in *OED3* etymologies, as the *OED* readers are less likely to have these terms at their fingertips than most users of *DOE*. Unlike in *DOE*, the note in *OED3* does not list all attested spellings but relies on citing representative, sometimes standardized forms as they might be found in grammars. Similar observations could be made in comparing the treatment of verbal inflection in *DOE* and *OED3*.

Very occasionally *DOE* offers etymological information in the same section as grammatical information, although, as discussed below, usually etymological considerations are not explicitly treated but are covered in a different way, by cross-references to morphologically related entries and by references to the entries of *OED*, *MED*, and other sources that do contain etymological treatment.

The sections on Spellings in *DOE* and *OED3* have already been alluded to.²³ Here, for example, is the parsed list of spellings which *DOE* offers for *BRYTTISC*:

²³ The section is called “Attested Spellings” in *DOE*, abbreviated as “Att. Sp.” In *OED3* (and earlier versions of *OED*) the list is introduced in the text of the entry as “Forms” (while before the re-launch of *OED Online*, the clickable button was labelled “Spellings”).

Att. sp.: bryttisc, brytisc || brittisc || bryttiscne, brytiscne | brittiscne |
brettisc || brittisces || bryttiscum, bryttiscan

Once again, interpreting this list requires a certain amount of familiarity with Old English grammar on the part of the reader. The sections divided by double vertical lines are, apparently, nominative singular, strong masculine; nominative singular, strong neuter; accusative singular, strong masculine; genitive singular, strong (neuter); dative singular and plural,²⁴ while the single vertical lines are employed to distinguish the different types of stem vowel attested for the accusative. Comparison with the entry *ENGLISC*, for example, shows that the distinction between double and single vertical lines is not always employed in quite the same way. The latter adjective is attested both more frequently and in a greater number of grammatical forms.²⁵ Here the single vertical lines are chiefly used to distinguish the grammatical genders, while the double vertical lines are used to distinguish the cases, and the strong and weak forms are explicitly labelled, in a manner corresponding to the labelling already observed at the *DOE* entry *ÆPPEL*. The *DOE* system permits a degree of flexibility that allows it to adapt to what forms are actually attested; it also permits it to group forms together that are distinguished in grammars but where the grammatical distinction is not reflected in the spellings, such as the oblique singular cases of *fōda*: since the accusative, genitive, and dative singular are identical in form (standard *fōdan*), although historically distinct cases, they are listed together in one section.

Nevertheless, interpreting such lists requires a certain amount of knowledge of Old English grammar, which is one of the reasons why *OED3* continues to infer base forms where it is possible to do so with reasonable confidence. Thus, the forms list for *BRITISH adj.* and *n.* shows nominative singular masculine forms, some of which, as comparison with the *DOE* entry shows, are inferred from oblique forms:

Forms: OE *Brettisc*, OE *Brittisc*, OE *Brytisc*, OE *Bryttisc* [. . .]

24 Judging by the way it is represented here, the form *bryttiscan* (a variant reading where an earlier manuscript shows *bryttiscum*) is probably interpreted as a spelling of the strong dative singular, reflecting weakening of the vowel and the nasal, rather than a weak form in a context where a strong form is expected.

25 *DOE* notes 16 occurrences of *BRYTTISC* as opposed to *c.*550 occurrences of *ENGLISC*. (The rounded number apparently reflects the occurrence in multiple manuscripts; cp. discussion below.) In the case of *BRYTTISC*, one needs to bear in mind that its use partly overlaps with the Old English meanings of *WELSH adj.* and *n.*

This also shows the dating style used in *OED3*. All the forms just quoted are dated “OE.” The dating style has changed significantly compared to previous practice, both for forms and for Old English quotations. In the quotation paragraphs of *OED3* entries, individual dating of Old English quotations has been abandoned and replaced by a simple threefold division of all pre-1150 quotations into early Old English (“eOE”: 600-950), Old English (“OE”: 950-1100), and late Old English (“IOE”: 1100-1150), based on manuscript dates as agreed by the most recent authorities: Neil R. Ker’s *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (1957; reissued with supplement 1990); and (for manuscripts of charters, which are not included by Ker) Peter H. Sawyer’s *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (1968), more especially in the fully revised and electronic version published by the University of Cambridge as *The Electronic Sawyer* (2006-). This threefold division is mirrored in the Forms sections of *OED3* by use of the same three styles (“eOE,” “OE,” and “IOE”) for the dating of forms. For this purpose “OE” is used as the default date for all pre-1150 forms, with “eOE” and “IOE” employed to indicate occurrence only in pre-950 and post-1100 manuscripts, respectively. Post-1150 spellings of Old English material are usually dated “eME” (early Middle English), not “OE,” if attested in manuscripts copied before c.1325; for all later redactions of Old English material, the style “OE . . . (*in a late copy*)” is used (where the word is dated “OE” but followed by the comment “*in a late copy*” in parentheses) to indicate a spelling found only in post-1325 Middle English copies (chiefly in cartularies containing copies of Anglo-Saxon charters).

In the quotation paragraphs, such late material is given an Old English composition date in parentheses, but dated (numerically) by manuscript date, for example, “a1225 (OE) *Rule St. Benet* (Winteneý)” for the early thirteenth-century Winteneý version of Æðelwold’s translation of the Benedictine Rule. The reason for the difference in treatment of material copied after c.1325 is that Old English text copied up to this date may reflect some degree of linguistic continuity, while text copied after that date almost certainly does not, as is shown by the frequent garbling of poorly understood Old English in late medieval cartularies.

Spellings dated “eME” and “OE (*in a late copy*)” mostly correspond to those labelled in *DOE* as “late” (usually for forms attested from c.1200 onwards). For instance, the entry *ÆPPEL* includes the following listing of late forms (in this case, with grammatical labels):

Late: aepes (gen.sg., xiii) || æpple (acc.pl., xiii); æple (acc.pl., xiii)

In *OED3*, the last of these, for instance, which reflects the attestation in the above-mentioned early thirteenth-century Winteneý version of the Benedictine Rule, is covered, labelled “eME,” according to the following formula:

OE-eME æpl- (inflected form)

OED3 lists this as *inflected form* since syncopated oblique forms such as *æple* do not in themselves necessarily imply a nominative singular *æpl*. This form is, in fact, attested but much less frequently than the inflected forms (and not after 1150), and accordingly it is listed separately as

OE æpl (*rare*)

Compare also the following spelling, listed in *DOE* in the (unlabelled) dative plural section as

æwplum (*ÆTemp MS f^a*).

This refers to the copy of Ælfric’s *De Temporibus Anni*²⁶ in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 367, which is dated by Ker as xii/2, that is, to the second half of the twelfth century (Ker no. 62). Since twelfth-century forms are not treated by *DOE* as late (although sometimes they are explicitly labelled “xii”), the form appears in the main sequence of spellings there. As the form apparently shows a not uncommon scribal confusion of wynn and *p*, it appears in the *OED3* forms list as follows:

eME æwplum (dative plural, transmission error).

Characteristically, the *OED3* forms list offers a clearer interpretation here, but makes it less easy for the specialist to trace the form back to its source; conversely, *DOE*, being intended for the expert, requires more interpretation. Similarly, early and non-West Saxon material is usually not explicitly labelled in *DOE*, but characteristically early spellings²⁷ are often so labelled in *OED3*, and exclusively Mercian, Northumbrian, and Kentish forms are usually so labelled, for instance:

26 Chapter IV. 53: Henel, ed., *Ælfric’s De Temporibus Anni*, p. 40; corresponding to Blake, ed., *Ælfric’s De Temporibus Anni*, p. 84 (line 215; see textual notes on p. 145).

27 An exception, in *DOE*, seems to be the entry *GE-DON*, which uses the label *Anglian*. Occasionally *Northumbrian* is used in more discursive comments — for example, at *BĒON*. For the purposes of *OED3*, “early” refers to attestation of the form only in manuscripts written no later than s. x/med.

eOE *eappul* (*Mercian*).²⁸

The following section of a standard *DOE* entry is Occurrences and Usage. This contains a frequency count, with reference to the *DOE Corpus*, although sometimes qualified by “ca.,” apparently usually in the case of occurrence in multiple manuscripts, although occurrence in multiple manuscripts in the case of lower numbers may be explicitly stated, too. It may also contain comments on restricted usage, for example, in the case of *fōda*: “(mainly in *Ælfric* and in glosses).”

As *OED3* is not corpus-based in the same way as *DOE* is, it avoids giving numerical frequency information, usually limiting itself to judicious use of the label *rare*. However, restrictions of occurrence may be discussed in the etymology section, especially where they have implications for the interpretation of the evidence. There is no such discussion in the case of *FOOD n.*, as the distribution was considered to have no implications reaching beyond the English period, but there is discussion of such issues, for instance, at the revised entry *SKIN n.*, which, as a loan from Scandinavian, can be expected to be found only in relatively late Old English sources.

There are many more issues that could be addressed in this context, but it is hoped that the above suffices to show that in the coverage of grammar and spellings, *DOE*'s treatment, as perhaps might be expected, tends towards the synchronic, while *OED3* tends towards the diachronic, and that these two approaches usefully complement each other. The following section will attempt to demonstrate a similarly complementary approach with regard to discussion of semantic issues and the selection of illustrative quotations.

Differences in the main body of the entry in each dictionary: a contrastive study of *OED3*'s ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.* (and related entries) and *DOE*'s ENGLISC

While the *DOE* entry ENGLISC is an entry that stands more or less on its own (as is, on the most superficial level, indicated by the lack of cross-references to other entries), the *OED3* entry ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.* is a part of a cluster of entries that includes

28 This, in fact, is a form not listed by *DOE* at *ÆPPEL*, because it occurs only for the word as first element in *eappultun* in the Vespasian Psalter and so is covered at *ÆPPEL-TŪN* as “eappultun (PsGIA).” (Anyone familiar with the attestation of OE dialects, of course, will be aware that the Vespasian Psalter is glossed in Mercian.) *OED3*, on the other hand, covers at the main entry forms of the word occurring only in compounds if the compound does not have an entry with a forms list of its own, and so the form *eappul* is covered at *APPLE n.*; however, in *OED3* there is the option of adding a comment “(in compounds)” in parentheses if the editor considers the pattern of attestation significant.

ENGL *n.*, ENGLAND *n.*, and ANGLE *n./3*. All of these contain Old English material, material that is excluded from *DOE* on the grounds that *DOE* does not cover ethnonyms and place names as main entries. ENGL *n.* and ANGLE *n./3* are included in *OED3* because *OED* does include ethnonyms, in particular when they show a complex sense structure and extended uses or are etymologically relevant to a morphological group. Place names such as ENGLAND *n.* are normally included, not because they are used as place names, however important and familiar, but to account for any extended or lexical uses of the name. *OED3* is applying this principle more rigorously than previous editions: whereas *OED1* often placed coverage of purely onomastic uses in the sense section, *OED3* moves this information to the etymology section, leaving only the lexical, extended, and phrasal uses in the main part of the entry. This has also happened in the case of ENGLAND *n.*, leaving only modern English senses such as “The inhabitants of England (sometimes also Britain) regarded collectively” in the main part of the entry, while the etymology section discusses the historical development of the word as a geographical and political name.

Not only the entry for ENGLAND *n.* but all of the *OED* entries mentioned have undergone major changes during revision. ENGL *n.*, in fact, is an entirely new entry, drafted in the course of reassessment of the relationship between Old English *Angle* (plural) and modern English *Angles* (singular *Angle*) as it was previously treated at ANGLE *n./3*. In revising the Old English component of the entry ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.*, *OED* editors made much use of the corresponding *DOE* entry, but also drew on other research and did some of their own, as will be seen. In revising ENGLAND *n.* and ANGLE *n./3* and drafting ENGL *n.*, the *OED3* editors had no matching entries to draw on, but the parameters of their revision, as for *OED3* entries outside the A to G range, were determined by the availability of data in the *DOE Corpus* and strongly influenced by *DOE* bibliographical practice.

In *OED1*, the entry ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.* distinguished four main senses of the adjective and six for the noun, besides listing a substantial number of combinations (compounds and phrases). The arrangement of the senses was not strictly chronological, but followed semantic considerations; this is a practice that *OED3* has broken with, now observing a strict chronological ordering at each level in the entry, hence at the level of branches, of numbered senses within a branch, of subsenses within a main sense, and so forth.

Old English material was covered at sense 1 of the adjective (for which see discussion below, p. 250) as well as at sense 4 (“As the designation of a language”) and

at senses 1 and 3 of the noun (“The English language” and “English equivalent for a foreign word,” respectively). Old English was also discussed briefly in the etymology, which was comparatively short and cross-referenced to *ANGLE n./3* for the origin of the name of the Angles.²⁹ Old English forms were covered in the forms list as well, to some extent duplicating information also given in the etymology, thus showing a characteristic hesitation on the part of *OED1* as to whether to treat the Old English antecedent of a word as an earlier form of the same word or as its etymon.³⁰ All of this is true of the entry in *OED2* as well, which significantly differs from the entry in *OED1* only in the addition of two sections of new material, a section on “Misc[ellaneous] special Comb[ination]s” (sense 2e of the adjective) and a characteristic use of the word in *Billiards* (sense 7 of the noun).³¹

The most distinctive feature of the entry *ENGLISH adj. and n.* in *OED2*, apart from showing the frequency of lexicalized combinations (increasing in later English), was the length of the definitions of senses 1 of the adjective and 1a of the noun. Both these definitions included material that was strictly speaking etymological. Thus, in the case of the definition of sense 1 of the adjective, it is stated that the word had “lost its etymological sense,” namely, ‘the Angles,’ the sense given for the reconstructed form **Angli-*, antecedent of *Engle*, in the etymology. It furthermore becomes clear that sense 1 is not so much a single sense, but a cluster of early and historical uses outlined more or less clearly in a small-type note (discussed more fully below, p. 251) and all considered to be referring to a historically earlier stage than sense 2 “Of or belonging to England or its inhabitants.” The latter sense is shown as dating from the late thirteenth century, apparently on the assumption that by then the general and legal distinction between persons of English and of French descent, which obtained for a time after the Norman Conquest and which is discussed at sense 1, had

29 Actually, in *OED1* the cross-reference was to *ANGLE n./2*, but this was a typographical error corrected in *OED2*.

30 The shift of perception in the 19th and 20th centuries with regard to the point when English as a language begins are discussed in the entry *ENGLISH adj. and n.* itself at sense B.2.a and also at *OLD ENGLISH n. and adj.* (Cp. also the unrevised entry *SEMI-SAXON n.*, which shows that in 1847 even Layamon’s *Brut* was not yet considered fully English.) These issues and the way in which they are reflected in *OED* policy are discussed in more depth in Stanley, “Old English in *The Oxford English Dictionary*” and “*OED* and the Earlier History of English.”

31 As *OED2* is now more widely accessible than *OED1*, I will hereafter refer to *OED2*, on the understanding that all statements are true of *OED1* as well, unless otherwise indicated.

ceased “practically to exist,” although still surviving in formal state documents in the fourteenth century.³²

With regard to Old English uses of the adjective, the *OED2* note at sense 1 states,

The earliest recorded sense is: Of or belonging to the group of Teutonic peoples collectively known as the *Angelcynn* (‘Angle-kin’ = Bæda’s *gens Anglorum*), comprising the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, who settled in Britain during the 5th c. With the incorporation of the Celtic and Scandinavian elements of the population into the ‘English’ people, the adj. came in the 11th c. to be applied to all natives of ‘England’, whatever their ancestry. But for a generation or two after the Norman Conquest, the descendants of the invaders, though born in England, continued to be regarded as ‘French’, so that the word *English*, as applied to persons, was for a time restricted to those whose ancestors were settled in England before the Conquest.

In other words, it seems to be implied, as long as the word is used in making distinctions between the ‘English,’ on the one hand, and Celts, Scandinavians, or French living in English territories, on the other hand, the sense of the word is not the same sense as “Of or belonging to England or its inhabitants.” With reference to pre-Conquest concepts, ‘England’ (and also ‘English’) is given in quotation marks, as if it were regarded as England *avant la lettre*. This, in fact, seems not quite consistent with the treatment of the matching sense in the small-type note at ENGLAND *n.* 2 (“the southern part of the island of Great Britain”; etc.), where it is stated that *Engla land* in that sense dates from the “Danish conquest”:

In the writings of Ælfred and the earlier parts of the O.E. Chronicle, the name *Angel-cynn* race of the Angles (= Bæda’s *gens Anglorum*) is used to denote collectively the Teutonic peoples in Britain, and also the territories which they occupied. This seems to have been the only general name for the country until the Danish conquest, when it was superseded by *Engla land*.

The first quotation given for this sense is dated 1154, from the Peterborough continuation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and thus does not illustrate Old English use,

32 Cp. the entry ENGLISHRY *n.*, which was revised at the same time and shows that this distinction obtained in law at least until 1340 (see small-type note at sense 2a). Strangely, in the first quotation given at sense 2 of ENGLISH *adj.* in *OED2*, “englische barones” actually refers to Anglo-Saxon noblemen at the time of the Norman Conquest, although this would not have been obvious to the reader, given the lack of context for the phrase.

but “Danish conquest” appears to refer to the reigns of Swein and Cnut and must refer to the occurrence of *Engla land* in the annals of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 1014 onwards.

The definition of sense 1a of ENGLISH *n.*, although similar in length, is more clearly structured. The definition of the sense as such, that is, “The English language,” is short and to the point. It is followed by comments on particular phrases and (in a small-type note) on sense development. These are, in their turn, followed by an etymological comment, which is formally marked off as such by square brackets.³³ The small-type note on sense definition states,

In 9th c., and prob. much earlier, *Englisc* was the name applied to all the Angle and Saxon dialects spoken in Britain. The name *English* for the language is thus older than the name *England* for the country.

Thus, both notes, the one discussing early uses of the adjective and the other on early uses of the noun, refer to the history and sense development of *England* as a place name or name of a political entity, and it is these comments which explain why the definition “Of or belonging to England or its inhabitants” is considered by *OED2* not to cover Old English uses of the word, while it accepts the definition “English” when the Old English uses refer to language.

In the revised entry ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.*, perhaps the most obvious changes are that sense 1 of the adjective has now been merged with sense 2 and that the scope of the definition notes has been reduced, while, on the other hand, the etymology has been greatly expanded in length and now covers subjects previously dealt with in the definition notes. This is partly the result of the *OED* editors’ engagement with the *DOE* entry.

The *DOE* entry distinguishes the following main senses of the word (and it may be remarked here that while the corresponding senses are arranged in the same order in the revised *OED3* entry, the similarity is in a sense superficial, for *DOE* orders its senses primarily according to semantic considerations and only secondarily according to chronological considerations, while in *OED3* the priorities are reversed):

³³ This note discusses the use of the adjective as noun to designate the language and comparable uses in other European languages, especially within the context of phrases such as *on englisc* ‘in English.’ This discussion has been expanded and moved to the end of the main etymology in the revised entry.

- A. Adjective
 - A.1. English, of or belonging to England or its inhabitants
 - A.2. as the designation of a language or literary composition: English; written or expressed in the English language [etc.]
- B. used as substantive:
 - B.1. Englishman, person of English descent
 - B.2. *englisc* / *þæt englisc* ‘English, the English language’ [etc.]

It is immediately clear that, unlike *OED1*, *DOE* regards the definition “of or belonging to England or its inhabitants” as applicable to Old English quotations. The earlier dictionaries of Old English, Bosworth-Toller and Clark Hall, had not hesitated to gloss OE *englisc* simply as ‘English,’ but that was obviously in part an etymological equation (very clearly so, in the case of Clark Hall, who distinguishes glosses that are etymological equivalents by inverted commas). The *DOE* definition is more fully considered and deliberate, as the definitions of the sub-senses, in particular of sub-sense A.1.a., show:

A.1.a. ‘English, of England’, referring to the people of England without any explicit distinction drawn among Angles, Saxons and Jutes; often, as distinguished from other nations: the French, Scandinavians, Welsh, etc.; also of Englishmen of Anglo-Saxon origin as opposed to Celtic, Scandinavian or Norman descent; *englisc mann* ‘an Englishman; a member of the English nation.’

This definition clearly covers some of the same points as the small-type note in *OED2*. Thus, “without any explicit distinction drawn among Angles, Saxons and Jutes” resembles *OED1*’s comment that the word had apparently lost its former sense ‘of the Angles,’ but without making any explicit reference to the etymology. Similarly, “also of Englishmen of Anglo-Saxon origin as opposed to Celtic, Scandinavian or Norman descent” acknowledges the use of the adjective in Old English in making distinctions between English people of Anglo-Saxon descent and Celts, Scandinavians, or French living in English territories, but without taking this as evidence of an entirely different sense. *DOE* adds: “often, as distinguished from other nations: the French, Scandinavians, Welsh, etc.,” and so brings out more clearly that the term is also regularly used in Old English to distinguish the English ethnically from Scandinavians, French, and Welsh as associated with political entities outside England, such as Norway or France, just as it is used to distinguish the English from, for example, the Irish, Frisians, or Greeks (whereas the issue of Englishmen of Irish descent or Greek descent

would not normally arise). These entities are all termed *nations* in the *DOE* entry, although they are obviously not ‘nations’ in the modern sense of the word and it is clearly not meant to be implied that they are.

This is as much discussion of the subject as the *DOE* entry permits itself. The meaning and implications of particular phrases such as *englisc cnihta gild* ‘an English retainers’ guild’ and *englisc scol* ‘the English quarter’ are also briefly discussed (at the sub-sub-senses A.1.a.ii and A.1.a.iii, respectively), but other than that, *DOE* relies, as elsewhere, on its selection of illustrative quotations and the standard cross-references to entries in other dictionaries at the bottom of the entry, including the *OED* entry. The complexity of sense A.1., as well as being indicated by the length of the definition, is reflected in the large number of quotations selected to illustrate it.

There is some overlap between the quotations in *OED2* and *DOE*. As might be expected *OED2* selects quotations that underline the point the definition note is making and so picks quotations from laws and charters distinguishing persons of Anglo-Saxon descent from Scandinavians, Welsh, and French.³⁴ Similar quotations appear in the *DOE* entry as well. Thus, both entries select a quotation from *Dunsæte* to illustrate the arrangements between neighbouring Welsh and English settlements on the Wye, and one from the second law code of Æðelred to illustrate the distinct treatment of the descendants of the Danish invaders settled in the Danelaw. However, *DOE* has a wider spread from a number of different types of sources and shows how in other text types and from other perspectives, for example, from that adopted by Ælfric in his *Grammar*, English nationality can appear much less problematic.

In the revised *OED3* entry, as already mentioned, the former sense 1 has been merged with sense 2. This agrees not only with the treatment in *DOE*, but also with the treatment of the earliest Middle English evidence in *MED*; it also resolves the structural problems inherent in the definition of the former sense 1. There is still a small-type note at the definition, but it is much shorter than the note in *OED2* and states,

In early use sometimes *spec.* designating inhabitants of England of Anglo-Saxon descent, in contradistinction to those of Celtic, Scandinavian, or Norman descent.

³⁴ Arguably, the first of these quotations is a somewhat different case since it is taken from a treaty between two rulers (Ælfred and Guthrum) and therefore addresses external conflict rather than internal divisions. Moreover, the Danes, at the time of the treaty, are presumably still to be regarded as first-generation settlers in the Danelaw, if not straightforwardly as invaders.

In other words, the uses discussed at sense 1 in *OED2* are here regarded as specific uses of the word in sense 2 rather than serving as arguments for post-dating sense 2. This resembles the treatment in *DOE*, where, as we have seen, this use appears to be regarded as a sub-sense of the equivalent sense.

The paragraph of quotations in *OED3* has been considerably expanded. Not only have three of the four former quotations been retained (and, according to routine practice during the revision process, both checked and converted to the current standard edition),³⁵ but another three Old English quotations and two quotations from the second half of the twelfth century have also been added, the latter from sources covered by *DOE* though treated as early Middle English by *OED3*. All of the added quotations are among those also chosen by *DOE* for its entry; however, as for all added Old English quotations in *OED3*, the text of the *DOE Corpus* has been independently checked against the editions and the quotations have been converted to *OED3* citation style. The number of pre-1200 quotations in the revised quotation paragraph is unusually high by *OED3* standards, reflecting the editors' concern to illustrate a semantically complex and at least potentially problematic sense. Nevertheless, the number of quotations is considerably lower than at the corresponding *DOE* sense, as *OED3* also needs to document the subsequent development of the sense until the present day. The *OED3* quotations are ordered by manuscript date (the Old English quotations being dated "eOE," "OE," and "IOE," as outlined above), whereas the order of the quotations in *DOE* follows semantic criteria.

The retained and converted *OED2* quotations are

OE *Royal Charter: William I to Bishop William, Gosfrith the Portreeve, & Burghers of London* in A. J. Robertson *Laws Kings England* (1925) 230 Wil-
lelm kyng gret.. ealle þa burhwaru binnan Londone, Frencisce & Englice,
freondlice.

[William sends cordial greetings . . . to all the citizens within London, the
French ones and the English ones.]

35 Although not visible to the reader on *OED Online*, the fourth quotation (from the Treaty between Ælfred and Guthrum) has, in fact, not been dropped from the version of *OED3* stored in the internal database but is still extant in the copy of the entry there as a "suppressed" quotation and can be retrieved if needed. This agrees with a general *OED3* policy, according to which no original *OED* quotations, i.e., quotations already included in an earlier edition of *OED*, are actually deleted from the database, even if it is decided not to include them in an *OED3* entry. (Sometimes, the internal copy of an *OED3* entry also includes additional data recording quotations that were considered for inclusion during the revision process, but rejected at a later stage.)

IOE *Laws of Æðelred II* (Corpus Cambr. 383) II. v. 222 Gyf Ænglisc man Deniscne ofsleo [If an Englishman kills a Dane]

IOE *Laws: Dunsæte* (Corpus Cambr.) vi. 376 Nah naðer to farenne ne Wilisc man on Ænglisc land ne Ænglisc on Wylisc ðe ma.
[Neither must a Welshman travel in English territory nor an Englishman in Welsh territory.]

The added quotations are the following:

eOE *Bald's Leechbk.* (Royal) II. lxxv. 292 Wiþ utwærce genim unsmerigne healfne cyse, do englisces huniges IIII snæda to, wylle on pannan oþ þæt hit brunige.³⁶

[For dysentery (?), take a half cheese, not greasy, and four portions of English honey, boil [that] in a pan until it browns.]

OE *Ælfric Catholic Homilies: 2nd Ser.* (Cambr. Gg.3.28) ix. 74 Ða gelamp hi,.. þæt engliscse cypmenn brohton heora ware to romanabyrig.
[Then it happened . . . that English merchants brought their wares to Rome.]

OE *Ælfric Gram.* (St. John's Oxf.) 3 Nan englisc preost ne cuðe dihtan oððe asmeagean anne pistol on leden.
[Not one English priest knew how to compose or understand a letter in Latin.]

a1161 *Royal Charter: Henry II to Certain Bishops, Earls, Sheriffs, & Thegns* in J. Hall *Sel. Early Middle Eng.* (1920) 11 H[enry] þurh godes ʒefu ængleslandes king gret.. ealle mine þeinas, frencisce & engliscse.
[Henry, by the grace of God king of England, sends greetings . . . to all my thegns, the French and the English ones.]

c1175 *Anglo-Saxon Chron.* (Tiber. B.i) anno 1066, Ða wes þer an of Norwegan þe wiðstod þet Engliscse folc.
[There was one of the Norwegians who withstood the English people.]

These additions include another quotation from a charter, a late example of the type of formula already seen in the charter of William the Conqueror, which distinguishes addressees of English and of French descent. However, the majority of the added quotations are taken from other types of sources. Three are paralleled at *DOE's* sense A.1.a and refer, respectively, to English merchants in Rome, English priests unable to write or read Latin, and English troops fighting invaders from Norway; they illustrate the point

36 At the time of publication, mistakenly given as "III" in both *DOE* and *OED3* (to be corrected in their next updates).

that in some contexts the wider sense ‘of England’ is much more salient than the specific use to refer to Anglo-Saxon descent, even when referring to human beings. Moreover, in the case of the remaining added quotation from *Bald’s Leechbook*, which also appears at *DOE* sense A.1.d and refers to ‘English honey’ (that is, ‘honey produced in England’), the sense ‘of Anglo-Saxon descent’ is not applicable at all.

However, as already mentioned, the sense section is not the only part in which the revised entry engages with the issue. While the main transmission in the etymology is quite short, as the derivation itself is a straightforward matter (< ENGLE *n.* + -ISH *suffix*/1), the etymology also contains a lengthy small-type note that discusses the semantic development of the words *England* and *English* and related concepts such as Old English *Anglcyynn* more discursively and attempts to place them in the context of views on the development of ideas of nationality and statehood in Anglo-Saxon England as they are now prevalent among historians of the Anglo-Saxon period. This section reflects further research on the subject and takes in Anglo-Latin as well as English primary sources — in this connection particularly Bede, his reception of Gregory the Great’s writings, and the views he expresses in his *Ecclesiastical History*.³⁷

The section dovetails with the treatment of the meaning of *England* as a geographical and political entity in the etymology of the entry ENGLAND *n.*, the treatment of Latin *Anglus* at ANGLE *n.*/3 and the treatment of the place name *Angel* at ENGLE *n.* Thus, the shifting use of the political term *England*, which is discussed at ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.*, is illustrated by two quotation paragraphs in the etymology of ENGLAND *n.*, where additional comments mainly focus on the use as a geographical term:

From the Old English period onwards the name *England* has been used to denote the southern part of the island of Great Britain, usually excluding Wales (although compare quot. 1658 below), and in early use including territory extending as far north as the Firth of Forth (compare quot. eOE). In Old English one of several words for the whole of the territory occupied by the Germanic settlers of Britain and their descendants (compare *Anglcyynn*, *Angel-folc*, *Angel-pēod*, which more clearly denote the people as well as the land they occupy: see ENGLE *n.*). [...] In some of these examples (e.g. quots. a1398, a1400) the name is used more generally to refer to the whole of Britain. Such use is also found later, although it is now freq. objected to, especially by people in Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.

37 Works consulted include Brooks, *Bede and the English*; Foot, “English People,” 170–71; and Richter, “Bede’s *Angli*: Angles or English.”

The first paragraph of the above-mentioned small-type note at ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.* covers the role of the Angles in the Anglo-Saxon settlement in Britain, both as historians regard it today and as Bede reports it in his *Ecclesiastical History*. As in *OED2*, the editor makes the point that the original sense of the adjective must have been ‘of or belonging to the (Continental) Angles,’ but that this sense is not attested. The discussion also serves as a background to the definition of the relevant sense of ANGLE *n.*/*3*, sense 1 (“A member of a Germanic-speaking tribe,” etc.), which is cross-referred to this note at ENGLISH. The note at ENGLISH in its turn cross-refers to ENGLE *n.* for the discussion of the original home of the Angles and the etymology of the place name *Angel*. The etymology of ENGLE *n.* reads,

Cognate with Old Icelandic *Englar* (compare also Old High German *Angil-*, *Engil-*, an element in personal names) < *Angel* (Danish *Angel*, German *Angeln*), the name of a district in Schleswig in northern Germany and southern Denmark, believed to be the original home of the Angles (see ANGLE *n.*³), of uncertain origin, but often suggested to derive ultimately < the same Germanic base as ANGLE *n.*¹ on account of its shape.

The second paragraph of the etymological note at ENGLISH mainly discusses post-classical Latin usage, especially in British sources, with regard to different terms for the Anglo-Saxons, showing how the earliest development of the concept of ‘the English’ is first traceable in Latin rather than in English:

The use of the noun with reference to all Anglo-Saxons is first attested in Latin (post-classical Latin *Anglus*), in writings of Pope Gregory I about the Christian mission to England (595, in Gregory I *Epistolae*, vi. 10; compare also vi. 51, vi. 60). It was subsequently used by Bede and other early 8th-cent. authors to designate a primarily ecclesiastical identity, with ethnic but at first only marginally political implications (in Bede often in the phrase *gens Anglorum*, which is probably the model of Old English *Angelcynn*, *Angelþēod* (see ENGLE *n.*), although this has been disputed).

The discussion goes on to refer to the entry ANGLO-SAXON *n.*, which was revised at the same time; the etymology of ANGLO-SAXON *n.* contains a discussion of OE *Angel-Seaxe* as well as the use of post-classical Latin *Anglo-Saxones* in Continental and British sources, although the word ANGLO-SAXON itself is first attested in the early modern period (1602). Further on, the etymological note at ENGLISH, *OED3* also discusses the relevant uses of Latin *Saxones* and SAXON *n.* as follows (though the entry SAXON *n.* has not yet been revised):

The Romans and the Celts of Britain (e.g. Gildas *De excidio Britanniae*) had usually perceived the Saxon participation among the invaders as most prominent and applied the name ‘Saxon’ (post-classical Latin *Saxones*) to all Anglo-Saxon settlers generically. This use is occas. also reflected in Anglo-Saxon writers in Latin in the late 7th and early 8th centuries (compare *SAXON n.* 1), and this view is ultimately also reflected in the term *ANGLO-SAXON n.*

The third paragraph of the etymological note addresses the use of *ENGLISH* itself and points out, as *DOE* does, that there appears to be no clear evidence (in contrast to *ENGLE n.*) of the adjective *Englisc* referring to Angles settled in Great Britain rather than speakers of English or persons of Anglo-Saxon descent.³⁸ It considers the possible implications of this for a sense of linguistic rather than political identity:

The use of the noun *ENGLE n.* in this more general sense was perhaps preceded by a concept of linguistic identity associated with the adjective *ENGLISH adj.* This is suggested by the fact that Old English *Englisc* (adjective) is only attested with reference to speakers of English or persons of Anglo-Saxon descent generally, as distinct e.g. from persons of Celtic descent (compare *BRETT n.*¹, *WELSH n.* 2). See especially quot. eOE at *ENGLISHMAN n.* 1, taken from a legal text originally composed a726 in Wessex, i.e. in non-Anglian territory. As mentioned above, there is no trace of an earlier more restricted sense for the adjective or of an alternative more general term for

38 This does not mean that the word does not occasionally refer to speakers of English who are, coincidentally, Angles. However, it is not possible to show anywhere that, in doing so, a contrast with Saxons rather than, for example, with speakers of Irish is intended; compare, for instance, the quotation cited by *DOE* at sense A.1.a. from Book IV of the translation of Bede (Bede 4 4.274.12), which concerns English-speaking monks in Ireland who coincidentally are (almost certainly) Northumbrians. Cp. also the case of St. Oswald translating Aidan’s OIr. into (Anglian) OE, as described by Bede and his OE translator (see quot. eOE/1 at *ENGLISH n.* 2a in *OED3*). Latin *Saxonicus* is occasionally used in the sense ‘English’ in British sources. This use is apparently influenced by Continental or Celtic Latin models (cp. also the discussion of Asser’s use of *Saxonicus* by Foot, “The Making of *Anglécynn*,” 56–57). There seems to be no OE equivalent to this use. On the only occasion when Bede mentions the difference between the Northumbrian and the West Saxon form of a name, he calls the West Saxon variety “lingua ipsorum” ‘their own language [i.e., of the West Saxons]’; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ii.5, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 148 (the observation is omitted by the OE translator). *SAXISH* with reference to language is not attested until Layamon (cp. also *MED s.v. Saxish*); in fact, OE *seaxisc* is attested only in *Supseaxisc* ‘of Sussex.’

the language (compare e.g. the contrasting history of the designation of the German language: see DUTCH *adj.*, *n.*, and *adv.*).³⁹

The fourth paragraph considers how the use of *Engle*, *Engla land*, and *Englisc* (adjective and noun) was affected by political developments from the tenth century onwards, beginning with the rise of the kings of Wessex, while the following paragraph mainly considers post-medieval developments and their repercussions for the use and implied meanings of *England* and ENGLISH:

Once the kings of Wessex had begun extending their power over the rest of England in the 10th cent., after an intermediate stage, in which they sometimes referred to the people they ruled as Latin *Angel-Saxones* (see ANGLO-SAXON *n.* and *adj.*), the words ENGLE *n.* and (subsequently) ENGLISH *n.* came to be used with reference to all inhabitants of their realm, at first specifically those of Anglo-Saxon descent and so subject to Anglo-Saxon (rather than e.g. Danish) law. Similarly the name *England*, lit. ‘land of the ENGLE *n.*’ (see ENGLAND *n.*), was used of the part of Britain they inhabited. This concept survived the Norman Conquest, which obliterated earlier distinctions such as the special status of the DANE-LAW *n.* During the Anglo-Norman period, however, the Norman and other French invaders and their descendants at first continued to be regarded as ‘French’, so that ENGLISH *adj.* and ENGLISH *n.*, as applied to people, were for a time restricted to those whose ancestors had settled in England before the Conquest. [. . .]

While the geographical limits of *England* remained comparatively stable from the 10th cent. on, with the exception of some shifts of the border with Scotland, the political implications of ENGLISH *adj.* and ENGLISH *n.* (and of ENGLAND *n.*) changed [. . .].

These two paragraphs of the etymological note at ENGLISH conclude the passage discussing the semantics of the words ENGLE *n.* and ENGLISH *adj.* and *n.* — that is, their relationship with each other and with the geographical and political term *England*.

39 BRETT *n.*¹ and *adj.*, another word not covered by the *DOE* because it is an ethnonym, was revised in the same batch as ENGLISH and BRITISH. Cp. the definition of the noun at this entry: “A member of one of the Brittonic-speaking peoples originally inhabiting all of Britain south of the Firth of Forth, and in later times *spec.* Strathclyde, Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany; a Briton. Now *hist.* and *rare*. Note: The ordinary name used in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; in Scotland applied to the Strathclyde Britons until c1300, when their legal system, distinct from that of the Scots, was abolished by Edward I.” Publication of the revised entry WELSH *adj.* and *n.* is forthcoming, as is the revised entry SCOTTISH *adj.* and *n.*

The final two paragraphs of the note are devoted to more purely linguistic issues: the use as noun in the sense ‘the English language,’ and the forms history and pronunciation of the word (the latter is cross-referred to the entry *ENGLISH n.* and concerned with post-Old English developments).

This section of the etymology is an unusually detailed treatment of semantic issues for an *OED3* entry. The extensive treatment of the subject is justified by the fact that it not only helps to clarify the structure of the sense section of the entry *ENGLISH n.*, but also serves as a node for other entries of the semantic group that are explicitly or implicitly cross-referred to it. However, despite its unusual character, the etymology of *ENGLISH n.* does demonstrate the relative flexibility of etymological treatment in *OED3*, especially in the small-type notes, compared to the self-imposed limitations of the structure of *DOE* entries. It is the more intricate problems of the formal developments of an English word or issues involving possible cognates that more often require lengthier sets of small-type notes in the etymology of *OED3*, but, when necessary, the usually concise format of comments on semantic developments can be adapted to outline a complex development involving historical and political factors, the use of particular authors (such as Gregory the Great and Bede), and the influence of shifts in post-classical Latin usage on Old English, as here. However, the starting point for the discussion, in this case as in others, was the definition in the *DOE* entry and its response to the earlier editions of *OED*.

There are other senses of Old English *englisc* covered in the entry *ENGLISH adj.* and *n.* that could usefully serve as further points of comparison between *DOE* and *OED3* and help to illuminate their approaches to such subjects — for example, the treatment of the use of the adjective as noun to designate the English language — and further comparison could be made with the treatment of *BRITISH adj.* and *n.*, though the complexity of the material does not at present permit this. Nonetheless, I hope to have illustrated that in the discussion of semantic issues and the treatment of quotations as well as in the treatment of grammar and spellings, *DOE* and *OED3* are truly complementary, and should ideally be read together for a fuller picture of the development of the meaning of Old English words in a more comprehensive historical and linguistic context.

Conclusion

The main goal of this article has been to show how important the content of published *DOE* entries has been to ongoing work on *OED3* entries where editors have been in a position to consult them. To this end, I have selected two recently revised entries on adjectives derived from ethnonyms, *BRITISH adj.* and *n.* and *ENGLISH adj.* and *n.*, further supplementing the discussion with material from other revised entries, especially *APPLE n.* and *FOOD n.*, where it seemed necessary or helpful. Among other things I have examined the dictionaries' respective organization of lexical data and treatment of morphological, grammatical, and semantic issues. As is to be expected, *DOE* provides a more thorough treatment of details of attestation within Old English and is more strongly focused on synchronic aspects of the Old English vocabulary, whereas the corresponding *OED3* entries contextualize the Old English evidence more widely, not only with regard to its later history but also with regard to cognates and models in Germanic and Latin. In this context, the adaptability and flexibility of the *OED3* etymology in dealing with a range of problems posed by specific entries emerged. The two different approaches represented by *DOE* and *OED3* happily complement each other, and thus the editors of *DOE* and *OED3* are working in harmony to realize the goal, stated in the *DOE* preface, of providing a full historical description of the vocabulary of English.

Oxford English Dictionary

Bibliography

Abbreviations

- Bosworth-Toller. Toller, T. Northcote. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, based on the manuscript collections of Joseph Bosworth. With rev. and enlarged addenda and corrigenda by Alistair Campbell. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.
- DOE*. Healey, Antonette diPaolo, et al. *The Dictionary of Old English: A to G online*. 2007. <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>>.
- DOE Corpus*. Healey, Antonette diPaolo, et al. *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. 2009. <<http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>>.
- DOST*. Craigie, William A., Adam J. Aitken, and Margaret G. Dareau et al., eds. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen Univ. Press, 1931-2002. Available online with supplements at <www.dsl.ac.uk>; accessed June 2010.
- LAEME*. Laing, Margaret, and Roger Lass. *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325*. Edinburgh: Univ. of Edinburgh, 2007-. <<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html>>; accessed June 2010.
- LALME*. McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels, Michael Benskin. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. With the assistance of Margaret Laing and Keith Williams. Aberdeen: Aberdeen Univ. Press, 1986.
- MED*. Kurath, Hans, et al. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1956-2001. Updated and corrected version at <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>>; accessed June 2010.
- NED*. See *OED1*.
- OED1*. Murray, James A. H., et al. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Corrected re-issue of the First Edition (originally publ. as *A New English Dictionary*, 1884-1928) with a Supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- OED2*. Simpson, John A., and Edmund S. C. Weiner. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Online at <<http://oed.com>>; accessed June 2010.
- OED3*. Simpson, John A. *Oxford English Dictionary* (3rd ed. online: in progress). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000-. (Quarterly updates of new and rev. material from March 2000). <<http://oed.com>>.
- OED Additions*:
- Proffitt, Michael, ed. *Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series*, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Simpson, John A., and Edmund S. C. Weiner. *Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series*, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- and Edmund S. C. Weiner. *Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series*, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

- Blake, Martin, ed. *Ælfric's De Temporibus Anni*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009.
- Brooks, Nicholas. *Bede and the English*. Jarrow Lecture 1999. Jarrow: St. Paul's Church, 2000.
- Campbell, A. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Clark Hall, John R. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. With a Supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. 4th ed. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1960.
- Colgrave, Bertram, and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Foot, Sarah. "English People." In *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Michael Lapidge et al., 170-71. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- . "The Making of *Anglecynn*: English Identity before the Norman Conquest." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 6, Part 6 (1996): 25-49. Repr. in *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, edited by Roy M. Liuzza, 51-78. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 2002.
- Frank, Roberta, and Angus Cameron, eds. *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto Old English Series 2. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Henel, Heinrich, ed. *Aelfric's De Temporibus Anni*. EETS o.s. 213. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1942.
- Ker, N. R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Supplement, in *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976): 121-31. Repr., incl. supplement, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Richter, Michael. "Bede's *Angli*: Angles or English?" *Peritia* 3 (1984): 99-114.
- Sawyer, Peter H. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1968. Updated and rev. version at <<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/index.html>>; accessed June 2010.
- Scragg, Donald, et al. *MANCASS C11 Database Project: An Inventory of Script and Spellings in Eleventh-Century English*. Manchester: Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 2006-. <<http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/mancass/C11database/>>; accessed June 2010.
- Stanley, Eric G. "OED and the Earlier History of English." In *Lexicography and the OED: Pioneers in the Untrodden Forest*, edited by Lynda Mugglestone, 126-55. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
- . "Old English in *The Oxford English Dictionary*." In *Studies in Lexicography*, edited by Robert Burchfield, 19-35. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Sweet, Henry. *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.
- Venezky, Richard L., and Antonette diPaolo Healey. *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*. Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 1. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980.