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Abstract

This thesis consists of an edition of the text of Ælfric of Eynsham’s (c. 955 × 1010–20) Grammar based on the 11th century manuscript London, British Library, Harley 3271, together with an introduction which both surveys the work’s historical context and discusses key features of the text itself. An overarching theme of the introduction is the significance of the Grammar’s peculiar place in the history of textual transmission and of education in medieval England as it was the first translation of a Latin grammar into a vernacular European language. It thus provided its readers a more easily attainable access to Latin, the language of learning, for which reason Ælfric himself calls the text “the key that unlocks the meaning of books.”

Because the edition is based on a single manuscript, I have endeavoured to remain as faithful to the manuscript as may be reasonably achieved, retaining its spelling, its scribal alterations, and its textual divisions. Emendations and additions are generally reserved for damaged sections of text or for scribal errors or omissions which might otherwise be misleading to the reader and are made with reference to both the 1880 edition of Julius Zupitza and to a second manuscript, Oxford, St John’s College, MS 154.
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Introduction

1. Context and Significance of the Grammar

An appreciation of Ælfric’s career as a writer, translator, and teacher requires some reflection on the century immediately preceding his own time and, more specifically, on perhaps the most important figure in England during that time, King Alfred the Great.

In the relative peace secured by the successful defense of his kingdom, Alfred sought to begin the restoration of the once renowned scholarship and learning in England, which had been so devastated by the decades of Viking invasions and, according to Alfred’s own words, even more so by his people’s own negligence.¹ Alfred’s plan was twofold: his chief intention was to restore the widespread understanding of Latin grammar among the monastic community, but because this process would take many years, he also ordered, and himself took part in, the translation into English of texts which were deemed the most needful to know. In this way those without an understanding of Latin could still learn and promulgate the teachings of, for instance, the Bible and the Church Fathers.²

Viewed in the context of this educational reform, Ælfric’s extensive learning reveals the success of Alfred’s strategy, while his writings and translations were to become some of the most important texts for its further development. Ælfric’s Grammar especially fulfils both parts of Alfred’s plan, for the text is itself largely a translation (of the Excerptio de Prisciano)³ and thus

---

¹ “geþenc hwilce witu us þa becomon for þisse worulde, þa þa we hit [wisdom] na hwæðer ne selfe ne lufedon, ne eac oðrum mannnum ne lýdon, þone naman anne we lufdon, þæt we cristene wæron, and swiðe feawa þa þeawas” (“Remember what befell us in this world, when we neither loved wisdom in ourselves nor passed it on to other men. We loved only the name – that we were Christian – and very few loved the practices”) (Alfred, De Cura Pastoralis, Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS ii.2.4, f. 5v). More accurately then, Alfred viewed the Vikings not as the cause of the decline in learning, but as the instrument of God’s punishment for his people’s idleness and lack of true Christian virtue. For an edition of Alfred’s preface see “On the State of Learning in England,” in Dorothy Whitelock, ed., Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse, 15th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 4–7. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

² “forþi me þingð betere… þæt we eac sume bec þa þe nied-beþyrfysta syn eallum mannnum to witanne, þæt we þa on þæt geþeode wendon þe we ealle gecnawan mægen” (“Therefore I think it better that some books also which are most needful for all men to know, that we translate them to a language which we all can understand”) (Alfred, f. 6r).

carries on the work begun by Alfred, while its express purpose is to educate young students (puerulis tenellis)\(^4\) in the fundamentals of Latin grammar.

That Ælfric is conscious of his regal forerunner, moreover, is suggested by how closely his lament for the decline in learning echoes that of Alfred. In his Old English preface, Ælfric hopes that “seo halige lar on urum dagum ne acolige oððe ateorige, swa swa hit wæs gedon on Angel-cynne nu for anum feawum gearum, swa þæt nan Englisc preest ne cuðe dihtan oððe asmeagan ðæne pistol on Læden” (that “the holy teaching in our days grow cold or wane, just as it happened among the English people some few years ago now, so that no English priest could compose or understand a single letter in Latin”).\(^5\) Perhaps Ælfric recognized what is now evident, namely that he himself represented one of the greatest realizations of Alfred’s educational movement. Sadly for him, however, Ælfric’s greatness appeared near the end of an era and the very language he championed was within a few short centuries to become unintelligible even to his own countrymen. Even Alfred’s preface itself, in the Hatton MS (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20), was glossed in Latin by the famous Tremulous Hand of Worcester in the early 13th century, which shows how quickly and drastically the language had changed since even an English speaker found Latin more intelligible than an earlier form of his own language.\(^6\) Yet in spite of this, Ælfric’s works survive in comparably astonishing numbers. Of the twelve hundred or so manuscripts which have survived

---

\(^4\) f. 7r, p. 1. References to passages in the Grammar are given in the format: f. [folio number in the manuscript], p. [page number in this edition].

\(^5\) f. 7v, pp. 2–3. Cf. Alfred, f. 5r: “þæt swiðe feawa wærpon beheonan Humbre þe cuðon... an ærend-gewryt of Ledene on Englisc areccan” (“that there were very few beyond the Humber who could interpret a single brief writing of Latin in English”). It should be noted that “areccan” does not mean “to translate,” but rather “to render,” and is the Old English equivalent of the Latin enarratio, which is a technical term for one of the main functions of the artes grammaticae, namely, interpretation, the “activity focused on what was necessary to clarify a text in order to understand it” (M. B. Parkes, “Redan, Areccan, Smeagan: How the Anglo-Saxons Read,” in Pages from the Past: Medieval Writing Skills and Manuscript Books (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), p. 10).

\(^6\) See N. R. Ker, Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), § 324. Evidence that the scribe known as the Tremulous Hand actively studied Old English is to be found in several manuscripts of Alfred’s preface. See Timothy Graham, “The Opening of King Alfred’s Preface to the Old English Pastoral Care: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 20,” Old English Newsletter 38, no. 1 (Fall 2004).
from the seventh to eleventh century in England, sixty contain the writings of Ælfric and fifteen of these contain the Grammar (though not all of the latter are complete).⁷

The popularity of the Grammar was due primarily to its significance as a teaching instrument that is, its usefulness. Many other Latin grammars were in circulation in Ælfric’s time, such as those of Priscian and Donatus, to which he refers in his Latin preface,⁸ but what is unique about Ælfric’s Grammar is that it is the first translation into a vernacular language.⁹ This was of crucial importance to Anglo-Saxon students since, unlike their continental counterparts for whom Latin was essentially an antiquated dialect of their own language, their study of Latin was as of a foreign language, far removed from their own Germanic tongue.¹⁰ Ælfric thus perceived the paradox of using a Latin textbook to learn Latin, since that would presuppose some level of Latin understanding, and he accordingly set about composing a grammar which would better serve the needs of English-speaking students. In the Old English preface, Ælfric calls “stæf-cræft,” his term for “grammar,” “seo cæg ðe... bóca andgit unlycð” (“the key that unlocks the understanding of books”), but had he claimed this of his Grammar rather than of “stæf-cræft” in general, he would scarcely have been less accurate.

The influence of the Grammar extended even beyond the medieval period inasmuch as it served as a foundational entry point into the study of the Old English language itself – the Rosetta

---


¹⁰ Hurt observes that “The grammars of the major Greek and Roman grammarians were not primarily pedagogical grammars. For the most part, they were written for native speakers of the language and were objective investigations of the nature and structure of language,” while “Medieval grammars were written primarily to teach students a second language” (James Hurt, Ælfric, Twayne’s English Author Series 131 (New York: Twayne, 1972), p. 106). Evidence of this is to be found in the Grammar itself, which includes exhaustive lists of word forms of both nouns and verbs unlike its Latin predecessors which presupposed the knowledge of such information or offered at most an overview of it.
Stone of Old English, as it were. The Grammar and Glossary were invaluable to the earliest post-median scholars of Old English who, in the mid sixteenth century, studied the language by employing these texts in reverse, that is, by working from Latin into the as yet little-known Old English.¹¹ In consequence, modern Anglo-Saxon scholarship is doubly indebted to Ælfric as both a prolific author and pedagogue in his own right and as the means for its discovery. In a word, he is both a gateway into the Anglo-Saxon world and, by means of his Grammar, the very key that unlocks it.

2. Ælfric’s Life and Works

Little is known about Ælfric’s early life except that he was born c. 955 AD, probably in Wessex, that he had some instruction in Latin as a boy, and that he came to the monastic school at Winchester early in the 970s where he remained for “many years,” according to his Letter to the Monks of Eynsham.¹² There Ælfric studied under the bishop Æthelwold who was zealously furthering his mission of Benedictine Reform, a movement in which Ælfric himself was to become a key figure.¹³ The monks of Winchester were therefore expected to strictly follow the liturgical regimen, while those training to be monks studied a curriculum based upon the trivium and quadrivium, though the focus of their introductory years was on the first part of the trivium, namely grammar, that is learning to read and write Latin and studying Latin literature. Hurt observes,


¹² Hurt, Aelfric, pp. 27–8. For further information on Ælfric’s biography, see Hurt’s first chapter, “Ælfric and the Tenth Century.” See also Joyce Hill, “Ælfric: His Life and Works,” in A Companion to Ælfric, 35–65; Marguerite-Marie Dubois, Ælfric: Sermonnaire, Docteur et Grammairien (Paris: E. Droz, 1943). Hurt, however, describes the latter as “Lengthy and often useful, though not always reliable in detail” (p. 147). Hill argues, based on the evidence of Ælfric’s Preface to Genesis, that his early education suffered from inadequacies since his teacher only understood Latin “be dedal” (“in part”). See Hill, pp. 45–7. Accordingly, Ælfric’s numerous references to the poor state of education, which it is his great aim to remedy, are not mere generalizations, but come from his first-hand experience and, doubtless, frustration.

¹³ Hill notes the two-way nature of Ælfric’s relationship with the Reform, “of which he was so self-consciously product and proponent” (Hill, “Ælfric: His Life and Works,” p. 38).
however, that Ælfric’s own education extended far beyond the basic curriculum, even claiming that “he was probably the best-educated man in the England of his day.”

Ælfric put his education into practice upon being sent to the newly founded monastery at Cernel in 987 where he remained for eighteen years, instructing new monks concerning the Benedictine Rule and organizing the educational program. It was during this period, while at Cernel, that Ælfric produced the majority of his works, including the Grammar, which he composed some time between the years 992–1002. In 1005, Ælfric again moved to a newly founded monastery, this time to become the abbot at Eynsham, whence comes his epithet, “of Eynsham.” It seems that by this point Ælfric had already completed the main body of writings he had hoped to accomplish, for he produced very few while at Eynsham when compared with his copious output during previous years, and these later writings, moreover, were mostly undertaken not of his own will, but at the instigation of various persons who either had known him or had heard of his fame as a scholar and cleric. Among these are, for example, his Letter to the Monks of Eynsham and Letter to Sigeweard.

When Ælfric died, between 1010–1020, he left a remarkable legacy of work. He is indeed one of the most prolific writers of Old English prose. His reputation comes chiefly from his composition of over 160 homilies and saints’ lives, but in addition to these he produced several other ecclesiastical writings, such as translations of parts of the Old Testament, a summary of the entire Bible, and a scientific treatise on the creation of the world based on Bede, called De temporibus anni. Besides these, he also composed pedagogical works, namely, his Grammar, Glossary, and

---

14 Hurt, Ælfric, p. 31.
15 Ibid., p. 32.
18 Hurt, Ælfric, p. 41; Clemoes, Chronology, p. 35.
Colloquy, all of which are intended to aid the education of students in Latin.\textsuperscript{21} Ælfric’s corpus thus has the overarching theme of education, whether in the basics of Latin or in the teachings of the faith. He evidently took to heart the injunctions he put forth in the preface to his Grammar: “Ælcum men gebyrað, þe ænigne godne cræft hæfð, þæt he þone dó nytne oðrum mannum”\textsuperscript{22} (“it is necessary for each man who has any good skill that he use it for the benefit of other men”), and likewise that “Iungum mannum gedafenað þæt hi leornion sumne wisdóm, and ðam ealdum gedafenað þæt hi tæcon sum gerád heora iunglingum”\textsuperscript{23} (“it befits young men that they learn some wisdom, and it befits the old that they teach some wisdom to their children”). But scanty as our knowledge of Ælfric’s life may be, Caroline Louisa White, in Ælfric: A New Study of His Life and Writings, bids us be thankful for what we do know, reminding us that “there are men of greater note than he of whom we know less.”\textsuperscript{24}

3. The Function of the Grammar

Although the Grammar has much to say concerning Old English and its grammar,\textsuperscript{25} its main function remains that of a grammar of Latin. As such, it is directed toward young, beginning students and serves as an introduction to the basics of Latin grammar, beginning with the alphabet and pronunciation of each letter and diphthong, and proceeding through the parts of speech, the five cases, nouns and their declensions, and the conjugation of verbs.

The Grammar’s organization is not so different from that of a modern Latin grammar, which might suggest that it was also employed in a more or less equivalent way, but there are some meaningful differences. Unlike modern grammars, Ælfric’s Grammar has no index or finding aids and always employs lists, rather than tables of word forms. This lack is suggestive concerning how

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Although the Colloquy is now commonly known in Old English, the Old English text is in fact a gloss on Ælfric’s Latin composition, now extant in three manuscripts, one of which (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols 2–173) is glossed in Old English. See Ker, Catalogue, §§ 2, 186 art. 11; Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100 (University of Toronto Press, 2014), §§ 363 arts. 11, 686, 775.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} f. 7v, p. 2.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Caroline Louisa White, Ælfric: A New Study of His Life and Writings (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1974), p. 70.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} See “Uterque lingua: The Grammar as a Grammar of English,” below, p. xxii.
\end{itemize}
the *Grammar* was actually used by its readers. The absence of any visual mnemonic aids such as tables suggests that students would not have read the text to themselves in the modern sense, but, instead, would have had it read to them by an instructor,\footnote{The dual prefaces in Latin and Old English lend weight to this idea of a double audience, instructor and student. See the discussion of the two prefaces in “The *Grammar* as a Translation,” below, p. xvi.} while the lack of finding aids suggests that the text was not intended to be studied piecemeal, by jumping around here and there in order to read this or that section, that is as a reference text. On the contrary, the lack of finding aids implies that the work is to be read as a whole, sequentially, and with the profound concentration required for memorization which was expected of studious readers.\footnote{For a comprehensive discussion of medieval reading practices and the role of memory, see Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).}

That the *Grammar* was meant to be memorized can be inferred both from the nature of the subject – language acquisition inevitably requires much memorization – and from the usual practice of reading during the Middle Ages. Mary Carruthers, in *The Book of Memory*, argues that memory, or more accurately, *memoria*, the art of effectively both storing and recollecting information, was viewed as the foundation of learning from the classical through medieval periods. She quotes, for example, from Hugh of St. Victor’s *De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum*, which states: *In sola enim memoria omnis utilitas doctrinae consistit* ("the whole usefulness of education consists only in the memory of it").\footnote{Carruthers, pp. 101, 397 [Carruthers’ translation].} She also marks the differentiation between *memoria ad res* and *memoria ad verba*. *Memoria ad res* is one’s memory of concepts, ideas, or, as we might now say, “the gist” of a text once one has understood it and put it into his or her own words, while *memoria ad verba* is the memorization of the words of a text. Both of these forms of memory were commonly developed to a truly impressive degree.

Although Carruthers does not specifically address the relation of *memoria* to language acquisition and learning grammar, especially since nearly all the medieval texts devoted to the subject are in Latin and presume a Latin education, I would suggest that studying a language falls somewhere between *memoria ad res* and *memoria ad verba*. The memorization of declensions and conjugations, on the one hand, resembles *memoria ad verba*, since its aim is to remember exact word forms, which would fit very well into the sort of memorial framework promoted in works such as the *ad Herennium*,\footnote{For an edition and translation, see Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, tr. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library 403 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954).} insofar as they consist of small bits of information that can be easily

---

26 The dual prefaces in Latin and Old English lend weight to this idea of a double audience, instructor and student. See the discussion of the two prefaces in “The *Grammar* as a Translation,” below, p. xvi.
27 For a comprehensive discussion of medieval reading practices and the role of memory, see Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
28 Carruthers, pp. 101, 397 [Carruthers’ translation].
organized into a fixed and orderly set. Grammatical rules, on the other hand, may be ineffective if merely memorized by rote; it is necessary to understand them and be able to adapt them for them to be of use. They therefore more closely resemble memoria ad res. However that may be, the importance placed on memoria profoundly affected how medieval readers engaged with a text and must not be overlooked in the present case since a grammar, even more so than many texts, requires memorization for its usefulness.

This importance is further corroborated in the Grammar as the amount of explanation and translation in Old English tends to decrease over the course of the text. The Old English translation of each form within a conjugation, for instance, falls away following the change in hand to that of scribe B beginning with the section on the passive forms of the second conjugation. From this point onward, Ælfric no longer bothers to include the Old English translation of each verb form. He evidently judges that the reader should, by this point, be able to infer the translations for himself. This suggests further that the text, though only eighty-three folios in the Harley manuscript, was not intended to be read in a short space of time. The reader was instead expected to proceed only slowly, taking the time to internalize its teachings before continuing through to subsequent sections, since a proper understanding of the initial material is a prerequisite for the more advanced content that follows.

Carruthers also notes that thumbing through a manuscript to find this or that section of text was regarded by medieval thinkers to be terribly clumsy and time-consuming. Again, from the same work of Hugh of St. Victor, she quotes:

For surely, you do not think that those who wish to cite some one of the Psalms have turned over the manuscript pages, so that starting their count from the beginning they could figure out what number in the series of Psalms each might have? The labor in such a task would be too great. Therefore they have in their heart a powerful mental device, and they have retained it in memory, for they have learned the number and the order of each single item in the series.

Education consisted in storing away important texts in one’s memory rather than merely providing the tools to find and read them in books.

---

30 f. 52v, p. 76.
31 Carruthers, The Book of Memory, p. 341 [Carruthers’ translation].
The presupposition that the Grammar is to be read in its entirety and in order elevates the importance of its organization. As a rule, Ælfric follows the order of topics in the Excerptiones de Prisciano, which, in turn, follows the generally accepted organization of other more or less widely circulated grammars, medieval and earlier, such as those of Donatus, Priscian’s Institutiones grammaticae (the main source of the Excerptiones), and Charisius’ Ars grammatica. Ælfric’s Grammar, however, is of a more introductory nature than these earlier works – all of which presuppose Latin as a native language – and accordingly goes into less detail or is altogether silent regarding the more advanced topics such as de tropis, de metris, de idiomatibus. It proceeds, nevertheless, in logical order, from simple to complex, from the smallest divisions of words themselves, namely letters and syllables, through the eight parts of speech in detail, and ends with a brief sketch and summary of the triginta divisiones grammaticae artis, the “thirty divisions of grammar,” concluding with the various genres of literature.

The absence of the adjective among the parts of speech may strike the reader as conspicuous, concerning which it should be noted that Ælfric, following earlier grammarians, does not consider the adjective to be a part of speech in its own right, but rather only a subclass of nomina (“nouns”). He explains that “Sume [nomina] sind adiectiua, hæc sind ða ðe beoð geihte to oðrum namum and geatçað oððe herunge oððe tál”32 (“Some nouns are adjectives, that is, those which are added to other nouns and signify either praise or blame”). Vivien Law gives a synopsis of the medieval understanding of the adjective, which “was regarded as a type of common noun, as its name reflects – nomen adiectivum or nomen epitheton – although increasingly in the later Middle Ages adiectivum came to stand on its own, often contrasted with (nomen) substantivum.”33

Ælfric’s main sources, the Excerptiones de Prisciano and the two-part Ars grammatica of Donatus, deserve some attention in their own right. Donatus’ (fl. 340–60) Ars has been called “the most successful textbook ever written,” and served as the basic school text for over a millennium.34 Its two parts are the Ars minor, which is an introduction to the parts of speech and inflection, and the Ars maior, which treats of the classical divisions of speech, from the vox, letters, and syllables, to barbarisms, solecisms, and tropes.35 Priscian, who taught in Constantinople between 512 and 528, composed his Institutiones grammaticae in order to transfer the Hellenistic tradition of grammatike

32 f. 10v, p. 9. “herunge oððe tál”: i.e. either a positive or negative attribute.
34 Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, p. 58.
35 Ibid.
into Latin. The *Institutiones* gives a systematic treatment of grammar in its first sixteen books and discusses syntax in its final two, which are directed to advanced students. The *Excerptiones de Prisciano* is a ninth- or early tenth-century compilation of the *Institutiones* together with material from Priscian’s other works, Bede’s grammatical treatises, and Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*.

For Anglo-Saxon students Ælfric’s *Grammar* may have supplanted those of Donatus and Priscian as the first step of an education, but it did not replace them altogether. It instead served as an introduction to them. It provided students with the basic set of tools needed for reading Latin and furthering their studies which it achieved through the explanatory medium of the vernacular language, the use of which made it the first of its kind. But it should also be remembered that grammar, understood in the far more expansive medieval sense of the term, is not merely a set of rules, but an art, something valuable not only as a means but as an end in itself. It reaches beyond purely linguistic matters into rhetoric, dialectic, exegesis, and criticism. It is also understood as the necessary starting point of all learning.

The *ars grammatica* was commonly divided into four ascending divisions: *lectio*, the rules for correct reading, *enarratio*, the interpretation of a text, *emendatio*, rules for correcting texts, and *iudicium*, judgment or literary criticism. Irvine notes that grammatical discourse was employed to organize and classify the other *artes*, positioning *grammatica* as the foundation and arbiter of the whole order of knowledge. *Grammatica* was articulated as the foundation of a sequence of disciplines, each of which presupposes *grammatica* as the only point of entry into the system.

Ælfric’s *Grammar* was therefore an entry point on two levels, to the rules of a language and to a broader culture of learning, and it offered a glimpse, not only in the *triginta divisiones*, but also in

---

36 Irvine, pp. 61–2.
37 The *Institutiones* are also sometimes said to have a *minor* and *maior* part according to this division as indeed Ælfric mentions at the beginning of his Latin preface: “*hae Excerptiones de Prisciano, minore uel maiore*” (f. 7r, p. 1).
38 Irvine, p. 62.
41 Irvine, p. 63.
the quotations from authorities such as Vergil and the Bible, of what its readers’ studies would eventually lead to, namely the treasury of texts and knowledge to which grammar provided the key.

4. The Grammar as a Translation

Ælfric’s main textual sources for the Grammar are the Excerptiones de Prisciano and Donatus’ Ars minor, but the text is no mere translation or pastiche. Ælfric regularly quotes, translates, and expands, introduces original material, omits passages, and develops his own explanations and examples. His Grammar is therefore better termed an adaptation rather than a translation, though he is not unique in this regard. Jeanette M.A. Beer observes that

The most individual products of Latin–vernacular translation were, however, those in which the source text was completely reshaped and reinterpreted for a new public. Translation then allied itself with creation and the resulting works took on a life of their own... In those cases (frequently works of entertainment/instruction) the criterion of structural equivalence between source and derivative was subordinated to the criterion of structural appropriateness for a new target audience.  

Ælfric himself also comments on his practice in the preface, saying, Sciendum tamen quod ars grammatica multis in locis non facile Anglice lingue capit interpretationem (“it is to be understood, however, that in many places an ars grammatica art does not easily admit of a translation in the English language”). And again, in the preface to his Catholic Homilies, Ælfric explains that

ideoque nec obscura posuimus verba, sed simplicem Anglicam, quo facilius possit ad cor pervenire legentium vel audientium, ad utilitatem animarum suarum, quia alia lingua

---

42 Hurt, p. 108.
44 f. 7r, p. 1.
45 For further discussion of Ælfric’s comments on translation in his Latin prefaces, see Wilcox, Ælfric’s Prefaces, pp. 63–7.
nesciunt erudiri, quam in qua nati sunt. Nec ubique transtulimus verbum ex verbo, sed sensum ex sensu.46

(“And therefore we have not used obscure words, but simple English, in order that it might more easily reach the heart of those reading or listening, for the sake of providing something that will be to the benefit of their minds, because they are unable to be educated in a tongue other than that in which they were raised. Nor have we translated everywhere word for word, but sometimes sense for sense.”)47

Ælfric prefers simplicity and clarity over eloquence and rhetorical artifice, which he does for the benefit of his audience, who may be unlearned or, as is the case with the Grammar, newly embarking on an education. He makes no secret of his inclination to translate sense for sense when he judges it to be necessary or beneficial.

This tendency, moreover, arises out of Ælfric’s misgivings concerning translation, and especially translation of scripture, which result from the fear of misleading the unlearned who, he deems, are likely to understand only a literal interpretation, being oblivious to the deeper meanings of the text.48 In the preface to his translation of Genesis, Ælfric remarks that

this work is very perilous for me or any man to undertake, because I fear, if some foolish person reads this book or hears it read, that he will think that he may live now in the new law just as the patriarchs lived then in that time before the old law was appointed, or just as men lived under the law of Moses.49


47 “sense for sense,” cf. Ælfric’s treatment of the passive voice: “amatur a me, ’ic lufige’; legitur a me, ’ic rede’,” (f. 43r, p. 62) in which no attempt is made to translate the literal meanings, namely “it is loved by me” and “it is read by me.” Ælfric instead, very practically, gives only the sense of the Latin in idiomatic Old English.

48 These deeper meanings include primarily the allegorical and tropological: in the former, a correspondence is understood between terms and concepts in a cultural encyclopedia (e.g., “lamb” = “Christ”); in the latter, expressions indicate actual things, but these things in turn are understood to signify other events or concepts (e.g., the crossing of the Jordan River comes to signify baptism) (Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, p. 262). For a discussion of these methods of interpretation and their history, see Irvine, chapters four and six, “Enarratio I” and “Enarratio II,” pp. 118–61, 244–71.

49 Wilcox, Ælfric’s Prefaces, p. 78.
The Grammar, on the other hand, poses a different, if less perilous, challenge, namely that the text is about language itself. Sometimes this challenge is too great so that, for instance, Ælfric altogether omits any discussion of meter, saying, *de quibus hic reticemus* ("concerning which we are here silent"), while in other cases he admits that he cannot find a suitable translation. Of Latin *quiturus*, for example, he says that "we ne cunnon nan Englisc þær-tô" ("we know no English for it"). In most cases, however, Ælfric strives to do the best he can with the tools at his disposal. He thus finds it necessarily awkward to discuss certain aspects of Latin which have no counterpart in Old English such as, most notably, tenses other than the present and perfect. Accordingly, since Old English has no future tense, he must rely on adverbs and context to convey futurity. Thus for a single Latin verb, *stabo* ("I will stand"), he provides "ic stande nu rihte oððe on sumne timan" ("I stand right now or at some (future) time"), which is not only clunky, but even potentially misleading.

The examples Ælfric gives are especially reflective of his adaptive style of translation. He often adapts terms, names, and situations, which in his sources were based on traditional Roman society, to ones which would have been more familiar to his Christian, Anglo-Saxon audience. For instance, when he first introduces the noun as a part of speech, instead of using the examples for proper and common nouns given in the Excerptiones, namely *Virgilius* and *ars*, Ælfric provides the Latinized Anglo-Saxon names, *Eadgarus, Aðelwoldus*, and the more familiar terms, *rex, episcopus*. But by effecting such changes, Ælfric did more than aid the comprehension of his readers; he also left a window, however casual or idealized, into the commonplaces of 10th century Anglo-Saxon society. Thus, in keeping with the monastic setting of both its author and readers, books, students (*pueri*), and teachers are seemingly ubiquitous, as in, for instance, *multum ipse laborat docendo pueros* ("He labours much in teaching the children"), *commoda mibi librum ad legendum* ("Lend me a

---

50 f. 7r, p. 1.
51 f. 77r, p. 115.
52 f. 9r, p. 6. Cf. Porter, *Excerptiones de Prisciano: The Source for Æfric’s Latin-Old English Grammar*, p. 60. Note that these examples also correspond to historical figures both revered by Ælfric and familiar to his audience, namely King Edgar and Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester and Ælfric’s own teacher. Cf. also Thomas N. Hall, “Ælfric as Pedagogue,” in *A Companion to Ælfric*, p. 198. Ælfric later strikingly restricts the definition of *rex*, “cyning,” to a ruler “ðe rihtlice wissað his folce” (“who rightly governs his people”) (f. 56r, p. 82).
53 f. 50r, p. 73.
book to read”),54 and ab hoc magistro audiui sapientiam (“From this master I have heard wisdom”).55 Nor does he lose an opportunity to improve his students: injunctions such as o puer, lege (“O child, read”)56 and quando veniam ad te, doce me (“When I come to you, teach me”)57 are commonplace, while his often-repeated paradigm example of the comparative adjective is iustus, iustior, iustissimus (“just, more just, most just”). Moreover, most examples concerning servants58 especially espouse humility and beneficence, as a meo servuo monitus sum (“by my servant I am instructed”),59 meo mancipio fábrico domus (“I build a house for my servant”),60 and meos servuos diligo (“I love my servants”).61 In general, Ælfric chooses examples with a positive and encouraging tone, stressing the value of books, reading, learning, and of the Christian values of giving and loving.62 This tendency is perhaps best exemplified when, for utinam legissem in iuventute, he gives not only the literal translation “eala gif ic rædde on iugoðe” (“if only I had read in my youth”), but further adds, “ðonne cuð ic nu sum god” (“then I would now know some good”).63 In one instance, moreover, a lack of examples is suggestive: in his discussion of jurative adverbs, Ælfric gives only three examples before concluding that “Crist sylf us forbead ælcne að,” and therefore, “Ma sindon swerigendlice aduerbia, ac hwæt sceolon hi gesæde, nu we swerian ne moton?” (“Christ himself forbade us every oath,” and therefore, “there are more swearing adverbs, but what should be said of them, given that we are not supposed to swear?”),64 which both admonishes his readers not to swear and limits their ability to do so, at least in Latin. In a word, Ælfric’s original examples show that he is interested in imparting to his readers a wisdom beyond that of grammar alone.

It is also important to note that, although Ælfric tends to adapt and Christianize his sources, which quote only secular texts, he does not wholly omit classical pagan authors. He quotes from

54 f. 45v, p. 66.
55 f. 14r, p. 16.
56 f. 43r, p. 63.
57 f. 69v, p. 102.
58 Perhaps a more accurate and less anachronistic translation of the the Latin and Old English terms servus, ancilla, mancipium and “ðeow man,” “wyln,” “wealh” would be “slave” or “bonds(wo)man.”
59 f. 35r, p. 50.
60 f. 35v, p. 51.
61 f. 35r, p. 50.
62 Ælfric’s example for the reflexive pronoun se, for instance, is “Christus se dedit pro nobis” (“Christ gave himself for our sake”), f. 33v, p. 48.
63 f. 42v, p. 62.
64 f. 70r, p. 104.
Vergil’s *Aeneid* several times, including its famous opening line, *arma virumque cano*, twice, and further quotes, for example, Lucan, Sallust, Seneca, Terence, and Plautus. Thus, just as, in the words of Martin Irvine in *The Making of Textual Culture*, Isidore of Seville sees “Christian grammatica... as the continuation and completion – not the cancellation – of Roman imperial *grammatica*,”66 so does Ælfric see his *Grammar* as a manifestation of, and gateway to, both scriptural and classical secular authority.

It is a common trope for authors to belittle their own cleverness and stress their inadequacy, rather hypocritically, in the most elaborately constructed language they can compose.67 Ælfric stands out by being genuine in this regard since, rather than indulging in such intellectual decadence, he gives an argument, not an excuse, for the kind of simple language he actually employs. It is, moreover, natural that he should do so both for pedagogical reasons and because the work is a translation and not an original composition.

Many of Ælfric’s works of translation contain dual prefaces in Latin and Old English and the *Grammar* is no exception. The two prefaces, however, are not translations of each other; they are aimed at different audiences. In the Latin preface, Ælfric defines the nature of his text as a translation of the *Excerptiones de Prisciano* and gives his reason for producing it, namely, *inserere utramque linguam, uidelicet Latinam et Anglicam* (“to implant both languages, namely Latin and English”).68 He also specifies that the text is designed for beginning students, *puerulis, non senibus* (“for young boys, not old men”),69 and justifies his adaptive method of translation, reiterating that it is for the sake of his young audience, saying, *simplicem interpretationem sequor* (“I follow a simple

---

65 f. 8r, p. 4; f. 81r, p. 121.
66 Irvine, p. 234.
67 For examples and a discussion of this topos from its apparent origins with Cicero to its adoption by Christian authors, see the section titled “Affected Modesty” in Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series, XXXVI (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1973), 83–5. For a discussion of this issue pertaining specifically to Ælfric and what it implies for his practice of translation, see Robert Stanton, “Rhetoric and Translation in Ælfric’s Prefaces,” *Translation and Literature* 6, no. 2 (1997): 135–48. Stanton argues that Ælfric’s profession of modesty in his prefaces of the *Grammar* and of other works is not merely a rhetorical device, but that “Discomfort about written English competing with the higher-status Latin, and fears about excessive originality and displacement, lie, I think, behind Ælfric’s uneasiness about his own English translations. Not all of these can be ascribed to convention and written off as obligatory concessions to the ethos of the self-denying author” (p. 141).
68 f. 7r, p. 1.
69 Ibid.
interpretation”) and *estimamus ad inchoationem tamen hanc interpretationem paruulis prodesse posse* (“we judge that this interpretation can be useful as a starting point for children”).

In the Old English preface, on the other hand, Ælfric introduces his text as a “lytlan bóc,” a little book, about “stæf-craeft,” literally “letter-craft,” which is his Old English term for grammar. He mentions that it is translated, “awendan to Engliscum gereorde” (“translated to the English language”), but does not name the source text. The reason for producing the text is again to aid young children beginning their studies, “fremigan iungum cildum to anginne ðæs cræftes” (“to aid young children to begin this craft [grammar]”), though instead of giving his own credentials, he is here more explicit regarding the usefulness of the knowledge which the text itself reveals – he calls grammar “seo çæg ðe... bóca andgit unlycð” (“the key that unlocks the understanding of books”). He then gives some general moral precepts, saying that anyone with a skill ought to use it for the benefit of others, and that the old ought to teach and the young to learn. Next, he foreshadows the degradation that will surely befall society if such precepts are not adhered to, which he does with typical Anglo-Saxon pathos, asking, “hwanan scoldan cuman wise lareowas on Godes folce, buton he on iuguðe leornian?” (“whence shall come wise teachers to God’s people, if they do not learn in their youth?”) and he recalls how precisely such catastrophes had taken place not long before. Next, Ælfric specifies that his text serves only as “sum angin to æðrum gereorde” (“an introduction to another language”). Finally, he warns future scribes to take care to copy the text correctly. He even calls a poor copyist an “unwritere,” and says that such a one does “much evil.” And although such warnings to scribes are not uncommon, Ælfric is especially justified in this case since it is precisely the purpose of the text to transmit, with correct orthography, a massive array of Latin vocabulary and word forms, while the repetitiveness of large sections of it render it especially prone to scribal error.

The reason the two prefaces differ so greatly from each other is that they are directed to different audiences. The Old English preface is written for the true audience of the text, namely those who have not studied Latin at all and are using the *Grammar* as a first introduction to the

---

70 Ibid.
71 f. 7v, p. 2.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
75 ff. 7v–8r, p. 3.
76 f. 8r, p. 3.
language. It is therefore natural that in this preface, Ælfric finds it necessary to define the term “grammar” and explain its usefulness, and that he justifies himself not through reference to an authoritative text, but through general aphorisms of good sense and Christian sentiment. The Latin preface, on the other hand, presupposes a reader who has at least enough Latin training to puzzle his way through it. It is thus more likely that such a reader would pick up on Ælfric’s references to Priscian and Donatus. Perhaps this preface was directed towards teachers as much as to students, since such readers were more likely to be curious about or even suspicious of Ælfric’s method of translation. James Hurt notes that explanations of Ælfric’s methods of translation “Almost invariably... appear in the Latin prefaces rather than the English ones” and that they are therefore “addressed, unlike the translations themselves, to learned readers who might oppose both translation into the vernacular in general and Ælfric’s methods in particular.”

It is thus fitting that the tone of the Latin preface should be that of a defense of Ælfric’s work and methods, whereas the Old English preface, like the text as a whole, being addressed to initiates, has an encouraging tone which stresses the usefulness and even righteousness of the reader’s new undertaking.

5. Uterque lingua: The Grammar as a Grammar of English

Although the Grammar is, of course, a grammar of Latin, it inevitably has much to say about Old English grammar as well. Whenever Ælfric translates or expands upon some feature of

77 Hurt, p. 88.

78 That the Grammar functions or was intended at least partly as a grammar of English as well as Latin has not been universally accepted by scholars. For an argument against it, see Vivien Law, “Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric’s ‘Excerptiones de Arte Grammatica Anglice,’” Histoire Epistemologie Langage 9 (1987): 47–71. Law asserts that “No description of English is to be found in this text” (p. 47). For opposing arguments and a broader discussion of the issue, see Melinda J. Menzer, “Ælfric’s English ‘Grammar,’” The Journal of English and Germanic Philology 103, no. 1 (January 2004), 106–24; Helmut Gneuss, “The Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England,” in Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003), 75–105. Menzer notes that “Those who have claimed that the Grammar teaches English usually see that aspect of the text as secondary and accidental” (p. 108). Hurt, for example, would fit this category. He states that “Ælfric also goes beyond his sources in the attention he pays to English grammar and its relation to Latin,” but further remarks that Ælfric’s “comments on English... do not amount to anything like a systematic grammar” (p. 110). Menzer, on the contrary, concludes that “Ælfric was the first to study English systematically, and in so doing, he was the first to create English grammar” (p. 124). Gneuss agrees, stating that “the system and the categories of Latin grammar to which the Anglo-Saxons were thus exposed were also applied by
Latin grammar, he naturally must do so in Old English and, accordingly, he is compelled to make shift to fit his own language to some very specific and technical usages. To this end he coins a vast array of Old English grammatical terminology, a collection of which is given in the tables in Appendix B.

The fact that among English speakers Latinate words rather than descendants of Ælfric’s inventions are still used for grammatical terminology may at first seem to suggest a failure on his part, but this is not necessarily the case. On the one hand, historical factors and the swift linguistic changes brought with them, all manifestly beyond Ælfric’s control, were partly to blame. But more important than these is that Ælfric himself does not seem to have intended his inventions to replace their Latin counterparts. They were instead designed to serve as explanatory aids, to render obscure terminology more intelligible to his audience. Hurt calls Ælfric’s English terms “explanations of the Latin terms of the kind that a good teacher would provide to help his students understand and remember the new terms, not replacements for them.”

The tables of comparative terminology (see Appendix B) show how Ælfric achieves this pedagogical purpose, employing several different methods for coining his terms. One method he uses is simply to borrow the term directly from Latin, but treating it as an Old English word with the appropriate inflectional endings. Thus Latin *casus* becomes “case” and *pars*, “part.” Another of his methods is to employ an already existing English word with a new, technical meaning. Thus for Latin *nomen*, he uses “nama” (“name”), for *uerbum*, “word,” and for *tempus*, “tid” (“time”). The third method Ælfric uses is to combine Old English words to form a compound translation or calque of the Latin term. *Pronomen* accordingly becomes “naman speliend” (“name’s substitute”).

---

79 See Edna Rees Williams, “Ælfric’s Grammatical Terminology,” *PMLA* 73, no. 5 (1958): 453–62. See also R. M. Wilson, ed. *Sawles Warde*, Texts and Monographs: Leeds School of Eng. Lang., 1938, in which Wilson states, “The special grammatical terms of his original are not borrowed wholesale but are translated into their Old English equivalents…. On the whole it seems probable that this grammatical terminology died out, not from any lack in itself, but because it depended for its existence on constant literary use. Had it not been for the Conquest, we should probably still be using Ælfric’s grammatical vocabulary” (p. 6).

80 Hurt, p. 111. Hurt also cautions, however, that at least some of the English terms were likely already conventional, that “they seem inevitable and are probably not original with Ælfric” (ibid.).

and *interiectio* becomes “betwux alegednys” (“set between”) or “betwux aworpenyss” (“between thrown”).

In some cases, Ælfric essentially translates each morpheme of the Latin term, so that *participium*, for instance, becomes “dæl-nimend” (“part-taking”), *prepositio* becomes “fore-setnys” (“before-set”), and *subiunctius* is named “under-ðeodendlic” (“under-joined”). Although some of Ælfric’s terms, such as “cyn,” “dædlic,” and “getel,” are concise and appropriate enough for regular use, it is hardly likely that any student continued to use such a verbose construction as “forð-gewiten mare þonne ful-fremed” in place of *plusquam perfectum* once he had fully grasped its meaning by the aid of that explanatory term.

Even if Ælfric’s terminology was not intended as a replacement for Latin grammatical terms, it at least helped build a framework for speaking about English grammar, something which had so far scarcely been done. It is often in the course of learning a second language that many people begin to appreciate the grammar of their native tongue. Melinda Menzer, in her article “Ælfric’s English ‘Grammar,’” aptly captures this notion:

> Although it may seem obvious to say that English has grammar, that fact was not necessarily obvious to a tenth-century English reader; nor, for that matter, is it obvious to a modern English speaker. Speakers learn their native languages without knowing that they are learning “grammar.” We learn that we know English grammar only when we begin to consciously study our language. Ælfric teaches his readers to study their own language.

By developing a system of English terminology and providing parallel examples of Latin and Old English grammatical concepts, Ælfric teaches his readers to be aware that their own language has grammatical rules as well. These in turn can be fruitfully compared with the rules of Latin for the aid of the reader’s understanding and memorization. Such parallels are sometimes explicitly stated as, for instance, when Ælfric explains how the relative pronoun “is... ne mæg beon æfter rihte gecweden, buton þæt andgit béo ær fore-sæd, swa eac on Engliscræ spæce ne cweð nan man ‘se’

---

82 The fact that Ælfric himself is not consistent with his English terms lends additional weight to the supposition that they were intended as pedagogical aids, not replacements intended for ordinary use.

83 Menzer, p. 115.
buton he ær sum ðing be ðam men spræce” (“is cannot be properly spoken unless its meaning be already mentioned, just as in English speech no man says ‘se’ unless he has already said something about that man”).

Moreover, when explaining the Latin case system, for example, although he never claims that Old English has six cases, as Latin does, he nevertheless gives Old English translations of examples of each Latin case. This is not at all problematic for cases shared by both languages, such as, “Nominativus is ‘nemnigendlice.’” Mid ðam cásu we nemnað ealle ðinge,” and the corresponding example, “bic homo equitat, ðes man rít,” since here, both homo and “man” are, naturally, in the nominative case and are further marked as such by their corresponding demonstrative adjectives.

When, however, he explains the Latin vocative and ablative cases, which Old English does not have, he still endeavours to retain the peculiar meaning and use of each in his English example. Thus he gives the following example of the vocative: Ó homo, ueni huc, “eala ðu mann, cum hideh,” and of the ablative: ab hoc homine pecuniam accipi, “fram ðisum menn ic under-feng feoh,” where the phrases “eala ðu” and “fram” translate the equivalent case markers, Ó and ab, respectively. But this is no isolated phenomenon. Throughout the text, Ælfric consistently employs these markers in both languages to differentiate the vocative from the nominative and the ablative from the dative. He thus shows that the two languages function in similar ways, even if their grammatical functions are represented differently. He even discusses, for instance, patronymics which, although they are employed in Greek and English, significantly do not occur in Latin.

Such practices highlight how Ælfric makes use of the advantages available to him inasmuch as he strives to stress the parallels between the two languages – parallels which in Modern English may be lost. Because the marking of case, for instance, has all but vanished from Modern English (with the exception of certain pronouns), gaining an understanding of it is often one of the hurdles to modern English speakers in their acquisition of Latin. For Ælfric, on the other hand, the similarity between the case structure of Latin and Old English offered a great benefit. The

---

84 i.e. its “antecedent.”
85 f. 34v, p. 50.
86 f. 13v, p. 15.
87 f. 14r, p. 16.
88 “Sume [nomina] sindon patronomica, þæt sind ‘fæderlice naman,’ after Greciscum ðeawe, ac seo Leden spræc næð ða naman. Hi sind swa ðeah on Engliscre spræce” (“Some nouns are patronymic, that is ‘fatherly names,’ after the Greek custom, but the Latin language does not have these names. They are, nevertheless, in the English language”) (f. 11r–11v, p. 11).
argument can be made, moreover, that the six Latin cases are morphologically nearly reducible to Old English’s four, since the Latin vocative form rarely departs from the nominative, and dative and ablative forms are very often identical.\textsuperscript{89} More than this, however, Ælfric explicitly states that the fundamental framework of Latin grammar, the eight parts of speech, applies equally to English. He says, “Witodlice on ðisum eahta dælum is eall Leden spræc belocen and þæt Englisc geðwær-læhþ to eall δαμ dælum” (“Truly in these eight parts [of speech] is all Latin speech encompassed and English agrees in all these parts”).\textsuperscript{90}

Though it may not have been Ælfric’s intention to produce a systematic grammar of Old English alongside the Latin, he nevertheless revealed the possibility of doing so by showing that Old English, too, can be analysed according to the same systematic framework. It is thus no accident that in his preface, Ælfric hopes that his text will “implant both languages, namely Latin and English” (\textit{inserere utramque linguam, uidelicet Latinam et Anglicam}),\textsuperscript{91} in his readers’ minds since even if all of the discussion of English grammar were merely incidental and inevitable in such a work as the translation of a grammar, Ælfric foresaw it and took full advantage of it.

6. Manuscripts of Ælfric’s Grammar and the Manuscript of this Edition

The \textit{Grammar} survives, in whole or in part, in fifteen manuscripts, almost all of which were copied during the 11\textsuperscript{th} century or early in the 12\textsuperscript{th}. One exception to this is Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174, of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. Its scribe was the well-known Tremulous Hand of Worcester,\textsuperscript{92} who devoted many years to studying Old English, which had then already become like a foreign

\textsuperscript{89} Menzer argues precisely this point, saying that “Since the Latin dative and ablative cases are the same in the plural in all five declensions and often the same in the singular, and the nominative and vocative cases are almost always identical, it would be easy to apply the case system to English; the Old English dative could be seen as two cases, dative and ablative, and a vocative could be posited on the model of the nominative. Of course, ultimately, the case systems of Latin and English derive from a common Indo-European ancestry, so the languages do work in similar ways” (Ælfric’s English “Grammar,” p. 120).

\textsuperscript{90} f. 10r, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{91} f. 7r, p. 1.

language even to English speakers. Of the fifteen manuscripts, four contain only fragments, three are incomplete, and seven contain the *Glossary* in addition to the *Grammar*. Two manuscripts have happily been fully digitized and made freely available online (Harley 3271 and St. John’s College 154) as have been selections from a third (Durham, Cathedral Library, B.III.32). Here follow the manuscript sigla (following Zupitza) and the parts of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* each contains:

A = Oxford, All Souls College, 38, s. xi med; fragmentary;
C = Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 449, s. xi\(^1\); incomplete *Grammar* and *Glossary*;
D = Durham, Cathedral Library, B.III. 32, s. xi\(^1\); complete *Grammar*, omits *Glossary*;
F = London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x, s. xi\(^2\); prefaces (except for four lines) missing, includes *Glossary*;
H = London, British Library, Harley 107, s. xi med.; incomplete *Grammar* and *Glossary*;
J = London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, s. xi med.; prefaces missing, includes *Glossary*;
O = Oxford, St John’s College, 154, s. xi in.; complete *Grammar* and *Glossary*;
\(h\) = London, British Library, Harley 3271, s. xi\(^1\); complete *Grammar*, omits *Glossary*;
\(J\) = London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, s. xi med.; prefaces missing, includes *Glossary*;
\(O\) = Oxford, St John’s College, 154, s. xi in.; complete *Grammar* and *Glossary*;
\(P\) = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, anglais 67, s. xi\(^1\); fragmentary;
R = London, British Library, Royal 15. B. xxii, s. xi\(^2\); incomplete *Grammar*, omits *Glossary*;
\(r\) = London, British Library, Royal 12. G. xii, s. xi med; fragmentary;
S = Bloomington, Indiana, Lilly Library, Additional 1000 (formerly Sigmaringen), s. xi\(^1\); fragmentary;
T = Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 9. 17 (819), s. xi/xii; omits prefaces and *Glossary*;
U = Cambridge, University Library, Hh. 1. 10, s. xi\(^2\); complete *Grammar* and *Glossary*;
W = Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174, s. xiii\(^1\); omits prefaces, includes *Glossary*.\(^{94}\)

---


\(^{94}\) Though Gneuss’s *Handlist* omits the Worcester manuscript on account of its later date, it mentions one other manuscript which contains the *Grammar*, namely, Ushaw (co. Durham), St Cuthbert’s College, XX. K. 3. 7, though the information given on it is unusually sparse. It gives only the following: s. xi; Contents: Ælfric, *Grammar* (f); [no printed notice; information from A.I. Doyle] (Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, § 757.1).
The manuscript selected for presentation in this edition is London, British Library, Harley 3271. It was chosen as a representative manuscript for several reasons. First, it is among the earliest extant copies, as it was produced in the early 11th century. Second, it contains the complete text of the Grammar, including Ælfric’s two prefaces, which are omitted or lost in several of the surviving witnesses. That the manuscript does not contain the Glossary is of little importance for this edition, which reproduces only the Grammar. The Glossary, in any case, has been the focus of the greater part of the scholarship devoted to Ælfric’s grammatical writings. Third, the 1880 edition of Julius Zupitza uses a different manuscript, namely Oxford, St John’s College, MS 154, as its base text and provides only variant substantial readings from the Harleian or any other extant manuscript in its critical apparatus.

Harley 3271 is a miscellany primarily containing various grammatical and computistical texts which together suggest that it was intended for use in an Anglo-Saxon classroom. Besides the Grammar, the manuscript contains a number of Latin texts that are grammatical in nature. These include the manuscript’s first text, on the genre of nouns and pronouns and the first and second declensions (ff. 1r–6r) and, following shortly after the Grammar, a treatise entitled Dialogus de VIII partibus orationis, also known by its incipit, Beatus quid est (ff. 93r–113v). Other Latin texts are either of a religious genre, such as the Inventio corporis Sancti Stephani ad vesperam (ff. 115r) and the Missa pro sacerdote (ff. 121r–121v), or are computistical, such as the Ad dies Aegyptiacos (ff. 122r–122v), the Medicina ypocratis (ff. 122v–124r), and a text on the dies medicales (ff. 120v–121r).

The codex also contains a number of Old English texts. These include the Tribal Hidage (f. 6v), miscellaneous notes on computus (ff. 90r–92v), a text entitled Be þam halgan gaste on englisc (ff. 124r–125r), the De initio creaturae (ff. 128v–129r), and Ælfric’s letter to Sigeward, entitled De veteri testamento (ff. 125v–128v).

95 Hill characterizes the compilation as “school-texts from the cultural milieu of Æthelwold” (Hill, “Ælfric: His Life and Works,” p. 48). Daniel Anlezark agrees, arguing that “The nature of the main items – Ælfric’s Grammar, the Beatus quid est, and Abbo of St Germain’s Bella Parisiacaer urbis [which is bilingual in the manuscript] – provides indubitable evidence that the manuscript was designed for the needs of the Anglo-Saxon schoolroom, confirmed by a range of shorter texts included” (Daniel Anlezark, “Understanding Numbers in London, British Library, Harley 3271,” Anglo-Saxon England 38 (December 2009): p. 138). For a complete list of the manuscript’s contents, see Ker, Catalogue, § 239; Gneuss and Lapidge, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, § 435.
Finally, the manuscript contains one other bilingual text besides the *Grammar*, an excerpt of Abbo of St Germain’s *Bella pariscæ urbis*, which contains both the Latin text and a phrase-by-phrase Old English translation integrated into a single column (ff. 115v–120r).

The codex contains 129 leaves which are 270 x 180 mm in size, is written in several hands, usually with Latin text in Caroline minuscule and Old English in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, though this distinction is not present in the *Grammar*, and was produced in the 11th century in either Mercia or Northumbria.⁹⁶

The text of the *Grammar* is recorded by two scribes. Scribe A copied ff. 7r–52r and from ff. 79v–90r. Scribe B copied from f. 53r to part way through f. 79v, where scribe A again takes over. Folio 52v, at the end of scribe A’s first section, is left blank, which suggests that both scribes were working simultaneously. The scripts of both scribes are consistent and neat, scribe A’s appearing somewhat squat and dark in comparison with scribe B’s, which is somewhat narrower and more rounded and is written in a lighter, brownish ink. In both scribes’ work, decoration is limited to large initials, usually two or three lines in height, at the beginnings of sections with the exception of the opening of the text which includes a rubricated combination of the letters “e,” “g,” and “o,” into one large initial (f. 7r) and the only instance of rubrication in the text. For both scribes, each leaf quite regularly contains thirty lines of text in a single column with a rough average of ten words per line. The scribes use the same letter forms for both Latin and Old English text, excepting only the use of the “et” ligature for Latin *et* and the “tironian et” for Old English “and.”

Although both scribes use a *positura* system of punctuation, their practices in this regard nevertheless vary somewhat. Scribe A uses a simple *punctus* at the base of the line for minor divisions and a *punctus versus*, which closely resembles a modern semi-colon, for more significant divisions. He also quite regularly capitalizes the first letter of a new sentence. Scribe B, on the other hand, uses a *punctus* set at the height of a minim and his *punctus versus* resembles rather a modern colon with a dash between the two dots curving to the right and upwards and uses majuscule letters more frequently, often to signify a new lemma. Neither scribe uses the *punctus interrogativus* with regularity, even though many of the examples Ælfric gives are questions.

The nature of the text renders the scribes’ task of punctuation problematic, since it constantly shifts between languages and often appears as a series of lists segmented by frequent interjections rather than a continuous text. Still, according to M. B. Parkes’ principle that “Until one analyses the punctuation of a copy one cannot tell how well the scribe or corrector understood the

⁹⁶ Ker, *Catalogue*, § 239.
text – if at all,” both scribes show themselves to be competent readers of the text: they use punctuation on either side of words which are to be understood as words rather than signifiers, or similarly letters as letters (where the modern convention is to use italics or quotation marks), and, crucially, they consistently mark alternations between Latin and Old English text (with a punctus). These practices are especially significant on account of their usefulness to the text’s audience for whom Latin text, and perhaps reading in general, constituted unfamiliar experiences.

Scribal errors, however, are not uncommon. They are most often found in the Latin rather than the Old English and usually consist of omitted letters or words or incorrect letters, most frequently vowels. Many corrections have been made in the manuscript itself, sometimes in the same hand as the main text, but more commonly in a hand distinct from that of either scribe A or B. A particularly interesting error occurs several times in which scribe A applies Old English inflectional endings to Latin words, resulting in, for instance, the form congregað.

Unfortunately, the outer margins of leaves have been trimmed during a later binding process, which has caused portions of numerous marginal corrections to be lost. Other forms of damage, however, are rare and usually minimal in degree.

7. Editorial Principles and Procedures

This edition presents Ælfric’s Grammar as it stands in the manuscript, London, British Library, Harley 3271. Where readings from this manuscript are dubious, damaged, or erroneous, both Oxford, St. John’s College 154 and Zupitza’s edition have been consulted. The text has been emended where necessary, but manuscript readings are retained in the apparatus. For the sake of

---

98 f. 33v, p. 48; f. 83v, p. 125.
99 In such cases, readings have most often been supplied from O with additional reference to Zupitza’s edition.
100 Note that I have worked from the online digitized facsimiles of these manuscripts, having had no opportunity to examine them in person. In some instances, unfortunately, portions of text in these images are not visible (usually text very near the binding). In such cases, readings have most often been supplied from O with additional reference to Zupitza’s edition.
101 Ker describes this manuscript as “The only complete copy and probably the earliest” (Ker, Catalogue, § 362).
convenience, the manuscript sigla set out in Zupitza’s edition are employed for references to other manuscripts.  

Latin text is given in italics, Old English in Roman font. Abbreviations in both Latin and Old English are expanded silently, though unusual or ambiguous expansions are commented on in the notes. This includes the frequent expansion of the “et” ligature (resembling an ampersand) to Latin et and the “tironian et” to Old English “and.”

Modern punctuation has been applied according to my understanding of the sense of the text. Accordingly, proper names and the beginnings of sentences are capitalized. Word separation and hyphenation are normalized to correspond with standard Latin and Old English use. Spelling is regularly retained as found in the manuscript, including the use of ë where classical Latin would use ae, the distribution of Latin u and ù, and Old English “þ” and “ð.” An exception is that the Old English character, wynn (“ƿ”), is altered to the modern English equivalent, “w.” The scribes’ long vowel marks are also retained, although these are used inconsistently and sometimes incorrectly. Ælfric’s Old English translations of Latin words or passages are set within double quotation marks. The manuscript’s textual divisions, which are usually signified by titles in majuscule script or by a single enlarged majuscule letter, are retained, though I have inferred from them a hierarchy of divisions which is not necessarily visually represented in the manuscript. Roman numerals are not adjusted to modern conventions, but are presented as they are found in the manuscript. The manuscript’s scribal additions, deletions, and corrections are adopted into the main text while original readings are reported in the apparatus when they remain legible. With regard to additions and corrections present in the manuscript, the term “scribal” refers to alterations executed by any of the manuscript’s scribes, and does not necessarily imply that the specified alteration is in the same hand as the main text. For references to passages in the Grammar, both the folio number and the page number of this edition are given. All editorial references to Scripture are to the Weber-Gryson Vulgate, fifth edition, and follow its abbreviations for the books of the Bible.

---

103 This practice is extended also to quotations from other sources.
104 The word “God” has also been capitalized when the text refers to the Christian deity, which distinguishes it from the nearly identical Old English word “gód” (“good”), though the latter is not always given a long vowel mark in the manuscript.
105 The letter combination ae is very rarely found in the Latin text of the manuscript. Both scribes prefer either ë or simply e for classical Latin ae, though æ for Latin ae occurs thrice: twice on f. 56r, p. 82 and once on f. 63r, p. 93. The ae diphthong, however, should not be confused with the Old English ash (“Æ,” “æ”), which is naturally commonplace.
Ælfric’s Grammar
INCIPIT PRÆFATIO HUIUS LIBRĪ

ego Ælfricus, vt minus sapiens, has Excerptiones de Prisciano, minore uel maiore, uobis puerulis tenellis ad uestram linguam transf erre studui, quatinius perlectis octo partibus Donati in isto libello potestis utramque linguam, uidelicit Latinam et Anglicam, uestrę tenerritudini inserere, interim usque quo ad perfectiora perueniatis studia. Noui namque multos me reprehensuros quod talibus studiis meum ingenium occupare voluisset, scilicet grammaticam artem ad Anglicam linguam uertendo. Sed ego deputo hanc lectionem inscientibus puerulis, non senibus, aptandum fore.

Scio multimodis uerba posse interpretari, sed ego simplicem interpretationem sequor fastidii uitandi causa. Si alii tamen displiceret nostra interpretatio, dicit quomodo uult: nos contenti sumus sicut didicimus in scola Aðelwoldi uenerabilis presulis, qui multos ad bonum imbuat. Sciendum tamen quod Ars grammatica multis in locis non facile Anglice lingue capit interpretationem, sicut de pedibus uel metris, de quibus hic reticemus. Sed estimamus ad inchoationem tamen banc interpretationem paruulis prodesse posse, sicut iam diximus.

Miror ualde quare multi corripiunt sillabas in prosa que in metro breues sunt, cum prosa absoluta sit a lege metri, sicut pronuntiant pater Brytonnice et malus et similia, que in metro babentur breues.

---

1 Translations of both prefaces are given in Appendix A below, p. 139. The text of the Grammar begins on f. 7r of the manuscript.

2 i.e. as compared with Priscian and Donatus: Ælfric is participating in a common modesty topos. For a discussion of this topos, see the section titled “Affected Modesty” in Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, pp. 83–5.

3 Both Donatus’ Ars grammatica and Priscian’s Institutiones grammaticae were commonly divided into two parts, maior and minor. The former are systematic treatments of grammar while the latter are more advanced and discuss syntax (Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, 1994, pp. 58–9, 62). According to its recent editor and translator, David Porter, the Excerptiones was by the tenth century similarly divided into maior (De octo partibus) and minor (De constructione) (Porter, Excerptiones, p. 22).

4 i.e. Donatus’ Ars maior. See previous note.

5 reprehensuros] deprehensuros

6 nostra interpretatio] nostram interpretationem

7 i.e. Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester (963–984), and Ælfric’s teacher while he was a monk in Winchester (c. 964–987). See Hill, “Ælfric: His Life and Works.” For further reading on Æthelwold, see Barbara A. E. Yorke, Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1988).

8 reticemus] recitemus
Mihi tamen uidetur melius inuocare deum patrem honorifice producta quam Brytonice corripere; quia nec deus arti grammaticae subiciendus est.

Ualete, o pueruli, in domino.

Ælfric wolde ðas lytlan bóc awendan to Engliscum gereorde of ðam stæf-cræfte ðe is gehaten “grammatica,” syðdan ic da twa bec awende on hund-eahtatigum spellum for þan ðe stæf-cræft is seo sæg ðe þæra bóca andgit unlycð and ic dohte þæt þeos bóc mihte fremigan iungum cildum to anginne ðæs cræfes oð þæt hi to maran andgite becumon.

Ælcum men gebyrð, þe ænigne godne cræft hæð, þæt he þone dó nytne oðrum mannum, and befiæste þæt pand þe him God befiæste sumum oðrum men þæt Godes feoh ne ætlicge. And he beo lyðe ðeow gehaten and beo gebunden and geworpen into ðeostrum swa swa þæt halige godspel segð.

Iungum mannum gedafenað þæt hi leornion sumne wisdom, and ðam ealdum gedafenað þæt hi tæcon sum geråd heora iunglingum, for ðan ðe ðurh lare bið se geleafa gehealden, and ælc mann ðe wisdom lufð bið geselig. And se þe náðor nele ne leornian ne tæcan, gif he mæg, ðonne acolað his andgıt fram ðære halgan lære and he gewit swa lytltum and lytlum fram gode. Hwanan scoldan cuman wise larewares on Godes folce, buton he on iuguðe leornian and hu mæg se geleafa beon forðgenge gif seo lar and ða larewares ateoriað?

Is nu forði Godes ðeowum and mynster-mannum georne to warnigenne, þæt seo halige lar on urum dagum ne acolige, oððe ateorige, swa swa hit wæs gedon on Angelcynne nu for anum

Ælfric distinguishes between pāter, which he considers the correct pronunciation, and păter, which is apparently a common pronunciation in the native English accent. Ælfric evidently promotes the reform of orthography and pronunciation put forward by Alcuin in his De orthographia in which he “united orthographia with lectio” (Anna A. Grotans, Reading in Medieval St. Gall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). See also the section titled “Alcuin and medieval Latin culture: latinity, orthography, and the manuscript book” in Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, pp. 327–33.


For a discussion of Ælfric’s possible distinction between “mynster-mann” (“one who dwells in a ‘mynster’”) and “munuc” (“monk”) in the full Benedictine sense, see Christopher A. Jones, “Ælfric and the Limits of Benedictine Reform,” in A Companion to Ælfric, especially the section titled ‘Munuc and Mæssepreost’: Ælfric on the Monastic and Clerical Orders, pp. 79–95.
feawum gearum, swa þæt nan Englisc preost ne cuðe dihtan oððe asmeagan ænne pistol on Læden, oð þæt Dunstan arcebisceop and Aðelwold bisceop eft ða lære on munuc-lifum arædon.13
Ne cweðe ic na forði þæt þeos bóc mage micclum to lære fremian, ac heo bīð swa ðeah sum [8r] angin to æðrum gereorde, gif heo hwam licað.

Ic bidde nu on Godes naman, gif hwa þas boc awritan wille, þæt he hi gerihte wel be ðære bysne for ðan ðe ic nah14 geweald; ðeah hi hwa to woge gebringe ðurh lease writeras and hit bīð þonne his pleoh na min. Micel yfel deð se unwritere, gif he nele his woh gerihtan.15

13 Dunstan and Æthelwold, together with Oswald and Ælfric himself, are the chief figures in the Benedictine Reform movement in England. See Christopher A. Jones, “Ælfric and the Limits of Benedictine Reform,” in A Companion to Ælfric, 193–216; See also Hurt, Aelfric.
14 Scribal corr. from “nahge”.
15 Such warnings against the carelessness of scribes are common in many medieval texts. Ælfric’s use of the term “unwritere,” however, is particularly poignant, since it suggests that copying incorrectly not only mars the original, but in some way unmakes it. It is, moreover, fitting that Ælfric should be especially concerned with the correct copying of this work since the teaching the proper forms of the words therein is precisely the purpose of the text. See “Ælfric as Language Teacher” in Gneuss, Ælfric of Eynsham, pp. 22–4.
Secundum Donatum, omnis uox aut articulata est aut confusa. Articulata est quę litteris comprehendī potest, confusa quē scribi non potest. Stemm is geslagen lyft, gefrendelic on hlyste, swa micel swa on ðære heorcnunge is. Íc secge nu gewislicor þæt ælc stefn bið geworden of ðæs muðes clypung and of ðære lyfte cnyssunge. Se muð drifð ut ða clypunge and seo lyft bið geslagen mid ðære clypunge and gewyrð to stemne.

Ælc stefn is oððe andgit-fullic, oððe gemencged. Andgit-fullic stefn is ðe mid andgite bið geclypod, swa swa is arma uirumque cano; “ic herige ða wæpnu and ðone wer.” Gemencged stefn is ðe bið buton andgite, swilc swa is hryðera gehlow, and horsa hnægung, hunda gebeorc, treowa brastlung, et cetera.

DE LITTERA

Ittera is “stef” on Englisc and is se læsta dæl on bócum and un-todeledlic. We to-delað da bóc to cywym, and syddan ða cywys to dælum, eft ða delas to stef-gefegum, and syddan ða stef-gefegu to stafum, dønne beðð þa stafes un-todeledice for ðan ðe nan stef ne bið naht gif he gåð ón twa.

Ælc stef hæfð ðreo þing: nomen, figura, potestas, þæt is: “nama” and “hiw” and “miht.” Nama: hu he gehaten bið: a, b, c. Hiw: hu he gesceapen bið. Miht: hwæt he mage betwux oðrum stafum. Soðlice on Læden spræce [8v] sind ðreo and twentig stafa: a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, k, l, m, n,

1 i.e. quae.
2 Vergil, Aeneid, I. 1.
3 Scribal corr. from “ing”; this marginal correction is in a hand which differs from those of either scribe A, B, or those in which most other corrections are made.
4 Ælfric’s “miht” is equivalent to pronuntiatio, the sound-value of a letter. Cf. the Excersiones: “Potestas autem ipsa pronunciatio est, proprius enim et figura et nomina facta sunt... Force is the pronunciation itself, for whose sake both name and shape are made” (Porter, Excersiones de Prisciano, pp. 46–7). Translations of the Excersiones are from Porter’s edition. Irvine concludes from this passage in Priscian that “The common doctrine on litterae, therefore, included the following assumptions: a ‘letter’ is a minimal phonic/graphic unit (elementum) of ‘scriptible utterance’ (vox litterata); the concept of ‘letter’ entails distinctions by ‘properties’ (phonic value, written character, name) [Ælfric’s “miht, hiw, nama,” respectively]; the letter is what is read, an iterable signifying event” (Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, p. 100).
o, p, q, r, s, t, u, x, y, z. Of them sindon fif **uocales**, ðæt sind “clypigenclice”: a, e, i, o, u. Þas fif stafas æt-eowiað heora naman ðurh hy sylfe, and butan ðam stafum ne mæg nan word beon awritten, and forði hi synd *quinque uocales* gehaten. To þisum is genumen se Grecisca y, for intingan Greciscra namena and se ylca y is on Engliscum gewritum swiðe gewunelic. Ealle þa oðre stafas sindon gehatene *consonantes*, ðæt is “samod-swegende,” for ðan ðe hi swegað mid ðam fif clypigendlicum. Þonne beoð gyt of ðam samod-swegendum some *semioucales*, ðæt sind “healf-clypigende.” Sume sindon *mute*, ðæt sind “dumbe.”

*Semioucales* sindon seofan: f, l, m, n, r, s, x. Þas sindon “healf-clypigende” geciged, for ðan ðe hi nabbað fulle clypunge swa wa da quinte uocales, and da six onginnað of ðam stæfe e, and geendiað on him sylfum. X ana onginð of ðam stæfe i, æfter uðwitena tecunge.6 Da oðre nigon *consonantes* sind gecwedene *mute*, ðæt sind “dumbe.” Hi ne sind na mid ealle dumbe, ac hi habbað lytle clypunge. Þa synd: b, c, d, g, h, k, p, q, t. Ðas onginnað of him sylfum and geendiað on ðam clypigendlicum stafum: b, c, d, g, p, t geendiað on ðam e. H and k geendiað on a æfter rihte. Q geendrað on v.7 Z, eac se Grecisca stæf, geendrað on a. Se stæf is genumen of Grecum to Læden spræce for Greciscum wordum.

*I* and *u* beoð awende to *consonantes* gif hi beoð togædere gesette ðode mid oðrum swegendlincum. Gif ðu cweðst nu *iudex*, ðonne bið se *i consonans*. Gif ðu cwyðst *uir*, ðonne bið se *v consonans*. *Ianua* – her is se *i consonans*. *Uatis* – her is se *u consonans*. [9r] Ðas twegen stafas habbað maran mihte þonne we her secgan wyllað, eac we mihtan be eallum ðam oðrum stafum menig-fealdlice sprecan, gif hit on Englisc gedafenlic wære.

---

5 Scribal addition: “ða”.
6 Ælfric, following Priscian, incorrectly designates x a semivowel, presumably on account of the assumption that one written character presents one sound; x instead represents a consonant sequence /ks/. Cf. Excerptiones: “Semiovocales uero ab e incipit et in se desinunt, absque x, que ideo ab i incipit, quia apud Grecos in eandem desinit... The semi-vowels begin with the sound e and end with themselves, except for x, which begins with i because among the Greeks it ends in that sound,” i.e. the Greek ξ (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 46–7).
7 The scribe very seldom uses v. It is odd that here of all places, where the vowel is clearly implied, that he chooses v, which more commonly represents a consonantal value.
DE SYLLABA

yllaba is “stæf-gefel on anre orðunge geendod.” *A domo*, “fram huse” – her is se á for anum stæf-gefege. *Ab bomine*, “fram ðam menn” – her is se *ab* an stæf-gefeg. Hwilon bið þæt stæf-gefege on anum stafe, hwilon on twam, swa swa we ær sædon, hwilon on ðrim stafum: *arx*, “wighus”; hwilon on feower dæl, hwilon fif: *stans*, “standende”; hwilon on six: *styrps*, “styb” oððe “mægð.”

DE DIPTONGIS


PRAEFATIO DE PARTIBUS ORATIONIS

artes orationis sunt octo, “eahta dælas sind Leden spræce”: *nomen, praenomen, uerbum*, *aduerbium, participium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio*.

*Nomen* is “nama.” Mid ðam we nemnað ealle ðing, ægðer gesynderlice ge gemænelice. Synderlice be agenum naman: *Eadgarus, Aðelwoldus*; gemænelice: *rex*, “kyning”; *episcopus*, “bisceop.”

*Praenomen* is ðæs naman speliend se spelað ðone naman þæt ðu ne ðurfe tuwa hine nemnan. Gif ðu sweðst nu, “Hwa lærdé ðe?” ðonne sweðe ic, “Dunstan.” “Hwa hadode ðe?” “He me


Participium is “dæl-nimend.” 5 He nimð ænne dæl of naman and oðerne of worde. Of naman he nimð casus, þet is “declinunge,” and of worde he nimð tide and getacnunge. Of him bam he nimð getel and hiw. Amans, “lußigende,” cymð of ðam worde amo, “ic lußige.” Œonne nimð he of ðam naman him calle ða six casus: nominatium, genitium, datium, accusatium, uocatium, u...

---

1 This dialogue has been sometimes construed as an autobiographical note on the part of Ælfric, though some argue that Ælfric is simply reusing an example he remembers from his master Æthelwold, who was taught and ordained by Dunstan. For the former view, see Jonathan Wilcox, ed., Ælfric’s Prefaces, vol. 9, Durham Medieval Texts (Durham, England: Durham Medieval Texts, Department of English Studies, 1994); Law, “Anglo-Saxon England.” For the latter view, see Michael Lapidge, “Ælfric’s Schooldays,” in Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 301–309; Gneuss, Ælfric of Eynsham; Hill, “Ælfric: His Life and Works,” p. 36.

2 Ælfric explains the function of the pronoun with an illustration in Old English before giving an example in Latin, which he does presumably for pedagogical reasons, though it also reveals his concern for Old English grammar in addition to that of Latin.

3 Scribal corr. from “axst”.

4 Ælfric’s examples of “ȝeðafung” unfortunately do little to illustrate his point, since they are the passive forms of active verbs. A distinction is being made between active, passive, and intransitive voices, which Ælfric elsewhere calls neuter (“næðor”). Law clarifies the usual medieval terminology for the several voices: “The voices recognized included activum, passivum, neutrum (“intransitive”), commune (i.e. verbs passive in form with both active and passive meaning, e.g. scrutor, criminor), deponens (“deponent”), and, according to some early writers, impersonale (e.g. itur, taeled)” (Law, “Grammar,” p. 291–2). The confusion likely arises from Ælfric’s source, which here gives “actionem sive passionem sive utrumque... action or receiving action, or both” (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 58–9).

5 Apparently a calque of “participium.” That is, “pars” + “capio” = “dæl” + “nimian” = “part” + “to take.” Cf. modern English “participate,” literally, “to take part.”

Coniunctio is “geðeodnys” ðode “gefeingc.” Þes dæl ne mæg naht ðurh hine sylfne, ac he gefegð togedere ægðer ge naman ge word. Gif ðu befrinst, quis equitat in ciuitatem? “hwa rit into ðam port?” ðonne cweð he, rex et episcopus, [10r] “se kyning and se bisceop.” Se et, þæt is “and,” is coniunctio. Ego et tu, “ic and ðu.” Word he gefegð thus: stat et loquitur, “he stent and sprecð,” et cetera.

Prepositio is “fore-setnyss.” Se bið geðeod naman and worde and stent7 æfre on forewearðan. Ab illo homine, “fram ðam menn” – her is se ab prepositio. Apud regem sum, “ic com mid ðam cyninge” – her is se apud prepositio. Ad regem equito, “ic ride toyncge,” et cetera.


Witodlice on ðisum eahta dælum is eall Leden sprec belocen and þæt Englisc geðwær-læhfto callum ðam dælum9 swa swa we ne scoertlice trahtnodon.


---

6 i.e. the participle is declined into all six cases in both singular and plural forms, though this is already implied by “he nimð getel,” above.
7 Scribal corr. from “and ste”.
8 See p. 128, n. 10, below.
9 This is an indication that Ælfric realizes that, in the very process of explaining Latin, he is also developing a grammar of English, since he argues here that the same categories which he has described for Latin can be equally applied to English.
10 Scribal corr. from “unlichamlic”. 
Sume sind omonima, id sunt uniuoca.\textsuperscript{11} Da getacniað ma þinga mid anre clypunge: acties, “ecg,” oðde “se ord on here,” oðde “scæp gesihō”; aries bīð “ram betwux [10v] sceapum,” and “ram to weall geworce,” and aries is án ðæra twelf tacna.\textsuperscript{12}


\textsuperscript{11} i.e. homonym; but id sunt is strange, since it does not grammatically agree, though the Old English “sind” suggests the plural. The same occurs in the following paragraph on synonyms.

\textsuperscript{12} i.e. zodiacal signs.

\textsuperscript{13} These stagnum examples are erroneously included here and belong instead in the previous paragraph as instances of homonyms, not synonyms. They occur only in this manuscript and one other, J. See Ælfric of Eynsham, Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar, ed. Julius Zupitza (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880), p. 12.

\textsuperscript{14} Ælfric, following earlier grammarians, does not count the adjective as a separate part of speech, but as a subclass of the noun. Vivien Law explains that “The adjective was regarded as a type of common noun, as its name reflects – nomen adiectivum or nomen epiteton – although increasingly in the later Middle Ages adiectivum came to stand on its own, often contrasted with (nomen) substantivum” (Law, “Grammar.” p. 291). Cf. Isidore who “uses the term nomen to refer to both nouns and adjectives, and also to mean ‘name.’ The noun vs. adjective distinction is less clear-cut in Latin than in English because adjectives standing alone commonly function as substantives: bonus, ‘good’ or ‘a good man’” (Isidore of Seville, Etymologies. p. 42, n. 8). Ælfric also distinguishes between adiectiua, which are either ameliorative or pejorative and accidentia, which are value-neutral, though the inclusion of prudens in the latter list is conspicuous. Ælfric is here substantially condensing his source passage which more clearly explains the same examples: “Sumuntur autem hec a qualitate uel a quantitate animi uel corporis uel extrinsecus accidentium: animi, ut ‘prudens’… corporis, ut ‘albus’… extrinsecus accidentium, ut ‘dies’… Adjectives are assumed from a quality or quantity of a mind or body or from circumstantial characteristics: of a mind, such as ‘wise’… of a body, such as ‘white’… of circumstantial characteristics, such as ‘rich’” (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 64–5).

\textsuperscript{15} In modern linguistics, this is referred to as implicature. See Wayne Davis, “Implicature,” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2014).


---

16 Wilton was the site of Alfred’s first military action as king. See Sir Sir John Spelman, Alfredi Magni Anglorum Regis Invictissimi Vita (Oxford, 1778), p. 20.

17 i.e. onomatopoeic.

18 Cf. Isidore’s Etymologies: “The tintinnabulum takes its name from the sound of its voice, just like the ‘clapping’ (plaudere) of hands, and the ‘clapping’ (stridor) of hinges” (Isidore of Seville, Etymologies., III.xxii.13).

19 Cf. Etymologies: “The ‘turtle dove’ (turtur) is named from its call” (Isidore, XII.vii.60).

20 Ælfric departs from Isidore in attributing to bos an onomatopoeic etymology. Cf. Etymologies: “The Greeks call the ox βοῦς” (Isidore, XII.i.30).

21 Cf. Etymologies: “Cranes (grus) took their name from their particular call, for they whoop with such a sound” (Isidore, XII.vii.14).

22 Scribal corr. from “topozius”. 
Sume sindon *temporalia*, *ét* sind “tidlice.” *Pa* æteowiað timan: *annus*, “gear”; *mensis*, “monad”; *ebdomada*,


---

23 i.e. *bebdoma*, *bebdomas*.
25 Scribal corr. from “geagniend”.
26 Ælfric’s understanding of *possessiua* is not used in the same way as our grammatical term “possessive”; it refers instead to an object’s characteristics or properties.
27 *optimus*] Optimus
28 Scribal corr. from “superatiuus”.


29 Scribal corr. from “libellus”.
30 i.e. bomuncio.
31 mædenlic| mædencild
DE GENERIBUS

I.

After gecyndæ sindon twa cyn on namum, masculinum [12v] and femininum, þæt is “wærlíc” and “wiflic.” Wærlíc cyn bið bic uir, “ðes wer.” Wiflic: bëc femina, “ðís wif.” Þas twa cynn sind gecyndelice on mannum and on nytenum.

II.


III.


IV.


Ælfric gives a naturalistic explanation of grammatical gender. Masculine and feminine apply firstly to gendered creatures and secondarily, together with the neuter case, to things and concepts “æfter cræfte,” i.e. by analogy and tradition. Cf. Isidore’s discussion of gendered nouns in Etymologies, L.vii.28.
Sum cyn is gecweden *epicena*, þæt is on Leden *promiscua*, and on Englisc “gemenged”: *bic coruus*, “þes hrem,” swa hwæðer swa it bið, swa “he” swa “heó”; *bic miluus*, “þes glida,” ægðer ge “he” ge “héo”; 34 *hec aquila*, “ðes earn,” ægðer ge “he” ge “heo.” Eal swa *mustela*, “wesle,” et cetera.


---

34 Scribal corr. from “ge heó ge he”; it is interesting to note that the scribe thought it worthwhile to correct an error that has no real significance other than consistency.

35 An unusual use of the caudata in an Old English word.

36 Scribal corr. from “na”.
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Nominatiuus is “nemnigendlice.” Mid ðam cásu we nemnað ealle þinge. Swilce ðu cwede, bic homo equitat, “ðes man rít.”

Genitiuus is “gestrynendlic” oðde “geagnigendlice.” Mid ðam cásu bið geswutelod ðæces þinges gestreon oðde æhta: huius hominis filius, “ðises mannes sunu”; uel huius hominis equus, “oðde ðyse mannes hors.”


---

1 Seo] Se
2 It is strange that Ælfric uses such a relatively obscure word, especially one which is atypically masculine, as the paradigm for the first declension, though its Old English equivalent, “hearpere,” is more common and is also masculine. Law suggests that this “reflects the importance of the heapere [sic.] in Anglo-Saxon society (Law, “Anglo-Saxon England,” p. 57). Ælfric sensibly prefers Old English translations that share the gender of the Latin term when he is able to do so, though he explains above (De generibus, III, f. 12v, p. 13) that this is not always possible.
3 MS omits: Uocatiuo... hearpere; cf. O, f. 13r.
4 i.e. cytharistae.
Accussatius is “wrégendlic.” Mid ðam casu bið geswutelod hú menn sprecað he ælcum þinge: *hunc bominem accuso*, “ðisne mann ic wrege”; *hunc bominem amo*, “ðisne mann ic luðige”; *hanc rem apprehendi*, “ðis þing ic gelehte.”

Uocatius is “clypigendlic.” Mid ðam casu we clypiæð to ælcum ðince: ðo *homo, unen huc, “eala ðu mann, cum hider”; ðo *homo, loquere ad me, “eala ðu mann, sprec to me”; ðo magister, doce mé alicuie, “eala ðu lareow, tæce me sum þing.”

Ablatius is “æt-bredendlic.” Mid ðam casu [14r] bið geswutelod swa hwæt swa we æt-bredæð oðrum, ðode swa hwæt swa we under-fød æt oðrum, ðode hwanon⁶ we faro: *ab hoc bominem pecuniam accept*, “fram ðisum menn ic under-feng feoh”; *ab hoc magistro audiui sapientiam*, “fram ðisum lareowe ic gehyrde wisdóm”; *ab illa ciuitate equitauia, “fram þære byrig ic ræd”; á rége unen, “fram kynge ic com.”


---

⁵ accuso] acuso
⁶ Scribal corr. from “hwanan”.
⁷ Scribal corr. from “flagella”.
⁸ Scribal corr. from “poeto”.
⁹ i.e. *trapezita.*

On -ás geendiað agene naman: hic Eneas, huius Eneq, hunc Eneam,¹¹ ó Enea, ab hoc Enea. Nis ðær na menig-feald getel, for ðan ðe it is agen nama. Eal swa gæð hic Andreas Apostolus, hic Thomas, hic Mathias, hic Barnabás, et cetera.

On -es geendiað Greciscra manna naman: hic Anchises, huius Anchisę, hunc Anchisam, ó Anchises, ab hoc Anchisa. Nis na menig-feald getel on agenum namum.


SECUNDA DECLINATIO¹³

Habet terminationes sex: -er, -ir, -ur, -us, -eus, -um. Seo oðer declinatio hæfð six geendunga, ða ðe we nú namodon. Þa naman þe on -er geendiað ðíssere declinunge sind masculini generis, beon hi agene naman, beon hi elles gemænelice, swa swa is fæber, “smið.”


¹⁰ Scribal corr. from “litteras”.
¹¹ Scribal corr. from “aneam”.
¹² Scribal corr. from “mealdan”.
¹³ Scribal corr. from “DECLINATIO”.
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Of ðísam sind neutri generis: hoc pelagos, “ðeos wid-sé,” huius pelagi; hoc uulgus, “ðís ceorl folc” (uel bic uulgus); hoc uirus, “ðís wyrm,” indeclinabile; hoc pus, “ðeos for-rötednyss,” indeclinabile. Þa oðre naman ðíssere geendungr17 sind adiectiva,18 þæt sind “to-geicendlice,” and maciað masculinum on us, and femininum on á, and neutrum on um: Hic bonus homo, “þes goða mann”; bec

---

14 Scribal corr. from “smið”.
15 i.e. befer.
16 i.e. bir.
17 Scribal corr. from “endunge”.
18 Scribal corr. from “adectiuia.”


Da naman de geendiað on -eus sind agene naman, and Grecisce ealle ðaest: bic Titheus, bicus
Tithei; Pentheus, Penthei; Matheus se god-spellere, Mateus, vocatiuo: ó Matheu, et cetera.


19 Scribal corr. from “Treowa” (final a replaces an original a).
20 Scribal corr. from “calus”.
21 Scribal corr. from “abyssam”.
22 Scribal corr. from “hēc”.
23 i.e. eremus.


DE TERTIA DECLINATIONE

Tertia declinatio habet terminationes septuaginta octo. Seo ðridde declinatio is mare ðonne [17r] ealle ða ðdre. Heó hæfð eahta and hund-seofantig geendunga ðode mà.

I.26


25 Vergil, Aeneid, VIII. 77.
26 .I] Js; the scribe has evidently mistaken the Roman numeral of his exemplar for a “J” (or “I”) and doubled the “s” of “seo” to create a superfluous “Is.” Cf. Zupitza, p. 32. O omits this numeral, f. 19v.
27 Scribal corr. from “ðam”.
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.II.


.III.


28 Scribal corr. from “pawe”.
29 Scribal addition: “quaterionis... ealdor”.
30 i.e. locutio.
31 Scribal corr. from “accipe”.
32 wifum] wíüm
33 Here and below “heo” signifies that the preceding form is feminine. Thus baec dracena refers to a “she-dragon.”

.III.
On langne -o geendiað Grecisce naman, feminini generis, and sind agene naman: bec Dido, anes wifes nama, huius Didonis; bec Iuno, huius Iunonis; bec Io, huius Ionis, et cetera.

.V.

.VI.

.VII.
In -el productam, “on langne -el,” sind agene naman masculini: bec Danībel, huius Danielis; [18v] Michael, Gabrihel, Raphael. Ðas habbað langne e on eallum casum and hi geendiað heora ablativeum on sceortne é, swa swa ealle mæst ðyssere declinunge.

³⁴ Scribal corr. from “dymnys”.


35 Scribal corr. from “endunge”.
36 Scribal corr. from “cornicis”.

.XIII.


.XIII.


.XV.


.XVI.


.XVII.

In -ar productam, “on langne -ar,” geendiað þas naman: bic lár, “þis fyr,” on an-fealdum getele, and hit getacnað “hus” on menig-fealdum getele, bi lares, “ðas hus” (þanon is gecweden

38 The first “o” is subpuncted suggesting deletion.
39 draca] draaco; the final “a” and “o” very unusually share bows; cf. O, f. 23v.
lardum,⁴⁰ “spic,” for ðan ðe hit on husum hangað lange);⁴¹ bic nar, “an é” (naris bið “nosu”).


XVIII.


---

⁴⁰ i.e. laridum.
⁴¹ Cf. Etymologies: “Lard (lardum), because it is kept stored at home, for the ancients called their homes ‘dwellings’ (lar)” (Isidore, Etymologies, XX.ii.24).
⁴² Scribal corr. for “hæc”.
⁴³ i.e. uber.
⁴⁴ Scribal corr. for “iteneris”.
⁴⁵ Scribal corr. for “haec”.
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XVIII.


XX.

In -ir correptam, “on sceortne -ir,” beyló án agen nama neutri generis: hoc Gadíris, an burh, buius Gadiris.

XXI.


⁴⁶ Scribal corr. from “ð”.
⁴⁷ horror] hoorror
⁴⁸ Scribal corr. from “endunge”.
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.XXXII.


.XXXIII.

In -as correetam, “on sceortne -as,” geendið Grecisce naman, ac we ne gretað nu ðá.

.XXV.

In -ås productam, “on langne -as,” befallað fela naman communis generis: *bic et bec sumás et hoc sumate* (summas is “heafod mann” oðde “fyrnest manna”); optimás, “þegn”; primas, “fyrnest manna”; infimás, “wacost manna.” Ðas habbað langne ð on eallum casum and maciað heora *neutrum on té, and ablatiuum on ti. Þa ðøre ðyssere geendunge sindon feminini generis: *hec ciuitas, “ðeos

---

49 Scribal corr. from “ðes”.
50 roboris] roburis
51 Scribal corr. from “femininis”.
52 Scribal corr. from “смерис”.

And ealle oðre ðyllice felicitas, “ceaster aswunden fore halignyss,” buius maris; buias, “þis fæt,” buius uasis; boc fás, “alycledic þing”; boc nefás, “unalyzedlic” – þas twegen naman sind indicinabilia, þæt sind “ungebidendlice.” Án her is omnis generis, þæt is “ælces cynnes”: bic et bec et hoc nugas, þæt is “abroðen” on Englisc, and ungebidendlic on declinunge.

XXVI.


53 Scribal corr. from “habes”.
54 Scribal corr. from “quádrupes”.
55 Scribal corr. from “lybbende”.
56 Vergil, Aenéid, VII. 730-1.
XXVII.


XXVIII.


57 Scribal corr. from “stranges”.
58 Scribal corr. from “hec”.
59 The scribe uses an abbreviation here (瑢) which must signify boc, though it is used nowhere else in the manuscript.
60 Scribal corr. from “nædre”.


.XXVIII.


.XXX.

In -os correpam, “on sceortne -os,” geendað an nama: bec oss, “þis bán,” huius ossis (is eac gecweden boe ossum).

.XXI.


61 Scribal corr. from “ster setl”.
62 Scribal corr. from “custus”.
boues, horum et barum boum, his bobus, hos et bas boues, o boues, ab his bobus. Ne gæð nan oðer nama on ðæs wisan. Æn nama her is neutri generis: boc os, “þes muð,” huius oris, and ealle ðæs naman habbað langne ó on gebigedum casum, buton compos, and inpos.

XXXII.


XXXIII.


63 i.e. onus... oneris.
64 Ælfric is growing lazy (or working more efficiently) by omitting the often repeated “Sume sindon” and instead simply giving the gender of the nouns which follow. Other manuscripts do the same here; cf. O, 31v; Zupitza, p. 59.
65 i.e. tus... turis.
\[XXXIII.\]

In -ys sind Grecisce naman, þa we ne hreoppað nu buton bec clamys, “ðes basing,” huius clamydis.

\[XXXV.\]


\[XXXVI.\]


\[XXXVII.\]


\[XXXVIII.\]


\[66\] Scribal corr. from “glns”.

\[67\] Cf. Vergil, Aeneid, VIII. 6.

\[68\] It is not uncommon for the scribe to vary his use of the “h,” especially when it is word-initial. Cf. choors, cboortis, ydrops, hydropsis, below.

\[69\] Scribal corr. from “paren”.
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unsnotor,” of ṣam gefeged, is æfre nama; nocens, “derigende,” is nama and participium; innocens, “underigende,” of ṣam gefeged, is æfre nama, for ḷan de ælc participium de bido gefeged ñurh hine sylfne bido awend to naman.


XXXVIII.


XL.

In -uns, “on -uns,”70 geendað agene naman: hic Aruns, buius Aruntis, et cetera.

XLI.


XLII.


XLIII.72


---

70 Scribal addition: “On uns”.
71 Scribal corr. from “an”; a later scribe has clarified a previously unclear reading.
72 XLIII] XLIII.

In -urs: an nama geendað on -urs trium generum, þæt is “þreora cynna”: hic et hec et hoc Tyburs, huius Tyburtis, gentile nomen, “þeodlic nama.”


In -ebs corripectam: an nama geendað on sceortne -ebs omnis generis, þæt is “ælces cynnes”: hic et hec et hoc celebs, “clæne” oððe “heofonlic,” huius celebis.

In -ebs productam, “on langne -ebs,” geendað án nama feminini generis: hec plebs, “þís folc,” huius plebis, is eac gecweden hec plebes, huius plebei on ðære fiftan declinunge.

In -obs, “on -obs,” geendiað hec scrobs, huius scrobis; scrobs is “pyt” oððe “dic.”

33 i.e. cobors...cobortis.
.LII.

In -yps, “on -yps,” geendað án nama masculini generis: hic calybs, “þis isen,” huius calybs.74

.LIII.


.LIII.


.LIV.


.LVI.


.LVII.

In -yps geendað hic cynyps, “ðes stan-bucca,” huius cyniphys.77

74 Note that here, as elsewhere in the manuscript, for nouns which end in -ys, the inflectional ending of the genitive -is is changed to -ys.
75 Scribal corr. from “aucipis”.
76 ancipitë ancipite
77 Cf. Etymologies: “Larger he-goats are called cinypii from the river Cinyps in Libya, where they are born large” (Isidore of Seville, Etymologies, XII.i.14).
.LVIII.


.LVIII.

In -ax correptam, “on sceortne -ax,” geendað bec fax, “þes blysa,” huius facis. Ælc nama þe geendað on x oðde on twam consonantem bið lang on nominatiuo, ac se uocalis bið gescyrt on þam oðrum casum.

.LX.


.LXI.


.LXII.


78 Scribal corr. from “dystige”.
79 correptam] cerreptam
80 Scribal corr. from “hoc”.
81 Scribal addition: “hec ilex... ilicis”.
82 Scribal addition: “hic et hec... eadmod”.
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.LXIII.

In -ix correptam, “on sceortne -ix,” geendað þas naman: bic calix, “ðes calic,” buiui calicis; 
cetera.

.LXIII.

In -ix productam, “on langne -ix,” geendað þas naman: hic fenix, swa hatte án fugel on 
Arabiscre ðeode, se leofað fif hund geara, and æfter deade eft arist geedcucod, and se fugel getacnað 
urne ðeost on ðam ende nextan dæge, buiui fenícis.84 Generis feminini: bic cornix, “ðeos ceó”; 
generum: bic et bec et hoc felix, “gesælig,” buiui felicis; bic et bec et hoc pernix, “swyft,” buiui pernicis; 
hec nutrix, “þos fostor-modor,” buiui nutricis; bec uictrix, “ðeos sigefæste,” buiui uicricis. And ealle oðre 
þyllice, þe cumað of werlicum namum: bic cantor, “þes sangere,” bec cantrix, “ðeos sangystre”; 
neutrum on gebigedum casum, swa swa is gecweden, Uictricia tollite s igna,85 Nimað þa sigefæstan 
mearca. Nis swa ðeah gewunelic hoc uictrix ac on ðam gebigedum casum.

.LXV.

In -ox correptam, “on sceortne -ox,” geendað án nana feminini generis: bic nox, “ðeos niht,” 
buiui noctis; and án of ðam gefeged ðreora cynna: bic et bec et hoc pernox, “þurh-wacol,” buiui 
pernocis. On ðisum twam namum is se ó sceort on gecynde, ac ða twegen consonantes, c and t, hi ne 
doð langne.

83 Scribal corr. from “saticis”.
84 Ælfric likely has in mind the account of the phoenix in the Physiologus which agrees with him in the attribution of a 
lifespan of five hundred years to the creature unlike the Old English Phoenix or its source, the Carmen de ave phoenice 
attributed to Lactantius, which instead ascribe a one thousand-year lifespan (N. F. Blake, ed., The Phoenix, Old and 
Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964), p. 13). See also “The Development of the 
Phoenix Story” and “Sources, Authorship and Date” in Blake, The Phoenix, pp. 8–13, 17–24; “The Later History of 
Ælfric’s description with the parallel passages from the two poems: “oþþæt hē þūsende þisses līfes 
... wintra gebīdeþ” (The Phoenix, 151–2) and “Quae postquam vitae iam mille peregerit annos” (Carmen, 59 [also in Blake’s edition, p. 49]).
85 Lucan, Pharsalia, I. 347.
.LXVI.


.LXVII.


.LXVIII.


.LXIX.


.LXX.


.LXXI.

*In -aux geendað an nama: héc faux, “þés goma,” buius faucis.89* 

.LXXII.


---

86 Marginal scribal addition: “et híc... hic”.
88 The scribal antipathy to the ae digraph could scarcely be more evident than here as the scribe omits the a but four words after stating that the present category of nouns ends in -aex.
89 Scribal corr. from “facis”.


In -arx, “on -arx,” geendað an nama: *bec arx*, “ðis wig-hus,” *huius arcis*.


In -ac, “on -ac,” geendað an nama: *neutri generis*: *hoc lac*, “ðeos meolc,” *huius lactis*.

In -ac, “on -ac,” geendað an nama: *neutri generis*: *hoc lac*, “ðeos meolc,” *huius lactis*.

In -ac, “on -ac,” geendað an nama: *neutri generis*: *hoc lac*, “ðeos meolc,” *huius lactis*.


---

90 Scribal corr. from “am”.
Sume naman macið heora accusatiuin ægðer ge on -im ge on -en: puppis, “steor-setl,”
banc puppim uel puppem; nauis, “scip,” banc nauum uel nauem; clausi, “cæg,”
banc clauim uel clauem;
banc turrim uel turrem, and das macið heora ablatium on -e and -i: ab hac puppe uel puppi, et
cetera.

DE PLURALI GENITIUO

Gif hwam twynað be þam92 menig-fealdan genitiuo, þonne scege we her sceortlice be ðam
gearfoþostan. Supplex, “câddmod” oðde “aloten,” is þreora cynna: borum et barum et borum
supplicum; (supplicium is “wite”;) artifex, “craeftica,” borum artificum, “þyssera craêtscena”
(artificium is “craeft”); iudex, “dema,” borum iudicum, “þyssera demena” (iudicum is “dóm”); parens,
“fæder” oðde “modor,” borum parentum; vigil, “wacol,” borum vigilum; memor, “gemyndig,” borum
biems, “winter,” bienum; princeps, “ealdor-mann,” principum (principium is “angin”); municeps,
“burh-[28v]caldor,” municipum (municipium is “burh-sципe”); collis, “hyl” oðde “beorh,” collium;
iuuenum; panis, “hlaf,” panum; cánis, “lund,” canum; uates, “witega” oðde “scop,” uatum; ciuitas,
“ceaster,” ciuitatum; probitas, “gûynss,” probitatum (buton seo sincopa, þæt is seo “wanung,” bone i
of-teo, þæt is gecweden ciuitatem, probitatum, sanctitatum, et cetera); þe uires, “þas mágnu,” barum
uirium; bi et be tres et be tria, barum et barum et barum trium, “þyssera ðécora”; bi et be plures,
“ma,”93 et bec pluria, horum et barum et horum plurium; lis, “geflit,” litium, “geflita”; bic et bec dis,
“welig,” ditium; nox, “niht,” noctium; uox, “stemn,” uocum; consul, “dema,” consulum; dux, “here-
bos, “oxa,” boun. Þurh þas ðu miht ðæra oðra genitiuin understandan.

91 Scribal corr. from “ax”.
92 þam] þan
93 Scribal addition: “ma”.
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DE QUARTA DECLINATIONE


94 Datiuo] dotiuo
95 Scribal corr. from “fremung”

96 for ðan gescede þæt hi næron gelice arcibus, “wig-husum”; artibus, “craeftum”; partibus, “dælum.”


**DE QUINTA DECLINATIONE**

Quinta98 declinatio habet unam terminationem, in -és productam. “Seo fisre declinung hæfð ane geendunge, on langne -és,” and sind ealle feminini generis buton anum, þe is ægðres cynnes on an-fealdu getele and on menig-fealdu getele is masculini generis: hic uel hec dies, “þes dæg,” and án of ðam gefeged is masculini generis: hic meridies, “þes mid-dæg.”


96 Scribal corr. from “ge eacnung”.

97 But cf. Isidore’s *Etymologies*, where “A bow (arcus) is so called because it wards off (arcere) the adversary... Again, ‘bow’ from its appearance, because they are bent ‘rather tightly’ (artius); and “The joints (artus), with which the limbs are connected, are so called from ‘drawing together’ (artare)” (*Etymologies*, XVIII.ix.5, XI.i.82).

98 The initial “Q” is more decorative than usual in the MS and is very different from that beginning the *Quarta Declinatione* only two leaves previous.

99 i.e. caesaries.

DE NUMERO


100 Scribal corr. from “duritia”.
101 “sun” and ‘moon’ are [always] singular”; note that Ælfric begins by giving a familiar example in Old English before discussing the parallel concept in Latin which it illustrates.
102 Cf. Ps 5:7, odiisti omnes operantes iniquitatem perdes loquentes mendacium virum sanguinum et dolosum abominabitur Dominus.
103 Scribal corr. from “olæcunga”.
104 Marginal scribal addition: “Quadrie... cræt”.
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Sume naman habbað oðre declinunge on an-fealdum getæle and oðre on menig-fealdum, swa swa is *hoc iugerum*, “þes æcer”; se nama is þære oðre declinunge on an-fealdum getæle, and þære ðriddan declinunge on menig-fealdum getæle; *hoc uas*, “ðís ðæt,” is þære ðriddan declinunge on an-fealdum getæle, and þære oðre on menig-fealdum.

**DE FIGURA**

*Figura* is “hiw” on namum and on oðrum dælum, and æfter *Donatum* þam láreowe sind twa  
*figura: simplex, þæt is “an-feald,” et composita, þæt is “gefeged.”¹⁰⁸ An-feald hiw is decens,


than that in his usual source, the Excerptiones, which further divides figura into three categories: simplex, composita, and decomposita. The latter consists of words derived from compounds, but whose parts cannot be divided into two complete words, such as magnanimitas, from magno (“great”) and animitate (“souled”), where animitas is not used on its own (per se non dictur) (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 148–9).

109 Marginal scribal addition: “INdecent... unge dauenlic”.
110 Scribal corr. from “op”.
111 Scribal corr. from “fectus”.
112 Scribal corr. from “monaptato”.
113 naman] namann
Sume naman\textsuperscript{114} sindon dyptota\textsuperscript{115} gecwedene. [32r] Þa habbað twegen mislice casus and nà mà on gewunan: 

Sume sind gecwedene triptota.\textsuperscript{116} Þa habbað ðry ungelice casus, swa swa beoð ealle naman 
\textit{neutri generis} þære oðre declinunge on an-fealdum getele: \textit{hoc templum}, “ðis templ,” \textit{huius templi}, 
\textit{huic templo}. Nis þær na ma mislicra casa. Eall swa bið on menig-fealdum getele on eallum \textit{neutrum}:

Sume naman sindon gehatene tetraptota, þa ðe habbað feower ungelice casas, swa swa sind ealla ða ðe geendiað on \textit{er} on þære oðre declinunge: \textit{bic presbiter}, “ðes mæsse-preost,” \textit{huius presbiteri}, 
\textit{huic presbitero}, \textit{hunc presbiterum}, et similia.


Sume naman sind gecwedene exaptota,\textsuperscript{119} ðæt sind ða ðe habbað six casus, nan oðrum gelic, 

\textit{Sit hoc satis de sex casualibus formis}. “Beo ðis ðus genoh be þam six gebigendlicum hiwum 
gesæd.” We habbað nu\textsuperscript{120} gesæd be ðam fif ðingum þe ðam namum gelimpað. ðæt is \textit{species}, “hiw”:
Dride, \textit{numerus}, ðæt is “getel.” \textit{Feorde}, \textit{figura}, “hiw,” ðæt is hwæðer hit beo \textit{simplex}, “an-feald,” \textit{aut composita}, “oðde gefeged.” Fifte is \textit{casus}, ðæt is “fyll” oðde “gebigednys.” Nu wylle we onginnan 
\textit{pronomen}.

\textsuperscript{114} Scribal corr. from “namon”.
\textsuperscript{115} Scribal corr. from “dyptata”.
\textsuperscript{116} Scribal corr. from “triptata”.
\textsuperscript{117} Scribal corr. from “cornum”.
\textsuperscript{118} Scribal corr. from “pentaptata”.
\textsuperscript{119} i.e. hexaptota.
\textsuperscript{120} [\textit{nu}] un; cf. O, 46v.
incipit pronomen

Pronomen est pars orationis, que pro nomine proprio unitusciusque accipitur, personasque finitas recipit, “pronomen” is ‘nāman speliend,’ an del Leden spreçe, se bið under-fanged for agenum nāman, and he under-fėhō hadas mid fulre gewissunge.” Ñes del, þæt is pronomen, hǣfō six accidentia, þæt sind six “gelimp.” Him gelimpō: species, þæt is “hīw,” persona, þæt is “had,” genus, þæt is “cynn,” and figura, þæt is “an-feald hīw” oðde “gefėged,” and numerus, þæt is “getel,” and casus, “gebigednyss.” We secgað nu gewislicor be ðison.

Species pronominum bipartita est. “Þæra nāman speliendra hiw is on twá to-dæled,” for ðan ðe hi synd sume primitiua, þæt sind “frum-cennede,” sume diriuatiua, þæt sind “of-gangende.” Eahta ðær sind frum-cennede and seofan of-cumende. Se forma had is frum-cenned: ego, “ic,” eall swa se oðer: tu, “þu,” and eac se ēridda: ille, “he.” Se forma had and se oðer had habbað æn-þipige stemna, for ðan ðe hi beoð æbre æt-gædere and him be-twynan spreað þonne ic cwede, ego, “ic,” and ðu cweþst to me, tu, “þu,” þonne beo wyt æt-gædere, and for ði ne behoфаð nāðor ðissera pronomina nāma1 stemna buton twegra. Se ēridda had hǣfō six clypunda, for ðan ðe he is hwilon mid, hwilon on, oðre stowe: iste, “ðēs,” is æt-eowigendlic and ðær bið, þær man swa bicnað be him. Ille, “he” ne bið ðær [33r] æt-foran andwerd, þær man swa be him clypað.


1 nāma| namā; the scribe’s use of long vowel marks is inconsistent and occasionally incorrect, as here.
2 Cf. Excerptes: “In bis igitur quindecim pronominibus nulla fit controversia, quin omnes fateantur esse pronomina... There is no scholarly controversy about these fifteen pronouns, but all admit them to be pronouns” (Porter, Excerptes, p. 158–9).
On Leden sprece cwed ægðer ge wer ge wif ge ðeow mann ego et tu, and on Englisc, “ie” and “ðu,” for ði hi sind þreora cynna na on stemne, ac on andgite. Þa ðære ealle ðæst sind mobilia, þæt is “awendendlice,” fram cynne to cynne, swa swa we nū rihte cuðlicor secgāð.


---

3 Scribal corr. from “declinungne”.
4 mis appears to be an archaic form of meus or meis, neither of which seems correct here. Cf. O, 47v, which omits mei: “ego, ‘ic,’ uel mis, ‘min.’” The forms are not Ælfric’s, however, but are taken from the Excerptiones: “ego, mei (uel ‘mis’)… tui (uel ‘tis’)” (Porter, Excerptiones, p. 164).
5 See previous note.
6 congregat] congregað; the scribe has conjugated the verb congrego as though it were an Old English verb. The same occurs several times below: amað, f. 33v, p. 49; fecðo, f. 39r, p. 56; legðo, f. 42v, p. 61; fuerd, f. 47r, p. 68; congregað, f. 83v, p. 125; conversely, erat for “erað,” f. 36v, p. 52.


14 Scribal corr. from “under-ðedendlic”.
15 Quoted from the Excerptiones; cf. Porter, Excerptiones, p. 160
16 Note that Venus is here declined as a Latin noun, even though it is set in an Old English sentence. One might expect instead “Uenuses.” Compare present-day English “datum,” plural “data” and “criterion,” plural “criteria.” Cf. O, 50v: “ ueneres” where the Old English inflectional ending is attached to the Latin stem.
17 ðam] ðan
18 ipsarum] ipsarā
19 Scribal addition: “ipsi”.
20 Scribal corr. from “meoo”.
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21 Scribal corr. from “biglyfan”.
22 A rather decorative majuscule “A”, perhaps partly because there is simply room for it on the top line of a leaf.
23 Scribal corr. from “erant”, which is the more common word and therefore likely the reason for the scribal error.
24 fratum] frā
25 i.e. nostrae; Ælfric skips ahead to the plural, passing over most of the declension of nostra, as he explains immediately hereafter.
Se oðer had is tu, “ðu,” and his *genitius* bið tui, “ðin.” Þonne cymð of ðam *diriuatium*: 

*Generis feminini*: tua uilla, “þin tun,” *tue uille*, “þines tunes,” and swa forð æfter þære forman 
declinunge. *Generis neutri*: *tuum uerbum*, “ðin word,” *tui uerbi*, “þines wordes,” and swa forð æfter 
neutri generis.

Se frum-cenneda tú macað his menig-fealde getel, uos. Þonne cumað of his *genitius*, *uestri*, 
twa *diriuatium*: *uester*, “eower,” and *uestras*, “eower landes mann”; *uester bos*, “eower oxan,” *uestri bous*, 
“eowres oxan,” and swa forð, swa swa *noster*. *Femininum*: *uesta uestis*, “cowwer reaf,” and swa forð, swa 
swa *nostra*. *Generis neutri*: *uestrum iudicium*, “eower dom,” *uestri iudiciii*, “eoweres domes,” and swa 
forð æfter *neutri* generis.

Of ðam frum-cennedan sui cymð an *diriuatium*: *suus*, “his.” *Suus ager*, “his æcer,” *sui agris*, 
“his æceras,” and swa forð, swa swa ða oðre. *Femininum*: *sua uxor*, “his wif,” *sue uxoris*, “his wifes,” 
and swa forð, swa swa ða oðre. *Neutrum*: *suum rús*, “his land,” *sui rúris*, “his landes,” and swa forð 
æfter *neutri* generis.

We willað secgan hwæt si betwux ðam *genitiumm*, ðæra frum-cennedra *pronomena* and ðæra 
of-gangendra,26 *mei, tui, sui, nostri, uestri*, gif hi beoð frum-cennede *genitiui*, Þonne magon hi bëon 
gefærlechte eallum casum and ægðrum getele: *mei ager est*, “min æcer hit is”; *mei terra*, “min land”; 
*mei agros aro*, “mine æceras ic erige”; *mei uerba audisti*, “mine word ðu gehyrdest.”27 Eall swa *tui 
ðine æceras.” 
Eall swa *sui equus est*, “his hors hit is”; *sui homines pergunt*, “his menn gað”; *sui 
animalia sunt*, “his nytenu hit synd”; *sui ancilla laborat*, “his wyln swincð”; *nostri29 hominis equus est*, 
“ures mannes hors hit is”; *nostri seruari arguo*, “urne ðeowan mann ic dreage”; *nostri agros depasces*,30 
“ðu estt ure æceras”; *uestri sermo*, “eower spræc”; *uestri congregatio*, “eower gegaderung”; *uestri iudicia

26 Scribal corr. from “of-gangendra”.
27 The use of the genitive of the personal pronoun in this way is unusual. Cf. Allen and Greenough: “To express 
possession and similar ideas the possessive pronouns are regularly used, not the genitive of the personal or reflexive 
pronouns: *domus mea*, my house. [Not *domus met*.]” It is further noted there that “Exceptions are rare in classic Latin, 
Greenough et al. (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2014), § 302 a; n. 1). But cf. also Ælfric’s source, the 
28 erad] erat; the inverse error of that above in *congregað* and elsewhere, i.e. a Latin inflectional ending on an Old 
English verb. See p. 48, n. 6.
29 Scribal corr. from “Nostre”.

DE FIGURA


Þry eacan sind met, apte, ᵇ2 ce, ðe man eacnāð on Leden sprêc to sumum casum þises partes for gesceede oððe fægernysse: egomet, “ic sylf,” meimet, “mines sylfes,” mibimet, “me sylfum,” memet, “me sylflne.” On õam oðran hade, on genitiuuo: tuimet, “þines sylfes” (for þan ðe tuimet is word: tumeo,

³¹ i.e. istunc.
³² Scribal corr. from “pte.”

Hic est ægðer ge pronomen ge aduerbum: bic, “ðes”; and hic, “her.” Tantundem is nama, þæt is “eft swa micel.” His genitiuus is tantidem, “eft swa micle” oðde “eall swa micle.” Næðo he na ma casa. Totidem, “eall swa fela,” is eac nama and næðo na ma casa.

DE NUMERO


33 Scribal corr. from “tum&c”.
34 Scribal corr. from an erased word.
Oðer had and oðer cynn bið on ðam æhte ðe he embe spræcð, for ðan ðe þæt forme stæf-gefeg is þreora cynna: masculinum and femininum and neutrum, and þæt oðer stæf-gefeg is awendendlic fram cynne to cynne: meus ager, “min écer”; mea terra, “min land”; meum aratrum, “min sul.” Hi sind eac gecwedene possessiua, þæt sind “geagnigendlice, for ðan ðe hi getacniað oftost æhta, ac na swa þeah symle. Gif ic cweðe meus dominus, “min hlaford,” oððe meus pater, “min fæder,” ne bið þær nan æht geswutelod. Suus, “his,” is ægðres geteles, ge anfealdes ge menig-fealdes, buton Priscianus luge,35 for ðon ðe his frum-cenneda, sui, is ægðres geteles: sui causa facit, “for his intingan he hit deð”; et sui causa faciunt, “and for heora intingan hi hit doð”; sibi prodest, “him sylfum he fremað”; et sibi prosunt, “and him sylfum hi fremiað”; se custodit, “hin eðle he hylt”; et se custodiunt, “and hi healdað hi sylfe”; a se expulit hostem, “fram him he adræfðe36 done feond”; a se expellunt hostes, “hi adræfða heora fynd him fram,” et similia.

DE CASU


Ane nigon naman sind þe habbað þa ylcan declinunge þe pronomina habbað, and for þi wæron sume boceras swa bepehte þæt hi tealdon þa nigon naman to þisum dæle, þe we hatåð

35 i.e. “unless Priscian is mistaken.” Ælfric is responding to the Excerptiones: “Nam terria, que est ‘sui, sibi, se, a se’, non solum genera sed etiam numeros confundit… Now the third person, sui ‘one’s own… by oneself’, puts together not only the genders but also the grammatical numbers” (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 164–5). Law agrees, noting that Ælfric does not “hesitate to take issue with Priscian… and Donatus, accusing Priscian of lying about the number of sui… and quoting biblical passages which contradict both authorities” (Law, “Anglo-Saxon England,” p. 61). For an example of the latter, see f. 30r, p. 43, above, where Ælfric notes that a plural from of sanguis (“blood”) occurs in the Psalms.

36 Scribal corr. from “adræfða”.

37 Scribal corr. from “menig faldlice”.
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Hit is to witene41 þæt þas naman habbað mislic andgit, be ðan ðe hi gesette beod. Gif ic cwede, quis hoc fecit? “hwa dyde ðís?” þonne bið se quis interrogatium, þæt is “axigendlice.” Gif ic cwede, nescio quis hoc fecit,42 “nat ic hw ðís dyde,” þonne bið se quis infinitium, þæt is

38 Cf. Excerptiones: “Non enim declinatio sed uis et significatio uniuscuiusque partis contemplanda est. Quod si declinatio facit judicium, qualis sit dictio, debent omnia possessia pronomina, quae nominum declinatione sequuntur, et participia inter nomina computari, quod omnino caret ratione... But it is not the inflection that is to be considered, but rather the force and signification of each part of speech. For if inflection determines the part of speech, all possessive pronouns with noun endings and all participles as well must be counted as nouns, something that makes no sense at all” (Porter, Excerptiones, p. 178–9).
39 Scribal corr. from “ge teald”.
40 genera] genena
41 Scribal corr. from “to wite”.
42 fecit] fecið


Gyt sindon sume naman, þe ðæron unrihtlice getealde betwux namum speligendum, for ðan þe naman speligend ne mæg habban ða getacnunga, ðe hi habbað. An ðæra is qualis and quale, “hwile.” Þet getacnað þreo ðincg: interrogationem, þet is “axunge,” and infinitionem.
“endelesynsse,” et relationem, “and edlesunge.”
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Gif ic cweðe, qualis est rex? “hwilc is se cyning?”

donne bið he interrogatium, þet is “axigendlice.”

Gif ic cweđe nescio qualis est rex, “nat ic hwilc se
cyning is,” done bið se qualis infinitium, þet is “ungeendgendlic.”

Gif ic cweđe, tu scis bene qualis est, “þu wast wel hwilc he is,” done bið hit
relatiium, þet is “edlæsendlic.”

Talis and tale, “swilc,”

andwyrt ðam oðrum. Þu cwþest, qualis es ille?, “hwilc es he?” ic cweđe talis est, “swilc he es.” 

Das
twegen naman gað æfter ðære ðriddan declinunge. Da maciað heora ablative on i.


We cweþað, quot homines, “hu fel a manna”; quot littere, “hu fela stafa”; quot uerba, “hu fela worda”;
tot libri, “swa fela boca”; tot page, “swa fela trameta”; tot folia, “swa fela leafa”; and hi sind
undeclinendlice, ac hi andwyrtada swa þeah callum casum: bi quot, borum quot, bi tot, borum tot.


Hi sindon mobilia æfter ðære oðræ declinunge. Of ðam naman, quis, cumað ðreo genitiui æfter ealdre spræce: cuius, masculinum; cuía, femininum, cuíum, neutrum, ac we ne gimað ná swiðe on ðisum
dagum þissere genitiuo, ac brucað þæs anes on ælcum cynne: cuius bominis, “hwilces mannes” oððe
“ðæs mannes,” cuius femine, cuius animalis. Ec buton ðison cwædon þa ealdan, bic et hęc cuías et hoc cuíate, huius cuiatis. Þet bið þus on Leden spræce: cuías es? “hwilcere ðeode eart þu?” uestras sum, “eowere ðeode ic eom” oððe “eower landes mann,” swa swa cwæð se þalda Plautus: Quid est? cuíates estis, aut quo ex oppido? “hwæt is la? hwilcere ðeode sind ge, oððe of hwilcum fæstene?” Is eac to witenne þet ullus and nullus, nemo and ambo, ne nan ðæra namena þe andwerd ne bið on spræce, nøfð nønne vocatium. Eft, alter and ueter, ne nan þæra de geð on twá, nøfð nønne vocatium, for ðan se vocatius, þæt is “seo clypigendlice,” gebigednyss wyle beon æfre to andwerdum menn
geclyped and tó anum hade.

45 Scribal corr. from “edlesung”.


Nu sind þa word gehatene actiua, þæt er “dædllice,” da de geendað on -ó and maciað of him sylfum passiua uerba, þæt er “ðrowigendlice word,” gif se r bidoð þær-to genumen, swa swa we nu sædon. Þa word de geendað on -ó [41v] and ne magon æfter andgite beon passiua, þæt er neutra gehatene, þæt er “naðres cynnes. Uiuo, “ic lybbe”; spiro, “ic orðige”; sto, “ic stande”; ambulo, “ic gange”; sedeo, “ic sitte” – ne mæg her beon nan passiua on ðisum wordum, for ðan de heora getacnung ne byflyð on nanum oðrum menn, buton on ðam de hit cwþ. Swa ðeah sume of ðisum neutrum maciað passiua on ðam ðriddan hade, ná to mannum, ac to oðrum þingum: aro, “ic erige,” aras, “þu erast,” árat, “he erað.” Ne cwþð nan mann, “ic eom geerod,” ac on ðam ðriddan hade is gecweden, aratur terra, “þæt land is geered”; bibo, “ic drince”; bibitur uinum, “þæt win is”

1 neutrum, i.e. intransitive, as Ælfric makes clear in the following paragraphs.
2 Scribal addition: “is”.
gedruncen”; manduco, “ic ete”; manducatur panis, “se hlaf is geeten”; laboro, “ic swince”; laboratur\textsuperscript{3} uestis, “\'et h\'ægl is beswuncen,” et cetera.

\'Pa word \'e geendia\'d on -\'or habba\'d \'preo getacnunge. An is \'browigendlic, swa swa we \xer saxdon. O\'ber is commune, \'et is “gem\'ene twegra getacnunge,” for \'dan \'e on \xam worde bi\d xeg\'er ge d\'ed ge \xordung: oscul\textsuperscript{4}ur \'et, “ic cyss\'e \'de,” et oscul\textsuperscript{4}or a te, “and ic eom fram \'e cyss\'ed”; complector te, “ic ymb-clyppe \'de,” and complector a t\'e, and “ic eomfram \'e ymb-clypped.” \'Pas word and \'illice ne be\'o na Leden word gif se r bi\d a\'ege ged\'on.\textsuperscript{5}

\'Pa \'riddan getacnunget \'he\f deponens uerbum, \'et is “alecgende word,” for \'dan \'e he leg\'o him fra\'m \xam ane getacnunget and hylt \'o o\'dre. Deponentia uerba significant actum. “\'Pa aleggendlican word getacnia\'d d\'ede,” swa swa acti\'ua, ac hi geendia\'d on \'or, swa swa passi\'ua: luctor, “ic w\'raxlige”; loquor, “ic spr\'ace” – her is d\'ed on \'issere getacnunget. Hi ne be\'o\d n\'a Leden word gif se r bi\d a\'ege. \'Pa word \'e sind passi\'ua be\'o\d acti\'ua [42r] gif se r bi\d a\'ege ged\'on: armor, “ic eom gew\'apnod”; armo \'et, “ic w\'\xepnige \'de,” et cetera.

Twa d\'edlice word sind \'e habba\'d \'owyrlice getacnunget: \'het \p\'e\' d geendia\'d on o getacna\'d \xordung, and \'het \p\'e\' g\'eendia\'d on or getacna\'d d\'ede: timeo, “ic me on-dr\'ede”; metuo, “ic me on-dr\'ede.” Se \'e him on-dr\'et, sumes \'inges he him on-dr\'et. Timeo dominum, “ic me on-dr\'ede God”; timeor, “ic eom on-dr\'ed,” \'het is \'het sumum menn stent ege fram me. Metuor a pueris nostris, \'het is on andgite, “urum cildum stent ege fram me.”

\'Pa word eac sume, \'e sind neutra gecwedene, habba\'d \xordwigendlice getacnunget, swa swa is uapulo, “ic eom beswungen”; ueneo, “ic eom geseald.” Ac hi ne geendia\'d n\'efre on or, swa hw\'\xeder swa hi getacnia\'d.

\textbf{DE TEMPORE}

Tempus accidit uerbo. “\'Tid gelimp\'o worde” for getacnunget mislicra d\'eda. \'Et\'er gecynde sind \'oreo tida on \xalm worde \'e fulfremed\textsuperscript{8} bi\d. Presens tempus is “and-werd \textit{tid}: sto, “ic

\textsuperscript{3} laboratur\textsuperscript{]} loboratur
\textsuperscript{4} Scribal deletion between oscul and or.
\textsuperscript{5} Scribal corr. from “god\'on”.
\textsuperscript{6} Editorial addition: \p\'e; cf. O, 64r.
\textsuperscript{7} Editorial addition: \p\'e; cf. ibid.
\textsuperscript{8} fulfremed\textsuperscript{]} fulre med
stande.” *Preteritum tempus* is “forð-gewiten tíd”: *steti*, “ic stod.” *Futurum tempus* is “towerd tíd”: *stabo*, “ic stande nu rihete oðđe on sumne timan.” Ac, swa ðeah wise lareowas to-dæledon ðone *preteritum tempus*, þæt is þone “forð-gewitenan timan,” on ðreo; on *preteritum imperfectum*, þæt is “unful-fremed forð-gewiten,” swilce þæt ðing béo unggunnen and ne béo ful dón: *stabam*, “ic stod.” *Preteritum perfectum* is “forð-gewiten ful-fremed”: *steti*, “ic stode fullice.” *Preteritum plus quam perfectum* is “forð-gewiten mare þonne full-fremed,” for ðan ðe hit wæs gefyrn gedón: *steteram*, “ic stod gefyrn.” Forði is se forð-gewitena tima on ðreo to-dæled, for ðan ðe naht ne bið swa gemyndelic on gecynde, swa þæt is, þæt gedon bið. [42v]

**DE MODIS**

*Modus* is “gemet” oðđe “þære sprece wise,” and ðæra sind fif. *Indicatiuus* is “gebicnigendlice.” Mid ðam we geswuteliað hwæt we doð oðđe oðre menn. Ic sweðe nū, *lego*, “ic ræde” – þær bið min dǽd geswutelod, and ðis *modus* is ful-fremed on eallum tidem, and on eallum hadum, and is forði fyrmest.

Þæt ðær *modus* is *imperatiius*, þæt is “bebeodendlic.” Mid ðam gemete we hatæð oðre menn dón sum ðing oðđe sum ðing ðrowian: *lege*, “ræd ðū,” *legat*,¹² “ræde he”; *flagella istum puerum*, “beswing ðis cild”; *flagelletur*, “si he beswungen.” Þis gemet sprecð forð-werd and næð næne *preteritum*, for ðan ðe nan mann ne hæt dón þæt þe gedon bið. He sprecð tó oðrum, and ná to him sylfum, for ðan ðe gehwa hæt oðerne, na hine sylfne.

---

⁹ Ælfric necessarily finds it somewhat awkward to speak about the future tense in Old English since it has none itself, but instead relies on adverbs and context to convey futurity. The same is true for modern English (though it additionally employs modal verbs) and applies also, to varying degrees, to several other tenses and moods. See the corresponding discussion in “The Grammar as a Translation,” above, p. xvi.

¹⁰ Ælfric does not merely state that it is the case that there are three divisions of the preterite tense, but that certain “wise teachers” have so divided it, presumably including Priscian. Cf. *Excerptiones*, where Priscian explains why the preterite has three categories: *Sunt igitur tempora secundum naturam tria, praesens, praeteritum, et futurum. Sed rursus praeteritum diuiditur in tria: in praeteritum imperfectum, praeteritum perfectum, praeteritum plusquam perfectum. Nec mirum tam late patere praeteritum tempus, cum in notitiam nostram nibil sic naturaliter a longo seculorum spatio potest venire, quomodo actus praeteriti temporis.* (Porter, *Excerptiones*, p. 188). Ælfric closely follows the text of the *Excerptiones* here, directly translating the final *cum*-clause, beginning “for ðan ðe naht,” below.

¹¹ Scribal addition: “æs”.

¹² *legat*] legað
The additions to the Old English translations in this and the preceding few examples are quite interesting. They show that Ælfric is interested in imparting to his readers a wisdom beyond grammar. See the discussion of Ælfric’s examples in “The Grammar as a Translation,” above, p. xvi, especially pp. xviii–xx.

14 Scribal addition: “j”.
15 ðære] ðære
16 Scribal corr. from “ac”.

DE PERSONIS

Sunt igitur personne uerborum tres. “Pry hadas synd worda.” Se forma hadis is þe sprecð he him sylfum ana ðus: dico, “ic secege,” oððe mid oðrum mannum on menig-fealdum getele: dicimus, “we secgad.” Se oðer hadis is þe se forma sprecð to: dicis, “þu segst”; oððe menig-fealdlice:
dicitis, “ge secgað.” Se ðridda had is be ðam þe se forma had sprecð to ðam oðrum hade: dicit, “he segð,” oððe menig-fealdlice: dicunt, “hi secgað.”


**DE NUMERO**


---

17 Passages such as this show that Ælfric indeed has a sense of humour.
De Coniugationibus


19 Scribal corr. from “fargewitenre”.
20 Scribal corr.: there are two erased characters between “futu” and “ro”.
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---

21 Scribal corr. from “amares”.
22 utinam] uter
23 utinam] uter
24 Literally, “God grant that I might love,” in which the phrase, “God grant that,” is functionally a grammatical unit equivalent to “would that.”
25 amem] amen
26 Scribal corr. from “amares”.
27 perfecto] perfecto
28 Scribal corr. from “amauerim”; this form also occurs in O, 69v.
29 The scribe makes a series of mistakes here: amauerint and its Old English translation were originally omitted. Later, amaueritis was altered to amauerint, but without applying the concordant alteration to its translation or supplying the missing text, which has here been supplied from O, 69v, along with the necessary emendations.


Þet syxte gemet geð ofer calle ða oðre fif gemetu and nimð æfre ðone ðriddan hád of ðam passiuum: amatur, amatur a me, “ic lußige”; amabatur a me, “ic lußode,” and swa forð, ac hit nis na swide gewunelic on Leden spræce, ne huru on Englisc.

Quinque participalia uerba ueniunt a uerbo actiuo. [45v] “Fif dæl–nimendlice word cumað of þam dædlicum worde”: amandi, “to lußigenne,” amando, “lußigende,” amandum, “to lußigenne,” amatum, we sædon ær, amatu, “mid lufe.” We secgað\textsuperscript{31} þas word gewislicor: tempus est arandi, “hit is tima tó erigenne”; arando perficio, “erigende ic geðeo”; legendo doceo, “rædende ic tǽce”; arandum est mibi, “me is tó erigenne”; legendum est nobis, “us is to rædenne”; babes agros ad arandam, “hæfst þu æceras to erigenne”; comoda\textsuperscript{32} mibi librum ad legendum, “læne me ða bóc to rædenne”; amatum, we sædon ær; amatu bið geset for naman for ablatiuum, swa swa Priscianus awrát: nec uisu facilis, nec dictu affabilis ulli,\textsuperscript{33} “nis hit nanum eaðe on gesihðe, ne on cwyde asecgenlic.” Þas fif word sind swide wunderlice and avendað hi to eallum hadum, and to eallum tidum, and to ægðrum getele, and to eallum cynnum: amando patrem; amando matrem; amando fratres, et cetera. Ðas fif word sind gehatene participalia,\textsuperscript{34} for þan ðe hi synd gelice dæl–nimendum on gebigedum casum. Hi sind eac gecwedene gerundia of þam worde gero, “ic bere,” for þan ðe hi beræð manega andgitu. Hi sind eac gehatene sopina. Sopinum is “upp awend” and hi sind upp awende and bráde, for þan ðe hi undereððu ðæt ðæt, swa swa we her beforan sædon.

\textsuperscript{30} Technically the supine, which has no grammatical equivalent in Old English. Cf. Allen and Greenough, New Latin Grammar, § 509.
\textsuperscript{31} Scribal corr. from “secað”.
\textsuperscript{32} i.e. commoda.
\textsuperscript{33} Vergil, Aeneid, III. 621; Scribal corr. from “ullu”. Note that Vergil is not here named, but is quoted through Priscian. The Excerptiones likewise do not name Vergil as the source of this passage (Porter, Excerptiones, p. 198).
\textsuperscript{34} participalia] participa/lia

Ælc ðæra worda ðe ðus gāð, beo hit actium, beo hit neutrum, ælc ðæra is ðære forman declinunige. Æois forme coniugatio macað hyre preteritum perfectum on eower wisan.


\textsuperscript{35} Scribal corr. from “seal”.

\textsuperscript{36} i.e. incobo.

DE UERBO PASSIUO


37 Scribal corr. from “prestum”.
38 fuerat] fuerad
39 beon ge gelufode] beon gelufode; cf. O, 73v.


Infinitiuo modo: amari, “beon gelufod”; amari uolo, “ic wylle beon gelufod”; amari uolumus, “we wyllað beon gelufode.” Preterito perfecto et plus quam perfecto: amatum esse uel amatum fuisset. Ic

₄₀ ge we
₄₁ ametur] amatur
₄₂ gelufode] get; the scribe rather unusually uses an abbreviation in Old English here and once below: “gel” and later, “gf”.
₄₃ gelufode] gl; see previous note.


44 Scribal corr. from “ðrowiendlicū”.
45 Scribal corr. from “heo”.
46 frustror] frustræ; cf. O 76r.
47 Cf. Exceptiones: Sunt enim alicia uerba, quae quamuis non ab actiuis proficiscencia, tamen passiuam semper babent formam, et ex bis quaedam eadem uoce utrumque significat, id est actionem et passionem, quae communia nominamus, ut est ‘Oscular te’ et ‘Oscular a te’; ‘Criminor te’ et ‘Criminor a te’ (Porter, Exceptiones, p. 184).
“ic latige on sumere stowe” oððe “ic elcige.” Šás word macið heora *preteritum* on -atus: miratus sum, “ic wundrode,” to werlicum hade, mirata sum to wiflicum hâde, miratum to naðrûm cyrne. Furatus est uir bouem, “se ceorl for-stæl ænne oxan”; furata est mulier; furatum est mancipium, et cetera.


**DE SECUNDA**


---

48 SECUNDA] .II.

49 Although the “lære” and “tæcan” are synonyms, it is uncharacteristic of Ælfric to so use an alternate translation within a paradigm.

50 Scribal corr. from “doistis”.

---

71
esse; video te docturum

doceat
Tempore futuro

docuissent
Et pluraliter:
docuissem
docueritis
tæhtest
hi tæhton.
pluraliter:
docerem

doceretis,
edala gif ge tæhton,
docuerent,
edala gif hi tæhton.
Preterito perfecto et plus quam perfecto:
docuisset
Et pluraliter:
docuissetis

docuisses,
edala gif du tæhtest,
docuset,
edala gif he tæhte.
Et pluraliter:
docuissetemus,
edala gif we tæhton,
docisetis,
edala gif he tæhton,
docissent,
edala gif hi tæhton.

Scribal corr. from “doceat”.

Infinitiuo modo: docere, “tæcan”; docere uolo, “ic wylle nu tæcan”; docere uolebam, “ic wolde nu ær tæcan”; docere volumus, “we wyllað tæcan.”

“tæcan”; vidi aliquando te docuisse pueros, “ic gesah hwilon þe tæcan þam cildum.”

Futuro tempore:
doctum ire uel docturum esse; video te doctum ire, “ic geseo þæt du gæst tæcan”; video te docturum esse, “ic geseo þæt þu wylt tæcan.”

51 Scribal corr. from “doceat”.

52 [doctorum] doctorū

**Infinitiuo modo: doceri a me uolo, “ic wylle tæcan”; doceri a nobis volumnus, “we wyllað tæcan.”*54 Ac ōðises gemetes nis nan neod.


---

53 Ælfric here greatly condenses Priscian’s explanation of the impersonal mode and in so doing becomes potentially unclear, perhaps partly because Old English has no impersonal mode, but instead uses the noun “man” to convey impersonality, as in this very sentence: “behofað þæt man þær to dō”. He also makes a number of logical leaps in his example: *docetur* (“it is taught”) = *subaudis a me* (“you understand [something] from me) = ic tæce (“I teach [you]).

54 Cf. Priscian’s discussion of the difference between the passive infinitive, which “uerso eget solo ad perfectam significacionem, ut ‘Amari uolo’… requires only a verb, as in ‘I want to be loved,’” and the impersonal infinitive, which “non solum uerbo, sed etiam ablatiuo caso siue pronominis siue nominis per se indiget, ut ‘Amari a me uolo’ pro ‘Amare uolo’… requires not only a verb but also an ablative case of a pronoun or noun, as in ‘I wish there to be loved by me...’ for ‘I wish to love’” (Porter, *Excercitio*, pp. 194–5).

55 Scribal addition: “gan”.

56 Cf. Ps 125:1, *Cum converteretur Dominus captiuitatem Sión facti sumus quasi somniantes.*

57 Scribal corr. from “lufigenlicere.”


---

\(^{58}\) Scribal corr. from "oleui".

\(^{59}\) calleo] căle

\(^{60}\) timui] metui; the scribe evidently copied this from the following line of his exemplar.

\(^{61}\) i.e. absorbingui.

Seo feorðe preteritum geendað on -xi: lugeo, “ic heofige,” luxi, lactum; frigeo, “ic beo of-
calen,” frixi, frictum; augeo, “ic geice,” auksi,63 auctum.

Seo fifte preteritum awent þone -ó on -i: moueо, “ic styrige,” moui, “ic astyrede,” motum, 
astyred”; moueo, “ic beháte,” moui, motum; foueо, “ic beðige,” foui, fóturn; faueo, “ic fulturnige,” faui, 
fautum (for ðan ðe fáturn bið of ðam worde før, fárí); caueo, “ic warnige,” caui, cautum (catum is 
óder ðing); paueo, “ic forhtige,” paui; conniueo, “ic wincige,” conniui; ferueo, “ic wealle,” ferui, ac hi 
nabbað nænne sopinum; ciego,64 “ic geladige,” ciui, citum; uideo, “ic gesèo,” uidi, usum; and of ðam 
gefegede preudio, “ic foresceawige,” preüdi, preuisum; inüdeo, “ic andige,” inüdi, inuisum; sedeo, “ic 
sitte,” sedi, sessum [52r] (on twam essum); and of ðam gefegede possideo, “ic geagnige,” possedi, 
posseuim; obsideo, “ic ymsitête,” obsedi, obsuim. Eall swa insideo, “ic on-sitte”; subsideo, “ic under-
sitte”; resideo, “ic upp-sitte” oððe “ic eft-sitte”; strideo oððe strido, “ic cearcige” oððe “ic gristbitige,” 

Seo sixte preteritum gæð ðus: tondoo, “ic efesige” oððe “ic scere scep oððe hors,” totondi, 
tonsum; mordeo, “ic bite,” momordi, morsum; spondeo, “ic behate” oððe “ic beweddige,” spopondi, 
sponsum (of ðam cymð sponsus, “brydguma”); pendo, “ic hangige,” pependi, pensum (ac hine gæð na 
ðus gif hi beoð gefegede: suspendo, “ic áhó,” suspendi, “ic ahencge,” suspensum); detondeo, “ic of-
áefesige,” detondi, et cetera.

Sume word geendiað on -eð on ðam forman háde, ac hi ne geendiað on -es on ðam oðrum 
háde, for ðan ðe hi gæð æfter ðære forman coniugatione, ná æfter ðære ðære: meo, “ic fare,” meas, “ðu 
oððe “spæte”; laqeo, “ic fô mid grine,” laqueas;66 nauseo, “me platað,” nauseas; enucleo, “ic

62 Scribal addition: “to”.
63 i.e. auxi.
64 i.e. cieo.
65 Scribal corr. from “sume”.
66 laqueas] laqueos
De uerbo passióuo


fuissetis, fuissent. Eodem modo, tempore futuro: utinam docear, docearis, doceatur. Et pluraliter: utinam doceamur, doceamini, doceantur.⁷²


DE TERTIA CONJUGATIONE

Lego, “ic ræde,” legis, “ðu ræst,” legit, “he ræt.” Deos coniugatio is gecweden correpta, þæt is “gescyrt,” for dan de heo macā hire imperatium on scortne -e: legi, “ræd,” and eft on infinitium bip se -e scort: legere, “rædan.” And swa ealle ða word, þe to hire helim⁵⁴r pað,

⁷² The manuscript is damaged here, possibly by erasure. The r is visible, while the expected abbreviation for final ur is not, but has been supplied; cf. O, 84r.
⁷³ Scribal corr. from “ulteri”.
⁷⁴ Scribal addition: “l miseror.”


---

75 Scribal deletion: “Þ” preceding “þoń”.
76 Scribal addition: “óreo”.
77 Scribal corr. from “legere”.
78 Scribal corr. from “legissent”.
79 Scribal corr. from “numerus”.

Seo ēder preteritum geendāð on -ii ac oðere ne befeallāð 87 nama worda, þonne ða de gæf on twa wisan: cupio, “ic gewilnige,” cupui oððe cupii; arcesso, “ic a-flige mine fynd” 88 offe “genyrwige,” arcessiui oððe arcesii, and bið se ærra i æfre 89 sceort.


80 The eight ways of forming the preteritum are signified in the manuscript with Roman numerals in the margin, but since only this conjugation is so numbered, the numerals are here omitted.
81 i.e. quiesco.
82 on-cnawe] oncwayne
83 on-cnawe] oncwayne
84 on-cnawe] oncwayne
85 i.e. arcesso, arcessiui, arcessitum.
86 Scribal deletion following “sero”.
87 Scribal corr. from “ge fealdāð”.
89 Scribal addition: “æfre”.
90 Scribal corr. from “scride”.
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---

91 Ic ã ã
92 The inclusion of pluo here contradicts Ælfric’s earlier statement that it is only impersonal, being one of many words which “ne magon habban þa twegen forman hâdas, ac habbað ðone ðriðdan” (f. 43v, p. 63).
93 Scribal corr. from “ahredde”.
94 Scribal corr. from “cûposui”.
95 Scribal corr. from “cûpositû”.
96 Scribal addition: "í pario".
97 Scribal corr. from “nytte”.
98 Illegible erasure between nexui and nexú.
99 Scribal corr. from “nectu”.
100 Scribal corr. from “stepui”.
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\begin{footnotes}
\item[101] Scribal corr. from “Qatio”.
\item[102] Scribal corr. from “sceace”.
\item[103] Scribal corr. from “un”.
\item[104] i.e. prompsi, promptum; the scribe similarly omits the expected p preceding the t in several of the following past participles.
\item[105] Scribal corr. from “scalsi”.
\item[106] Erasure between illi and sū.
\item[107] Scribal corr. from “heafetýge”.
\item[108] i.e. abscedo.
\end{footnotes}
concedo, “ic getyðige,” conceus, consequent; incedo, “ic gange” oððe “on bestéppe”; and ealla þam word healdað ðone diptongon ae on preteritum.\textsuperscript{109} Eft, accedo, “ic genealæce,” accessi, accessum.\textsuperscript{110}


\textsuperscript{109} It is unclear what dipthong Ælfric here refers to. Perhaps the strange statement arises from a confusion of Latin caedo (“to cut, slay”) with cedo (“to fall, die”), which latter is the root of the complex verbs here given.

\textsuperscript{110} Scribal corr. from “accessisti”.

\textsuperscript{111} i.e. caedo.

\textsuperscript{112} Scribal corr. from “bedippe”.

\textsuperscript{113} Scribal corr. from “mærtū”; the use of the ash (æ) within Latin words here is unusual.

\textsuperscript{114} i.e. opposed to tyrannus and suggesting Ælfric’s opinion that a king who does not rule rightly is no king at all. See the corresponding discussion of Ælfric’s examples in “The Grammar as a Translation,” above, p. xvi, especially pp. xviii–xx.

\textsuperscript{115} An interesting pair of definitions in which Ælfric as compiler and Ælfric as homilist respectively shine through.


\(^{116}\) pupugi\(\overline{\text{g}}\) pupui

\(^{117}\) Scribal corr. from “finxn” \(^{[2]}\).

\(^{118}\) Scribal corr. from “grennige”.

\(^{119}\) Scribal corr. from “fictū”.

\(^{120}\) An abbreviation mark above the \(c\) which usually in the manuscript signifies the prefix con- must here denote that the root is omitted. The same occurs below in the inflected forms of destruo (f. 57r).

\(^{121}\) See previous note.

\(^{122}\) Scribal corr. from “uicū”.

\(^{123}\) Scribal addition: “ic oferræde”.
gebede"; uicco, "ic ofer-swyde," uici, uictum. Eall swa conuinco, -uici, -ctum (uinco, "ic binde," is ðære fecordan); linquo,\textsuperscript{124} "ic for-late," liqui, lictum; and of ðam, terlinquo and relinquo, of ðam ilcan andgite, -liqui, -lictum; delinquo, "ic agilte," rumpa, "ic to-brece" oðde "to-slyte," rupi, ruptum; and of ðam, disrumpo, abrumpo, on ðam ilcan andgite, -rupi, -ruptum; corrumpo, "ic gewæmme,"\textsuperscript{125} corrumpi, corruptum; soluo, "ic unbinde" oðde "untyte," [57v] solui, solutum; and of ðam, absoluo and dissoluo on ðam ilcan andgite, -solui, -solutum; uluo,\textsuperscript{126} "ic awende" oðde "wylewige," ului, ulutum; and eall swa reuoluuo; caluuo, "ic bespice," calui, calutum; bibo, "ic drince," bibi, bibitum; lambo, "ic licyge" oðde "lapige," lampi, lambitum; scabo, "ic clifrige," scabi, scabitum; uerto, "ic awende," uerti, uertum; uello, "ic awrytwalige," uelli uel uulsi, uulsum; eall swa euello, of ðam gefeged on ðam\textsuperscript{127} ilcan andgite; percello, "ic sleá," perculi, perculsum; psallo, "ic singe," psalli, næf ðys nænne sopinum; pando, "ic geopenige," pandi, pansum;\textsuperscript{128} defendo, "ic bewerige," defendi, defensum; ostendo, "ic geswutelig," ostendi, ostensum (ostensum is "fore-beacon"); scando and asendo, "ic astige," -di, -sum; fundo, "ic to-cleofe," fidi (butun\textsuperscript{129} n), fissum (on twam essum); scindo, "ic to-slite," scidi, scissum; fundo, "ic ageote,"\textsuperscript{130} fudi,\textsuperscript{131} fium (an s, for ðan ðe se u is lang); and of ðam gefegede, perfundo, "ic geondgeote," perfudi, perfusum; confindo, "ic gemænege" oðde "gescynde," confidi, confisum; cudo, "ic smyðyge," cudi uel cuui, cusum (of ðam bið geowden incu, "anfalt." Cuso and acuuo, "ic wregge," is ðære forman geðeodnysse; and excuso, "ic beladige," excusas; and recuso, "ic wið-sace"); diuido, "ic to-dele," diuisi, diuisum; facio, "ic do," faci, factum; and of ðam gefegede, perficio, "ic full-frette," perfeci, perfectum; insicio, "ic begleddige," insci, infectum, et cetera.

delfe,” *fodi, fossum* (on twam essum); and of *dam* gefegede, *perfodio,* “ic *durf* delfe” *oðde* “*durf* þy,” *perfodi,* *perfossum; subsfodio,* “ic under-delfe”; *effodio,* “ic ut adelfe”; *fugio,* “ic fleo,” *fugi,* *fuigitum.* Eall swa of *dam* gefegede, *refutio,* “ic ongean fleo” *oðde* “ic sece socne,” *refugi,* *refugitum* (of *dam* is *refugium,* “socn,” and *fuga,* “fleam,” and *profugus,* “flyma”); *confugio,* “ic samod fleo”; *perfugio,* “ic full fleo,”132 *perfugi,* *perfugitum.* Is eac to witanne þæt æfre bið se i sceot on þus geradum *sopinum æt-foran dam -tum* on ðysere coniugatione.


Seo cahteode *preteritum* þæt æfre stæf-gefeg ðus: *do,* “ic gife,” *das,* is ðære forma137 geðœodnisse, and of *dam* gefegede sind þære ðriddan: *credo,* “ic gelyfe” *oðde* “befæste,” *credidi,”138

---

132 Scribal corr. from “feo”.
133 Scribal corr. from “adrefe”.
134 Scribal corr. from “cesu”.
135 *pupugi* pupui; cf. O 93v.
136 Scribal corr. from “æt sprne”.
137 Scribal corr. from “form”.
138 Scribal corr. from “creditu”.
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DE UERBO PASSIUO


139 Marginal scribal addition: “pdo…pditiū”.
140 Scribal corr. from “letus” in all three cases.
141 fuimus] sun9
142 ulteriori] ulteri
143 Scribal corr. from “pteriti”.
144 Scribal corr. from “ulteri”.
145 Scribal addition: uī (i.e. utinam).


---

146 legerere] legereris
147 Scribal corr. from “ulteri”.
149 ulteriori] ulteri
151 loquor is given an enlarged majuscule L in the manuscript.
152 ingredior] ingredeor
153 Scribal corr. from “parē”.
154 Cf. De Uerbis Defectuís, below, f. 63v, p. 94.

DE QUARTA


155 Scribal corr. from “QUATA”.
156 MS omits futuro; cf. O, 97r; Zupitza, p. 188.

Infinitiuo modo, numeris et personis. Tempore presenti et preterito imperfecto: audire. [60v]

disilio, “ic of-alihte,” disilui; ðas word sind gefegede of salio,\(^{161}\) “ic hleape,” ac hi nabbað nænne sopinum on gewunun.


\(^{161}\) salio | salia
\(^{162}\) Scribal corr. from “saltū”.
\(^{163}\) Ælfric’s remark suggests that this p was not pronounced at least according to the common practice familiar to him.
\(^{164}\) “Custom is stronger than the rule” is a striking maxim, especially in a text designed to set out the rules of a language.

**DE UERBO PASSIUO**


Coniunctiuo167 modo, tempore presenti: cum audiari, cum audiariis uel audiare, cum audiatur. Et pluraliter: cum audiamur, cum audiamini, cum audiuntur. Eodem modo, tempore preterito imperfecto:

---

165 *auditi fuistis*] auditi fu fuistis
166 Scribal corr. from “audiat”.
167 Coniunctiuo] Coniuntiuo
cum audi
er, cum audir
eris uel audi
tere, cum audi
teretur. Et plura
liter: cum audi
temur, cum audi
teremini, cum audi
terentur. Eodem 
modo, tempore pre
terito perfecto: cum audi
tus sim, cum audi
tus sis, cum audi
tus sit. Et plica
liter: cum audi
ti simus, cum audi
ti sitis, cum audi
ti sint. Et ul
teriori modo: cum audi
tus fuerim, cum audi
tus fuere
tis, cum audi
tus fuerit. Et plura
liter: cum audi
tus fuerimus, cum audi
tus fueritis, cum audi
tus fuerint. [62v] Eodem 
modo, tempore pre
terito plus quam perfecto: cum audi
tus essem, cum audi
tus esses, cum audi
tus esset. Et plura
liter: cum audi
tus essemus, cum audi
tus essetis, cum audi
tus essent. Et ul
teriori modo: cum audi
tus fuerim, cum audi
tus fueris, cum audi
tus fuerit.

Infinitiuo modo, numeris et personis. Tempore presenti: audiri. Pre

DE UERBIS ANOMALIS UEL INEQUALIBUS

Sume word sind gehatene onomala oððe inequalia. Onomalus is “unemne,” inequalis, “ungelic.” Hi sind swa gehatene for þan þe he ne gað na swa oðre word on sumere stowe.


---

174 legatur] legæt
175 Scribal corr. from “æghwr”.
176 Scribal addition: “se”.
177 Marginal scribal additon: “æghwær... scort”; cf. O, 103r; Zupitza, p. 198.
178 Scribal corr. from “uul”.
179 non uult] nonuul
De uerbis defectiuis

gange to ceape” oðde “ic beo gesaeld,” uenibam, ueniui, uenibo, et cetera.


Desum, “ic eom wana of ðam getæle,” dees, deest; de est mibi pecunia, “me is feos wana”; desunt mibi numini, “me sind wana penegas,” et similia.

\textsuperscript{180} A glimpse of Ælfric the homilist is again visible in this elaboration on the meaning of \textit{sum}.

\textsuperscript{181} Ælfric employs an economical expedient: he points readers to the often repeated conjugation of \textit{sum} present in the conjugations of passive verbs rather than reiterating it here.

\textsuperscript{182} Marginal scribal addition: “et prf”.

\textsuperscript{183} \textit{defectiua} is written in majuscule script alongside the title of the section, one line above its proper spot, which is left blank.

\textsuperscript{184} Scribal corr. from “partus”.


Sume word sind gecwedene inpersonalia, þæt sind “buton hade.” Hi habbað ðone ðriddan had and sind ateorigendlice: iuuat, “gelustfullað”; stat “stent”; constat, “swutol is.” Ic wille secgan hwæt hi ealle habbað and hu hi beoð geðæodde. Sume hi teð nominatium casum: restat, “to lafe is,” and Joseph cwað, Adubic restant anni quinque, “git ðær sind fif gear to lafe.” Iuuat me, “me gelustfullað” – her is acussatiuus. Eall swa delectat, “gelustfullað,” me, te, illum. Datius: uacat mibi,

185 i.e. intransitive. See p. 7, n. 4, above.
186 Scribal corr. from “andweard”; the correction is strange since the form “andweard” occurs several times in the manuscript, in both scribes’ hands, though less frequently than “andward”.
187 Ps 118:113, Iniquos odio babui et legem tuam dilexi.
188 Scribal corr. from “restat”.
189 Gn 45:6, adubic enim quinque anni residui sunt famis, ne et tu pereas et domus tua et omnia quae possides.


\textsuperscript{190} i.e. vacatae, gen.
\textsuperscript{191} Scribal corr. from “rædanne”.
\textsuperscript{192} Scribal corr. from “gerint”.
\textsuperscript{193} Iob 10:1, taedet animam meam vitae meae, dimittam adversum me eloquium meum, loquar in amaritudine animae meae.
\textsuperscript{194} i.e. of three syllables.
\textsuperscript{195} Scribal corr. from “cwæð”.

96
Vivien Law observes that medieval etymology was ‘the historical study of word forms’; medieval etymology was usually pursued on a synchronic rather than a diachronic basis, and its aim was to find the true meaning of words by revealing connections with other similar-sounding words” (Law, “Grammar.” p. 291).

Ps 50:1, Miserere mei Deus secundum magnam misericordiam tuam, et secundum multituidinem miserationum tuarum, dele iniquitatem meam.

Ps 63:1, Exaudi deus orationem meam cum deprecor, a timore inimici eripe animam meam.

DE INCHOATIUIS


Sindon eac sume word ðissum gelice ðe ne sind na inboatiua: pasco, “ic læswige”; posco, “ic bidde,” et similia.

DE UERBIS FREQUENTATIUIS


---

205 Scribal corr. from “ðe”.
206 Scribal corr. from “on”.
207 Scribal corr. from “for milte”.


---

208 domito] domitū
209 Scr. corr. from an erasure.
210 Scr. corr. from “fil”.

DE FIGURA


²¹¹ Scribal corr. from "if".
²¹² deponans] deponens


Dis word and orior sind swiðor ðære feorðan, and morior, þære ðriddan.


Mid *prepositione*: [69r] indico, indicas, “ic gebincige”; indico, indicis, “ic on gecwðe”; liquo, liquas, “ic hlyttrige,” and of ðam, eliquo, “ic ofer-hlyttrige”; consternor, consternaris, “ic eom ablícged,” deponans; *in* and *e* and *con* sindon foresetnyssa.

\(^{213} \) Scribal corr. from “gewylnunge”.
\(^{214} \) Scribal corr. from “grunweall”.
\(^{215} \) Scribal addition: “an”.
\(^{216} \) Scribal corr. from “excelfo”.
\(^{217} \) Scribal addition: “ic getacnie”.
\(^{218} \) Scribal corr. from “ju”.
\(^{219} \) Scribal corr. from “getácn”.

101
Nelle we na swidhor her be ðam worde sprecan. Wel, gif ðis aht fremað.

**INCIPIT ADUERBIUM**

Aduerbiest pars orationis\(^1\) indeclinabilis, cuis significatio uerbis adicitur. “Aduerbium is an dæl Læden spreæce, undeclinigendlic, and his getacnung bið to wordum geðeod.” Aduerbium mæg beon gecweden “wordes gefera” for ðan ðe he bið æfre to wordum geðeod and næfð full andgit buton he mid worde beo. Sapienter, “wislice,” is aduerbium. Íc swede nu swutelicor, sapienter loquor, “wislice ic spreæce”; feliciter facis, “gesæcellice ðu dest”; humiliter precatur, “eadmodlice he bit.”


---

1. *orationis* oratio
2. Scribal corr. from “getacnung”.

102


Sume sind iaratiua, þæt sind “swerigendlice”: per, “ðurh”; iuro per deum, “ic swerige ðurh God”; per meum caput,10 “þurh min heafod”; per nostram fraternitatem uerum dico, “þurh uncer broþer-rædene ic sege sóð.” Ac Crist sylf11 us forbead ælcne að, and het us ure spræce12 þus

---

3 Ps 126:1, Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum in vanum laboraverunt qui aedificant eam nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem frustra vigilavit qui custodit.
4 Scribal addition: “ðu”.
5 Scribal corr. from “neumquam”.
6 Scribal corr. from “simil” [final “a” added, as below).
7 Scribal addition: “l ad” [MS omits firmatiua].
8 i.e. nempe.
9 Scribal corr. from “simil”.
10 Cf. Mt 5:36; see below, p. 104, n. 14.
11 Scribal corr. from “crissylf”.
12 Scribal corr. from “sprce”.

103
afæstnian: est? “hit is swa?” est, “hit is”; non? “nis13 hit swa?” non, “hit nis.”14 Ma sindon swerigendlice aduerbia, ac hwæt sceolon hi gesæde, nu we swerian ne moton?215

Sume sindon optatiua, þæt sind “gewisenclice”:16 utinam baberem pecuniam, “eala gif ic hæfde feoh.” Ó and si ge tacniađ þæt ylce: o, si baberem, “eala gif ic hæfde.”


---

13 Scribal corr. from “nit”.
14 Cf. Mt 5:33–7, iterum audistis quia dictum est antiquis non peierabis reddes autem Domino iuramenta tua ego autem dico vobis non iurare omnino neque per caelum quia thronus Dei est neque per terram quia saeclum est pedum etus neque per Hierosolymam quia civitas est magni Regis neque per capat tuum iuraveris, quia non potes unum capillum album facere aut nigrum sit autem sermo vester EST NON NON quod autem hi abundantius est a malo est. Cf. also Exercipiones: “Sunt et ala iuratiua, quibus Christianis ati non licet... There are also other adverbs of swearing that Christians are not allowed to use” (Porter, Exercipiones, pp. 262–3).
15 Cf. Latin preface: nec deus arti grammaticae subiciendus est (“neither is God to be made subject to the science of grammar”); Ælfric prefers to obey Christ’s injunction and extend it to others rather than to be exhaustive in his grammatical endeavours when doing so would contradict the former. See preceding note and the discussion of Ælfric’s examples in “The Grammar as a Translation,” above, p. xvi, especially pp. xviii–xx.
16 Scribal corr. from “wiscenlice”.
17 Scribal corr. from “mænigfeallice”. 


Diminutiua sind “wanigendlici”: clam is “digellice,” and of ðam is wanigendlici, clanculum, “hwonlicor digellice”; bene, “wel,” and of ðam is belle, “na ealles swa wel,” bellissime, “ealra wacicost.”

Demonstratiua²⁰ sind “æt-cowigendlice”: én, “efne” oððe “loca nu her hit is”; én adest episcopus, “efne her is se bispoc.” Eall swa ecce: ecce uenit rex, “efne nu her cymð se cyninge.”


Quandoque, “on sumne sæl.”

¹⁸ confestim] Confestim
¹⁹ Marginal scribal addition: “positius…ofe stæpe”.
²⁰ Scribal corr. from “Demonstrantiua”.
²¹ Scribal corr. from “hw”.
²² is] Is is
Numeralia sindon ða ðe getæniað getæl: semel, “æne”; bis, “tuwa”;


Sume cumað of naman speliendan: bic, “her”; illic, “ðær.”


Sume cumað of fore-setnyssum: ex is prepositio, þæt is “fore-setnys,” and of ðam cyms extra, “wið-utan”; in is propositio and intra, “wið-innan,” aduerbium.


---

23 Scribal corr. from “tua”.
25 Scribal corr. from “wiðutran.”
it was not replaced with the expected mark the prefixes of each of these adverbs.

humaniter

dilig d
neod
sero
sedulo
Ebreisc.
Læden
oððe
cetera.
willes
cume
eom ælðeodiglice her
and

cystig
ærest.

The scribe uncharacteristically uses hyphen-like marks to signify that this word extends over a line break.


Þas geendiað on -u: diu, “lange”; interdiu, “on dæg”; noctu, “on niht.”


---

37 Mt 25:31, Cum autem venerit Filii hominis in maiestate sua et omnes angeli cum eo tunc sedebit super sedem maestatis sua.
38 Scribal corr. from “susum”.
39 Scribal deletion: “cei”.

108
On -is geendað satis, “genoh” (man cwēð eac sat, “genoh,” buton -is), satius, “bet”; nimus, “dearle.”


O is to-clipigendlic aduerbium: o magister, doce me, “eala du lareow, tæc me.” He is eac wundrigendlic: o qualis facies, “eala hwilc ansyn.” He stent on fore-wardan. Iam, “eallunga” oððe

---

<sup>40</sup> Scribal corr. from “naelles”.

<sup>41</sup> Erasure: “gru”.

<sup>42</sup> Scribal corr. from “ma”.

<sup>43</sup> Marginal scribal addition: “interius wiþ innan”; cf. O, 199v; Zupitza, p. 240.

**DE PARTICIPIO**


We willað nu seccan be þissum eallum gewislicor.

Ealle þa dæl-nimendan de getacniað and-werde tide sindon ðreora [74v] cynna. Of ðam worde amo, “ic lufige,” cymð participium, and-werdre tide, *bic et bec et boc amans,* “ñes and þeos and ðis lufiende,” huius amantis, and swa forð æfter þære ðriddan declinunge. Da ofre ealle geendiað on –us and sind ealle mobilia, ūæt is “awendedlice,” fram cynne to cynne: amatus, “gelufod,” to werlicum hade; amata, to wiflicum cynne; amatum, to nœrum cynne. Eall swa doctus, “gelæred,” he; docta, heo; doctum, hit. Þas ðreo cynn sind on ðissum dæle and náma for ðan ūe on ðisum dæle ne bið nan commune duum generum, ūæt is “gæmæne twegra cynna,” ne nan epicenón,² ūæt is “gemencged cynn.” Man cweð on Læden, *bic milius,* ðes glida,” swa hwæder swa hit sy, hé oððe³ heo; and *hec aquila,* “þes earn,” he and heo, ac ūæt gecynd nele geþafian ðas cynn beon þissum dæle.

---

⁴⁴ Cf. Donatus’ *Ars minor:* “De intus autem et de foris sic non dicimus, quo modo ad foras uel in foras” (Donatus, “Ars Minor,” p. 597).

⁴⁵ Cf. Le 11:40, “stulti nonne qui fecit quod de foris est, etiam id quod de intus est fecit.”

¹ The only instance of the *est* (ē) abbreviation in the manuscript.

² “In Latin and ancient Greek grammar: designating a class of nouns which may denote either males or females but which have a fixed grammatical gender” (OED, s.v. *epicene, adj* and *n*, sense 1).

³ oððe] ðe
Swa swa Ȝa word belimpað to þrim cynnun, swa eac Ȝa participia Ȝe of Ȝam wordum cumað belimpað to þrim cynnun: to were, and to wife, and to naðrum cynnne. Doceo, “ic tæce,” wer tæcð, and wif tæcð, and mācipium, Ȝet is “weal,” tæcð sumne cræft. Nu cymð of Ȝam worde participium, docens, “tæcende,” þære cynnna, and doctus, “gelæred,” docta, doctum, swa swa we ær cwædon. Ealle Ȝa ðe geendiað on -us folgiað dāre oþre declinunge æfter werlicum hade, and Ȝa ðe geendiað on -um gāð æfter neutrum, and Ȝa ðe geendiað on -a folgiað dāre forman declinunge.

DE CASIBUS

Ȝ es dæl hæfð six casus æfre befullan, and heora nan ne ateorāð on ænigre declinun[75r]ge, Þeah ðe sume naman don.

DE TEMPORIBUS

Ȝ es dæl hæfð Þa ylcan tida ðe Ȝa word habbað Ȝe he of-cymð. Þes part, Ȝode Þes dæl, næfð nan angin ne nænne stede of him silfum, ac bið of worde acenned, and becymð syððan to his agenre gehincðe, swa swa nan oðer neðed. Þa oðre seofon dælas sindon sume frum-cennede; sume cumað of oþrum. Rex, “cyninge,” is frum-cenned nama; regalis, “cynelic,” cymð of Ȝam, and hæfð ealle Ȝa ðingc ðe his ealdor hæfð, and eal swa ealle Þa oðre dælas.

Gyf ðonne se of-gangende dæl gewent to oðrum dæle, Þonne hæfð he Þa ðingc eac Þe him to gebyriað. Bonus, “god,” is nama, and of Þam cymð aduerbium, bene, “wel.” Nu hæfð se bene Þa ðingc Þe aduerbio gebyrað to hæbbene, na Þa ðingc Þe naman gebyriað, Þeah ðe he of naman come. Eall swa uigilo, “ic wacyge,” is word, and of Þam cymð nama, uigil, “wacol,” ac Þet word hæfð Þa ðingc ðe him to gebyriað and se nama hæfð Þa ðingc ðe him gebyriað. Þonne he oðer dæl is, oðer is ealdor, and swa gehywlce oþre.

Nu is participium of worde and of worde cymð, bið swa Þeah oðer dæl and oðer ðingc, oðer his ealdor bið and forði hæfð sume gelimp ðe his ealdor næfð, swylce he si frumcenned, Þeah ðe he simle of oðrum cume. Ne sy nan man swa disig Þet he Þas gelicynesse to ænigum halgum ðinge

---

4 Scribal corr. from “ateorāð”.

5 Ælfric’s term for a root word, “ealdor,” is quite charming, though it implies only a grammatical relationship, not an etymological one (in the modern sense of a word’s origin and historical development).
awende, for ðan þe þis is woruld-craeft fram ðowitum aset to gescead wisre sprecke and ne mæg ne ne mot ænigum halgum ðinge beon geofenlehte.


Of dædlicum worde cumað twegen *participia*. An is and-werdre tide: *legens*, “rændende.” Óðer is to-werdre tide: *lecturus*, “se ðe rædan sceal”; *lecturus sum cras*, “ic sceal rædan to-merigen.”

Of ðam þrowigendlicum worde cumað eft twegen *participia*. Forð-gewitenre tide, swa swa is *lectus*, “geræd.” To-werdre tide is *legendus*, “þæt ðe sceal beon geræd,” and swa ungerime ðore.

Of nāðres cynnes wordum cumað eac *participia*, and-werdre tide and to-werdre, swa swa of dædlicum wordum. *Sto*, “ic stande,” is *neutrum*, and of ðam is *participium*, *stans*, “standinge,” and *staturus*, “se ðe standan sceal.”


Of ðam worde ðe is gekwened *deponens* cumað þreo *participia*: *loquor*, “ic sprecke,” is *deponens*, and of ðam is *participium*, *loquens*, [76r] “spreckende,” and *locutus*, “se ðe spræc,” and *loquuturus*, “se ðe wile oððe sceal sprecken.”

Of ðam worde þe ðe is gekwened *commune* cumað feower *participia*, twegen dædlcile and twegen þrowigendlice: *osculor*, “ic cisse,” getacnað ægðer ge dæde ge þrowunge, and of ðam is *participium*,

---

6 Ælfric here shows a firm stance on the philosophical issue of the ability of human language to adequately express God and other divine matters. He suggests that “no man is so foolish” as to suppose that human language can be applied directly and univocally to God, which sentiment would become in the course of time a rather harsh criticism of, for instance, the Franciscan, Duns Scotus. Ælfric must then adhere to either the doctrine of equivocity or to something like Aquinas’ doctrine of analogy, though of course, Ælfric predates the latter.

7 Ælfric’s use of the modal verb “sceolan” to convey futurity here and following is more natural to a modern English speaker than his handling of the future tense elsewhere, e.g. “*amabo*, ‘ic lufige gyt to-dæg oððe to-merien,’” (f. 44r, p. 64).

8 Scribal corr. from “geworhen”.

9 þrowung] þrownwunge


Þrowigendlice word beoð oföst geendiað ablattium: amor a te, “ic eom gelufod fram ðe,” and participium, amatus a te, “gelufod fram ðe,” and swa fela oðre.

Deponentia nimð sume genitium and datium: misereor tui and tibi and te, “ic miltsige ðe,” miserens tui and miserens illius, “miltsiende ðin” and “miltsiende his (we cweðan miserere nostri, domine,14 and miserere15 nobis, domine,16 “milsa us, drihten”); obliuiscor tui and tibi and te, “ic for-gite

---

10 Scribal addition: “ealle”.
11 Scribal corr. from “þas”.
12 Scribal corr. from “imperas”.
13 Scribal corr. from “inuideo tibi. Inuideo tibi”.
14 Ps 122:3, miserere nostri Domine miserere nostri quia multum repleti sumus despectione.
15 miserere] misere
16 Th 8:10, dixit itaque Sarra miserere nobis Domine miserere nobis et consenscamus ambo pariter sani.
ðe,” obliuisce tui and tibi and te; recordor tui, “ic gemune ðe,” offe “ic eom gemindig ðin,” recordans tui.

Sume gað elles: loquor uerbum, “ic sprece word,” and loquor17 ad te, “ic sprece to ðe,” loquens ad te oðde loquutus,18 loquor tibi; precor deum, “ic bidde God,” precans and precatus deum; dignor te illa re, “ic me demige ðe to þam ðinge,” and dignans te illa ré, “me demigende ðe to þam ðinge”; careo mea pecunia, “ic dolige mines feos,” carens sua re, “þeligende his ðinges.”


Hi magon eac sume beon geðeodde datiuo gehiwodlice: amicus illi est, “he is him freond”; scriptor illi21 est, “he is him writere,” þæt is “Ðam men ðe he writ.”

Sume nimað accusatiuum gehiwodlice: exosus bella, “on scunigende gefeoht”; prescius futura, “fore-witig to weardra ðinga.”

Sume teoð ablatiiuum: dignus est bono, “he is wyrðe godes”; dignus est morte, “he is wyrðe deaþes”; mactus uirtute, “geðogen on mægene.” And eall swa hi gað mænig-fealdlice and to ælcum cynne.


---

17 Scribal corr. from “loquuor”.
18 The second u is incorrectly subpuncted for deletion, i.e. loquutus. The scribe evidently reverses the mistake of one line above.
19 Scribal corr. from “sldig”.
20 Scribal corr. from “fan”.
21 illius; other MSS have “illi” which makes more sense here since Ælfric is demonstrating the dative of possession; cf. O, 124v; Zupitza, p. 250.
22 Scribal corr. from “calde”.
23 on] of; other MSS have “on”; cf. O, 125r; Zupitza, p. 252.
participia sind ðas: iturus, “se ðe wile oððe sceal faran”; quiturus, ac we ne cunnon nan Englisc þær.


DE NUMERO


DE FIGURA

ne bið nan participium gefeged boton þæt word ðe he of-cymð beo ær gefeged. Facio, “ic wyrce,” is an-feald word, and of ðam is an-feald participium,28 faciens, “wyrconde.” Of ðam is gefeged perficio, “ic gefremme,” and of ðam is gefeged participium, perficiens, “gefremmende.” And swa fela oðre gif þonne se participium bið gefeged ðurh hine sylfne and þæt word ne bið na gefeged þonne wyrð se participium to naman: noceo, “ic derige,” and of ðam nocens.

24 It is curious that Ælfric declines to translate quiturus with an Old English equivalent of “he who will or shall be able.” Doing so would likely be awkward, but not much more so than some other of his translations. One wonders, further, what his reason is for including an example which he is uncharacteristically unable to explain.
25 Scribal addition: “gað”.
26 Ælfric makes a similar observation above (f. 61v, p. 90) in his discussion of the fourth declension: “se gewuna is strengra on ælcum worde þonne his regol sy.”
27 Scribal corr. from “singuraris”.
28 Scribal corr. from “participia”.

115
“derigende,” ægðer ge participium ge nama; innocens, “unsæððig,” is æfre nama, for ðan þe he is gefeged buton ðam worde innoceo, ne bið na gewunelice word; sapio, “ic wat,” and of ðam, sapiens, “wis,” is participium and nama; insipiens, “unwis” oððe “unsnoter,” is æfre nama, for ðan ðe he is swa gefeged swa þæt word ne mæg beon þe he [78r] of-com, and swa fela oðre. Eft gif hi beoð wið-metene, þæt is if hi beoð comparatiua, þonne beoð hi eac naman: indulgens, “milsigende,” indulgentior, “mildre”; acceptus, “and-fenge,” acceptior, “and-fengra,” and fela oðre.


---

29 Scribal corr. from “participia”.
30 Scribal corr. from “unawendedlice”; the form “awendedlice” nevertheless occurs elsewhere in the manuscript; cf. f. 74v, p. 110.
31 Scribal corr. from “sweg”.
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on Englisc awend, buton oþrum wordum. Andgit gif he ana stent, ac on endebirdysse Læden spræce he gelimað ða word. Ne he ne bið naht on Englisc awend, buton oþrum wordum.

**DE CONIUNCTIONE**

Coniunctio est pars orationis indeclinabilis adiectens ordinansque sententiam. Coniunctio meg beon gecweden “geþeodnis.” “Se is an dæl Læden spræce undeclinigendlic, gefæstnigende and endebyrdigende ælne cwyde.” Swa swa lǐm gefæstnað fel to sumum brede, swa getihð seo coniunctio þa word to-gæðere. 1 ðes dæl gefæstnað and gefæstwað Læden spræce and hwilon to-scæt, hwilon geþeodbyrht. Pius et fortis fuit Dauid rex; “arfiest and strang was Dauid cyninge” – se et is coniunctio, þæt is on Englisc, “geþeodnys,” and, ego et tu, “ic and ðu,” nos et uos, “we and ge,” willað an. Nu ðu mihte gehiran hu ðes dæl tihð þa word to-gæðere. Næfð þes dæl nane mihte ne nan andgit gif he ana stent, ac on endebirdynsse Læden spræce he gelimað ða word. Ne he ne bið naht on Englisc awend, buton oþrum wordum.

---

12 Scribal corr. from “gescyd”.
13 Scribal corr. from “pellon”.
Ælfric here uncharacteristically uses metaphor to explain a grammatical concept though, perhaps less surprisingly, his chosen metaphor involves the production of books: “just as the glue fastens the leather to the board, so the conjunction binds words together.”
Ælfric here Christianizes the example given by Priscian, “Pius et fortis fuit Aeneas” (Porter, Excerptiones, p. 280).
Scribal addition: “geþeodnys”.
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Tria accidunt coniunctioni, “díro ðing gelimpáð díssum dæle.” An is potestas, “miht.” Óðer is figura, “gefegednys.” Þridde, ordo, “endebyrðnis.” Potestas is “miht” and seo geswutelað hwæt þes dæl mæg fremman, for ðan þe he hwílon geðeot ofre dælas, and hwílon to-scæt.

Sume sindon gehatene copulatiue, þæt sind “geðeodendlice,” for ðan ðe hi geðeodáð ofre dælas on ðære spræce endebyrðnisse, ac hi nábbað nan andgit gif hi ana standáð. Þæs sind geðeodendlice: et, que, ac, ast, at, atque. Úir et mulier, “wer and wif”; [79v] stetitque, “and he stod”; cantavitque, “and he sang”; omnis populus uirorum ac mulierum, “eal folc, wera and wífa”; at alií adfirmánt, “and ðære seþað.” At is ongean-weetlic: at Iesu ñæt, “and se helend cwæð him to-geanes”; at illi tacuerunt,4 “and hi suwodon to-geanes ðes helendes wordum”; atque aliís est largus, “and oðrum he is cystig.” Ëalle ðas habbað an Englisc, þeah ðe hi for fægernisse fela sind on Leden spræce.

Sume sind gehatene disiunctiue, þæt sind “ascrigendiendlice,”5 for ðan ðe hi to-twemað þæt andgit and ða word geðeodáð. Her sind ða: aut, ue, uel, ne, nec, an, neque. Lege aut scribe, “ræd oððe writ”; aut aliíquis latet error,6 “oððe sum gedwild lutað þæt”; ne lingua nec manus ocuilde peccent, “ne tunge ne handa oððe eagan singion”; sentíne, “understentst ðu lá”; uísne, “wilt ðu lá”; uel dies est uel nox, “oððe hit is dæg oððe niht”; tota die uel legit iste uel cogitat, “ealne dæg oððe ðes man ræt oððe he ðencð”; nec laudo nec uitupero,8 “ne ic ne herige, ne ic ne tæle.” Ëft, ongean-werplice: nec una bora avarus negliget lucrum neque pius iustitiam, “ne forgit se gitsere his gestreon ane tid, ne se

---

4 Lc 14:4, at illi tacuerunt ipse vero adprehensum sanavit eum ac dimisit.
5 Scribal corr. from “ascrigendiendlice”.
6 Aeneid, II. 45.
8 Ælfric may be alluding to the Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, one 10th century manuscript of which (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 2076) is known to have been used by Benedictine scholars. The relevant passage is as follows: Cotidiæ eucharistiae communio nem percipere nec laudo nec uitupero: omnibus tamen dominiciis diebus communicandum botor, si tamen mens in affectu peccandi non sit, nam babentem adhuc voluntatem peccandi grauari magis dico eucharistiae perceptione quam purificari. See C. H. Turner, ed., “The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum Attributed to Gennadius,” Journal of Theological Studies os-VII, no. 25 (October 1, 1905), pp. 81–2, 94.
arfæsta his rihtwisnyssce. "Siue and seu sindon eac9 disiunctiue;10 siue errore uię, seu tempestatibus acti,11 "hi sind geneadode, oððe mid gedwolæn þæs weges, oððe mid stormum ðæs unwederes”; siue uir siue mulier, “swa hwæðer swa hit sy swa wer, swa wif.”

An is interrogatiuæ, þæt sind “axiendlic”: tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus?12 “eart ðu se de to-werd is, oððe we oðres and-bidian sceolon?” He is eac dubitatiuæ, þæt is [80r] “twyniendlic”: eloquar13 an sileam,14 “hwæðer ic sprece oððe suwige.”


---

9 Scribal corr. from “ac”.
10 Here the hand reverts to that of scribe A. Unlike the former case, where a blank folio marks the change in hand, this change occurs partway through a page and in the middle of a continuous passage, rather than at a natural break in the text.
11 Aeneid, VII. 199.
12 Mt 11:3, ait illi tu es qui venturus es an alium expectamus.
13 eloquar] eloquor
14 Aeneid, III. 39.
15 Ps 40:11, tu autem Domine miserere mei et resuscita me et retribuam eis.
16 Ps 80:11, ego enim sum Dominus Deus tuus qui educi te de terra Aegypti dilata os tuum et implebo illud.
17 Ps 49:17, tu uero odisti disciplinam et proiecisti sermones meos retrosum.
18 Scribal corr. from “quidem”.
19 Scribal addition: “ic eom gelæred”.
20 Scribal deletion: “ic eom gelæred”.

Sume sind gecwedene rationales. Ratio is “gesced” and þas sind for sumon gesceade gesette on endebyrdnyssë Leden spræce: ergo, igitur, ita, itaque, utique. Tulit ergo dominus bominem, 20 “Eornestlice drihten genam þone mann”; igitur perfecti sunt ēeli et terræ, 31 “eornestlice heofonas and

22 II Cor 12:6, nam et si voluero gloriari non ero insipiens veritatem enim dicam parco autem ne quis in me existimet supra id quod videt me aut audit ex me.

23 Io 11:25, dixit ei Jesus, ego sum resurrectio et vita qui credit in me et si mortuus fuerit vivet.

24 Scribal corr. from “telð”.

25 Donatus in fact gives a number of examples which Ælfric omits: Da causales. Si, etsi, etiamsi, si quidem, quando, quandoquidem, quin, quin etiam, quatenus, sin, seu, siue, nam, namque, ni, nisi, nisi si, si enim, etenim, ne, sed, interea, lice, quamobrem, praesertim, item, itemque, ceterum, aliocum, praeterea (Donatus, “Ars Minor,” pp. 599–600).

26 Ps 126:1, Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum in vanum laboraverunt qui aedificant eam nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem frustra vigilavit qui custodit.

27 Donatus also provides these examples (see quoniam in Donatus’ list in the above note), though he places quoniam and quia under the category rationales. See Donatus, “Ars Minor.” Ælfric instead follows Priscian who gives these three as the only examples of the causales category: “Causalis est ‘quoniam’, ‘quia’, ‘quamobrem’… Causal conjunctions are such as ‘because’, ‘whereas’, and ‘wherefore’” (Porter, Exceptiones, pp. 280–1).

28 Ps 117:1, Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus quoniam in saculum misericordia eius.

29 Mt 16:18, et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam.

30 Gn 2:15, tulit ergo Dominus Deus bominem et posuit eum in paradiso voluptatis ut operaretur et custodierit illum.

31 Gn 2:1, igitur perfecti sunt caeli et terra et omnis ornatus eorum.
cordan waren ful-fremedlice geworhtes; sic domino placuit, ita factum est,32 “swa swa hit drihtene gelicode, swa hit is gedon”; itaque epulemur in domino,33 “witodlice uton wist-fullian on drihtne”; utique34 uolo, “witodlice ic wille”; utique volumus,35 “witodlice we wyllad.”


Sume sind gehatene enclitique on Grecisc, þæt is on Leden, inclinatiuę, and on Englisc, “ahylendlich,” for ðan de hy ahylðað and gebigað heora sweg to ðam stæf-foran stent. Þæt sind ðreo: -que, –ne, –ue. Arma uirumque,40 “da wæpnu and ðonne wer”; oculiuę, “oðde eagan”; satisme est, oðde estne satis? “is ðær genoh lá?” On eallum ðisum and ðyllecum gæð se sweg to

---

32 Iob 1:21, et dixit nudus egressus sum de utero matris meae et nudus revertar illuc Dominus dedit Dominus abstulit sicut Domino placuit ita factum est sit nomen Domini benedictum. Ælfric’s quotation, “sicut Domino placuit ita factum est,” is given by Weber-Gryson as a textual variant (p. 733).

33 1 Cor 5:8, itaque epulemur non in fermento veteri noque in fermento malitiae et nequitiae sed in azymis sinceritatis et veritatis.

34 Scribal corr. from “utq;”.

35 Scribal addition: “witodlice ic wille. Utiq: volumus”.

36 From Priscian’s list Ælfric omits saltim. Although he provides examples of its use below, he does not follow Priscian’s quotation of Vergil. Compare: “Aduersatiae sunt que adversum convenientes rei significant, ut ‘tamen’, ‘quamquam’, ‘quamuis’, ‘licet’, ‘etsi’, ‘etiamsi’, ‘saltim’. Haec etiam diminutionem significant, ut Virgilius: ‘Saltim si qua mihi de te fuisset soles’… Adversative conjunctions are those which denote opposition to a consistent situation; for example, ‘nevertheless’, ‘although’, ‘though’, ‘even though’, ‘yet’, ‘even if’ and ‘at least’. These also express a diminutive meaning, as in Vergil: ‘At least if there had been for me a child by you’ (Porter, Excerptiones, pp. 282–3); cf. Aeneid, IV. 327–8: saltim si qua mihi de te suscepis fuisset / ante fugam suboles.

37 Mc 6:23, et iuravit illi quia quicquid petieris dabo tibi licet dimidium regni mei.

38 Scribal corr. from “inlitü”.

39 Another example of Ælfric’s hortatory pedagogical examples.

40 Aeneid, I. 1.
ðam stæf-gefege þe him ðæ-foran stent. Des -que is scort, mid þrim stafum gewritten oððe getitolod, and se langa que, þe is femininum of quis, sceal beón mid feower stafum, q u a e aritten.41


DE FIGURA

Fæawa coniunctiones beoð gefegede si and que and under-foð fegincge ðus: sīquis, “swa hwa”; siguando, “gif æfre” oððe “ahwenne”; ne quis furetur, “þæt nane stele”; ne quando obdormiam in morte,43 “þæt ic næfre on deaðe ne slape,” and þas sind mobilia; quisque, “gehwa”; ubique, “gehwaer”; undique, “æg-hwanon.” On ðisum æftemystan nis na se que encletica, for ðan þe he ne ahylt döne sweg him tó, swa swa his gewuna is. Nam is an-feald coniunctio and namque is gefeged, and swa gehwilce.44

DE ORDINE

Ondo is “endebyrdnyss,” and sume coniunctiones æfter gecynde standað æfre on fore-wardan on ælcer Leden spræce, swa swa doð þas: at, ast, si, and gehwilce ðøre. Þas and ðillice sind gehatene prepositiue, þæt sind “fore-settendlice.”

41 The importance of this rule is rather ironically stressed, since throughout the manuscript it is almost invariably ignored, not least strikingly here in the very sentence in which it is articulated as it is referred to as “se langa que”.
42 Scribal corr. from “facius” [or “facicis”].
43 Ps 12:4, respice exaudi me Domine Deus meus inlumina oculos meos ne umquam obdormiam in mortem.
44 Scribal corr. from “hwilce”.
Sume sind gehatene *subiunctiue*, þæt sind “under-ðeodendlice,” for ðan de hi beðæ æfre under-ðeodde on ðære Leden sprece endebyrdnyssse, swa swa is *que* and *autem* and gehwilce ðære.

Sume sind *communes*, þæt is “gemanres endebyrdnesse,” for ðan de hi magon hwilol æt-foran standan, hwilol be-æfton, swa swa deð *ergo* and *igitur* and gehwilce ðære.

**INCIPIT PREPOSITION**


An ðing gelimpð disum dæle, þæt is casus. Twegen casus he tihð him tó: *accusativum* and *ablatiuum*. We wyllað nu ærest awritan þa *prepositiones* de belimpað tó *accusativum*, a ðonne nabbað na full andgit gif he ana standað, buton oðrum wordum. Her sind ða: *ad*, *apud*, *ante*, *aduersum*, *cis*, *citra*, *circum*, *circa*, *contra*, *erga*, *extra*, *inter*, *intra*, *infra*, *iuxta*, *ob*, *pone*, *per*, *prope*, *propter*, *secundum*, *post*, *trans*, *ultra*, *preter*, *supra*, *circiter*, *usque*, *secus*, *penes*.1 We cweddað *ad patrem*, “to fæder”; *ad deum*, “to Gode”; *ad regem equito* “to cincge ic ride”; *apud homines sum*, “mid mannum ic eom”; *apud episcopum manet*, “mid ðam bisceope he wunað”; *ante hostium stat*, “æt-foran ðære duru he stænt”; *ante regem stat*, “æt-foran ðam cyninge he stent”; *aduersum inimicum pergit*, “tó-genes his fynd he geð”; *cis Romam*, “beheónan Rome”; *cis Alpes*, “be-heonan muntan”; *citra plateam*, “be-heonan ðære stræt”; *circum montem*, “ymbe ða dune”; *circa forum*, “wið þa cep-stræt”; *contra ignem*, “ongean þæt fýr”; *erga propinquos curo*, “embe mine magas ic hogige”; *extra terminum*, “ofer land gemærnu”; *extra legem dei facit*, “ofer Godes æ he deð”; *inter amicos sum*, [82v] “betwux freondum ic eom”; *intra menia*, “binnon weallum”; *infra tectum*, “under hrofe”; *iuxta uiam*, “wið ðone weg”; ob

---

45 Scribal corr. from “gemanres”.

1 Note that until *secundum*, Ælfric organizes the list in a-order (that is alphabetical order based on initial letter alone), unlike that in the *Exercptiones* which is ordered instead according to number of syllables (Porter, *Exercptiones*, p. 288).

Das prepositiones sune magon beó aduerbia gif hi beóð bæftan gesette: ego supra aspicio, tu infra, “ic hawige bufan, and ðu beneðdān” – [83r] her is se infra aduerbium; ego in hac parte sto, tu contra, “ic stande on ðas heafe, and ðu ongean” – her is se contra aduerbium, and swa gehwilce ðøre.

Das ðøre beóð geðeoodde to ablatiuium: a, ab, abs, cum, coram, clam, de, e, ex, pro, pre, palam, sine, absque, tenus. We cweфаδ on Leden spreæe, a domo, “of huse” oððe “fram huse”; ab homine, “fram menn”; ab illo, “fram him”; abs quolibet iussu, “butan ænigre hæse”; cum exercitu pergit, “mid here he fæδ”; cum rege est, “mid cince he is”; coram ubis stat, “æt-foran eow he stent.” Clam is swδor aduerbium þonne prepositio: bona aperte facit, mala clam, “god he ðeþ openlice, and yfel digellice” – her is clam aduerbium, ac he biþ swa ðealh prepositio þonne he biþ fore-set: clam custodibus surgo, “nytendum þam weard-mannum ic arise”; clam te est, “digele ðe is”; de loco, “fram

---

2 Scribal corr. from “dura”
3 Is 13:6, ululate quia prope est dies Domini quasi vastitas a Domino veniet.
4 The incipit of a responsory chant now most well known through the 16th century English composer Thomas Tallis. For extant manuscripts and images, see “Can 007684,” in Lacoste and Koláček, Cantus.
5 The incipit of an antiphony for matins. See “Can 005068,” in Cantus. Cf. also Io 21:20, conversus Petrus vidit illum discipulum quem diligebat Jesus sequentem qui et recubuit in cena super pectus eius et dixit Domine quis est qui tradit te.
6 circiter] cercīt
7 Scribal addition: “prittig”.
8 Ælfric usually declines Latin nouns according to their functions when they occur within Old English sentences, but he does not do so here.
stowe” oðde “be stowe”; de domo dei, “of Godes huse”; de illo bonimine loquor, “be þam menn ic sprece”; de rege loquitur episcopus, “be þam cinge spreð se bishop”; E\textsuperscript{10} terra, “of eorðan”; fons ascendebat e terra,\textsuperscript{11} “se wyll astah upp of ðære eorðan”; ex illo loco, “of ðære stowe”; pro bominibus oro, “for mannum ic gebidde”; pre timore non audeo, “for ege ic ne dear”); palam omnibus dico, “openlice ic sece him eallum”; sine labore hic sedeo, “buton geswince ic sitte her”; sine crimine, “buton leahtræ”; absque terrore quiescit, “butan ogan he hine gerest”; absque ambiguitate, “butan twynunge.” Tenus is aduerbium mid Grecum, ac he is mid Leden warum geteald to\textsuperscript{12} prepositio,\textsuperscript{13} for ðan\textsuperscript{14} þæt he ne meág án [83v] standende ænige mihte habban, and bið oftost swa ðeah geendbyrd bæftan: capulo tenus abdidit ensem,\textsuperscript{15} “oð ða” hylte he behydde þæt swurd.” Eall swa pube tenus, “oð cniht-hade”; et fine tenus, “oð ende”; morte tenus, “oð deað”; colló tenus, “oð ðone swuran”; ursa ténus, “be worde”; taló tenus, “oð oð ða and-cleow.” He bið eac geðeod genitiuo æfter\textsuperscript{17} Greciscum gewunan: crurum tenus, “oð ða scanca” (hoc crus, “þes sceanca,” borum crurum, “þissera sceancana”). He awent eac to aduerbium, actenus,\textsuperscript{18} “oð ðæt” and “oð ðís.”

Sume of ðisum beoð aduerbium, swa swa we ær sædon. Gyt sind feower prepositiones ða magon beón geðeodde ægðer ge accusatiuo ge ablative: in, sub, super, subter. In and sub beoð geðeodde accusatiuo þonne hi getacnið ad locum, þæt is “færeld tó sumere stowe”: in urbem uado, “ic gange into ðære byrig”; introibo in domum tuam, domine,\textsuperscript{19} “ic gange into ðinum huse, drihten”; in ciuitatem equitaut rex, “into ðære ceastre rad se cynincg”; sub ipsos postes, “under ðam sylfum postum”; gallina congregat\textsuperscript{20} pullos suos sub alas,\textsuperscript{21} “henn gegaderð” hyre cicena under ðísere. Eft, þonne hi getacnið in loco, þæt is “on ðære stowe,” þonne beoð hi geðeodde ablative: in aula sdeo,

\textsuperscript{9} Scribal corr. from “pre[?]cð”.
\textsuperscript{10} E \textgreek{eta}
\textsuperscript{11} Gn 2:6, sed fons ascendebat e terra inrigans universam superficiem terrae.
\textsuperscript{12} Scribal corr. from “te”.
\textsuperscript{13} Again undeclined. See p. 124, n. 8, above.
\textsuperscript{14} Scribal addition: “ðan”.
\textsuperscript{15} Aenid, II. 553.
\textsuperscript{16} Scribal corr. from “oðde”.
\textsuperscript{17} æfter ærter
\textsuperscript{18} i.e. bac[tenus].
\textsuperscript{19} Ps 5:8, ego autem in multitudine misericordiae tuae introibo in domum tuam adorabo in templo sancto tuo in timore tuo.
\textsuperscript{20} congregat] congregat
\textsuperscript{21} Mt 23:37, Hierusalem Hierusalem quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui ad te missi sunt quotiens volui congregare filios tuos quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas et noluitist.
\textsuperscript{22} Scribal corr. from “gederað”.
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“on healle ic sitte”; in lectulo iacet, “on bedde he lið”; sub arbo re sto, “under treowe ic stande”; sub diem and sub die, “under dæge”; sub iustitiam and sub iustitia, “under rihtwisnyss.” Super et subter, ðonne hi getacniað styrunge, ðonne beoð hi geðeodde accusativo: qui ascendit super celos,23 “se ðe astah ofer heofanas”; super montem excelsum ascende tú,25 “ofer healice dune astih ðu”; subter aquam26 mersus est, “under wætere he is besenced.” Eft, ðonne hi getacniað in loco, þæt is “on stowe,”27 þonne [84r] genimað hi ablattium: fronde super uiridi sunt nobis mitia poma,28 “us sind líðe æppla ofer genum bóge”; super arbore29 sedent, “ofer treowe hi sittlað.” He getacnað eac gemynd, swa swa de super bac re and de bac re, “bi ðisum ðinge.”


23 Scribal corr. from “asendit”.
24 Eph 4:10, qui descendit ipse est et qui ascendit super omnes celos ut impleserit omnia.
25 Is 40:9, super montem excelsum ascende tua quae evangelizas Sion exalta in fortitudine vocem tuam quae evangelizas Hierusalem exalta noli timere die civitatis ibudæ ecce Deus vester.
26 Scribal corr. from “quã”.
27 stowe| stowowe
28 Vergil, Eclogues, I. 80.
29 arbore] abborae
30 Scribal corr. from “ofælæde”.
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superficies, "sumes [84v] ðinges bradnyss," and swa gehwylce ðøre, ac swa ðeah ne beoð hi ealle gefegede.


**INCIPIT INTERIECTIO**

Interiectio est pars orationis significans mentis affectum uoce incondita. "Interiectio is an dǽl Leden spræce getacnigende þæs modes gewilnunge mid ungesceapenre stemne." Interiectio meg beón gecweden "betwux alegednys" on Englisc, for ðan ðe he lið betwux wordum and geopenað ðæs modes styrunge mid behydre stemne. An ðing he hæfð: significatio, Þæt is "getacnung," for ðan ðe he getacnað hwilon ðæs módes blisse, hwilon sărnysses, hwilon wundraunge, and gehwæt.

Heu getacnað Þæs módes sărnysses: heu mibi, domine, quia peccaui nimis inuita mea,1 "wá is me, drihten, for ðan ðe ic syngode swið eón minum life." [85r] Þes heu and ei getacniað wánunge.

Hui man cweð on Leden and eall swa on Englisc: huig, hu færst2 ðu? Ùc getacnað hwilon wánunge, hwilon ðeowracan, hwilon wyriunge: vae mihi, quia tacui,3 "wá is me, þæt ic suwode." Crist cweð be Iudan: uae illi,4 "wá him." He cweð be Þam ungeleaf-fullum Iudeiscum: uae uobis,5 "wá eów." On wyriunge: uae tibi sit, "wá þe si." Eft, he getacnað wawan, swa swa se witega Ezechiel cweð be ðære

---

1 Cf. Ps 6:4, et anima mea turbata est valde, et tu Domine usquequo.
2 Scribal corr. from “fæst”.
3 Is 6:5, et disi vae mibi quia tacui quia vir pollutus labiis ego sum et in medio populi opolluta labia habentis ego babito et Regem Dominum exercituum vidi oculis meis.
4 Mt 26:24, vae autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis traditur.
5 Cf. Lc 11:42–52.
bec de him was gebroht fram Gode: et scripte erant in eo lamentationes et carmen et uae," and on ðære wæron awritene heofunga, and leð, and wawa." Þa heofunga getacnodon ðæra manna wór þe heóra synna beherowsiað and mid soôre dæd-bótge gebetað. Þæt leð getacnode Godes œowena sang and ðæra manna de God heriað mid gaslicum lof-sangum. Se wawa getacnað done ecan wawan de ða habbað on helle wite ðe nû God for-seð and his beboda. This passage gives another glimpse of Ælfric the homilist.


9 Scribal corr. from "gebysmerunge".

10 Vab and racha: cf. Mt 27:40, et dicentes uab qui destruit templum et in triduo illud reaedificat salva temet ipsum si Filius Dei es descend de cruce. The inclusion of vab is given as a textual variant by Weber-Gryson (p. 1572). Cf. also Mt 5:22, ego autem dico vobis quia omnis qui irascitur fratri suo reus erit iudicio qui autem dixerit fratri suo racha reus erit concilio qui autem dixerit fatae reus erit gehennae ignis.

11 ðæf haf

12 Ælfric was doubtless keenly aware of such difficulties many times throughout his distinguished career as a translator, especially in the translation of scripture. The statement also echoes a passage in his Latin preface (f. 7r, p. 1): Sciemendum tamen quod ars grammatica multi in locis non facile Anglice lingue capiti interpretationem ("It is to be understood, however, that in many places an ars grammatica does not easily admit of a rendering in the English language").

13 Lucan, Pharsalia, III. 73.
Ålfric’s examples give a fascinating glimpse into spoken Old English which is seldom represented in the more reserved, formal language of written records.
DE NOMINIBUS NUMERORUM


Of ðisum beoð acennede ordinalia nomina, þet sind “endebyrdlice naman”: primus, “se forma,” prima, primum, and swa forð on þreo wisan; secundus, “se øer”; tertius, “se øridda”; quartus, “se feorða”; quintus, “se fifta”; sextus, “se sexta”; septimus, “se seofoda”; octauus, “se eahteoða”; nonus,


---

7 Scribal corr. from “fifteoða”.
8 Marginal scribal addition: “quinquagessimus, se fifteoða”; cf O f. 140r; Zupitza, p. 283.
9 Marginal scribal addition: “octogessimus, se hundeahtatigoða”; cf. ibid.
10 Scribal corr. from “sesscentessim”.


12 semel legi] semellei
13 Scribal corr. from “ræde”.
15 Scribal corr. from “unde uiginti”.
16 Another example of Ælfric’s sense of humour.

---

18 Scribal corr. from “gehíht”.
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Gramma on Grecisc is littera on Leden, and on Englisc, “stæf,” and grammatica is “stæf-cräeft.” Se cræf geopenað and gehylt Leden spræce, and nan mann næð Leden bóca andgit befullon, buton he ðone cræft cunne. Se cræft\(^1\) is ealra bóclicra cræfta ord-fruma and grund-weall. Grammaticus is se ðe kann ðone cræft grammatican\(^2\) befullan, and se cræft næð ðritig to-dál.

Þæt forme to-dál is uox, “stemn,” þæt oðer, littera, “stæf.” Þæt ðride is sillaba, “stæf-gefeg.”\(^3\) Be ðisum ðrim to-dalum we ariton on forewerdre ðyssere béc. Æfter ðisum, we tellað octo partes orationis, þæt sind “ða eahta dælas Leden spræce,” be þam de ðeos bóc is geset. Ac we secgað her þæt feower ðæra dæla sind declinabilia, þæt is “declinigendlice.” Da ðry man gebigð on casum: nomen, and pronomen, and participium. Verbum bið gebiged in modis, þæt is “on gemetum” oððe “on ðære spræce wison.” Da oðre feower, aduerbium, coniunctio, prepositio, sindon indeclinabilia, þæt is “undeclinigendlice.” Her sind nu geteald endlufan to-dál.\(^4\) [88v]

.XII.

Sume to-dál sindon pedes, þæt sind “fét,” and þæra fota is fela mid ðam setton poete, þæt sind “gelærede sceopas,”\(^5\) heora leoð-cräeft on bocum.

.XIII.

Sum to-dal is accentus, þæt is “sweg,” on hwilcum stæf-gefege ælc word swegan sceal.

\(^1\) Scribal corr. from “cræf”.

\(^2\) The only instance in the text of the term “grammatica” being adopted into Old English and inflected accordingly. More common is Ælfric’s translation, “stæf-cräeft,” (“letter-craft”). Two manuscripts, however, have “grammaticam,” i.e. the Latin accusative form; cf. Zupitza, p. 289.

\(^3\) “forme,” “oðer,” “ðride”: these are signified by marginal Roman numerals, .I., .II., and .III., respectively. Subsequent diuisiones are unnumbered until pedes, numeral XII, below.

\(^4\) These eleven parts (vox, littera, sillaba, and the eight parts of speech) are those covered within the Grammar. In divisions twelve through thirty, Ælfric gives an overview of the remaining more advanced parts of the craft of grammar.

\(^5\) Note the specification “gelærede,” which seems to imply that Latin poetry is no mere rollick around the drinking table, but a thoughtful process requiring much training. That is not to say, however, that all Old English poetry is mere joviality or the like – of course it is very much more than that, and Ælfric himself would certainly not wish to belittle it. The difference lies in the orality of English poetry on the one hand and the textual nature of Latin poetry, which required one to be “gelered” in order to read and appreciate (or compose) it. Compare with division XXVIII, metra, below, f. 90r, p. 138.
XIII.

Sume sind positurē, þa sind on ðœre wison gehatene distinctiones, þæt sind “tō-dāl,” hu man to-dālō ða uers on ðœðincge.6 Se forma prica on ðam uerse is gehaten media distinctio, þæt is “on-middan tō-dāl.” Se ðœðer hatte subdistinctio, þæt is “under tō-dāl.” Se ðœridda hatte distinctio oððe periodas. Sé belicō þæt færs.7 Distinctio is “tō-dāl” and periodas is “clysing” oððe “geendung” þæs ferses.

XV.

Sum ðæra dæla is gehaten nóta, þæt is “mearcung.”8 ðæra mearcunga sind manega and mislice gesceapene, ægðer ge on sang-bocum, ge on leōd-cœfte,9 ge on gehwilcum gesceade, sceawige se ðe wylle.

XVI.


---

6 i.e. punctuation, which helps the reader know where and for how long to pause when reading verse. For discussion of the positurae system which Ælfric here mentions and of the history of punctuation generally, see Parkes, Pause and Effect.

7 i.e. modern English “verse.”

8 i.e. musical notation.

9 i.e. either in liturgical chant or in secular verse.

10 In the following, Ælfric gives examples of misspellings and commonly confused words. Some of them, such as the confusion of baud and aut, are suggestive concerning the pronunciation of Latin among contemporary English-speakers, or at least those familiar to Ælfric – perhaps those, like him, trained in the Winchester school.

11 Scribal addition: “ætforan... næne o”.
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geendað on d, and word geendiað on t: cum eset, “ða ða he ðæs”; cum amasset, “ða ða he luðode,” et cetera.

.XVII.

Sum ðæra dæla hatte anologia on Grecisc, þæt is on Leden, similium rerum comparatio, and on Englisc, “gelicra þinga wið-metynnyss.” Gif ðu nást sume Leden naman, hwilces cynnes he sy on ðam cæfte, þonne sceawa ðu be sumum oðrum ðe him gelic sy, and ðu wast þonne. Gif ðu smeast þonne, hwilces cynnes sy, šünis, “rap,” þonne bið panis, “hlaf,” him gelic on declinunge, and hi begen sind masculini generis, and swa gehwilce oðre.

.XVIII.

Sum ðæra hatte etheimologia, þæt is “namena ord-fruma,” and gescead hwi hi swa gehatene sind. Rex, “cyning,” is gecweden a regendo, þæt is “fram recendome,” for ðan ðe se cyning sceal mid miclum wisdome his leode wissian and be werian mid cæfte.12 Homo, “mann,” is gecweden fram humo, þæt is fram “moldan,” for ðan ðe seó eorðe wæs þæs mannnes an-timber,13 and swa gehwilce oðre.

.XVIII.

Sum ðæra is glossa, þæt is “glesing,” þonne man glesð ða earfoðan word mid eaðran Ledene.14 Faustus is on oðrum Ledene, beatus, þæt is “eadig.” Fatuus is on oðrum Ledene, stultus, þæt is “stunt,” and swa gehwilce oðre.

12 Cf. Isidore’s Etymologies, where “kings (rex, gen. regis) [are so called] from governing (regere, also meaning ‘keep straight, lead correctly’). But he does not govern who does not correct (corrigere); therefore the name of king is held by one behaving rightly (recte), and lost by one doing wrong. Hence among the ancients such was the proverb: ‘You will be king (rex) if you behave rightly (recte); if you do not, you will not’” (Isidore of Seville, Etymologies. IX.iii.4). See also p. 82, n. 114, above.

13 Cf. Isidore’s Etymologies, where “Human beings (homo) are so named because they were made from the soil (humus), just as is said in Genesis (cf. 2:7): ‘And God created man of the soil of the earth.’ Incorrectly, the whole human is named from this term, that is, the whole human consisting of both substances, the association of soul and body. But strictly speaking, ‘human being’ is from ‘soil’” (Isidore of Seville, Etymologies, XI.i.4).

14 Note that Ælfric describes glossing as the substitution of difficult words with more familiar Latin words, rather than with Old English translations.
XX.

Sum þæra is *differentia*, þæt is “to-dál betwux twam ðingum.” Ic cweðe nú, *rex*, “cynincg,” þæt is se ðe gemetfesliçce his folc gewissað. Gif he ðonne mid his ricetere [89v] hi of-sit, ðonne bið he *tyrannus*, þæt is “reðe” oððe “wæl-hreow.”

XXI.

Sum þæra is *barbarismus*, þæt is “anes wordes gewémednyss,” gif hit bið miswiten oððe miscweden of ðam rihtan cræfte.

XXII.

Sum ðara is *solocismus*, þæt is miscweden word on endebyrdnyss ðære rædinge of ðam rihtan cræfte. *Barbarismus* bið on anum worde, and *solocismus* bið sum leas word on ðam uerse. Swa ðeah ne gebiriað ðas twegen dælas to ðam cræfte, ac hi becumad of ðam sam læredum, leaslice geclypode oððe awritene.

XXIII.

Sume sind gecwedene *uitia*, þæt sind “leahtras,” on Leden spræce, on manegum wisum miswritene oððe miscwedene ðam eallum we sceolon wið-cweðan gif we cunnon þæt gescead.

XXIII.

Sum ðæra dæla is *metaplasmus*, þæt is “awend spræc tó oðrum hiwe,” hwilon for fægernyssse, hwilon for neóde, swa swa is *audacter*, “dyrstelice.” Hit sceolde beón *audacter* gif hi moste, and swa gehwilce oðre.

XXV.

Sume sind gehatene *scemata*, þæt sind mislice hiw and fægernyssa on Leden spræce – hu heo betst gelogod beoð.

XXVI.

Sume sind gehatene *tropi*, þæt sind mislice getacnunga oððe wisan on Leden spræce, abrodene of heora agenre taecnunge to oðre gelicnyssse. Swa swa is gecweden *fluctuare segetes, gemmare uitae*,16 “þæt Æceras yðiað, and wintreowa gimmiad,” for ðan ðe Æceras farað on sumera, swa swa sæ

---

15 See p. 136, n. 12, above.
yðigende, and wintreowa blostman beoð gimmum gelice. Eall swa floridam iuuentutem et lacteam caniciem,17 “þa blostm-bærân iuguðe and ða meolc hwitan harunge.”

.XXVII.
Sum ðæra is [90r] prosa, þæt is forðriht Leden, butan leood-cræfte gelencged and gelogod.

.XXVIII.
Sume sind gehatene metra on Grecisc, þæt is on Leden, mensurę, and on Englisc, “gemetu.” Þa gemetu gebyrialo to Ledenum leood-cræfte. Se cræft is swâ ameten þæt þær ne mot beóń furðon án stæf ofer getel, ac beoð ealle ða uers geemnytte be anum getele, gif hit aht beón sceal.

.XXIX.
Sume sind gehatene fabulę, þæt sind “idele spellunga.” Fabulę sind þa saga ðe menn secgad ongean gecynde þæt þe næfre ne gewearð, ne gewurðan ne mæg.

.XXX.
Sum ðæra is gehaten historia, þæt is gerecednyss mid ðære mann awrit, and gerehð ða ðing, and ða dæda þe wæron gedóne on ealdum dagum, and us dyrne wæron.

SY ÐEOS BÓC ÐUS HER GEENDOD

17 Ibid.
Appendix A: Translations of Ælfric’s Two Prefaces

Latin Preface

I, Ælfric, as being less wise,¹ have endeavoured to translate into your language these Excerpts from Priscian, minor and maior, for you young boys, so that, having read through the eight parts of speech in that well-known book of Donatus, you can implant both languages, namely Latin and English, into your tender minds now, until such time as you come to a more perfect understanding. For I know that many will find fault with me because I have deigned to busy my mind with such pursuits, namely translating an ars grammatica to the English language. But I judge this text to be suited to unlearned boys rather than for old men.

I know that words can be interpreted in many ways, but I follow a simple interpretation for the sake of avoiding fastidiousness. If, however, our interpretation should displease anyone, let him speak however he wishes – we are content with the method we learned in the school of the venerable priest Athelwold, who has instructed many for the better. It is to be understood, however, that in many places an ars grammatica does not easily admit of a rendering in the English language, as in the matter of metrical feet or rhythms, concerning which we are here silent. But we deem nevertheless that the renderings offered here can be useful as a starting point for children, as we have already said.

I marvel greatly wherefore many shorten syllables in prose that in meter are short, since prose is free from the law of meter, just as, for example, they pronounce pāter and mālus² and the like in the British fashion, which syllables are held to be short in poetry. It seems to me better to invoke the Lord as pāter reverently, with a lengthened syllable, rather than to shorten it in the British fashion; neither is the Lord to be made subject to the science of grammar.

Fare well in the Lord, O children.

¹ i.e. in comparison with Priscian and Donatus mentioned below.
² Note that these differences in pronunciation are indeed significant: mālus means “bad,” whereas mālus means “apple-tree” or “mast.”
Old English Preface

I, Ælfric, wished to translate into the English language this little book about letter-craft, which is called “Grammatica,” after I have translated those two books of eighty homilies, because grammar is the key which unlocks the understanding of those books and I thought that this book might help young children to begin this craft until they come to greater understanding.

It is necessary for each man who has any good skill that he use it for the benefit of other men, and he entrusts that talent which God committed to him to other men so that God’s gift might not lie idle and that he might not be called a poor servant and be bound and cast into darkness just as the holy gospel says.

It befits young men that they learn some wisdom, and it befits the old that they teach some wisdom to their children. For through learning is faith kept, and every man who loves wisdom is blessed. And he who wishes neither to learn nor teach, although he is able, his understanding cools away from this holy teaching, and he turns little by little away from good. Whence shall come wise teachers to God’s people if they do not learn in youth and how can the faith go forth if the teaching and the teachers should fail?

Now, therefore, let God’s servants and monastery-men⁴ be eagerly on guard lest the holy teaching in our days grow cold or wane, just as it happened among the English people some few years ago now, so that no English priest could compose or understand a single letter in Latin until archbishop Dunstan and bishop Athelwold again raised up the teaching in the monastic life. Nor do I say therefore that this book can aid a man to learn very much, but it is nevertheless an introduction to a second tongue, if it please him. I now ask, in God’s name, that if anyone wishes to copy this book, that he rightly corrects it according to the exemplar, for I do not have that power; if someone should bring it to error through inaccurate scribes, it is then his problem, not mine. The un-writer does great evil if he does not correct his error.

---

⁴ See p. 2, n. 10, above.
Appendix B: Terminological Tables

### Partes Orationis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>nama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>pronomen</td>
<td>naman speliend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>uerbum</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>aduerbia</td>
<td>wordes gefera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>prepositio</td>
<td>fore-setnys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>participium</td>
<td>del-nimend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>coniunctio</td>
<td>geðeodnys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjection</td>
<td>interiectio</td>
<td>betwux alegednys / betwux aworpennys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accidentia Verborum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>persona</td>
<td>hád</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>numerus</td>
<td>getel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>tempus</td>
<td>tíd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
<td>modus</td>
<td>geget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning / voice(^1)</td>
<td>significatio</td>
<td>getácnung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species</td>
<td>species</td>
<td>hiw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjugation</td>
<td>coniugatio</td>
<td>geðeodnys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) “Voice” is the technical meaning of *significatio* in the grammatical context. Vivien Law explains how “The fundamental distinction between meaning and form was encoded with care in the terminology. *Significatio*, preferred by most grammarians of late antiquity, gave way in the early Middle Ages to *sensus* and *intellectus* (possibly because significatio also had the technical sense ‘voice’ with reference to verbs). ‘Form’ was rendered by *sonus*, or in the central Middle Ages by *superficies* or *litteratura*” (Law, “Grammar,” pp. 290–1).
### Casus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>nominatiuus</td>
<td>nemnigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>genitiius</td>
<td>geagnigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>datiuus</td>
<td>forgifendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>accusatiuus</td>
<td>wrégendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocative</td>
<td>vocatiuus</td>
<td>clypigendlic / gecigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>ablatiarius</td>
<td>æt-bredendlic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Miscellaneous Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>genus</td>
<td>cyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td>casus</td>
<td>casus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>accidentia</td>
<td>gelimplice ðing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>singularis</td>
<td>an-feald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>pluralis</td>
<td>mening-feald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>presens</td>
<td>and-werd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>futurum</td>
<td>to-werd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>preteritum</td>
<td>forð-gewiten ful-fremed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>imperfectum</td>
<td>forð-gewiten unful-fremed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>plusquam perfectum</td>
<td>forð-gewiten mare þonne ful-fremed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>indicatiuus</td>
<td>gebicnigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>subiunctius</td>
<td>under-ðeodendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>imperatiuus</td>
<td>bebeodendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optative</td>
<td>optatiuus</td>
<td>gewiscendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>infinitiarius</td>
<td>ungeendigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>actiuas</td>
<td>dædlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>passiua</td>
<td>ðrowigendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponent</td>
<td>deponens</td>
<td>alegendlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparative</td>
<td>comparatiua</td>
<td>wið-metenlice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter</td>
<td>littera</td>
<td>stæf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syllable</td>
<td>syllaba</td>
<td>stæf-gefeg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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