

'Legal Glossaries (Old and Middle English)'. *Medieval Glossaries from North-Western Europe: Tradition and Innovation*. Eds. Annina Seiler, Chiara Benati and Sara M. Pons-Sanz. *The Medieval Translator / Traduire au Moyen Âge* 19. Turnhout: Brepols, 2023. Pp. 272-81.

Legal glossaries

Sara M. Pons-Sanz

Introduction

Despite the existence of a very rich native legal tradition (see, for instance, Wormald 1999 and Oliver 2002), legal studies in medieval England focused mainly on one's familiarization with Roman and canon law. The latter had its roots in Roman law, but the focus of the two legal systems was different: Roman law was particularly concerned with civil matters, while canon law was the Church's own legal system, a way to regulate its structure and governance, as well as those activities that had an impact on religious life and, hence, eternal salvation. As such, it included the decrees put forward in Church councils and papal decretals. The curriculum at the first school in medieval England we know about, the renowned establishment founded in Canterbury by Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian in 678, comprised both (see Lapidge 1986) and, indeed, Roman and canon law seem to have maintained some academic significance through the late Anglo-Saxon period and, particularly, in the post-conquest period, when they had a central role in legal university degrees and the renewed professionalisation of lawyers.¹

Legal vocabulary in Anglo-Saxon glossaries

¹ On the significance of Roman law in medieval England, see further Senior (1931), Rathbone (1967), Turner (1975), Barton (1984) and Winkler (1992); on the knowledge and use of canon law, see Helmholz (2004) and Elliott (2013); on their interaction, see Helmholz (2015) for an introduction and Duggan (2010) for a specific case study; on their place in early medieval studies, see Riché (1976) and Brundage (2008: Chapter 2); on their place in university legal curricula, see Leader (1988: Chapter 8) and Brundage (2008: Chapter 6).

In a letter to Bishop Haeddi (c.680), → ALDHELM, one of the most famous students from the Canterbury school, wrote about the time that he had spent studying Roman law.² However, unfortunately, he did not include any details about his legal education. Cook (1924) proposed that the *Breviary of Alaric* (a.k.a. *Breviarium Alaricianum* or *Lex Romana Visigothorum*), a compilation promulgated in 506 by the Visigothic king Alaric II, might have been one of the key texts used at the school. Lapidge (1996: 149), on the other hand, preferred to identify Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis*,³ particularly the *Codex Iustinianus* and the *Novellae Constitutiones*, as likely sources on the basis that Theodore drew on these texts in his *iudicia*, a.k.a. *canones Theodori*.⁴ While these suggestions are hypotheses, Aldhelm's works and the glossaries that reflect the Canterbury school's lexicographical activity are very strong evidence that Isidore of Seville's survey of Roman law in his encyclopaedic work *Etymologies* (particularly Book V, but also Books IX, X and XV) was a fundamental study text.⁵ Two of these glossaries record a significant amount of Isidorian lemmata referring to Roman law: the First Cleopatra glossary (CleolI) includes approximately thirty legal lemmata (most of them from a batch marked with the enigmatic abbreviations *frs* and *fri*),⁶ while the class glossary (or list) written in the margins of a manuscript now separated into London, BL,

² See Leach (1911: 8–9) for an edition of the letter.

³ See Mommsen and others (1908–12) for an edition.

⁴ For an edition, see Finsterwalder (1929); the Old English translations are edited by Fulk and Jurasinski (2012). For further information on this text, see Charles-Edwards (1995).

⁵ For an edition, see Lindsay (1911); for a translation into English, see Barney and others (2006). For further information on this work and its influence on the European glossarial tradition, → ISIDORE'S *ETYMOLOGIES*; for its influence on Anglo-Saxon glossaries, see Lazzari (2007 and 2016) and Porter (2014); for its influence on Aldhelm's works, see the apparatus to his *Prosa de virginitate* in Gwara (2001) and Porter (2011b: 175–76), who provides an overview of the information in Gwara's apparatus. On the glossaries associated with the Canterbury school, see Lapidge (1986) and → OLD ENGLISH GLOSSARIES.

⁶ London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra A. iii, fols 5–75; s. x med., St Augustine's, Canterbury. For an edition, see Rusche (1996); for further information, → CLEOPATRA GLOSSARIES. This glossary was the main source for the glossary included in London, BL, MS Cotton Otho E. i (s. xi in., Christchurch, Canterbury; ed. Meritt 1961: 446), but, because of its badly damaged state, we cannot trace the Roman legal terms here.

MS Add. 32246 and Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS M 16. 2 (AntGl ClassGl) incorporates about eighty terms.⁷ They are misplaced in the midst of a list of people's occupations and sicknesses (*Nomina omnium hominum communiter*; AntGl ClassGl 277–359) yet they still show to a great extent the Isidorian structure. The two glossaries share around twenty lemmata: AntGl ClassGl 277–79, 283, 286, 292–93, 299, 318, 320, 327–28, 330, 337, 339, 341–43, 346. Porter (2011b and 2014) has argued that the Antwerp-London Class Glossary is a more complete witness of their likely shared source: an Isidorian glossary derived from a shortened epitome of the *Etymologies* and supplemented with further materials (see also Rusche 2005 and → ISIDORE'S *ETYMOLOGIES*).⁸ The hypothesis that an epitome lies at the basis of this glossary is supported by the fact that the entries from the *frs/fri* batch in the First Cleopatra Glossary (legal and otherwise) often include explanations in Latin prose together with Old English interpretamenta: e.g. CleoI F430: *familia erciscundæ* : *yrfegedal quia ærciscunda enim apud ueteres diuisio nuncupabatur* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 342:

⁷ S. xi¹, Abingdon (but see Gwara 1997); fols 2–7, 8, 9–15 and 17–21 in Add. 32246, and fols 3–4 in Antwerp, M 16. 2. For an edition, see Porter (2011a); for further information, → ANTWERP-LONDON GLOSSARIES.

⁸ Until David Porter publishes the second volume of his edition, where the sources of the glossary will be discussed, those interested in the exact Isidorian contexts behind the legal lemmata recorded in the Antwerp-London Class Glossary can consult Meyer (1956: 400–02), who takes as his starting point an older, erroneous, attribution of the glossary to Ælfric, and Lazzari (2016: 287–95). → ÆLFRIC'S GLOSSARY (ed. Zupitza and Gneuss 2003: 297–322, referred to by page and line number), which also represents the Canterbury Isidorian epitome/glossary and is often associated with the London-Antwerp Class Glossary, does not share the same interest in Roman law as the latter (see Gillingham 1981: 66), although it does include some legal terms of general use which, like the rest of the glossary, reflect Ælfric's interest in lexico-semantic relations: e.g. 319.13: *homicida* : *manslaga* ('murderer'; cf. *Etymologies* V. xxvi. 15); 319.13: *patricida* : *fæderslaga* ('parricide'); 319.13: *matricida* : *moderslaga* ('matricide'); 319.14: *fatricida* : *broðerslaga* ('fratricide'); and 319.14: *parricida* : *mægslaga* ('parricide'; cf. *Etymologies* V. xxvi. 16 and X. 225, and AntGl ClassGl 345; see below). These terms are included in a section dealing with unfavourable qualities human beings and disreputable people.

familie erciscunde : *yrfegedaal* ‘division of an inheritance’).⁹ Besides lemmata that are likely to have been part of the shared source but which, for whatever reason, were not included in the Antwerp-London Class Glossary (e.g. CleoI I408–10), the First Cleopatra Glossary also includes legal terms that derive from other sources, particularly Aldhelm’s texts, as in the *dl* or *nigl* batches: e.g. CleoI A550: *arratam* : *beweddad* (‘betrothed, married’; cf. AntGl ClassGl 322: *arrabona vel arrabo* : *wedd vel wedlac* ‘pledge, dowry’); and CleoI P118: *parricida* : *mægmyrþra* (‘murderer of kin’; cf. AntGl ClassGl 345: *parricidii actio* : *mægmorþres witnung* ‘punishment for murder of kin’, on which see above, note 8). As noted by Porter (2011b), Aldhelm’s lexical choices and the glosses that they receive are also likely to have been associated with the Canterbury Isidorian epitome/glossary shared by the First Cleopatra Glossary and the Antwerp-London Class Glossary.

Other glossaries associated with the Canterbury tradition are much less interested in Roman legal terms, but they do record a number of the Isidorian lemmata included in the First Cleopatra and the Antwerp-London Class Glossaries. This is particularly the case with the main Corpus Glossary (Cp; and, hence, the fragmentary and highly alphabetized Harley Glossary, which is very closely associated with it),¹⁰ but we also find some of these legal

⁹ Cf. *Etymologies* V. xxv. 9: *Familia herciscunda est divisio hereditatis inter heredes. Herciscunda enim apud veteres divisio nuncupabatur [...]*.

¹⁰ Corpus Glossary: Cambridge, CCC, MS 144; s. ix in., **St Augustine’s**; fols 4^r–64^v. For an edition, see Lindsay (1921). This glossary relies heavily on the original behind the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary, on which see further below, note 11. Harley glossary: London, BL MS Harley 3376; s. x–xi, Worcester; fols 1–94. For an edition, see Oliphant (1966); on the connection between the Corpus and Harley Glossaries, see Cooke (1997) and → ÉPINAL-ERFURT GLOSSARY. Because the compiler of the Harley glossary also seems to have expanded his entries by relying directly on a copy of the *Etymologies* (see further Lazzari 2007: 77–80) and because he was careful to rework his interpretamenta with information from various sources, its entries do not always show a direct relationship with those in the Corpus Glossary (and related glossaries) and might, therefore, represent later additions: e.g. *facultates quae non habent firmitatem* (Cp B177) vs *quibus nemo succedit* (Harley B345) as glosses for *bona caduca* (cf. *Etymologies*, V. xxv. 8, and CleoI I418, where *caduca* is included as part of the interpretamentum for *intestata hereditas*, explained in *Etymologies*, V. xxv. 9).

lemmata in other related glossaries, such as the → ÉPINAL-ERFURT GLOSSARY (EpErf).¹¹ Consider, for instance, Cp C975: *cyrograffum* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 331); Cp D100: *depositum* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 319); Cp D347: *dos* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 333); and Cp S259: *senatusconsultum* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 295).¹² These glossaries also include some lemmata that might have been present in the original Isidorian epitome/glossary but are not recorded either in the First Cleopatra or the Antwerp-London Class Glossary. Like those entries in the *frs/fri* batch of the First Cleopatra Glossary, some of them still retain a clear connection with the text of the *Etymologies*.¹³

Theodore is known to have avidly engaged in the study of canon law and, to some extent, its production. His own interpretation of matters dealing with penitence, ecclesiastical discipline, etc. (i.e. the *iudicia*) was disseminated by Anglo-Saxon missionaries on the Continent. More importantly for our purposes, we know that canon law was part of his teachings in Canterbury because of a series of canonical lemmata with Latin interpretamenta included in a number of continental glossaries linked to the school, all of them members of the so-called Leiden family.¹⁴ There is some disparity in relation to the lemmata that they include and their arrangement. For instance, the → LEIDEN GLOSSARY (VLQ 69) has over

¹¹ Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 72; s. viii, England or an English house in the Continent; fols 94–107. Erfurt, UB, Dep. Erf., CA. f. 42; s. ix¹, Cologne; fols 1–14 (First Erfurt Glossary). For an edition, see Goetz (1894), who based his work on Erfurt but included variants from Épinal; and Pfeifer (1974), who only edited the entries with Old English interpretamenta. Quotations below follow Goetz's edition, referred to by page and lemma number.

¹² Cf. EpErf 350.13, 356.9 and 356.66; and Harley C2246, D211 and D799. On the rendering of Roman government posts and institutions in Old English glossaries, see further Porter (2019). On the gloss for L *senatusconsultum* in the Antwerp-London Class Glossary, → OLD ENGLISH GLOSSARIES.

¹³ E.g. EpErf 380.4: *peculatus : furatus de peculio puplico* and Cp P 339: *peculatus : furtum puplicum*; cf. *Etymologies*, V. xxvi. 22: *Peculatus iudicium in eos datur qui fraudem aerario faciunt, pecuniamque publicam intervertunt. Nam a pecunia peculatum esse dictum [...]*. Cf. as well Cp P245: *peculatus : furatus*; and P327: *peculator : qui pecuniam puplicam rapit*, which Lindsay (1917) identifies as having originated in the Abtrusa Glossary (→ LATIN GLOSSARIES).

¹⁴ See the appendix in Lapidge (1986) for a full list, and →LEIDEN GLOSSARY.

160 canonical entries,¹⁵ split into groups and with varying arrangements: section I is alphabetized (*a*-order), while sections XXXIX. 53–57 and XL I. 1–6 are not. Paris, BN, MS lat. 2685 (Paris 2685) has only fifty-one lemmata associated with canon law,¹⁶ organized as follows: ‘The early elements of the glossary are arranged in part in the order of the councils of the source, each with its own rubric, though the later section, especially that part taken from the decretals, disintegrates into disorder’ (Brett 1995: 134). Its retention of textual order and its lower number of lemmata could be taken as an indication that Paris 2685 is a closer representation of the original Canterbury canonical *glossae collectae*, as argued by Elliott (2013: Chapter 5). The two manuscripts share seventeen lemmata: VLQ 69 I. 1, I. 14, I. 17, I. 47, I. 53, I. 57, I. 70, I. 79, I. 124, XXXV. 46, XXXIX. 56, XXXIX. 58, XXXIX. 61–62, XXXI. 65, XXXIX. 68 and XXXIX. 71). Ten of them are paired with the same or a very similar interpretamentum and are, therefore, the most likely products of the glossographical activity led by Theodore and Hadrian. Given the close connection between the Leiden family and other glossaries associated with the Canterbury school, it is not surprising to find some of these lemmata and interpretamenta there as well, although the integrity of the batch is not maintained because of the alphabetical order of the latter: e.g. VLQ 69 I. 1: *aleator : ludor cupiditatis* (cf. Cp A466 and EpErf 344.55); VLQ 69 I. 57: *genuinum decus : naturale uel intimum* (cf. Cp G76 and EpErf 363.56). We also see lexemes recorded in VLQ 69 and Paris 2685 in batches of glosses deriving from Aldhelm’s works, which could be taken as further testament to the school’s familiarity with these terms: e.g. VLQ 69 I. 14: *arcimandritis* (cf. CleoI A106: *archimandrita : heahleareow*).¹⁷

These shared glosses have been studied mainly in an attempt to identify the canonical texts that the early Canterbury school had access to. The *Collectio canonum Dionysiana conciliorum*, particularly the second recension,¹⁸ or the *Collectio canonum Dionysio-Hadriana* (or enlarged versions of these texts),¹⁹ and the *Collectio canonum Sanblasiana* are

¹⁵ Leiden, UB, MS VLQ 69; s. ix in., St Gall. For an edition, see Hessels (1906).

¹⁶ S. ix², Belgium or Holland. The relevant batch is unedited, but the Old English glosses have been edited by Kluge (1902: 12) and Meritt (1945: nos 33–35, 40–42, 45, 48 and 53).

¹⁷ The entry in the First Cleopatra Glossary is part of the batch marked as *dl*, which includes entries from Aldhelm’s prose and verse *De laudibus virginitatis*.

¹⁸ This is the main source identified by Brett (1995) for the two manuscripts as they currently stand. For an edition, see *PL* 67: 139–230; see also, Brett (1995: 138–40).

¹⁹ For an edition, see Wendelstein (1525).

likely to have been at the core of Theodore's own collection and teaching.²⁰ The common batch of glosses was then enlarged with other sources; for instance, Paris 2685 relies more heavily on the papal decretals of the second *Dionysiana* than VLQ 69 (Brett 1995: 134).²¹ Despite recent attention, much remains to be done on the canonical glosses in the Leiden family manuscripts, as many of them are still unedited.

Moving beyond the area of influence of the Canterbury school, there are no Old English glossaries that incorporate a significant number of Roman legal terms, although it is worth noting that in the last quarter of the tenth century Aldred, provost of the community of St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street (County Durham), expanded and provided Old English interlinear glosses for 225 *notae iuris*, alphabetized in *a*-order, in quire XI of Durham, CL, MS A. iv. 19 (fols 85–86).²² Approximately a quarter of them were Roman *notae iuris*, or abbreviations of words belonging to different lexico-semantic fields that could appear in legal texts. While no clear source has been identified for these *notae*, Jolly (2012: 176) points out that Aldred's list shares about 140 lemmata with the *notae Lindenbrogiana*e, a list compiled by the German jurist and philologist Friedrich Lindenbrog (ed. Mommsen 1864) which probably goes back to the eighth century. As one might expect, there is also some overlap with the terms recorded in the glossaries discussed above: e.g. *hereditas* (cf. CleoI H69 and AntGI ClassGI 337) and *ius quiritorium* (cf. CleoI I412 and AntGI ClassGI 293).

Even though key figures in the Anglo-Saxon Church continued to be very closely linked to the production and study of canonical pronouncements (see Elliott 2013),²³ we do not find either much interest in canon law in glossaries that are not associated with the Canterbury school, with the exception of the glossary recorded in the recto of the first page of

²⁰ The latter was already identified as a significant source by Lapidge (1986) on the basis of its contents and the fact that it is preserved in an early-eighth-century manuscript possibly from Northumbria: Cologne, Dombibliothek, MS 213.

²¹ See Elliott (2013: Chapter 5) for more information on the aforementioned collections, their use in England (see also Helmholz 2004: Chapter 1) and the relationship between VLQ 69 and Paris 2685.

²² For an edition of the *notae*, see Jolly (2012: 329–38); see further Pons-Sanz (forthcoming).

²³ On the Legatine Capitulary, an important collection of canons from eighth-century Northumbria, see Carella (2007: Chapter 2). On the collection of canons that Archbishop Wulfstan II of York revised, probably with help from Abbot Ælfric of Eynsham, see Cross and Hamer (1999).

a bifolium (fols 250–51) in Oxford, Bdl, MS Bodley 163.²⁴ Amongst the ninety-two items included there, we find lemmata taken from decretals IV and VIII of Innocent I,²⁵ from letter XXVI of Gelasius I,²⁶ and from Church canons originating from the Councils of Chalcedon and Carthage. Even though the canons of those councils are included in the *Collectio canonum Dionysiana conciliorum*, there is only one overlap with the lemmata from VLQ 69, but not with Paris 2685 (viz. *conductores*: VLQ 69 I. 26 and Bodley 163 80).

Legal vocabulary in later medieval glossaries

Despite the increasing central role of Roman and canon law in the education system of later medieval England,²⁷ we do not have any glossaries originating from England during this time with a strong interest in either of these legal systems. The first glossary included in Oxford, Bdl, MS Bodley 370 (→ BODLEY 730), other so-called *nominale* and the large Latin–Latin / English and English–Latin alphabetical glossaries/ dictionaries of the fifteenth century (*Medulla grammaticae*, *Ortus vocabulorum*, *Promptorium parvulorum* and *Catholicon Anglicum*; → BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES) and do include some legal terms amongst their entries, but, as it is the case in Ælfric’s Glossary (see above, note 8), rather than terms directly associated with Roman law, the entries tend to present general terms: e.g. *lawere or lawzer* : *legista, jurista, legisperitus, jurisperitus, scriba* in the *Promptorium parvulorum*.²⁸ They also include terms referring to crimes (amongst others naming vices and sins) associated with the behaviour of morally corrupt people, such as the entries included under the section on *Nomina reprehensibilium virorum* in the Mayer *Nominale*:²⁹ e.g. 694.15: *hic*,

²⁴ S. xi, Peterborough?. For an edition, see Lendinara (1999: 328–55).

²⁵ They are edited in **PL 67: 239–41**.

²⁶ It is edited in **PL 67: 309–10**.

²⁷ E.g. English canonists such as John Athon / Acton / Ayton and William Lynwode / Lynwood provided glosses on key (local) decrees that would soon become part of the established corpus of works to be consulted by would-be canonists together with Gratian’s *Decretum* from c.1140; see further Baker (1998: Chapters 4–5).

²⁸ For an edition, see Way (1843–65).

²⁹ London, BL, MS Add. 34276; s. xv, Lincolnshire; fols 12–22. For an edition, see WW (1884: I, no. XIX, cols 673–744), cited by column and lemma number.

hec homicida : mansleer ('murderer'); 694.16: *hec, hic patricida : a^{cce} que vel qui occidit patrem*; 694.17: *hec, hic matricida : que vel qui occidit matrem*; 694.18: *hec, hic parenticida : qui vel que occidit parentes*. Of the four main dictionaries, *Ortus vocabulorum* shares the highest number of legal lemmata with the First Cleopatra and Antwerp-London Class Glossaries:³⁰ e.g. *plebiscitum : a byrelawe* ('body of customs or regulation in a community'; cf. AntGl ClassGl 294); *constitutio : an ordynaunce* ('regulation(s), prescribed custom'; cf. AntGl ClassGl 296); *rodia die : quedam lex nobilis* (cf. AntGl ClassGl 286 and CleoI H68); and *olografium : testamentum* (cf. CleoI O211). The late Middle English glossaries also include some canonical terms, but, as it is the case with the other legal terms, most of them tend to be words that were used beyond the contexts purely associated with canon law: e.g. all four main fifteenth-century dictionaries record, amongst others, *birrus / -um* (cf. VLQ 69 I. 17), *diaconus* (cf. VLQ 69 I. 41) and *pulpitum* (cf. VLQ I. 65). It is difficult to establish the reasons for the overlap between the Old and Middle English glossaries because the extant evidence and the limited work that has been done so far on these texts do not allow us to draw a direct line of transmission. However, it is likely to be the case that some of the Old English glossaries and, certainly, Isidore's *Etymologies*, are amongst the ultimate sources of the late medieval glossaries.³¹

Expositiones vocabulorum

More interesting for our purposes are the so-called *expositiones vocabulorum*, lists of (Old) English feudal and legal terms referring to well-established formulas, liberties, privileges, immunities, etc., glossed with Anglo-Norman or Latin interpretamenta.³² These lists were probably intended, at least in the initial instance, to clarify some of the terminology included

³⁰ For an edition, see Alston (1968).

³¹ See further Franzen (2016), Lancashire (2018) and → BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES.

³² A list of (Old) English legal terms with English interpretamenta (very similar to that edited by Skemer 1998) can be found in the only extant statute book in Middle English, viz. the fourteenth-century Oxford, Bdl, MS Rawlinson B 520 (list in fols 49^r–50^r; ed. Fennell 2011: 101–02).

in Anglo-Saxon legal codes (see O'Brien 2015) and archived Anglo-Saxon charters,³³ as well as Old English phrases and terms in newly issued royal charters, where they were clearly perceived as archaic and, hence, having the authoritative weight of tradition (see Vincent 2015). Thus, these lists mirror some of the very significant sociolinguistic changes caused by the Norman Conquest: during the Anglo-Saxon period English had frequently been used in legal contexts but after the Conquest Latin and French took over as the languages of legal transactions.

The oldest records of such lists, in thirteenth-century manuscripts, tend to have Anglo-Norman interpretamenta and tend to start with the lemma *mondbreche*. See, for instance, the versions in the Red Book of the Exchequer;³⁴ *Placita de Quo Warranto*;³⁵ Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 101 (this short list starts with *sak*); and London, BL, MS Cotton Julius D. vii.³⁶ In the latter manuscript the list appears together with a chronicle attributed to John of Wallingford and this early association with historical texts is something that we see in other contexts. Thus, Latin versions of a *mondbreche*-type list appear, amongst other contexts, with the thirteenth-century chronicle of Roger of Hovenden and the mid-fourteenth-century chronicle of Ranulf Higden,³⁷ where the list is included to explain Anglo-Saxon legal terms in the *Leges Edwardi*.³⁸

Latin interpretamenta to the English items tend to appear in versions of the list that start with *sok* and *sak*. Skemer (1998: 68–73) has edited a version of such a list (which has longer explanations than the Anglo-Norman lists) on the basis of the collation of 21 manuscripts. He explains that lists with Latin translations tend to be recorded in statute books. They had a much clearer educational purpose than the works where one normally

³³ They were possibly confirmed by the Angevin kings. On the Anglo-Saxon legal terms and formulas, see Harmer (1989: 61–78); see also the relevant entries in the *Middle English Dictionary* (1952–2001).

³⁴ For an edition, see Hall (1896: III, 1032–39).

³⁵ For an edition, see Illingworth (1818: 275). Here the list accompanies a charter of Edward the Confessor to Westminster.

³⁶ For an edition of the latter two texts, see Hunt (1991: I, 54 and 55).

³⁷ For editions of these texts, see Stubbs (1868–71: II, 242), and Babington and Lumby (1865–86: II, 94–96), respectively.

³⁸ For a list of some of the manuscripts containing versions closely associated with that included in the Book of the Exchequer, see Hall (1896: I, cxiii–cxv).

finds the French version, as the statute books provided a corpus of legal texts useful as desk reference. Table 1 contrasts the headwords in the list compiled by Skemer with those included in the list recorded in the Red Book of the Exchequer.

Red Book of the Exchequer	Skemer (1998)
Mondbreche	Soc
Boroubreche	Sac
Miskemyng	Tol
Shewite	Theam
Lesting	Infangenthef
Frithesokne	Utfangenthef
Flemenefreme / flemenefremth	Hangwite
Weregult þef	Hamsocne
Utlep	Grithbreche
Forfeng	Blodwite
Infeng	Plithwite
Ferdwyte	Flitwite
Fihtwyte	Fledwite
Blodewyte	Flemensfrith
Wardewyte	Leirwite
Hengwyte	Childwite
Hamsokne	Forestall
Forstal	Scot
Infongeneþef	Geld
Sakke	Hidage
Sokne	Caruage
Tol	Danegeld
Them	Horngeld
Hudegeld	Wapentak
Boroubote	Lestage
Briggebote	Stallage

Ferdfare	Schewinge
Inlage	Miskeninge
Utlage	Burgbreche
Cherchesed	Wardwite
Chircheomer / chircheambre	Hundredpeny
Peu	Bordalepeny
Peyn	Burgbote
	Briggebote
	Averpeny

Table 1: Common types of lists of (Old) English legal terms in late medieval manuscripts

As Table 1 exemplifies, the Latin versions often end with the new-formation *averpeny* (cf. AN *average* + ME *peni*), a lemma that starts the third main type of the list, as exemplified by the list (ending with *yrfe*) that accompanies the Latin collection of English laws known as the *Leges Anglorum*, compiled in London at the beginning of the thirteenth century.³⁹ Given that this collection was probably intended to be a record of English customary law at a time when there were clear demands to ensure that legal practice was based on legal custom rather than merely royal will, understanding these terms was particularly important.

Early Modern lexicographers were aware of the usefulness of these lists. Thus, (often abbreviated) versions were included, for instance, in John Rastell's legal dictionary *Exposiciones Terminorum Legum Anglorum* (1523–24?; a.k.a. *Les Termes de la Ley*), Stephen Batman's *Batman vppon Bartholome* (1582) and William Fleetwood's glossary included in his *Treatise vpon the Charters Liberties Lawes and Customes of all Forrestes Parkes Chases and Free Warrens* (included in Cambridge MA, Harvard Law School Library, MS 15).⁴⁰ In spite of their significance in late medieval and early modern England, much more work remains to be done on the relationships between the various (types of) lists and their association with their immediate co-texts, as well as the cultural and sociolinguistic milieux in which they were produced.

³⁹ An abbreviated version of this list can be found in Liebermann (1894: 1).

⁴⁰ See further Berkhout (1985), Lancashire (2006 and 2018) and → RENAISSANCE LEXICOGRAPHY.

References

- Alston, R. C. 1968. *Ortus Vocabulorum*, English Linguistics 1500-1800: A Collection of Facsimile Reprints 123 (Menston: Scolar Press).
- Babington, Churchill, and Joseph Rawson Lumby (eds). 1865–86. *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis: Together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, 41, 9 vols (London: Longman, Green and Co.).
- Baker, John H. 1998. *Monuments of Endlesse Labours: English Canonists and their Work 1300–1900* (London: Hambledon Press).
- Barney, Stephen A., and others (trans) 2006. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Barton, John L. 1984. ‘The Study of Civil Law before 1380’, in *The History of the University of Oxford, I: The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. by Jeremy I. Catto (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 519–30.
- Batman, Stephen. 1582. *Batman vpon Bartholome: His Booke De Proprietatibus Rerum* (London: Thomas East).
- Berkhout, Carl T. 1985. ‘Stephen Batman and the *Expositio Vocabulorum*’, *Neophilologus*, 69: 476–78. Repr. in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers, II: Middle English*, ed. by Christine Franzen (Abingdon: Ashgate, 2016), no. V.
- Brett, Martin. 1995. ‘Theodore and the Latin Canon Law’, in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies of his Life and Influence*, ed. by Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 120–40.
- Brundage, James A. 2008. *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians and Courts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Carella, Bryan. 2007. ‘Alcuin and Alfred: Two Anglo-Saxon Legal Reformers’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).
- Charles-Edwards, Thomas. 1995. ‘The Penitential of Theodore and the Iudicia Theodori’, in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies of his Life and Influence*, ed. by Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 141–74.
- Cook, Albert Stanburrough. 1924. ‘Aldhelm’s Legal Studies’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 23: 105–13.

- Cooke, Jessica. 1997. 'Worcester Books and Scholars, and the Making of the Harley Glossary (British Library MS Harley 3376)', *Anglia*, 115: 441–68.
- Cross, James E. and Andrew Hamer (eds). 1999. *Wulfstan's Canon Law Collection* (Cambridge: Brewer).
- Duggan, Anne J. 2010. 'Roman, Canon and Common Law in Twelfth-Century England: The Council of Northampton (1164) Re-Examined', *Historical Research*, 83: 379–408.
- Elliott, Michael D. 2013. 'Canon Law Collections in England ca 600–1066: The Manuscript Evidence' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Toronto) <
https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/43550/1/Elliot_Michael_D_201311_PhD_thesis.pdf> [accessed 29 November 2018].
- Fennell, Claire (ed.). 2011. *A Middle English Statute-Book, Part I: Statuta Antiqua: Edited from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B 520*, Middle English Texts, 44 (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Fulk, R. D., and Stefan Jurasinski (eds). 2012. *The Old English Canons of Theodore*, Early English Text Society, s.s. 25 (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Finsterwalder, Paul Willem (ed.). 1929. *Die Canones Theodori Cantuariensis und ihre Überlieferungsformen* (Weimar: Böhlau).
- Franzen, Christine (ed.). 2016. 'Introduction', in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers, II: Middle English*, ed. by Christine Franzen (Abingdon: Ashgate), pp. xv-lxviii.
- Gillingham, Robert George. 1981. 'An Edition of Abbot Ælfric's Latin-Old English Glossary with Commentary' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Ohio State University).
- Goetz, Georgius (ed.). 1894. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum: a Gvstavo Loewe Incohatum, Avspiciis Academiae Litterarum Saxonicae, V: Placidvs liber glossarvm glossaria reliqva* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Gwara, Scott. 1997. 'Canterbury Affiliations of London British Library MS Royal 7 D.xxiv and Brussels Bibliothèque Royale MS 1650 (Aldhelm's *Prosa de Virginitate*)', *Romanobarbarica*, 14: 359–74.
- Gwara, Scott (ed.). 2001. *Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de Virginitate, cum Glosa Latina atque Anglosaxonica*, Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina, 124 (Turnhout: Brepols).
- Hall, Hubert (ed.). 1896. *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, 99, 3 vols (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode).
- Harmer, Florence E. 1989. *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, 2nd ed. (Stamford: Paul Watkins).

- Helmholz, R. H. 2004. *The Oxford History of the Laws of the England, I: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Helmholz, R. H. 2015. 'Canon Law and Roman Law', in *Roman Law*, ed. by David Johnston (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 396–422.
- Hessels, John Henry (ed.). 1906. *A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary: Preserved in the Library of the Leiden University (Ms. Voss. Q^o. Lat. N^o. 69)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hunt, Tony. 1991. *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, 3 vols (Woodbridge: Brewer).
- Illingworth, William (ed.). 1818. *Placita de Quo Warranto Temporibus Edw. I, II, et III in Curia Receptae Scaccarii Westm. Asservata* (London: G. Eyre and A. Strahan).
- Jolly, Karen Louise. 2012. *The Community of St. Cuthbert in the Late Tenth Century: The Chester-le-Street Additions to Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press).
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1902. *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch*, 3rd ed. (Halle: M. Niemeyer).
- Lancashire, Ian. 2006. 'Law and Early Modern English Lexicons', in *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, ed. by R. W. McConchie and others (Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project), pp. 8–23.
- Lancashire, Ian (ed.). 2018. *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (Toronto: University of Toronto Library and University of Toronto Press) <<https://leme.library.utoronto.ca>> [accessed 18 February 2019].
- Lapidge, Michael. 1986. 'The School of Theodore and Hadrian', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 15: 45–72.
- Lapidge, Michael. 1996. *Anglo-Latin Literature* (London: Hambledon Press).
- Lazzari, Loredana. 2007. 'Isidore's *Etymologiae* in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries', in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Kees Dekker, *Mediaevalia Groningana* n.s. 9 (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 63–93.
- Lazzari, Loredana. 2016. 'Isidore's *Etymologiae* and the Bilingual Antwerp-London Glossary', in *Fruits of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Kees Dekker, *Mediaevalia Groningana* n.s. 21 (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 279–302.
- Leach, Arthur F. 1911. *Educational Charters and Documents: 598 to 1909* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- Leader, Damian Riehl. 1988. *A History of the University of Cambridge, I: The University to 1546* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Lendinara, Patrizia. 1999. *Anglo-Saxon Glosses and Glossaries* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Liebermann, Felix (ed.). 1894. *Über die Leges Anglorum Saeculo XIII Ineunte Londoniis Collectae* (Halle: Max Niemeyer).
- Lindsay, Wallace Martin (ed.). 1911. *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lindsay, Wallace Martin. 1917. 'The Abtrusa Glossary and the Liber Glossarum', *Classical Quarterly*, 11: 185–200. Repr. in *Studies in Early Mediaeval Latin Glossaries*, ed. by Michael Lapidge, (Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1996), no. VII.
- Lindsay, Wallace Martin (ed.). 1921. *The Corpus, Épinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Meritt, Herbert Dean. 1945. *Old English Glosses (a Collection)* (New York: Modern Language Association of America).
- Meritt, Herbert Dean. 1961. 'Old English Glosses, Mostly Dry Point', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 60: 441–50.
- Meyer, Robert T. 1956. 'Isidorian "Glossae Collectae" in Ælfric's Vocabulary', *Traditio*, 12: 398–405.
- Middle English Dictionary*. 1952–2001. Ed. by Hans Kurath et al. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- Mommsen, Theodor (ed.). 1864. 'Notarum Laterculi', in *Grammatici Latini*, ed. by H. Keil, IV: *Probi, Donati, Servii qui feruntur De arte grammatica libri, et Notarum laterculi* (Leipzig: Teubner), pp. 265–352.
- Mommsen, Theodor and others (eds). 1908–12. *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3 vols (Berlin: Weidmann).
- O'Brien, Bruce. 2015. 'Pre-Conquest Laws and Legislators in the Twelfth Century', in *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past*, ed. by Martin Brett and David A. Woodman (Farnham: Ashgate), pp. 229–74.
- Oliphant, R. T. 1966. *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary, Edited from British Museum MS Harley 3376* (The Hague: Mouton).
- Oliver, Lisi. 2002. *The Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- Pheifer, J. D. (ed.). 1974. *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Pons-Sanz, S. M. Forthcoming. 'Aldred's Glosses to the *Notae Iuris* in Durham A.iv.19: Personal, Textual and Cultural Contexts', *English Studies*.
- [PL =] Migne, Paul (ed.). 1844–64. *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina*, ed. by Paul Migne, 217 vols (Paris).
- Porter, David W. 2011a. *The Antwerp-London Glossaries: The Latin and Latin-Old English Vocabularies from Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus 16.2 – London, British Library Add. 32246, I: Text and Indexes*, Publications of the Dictionary of Old English, 8 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies).
- Porter, David W. 2011b. 'The Antwerp-London Glossaries and the First English School Text', in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses: New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography*, ed. by Patrizia Lendinara and others, *Textes et études du Moyen Âge*, 54 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 153–77.
- Porter, David W. 2014. 'Isidore's *Etymologiae* at the School of Canterbury', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 43: 7–44.
- Porter, David W. 2019. 'Legal Terminology in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries', in *Languages of the Law in Early England: Essays in Memory of Lisi Oliver*, ed. by Stefan Jurasinski and Andrew Rabin, *Medievalia Groningana n.s.*, 22 (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 211–22.
- Rastell, John. 1523-24. *Exposiciones terminorum legum Anglorum* (London: John Rastell).
- Rathbone, Eleanor. 1967. 'Roman Law in the Anglo-Norman Realm', in *Collectanea Stephan Kuttner*, ed. by J. Forchielli and A. M. Stickler, *Studia Gratiana post Octava Decreti Saecularia*, 11-14, 4 vols (Bologna: Institutum Gratianum), I, 253–71.
- Riché, Pierre. 1976. *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press).
- Rusche, Philip Guthrie. 1996. 'The Cleopatra Glossaries: An Edition with Commentary on the Glosses and their Sources' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University).
- Rusche, Philip. 2005. 'Isidore's *Etymologiae* and the Canterbury Aldhelm Scholia', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 104: 437–55.
- Senior, W. 1931. 'Roman Law MSS. in England', *Law Quarterly Review*, 47: 337–44.
- Skemer, Don C. 1998. '*Expositio Vocabulorum*: A Medieval English Glossary as Archival Aid', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 19: 63–75.
- Stubbs, William (ed.). 1868-71. *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, 51, 4 vols (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.).
- Turner, Ralph V. 1975. 'Roman Law in England before the Time of Bracton', *Journal of British Studies*, 15: 1–25.

- Vincent, Nicholas. 2015. 'The Use and Abuse of Anglo-Saxon Charters by the Kings of England, 1100–1300', in *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past*, ed. by Martin Brett and David A. Woodman (Farnham: Ashgate), pp. 191–227.
- Way, Albert (ed.). 1843-65. *Promptorium parvulorum sive clericorum: Lexicon anglo-latinum princeps*, Camden Society o.s., 25, 54, 89 (London: Camden Society).
- Wendelstein, J. 'Cochlaeus' (ed.). 1525. *Canones apostolorum. Veterum conciliorum constitutiones. Decreta pontificum antiquiora. De primatu Romanae ecclesiae* (Mainz)
- Winkler, John Frederick. 1992. 'Roman Law in Anglo-Saxon England', *Journal of Legal History*, 13: 101–27.
- Wormald, Patrick. 1999. *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, I: *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- [WW=] Wright, Thomas, and Richard Paul Wülcker. 1884. *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, 2nd ed., 2 vols (London: Trübner; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968).
- Zupitza, Julius and Helmut Gneuss. 2003. *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar: Text und Varianten*. 4th, unchanged repr. of the 1st ed. (Berlin, 1880), with a new preface by Helmut Gneuss (Hildesheim: Weidmann).