

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/136682/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Pons-Sanz, Sara 2021. Aldred's glosses to the notae iuris in Durham A.iv.19: personal, textual and cultural contexts. *English Studies* 102 (1) , pp. 1-29. 10.1080/0013838X.2020.1866305

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2020.1866305>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



This paper has been accepted for publication in *English Studies*.

Aldred's glosses to the *notae iuris* in Durham A.iv.19: Personal, textual and cultural contexts

Dr Sara M. Pons-Sanz, Cardiff University

Abstract: This paper discusses Aldred's glosses to the expanded forms of a series of abbreviations (or *notae*) of (Roman) legal terms included on fols 85r–86r of Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.iv.19. By taking a novel approach to Aldred's work and focusing on what his glossing practices can tell us about his scholarly interests rather than his taste for morphological and semantic structures, this paper shows that, unlike other glossators working south of the Humber, Aldred did not have an interest in the study of (Roman) legal matters and therefore his work should not be aligned with that of Southumbrian scholars, as has been the case in the past. Nonetheless, his work is still very important for our understanding of legal studies in Anglo-Saxon England: while the Southumbrian materials are dominated by Isidore's *Etymologies*, Aldred's list provides an insight into other sources available to pursue this field of study in Anglo-Saxon England.

Keywords: glosses, Aldred, legal vocabulary, Anglo-Saxon England, Northumbria, Roman law

Acknowledgements: I am very thankful to Kees Dekker, Julia Fernández Cuesta, Karen Jolly and the anonymous readers for their suggestions and advice on previous drafts of this paper. Needless to say, any remaining shortcomings are my own. I am also very thankful to the Spanish Agency for Research (grant no. FFI2017-88725-P) for their financial support.

Introduction

During the tenth century, Aldred, a member of the community of St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street, added glosses to and colophons for the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero D.iv) and the so-called Durham Collectar or Durham Ritual (Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.iv.19; hereafter Durham A.iv.19).¹ These texts are fundamental for our understanding of a wide range of key linguistic, cultural and historical issues.

Accordingly, they have been the focus of renewed scholarly interest in recent years, particularly in terms of the following aspects:

(1) Their linguistic features: Aldred's texts are written in Late Old Northumbrian, a dialect of Old English which has traditionally been overshadowed by the better-attested late West Saxon. This variety is very important for our understanding of linguistic diversity during the Old English period and the history of the English language more generally, because it exhibits many features more commonly associated with the Middle English period, such as syncretism in nominal morphology, the typically northern ending *-s* for the 3rd person singular and plural present indicative and plural imperative, and the presence of non-technical Norse-derived terms.

(2) Aldred's historical, cultural and religious milieu: attention here has centred around the Latin texts of the Gospels to which he had access, his education and possible connections with the Benedictine Reform, the scholarly context that might have enabled glossators to

¹ His hand has also been identified in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819, where he added sporadic Latin glosses to Bede's commentary on Proverbs. Neither 'Collectar' nor 'Ritual' are fully appropriate terms to describe the whole of Durham A.iv.19 (see below); accordingly, I follow Karen Jolly, *Community*, in referring to this manuscript by its classmark instead.

have access to each other's work or very similar sources (especially with regard to the close interaction between Aldred's glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and those added by Owun and, to a lesser extent, Farman to the Rushworth or MacRegol's Gospels, viz. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D.2.19) and the strategic role of the community of St Cuthbert in fostering Northumbria's political links with southern kings.

The Aldredian texts have also been analysed in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the man behind the work, something that cannot be easily done for many Anglo-Saxon authors because most Old English texts are anonymous. Attention in this respect has centred on:

(1) the factors that might account for the clear morphosyntactic and lexical differences between the Lindisfarne glosses and those which he added, possibly around 20 years later,² to

² The dating of the two sets of glosses relies on the information that Aldred provides in the two colophons: in the colophon to the Lindisfarne Gospels (fol. 259r) he identifies himself as a *presbyter*, a term commonly translated as 'priest', while in the colophon to Durham A.iv.19 (fol. 84r) he tells us that he is a *profast* 'provost' and that he has copied four prayers in honour of St Cuthbert on "Wednesday, Lawrence's Feast Day (the moon being five nights old), before Tierce", i.e. Wednesday 10th of August. This makes 970 the most likely year for his work on (at least this part of) Durham A.iv.19. If one allows for a number of years for him to progress up the community's ranks, ca. 950 seems an appropriate date for the composition of the Lindisfarne gloss (see Ross, Stanley and Brown, 26–32; and Jolly, *Community*, 1–2). See, however, Roberts, 48–51, for an argument in favour of understanding *presbyter* as a higher rank than 'priest', perhaps 'dean', which would suggest that there does not need to be such a large chronological gap between the two glosses. On these titles, see further Tinti, 67–73, with references.

Durham A.iv.19, such as the possibilities that he might have relied on a number of sources when writing his glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (and hence it is difficult to see there his actual idiolect) or that his language in Durham A.iv.19 might have been the result of a conscious effort to accommodate to West Saxon linguistic practices;

(2) Aldred's personal interests and working methods, with special attention to his determination, bordering on obsession, to capture the morphosyntactic structure and semantic nuances of the Latin lemmata.³

The work presented in this article strides the two aspects (contextual and personal) outlined above. It discusses Aldred's glosses to the expanded forms of a series of abbreviations (or *notae*) of (Roman) legal terms, included amongst a longer list of Latin abbreviations that he copied, expanded and glossed on fols 85r–86r of Durham A.iv.19. Thus, this paper is first and foremost concerned with his personal interests and glossing methods, and what they can tell us about other aspects of his work. As noted above, Aldred is often described as someone who was highly interested in vocabulary, in terms of morphology and semantic structures, the latter from both a semasiological (i.e. the semantic range of existing words) and an onomasiological perspective (the structure of lexico-semantic fields, mainly in relation to near-synonymy).⁴ However, there has not been much research into his glossing of

³ The publication of three collections of essays on Aldred's work, particularly the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and their context, in quite close proximity is a testament to renewed interest in these texts: Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, Gameson and van Gelderen. The articles in these collections cover all the issues mentioned above (see also their references).

⁴ For a recent investigation of Aldred's attempts to mirror the morphological structure of the Latin lemmata in his glosses, which often results in loan-translations not attested elsewhere,

specific lexico-semantic fields and what this can tell us about his scholarly interests. For example, Pons-Sanz (2018) is the only other study which analyses his engagement with legal terms. It explores Aldred's handling of the Latin legal technoelect in John's Gospel, which shows a much clearer focus on legal issues than the synoptic Gospels. The paper concludes that Aldred does not appear to have been particularly concerned about using contemporary Old English legal terms, preferring instead to render the legal Latin lemmata with words that are more common in religious contexts. For instance, John places much emphasis on the provision of testimony as an important component of the lawsuit motif that dominates the Gospel, in terms of both the worldly trial that Jesus faces and a cosmic trial involving God (through his son) and the world. Notably, Robert Maccini notes that his Gospel "contains roughly 41 percent (47 out of 114) of the New Testament occurrences of *μαρτυρέω* ['to bear witness, give evidence'] and *μαρτυρία* ['testimony, witness']"⁵ Aldred's preferred gloss for *testimonium* is OE *cȳþnes*, a term commonly used in religious texts (e.g. the Psalms) to render the Latin noun, and only very occasionally does he use OE *witnes*, either in a double gloss with OE *cȳþnes* (John 1:7, 3:11, 3:32, 3:33) or in an incomplete gloss (John 8:17).⁶ By contrast, the near-contemporary translation of the Gospel in the so-called Old English or West Saxon Gospels records OE (*ge*)*witnes*, the noun that is commonly found in Old English

see Sauer and Schwan. Aldred's multiple glosses are key in his exploration of the semantic structure of the Old English vocabulary; see Pons-Sanz, 'Study'.

⁵ Maccini, 59–60.

⁶ Cp. the *Dictionary of Old English*, hereafter *DOE*, s.v. *cȳþnes*. The meanings of Old English terms starting in *a* to *i* mentioned in this paper follow the *DOE*; the meanings of other Old English terms follow Clark Hall.

legal texts, as the preferred option and OE *cȳþnes* is only chosen in John 3:11, 3:32 and 3:33.⁷ Nonetheless, given that the legal lemmata are included in a religious text, one could argue that Aldred's lexical choices are mainly dictated by generic conventions and therefore cannot tell us much about his other interests. Thus, analysing his rendering of legal lemmata in a non-religious context is a necessary step in any attempt to establish Aldred's possible desire to explore the correlations between the Old English and Latin legal terms as part of his wider scholarly concerns.

The discussion in this paper also engages with current work on Aldred's broader cultural and educational context, particularly in relation to the study of Roman legal terminology in early medieval England and the Anglo-Saxons' attempts to make sense of it. Even though its use and study had quickly declined after the fall of the Western Roman Empire centuries earlier, this legal system was still relevant: some of its tenets were adopted into Anglo-Saxon legislation; Roman law lay at the roots of canon law (the legal system followed by the Christian church); and some Anglo-Saxon and most continental legal texts were written in Latin and hence, at the very least, some familiarity with the Latin legal technoelect was necessary for those writing and using the texts.⁸ For instance, terms such as *heres* 'heir',

⁷ For an edition of Aldred's gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels, see Skeat; for an edition of the Old English Gospels, see Liuzza.

⁸ On the significance of Roman Law in Anglo-Saxon England, see Winkler. On the knowledge and use of canon law, see Helmholz, *Oxford*; and Elliott. On their interaction, see Helmholz, 'Canon'. On the place of Roman law in early medieval studies, see Riché; and Brundage, ch. 2. On the significance of legal documents written in Latin for our understanding of the Latin culture in Anglo-Saxon England (particularly in the tenth century), see Lapidge, 'Present', 54–6.

hereditas ‘inheritance’ or members of the *L manumittere* ‘to free a slave’ word field are not uncommon in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman legal documents.⁹

In spite of the benefits associated with the study of Aldred’s work on the list of abbreviations that concerns us here, this part of his corpus has not received much scholarly attention. For instance, because it is not a typical example of either a class glossary or an encyclopaedic note, Kees Dekker does not mention the list in his studies of Aldred’s encyclopaedic interests,¹⁰ and only devotes a few lines to it in his discussion on the relationships between those two genres.¹¹ Similarly, this text is the focus of less than four pages in Jolly’s excellent monograph on Aldred’s work on Durham A.iv.19.¹² This paper hopes to redress the current situation and show the significance of the list in connection with the various aspects outlined above. Before the spotlight falls directly on Aldred’s glosses, the next section introduces the list in its manuscript context and in relation to legal studies in Anglo-Saxon England, two issues of key importance to understand Aldred’s work.

Aldred’s *notae iuris*: manuscript and cultural contexts

Durham A.iv.19 is a composite manuscript. It started life as an early tenth-century Southumbrian compilation of texts related to the daily life of a religious community: Latin collects and chapters for the mass of the daily office, prayers, chants, readings, as well as

⁹ See, for instance, the entries for these terms in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, hereafter *DMLBS*. I use *word field* in this paper to refer to the group of words that share the same root, including simplexes as well as complexes (derivatives and compounds).

¹⁰ Dekker, ‘Aldred’s’; and id., ‘Vernacularization’.

¹¹ Dekker, ‘Glosses’, 190.

¹² Jolly, *Community*, 175–8.

blessings and rituals used for pastoral care (hence the names ‘collectar’ and ‘ritual’). Eight quires of this stratum survive (fols 1–69r); however, more than twenty folios, including the original first quire, are missing.¹³ Once the manuscript had made its way to Chester-le-Street, it received three additional quires, which seem to have had an independent existence for some time. Indeed, in the colophon Aldred only refers to some of the additions that he made to the last quire, no. XI (see above, note 2), which might suggest that, when he added the colophon, he did not have at hand the whole manuscript as it now stands. The materials added to quire XI up to the colophon (fols 77r–84r) are in keeping with those included in the original collection (i.e. daily office materials and rituals for pastoral care), while those added after the colophon have a diverse character, which has led scholars to hypothesise a change in function: from a collectar to “a sort of reference book for the community”.¹⁴ Besides the list of abbreviations that is the focus of this paper, Aldred’s ‘micropedia’, a term coined by Kees Dekker,¹⁵ includes texts on origins (e.g. the eight pounds of material Adam was made of, the origins of hot and cold breath and the origin of the wind from the *seraphim*), interpretations of names and words (e.g. an alphabet of words, eleven Roman imperial offices, terms for ‘king’ in various languages, and ecclesiastical offices and feasts) and other topics, such as the

¹³ This part of the manuscript is edited by Corrêa.

¹⁴ Corrêa, 79–80. Lindelöf edits the whole manuscript, including the Old English gloss. For a facsimile edition, see T. J. Brown. The additions to the original collectar have most recently been edited by Jolly, *Community*, 231–357, and this is the edition followed in this paper; references to the rest of the manuscript follow Lindelöf’s edition (in both cases, by page and line number). The manuscript is also available online:

<https://n2t.durham.ac.uk/ark:/32150/t2m0p096691f.html>.

¹⁵ Dekker, “Anglo-Saxon”.

burial places of the disciples and the evangelists.¹⁶ In addition to new Latin texts, Aldred added word-by-word glosses to the original and additional texts, a task that Dekker associates with the possible change in function of the manuscript.¹⁷ The latter might be closely related to an attempt to vernacularize its materials and make them fully at home in a Northumbrian context.¹⁸

In relation to similar compilations, Dekker explains that

[a]lthough it might be surmised that encyclopaedic notes were linked to the intellectual and possibly didactic processes at work in early medieval monastic and educational environments, the precise reason for their production, transmission and wide dissemination is not entirely clear, and leaves us with many questions about who compiled such notes, why they were copied, why they were worth copying, and what their purpose was.¹⁹

Most of these questions are relevant to Aldred's work. There is no clear direct source for most of his texts. Variations in style and abbreviations suggest that Aldred himself might have put the collection together from several exemplars,²⁰ although his reasons for doing so (and for adding a gloss to these texts) are unclear. An intrinsic "taste for encyclopaedic

¹⁶ On the make-up of the manuscript and its historical context, see further Jolly, *Community*; and id., "Process", 373–5. On the Northumbrian religious additions, see Jolly "Prayers"; and id., "Process". On the educational additions, see Jolly, *Community*, ch. 5; Dekker, "Aldred's"; and id., "Vernacularization", 68–75.

¹⁷ Dekker, "Vernacularization", 71.

¹⁸ Cp. Jolly, "Prayers".

¹⁹ Dekker, "Vernacularization", 66.

²⁰ Cp. Jolly, *Community*, 175.

knowledge”, as suggested by Dekker,²¹ might provide some explanation. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183, a manuscript that is said to have been given by King Athelstan to the community of St Cuthbert at some point between 934 and 939, might have inspired him, as it includes a group of encyclopaedic notes in between Bede’s prose and verse lives of St Cuthbert.²² Even if that is the case, this is probably not the full story.²³ In fact, Jolly proposes that the common feature uniting the educational texts and their glosses is an

interest in the insights to be gained from multiple languages translated into the Anglo-Saxon vernacular. [...] Aldred may have seen himself adding value to the three sacred languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin by a fourth language to complete them, Old English. The vernacular offered not just literal comprehension but added interpretive breadth to bring about greater devotional understanding in the heart.²⁴

Thus, Aldred’s linguistic interests are brought again to the forefront of his work.

The list of abbreviations that concerns us here is introduced as follows: *hae sunt notas predistinatas* ‘these are predetermined notations’. It comprises abbreviations for approximately 230 Latin terms and grammatical endings that one could find in a legal

²¹ Dekker, “Aldred’s”, 583.

²² On this manuscript, see Keynes, 180–5; on its intellectual and educational context, see Gretsche, 352–9. These notes were copied by the main scribe, and, thus, were part of the original manuscript. See Rollason for a suggestion that this was not one of the manuscripts donated by Athelstan; in his view, this manuscript only made its way to Durham after the Norman Conquest.

²³ See Dekker, “Vernacularization”, 70; and Jolly, *Community*, 173.

²⁴ Jolly, *Community*, 175.

document (hence the common denomination *notae iuris*),²⁵ including words belonging to the legal technolact itself (see below, Table 1), eleven ecclesiastical terms,²⁶ common words, both lexical and functional (e.g. 329.2 *a~p : aput : æt* ‘near’; 329.2: *a~ : aut : oðða* ‘or’; 329.3: *at~ : autem : wvt*;²⁷ cp. OE *witodlice* ‘certainly’; 336.16: *st~ : sunt : sindon* ‘they are’), and common grammatical abbreviations (e.g. 337.23: *t' : tur : bið*, where the form of OE *bēon* ‘to be’ indicates that L *-tur* is a common 3rd person singular (medio)passive ending). As these examples show, Aldred expanded the abbreviations and glossed them.

This list could be said to be one of the texts with a clearer educational function amongst the other additions in the second part of quire XI, for the study of common Latin abbreviations, including those of a legal character, was an important part of classical and early medieval education.²⁸ Isidore of Seville mentions the significance of legal abbreviations in his *Etymologies* (I.xxiii):

In books of law certain letters stand for words; in this way the writing becomes quicker and shorter. So, for instance, *bonum factum* (‘good deed’) would be written as **BF**, *senatus consultum* (‘senate decree’) as **SC**, *respublica* (‘republic’) as **RP**, *populus*

²⁵ On the various types of abbreviations that one could find in Latin texts, see Lindsay, *Notae*; on the *notae iuris* and their varied nature, see his ch. 3.

²⁶ These terms are L *affectus* ‘state or disposition of mind, mood’, *beatus* ‘blessed, happy’, *egressus* ‘digression’, *lapis* ‘stone’, *lapsus* ‘fault, error’, *omnipotens* ‘omnipotent’, *salus* ‘salvation; health’, *spes* ‘hope’, *zabulus* ‘devil’, *zelus* ‘jealousy; zeal’ and *zelotes* ‘one that is jealous’. See further Stelten; and, specifically on the last three words, which are not recorded in the *Notae Lindenbrogianiae* (see below), Jolly, *Community*, 176, notes 95–6.

²⁷ A straight apostrophe here and elsewhere in the paper reproduces a suspension mark.

²⁸ Riché, 242.

Romanus ('Roman people') as **PR**, *dumtaxat* ('at least') as **DT**, *mulier* ('woman') by the upside-down letter **M**, *pupillus* ('male orphan') by a regular **P**, *pupilla* ('female orphan') by a **P** with the top reversed, *caput* ('head') by a single **K**, *calumniae causa* ('case of false accusation') by two joined **KK**, *iudex esto* ('let the judge be present') by **IE**, *dolum malum* ('grievous fraud') by **DM**. We find very many similar signs of this type in ancient books. Recent emperors have ordained that these legal signs be abolished from codes of law, because shrewd people were cleverly deceiving many ignorant people by means of these signs. So the emperors ordered that full words should be used to write the laws, so that they would cause no errors or ambiguities, but would clearly show what must be obeyed and what must be avoided.²⁹

In spite of the ban that Isidore mentions, these abbreviations continued to be used and studied, as suggested by the survival of various late antique and early medieval lists, many of which were edited by Theodor Mommsen.

Legal studies in general, beyond the mere acquisition of common abbreviations, also seem to have been an important part of the curriculum in (some) Anglo-Saxon schools since the first school we know of, i.e. the establishment of Archbishop Theodore and Bishop Hadrian in seventh-century Canterbury. We know that, besides canon law, the study of Roman law was also significant in the school. This is explicitly stated by Aldhelm, one of its most famous students, in a letter to Bishop Haeddi (ca. 680),³⁰ and it is also implicitly suggested by the glossaries which are directly or ultimately associated with the school. The glossaries show that Isidore's *Etymologies* (particularly Books V and IX) was the key textbook for the study

²⁹ Barney et al., 51–2. For the original Latin text, see Lindsay, *Isidori*.

³⁰ See Leach, 8–9, for an edition of the letter.

Roman law in Anglo-Saxon England.³¹ This is perhaps most clearly reflected by the list of approximately eighty legal lemmata included in the bilingual class glossary that is part of the collection known as the Antwerp-London Glossary (Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, M 16. 2 + London, British Library, MS Add. 32246; from eleventh-century Abingdon).³² The legal terms are misplaced in the midst of a list of people's occupations and sicknesses ('nomina omnium hominum communiter'; nos 277–359), yet they still show to a great extent the Isidorian textual structure. This glossary and the related lists of legal terms that we find in the alphabetised glossaries known as the First Cleopatra Glossary (London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra A. iii; from eleventh-century Canterbury) and the Harley Glossary (London, British Library, MS Harley 3376; probably from late-tenth or eleventh-century Worcestershire) are a testament to the interest in Roman legal terminology amongst various circles in late Anglo-Saxon England.³³

³¹ For a list of manuscripts written or owned in England before 1100 which include (fragments of) Isidore's *Etymologies*, see Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon*, 916. It has, however, been suggested that an epitome, rather than a copy of the whole work, lies at the core of the Isidorian entries in the glossaries; see Lapidge, "Isidorian", and Porter, "Isidore's".

³² For an edition, see Porter, *Antwerp-London*.

³³ For an edition of the three Cleopatra glossaries, see Rusche, "Cleopatra". For an edition of the Harley Glossary, see Oliphant. This glossary incorporates entries shared with the other glossaries associated with the Canterbury school, particularly the Corpus Glossary (see below, note 73), as well as entries not attested elsewhere and, hence, probably borrowed directly from the *Etymologies* rather than from the glossarial tradition; see Cooke. On the

It might be the case that Aldred’s list is also somehow linked to Isidore’s encyclopaedic work. Two manuscript fragments of possible Northumbrian origin (Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, fragm. K15: 017 and K19: Z8/7b; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 4871, fols 161–8) might provide material evidence that the *Etymologies* were known in Northumbria from the eighth century.³⁴ Furthermore, some influence by Isidore’s *Etymologies* on Aldred’s work itself might be suggested, for instance, by the facts that many of the legal terms included in the list are explicitly discussed by Isidore (see below Table 1) and that isolated explanations could be said to have an Isidorian ring. Two of Aldred’s glosses are particularly striking in this respect. He seems to have interpreted *kalendas* as ‘a day of worship’ in 333.9 because he renders it with *begeongenise* (OE *begannes* ‘observance, celebration’),³⁵ and this interpretation finds interesting *comparanda* in *kalende* : *begannes* (no. 915 in the Second Cleopatra Glossary) and *Etymologies* V.xxxiii.12–13:

Moreover, the Romans established the Kalends, Nones, and Ides with reference to festival days, or with reference to the offices of their magistrates, for on those days there would be an assembly in the cities. Some people think that the Kalends (i.e. the first day of the month) were named after ‘to worship’ (*colere*), for among the ancients the beginnings of every month were worshipped, just as among the Hebrews.³⁶

evidence that glossaries provide for legal studies in Anglo-Saxon England, see Pons-Sanz, “Legal Glossaries”.

³⁴ See Gameson, “Northumbrian”, 78 and 81; Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon*, nos 821 and 885; and Lazzari, “Anglo-Saxon”, 66.

³⁵ See the *DOE*, s.v. *begannes*, sense a.

³⁶ Barney et al., 128.

Notably, Aldred's and the Cleopatra glosses are the only extant contexts in the Old English corpus where *L kalendas* is rendered by members of the OE *begān* 'to practise, perform; worship, revere' word field, a more common interpretamentum for the Latin lemma being OE *clipung* 'invocation, appellation'.³⁷ The equivalent gloss in the Antwerp-London class glossary brings both interpretations together: *kalendas : uocationes, geheald dagas t halige dagas* (no. 2549).

Aldred's glossing of *priiilegium* with *synduræ* (cp. OE *synderæ* 'special / private law' and *synder* 'singular, separate, private') is also relevant to the possible influence of Isidore's work. The Latin term was borrowed into Old English to refer to a 'special honour or particular freedom' and the text that recorded it.³⁸ We see this meaning reflected in the fact that the term is rendered by OE *weorþmynd* 'honour' in various glosses to Aldhelm's works (cp. *priiilegium : honorem* in the Third Cleopatra Glossary, no. 726).³⁹ However, Isidore makes explicit in his explanation that, in the Roman legal system, it referred to a special type of law, dealing with private matters: "Private statutes are the laws of individuals, private laws (*privatae leges*) as it were. It is called a 'private statute' (*privilegium*) because it is applied in private use (*privatus*)" (*Etymologies*, V.xviii).⁴⁰ This is the meaning that we see both in

³⁷ See, for instance, the following explanation in Ælfric's *Grammar*: "*circiter kalendas wið ðam monðe kalendae synd clypunga, forðan ðe ða ealdan men clypodon symle on niwum monan*" (Zupitza, 270.15–17).

³⁸ See Harmer, 129–30 and 432; cp. the *DMLBS*, s.v. *privilegium*, senses 1 and 2.

³⁹ For the relevant Old English glosses to Aldhelm's works, see Goossens, nos 4686 and 5270; and Napier, nos 4805 and 5394. On the close connection between the Third Cleopatra Glossary and Aldhelm's works, see Rusche, "Cleopatra", ch. 3.

⁴⁰ Barney et al., 119.

Aldred's gloss and in the gloss that the term receives in the Corpus Glossary (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 144), one of the early glossaries closely linked to the Canterbury school: *priuilegium : lex priuata l propria praesumptio* (no. P575).⁴¹

While some interpretamenta can be used to associate the list with the *Etymologies*, we cannot establish a direct relationship between them. For instance, not all the terms included in the list are discussed or even mentioned in the *Etymologies* (see below, Table 1). Jolly explains that, while no exact exemplar for Aldred's list has been found, the eighth-century continental list known as *Notae Lindenbrogianiae* (on the basis that it was recorded by the German jurist and philologist Friedrich Lindenbrog) provides an interesting *comparandum*.⁴² Nonetheless, this is unlikely to be the list followed by Aldred, as suggested by a number of factors: the abbreviations do not always correspond, the entries do not appear in exactly the same order, and Lindenbrog's list does not include all the terms copied by Aldred (cp. above, note 26; and below, Table 1). Notably, Lindenbrog's list has significant overlap with a list said to have been compiled by Magnus, a ninth-century bishop of Sens (Mommsen's *Notae Magnonianiae*), probably on the basis of an original from Rome or Africa dating back to the fourth or fifth century.⁴³ As it is the case with Aldred's and Lindenbrog's lists, Magnus's and Lindenbrog's do not fully coincide with regard to the terms included or their order. This hints at the existence of a common list that was reshaped and expanded in later recensions as necessary.⁴⁴

⁴¹ For an edition of this glossary, see Lindsay, *Corpus*.

⁴² Jolly, *Community*, 176.

⁴³ Mommsen, 285–8.

⁴⁴ Cp. Cordoñer.

Table 1 presents a comparison between Aldred’s legal terms, and those included amongst the *Notae Lindenbrogianaie* and in Isidore’s encyclopaedic work. Various decisions have been made when compiling this table:

(1) Given the difficulties involved in drawing a line between legal and non-legal terms, the list presented below includes only the lexemes and phrases in Adolf Berger’s dictionary, a well-established source for the study of Roman legal terminology. Berger’s explanations are the basis for the legal meaning(s) provided for each lexeme / phrase. When either the same lexeme or a homonym also has a more general, non-legal meaning, this meaning is given first in italics, on the basis of Charlton Lewis and Charles Short’s definitions.

(2) Although the study of the different *notae* themselves is an important part of classical and medieval palaeography, they have been left out because the focus of this paper lies instead on Aldred’s lexical decisions; those interested in the disparities between the *notae* in the two lists can consult their editions directly.

(3) When the term included in the *Notae Lindenbrogianaie* represents the same lexeme as Aldred’s but in a different grammatical form, the actual form in the *Notae Lindenbrogianaie* is given in brackets; -- indicates that no equivalent lexeme can be found.

(4) References to Isidore’s work in **bold** indicate that the lexeme is explicitly discussed in terms of its legal meaning or its use in a legal context, while references in *italics* indicate that the lexeme is discussed in terms of its general meaning, without any clear legal connections; ‘throughout’ indicates that the lexeme appears throughout the text but it is not explicitly explained; -- indicates that the lexeme is not recorded in the text. The reason to single out words that receive an explanation is that these are likely to have been perceived as key words and, hence, words that would have often been abbreviated.

Latin term	Aldred’s <i>notae iuris</i>	Aldred’s gloss	<i>Notae Lindenbrogianaie</i>	Isidore’s <i>Etymologies</i>
------------	--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

	(Jolly, <i>Community</i>)		(Mommsen) ⁴⁵	(Lindsay, <i>Isidori</i>)
<i>auctio</i> (cp. L <i>auctio</i> 'increase; public sale by auction')	329.3–4	<i>ecnung</i> (cp. OE <i>ēacnung</i> 'increase, addition; conception; childbirth')	--	--
<i>actionem</i> (cp. L <i>actio</i> 'action, <i>act</i> ; action of a plaintiff by which he initiates a suit; the whole proceedings')	329.4	<i>gescir l</i> (cp. OE <i>gescīr</i> 'office, appointment; charge; authority')	288.A5	throughout (e.g. V.xxv)
<i>augustus</i> (cp. L <i>augustus</i> 'majestic, venerable'; <i>Augustus</i> 'honorary title conferred to the first Roman emperor')	330.5–6	<i>caser</i> (cp. OE <i>cāsere</i> '(Roman) emperor')	(cp. 288.A22: <i>Augusti</i>)	IX.iii.14–16
<i>augusti</i> (cp. L <i>augustus</i> ; <i>Augusti</i> 'two emperors, each being simultaneously head of the state'; cp. <i>Augustus</i>)	330.6	<i>caseres</i> (cp. OE <i>cāsere</i>)	288.A22	IX.iii.14–16
<i>amplius</i> (cp. L <i>amplius</i> 'further'; often used to refer to the need for further investigation, viz. L <i>ampliatio</i>)	330.7–8	<i>f̆ðor</i> (cp. OE <i>furþor</i> 'further')	--	throughout (e.g. <i>III.xlix</i>)
<i>brevis</i>	330.8	<i>scort</i>	-- ⁴⁶	-- ⁴⁷

⁴⁵ The edition is referred to by page number and entry number under each letter.

⁴⁶ The term is recoded in Magnus's list (Mommsen, 289.B5) and the list of *notae* included in fols 1–3 of the ninth- or tenth-century manuscript El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, T.ii.24, which is quite closely aligned with Magnus's; see Cordoñer, 123.

⁴⁷ The adjective L *brevis* is used throughout, but not the homonymous noun.

(cp. L <i>brevis</i> ‘short, little’; <i>brevis</i> ‘any kind of lists and registers used in the Roman administration of the later empire, particularly financial reports about payments (taxes) and expenditures; list of tax-debtors’)		(cp. OE <i>scort</i> ‘short, not long’)		
<i>breuem</i> (cp. L <i>brevis</i>)	330.8–9	<i>scortne</i> (cp. OE <i>scort</i>)	--	-- ⁴⁸
<i>bonorum</i> (cp. L <i>bonus</i> ‘good’; <i>bonum</i> ‘possession, valuable’)	330.11	<i>godra</i> (cp. OE <i>gōd</i> ‘good’; OE <i>gōd</i> ‘that which is good; good, property, possession’)	289.B6 (cp. 289.B7: <i>bonorum possessiones</i> and 289.B8: <i>bonorum possessio</i>)	V.xxv.4–6
<i>beneficium</i> (cp. L <i>beneficium</i> ‘favour, service; benefit; kindness; legal benefit or remedy of an exceptional character; privileges granted by the emperor to individuals’)	330.11–12	<i>velfremming</i> (cp. OE <i>wel</i> ‘well’ and <i>fremung</i> ‘advantage, profit’)	289.B11	throughout (e.g. V.xxiv.14)
<i>bellum</i> (cp. L <i>bellum</i> ‘war’, L <i>bellum indicere</i> ‘to declare war’, in discussions about who had the right to do so)	330.12	<i>gifeht</i> (cp. OE <i>gefeht</i> ‘fight, battle’)	289.B12 (<i>bellorum</i>)	XVIII.i
<i>causa cognita</i> (cp. L <i>causa</i> ‘cause, reason; trial itself, etc.’; <i>causa cognita</i> ‘a case whose circumstances have been examined’)	330.13–14	<i>intinga cuð</i> (cp. OE <i>intinga</i> ‘cause, reason, sake; charge, legal case’ and <i>cunnan</i> ‘to know’)	289.C2 and 289.C4	(XVIII.xv.2: causa)

⁴⁸ Cp. above, note 47.

<i>ciues romanus</i> (cp. L <i>civis Romanus</i> ‘Roman citizen’)	330.17	<i>portver romanisc</i> (cp. OE <i>portwer</i> ‘town-inhabitant, citizen’, <i>rōmānisc</i> ‘Roman’)	290.C13 (<i>ciuis romanus</i>)	throughout (e.g. V.xxiv.12)
<i>crinem</i> (cp. L <i>crimen</i> ‘a crime; accusation of a crime; trial following the accusation of a crime; verdict’)	330.18	<i>hehsynn</i> (cp. OE <i>hēahsynn</i> ‘grievous, serious sin’; OE <i>synn</i> ‘sin; misdeed, crime, wrong’)	--	V.xxvi.1
<i>confessus</i> (cp. L <i>confiteri</i> ‘to acknowledge, confess’; <i>confessio</i> ‘admission of liability by the defendant’)	330.19	<i>ondetende</i> (cp. OE <i>andett(i)an</i> ‘to confess’)	--	throughout (e.g. <i>VII.ix.2</i>)
<i>dotes</i> (cp. L <i>dos</i> ‘gift, endowment; quality; dowry’)	331.22	<i>geafo</i> (cp. OE <i>gyfu</i> ‘gift; dowry’)	291.D15 (<i>dotis</i>)	V.xxiv.25–6
<i>dolus</i> (cp. L <i>dolus</i> ‘device, artifice, evil intent’; <i>dolus malus</i> ‘deceit or contrivance used to deceive, defraud or cheat another’)	331.3	<i>facon is</i> (cp. OE <i>fācen</i> ‘deceit, guile, treachery’)	(cp. 291.D1 and D4: <i>dolo malo</i> ; and 291.D3: <i>dolum malum</i>)	V.xxvi.7
<i>edicti</i> (cp. L <i>edictum</i> ‘order, command; the whole edict published by the magistrate on the album where he assumed his office or a single clause thereof’)	331.4	<i>giboden'</i> (cp. OE <i>gebēodan</i> ‘to command, ordain’)	292.D5 (<i>edictum</i>), 229.D20 (<i>edicta</i>)	II.x.1, V.xiii
<i>facta</i> (cp. L <i>factum</i> ‘action by a human being; event, happening independent of human action’; it is often opposed to <i>ius</i>)	331.7	<i>awordno</i> (cp. <i>aweorþan</i> ‘to come to existence, arise’)	293.F17	V.xx

<i>facto</i> (cp. L <i>factum</i>)	331.7	<i>to doeno'</i> (cp. OE <i>dōn</i> 'to do, perform')	293.F18	V.xx
<i>fugiens</i> (cp. L <i>fugire</i> 'to flee'; <i>fugiens</i> 'defendant in a trial')	331.8	<i>fleende</i> (cp. OE <i>flēon</i> 'to flee')	--	throughout (e.g. <i>XIII.xvi.8</i>)
<i>fide commissum</i> (cp. L <i>fideicommissum</i> 'a request addressed by the testator to his heir to carry out a certain action for the benefit of a third person')	331.11– 332.12	<i>lyfe beboden</i> (cp. OE <i>lufu</i> 'love, kind action', <i>bebōdan</i> 'to command, bid, charge')	293.F16	V.xxiv.17
<i>filio iuris</i> (cp. L <i>filius sui iuris</i> 'a son who used to be under the power of his father (<i>filius familias</i>) but has become an independent legal person after his death')	332.13	<i>bearne rehtes</i> (cp. OE <i>bearn</i> 'descendant, child'; <i>riht</i> 'justice, law, legal action')	-- ⁴⁹	-- ⁵⁰
<i>forte</i> (cp. L <i>fortis</i> 'strong, powerful'; <i>forte</i> 'perchance, by accident')	332.13	<i>strongi</i> (cp. OE <i>strang</i> 'strong, powerful')	292.2	throughout (e.g. <i>VI.xix.61</i>)
<i>fundi</i> (cp. L <i>fundare</i> 'to make a foundation, found, begin'; <i>fundus</i> 'a plot of land')	332.13	<i>gesetted</i> (cp. OE <i>settan</i> 'to make, found, build; appoint, assign')	292.F4 (<i>fundum</i>)	XV.xiii.4
<i>fides</i>	332.14	<i>geleafa</i>	--	V.xxiv.17

⁴⁹ The list includes a reference to *filius familias* (*filius familiae* in 293.F20), but not to *filius sui iuris*.

⁵⁰ The phrase is not discussed but see IX.v.17–18 for an explanation about the legal emancipation of children.

(cp. L <i>fides</i> ‘trust, faith; honesty, uprightness, trustworthiness’)		(cp. OE <i>gelēafa</i> ‘belief, faith’)		
<i>filius</i> (cp. L <i>filius</i> ‘son’)	332.14	<i>svnv</i> (cp. OE <i>sunu</i> ‘son’)	--	<i>IX.v.11</i>
<i>frater</i> (cp. L <i>frater</i> ‘son of the same parents, or the same father or mother only’)	332.15	<i>broðer</i> (cp. OE <i>brōþor</i> ‘brother’)	--	<i>IX.v.5</i>
<i>gaius</i>	332.16	<i>gaius</i>	293.G3 (cp. 293.G4: <i>Gaius Seius</i>)	V.xxxix.26 ⁵¹
<i>genus</i> (cp. L <i>genus</i> ‘kind, sort, type’; often used in contrast to <i>species</i> , to refer to fungibles (one thing that can be replaced by another of the same quality))	332.18	<i>cynn</i> (cp. OE <i>cynn</i> ‘kind, sort, species’)	293.G7	II.v.3
<i>gratia</i> (cp. L <i>gratia</i> ‘favour, esteem, love, friendship; act of grace by the emperor’)	332.19	<i>gefe</i> (OE <i>gyfu</i> ‘gift; favour, clemency; thanks, gratitude’)	293.G5	<i>VI.xxix.38, VII.iii.20, X.G.113</i>
<i>gentem</i> (cp. L <i>gens</i> ‘major group of several families (really or supposedly) descending from an ancestor’)	332.20	<i>cynn</i> (OE <i>cynn</i> ‘race, nation, people’)	293.G14 (<i>gentes</i>)	<i>IX.vi.22</i>
<i>heres</i> (cp. L <i>heres</i> ‘heir’)	332.21	<i>erfeweard</i> (cp. OE <i>yrfeweard</i> ‘heir’)	294.H4	IX.v.1
<i>hereditas</i>	332.22–3	<i>erfevardise</i>	294.H10 (<i>hereditatis</i>)	V.xxv.1

⁵¹ Isidore talks about Gaius Caligula, a Roman emperor from the 1st century AD. Gaius is also the name of a well-known jurist from the 2nd century AD; his *Institutes* are amongst Isidore’s sources for Book V of his *Etymologies* (Barney et al., 15).

(cp. L <i>hereditas</i> 'inheritance')		(cp. OE <i>yrfewardes</i> 'inheritance')		
<i>institutus</i> (cp. L <i>instituire</i> 'to put in place, plant, fix, set'; <i>heres institutus</i> 'designated heir')	332.2	<i>ingesetted</i> (cp. <i>insettan</i> 'to instruct, train', cp. OE <i>settan</i>)	295.I26 (cp. 294.H8: <i>heres institutus</i>)	V.xxiv.15 (<i>heres institutus</i>)
<i>ius intigri</i> (cp. L <i>ius integrum</i> 'unimpaired legal right'; <i>restitutio in integrum</i> 'reinstatement into the former legal position')	333.3	<i>reht befvlle'</i> (cp. OE <i>riht</i> ; <i>be fullan</i> 'completely, in full')	295.I18 (<i>in integrum</i>)	-- ⁵²
<i>iuris iurandi</i> (cp. L <i>iusiurandum</i> 'oath')	333.3–4	<i>rehtes gesvorennes</i> (cp. OE <i>riht</i> ; <i>swerian</i> 'to swear')	294.I9 (<i>ius iurandum</i>)	--
<i>ius quirikum</i> (cp. L <i>ius Quiritum</i> 'ancient national law of the Romans')	333.4	<i>reht romwala</i> (cp. OE <i>riht</i> ; <i>rōmwalh</i> 'Roman')	294.I15	V.ix
<i>in iure</i> (cp. L <i>in iure</i> 'legally; before the judicial magistrate'; <i>iusiurandum in iure</i> 'oath given during a judicial trial')	333.5	<i>vnreht</i> (cp. OE <i>unriht</i> 'wrong, injustice')	294.I13	throughout (e.g. V.xxiv.26 , V.xxv.23)
<i>iudicio</i> (cp. L <i>iudicium</i> 'trial, judgement')	333.5–6	<i>dome</i> (cp. OE <i>dōm</i> 'judgement')	-- ⁵³	XVIII.xv.2
<i>interim</i> (cp. L <i>interim</i> 'meanwhile', used to refer to the time between two legally important events)	333.7	<i>ða hvile</i> (cp. OE <i>hwīl</i> 'period of time'; <i>þā hwīle</i> 'in the meantime')	-- ⁵⁴	V.xxv.33

⁵² Cp. **V.xxv.36**: *integri restitutio*.

⁵³ Included in Magnus's list (Mommsen, 295.I18).

⁵⁴ Included in Magnus's list (Mommsen, 295.I13).

<i>kapite</i> (cp. L <i>caput</i> ‘head; civil status of a person’)	333.8	<i>gefoað</i> (cp. <i>gefōn</i> ‘to grasp, seize, take’)	295.4 (<i>capite decinit</i> for <i>capite decedit</i>)	X.C.54
<i>kaduca</i> (cp. L <i>caducus</i> ‘that falls, falling, fallen’; <i>caduca</i> ‘testamentary dispositions made in favour of persons who, according to certain statutes, could not acquire under a will; inheritance which became vacant because of the incapacity of the heir or the legatee or due to other reasons’)	333.8–9	<i>ða geheno</i> (cp. OE <i>gehȳne</i> ‘liable to fall’, OE <i>gehȳnan</i> ‘to lay waste, destroy; oppress, afflict’)	295.3	V.xxv.8
<i>kalendas</i> (cp. L <i>kalendae</i> ‘first day of a month; usually the day fixed for the payment of debts and interests)	333.9	<i>begeongenise</i> (cp. OE <i>begangnes</i> ‘observance, celebration’)	295.12 (<i>kalendae</i>)	V.xxxiii.12–13
<i>karitas</i> (cp. L <i>caritas</i> ‘love, affection’; used in some legal texts as a psychological and humane element that had to be taken into consideration in some legal situations that required mild and benevolent treatment)	333.9–10	<i>lyfv</i> (cp. OE <i>lufu</i> ‘love’)	295.7 (cp. 295.8–10)	VII.iii.18, VIII.ii.6
<i>licet</i> (cp. L <i>licere</i> ‘to be permitted by law or custom’; <i>licet</i> ‘although, even if’)	333.10	<i>gidæfnað</i> (cp. OE <i>gedafenian</i> ‘to be fitting, appropriate’)	296.2	throughout (e.g. V.19)
<i>lex</i> (cp. L <i>lex</i> ‘law’)	333.11	<i>æ</i> (cp. OE <i>ǣ</i> ‘law’)	296.1	II.x.1, V.iii.2–3
<i>legem</i> (cp. L <i>lex</i>)	333.12	--	296.3	II.x.1, V.iii.2–3

<i>ludo</i> (cp. L <i>ludere</i> ‘to play (at a game)’; <i>ludus</i> ‘game, sport’; <i>ludi</i> ‘public games organised by the state or individuals to win the favour of people’)	333.13	<i>ic besvico</i> (cp. OE <i>beswīcan</i> ‘to delude, deceive; entrap’)	296.10 (<i>ludus</i>)	<i>XVIII.16.1–2</i>
<i>modo</i> (cp. L <i>modo</i> ‘almost, nearly; now’; <i>modus</i> ‘measure, limit; duty imposed in acts of liberality on the beneficiary; condition’)	333.14	<i>nu</i> (cp. OE <i>nū</i> ‘now’)	296.15	<i>IV.ii</i>
<i>manu mittit</i> (cp. L <i>manumittere</i> ‘to free a slave’)	333.14	<i>honde sendeð</i> (cp. OE <i>hand</i> ‘hand’, <i>sendan</i> ‘to send, throw, cast’)	296.11 (<i>manumitti</i>)	IX.iv.48
<i>magis</i> (cp. L <i>magis</i> ‘more’; often used to give preference to one legal opinion over another)	333.16	<i>mara</i> (cp. OE <i>māra</i> ‘more, greater’)	296.10	throughout (e.g. <i>L.xvii.7</i>)
<i>mandatis</i> (cp. L <i>mandatum</i> ‘command, order; consensual contract by which a person assumed the duty to conclude a legal transaction or perform a service for free’)	333.16	<i>bebodum</i> (cp. OE <i>bebod</i> ‘command, order; commandment’)	--	V.xxiv.20
<i>manu missa</i> (cp. L <i>manumittere</i>)	333.17	<i>honde gesendeð</i> (cp. OE <i>hand</i> ‘hand’, <i>sendan</i> ‘to send, throw, cast’)	296.12 (<i>manumissus</i>)	IX.iv.48
<i>meum</i>	333.18	<i>mīn</i> (cp. OE <i>mīn</i> ‘my, mine’)	--	-- ⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Often mentioned as a possessive pronoun (e.g. *Etymologies*, I.viii.5).

(cp. L <i>meus</i> ‘my’; <i>meum</i> ‘my property’)				
<i>mentem</i> (cp. L <i>mens</i> ‘mind, disposition; intention, volition, purpose’)	333.18	<i>ðoht</i> (cp. OE <i>þōht</i> ‘mind, thought; purpose’)	296.21	<i>X.D.79</i>
<i>manifestum</i> (cp. L <i>manifestare</i> ‘to make public, manifest’; used of imperial constitutions by which a legal rule is settled; <i>furtum manifestum</i> ‘a theft detected when being committed’)	333.19	<i>geypped</i> (cp. OE <i>yppan</i> ‘to bring out, open, manifest’)	296.9	throughout (e.g. <i>VI.xvii.16</i>)
<i>mortis tempore</i> (cp. L <i>mors</i> ‘death’, <i>tempus</i>)	333.19– 334.20	<i>deaðes tide</i> (cp. OE <i>dēap</i> ‘death’, <i>tīd</i> ‘time, period’)	296.16	(<i>VIII.xi.51</i> and <i>X.M.183: mors</i>)
<i>maximus</i> (cp. L <i>maximus</i> ‘large, great, big’; <i>optimus maximus</i> : words added in sales or legacies of immovables to indicate the legal and factual conditions of the land or building: <i>optimus</i> indicated that it was free from easements, <i>maximus</i> that it had the size stated by the seller)	334.20–1	<i>maast</i> (cp. OE <i>māest</i> ‘biggest; mostly’)	296.8 (<i>maximum</i>)	throughout (e.g. <i>I.xxvii.15</i>)
<i>mandatis</i> (cp. L <i>mandatum</i>)	334.23	<i>bebodum</i> (cp. OE <i>bebod</i>)	--	V.xxiv.18
<i>mandatvm</i> (cp. L <i>mandatum</i>)	334.23	<i>gebod</i> (cp. OE <i>gebod</i> ‘command, order; commandment’)	--	V.xxiv.18
<i>mulier</i> (cp. L <i>mulier</i> ‘(married) woman’)	334.1	<i>vif</i> (cp. OE <i>wīf</i> ‘woman; wife’)	226.4	I.xxiii.1
<i>mulierum</i> (cp. L <i>mulier</i>)	334.1–2	<i>wifmonna</i>	--	I.xxiii.1

		(cp. OE <i>wīfmann</i> 'woman')		
<i>nihil</i> (cp. L <i>nihil</i> 'nothing'; <i>nihil</i> <i>agere</i> 'to perform an act which is legally invalid')	334.5	<i>noht</i> (cp. OE <i>nāht</i> 'nothing; useless, bad, poor')	297.15	<i>X.N.185</i>
<i>obprobrium</i> (cp. L <i>opprobrium</i> 'reproach, taunt, abuse; an ignominious, disgraceful doing')	334.10	<i>scoma</i> (cp. OE <i>scamu</i> 'shame, disgrace, dishonour')	--	throughout (e.g. <i>XVI.xxi.2</i>)
<i>officium</i> (cp. L <i>officium</i> 'service; kindness, favour; moral duty originating in family relationship or friendship; duty connected with the defence of another's interests; official duties of any person employed in public service and the office of a magistrate together with his personnel')	334.10– 335.11	<i>hernise</i> (cp. OE <i>hȳrnes</i> 'hearing; obedience; duty, service')	--	throughout (e.g. V.xxxiii.12)
<i>ordinem</i> (cp. L <i>ordo</i> 'sequence, (proper) order; the order in which a group or class of successors under praetorian law are admitted to inheritance; order in which citizens are called to fulfil social services; social class or professional group'; <i>ordo iuris</i> 'rule of law')	335.11	<i>endebred'</i> (cp. OE <i>endebyrdnes</i> 'row, series; rank, order')	--	throughout (e.g. V.xxv.6)
<i>populus</i> (cp. L <i>populus</i> 'people, nation; all citizens; all men gathered together in a popular assembly')	335.15	<i>folc</i> (cp. OE <i>folc</i> 'people, nation; general populace; people entitled to participate in the administration of law')	298.13	throughout (e.g. I.xxiii.1: <i>populus</i> <i>Romanus</i>)

<i>peccunia</i> (cp. L. <i>pecunia</i> 'money; property')	335.15	<i>feh</i> (cp. OE <i>fēoh</i> 'cattle; money; property')	298.10	X.P.209
<i>possessionem</i> (cp. L <i>possessio</i> 'factual, physical control of a corporeal thing; possession')	335.17	<i>agnvng</i> (cp. OE <i>āgnung</i> 'possession, ownership')	298.21	XV.xiii.3
<i>pretorium</i> (cp. L <i>praetorium</i> 'military unit serving as bodyguards to the emperor; residence of a provincial governor'; <i>praetorius</i> 'retired praetor (highest official or magistrate)'; <i>praetorius</i> 'of or associated with the praetor, praetorian')	335.18	<i>cefertvn'</i> (cp. OE <i>cafertūn</i> 'enclosure, forecourt; entrance; palace')	--	XV.ii.29 (see also V.xxiv.6)
<i>proprio</i> (cp. L <i>proprius</i> 'belonging to a certain person as his own'; <i>proprio (suo)</i> <i>nomine</i> 'on one's own behalf')	335.18–19	<i>syndrigne</i> (cp. OE <i>syndrig</i> 'separate; private, peculiar')	--	throughout (e.g. V.v)
<i>proconsul</i> (cp. L <i>proconsul</i> 'an ex-consul whose magisterial power was prolonged and was entrusted with the administration of a province')	335.19	<i>f'e froefrend l</i> (cp. OE <i>fore</i> 'before', <i>frēfrend</i> 'one who consoles or comforts')	--	IX.iii.8
<i>priuilegium</i> (cp. L <i>privilegium</i> 'legal enactment concerning a specific person or case and involving an exemption from common rules')	335.20	<i>synduræ</i> (cp. OE <i>synderæ</i> 'special law')	--	V.xviii
<i>pater familias</i>	335.20–1	<i>feder hiwisc</i>	--	IX.v.7

(cp. L <i>pater familias</i> ‘head of a family’)		(cp. OE <i>fæder</i> ‘father’, <i>hīwisc</i> ‘household, family’)		
<i>prouincia</i> (cp. L <i>provincia</i> ‘sphere of action of a magistrate with <i>imperium</i> ; territory outside Italy assigned to a Roman magistrate; official duty, office’)	335.21	<i>mægð</i> (cp. OE <i>mægð</i> ‘family group, clan; province’)	--	XIV.v.19
<i>quęstio</i> (cp. L. <i>quaestio</i> ‘questioning, enquiry; question, issue disputed; form of criminal proceedings; type of court’)	336.8	<i>geflit</i> (cp. OE <i>geflit</i> ‘dissension, discord; argument, debate; legal dispute, lawsuit’)	298.23 (cp. 298.24: <i>quaestionem</i>)	<i>VI.viii.15</i>
<i>rem</i> (cp. L <i>res</i> ‘corporeal and incorporeal thing; entire property of a person; object of the controversy and litigation itself; physical delivery of the object of litigation to a person’)	336.10	<i>ðing</i> (cp. OE <i>þing</i> ‘thing; motive, reason; event, affair; lawsuit;’)	299.15	V.xxv.1–3
<i>rem publicam</i> (cp. L <i>res publica</i> ‘state; sum of the rights and interests of the Roman people; public property’)	336.10–11	<i>caserdom</i> (cp. OE <i>cāserdōm</i> ‘rule of the emperor’)	299.7 (cp. 299.8: <i>res publica</i>)	throughout (e.g. I.XXIII.1)
<i>recte dari</i> (cp. L <i>recte</i> ‘correctly, rightly’; <i>dare</i> ‘to give’)	336.11–12	<i>rehtelice gesealla</i> (cp. OE <i>rihtlice</i> ‘justly, properly’, <i>sellan</i> ‘to give’)	299.5 (<i>recte date</i>)	(V.xxv.3: recte)
<i>rerum</i> (cp. L <i>res</i>)	336.12	<i>ðingana</i> (cp. OE <i>þing</i>)	299.9	V.xxv.1–3
<i>rebus</i> (cp. L <i>res</i>)	336.13	<i>ðingv’</i> (cp. OE <i>þing</i>)	299.11	V.xxv.1–3
<i>res</i>	336.14	<i>aeht</i>	299.10	V.xxv.1–3

(cp. L <i>res</i>)		(cp. OE <i>æht</i> ‘possession, property’)		
<i>sufficit</i> (cp. L <i>sufficere</i> ‘to suffice’; often used of an action or another procedural remedy available to a person for putting forward his case)	336.15	<i>genog fremað</i> (cp. OE <i>genoh</i> ‘enough’, <i>fremman</i> ‘to do good, bring about benefit’)	299.9	throughout (e.g. II.xxvi.7)
<i>sors</i> (cp. L <i>sors</i> ‘lot; lot to be the plaintiff in an inheritance trial; plot of <i>ager publicus</i> assigned to a member of a colony; sum lent at interest’)	336.16	<i>gehlytte</i> (cp. L <i>gehlyta</i> rare; <i>hlēotan</i> ‘to cast lots’)	299.19	X.B.51
<i>sententia</i> (cp. L <i>sententia</i> ‘opinion, judgement, thought; final judgement in a trial given by a judge or a judicial official’)	337.20	<i>ondsvære</i> (cp. OE <i>andswaru</i> ‘answer; solution’)	299.13	II.ix.9
<i>testamentum</i> (cp. L <i>testamentum</i> ‘(Old and New) Testament; solemn act by which a testator instituted one or more heirs to succeed to his property after his death’)	337.1–2	<i>gecyðnisse</i> (cp. OE <i>(ge)cȳþnes</i> ‘testimony, witness; covenant, testament’)	330.9	V.xxiii, V.xxiv.2
<i>testamento</i> (cp. L <i>testamentum</i>)	337.2–3	<i>try(m)nisse</i> (cp. <i>trymnes</i> ‘strengthening, confirmation; exhortation, instruction’)	(cp. 330.11: <i>testamentorum</i>)	V.xxiii, V.xxiv.2
<i>tempus</i> (cp. L <i>tempus</i> ‘time, period’, often used in particular phrases, such as ‘ <i>certum tempus</i> ‘fixed day or interval of time by which certain legal acts have to be carried out’)	337.4	<i>tiid</i> (cp. OE <i>tīd</i>)	300.3 (<i>tempore</i>)	throughout (e.g. XIII.xi.20)

<i>uero</i> (cp. L <i>verus</i> ‘true, real, authentic’, <i>vero</i> ‘in truth, in fact’)	337.5–6	<i>hvoeðre</i> (cp. OE <i>hwæþere</i> ‘but, nevertheless’)	300.U6	throughout (e.g. <i>III.v.1, V.xvi</i>)
<i>uerum</i> (cp. L <i>verus</i> ; <i>verum est</i> ‘it is true, correct’, expression commonly used in juristic writings to underscore indisputable opinions or to limit a previous rule to a specific situation)	337.6	<i>soð</i> (cp. OE <i>soð</i> ‘true, genuine, real’)	--	throughout (e.g. <i>V.xxvi.9</i>)
<i>uxor</i> (cp. L <i>uxor</i> ‘wife, married woman; strictly speaking, only the wife of a Roman citizen’)	337.7	<i>gibedd</i> (cp. OE <i>gebedda</i> ‘bedfellow wife; husband’)	--	<i>IX.vii.11–12</i>
<i>utilis</i> (cp. L <i>utilis</i> ‘useful’; used of legal acts, transactions and procedural steps which have been, or can be, successfully achieved in a given situation)	337.7	<i>ðorfæst</i> (cp. OE <i>þorfæst</i> ‘useful’, <i>þearf</i> ‘needful, necessary’)	330.5	<i>X.V.274</i>
<i>existimo</i> (cp. L <i>existimare</i> ‘to assume, consider’) ⁵⁶	338.8	<i>ic gere vat</i> (cp. OE <i>gearwe</i> ‘well, clearly, for certain’, <i>witan</i> ‘to know’)	--	throughout (e.g. <i>X.S.244</i>)

Table 1: Legal terms in Aldred’s list and their equivalents in relevant *comparanda*

Aldred’s glosses to the legal terms

Aldred’s list includes an interesting combination of words (cp. Isidore’s explanation on the use of *notae iuris* quoted above). While some words / phrases have a very clear legal

⁵⁶ An erroneous belief is irrelevant from a juristic point of view.

meaning, the legal colouring of others is much less obvious because they could also be used in non-legal contexts. In fact, we could separate the words into three groups (words given in alphabetical rather than manuscript order):

1) Words which do not have a specialised legal meaning *per se* and it is only when they are used in a specific legal context (including set phrases) that the legal overtones become clear: *amplius, bellum, dolus, existimo, facta, facto, fides, filius, forte, frater, gaius, gentem, genus, institutus, interim, kalendas, karitas, magis, manifestum, maximus, mentem, mulier, mulierum, nihil, obprobrium, proprio, sufficit, tempus, uero, uerum, utilis, uxor.*

2) Words which are polysemous and can have either a general meaning or a specialised legal meaning, a trait that is particularly common of what Rupert Haigh calls ‘legal terms of art’,⁵⁷ as well as groups of homonymous words not all of which have a legal meaning: *actionem, auctio, augusti, augustus, beneficium, bonorum, breuem, breuis, confessus, dotes, edicti, fugiens, fundi, kaduca, kapite, licet, ludo, mandatis, mandatum, meum, modo, officium, ordinem, peccunia, populus, possessio, quęstio, rebus, rem, rerum, res, sententia, sors, testamento, testamentum.*

3) Words and phrases which are most clearly part of the legal technolact and are systematically used in a legal sense: *causa cognita, ciues romanus, crinem* (for *crimen*), *fide commissum, filio iuris* (probably for *filio sui iuris*), *hereditas, heres, in iure, ius intigri* (possibly for *in integrum*, part of the phrase *restitutio in integrum*), *ius quiritum, ius iurandi, legem, lex, manu missa, manu mittit, mortis tempore, pater familias, pretorium, priuilegium, proconsul, prouincia, recte dari, rem puplicam.*

⁵⁷ Haigh, 7–8.

The lexemes that Aldred chooses to render the terms in the three categories (and elsewhere in his work) share a number of trends:⁵⁸

1) Attempts to capture the morphological structure of the Latin lemma as well as the general meaning (cp. above, note 4): consider, for instance, the loan-translations *ingesetted* as the gloss for *institutus*, where we have direct correspondence between the prefixes and past participles in the two terms;⁵⁹ and *welfremming*, where OE *wel* renders L *bene* and a noun that belongs to the OE *fremman* ‘to do good, bring about, benefit’ word field renders the second part of the Latin compound, which is part of the L *facere* ‘to do, make, construct’ word field.⁶⁰ Elsewhere in Durham A.iv.19 Aldred prefers OE *welfremnes*, which simply differs from the gloss under

⁵⁸ In keeping with the aim of this paper, the discussion below focuses on the lexeme chosen to render each expanded form, not the specific grammatical form of each Old English lexeme, which does not always coincide with that of the Latin lemma: e.g. *proprio*, a masculine or neuter, dative or ablative, singular form of the adjective L *proprius* is rendered by *syndrigne*, an accusative, masculine, singular form of the adjective OE *syndrig*. Lack of grammatical correspondence between Latin and Old English forms is not uncommon in Aldred’s work (cp. Ross), although this particular example could also be associated with the trends towards accusative-dative syncretism that we find in Aldred’s work (cp. Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma).

⁵⁹ Cp. the *DOE*, s.v. *ingeseted*.

⁶⁰ Cp. *genog fremað* as the gloss for *sufficit*, where a form of OE *fremman* renders the root of the Latin verbal complex while OE *genoh* ‘enough’ helps to capture the semantics rather than the morphology of the lemma.

consideration with regard to the nominal suffix, as the gloss for L *beneficium*.⁶¹ Nonetheless, the glossaries associated with the Canterbury school show that OE *fremu* ‘act of kindness, good deed; profit advantage’ by itself would probably have been a more idiomatic choice.⁶² Interestingly, there are some cases where Aldred’s attempts to capture the morphological make-up of the Latin word lead him down erroneous paths: e.g. the fact that *vnreht* renders *in iure* suggests that Aldred interpreted L *in* not as a preposition but as a prefix used to create antonyms, while *f’e froefrend* as the gloss for *proconsul* indicates that he associated L *consul* with L *consolare* ‘to console’ rather than L *consulere* ‘to deliberate, take counsel, meet and consider’. These attempts to mirror the morphology and the etymology of the lemma are fully in keeping with the medieval belief (well exemplified by Isidore himself) that one needs to combine morphological and etymological explanations in order to capture the true meaning of a word.⁶³ Notably, though, when translating the term in the list of Roman imperial offices, Aldred approaches it from a cultural rather than an etymological / semantic and morphological perspective, trying to explain the unfamiliar office to an Anglo-Saxon audience (although, since this is Aldred we are talking about, he cannot avoid the use of yet another morphologically based loan-translation: OE *forelātteow*; cp. OE *fore* ‘before’ and *lātteow* ‘leader, guide, general’): *proconsul sub consule fuit : f’elatwa vnder herges larwv væs* (343.22–3). This gloss comes closer to other attempts that we see in the Canterbury-related glossaries,

⁶¹ See, for instance, 39.10, 41.21, 73.2 and 83.14. Outside Aldred’s works, the loan-translation OE *weldād* is preferred.

⁶² See Pheifer, no. 135, for the Old English entries in the Épinal and Erfurt Glossaries (Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 72 (2); and Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, MS Amplonianus, MS 2^o 42, respectively); and no. B.68 in the Corpus Glossary.

⁶³ Cp. Gneuss, ‘Study’, 22–5.

which capture Isidore's explanation; thus, the Antwerp-London Glossary equates L *consul* with OE *gerefa* and L *proconsul* with OE *undergerefa* on the basis of *Etymologies* IX.iii.6 and IX.iii.8.⁶⁴

2) Lack of consistency:⁶⁵ e.g. while *mulier* is rendered by OE *wīf*, the compound OE *wīfmann* is chosen as the translation for *mulierum*. Similarly, OE *þing* is Aldred's preferred interpretamentum to render L *res* (see further below), but on one occasion he opts for OE *ǣht*, which only covers one specific area of the Latin word's semantic space. The various ways used to refer to Roman citizens (*portver romanisc* vs *romwala*) further exemplify this trend, although this variation is also likely to have been caused by Aldred's interest in mirroring the morphosyntactic structure of the Latin lemma.

⁶⁴ See Porter, *Antwerp-London*, nos 128–9; and id., “Legal”, 216–7. OE *undergerefa* is similarly a loan-translation, but one that attempts to capture what the role actually entailed; cp. Lazzari, “Bilingual”. It is only attested here and in Ælfric's works, which is not surprising if we consider that Ælfric's Glossary and the Antwerp-London Glossary are likely to derive from the same source, even though Ælfric does not share the glossator's interest in Roman legal terms; see Pons-Sanz, “Legal Glossaries”. Interestingly, *f'e froefrend* is the first interpretamentum in one of the (empty) double glosses in the list: it is followed by *l* (the standard abbreviation for L *vel* ‘or’) but no alternative rendering is provided. Given Aldred's use of OE *forelātteow* to translate the same Latin term later on in the work, this context is in keeping with other empty glosses in Durham A.iv.19, where the presence of *l* seems to indicate that there are other possible interpretations and that this is a term to ponder over, as suggested by Jolly, *Community*, 177, when discussing *gescir l* as the empty double gloss for *actionem* (cp. Jolly, “Process”, 369).

⁶⁵ Cp. Pons-Sanz, “Study”, 312–3.

3) Choice of interpretamenta that reflect the meaning of the terms in religious rather than legal contexts.⁶⁶ e.g. L *fides* is rendered by OE *gelēafa* and *lufu* (in the legal phrase *fide commissum*), the terms which often translate it in religious texts,⁶⁷ while OE *trūwa* ‘fidelity, trust, belief’ and members of its word field are more common in legal contexts when the discussion involves one’s trustworthiness rather than one’s Christian belief (e.g. VI Æthelstan §10, I Æthelred §1, etc.).⁶⁸ OE *trūwa* is also the term that we find in the Harley Glossary when rendering the legal phrase: *fidei commissum* : *on treowe gelæton* (F365). Aldred’s rendering of *kalendas* (discussed above) and L *testamentum* paint a similar picture. The semantic spaces of L *testimonium* and *testamentum* overlap in that both of them could refer to a covenant, particularly God’s covenant with humanity (reflected by the Old and New Testaments). Religious texts make this overlap clear, for there OE *cȳþnes*, the term often used to refer to the

⁶⁶ Cp. Pons-Sanz, “Legal Vocabulary”. Jolly, *Community*, 178, points out that Aldred’s religious habits also come through when dealing with abbreviations that are not solely associated with the legal technoelect: *qs~* (336.5) is expanded as *quasi*, a conjunction meaning ‘as if, as though’, but, when glossing it, Aldred seems to have thought of the abbreviation in a religious context, where it often means *quaesumus* ‘we request’ (cp. Lindsay, *Notae*, 214–5), and glossed it accordingly (viz. *we biddas*) before recognising his mistake and adding the appropriate gloss for the expanded form he had actually written, viz. *svæ* (cp. OE *swā* ‘if, as if; so’).

⁶⁷ E.g. both are given as alternatives in Aldred’s gloss to Matthew 8:10 in the Lindisfarne Gospels, although Aldred tends to prefer OE *gelēafa* to render L *fides*. On Aldred’s reliance on these terms to render L *fides*, see further Jolly, “Letter”, 132–5.

⁶⁸ See Liebermann, I.182 and 216.

provision of testimony (see above), renders either term when expressing this concept.⁶⁹ OE *trymnes* as a gloss for L *testamentum* appears to have been characteristic of Aldred’s idiolect, an association probably arising from the fact that a testament is, after all, the confirmation (cp. OE *trymman* ‘to strengthen, affirm, confirm’) of one’s wishes.⁷⁰ Yet, neither OE *cȳþnes* nor OE *trymnes* captures the legal association of L *testamentum* with the process of inheritance distribution; this is precisely what the Canterbury-related glossaries highlight, preferring OE *yrfebēc* (cp. OE *yrfe* ‘inheritance’ and *bōc* ‘book’) instead (e.g. nos 290 and 325 in the Antwerp-London Glossary, and nos I.415, I.416 and O.211 in the First Cleopatra Glossary). The compound *hehsyn* as the gloss for *crinem* (read *crimen*) might provide a further example here, as the former is only used in religious contexts (Aldred’s own glosses being particularly prominent) as a reference to sins.⁷¹ However, as noted in Table 1, the simplex OE *synn* is also recorded in secular texts, including law-codes, meaning ‘crime, misdeed, wrong’.⁷²

Beyond these general trends, we also see some differences in Aldred’s responses towards the different types of words:

1) Words whose legal meaning is purely contextual: as one might expect, these words are rendered by interpretamenta without any clear association with the Old English legal technolect.

⁶⁹ See the *DOE*, s.v. *cȳþnes*, sense 2.

⁷⁰ Cp. Pons-Sanz, “Legal Vocabulary”, 581.

⁷¹ See the *DOE*, s.v. *hēahsynn*.

⁷² Aldred’s rendering of forms of L *lex* with OE *ǣ* might provide a further example of a Latin legal term being translated with an Old English word more closely associated with religious texts, but this is not as clear as with other terms; see Pons-Sanz, “Legal Vocabulary”, 575.

2) Words (and homonyms) with legal and non-legal meanings: we see here the same trend not to engage specifically with the legal meaning of the word and render the term instead in relation to its more general sense. One of the clearest examples is Aldred's glossing of *kaduca*, where he recognises the nominalised character of the term but simply emphasises the concept of falling and does not try to explain its more specialised meaning, in contrast to what we find in the Canterbury-related glossaries: *bona caduca : quibus nemo succedit* (no. B345 in the Harley Glossary),⁷³ and *intestata hereditas : ungewriten yrfe eadem et caduca* (no. I 418 in the First Cleopatra Glossary), which show familiarity with the explanation in *Etymologies*, V.xxv.8: "An inheritance is called *caduca* (i.e. property without an heir), because its heirs have died (*cadere*)".⁷⁴ The preference for non-legal interpretations can transcend lexical boundaries, as in the case of *gefoað* (imperative plural) and *ic besvico* (1st person singular present indicative) as glosses for *kapite* and *ludo*, respectively; the glosses suggest that the Latin terms are taken to be verbal (L *capere* 'to take, seize' and *ludere* 'to play') rather than nominal forms. On some occasions, though, because a polysemous Latin term is rendered by a similarly polysemous Old English word, the latter can also be used with a legal sense: e.g. the rendering of *confessus* with *ondeten*, *dotes* with *geafo*,⁷⁵ various forms

⁷³ This is one of the cases in which the Harley Glossary does not simply follow the Corpus Glossary (see above, note 33), where an equivalent entry, capturing the more general sense of the term, reads as follows: cp. *bona caduca : facultates quae non habent firmitatem* (B.217).

⁷⁴ Barney et al., 121.

⁷⁵ Notably, in other glossaries OE *gyfu* / *gifu* receives some premodification in order to account for the more specific meaning of L *dos* as 'dowry': e.g. OE *morgengyfu* in the Antwerp-London Glossary, no. 333; and the possible compound *weddygyfu* in the Harley Glossary, no. D799 (see the *DOE*, s.v. *gyfu*, *gifu*, sense A.3.a.iv).

of L *mandatum* with OE *gebod*, *officium* with OE *hernise*, *peccunia* with *feh*, *populus* with *folc*, *possessionem* with OE *agnvng* and various forms of L *res* with OE *þing*.⁷⁶ These terms capture to a great extent the various meanings of the Latin interpretamenta and could be taken as examples of Aldred's attempts to show the semasiological alignment of various Latin and English words,⁷⁷ even if, as expected, those alignments don't always fall into place neatly: for instance, *questio* has as its core meaning the concept of enquiry or questioning while Aldred's *geflit* refers primarily to the existence of dissension or discord, although the latter could also mean 'a matter of dispute, debate' and they can both refer to legal proceedings (albeit, different aspects thereof).⁷⁸

3) Words / phrases which only have a legal meaning: it is no surprise that these are the words where Aldred demonstrates some knowledge of the Latin legal technoelect most clearly. This is the case not only with words that the Anglo-Saxons would have encountered frequently (e.g. his rendering of *heres*, *hereditas*, *iudicio* and *priuilegium*, on which see above), but also with words that are most specifically associated with the Roman context: e.g. various forms of OE *cāsere* for L *Augustus* and *cāserdom* for *rem publicam* are clear pointers to the context where the lemmata apply.⁷⁹ However, as noted at various points in this paper, Aldred does not show the same interest in making correspondences between the Latin and Old English

⁷⁶ On the legal uses of OE *āgnung*, *(ge)andett(i)an*, *fēoh*, *folc* and *hȳrnes*, see their respective entries in the *DOE*; on the legal sense of OE *þing*, see Pons-Sanz, "Legal Vocabulary", 572.

Cp. as well the rendering of the polysemous *causa* (part of the legal phrase *causa cognita*) with *intinga*.

⁷⁷ But cp. OE *ǣht* as the gloss for L *res*, discussed above.

⁷⁸ See the *DOE*, s.v. *geflit*, sense 3.b.

⁷⁹ Cp. *DOE*, s.vv. *cāserdōm* and *cāsere*.

legal technolects and exploring the specific meaning of the legal terms as the various glossaries (ultimately) associated with the Canterbury school, to the extent that some words that elsewhere might have received glosses appropriate to a legal context are here rendered following his common trend to show more concern for morphological structure than cultural knowledge. For instance, when rendering L *iusiurandum* in the Lindisfarne Gospels, Aldred makes sure that he captures the general meaning of the complex with OE *āþ* ‘oath’ while also attempting to mimic its structure somewhat with the use of a past participle of OE *swerian* ‘to swear’ to replicate the gerund form of L *iurare* (cp. *að gesuoerenum* in Matthew 6:26, and *að þæt gesuoren* in Luke 1:73). Nonetheless, in the context under investigation, by rendering it as *rehtes gesvorennes*, he prefers to create a close loan-translation rather than explaining what the term actually meant (cp. his rendering of *proconsul*, discussed above). While this approach might give the reader at least some indication of the meaning of the term / phrase in some cases (e.g. Aldred’s rendering of *causa cognita*, *ciues romanus*, *fide commissum*, *filio iuris*, *ius intigri*, *ius quirinum*, *pater familias*, *recte dari*), it is not very helpful in others. Given these examples, one might think that Aldred is especially keen to prioritise a morphological rendering with regard to legal terms that are characteristically Roman and have less obvious relevance in an Anglo-Saxon context, but this is also the approach that he takes when rendering various forms of L *manumittere*, a verb which, as noted above, was often used in Latin texts from Anglo-Saxon England (cp. *manumissus* : *gefreod* in the First Cleopatra and Harley Glossaries; nos M360 and M4189, respectively). The morphological structure of the expression is likely to have been as influential in Aldred’s rendering as the applicability of the terms to a contemporary context, if not more.

Conclusions

This paper has explored Aldred's glosses to a series of (Roman) legal terms which he provided as expansions of the *notae iuris* that he included together with the various educational materials in quire XI of Durham A.iv.19. His scholarly and glossarial activities in this manuscript have traditionally received much less attention than the glosses he added to the Lindisfarne Gospels, although recent work has shown that they have much to offer to our understanding of Aldred's language, interests and cultural context. The list at the centre of this paper has received even less attention than other texts in this quire because it is not a typical example of either a glossary or an encyclopaedic note. Nonetheless, this study has shown that following paths hardly trodden by scholars interested in Aldred's work, in terms of both the textual and philological perspective (in this case, his handling of one specific lexico-semantic field), can be very fruitful for our understanding of Aldred's lexical practices, his scholarly interests and connections (and, by association, those of his community) and the cultural life of Anglo-Saxon England more broadly.

While other scholars have noticed Aldred's keenness on exotic vocabulary and have attributed some of his handling of different languages to his desire to "flex his vocabulary muscles",⁸⁰ this paper has taken further the findings presented in Pons-Sanz (2018) and has shown that his lexico-semantic interests did not extend as far as the legal technolcts of Latin and Old English. This argument has implications for discussions about the linguistic relationships between the Lindisfarne and Durham glosses and the extent of Aldred's authorship: even though in other lexical matters the two glosses have been shown to exhibit significant differences,⁸¹ that is not the case as far as the principles underlying the rendering

⁸⁰ Jolly, *Community*, 178; see also *ibid.*, 176; and *id.*, "Process", 363–5.

⁸¹ See, for instance, Pons-Sanz, *Lexical*, 265–9, on differences with regard to their use of Norse-derived terms.

of legal terms are concerned. Therefore, this work offers further evidence in favour of common authorship of the two glosses and against Aldred's role as mere copyist of pre-existing translations of the Gospels.

More importantly for the specific focus of this paper, this analysis should make us question John Winkler's statement that, with the glosses under consideration here, Aldred "explained to students the meaning in Old English of *caduca*, *fidecommissum* and other Roman legal concepts".⁸² If by "explained" we mean that Aldred provided literal translations, often mirroring the structure of the lemmata and reflecting the more general sense of the Latin term, this suggestion stands unproblematically. If we mean instead that he attempted to indicate how these terms functioned in the Roman legal system by providing equivalent terms in an Anglo-Saxon context, Winkler's statement requires thorough revision. In fact, Aldred's handling of the *notae iuris* is not dissimilar to his approach to the notes on the eight parts of which Adam was made, and on warm and cold breath (fol. 86). Dekker has shown that the information presented in those texts is somewhat discordant, which leads him to conclude that Aldred "was presumably unaware of the significance of his material".⁸³ In a similar way, Aldred does not capitalise to the same extent as the Canterbury-related glossaries on the didactic opportunities offered by the list of *notae iuris*.

This should not be taken as an indication that he did not take his job as an educator seriously. His careful guidance of a less highly trained companion (Scribe B) in the writing and linguistic interpretation of a prayer against poison included in fol. 61r of Durham A.iv.19 offers clear evidence to the contrary.⁸⁴ The principles behind his glossing of legal terms

⁸² Winkler, 106.

⁸³ Dekker, "Aldred's", 590.

⁸⁴ Jolly, *Community*, 155–62; and id., "Process".

might be puzzling if one assumes that the list of *notae iuris* is a context where the focus is to make sense of the technicalities of legal documents. However, while Aldred's role as a *provost* (see above, note 2) and the community of St Cuthbert's numerous landed possessions might have led him and other members of the community to engage with practical legal affairs often,⁸⁵ the little that we know about the make-up of the community's library does not suggest that the study of legal texts was an important component of the community's educational activities.⁸⁶ Aldred's glossing practices and the fact that he not incorporate the abbreviations in our list elsewhere in his work can be taken as further evidence in that respect.⁸⁷

The present paper has also shown that Aldred's list of *notae iuris* does not show clear direct connections with Isidore's *Etymologies*. This applies to the list of abbreviations itself and also to his glosses for the expanded forms. With some possible exceptions, the latter suggest that Aldred was unaware of Isidore's explanations on Roman legal terms and their transmission through the Southumbrian glossarial tradition. This finding has implications on various fronts. In terms of Aldred's educational connections and background, the work carried out here complements Philip Rusche's exploration of possible Isidorian influence on Aldred's glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels by providing a further case study,⁸⁸ for it is

⁸⁵ On the community's possessions, see Pons-Sanz, *Analysis*, 23–30.

⁸⁶ See Lawrence-Mathers, 16–26, on what we know about the volumes that were in place in 1083, when William of St Calais replaced the community's clerks with Benedictine monks. See Boyd, 56–7, for a list of the sources that Aldred might have consulted when glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels.

⁸⁷ See Jolly, *Community*, 178; and id., "Process", 364–5.

⁸⁸ Rusche, "Glosses", 67–8; see also Dekker, "Glosses", 192–3.

precisely in this type of highly technical vocabulary where one would have expected to find Isidore's influence. As is the case here, and *pace* Boyd,⁸⁹ Rusche does not find any strong evidence of Aldred's familiarity with Isidore's work. Given that this is one of the features that characterise the glosses produced under the influence of the Benedictine Reform, this evidence can be used to argue against Aldred's direct connection with this movement, even if he shared some of its concerns.⁹⁰

In terms of the sources for Roman legal studies available to the Anglo-Saxons, Aldred's list of *notae iuris* is highly significant because it offers a very different picture from the Southumbrian, Canterbury-related glossaries. The latter suggest that, while significant and fairly chronologically and spatially widespread, the study of Roman law in Anglo-Saxon England was rather textually limited because its main source was Isidore's *Etymologies*. Admittedly, we cannot easily glean yet the full implications of the non-Isidorian evidence offered by Aldred's list because its direct source remains unknown, but this situation might change as Anglo-Latin studies continue to develop and more work is done on the medieval Latin manuscripts kept in continental libraries.

References

Barney, Stephen A., et al. (trans.). *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Beeby, Andrew, et al. "Aldred's Red Gloss". In *The Lindisfarne Gospels: New Perspectives*, edited by Richard Gameson, 200–05. Library of the Written Word 57. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

⁸⁹ Boyd, 57 (see above, note 86).

⁹⁰ For suggestions that Aldred might have worked under the influence of the Benedictine Reform, see Michelle Brown, 23–36; Cavill, 83 and 101; and Jolly, "Process", 368–9.

- Berger, Adolf. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1953.
- Boyd, W. J. P. *Aldred's Marginalia: Explanatory Comments in the Lindisfarne Gospels*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1975.
- Brown, Michelle P. "‘A Good Woman’s Son’: Aspects of Aldred’s Agenda in Glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels". In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 13–36.
- Brown, T. J. (ed.). *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions: Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 16. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1969.
- Brundage, James A. *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians and Courts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Cavill, Paul. "Maxims in Aldred’s Marginalia to the Lindisfarne Gospels". In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 79–101.
- Clark Hall, J. R. (ed.). *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th ed. with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Cooke, Jessica. "Worcester Books and Scholars, and the Making of the Harley Glossary (British Library MS Harley 3376)". *Anglia* 115, no. 4 (1997): 441–68.
- Cordoñer, Carmen. "Posibles sistemas de compilación en las *notae iuris* y el Liber Glossarum". In *L'activité lexicographique dans le haut Moyen Âge latin: Rencontre autour du Liber Glossarum*, edited by Franck Cinato and Anne Grondeux. *Dossiers d'HEL* 8 (2015): 111–29.
- Corrêa, Alicia (ed.). *The Durham Collectar*. Henry Bradshaw Society 107. London: Boydell Press, 1992.

- Dekker, Kees. “Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function”. In *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr, and Kees Dekker, 279–315. Mediaevalia Groningana n.s. 9. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . “Aldred’s Appetite for Encyclopaedic Knowledge: The Secret of Warm and Cold Breath”. *English Studies* 93, no. 5 (2012): 583–92.
- . “The Vernacularization of Encyclopaedic Notes in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts”. In *Secular Learning in Anglo-Saxon England: Exploring the Vernacular*, edited by László Sándor Chardonnens and Bryan Carella, 65–95. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 69. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012.
- . “Glosses, Glossaries and Encyclopaedic Notes”. In *Studies on Late Antique and Medieval Germanic Glossography and Lexicography in Honour of Patrizia Lendinara*, edited by Claudia di Sciacca et al., 177–95. Pisa: ETS Publishing, 2018.
- [DMLBS =] *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, edited by R. E. Latham et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975–2013.
- [DOE =] *Dictionary of Old English: A to I online*, edited by Angus Cameron et al. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018.
- Elliott, Michael D. “Canon Law Collections in England ca 600–1066: The Manuscript Evidence”. Unpublished doctoral diss., University of Toronto, 2013. Available at <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/43550/1/Elliot_Michael_D_201311_PhD_thesis.pdf>, accessed on 29/11/2018.
- Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Sara M. Pons-Sanz (eds.). *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*. Anglia Book Series 51. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.

- Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma. “Reduced Forms in the Nominal Morphology of the Lindisfarne Gospel Gloss: A Case of Accusative/Dative Syncretism?”, forthcoming.
- Gameson, Richard (ed.). *The Lindisfarne Gospels: New Perspectives*. Library of the Written Word 57. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- . “Northumbrian Books in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries”. In *Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Gameson, 43–83.
- van Gelderen, Elly (ed.) *The Northumbrian Old English Glosses. NOWELE: North-Western European Language Evolution* 72 (2019).
- Gneuss, Helmut. “Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England”. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 72, no. 1 (1990): 3–32.
- Gneuss, Helmut, and Michael Lapidge: *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
- Goossens, Louis (ed.). *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm’s De laudibus virginitatis)*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Akademie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der Letteren 74. Brussels: AWLSK, 1974.
- Gretsch, Mechthild. *The Intellectual Foundations of the Benedictine Reform*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Haigh, Rupert. *Legal English*, 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Harmer, Florence E. *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, 2nd ed. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1989.
- Helmholz, R. H. *The Oxford History of the Laws of the England, Vol. 1: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- . "Canon Law and Roman Law". In *Roman Law*, edited by David Johnston, 396–422. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Jolly, Karen Louise. "Prayers from the Field: Practical Protection and Demonic Defense in Anglo-Saxon England". *Traditio* 61 (2006): 95–147.
- . *The Community of St. Cuthbert in the Late Tenth Century: The Chester-le-Street Additions to Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19*. Columbus: Ohio University Press, 2012.
- . "The Process of Glossing and Glossing as a Process: Scholarship and Education in Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.iv.19". In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 361–75.
- . "Letter by Letter: Manuscript Transcription and Historical Imagination". In *Slow Manuscripts: Medieval Research and the Neoliberal University*, edited by Catherine Karkov, 124–41. English Association Series. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2019.
- Keynes, Simon. "King Athelstan's Books". In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, 143–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Lapidge, Michael. "The Present State of Anglo-Latin Studies". In *Insular Latin Studies: Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles, 500-1066*, edited by M. W. Herren, 45–82. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.
- . "An Isidorian Epitome from Early Anglo-Saxon England". *Romanobarbarica* 10 (1987–9): 443–83. Reprinted in his *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899*, 183–223 (London: Hambledon Press, 1996).
- Lawrence-Mathers, Anne. *Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003.

- Lazzari, Loredana. "Isidore's *Etymologiae* in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries". In *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Kees Dekker, 63–93. *Mediaevalia Groningana* n.s. 9. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . "Isidore's *Etymologiae* and the Bilingual Antwerp-London Glossary". In *Fruits of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Kees Dekker, 279–302. *Mediaevalia Groningana* n.s. 21. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Leach, Arthur F. *Educational Charters and Documents: 598 to 1909*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.
- Liebermann, F. (ed.). *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. Halle: Niemeyer, 1903–16.
- Lindelöf, U. L. (ed.). *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis: The Durham Collectar, a New and Revised Edition of the Latin Text with the Interlinear Anglo-Saxon Version*. Surtees Society 140. Durham: Andrews & Co., 1927.
- Lindsay, Wallace Martin (ed.). *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911.
- (ed.). *The Corpus Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921.
- . *Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the Early Miniscule Period (c.700-850)*, with a supplement by Doris Bains. Hildesheim: Olm, 1963.
- Liuzza, R. M. (ed.). *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, 2 vols. EETS o.s. 304 and 314. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994–2000.
- Maccini, Robert Gordon. *Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses according to John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

- Mommsen, Theodor (ed.). “Notarum Laterculi”. In *Grammatici Latini*, edited by Henry Keil, vol. 4, 265–352. Leipzig: Teubner, 1864.
- Napier, A. S. *Old English Glosses Chiefly Unpublished*, Anecdota Oxoniensia. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900.
- Oliphant, Robert T. (ed.). *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary: Edited from British Museum MS Harley 3376*. Janua Linguarum Series Practica 20. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Pheifer, J. D. (ed.). *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Pons-Sanz, Sara M. *Analysis of the Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels*. Studies in English Language and Linguistics 9. Valencia: University of Valencia, 2000.
- . *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- . “A Study of Aldred's Multiple Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels”. In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 301–28.
- . “Legal Vocabulary in Early English Translations of the Bible”. In *Studies on Late Antique and Medieval Germanic Glossography and Lexicography in Honour of Patrizia Lendinara*, edited by Claudia di Sciacca et al., 565–85. Pisa: ETS Publishing, 2018.
- . “Legal Glossaries”. In *Medieval Glossaries: A Meeting of Traditions*, edited by Annina Seiler et al. The Medieval Translator. Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming.
- Porter, David W. *The Antwerp-London Glossaries: The Latin and Latin-Old English Vocabularies from Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus 16.2 – London, British Library Add. 32246*, vol. 1: *Text and Indexes*. Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 8. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2011.

- . “Isidore’s *Etymologiae* at the School of Canterbury”. *Anglo-Saxon England* 43 (2014): 7–44.
- . “Legal Terminology in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries”. In *Languages of the Law in Early England: Essays in Memory of Lisi Oliver*, edited by Stefan Jurasinski and Andrew Rabin, 211–22. *Medievalia Groningana* n.s. 22. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- Riché, Pierre. *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1976.
- Roberts, Jane. “Aldred: Glossator and Book Historian”. In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 37–59.
- Rollason, David. “St Cuthbert and Wessex: The Evidence of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 183”. In *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to A.D. 1200*, ed. by Gerald Bonner et al., 413–24. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989.
- Ross, Alan S. C. “The Errors in the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels”. *Review of English Studies* 8, no. 32 (1932): 385–94.
- Ross, Alan S. C., E. G. Stanley and T. J. Brown. “The Anglo-Saxon Gloss”. In *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, Musei Britannici Codex Nero D.IV*, ed. by T. D. Kendrick et al., Volume II, Part II. Olten: Graf, 1956–60.
- .Rusche, Philip Guthrie. “The Cleopatra Glossaries: An Edition with Commentary on the Glosses and Their Sources”. Unpublished doctoral diss., Yale University, 1996.
- . “The Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Benedictine Reform: Was Aldred Trained in the Southumbrian Glossing Tradition?”. In *Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, edited by Fernández Cuesta and Pons-Sanz, 61–77.
- Sauer, Hans, and Birgit Schwan. “Aldred’s Combinations with *efne*, *eft*, and *ymb*: Their Status (Word-Formation, Glossing Device, or Both) and Their Treatment in Dictionaries”. In *Aspects of Medieval English Language and Literature*, edited by Michiko Ogura and

- Hans Sauer, 141–78. *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 55. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2018.
- Skeat, Walter W. (ed.). *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*, 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871–87.
- Stelten, Leo F. *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Tinti, Francesca. *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c.870 to c.1100*. *Studies in Early Medieval Britain*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
- Winkler, John Frederick. “Roman Law in Anglo-Saxon England”. *Journal of Legal History* 13, no. 2 (1992): 101–27.
- Zupitza, Julius (ed.). *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*. Sammlung englischer Denkmäler 1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1880. Reprinted with introduction by Helmut Gneuss (Berlin: Weidmann, 1966).