Winchester Pedagogy and the *Colloquy* of Ælfric

Joyce Hill

Most of the essays in this collection celebrate Peter Meredith's contributions to the study of Middle English literature, and in particular his renown as a specialist in medieval English drama. Anglo-Saxon England provides no drama on which I can base my own celebratory offering to Peter, but it does have one famous quasi-dramatic text in Ælfric's *Colloquy*. The choice of this text as my subject, then, is partly dictated by the aptness of its form, but it is also chosen because, as I hope to show, it exemplifies the well-considered, imaginative and yet kindly teaching which is as characteristic of Peter as of Ælfric, and which those of us who have worked alongside him at Leeds, teaching Old as well as Middle English, would want to celebrate in this retirement festschrift. My purpose will be to examine Ælfric's pedagogic techniques, as witnessed by the copy of the *Colloquy* preserved in British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A iii, fols 60v-64v,[1] considered to be the closest to Ælfric's original, and to suggest why, despite its undoubted pedagogic sophistication, it did not achieve the popularity of his *Grammar* and *Glossary*.

* * *

The Tiberius text gives a conversation which has several distinct phases:

Question and answer

1-10: an exchange between the master (*magister*) and the boys (*pueri*), in which the boys ask to be taught to speak Latin correctly (*recte*), to be treated kindly and not to be beaten more than necessary.

11-21: the master asks one boy what he does. He says that he is a monk and briefly outlines his daily routine. The master asks him what his companions do and

the young monk lists the occupations of ploughman, shepherd, oxherd, hunter, fisher, fowler, merchant, leather-worker (shoemaker), salter, baker and cook.

22-202: boys play the roles of the occupations named, each answering the master's questions about his assumed occupations. The order is that of the list in 18-21.

203-210: the master praises the young monk for having such good and useful companions and, in reply to a question, the monk adds several other crafts to the list. The master asks if there is a wise counsellor (*consiliarius*) amongst his associates; the reply is affirmative, for without him, the monk says, their society could not be ruled.

Debate with referee

211-243: the master asks the counsellor who has first place. The counsellor gives priority to the religious, but is then asked by the master which has first place from among the secular occupations. He replies that the ploughman does, but a debate ensues, involving the counsellor, the blacksmith and the woodman (two of the additional occupations named in 205-207). The counsellor asks for peace, restates the primacy of the ploughman, but finally urges that everyone, secular or religious, should be diligent in his calling.

Question and answer mingled with debate

244-265: the master asks the boys what they think of this exchange. Their spokesman says they appreciate it, but find it too profound and they ask the master to speak according to their youthful understanding; all they want to do is learn, in order not to be like beasts. The master then involves them in a debate about the nature of the 'wisdom' they seek to acquire (cunning and hypocrisy, or the wisdom of knowing good from evil). The boys make the right choice, but again ask the master not to be too profound.

266-307: the master agrees and reverts to practical matters, quizzing one boy on life in the monastery – the monastic horarium, food and drink, whether he has been beaten for misbehaviour that day, and whether he would reveal it if his companions if had done anything to deserve a beating. He would not.

Exordium

308-315: exordium – an exhortation by the master to behave well according to the Rule.

The *Colloquy* has often justifiably been praised for its liveliness, but what interests me here is its effectiveness as a pedagogical tool. The summary shows, clearly enough, that it is structurally varied, that it is diverse in subject-matter, that no conversational pattern or topic is dwelt on for long, and that there is ample opportunity for different people in the group to have turns in speaking, all of which are good qualities for a language training text, particularly when, as in the context of the tenth-century monastic reform, a command of spoken Latin is one of the goals. But the skills that Ælfric uses in maintaining the boys' level of interest and imaginative engagement are greater than this summary suggests, for even in the occupations section (lines 22-202), which could easily be very repetitive, the format of the questions and answers varies; new characters are introduced part way through the *Colloquy*; there is interchange between the nature of the discourse (practical and abstract); there is variety of register (formality, colloquial grumbles, vigorous protests, energetic debate); variety of characterization (a bold hunter followed by a timid fisherman, for example); and some teasing when the *consiliarius* puts down the rather assertive blacksmith by asking in a scornful tone: 'Tu, quid dat nobis in officina tua nisi ferreas scintillas et sonitus tundentium malleorum et flantium follium?', 'You, what do you provide for us in your workshop but sparks of iron, the noise of hammers striking and bellows blowing?' (lines 226-28). Sparks of iron, the noise of hammers, and the windy sound of the bellows are poor sustenance, compared with the real food provided by the worthy ploughman, with whom the contrast is made.[2] There is even an overt recognition of levels of difficulty within the text. After the debate with the *consiliarius*, the boys ask to talk about easier things and the master agrees, at which point, in fulfilment of his promise, he drops the abstract discussion and returns to more everyday conversation of the kind used at the beginning of the *Colloquy*. The questions, once again, are versions of the fundamental language-learning type: 'what have you done today?' This is easier than the debate both in language and concept, but it is easier also because at this point the boys move on to talking about their own lives in the monastery, referring to their own circumstances and using what was for them the more familiar vocabulary of cloister life, more accessible even than the vocabulary of secular life which they had exercised by role-play earlier on. There is encouragement at the outset, and encouragement at the end, with a more testing period

part way through; the wise teacher is as alert to his pupils' limitations as he is to the opportunities to make demands. As a pedagogical vehicle, then, the *Colloquy* is skilfully and sensitively constructed, displaying to good effect Ælfric's well-known gift for responding to the needs of his audience. But if we are to judge its didactic effectiveness, we must also pay attention to the substance of what is being practised.

It is generally assumed – although there is no explanatory preface or coda by Ælfric – that the *Colloquy* was written after the *Grammar* and *Glossary*, probably not long after, and that the three texts thus formed a systematic pedagogical set.[3] If so, the *Colloquy* was designed to put into practice what the *Grammar* and *Glossary* taught in a more formalized way. The most obvious practice function of the *Colloquy* is the exercising of vocabulary, particularly in the descriptions of the occupations, where lists are embedded in the conversation. In this respect the direct relationship is to the *Glossary*, since there is a measure of agreement between the *Colloquy* lists, necessarily grouped by subject by virtue of the question and answer form, and the *Glossary* lists, which are also subject-based. It is notable, however, that in writing the *Colloquy* Ælfric was by no means a slavish user of his own class-glossaries; indeed, one of the interventions of Ælfric's pupil Ælfric Bata in his augmented version of the *Colloquy*, extant in Oxford, St John's College, MS 154, was the extension of the *Colloquy*'s lists as known from Tiberius A iii by the systematic addition of more items from the *Glossary*'s lists, an augmentation which has a depressing effect on the lively, attention-keeping drama of the *Colloquy* as originally conceived: the lists in Ælfric Bata's text continue interminably, and also quite improbably, since he is entirely lacking in discrimination and so unloads into the *Colloquy* lists such creatures as elephants, lions and camels, which were hardly a feature of everyday Anglo-Saxon life.

Other practice functions of the *Colloquy* relate more directly to the *Grammar*. I have already noted in the summary that in the first sentence the boys ask to be taught to speak Latin correctly, *recte*; they explain that they speak it at present *corrupte* and that, in their attempts to remedy this, they do not mind what they talk about, provided that 'recta locutio sit', 'it may be a correct way of speaking'. Obviously part at least of what this means is speaking Latin grammatically, and the *Colloquy*'s conversational mode, with its changes of person, tense and mood, is an ideal practice medium. But if we look more closely (and here I leave the exordium out of account, for reasons which will become obvious later), we see that the *Colloquy* is skilfully structured to reinforce grammatical and lexical patterns. On one level, as I have already suggested, the *Colloquy* is related to the *Glossary* and is aimed at reinforcing a growing vocabulary, since the descriptions of occupations are properly concerned with lexical

diversity. But simultaneously the *Colloquy* exercises the common bases of Latin and so, intermingled with diversity, there is repetition. Ælfric does not, for example, concern himself with stylistic diversity when dealing with common actions such as 'to sing', or 'to speak'; rather, he keeps to one verb (usually the one used as an example in the *Grammar*) and exercises it in various forms, often with the grouping of the repetition and variation, before moving on to a new lexical group. For instance, in lines 1-12 we find a standard example in the *Grammar*, the deponent verb *loquor*, used in the forms *loqui*, *loquimur*, *loquamur* and *loqueris* and it occurs in company with the related noun *locutio*, thus illustrating not only elements of the conjugation but also a point about the variations of form between different parts of speech, to which a section of the *Grammar* is devoted.[4] Between lines 269-277, in a passage of only sixty-four words, we find *cantaui* once, *cantauimus* three times, and *cantare* once. Similarly, in the conversation with the hunter, we find *capis* (65), *capio* (66, 81), *cepisti* (70, 72), and *cepi* (73), continuing into the following exchange with the fisherman, where there is *capis* (90, 100, 105), *ceperint* (92), *capere* (99, 109, 112, 116), and *capiunt* (119). There is, of course, a perfectly good dramatic justification for all this: the boys *are* talking about speaking Latin; as young monks they *do* sing; the huntsman and fisherman *are* concerned with catching things – and so perhaps it is only when we have read the *Colloquy* several times that we notice the lexical restraint, the exploitation of illustrative vocabulary from the *Grammar*, and the device of pedagogical repetition – a device which, as I have noted in my study of Ælfric's use of etymologies, is often employed by him, in the *Grammar* and in his homilies, when he is making a linguistic point.[5] We are, after all, dealing with a world in which language is an auditory matter, rather than (as with many of us) something that is also significantly visual, and it is in any case a sound device in practice dialogues, which are a staple of language learning, that situations are created in which there is opportunity both for simple repetition and repetition with variation of form.

The relationships between the *Colloquy* and *Grammar* which I have referred to so far, as well as those between *Colloquy* and *Glossary* which I referred to earlier, can be identified in the surviving written text. But the mention of the auditory dimension reminds us that there is one further relationship, which can now only be inferred, that of pronunciation. To speak Latin correctly, which is what the boys ask to be taught, includes the correct pronunciation of Latin, and this is something which the master could monitor in the conversational exchange. By the very nature of things, there is no evidence for this pedagogical dimension in the written text, but *recte*, with its opposite in this context, *corrupte*, could well be an allusion to it, and it is worth remembering, when we consider the full implication of what *recte* and *corrupte* might

mean in the opening sentence of the *Colloquy*, that in his *Grammar* Ælfric makes frequent reference to pronunciation. Indeed, his commitment is made perfectly clear in the *Grammar*'s Latin preface, where he expresses his amazement that some pronounce words like *pater* and *malus* short in prose because they are counted short in verse:

> miror ualde, quare multi corripiunt sillabas in prosa, quae in metro breues sunt, cum prosa absoluta sit a lege metri; sicut pronuntiat *pater* brittonice et *malus* et similia, quae in metro habentur breues. mihi tamen uidetur melius inuocare deum patrem honorifice producta sillaba, quam brittonice corripere, quia nec deus arti grammaticae subiciendus est.[6]
>
> [I greatly marvel how in prose many people pronounce as short those syllables which are short in verse, even though prose is not subject to the law of metre – for example pronouncing in the British manner *pater* and *malus* and the like, which are kept short in verse. Nevertheless, it seems better to me to invoke God the Father reverently with the first syllable lengthened than to shorten it in the British manner, because God should not be subject to the Art of Grammar.][7]

As a context for this interest in speaking correctly it is, of course, important to remember chapter 45 of the Benedictine Rule:

> Si quis dum pronuntiat psalmum, responsorium, aut antiphonam, uel lectionem fallitur, nisi per satisfactionem ibi coram omnibus humiliatus fuerit, maiori uindictae subiaceat; quippe qui noluit humilitate corrigere quod in neglegentia deliquit. Infantes autem pro tali culpa uapulent.[8]
>
> [If anyone makes a mistake in enunciating psalm, responsory, antiphon or lection, and does not make satisfaction there, humble in the presence of all, let him undergo a greater punishment, inasmuch as he will not repair by humility what he failed to do by negligence. But for such a fault children shall be flogged.]

One further pedagogical dimension of the *Colloquy* deserves comment before I consider its relationship to Winchester pedagogy and its treatment by subsequent users. As a monastic text it gives priority, in speech as well as in value-judgement, to

the religious life, and it reinforces for the boys of the community the monastic routine, the expected standards of behaviour, the regime of obedience and the community ideal; the themes central to their regular life are woven into the dialogue with as much skill as the grammatical and lexical elements are. In the Old English preface to the *Grammar*, Ælfric had presented the learning of Latin as a means to a religious end,[9] and the *Colloquy* acts this out in the fullest possible sense.

If Clemoes was right in dating the *Grammar*, *Glossary* and *Colloquy* to the period 992-1002, they were written when Ælfric was at Cerne Abbas.[10] But this was a new foundation, with no established traditions of its own, and it is to Winchester that we must look for Ælfric's formative influences and pedagogical models. We are, in any case, encouraged to do so by Ælfric himself. In the Latin preface to the *Grammar* he justifies what he considers to be a relatively simple and straightforward approach by saying that it is 'sicut didicimus in scola Aðelwoldi, uenerabilis praesulis', 'just as we mastered it in the school of the venerable prelate, Æthelwold',[11] and his debt to Æthelwold is freely acknowledged elsewhere – in the Latin preface to the First Series of Catholic Homilies, in his *Vita Æthelwoldi*, and in the Letter to the monks of Eynsham.[12] At this point, admittedly, it is difficult not to become trapped in a circular argument because, as Michael Lapidge explains in his study of Æthelwold as scholar and teacher, an important part of our evidence for Winchester education and scholarship under Æthelwold is what can be inferred from examining the work of his pupils and in this context Ælfric becomes one of the major sources of information.[13] However, what I am interested in at this point is Winchester's tradition of colloquy-writing, and here we are fortunate in having some reliable evidence which is independent of Ælfric.

The pedagogical use of a predetermined dialogue was a well-established tradition in classical times and was exploited throughout the early Middle Ages, not least by the Carolingians, from whom the English monastic reform inherited so much, so that in using it to a limited extent in the *Grammar* itself and in a highly developed form in the *Colloquy*, Ælfric was working within the mainstream educational tradition.[14] More specifically, there are two dialogue poems, called by Michael Lapidge the *Altercatio magistri et discipuli* and the *Responsio discipuli*, which seem to have been composed at Winchester, either in Æthelwold's school, or very soon after his death.[15] Admittedly they are much more *recherché* than Ælfric's *Colloquy*, but they show that Ælfric came from an educational milieu which not only used Latin dialogues between master and pupil, but also produced its own elaborate versions of this scholastic genre. In this respect, then, Ælfric stands *with* the Winchester tradition, and we may suppose that his compulsion to teach, his high standards of scholarship, and his use (where necessary) of the vernacular, owes a great deal to Æthelwold's influence. Æthelwold's

own skills in Latin are well attested by his extant writings; his willingness to use Old English is explained by him in his vernacular account of the monastic reform and is commented on in the *Vita Æthelwoldi*, a detail retained by Ælfric in his abridgement; it is also demonstrated in his translation of the Benedictine Rule; and his exacting, not to say formidable, standards as a teacher are praised on more than one occasion by another of his pupils, Wulfstan the Cantor.[16]

Yet there were respects in which Ælfric asserted his independence, theologically, for example, in taking his own line on the narratives of the assumption of the Virgin and the stories of St George and St Thomas, and stylistically in rejecting outright Æthelwold's propensity for ostentatious and obscure vocabulary, the style of writing which we call hermeneutic.[17] Since the style was immensely popular in scholarly Reform circles in Ælfric's lifetime, his avoidance of it must be seen as deliberate, and in the study of the *Colloquy* – a text which is all the more effective pedagogically for its stylistic restraint – signs of the hermeneutic style may be taken as evidence that the text has been adapted from what Ælfric originally wrote, as is the case with the exordium to the Tiberius version, where the density of hermeneutic phrasing and lexis is stylistically and pedagogically at odds with what has come before. This passage, which is set off in the manuscript, thus signalling some kind of distinction from the main body of the text, is as follows:

> O, probi pueri et uenusti mathites, uos hortatur uester eruditor ut pareatis diuinis disciplinis et obseruetis uosmet eleganter ubique locorum. Inceditis morigerate cum auscultaueritis ecclesie campanas, et ingredimini in orationem, et inclinate suppliciter ad almas aras, et state disciplinabiliter, et concinite unanimiter, et interuenite pro uestris erratibus, et egredimini sine scurrilitate in claustrum uel in gimnasium.[18]
>
> [O good boys and pleasant scholars, your teacher exhorts you to obey the divine precepts and everywhere behave yourselves decorously. Go in an orderly fashion when you hear the bells of the church, and enter into [the house of] prayer and bow towards the holy altars in the manner of a supplicant, and stand in a disciplined way, and sing in unison, and pray for your sins, and go out into the cloisters or into the schoolroom without playing the fool.]

Garmonsway questioned the authenticity of the exordium on the grounds that

'such general remarks on conduct could well have been added by any one wishing to enlarge on the Benedictine Rule'.[19] Lapidge suggested that the exordium was written by Ælfric's pupil Ælfric Bata, who demonstrates elsewhere his penchant for hermeneutic vocabulary.[20] He cites three hermeneutic words in the passage: *disciplinabiliter*, *morigerate*, and *mathites*; *disciplinabiliter* being one of those adverbs in *-iter* which is characteristic of this style, *morigerate* being comparable with Ælfric Bata's hermeneutic *morigeranter*, and *mathites* being a grecism, which is also a characteristic of hermeneutic vocabulary. Lendinara added to the evidence by drawing attention to *gimnasium* as a grecism and *unanimiter* as a further *-iter* adverb.[21] More recently, David Porter has added *eleganter* and *suppliciter* as evidence in support of his convincing argument that Ælfric Bata was indeed the author of these lines.[22] But even when all of these examples are taken into account, they do not give us the full measure of the density of the hermeneutic style at this point and thus of the dramatic change in the nature of the text. We need also to take note of *eruditor*, a post-classical coinage which conflicts with the *Colloquy*'s *magister*; *inceditis*, a verb meaning in classical Latin 'to go at a measured pace' or (in military contexts) 'to advance, march, triumph over', but here meaning simply 'go', in conflict with the *Colloquy*'s straightforward *exire*, used in lines 23 and 269 in the forms *exeo* and *exiui*; *auscultaueritis*, an antiquarian word conflicting in the *Colloquy* with Ælfric's choice of the basic verb *audire*; and *concinite*, which conflicts with the *Colloquy*'s frequent and exclusive use of *cantare*. We may also add *aras*, 'altars'. Altars are not referred to elsewhere in the *Colloquy*, but the usual ecclesiastical Latin term was *altare*, which is what Ælfric uses in his Second Latin Letter to Wulfstan.[23] *Auscultare*, *ara*, and *concinire* are more frequent in verse than in prose (by contrast with the 'normal' prose words identified here as Ælfric's alternatives), a feature of lexical choice which also contributes to the precious quality of the style, and there is an echo of verse-form in 'eleganter ubique locorum', which is a metrically perfect end to a hexameter.[24] The exordium gives a stylistic jolt to the reader in being at odds with Ælfric's carefully cultivated plain Latin style, here and elsewhere; more immediately, it is a change of style and lexis which makes no sense in the context of the *Colloquy*'s linguistically self-referential pedagogy, carefully sustained within the single text and within the instructional sequence to which we must assume it belongs.

Equally, the Old English gloss was not part of Ælfric's pedagogic plan. It is true that Ælfric frequently used English as a didactic medium and that his role-model Æthelwold found it a pleasure 'adolescentes et iuuenes semper docere, et Latinos libros Anglice eis soluere, et regulas grammaticae artis ac metricae rationis tradere, et iocundis alloquiis ad meliora hortari', 'to teach young men and the more mature

students, translating Latin texts into English for them, passing on the rules of grammar and metric, and encouraging them to do better by cheerful words',[25] but neither of them makes texts accessible by interlinear vernacular glossing or even by a strict verbatim method of translating. In any case, Ælfric would have seen the glossing of the *Colloquy* as a completely pointless exercise, since it was designed for practising the speaking of Latin after one had worked through the *Grammar* and *Glossary*, where the English meanings of most of the words are already given. There is in fact no room for doubt: it was pointed out by Schröder at an early stage that the English equivalents in the *Colloquy* gloss do not always agree with those of the *Glossary* and *Grammar*;[26] and although the brevity of the text and the nature of its vocabulary means that it cannot properly be assessed for the incidence of 'Winchester words', such analysis as one can make points away from Ælfric rather than towards him.[27] Finally, we need to remember that the gloss is virtually complete and covers those parts of the text which must be seen as non-authorial augmentations, including the whole of the exordium and the extended list of fish names which, if original, would have been in the accusative as objects of the unspoken verb *capio*, but which have retained the nominative forms that they had in the glossary from which they have evidently been drawn.[28] Porter has argued with conviction that the interpolations were all made by Ælfric Bata and that it was he who then made the interlinear translation, which means that these features of the text almost certainly originated in Canterbury, where he seems to have had a colourful career.[29]

We can thus see that Ælfric's *Colloquy* was not necessarily transmitted textually in the form he intended. The manuscript contexts likewise provide us with further indications that Ælfric's intentions were thwarted. If it was to have formed a pedagogical set with the *Grammar* and *Glossary*, as common sense and vocabulary evidence suggest, then it has to be said that the manuscripts do not perpetuate this, nor do they indicate that this colloquy *as written* was much used at all, for the *Colloquy* survives in only three manuscripts: the Tiberius version which we have been examining, the closest to Ælfric's original but modified somewhat, probably by Ælfric Bata (s. xi med.); a now incomplete Latin-only version in a dismembered manuscript divided between London and Antwerp, which has been modified a little more, perhaps by Ælfric Bata as Porter has argued,[30] and which displays some scattered features of the hermeneutic style (s. xi in., xi[1]); and the greatly augmented Latin-only version now in St John's College Oxford, in which Ælfric Bata explicitly claims a hand (s. xi in.).[31] By contrast, there are fourteen manuscript witnesses to the *Grammar* and seven to the *Glossary*, which always occurs in conjunction with the *Grammar*.[32] The dates of these manuscripts are all eleventh-century, most usually from the first

half, except for an abbreviated version of the *Grammar* from c.1200 (Cambridge, Trinity College R. 9. 17 (819)) and a thirteenth-century copy of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* in Worcester Cathedral Library (F. 174) written in the 'tremulous hand'.[33] As far as one can tell, the *Grammar* and *Glossary*, which quickly achieved a degree of popularity, sometimes circulated as free-standing items; in other cases they are associated with a grammatical dialogue, but it is a telling fact that this dialogue (in Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B III 32 [s. xi^1], British Library, MS Harley 107 [s. xi med.], and British Library, MS Cotton Faustina A. x [s. xi^2]), is not Ælfric's *Colloquy* but a question and answer routine on the declensions.[34] The only manuscript which has any claim to be an exception to this pattern of transmission is the version in St John's College, MS 154, but this is a peculiar case which only serves to emphasize the point I am making, for although the *Grammar* and *Glossary* appear here together and are followed – but not quite directly – by Ælfric's *Colloquy*, it is the *Colloquy* as substantially rewritten by Ælfric Bata, and this rewritten version stands in the manuscript as one of a collection of rather esoteric colloquies otherwise wholly by Ælfric Bata.[35] Internally, the nature of Ælfric's *Colloquy* is changed through the nature and extent of the augmentations, and contextually it is redefined, despite its juxtaposition with the *Grammar* and *Glossary*, as being part of a collection of learned texts, which its original author did not intend it to be.

In composing the *Colloquy* Ælfric had a clear purpose in mind, which he carried out with the linguistic awareness and imaginative sensitivity that we have come to recognize as characteristic. But just as characteristic, and just as important in understanding him, is the extent to which he was prepared to follow his own didactic standards, in this case avoiding the hermeneutic style, which would have displayed his own knowledge but done little to meet the immediate practical needs of his pupils. The colloquy need not be an abstruse exercise, as Ælfric shows but, to quote Michael Lapidge, 'Most often, as in the case of the colloquies of Ælfric Bata, [it] becomes a showpiece of excessively obscure vocabulary'.[36] Perhaps this accounts for what seems to be the relative unpopularity of Ælfric's *Colloquy* and the urge to 'improve' it, in the Tiberius manuscript, more extensively in the Antwerp / London mansucript, and far more drastically in the St John's College manuscript. Ælfric wrote for the real needs of his immediate audience, but in consequence failed to meet the requirements of the indirect audience, that is to say, other Latin scholars, who at this date saw the written colloquy as a means of displaying their own learning. It is in any case striking, with the *Colloquy* as with so much else he wrote, that Ælfric's characteristically clear and independent intentions soon came to be over-ridden by those who did not share his ideals.

NOTES

[1] Quotations and line references will be from the edition by G. N. Garmonsway, *Ælfric's Colloquy*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen, 1947). The other versions, which differ from MS C (the Cotton Tiberius MS) and from each other, are: Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS M. 16. 2 (earlier numberings 32, 47 and 68), fols 18r-19v + London, British Library, Additional MS 32246, fols 16v-17v (MSS R_1 + R_2); and Oxford, St John's College, MS 154, fols 204r-215r (not 221v as given by Garmonsway, p. 1) (MS J). The Antwerp part of the text in the Antwerp/London MS, which ends imperfectly at *utimini*, corresponding to line 184 in Garmonsway's edition of the Tiberius text, has been edited by Max Förster, 'Die altenglisch Glossenhandschrift Plantinus 32 (Antwerpen) und Additional 32246 (London)', *Anglia*, 41 (1917), 94-161 (pp. 147-52); the unedited part of the text in the London MS follows on directly and continues to *ecclesiam*, corresponding to line 269 in Garmonsway's edition. MS J has been edited by W. H. Stevenson, *Early Scholastic Colloquies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), pp. 75-101.

[2] On the social debate, see in particular Earl R. Anderson, 'Social Idealism in Ælfric's *Colloquy*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3 (1974), 153-62. Anderson also comments on the *Colloquy*'s portrayal of monastic life.

[3] Clemoes dates their production to the period 992-1002: P. A. M. Clemoes, 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959), pp. 212-47 (p. 244). The *Grammar* and *Glossary* are edited by Julius Zupitza, *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880), reprinted with a preface by Helmut Gneuss (Berlin, Zurich, Dublin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Max Niehans, 1966).

[4] See pp. 213-17 of Zupitza's edition. *Loquor* is used as an example on pp. 122, 247 and 250, illustrating, sometimes more than once, *loquor* itself, *loquens*, *locutus/loquutus*, *loquuturus*.

[5] 'Ælfric's use of etymologies', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17 (1988), 35-44.

[6] *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, p. 2.

[7] The translation is from *Ælfric's Prefaces*, ed. by Jonathan Wilcox (Durham: University of Durham, 1995), p. 130.

[8] *The Rule of St Benedict: The Abingdon Copy*, ed. by John Chamberlin (Toronto: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1982), p. 53. The codex containing this Rule, now MS 57 in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is known to have been at Abingdon early in the eleventh century. This was the monastery reformed by Æthelwold

before he became Bishop of Winchester in November 963. The English translation which follows is my own.

[9] *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, pp. 2-3.

[10] On the dating, see note 3 above. The foundation (or refoundation) of Cerne Abbas is discussed by Barbara Yorke, 'Æthelmær: the Foundation of the Abbey at Cerne and the Politics of the Tenth Century', in *The Cerne Abbey Millennium Lectures*, ed. by Katherine Barker (Cerne Abbas: The Cerne Abbey Millennium Committee, 1988), pp. 15-25 (pp.22-24).

[11] *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, p. 1, with the English translation of Wilcox, *Ælfric's Prefaces*, p. 130.

[12] *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies. The First Series: Text*, ed. by Peter Clemoes, Early English Text Society, ss 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 175; 'Ælfric's *Vita S. Æthelwoldi*', in *Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 71; 'Ælfrici abbatis epistula ad monachos Egneshamnenses directa', ed. by H. Nocent, in *Consuetudinum saeculi X/XI/XII monumenta non-Cluniacensia*, ed. by K. Hallinger, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 7.3 (Siegburg: Schmitt, 1984), p. 155.

[13] Michael Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher', in *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), pp. 88-117.

[14] There is an extensive literature for the classical and late antique period. For studies with a Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon focus, see: G. N. Garmonsway, 'The Development of the Colloquy', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture*, pp. 248-61; Vivien Law, 'The Study of Grammar', in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 88-110; *Latin Colloquies from Pre-Conquest Britain*, ed. by Scott Gwara (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1996), pp. 10-16.

[15] Michael Lapidge, 'Three Latin poems from Æthelwold's school at Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), 85-137. The other poem in this group of three edited by Lapidge, the *Carmen de libero arbitrio*, is not relevant to the present discussion.

[16] For a detailed survey of the evidence, see Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as Scholar and Teacher'. See also pp. 145-46 and note 25 below.

[17] For an overview of Ælfric's theological independence, including discussion of his treatment of the Virgin and St Thomas, see Joyce Hill, 'Reform and Resistance: Preaching Styles in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *De l'homélie au sermon: histoire de la prédication médiévale*, ed. by Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand (Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1993), pp. 15-46. On St George, see Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric, Gelasius and St George', *Mediaevalia*, 11 (1989 for 1985),

1-17. For discussion of Latin style, see Michael Lapidge, 'The hermeneutic style in tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 67-111, and the further comments and examples in ' Three Latin Poems'.

[18] Lines 308-315 in Garmonsway's edition. The following translation is my own.

[19] *Ælfric's Colloquy*, p. 7.

[20] 'The hermeneutic style', p. 98.

[21] Patrizia Lendinara, 'Il Colloquio di Ælfric e il Colloquio di Ælfric Bata', in *'Feor ond neah': scritti di filologia germanica in memoria di Augusto Scaffidi Abbate*, Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Palermo: Studie e richerche, 3, ed. by Patrizia Lendinara and Lucio Melazzo (Palermo: University of Palermo, 1983), pp. 173-249 (p. 210). Lendinara also lists *duriter* but this occurs at line 307 of Garmonsway's edition and is not within the exordium, which she correctly specifies as being lines 308-15.

[22] David W. Porter, 'Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Ælfric Bata', *Neophilologus*, 80 (1996), 639-60 (p. 643).

[23] *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, ed. by Bernhard Fehr, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, IX (Hamburg: Grand, 1914), reissued with a supplement to the introduction by Peter Clemoes (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), p. 61.

[24] On the words cited, see *A Latin Dictionary*, ed. by Carlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879) and *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, ed. by R. E. Latham, D. H. Howlett, and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975-) (now extending to G). I am grateful to Dr Andy Orchard of Emmanuel College Cambridge for the observations on metre and poetic lexis.

[25] *Wulfstan of Winchester: The Life of St Æthelwold*, pp. 46-49 (Latin and Old English). Although Ælfric's version of the *vita* is heavily abbreviated, it is indicative of the evident importance of this detail for Æthelwold's pupils and no doubt also its significance for Ælfric in particular that he retained the reference to Æthelwold teaching in the vernacular, except that the *libros* are not defined as *latinos* (although the implication that they are Latin books is clear enough), and there is no reference to his teaching of the rules of grammar and metre (p. 77, Ælfric's chapter 20 drawing at this point on Wulfstan's chapter 31).

[26] E. Schröder, 'Colloquium Ælfrici', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 41 (1897), 283-90 (p. 289), although note Garmonsway's caveats, *Ælfric's Colloquy*, pp. 9-10. By contrast, Lendinara, 'Il Colloquio di Ælfric', drew attention to the large number of Old English words that the *Grammar*, *Glossary* and *Colloquy* have in common, which led her to think that there was common authorship. On the other hand, there would inevitably be a very high level of correspondence in such systematic contexts

simply by virtue of the lexical choices available. Thus, in these circumstances difference carries more weight than identity.

[27] Walter Hofstetter, *Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch: Untersuchungen zur geographischen und zeitlichen Verbreitung altenglischer Synonyme*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englishen Philologie, 14 (Munich: Fink, 1987), where the evidence of the *Colloquy* is presented on p. 211. The framework of Hofstetter's argument, but inevitably without a full presentation of the primary evidence, is to be found in Walter Hofstetter, 'Winchester and the standardization of Old English vocabulary', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17 (1988), 139-61. On Winchester vocabulary, see also Helmus Gneuss, 'The origin of standard Old English and Æthelwold's school at Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1 (1972), 63-83. The syntax has no evidential value, since the Old English, in being a verbatim interlinear gloss, follows the Latin.

[28] At line 105 the master asks the 'fisherman': 'Quid capis in mare?', 'What do you catch in the sea?', to which the reply is: 'Alleces et isicios, delfinos et sturias, ostreas et cancros, musculas, torniculi, neptigalli, platesia et platissa et polipodes et similia' (lines 106-8) 'Herrings and salmon, porpoises and sturgeon, oysters and crabs, mussels, winkles, cockles, plaice and flounders and lobsters and suchlike'. The nominative forms are *torniculi, neptigalli, platesia* and *platissa*, the last two being doubly anomalous in being singular. These irregularities were first noted by Julius Zupitza, 'Die ursprüngliche Gestalt von Ælfrics Colloquium', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 31 (1887), 32-45 (p. 38).

[29] 'Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Ælfric Bata'. Ælfric Bata's pedagogical techniques are discussed by Porter, 'The Latin Syllabus in Anglo-Saxon Monastic Schools', *Neophilologus*, 78 (1994), 463-82 and by Gwara in *Latin Colloquies*. Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), p. 266, summarises the tantalizing information we have about Ælfric Bata (if this is the same man). The Canterbury origin of Cotton Tiberius A iii is established with far more certainty than hitherto by Helmus Gneuss, 'Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxons Manuscripts: the Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III', in *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers. Essays presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. by P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 13-48.

[30] 'Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Ælfric Bata'.

[31] See note 1 above for the details of these manuscripts and the published texts.

[32] Details of the manuscripts are given by Gneuss on pp. iv-vii of his preface to Zupitza's edition of *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*. Several of the manuscript witnesses to the *Grammar* are so fragmentary that we have no idea whether the *Glossary* was included in them as a companion text.

[33] The treatment of the *Grammar* and *Glossary* in this manuscript is discussed by Christine Franzen, *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), particularly in ch. 3.

[34] For further comment on these manuscripts, see N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), arts. 107B, 227 and 154 respectively. For an extended example of the importance of the dialogue in the teaching of Latin grammar in the early years of the eleventh century, see Martha Bayless, *'Beatus quid est* and the Study of Grammar in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Historiographia Linguistica*, 20 (1993), 67-110.

[35] First edited by Stevenson, *Early Scholastic Colloquies*, and more recently by Gwara, *Latin Colloquies*.

[36] 'Three Latin Poems', p. 98.