

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

R. M. Wilson, 'The Provenance of the Lambeth Homilies with a New Collation', *Leeds Studies in English*, 4 (1935), 24-43

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=134404&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

THE PROVENANCE OF THE LAMBETH HOMILIES WITH A NEW COLLATION.

The homilies contained in the Lambeth MS. 487¹ are of varying origin. At least two of them—Nos. 9 and 10—are Middle English adaptations of extant Old English material and it is probable that most are of pre-Conquest origin. Only one of the homilies—No. 7, a rhyming “Creed”—is certainly of Middle English origin though one or two of the others may also be post-Conquest in composition. In the manuscript these homilies are followed by an incomplete version of the “Poema Morale” and by a devotional piece entitled “On Ureisun of ure Louerde.” It is not proposed to deal here with these two latter pieces since the literature dealing with the former of them is already sufficiently voluminous and the latter is said to be written in a slightly later hand. The homilies dealt with here are the first seventeen printed by Morris, pp. 3-159.

All previous writers on the dialect of these homilies have decided that they are written in the Middlesex dialect, a dialect closely allied to that of London. Professor Wyld² finds numerous similarities between the dialect of the “Lambeth Homilies” and that of contemporary London documents and decides that “until some good evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, we may without undue rashness assume that both the Trin. and Lamb. MSS. were written within a radius of fifteen miles or so of London. We might suggest, tentatively, that the Lamb. MS. was written in the neighbourhood of Brentford.” (op.cit. 138). Dr. P. H. Reaney³ collects further material from official documents which, in his opinion, confirms Wyld’s localization. “A similar comparison of the chief features of the Lambeth and Trinity Homilies with those of

¹ Ed. R. Morris, *Old English Homilies*, Series 1. (EETS., 1867-8).

² H. C. Wyld, “South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects in Middle English.” (*Essays and Studies*, vi, 112-145).

³ P. H. Reaney, “The Dialect of London in the Thirteenth Century.” (*Englische Studien*, 61, 9-23).

our documents for about the same period confirms Wyld's suggestion that the texts are written in the London dialect. We find, on the whole, the same forms and the same combination of forms . . . The agreement between the texts and the documents is as close as could be expected in dealing with a mixed dialect." (op.cit. 22). Finally, Miss Mackenzie⁴ accepts the "Lambeth Homilies" as representing the Middlesex dialect. "A comparison between the dialect features of the two groups of homilies (i.e. "Lambeth" and "Trinity Homilies") and those of the Middlex. Pl.-Ns. confirms Wyld's localization of these texts." (op.cit. 23).

But the evidence so far produced hardly seems to justify this unanimity, and the dialect of LH. differs in various particulars from the characteristics of the Middlesex dialect as given by Mackenzie. In her book, already quoted, she gives the following characteristics as being the "Middlesex Dialect Complex" (p. 83).

I. *en* for O.E. *an-i*. 2. *e* for O.E. *æ*. 3. *er* for O.E. *ear*. 4. *el* for O.E. *æl* + cons. (unlengthened). 5. *eld* for O.E. *æl* + *d*. 6. (ɛ) for O.E. *ǣ*.¹ 7. (ɛ) for O.E. *ǣ*.² 8. *u*, later *i* for O.E. *y*, *ȳ*. 9. *e* (ø) for O.E. *eo*, *ēo*. 10. *e*, *i*, *u* for O.E. *ea-i*, *ēa-i*. 11. *e*, *i*, *u* for O.E. *io-i*, *īo-i*. 12. *eg*, *eie*, &c., for O.E. *ēag*, *ēah*.

It will be as well if, in the first place, we see to what extent the dialect of LH. agrees with this list.

1. In LH. *e* is invariable for the *i*-mutation of OE. *a* before a nasal. In the Middlesex PNs. the *e*-type seems to be usual though one example of *a* is found in an East Middlesex name.

2. *e* is the regular development of OE. *æ* and most of the few exceptions given by Mackenzie can be explained easily enough. *habbe* 5/13, etc., *nabbe* 31/9, 1st sg.pr.ind. are due to the analogy of the infinitive. In *fader* 143/35, 145/30, *-fad(e)res* 73/28, 31, *fadre* 141/25, *water* 39/1, 159/5, 8, 12, 13, *-e* 51/32, 141/17, *-es* 159/1 there is some evidence for the presence of a back-vowel in the second syllable of these words,

⁴ B. A. Mackenzie, *The Early London Dialect*. (Oxford, 1928).

cf. the forms *feader*, *weattres* found regularly in the Katherine Group. In *hwat* 51/24, etc. the *a* may be due to the retracting influence of the preceding *w* and in *abac* 51/32, to the preceding *a*. *pat* 5/22, etc., *nas* 81/20, 91/22 are due to lack of accent as also *at* 35/24, 47/27, where it is a verbal prefix, cf. Vespasian Psalter *ðæt*, *æt*. In addition the following words are to be derived differently: *wat* 17/33 is OE. *wāt* and not *hwæt*, *ibad* pa.t.sg. 35/14 is more probably OE. *bād* than *bæd*. The forms *æt*, *æat* are not to be found on p. 233 where only *et*, 233/6, occurs. In any case this homily is from the Cotton Vespasian and not the Lambeth MS. Exceptions not given by Mackenzie are *cachepol* 97/30, probably a post-Conquest borrowing and not from the Old English *cæccepol*, *almesse* III/4, *almisse* 137/18, and two *ea* spellings *feader* 137/16, possibly due to back-mutation, and *fearð* 103/30.

e is the usual form in the Middlesex PNs. but some *a* forms also occur especially in the South-East of the county.

3. OE. *ear* regularly appears as *er* with occasional *ea* forms probably due to the influence of the Old English originals. Of the exceptions, *-ward* is invariable and due to the lack of stress and influence of *w*. *swart* 53/16, *warþ* pa.t.sg. 41/24, *warniene* 109/16 are probably due to the retracting influence of the preceding *w*; *izarket* 19/10, *izarwed* 139/2, *zaru* 153/33 are probably due to the shifting of stress and the absorption of the front element of the diphthong by the preceding palatal; *iarnede* 93/35, may be due to contraction from an OE. *geearnode*. Note also *parua* 115/8, *markian* 127/31.

warþest (not *warþ*) 7/17, and *iwarþen* (not *warþest*) 143/29, given by Miss Mackenzie, are due to ON. *varþa* and not to be derived directly from OE. *weorþan*.

The Middlesex PNs. afford no evidence for the development of OE. *-ear* so that the "Trinity" and "Lambeth Homilies" are the only authorities for the assertion that "the Middle-dialect proper belonged to area (B), where *ær* from *ear* was raised to *er*." (op.cit. 36).

4. *al* is regular for OE. *æl* + cons. (unlengthened). Two

e forms only are found, *help* 79/6, and *abelh* III/3. Two *ea* forms, *ealle* 97/21, *forswealh* pa.t.sg. 123/22, are probably unadapted forms of the original. *swealt* (not *swealte*) 225/5, given by Mackenzie, is from the "Cotton Vespasian," not the "Lambeth Homilies."

"The Middlesex dialect proper differed from the City-Essex dialect in having *el* for O.E. *eal*. This *el*-type, however, was early ousted by the City-Essex *al*-type." (op.cit. 39). But on the evidence of two *e*-forms and two *ea* forms it is difficult to see how the LH. can be described as "exhibiting traces of an undoubted *el*-form." In this characteristic LH. definitely differ from the evidence of the Middlesex PNs.

5. OE. *æ*l + *d* appears regularly as *ald* with occasional *old* forms as *monifolde* (not *monifold*) II/3, 45/2, *hunfold* 21/3, *feolefolde* 135/19, *etholdan* (not *etholden*) 91/33. *olde* 151/8, given by Mackenzie, should be *alde*. The rare *ea* forms probably represent unadapted forms from the original as in *ealde* 9/2, *ealdan* (not *ealden*) 89/5, *onealde* 97/7, *healded* (not *healdet*) 13/17, *sealden* 91/23. *weldeð* 153/14, *ealdre* 23/3, *elde* 145/3, *iwelt* III/22, have undergone *i*-mutation.

Here again the characteristics of LH. differ considerably from those of the Middlesex PNs. "There are very few Middlex. Pl.-Ns. which illustrate the development of O.E. *æ*l + *d*. The evidence, though rather scanty, clearly shows that Middlex. belonged to the fracture area." (op.cit. 44). But in that case it is improbable that LH. were written in the Middlesex dialect, since they have the unfractured forms quite regularly.

6. OE. *ǣ*¹ is almost invariably written *e* though there is no evidence to show whether this vowel is tense or slack. There is one example of *a*, *radeð* 133/33, which may be due to a copyist's error, and one of *ea*, *readan* 115/23; cf. similar spellings of OE. *rǣdan* with *ea* in the Katherine Group which regularly has the spelling *e* for *ǣ*¹. Mackenzie decides that the *e* is probably slack though, as she observes, "the *a/e* spellings in words containing O.E. *ǣ*¹ shortened are unreliable as a test of the quality of the corresponding long vowel."

(op.cit. 50). Whatever may be the case as far as Place-Names are concerned, it seems fairly certain that no conclusions can be drawn from the shortened forms of such words which are found in Middle English texts. This is a point which has never been properly investigated but even in texts where \bar{a}^1 undoubtedly gave tense *e*, we find certain examples of *a* in the shortened forms, compare for example the rhyme *adrad/gad*. (Havelok, 278-9). Nor can we prove anything from the rhymes of OE. \bar{a}^1 with OE. $\bar{e}a$ which are found in No. VI. of the *Lambeth Homilies*, *bred/red* 63/12-3, *red/ded* 63/28-9, 71/23-4. (The rhyme *ibeden/reden* 55/8-9, also given by Mackenzie, is probably not an example of such a rhyme). At the most such rhymes can only show that the original dialect in which the poem was written had the development of OE. \bar{a}^1 to slack \bar{e} . But such rhymes as *þenne/wunne* 55/20-1, show that the present dialect of the poem can hardly be that in which it was originally written. It follows, then, that the fact that \bar{a}^1 became slack *e* in the original dialect in which the poem was written provides no evidence for its development in the present dialect. In any case it is doubtful whether such rhymes can prove anything, even under the most favourable circumstances.⁵

The form *weoren* 135/4 may, as Mackenzie observes, point to a tense vowel but the rhyme *red/unhed* (really *inhed*) 69/30-1, proves nothing, see the above remarks, and it is impossible to say definitely whether the vowel is tense or slack in this text.

The forms of the Middlesex PNs. are said to be developed from the slack-vowel.

7. OE. \bar{a}^2 usually appears as *e* though again there is little evidence to show whether the vowel is tense or slack. It is perhaps worth noting that whilst \bar{a}^1 is invariably represented by *e*, there are a certain number of *ea* spellings for \bar{a}^2 , cf. *eani* 33/22, 41/26, 43/27, *ear* 17/18, 19/12, 21/9, *earþon* 3/18, 25/5, *eauer* 139/12, *bileafden* 93/23, *leaden* 89/6, *leaded* 3/8,

⁵ R. M. Wilson, " \bar{a}^1 and \bar{a}^2 in Middle English." (*Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literary & Historical Section* III, 342-6).

learð 95/23, *neaurē* 133/16, *sea* 43/2, 51/30. This may indicate a slack *e* for \bar{e}^2 and a tense *e* for \bar{e}^1 ; note the similar distinction in spelling which is found in the Katherine Group. But the evidence is far too slender for any definite decision on this point.

The only example of an *a* spelling for \bar{e}^2 is *dale* 123/18. Other examples given by Mackenzie are uncertain; *dalneominde* 47/8 is a compound word though not printed as such by Morris, and the *a* is probably due to early shortening of \bar{e} . *ariste* 45/32 is probably due to the influence of the verb *arīsan*. In addition three spellings with *æ* are found and probably represent unadapted spellings of the original, *æuriche* 135/10, *æuric* 137/31, 33.

e forms only occur in the Middlesex PNs. and this should, presumably, indicate a development to tense *e* in the Middlesex dialect. But "the appearance of *ea*-spellings in Lamb. Homs. and the Procl. indicates that \bar{e} from O.E. \bar{e}^2 was slack in quality in the Middlex. dialect, and this is supported by the evidence of \bar{e}^2 - $\bar{e}a$ rhymes in Davy." Presumably the *e* forms in the PNs. are explained as being due to an early shortening of the \bar{e} and subsequent raising of the *æ* to *e*. If this is so, it indicates that PN. forms are valueless as evidence for the development of OE. \bar{e}^1 and \bar{e}^2 in those districts where OE. *æ* was raised to *e*, i.e. in the South-East and in the South-West Midlands.

8a. The precise dialectal significance of the development of the *sel-*, *seg-* groups has never been worked out. In some cases the *e* is rounded to *y* in LOE. but whether this is dialectal or not is unknown. In any case the ME. development will be the same as for original OE. *y*, except that *e* forms will not necessarily indicate a South-Eastern origin. In LH. forms with *u* and *e* are found side by side, e.g. *suggen* 131/26, 133/24, *seggen* 7/18, *seggeð* (not *segged*) 57/29, 59/12, *segged* 3/9; *sullan* 109/4. One *i* form is to be found in *siggen* 19/36. But such forms as *solf* 147/13, *soluen* 53/28, *solue* 61/9, given under this heading by Mackenzie, are more probably to be explained as from OE. *seolfa* with Anglian fracture of *e* before *lf*.

8. In the development of OE. *y*, *ȳ*, LH. show a very different state of affairs from that shown by the Middlesex PNs. In this text OE. *y*, *ȳ*, regularly give *u* and most of the apparent exceptions given by Mackenzie are to be explained otherwise. The only certain *i* form is *winne* 147/7, a word in which *i* for *u* would be a very probable scribal error. Forms such as *bisne*, *chirche*, *drihten*, *king*, all of which invariably have *i*, are more probably to be derived from OE. forms in *i* since such forms of these words are regular in the Katherine Group which invariably has *u* for OE. *y*, *ȳ*. Rhymes such as *inne:sunne* 55/24-5, 63/5-6, *linnen:sunnen* 67/28-9, merely prove that *i* forms were to be found in the dialect in which the poem was originally written, but not necessarily in its present dialect. Obviously the development in the scribe's dialect must have been to *u* only since, if *i* forms had been found, he would not have been under the necessity of spoiling the rhymes by writing *u*. Only rare examples of *e* are to be found in the text, *unnet* 23/21, 107/3, 153/28, *inhed* 69/30. In *asterde* 95/14, the vowel may be due to the influence of the following *r* since in all dialects we find occasional examples of *y* becoming *e* before *r*. In *wurðment* 107/21, the *e* is probably due to lack of stress; *embe* 51/23, also given by Mackenzie, is more probably from an OE. form in *e*, and on the rhyme *wunne:þenne* 55/20-1, see the remarks above.

Consequently in LH., with the exception of two examples of *e* and one possible example of *i*, we find OE. *y*, *ȳ*, invariably represented by *u*. But in the Middlesex PNs. we find a very different state of affairs since "the early forms of the Middlex. Pl.-Ns. generally have *i* or *u*. Forms with *i* predominate slightly" (op.cit. 65). Actually the proportions as given by Mackenzie are 36 *i* forms, 29 *u* forms and 14 *e* forms. If we are to draw any conclusions at all from this, it would indicate that all three forms were current in the Middlesex dialect. But since *u* is practically invariable in LH., it is difficult to see how they can be fitted into a dialect which uses all three forms.

9. OE. *eo*, *ēo*, usually appear in LH. as *eo* or *o*, both spellings presumably indicating a rounded vowel. A certain number of *e* forms are to be found, *zerne* 11/3, 13/14, *heuene* 15/21, 59/19, etc. (17), *þeues* 15/34, 79/19, *sefene* 27/31 *fre-* 41/9, 75/35, *þre* 51/15, 77/2, *steruen* 71/30, *uel* 79/21, *fellen* 79/20, *prest* 81/17, *-es* 83/28, *smerte* 83/30, *crepan* 23/21, *trewfestnesse* 99/31, *lef* 57/13. Forms such as *sec* 23/3, *seke* 37/34, 111/1, *feh* 91/18, 109/29, are probably due to smoothing in LOE., and forms such as *werke* 9/28, etc. and *herkien* 31/6, etc. given by Mackenzie are more probably to be explained as from LOE. forms in *e* with Anglian smoothing of *eo* to *e* before *rc*. *em* 25/12, 115/8, may be from OE. *eam*.

The rounded form is also found in the early forms of the Middlesex PNs.

10. The *i*-mutation of OE. *ea*, *ēa*, regularly appears as *e*. *u* is invariable in three words, *scuppend(e)* 75/26, 129/26, *nutenu* 105/4, 129/23, *ruþeres* 15/34, 29/27, *rubberes* 29/12. This may indicate that they were unknown to the scribe who has mechanically transcribed the LOE. *y* of his original by *u*. *icwime* 95/32, is probably an unadapted form from the original. It is unlikely that *walmes* 141/17, is a mistake for *wulmes* as Mackenzie supposes. Such a form for the mutation of *a* before *l* + cons. would be quite exceptional in this text, cf. *welle* 41/27, etc. It may be a mistake for *e* or it may be the regular development of an Ang. *wælm*. *e* seems to be the usual form in the Middlesex PNs.

11. The *i*-mutation of *io*, *īo*, usually appears as *eo* with occasional *e* forms. Mackenzie does not mention this but says that "traces of the *ie*-type occur in the Lamb. Homs.," though the examples given are all doubtful. *fir* 103/2, 137/5, may be from an unfractured OE. form; *horde* 79/10 is more probably a spelling for *heorde* since the high-front-rounded vowel is not elsewhere represented by *o* in these homilies, whereas *eo* frequently is; *fur* 39/1 is from OE. *fȳr* showing the *i*-mutation of *ū* and not of *io*. But if "in the Middlex. dialect O.E. *io* is mutated to *ie*," it is unlikely that LH. were written in that

dialect since they do not show this change. Actually the evidence which Mackenzie produces for the *ie* type in Middlesex is decidedly weak.

12. OE. *ēag*, *ēah* appear invariably as *eʒ*, *eh*. The exception *ie* 19/26, given by Mackenzie, is from OE. *ege* "fear" and not OE. *ēage* "eye." The Middlesex PNs. have *-e*, *ei*.

If, then, we compare the dialectal features of the *Lambeth Homilies* with those of Middlesex as given by Mackenzie, we discover the following differences. The variations are few but perhaps significant.

	<i>Test.</i>	<i>Middlesex.</i>	<i>Lambeth Homilies.</i>
1.	OE. <i>an-i</i> .	e.	e.
2.	OE. <i>æ</i> .	e.	e.
3.	OE. <i>ear</i> .	e (a).	e.
4.	OE. <i>æ</i> l + cons.	a, e.	a.
5.	OE. <i>æ</i> ld.	eld (ald).	ald.
6.	OE. <i>ǣ</i> ¹ .	ē.	e [?] .
7.	OE. <i>ǣ</i> ² .	ē.	ē.
8.	OE. <i>y</i> , <i>ȳ</i> .	i, u.	u.
9.	OE. <i>eo</i> , <i>ēo</i> .	e, ø.	ø.
10.	OE. <i>ea</i> , <i>ēa-i</i> .	e (i, u).	e.
11.	OE. <i>io</i> , <i>īo-i</i> .	e (i, u).	eo, e.
12.	OE. <i>ēag</i> , <i>ēah</i> .	e (ei).	e.

But, given these characteristics, it seems doubtful whether we can decide in exactly what county any given text may have been written. The above characteristics show conclusively that LH. are written in either a Western or a Southern dialect, but there seems to be no reason why we should decide that that dialect is Central-Southern rather than Western. In fact these characteristics—among others—are given by Serjeantson⁶ as definitely indicating a West Midland origin for a text. It is doubtful whether we can ever localize a text, on linguistic evidence alone, so accurately as LH. have been localized by Wyld. Our knowledge of Middle English dialects is far too limited to allow us even to specify the county of origin with any certainty. In any case a much closer examination of the

⁶ M. S. Serjeantson, "The Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English." (RES., iii, 54-67, 186-203, 319-331).

phonology and syntax of our text is necessary before even an approximate ascription can be made. We may note here that in those points in which LH. differ from the Middlesex dialect they agree rather with the West Midland dialects.

In addition to the characteristics dealt with above, Wyld gives other points which led him to localize the LH. in Middlesex. These are:—

14. *-eð* as the ending of the 3rd sg.pr.ind.

15. *-eð* (*-en*) as the ending of the 3rd pl.pr.ind. The *-en* forms are rare and it is not always easy to decide whether the form is indicative or subjunctive.

16. *-en, e* as the ending of the past part with an invariable *i*-prefix.

17. *-en, -ien* as the ending of the infinitive. Occasionally the *-an, -ian* endings of the original still remain.

18. *-ende, -inde* as the ending of the pres. part. Verbs of the 2nd Weak Class regularly end in *-iende* (13) but apart from this the two endings are used fairly evenly with *-ende* slightly predominating. The numbers are *-ende*, 15, *-inde* 13.

19. For the Acc.Pl.Pron. "*hes* frequent." So Wyld who, presumably, takes into account the "*Poema Morale*" since, apart from this text, it occurs three times only, all in the rhyming "*Creed*." The rhymes in this homily show that the dialect in which it is now written is not that in which it was originally composed. *hes* occurs in none of the other homilies and so probably represents an unadapted form of the original dialect. In any case it can hardly be assumed to be a characteristic of the present dialect of the homilies.

20. The N.G.D. of the Pl.Pr. occur as *he; hem, ham; here, hare, hire*. These are the only forms given by Wyld, but actually the regular forms are *heo, heore, heom*, any other forms being comparatively rare exceptions. Excluding the "*Poema Morale*" we obtain the following statistics for the occurrences of the various forms:—

N.Acc.Pl. *heo* 128, *ho* 18, *hi* 9, *ha* 7, *he* 1.

G.Pl. *heore* 105, *hore* 19, *here* 2, *hare* 2, *heor* 1, *heoran* 1.

D.Pl. *heom* 83, *hom* 17, *ham* 5, *hem* 3, *him* 1.

It is difficult to be certain that such figures are absolutely accurate but they do, at all events, show the proportions in which the forms are found.

21. The pres.ind.pl. of the verb *to be* is invariably *beoð*. A form *beað* 89/34, is presumably due to a scribal error.

But, of these additional points, No. 19 alone indicates a South-Eastern rather than a Western origin. This point, however, seems rather indicative of the original than of the present dialect of the homily in which it occurs. It may be worth while to examine the characteristics of the West Midland dialect as given by Serjeantson (op.cit.), and to compare these with the characteristics of LH. As a typical example of the West Midland dialect we may take the B. MS. of the Katherine Group since it is as nearly contemporary with LH. as any of the West Midland writings. Moreover all authorities agree that the Katherine Group is written in the West Midland dialect. Serjeantson herself localizes the R. MS. of this group in Hereford and the only difference between the two manuscripts is that B. presents a much more regular dialect. The following points are given by Serjeantson as characteristic of the West Midland dialect:—

1. OE. *æ* appears as *e* in the Southern part of the area. *e* is regular in the KGr. where, too, we find such forms as *feader*, *weattres* indicating a back vowel in the second syllable, also a tendency to retract the *æ* to *a* after a *w*, *war*, *warschipe*, etc.

2. OE. \bar{a}^1 appears as tense *e* and

3. OE. \bar{a}^2 appears as slack *e*. As we have pointed out above, it is impossible to say definitely what the quality of the vowels may be in LH. The invariable spelling of \bar{a}^1 as *e* and the occasional spellings of \bar{a}^2 as *ea* may indicate a tense *e* for the former and a slack *e* for the latter. Compare the similar spellings in the KGr. where they are used regularly.

4. OE. *y*, \bar{y} , are found regularly as *u* in the West Midland dialects; so also in the KGr. and LH. Note, too, that such forms as *king*, *drihten*, etc. are regular in the KGr.

5. OE. *eo*, *ēo*, remain as a rounded vowel. In the KGr. the spelling is *eo*; in LH. *eo* is usual with a certain number of *o* spellings and occasional *e* forms.

6. OE. *eo* before *r* + back consonant. "Normally, then, the West Midland dialects have *e* for OE. *eo* + back cons., except perhaps in the extreme south of the area (South Glos.)." (op.cit. 191). *e* is regular in the KGr. and usual in LH., cf. *werke* 9/28, etc., *herkien* 31/6, etc., *eo* spellings which may be merely traditional are also found, *weorc* 93/21, 99/13, *weorke* 31/26, *weorkes* 45/12, 47/3, *weorcas* 107/5, *weorcan* 107/8. In addition there are two *o* forms, *worc* 101/7, *worke* 125/21.

7. OE. *æ* before *l* + consonant appears normally as *a* in the West Midlands. This is the regular development in the KGr. and in LH.

8. OE. *æ*l + cons. + *i*, *j* (unlengthened). *al* is found in the North-West and perhaps in the Central West Midlands in early ME., *il*, *ul*, in the South-West and *el* elsewhere. *al* is the usual form in the KGr. and may also be found in LH. in *walmes* 141/17, but the more usual form is *el*, cf. *welle* 41/27, 28, 129/6, 159/12, *welleð* 159/12.

9. OE. *ear* (< *ær* + cons.) appears as either *er* or *ar* in the West Midland dialects. Apparently the earlier the text, the greater number of *er* forms are found. The KGr. has regularly *er/ear* whilst LH. have almost invariable *er* forms.

10. OE. *a* + nasal (unlengthened) appears in the West Midland dialects as *on*, *om*; elsewhere *an*, *am*, is the regular form. The *o* forms are regular in the KGr. and also in LH. where *a* is found only very infrequently, except in unaccented words in which *a* is regular in the KGr. too. It is rather surprising that this distinctive characteristic has been completely ignored by all previous investigators. Serjeantson accepts the localization of LH. in Middlesex and states "The type with *a* is by far the most common and is current over the whole of the Central and East Midlands and South-East—except, perhaps, for a small area represented by LH. and a few other texts." (op.cit. 194). But this rounding is usually

supposed to be a distinctively Western change (see Jordan, 48; Luick, 357). The presence of the rounded forms in LH. would indicate rather a Western dialect for these Homilies than that the rounding took place in the East. There seems to be no other evidence for such a change in the Middlesex dialect. The Place-Names of the County⁷ seem to have *a* as a rule though, since the usual PN. elements have *a* + nasal + cons., the occasional *o* forms are more probably due to the rounding of *ā* to *ō*.

11. OE. *ea*, *ēa*—*i*, *j*, appear regularly as *e*, though with a certain number of *u* forms in the more southerly districts. *e* is invariable in the KGr. and regular in LH.

12. OE. *ēag*, *ēah*. "The prevailing type in the place-names of the West Midlands is the diphthongal form *ei*" (op.cit. 196). But *-eh*, *eg* is the regular development in the KGr. as in LH.

13. The ending of the infinitive is *-en* or *-e*. The *-i-* of the OE. *-ian* verbs is usually retained in the 13th century. In the KGr. the ending of the 2nd class of Weak Verbs is *-in* after a long-stem syllable, *-ien* after a short-stem syllable, otherwise the endings are as above. In LH. the ending of the 2nd Weak Class is usually *-ien*, *-ian* whatever the length of the preceding syllable. The difference here is probably due to the earlier date of LH. Otherwise the endings are *-an*, *-en*, *-e*.

14. All three endings of the pres.part. are found in the West Midland dialects. In the KGr. *-ende* and *-inde* are found side by side and this is also the case in the LH.

15. In the West Midlands the past part. usually has an *i*-prefix and loss of final *-n*. This is the case in the KGr.; in LH. the *-n* occasionally remains because of the early date.

16. The ending of the 3rd sg.pr.ind. is regularly *-eþ* in the early period though *-es* appears later in the more northerly parts. In the KGr. and the LH. *-eþ* is invariable.

17. The ending of the pl.pr.ind. is regularly *-eþ* with *-en*, *-es* appearing during the 14th century. *-eþ* is invariable in the KGr. and regular in the LH. where, however, there may be a few *-en* forms.

⁷ J. E. B. Gover, *The Place-Names of Middlesex*. (London, 1922).

18. The pl. of the verb *to be* is regularly *beoþ* until the 15th century. This is the invariable form in the KGr. and the LH.

19. LH. are too early for the form of the Fem.sg.pron. to have much significance, since at this date we should hardly expect *s*-forms even in the East Midland dialects. The typical West Midland forms are *heo*, *hue*, *ho*. In the KGr. *ha*, *heo* are usual; in LH. we find *heo* (57), *ho* (8), *ha* (3).

20. The Pl.Pron of the 3rd person. "One of the leading characteristics of the Western dialects of Middle English is the frequent occurrence of *heore*, *hore*; *heom*, *hom* for the Gen. and Dat. of the pl.pron. of the 3rd person, whereas the Eastern dialects have regularly *her* and *hem*, except in a few twelfth century texts in which *heom* occurs by the side of *hem*." (Serjeantson, op.cit. 202). The regular forms in the KGr. are *ha*, *heo*; *hare*; *ham* and in LH. *heo*; *heore*; *heom*.

From this survey it would appear that the "Lambeth Homilies" exhibit exactly those dialectal characteristics which are declared by Dr. Serjeantson to be peculiar to the West Midlands. The following list shows the similarity of the dialect of the *Homilies* to that of the KGr. as far as the above characteristics are concerned:—

<i>Test.</i>	<i>KGr.</i>	<i>LH.</i>
1. OE. <i>æ</i> .	e.	e.
2. OE. <i>æ</i> ¹ .	e (ē).	e [ē?]
3. OE. <i>æ</i> ² .	ea (ē:).	e/ea [ē:?]
4. OE. <i>y</i> , <i>ȳ</i> .	u.	u.
5. OE. <i>ēo</i> , <i>eo</i> .	eo [ö:, ö]	eo/o [ö:, ö]
6. OE. <i>eo</i> + <i>r</i> + back cons.	e.	e/eo.
7. <i>æ</i> <i>l</i> + cons.	a.	a.
8. OE. <i>æ</i> <i>l</i> + cons.— <i>i</i> , <i>j</i> .	a.	e/a.
9. OE. <i>ear</i> + cons.	er.	er.
10. OE. <i>a</i> + nasal (unlengthened).	o.	o.
11. OE. <i>ea</i> , <i>ēa</i> — <i>i</i> , <i>j</i> .	e.	e.
12. OE. <i>ēag</i> , <i>ēah</i> .	e3/eh.	e3/eh.
13. Infinitive.	-en/-ien/-in.	-en/-ien/-an/-ian.

	<i>Test.</i>	<i>KGr.</i>	<i>LH.</i>
14.	Pres. Part.	-ende/-inde.	-ende/-inde.
15.	Past Part.	y . . . e.	i . . . e(n).
16.	3rd sg.pr.ind.	-eþ.	-eþ.
17.	Pl.pres.ind.	-eþ.	-eþ/-en.
18.	Pl. ind. of <i>bēon</i> .	beoþ.	beoþ.
19.	Fem.sg.pron.	ha/heo;	heo;
20.	Pl.pron. 3rd person.	ha/heo. hare; ham.	heo. heore; heom.

In addition there are various other odd forms which, without belonging to any particular dialect, are common both to the KGr. and to LH. Such forms are:—*bluþeliche* found elsewhere only in the KGr.; *warhte* apparently a distinctively Western form appearing in the KGr. and the "Harley Lyrics"; *walde*, *nalde* are the regular forms in both texts; *kimeð* 3rd sg.pr. of *cumen* in both texts; *feader* regular in the KGr., occasional in LH.; *eskien*, cf. KGr. *easkin*; *scal*, cf. KGr. *schal*; etc. These similarities should not be stressed too heavily but, in conjunction with the above characteristics, they do indicate a likeness between the dialect of the KGr. and that of LH. At the same time it is unlikely that they are written in exactly the same dialect. Anglian back-mutation of *i* and *e*, though fairly common in LH., is by no means so regular as in the KGr. In addition, we find numerous examples of Mercian back-mutation of *æ* in the KGr. as against only isolated examples in LH. Some of these slight differences may be explained as due to a greater amount of scribal corruption in LH. and some of them are undoubtedly due to their earlier date. But they do seem to indicate, too, a slight difference of dialect, especially since we find two changes in our text which are not found in the KGr. There seems to be a definite tendency towards the unvoicing of final *-ng*, cf. *ofsþrinke* 75/31, *underfenc* 99/10, and such spellings as *dringen* 37/33, 43/27, *þong* 39/33, *biþengþ* 149/6, 153/7, may be reverse spellings. We find also the change *-eng*, *-enc* becoming *-ein* in LH., cf. *leinten* 25/19, *streinðe* 69/17, 113/16, *adreinte* 141/11, etc. Of these the

former seems to be a Western change whilst the latter is not particularly dialectal at all. The voicing of initial *f* to *v* is found fairly frequently in both the KGr. and LH. and in the latter we find one example of the voicing of initial *s*, *zeinte* 17/27, but this change is found in the South-East as well as in the West.

In conclusion, there is not the slightest evidence that the "Lambeth Homilies" were written in the Middlesex dialect and there are several points against such an ascription. The dialect agrees closely with the characteristics of the West Midland dialect as given by Dr. Serjeantson, and this, together with its similarity to the dialect used in the KGr., would indicate a Western origin. In the present state of our knowledge of Middle English dialects it is futile to attempt to decide in exactly what county the "Lambeth Homilies" may have been written. All that we can say is that their dialect is almost certainly West Midland and perhaps rather more central than the dialect used in the KGr.

NOTE.

Very little seems to be known of the history of the manuscript of the "Lambeth Homilies" previous to its appearance in the Lambeth Palace Library. Miss Irene Churchill, the Assistant Librarian, suggests that it may have been one of the group of manuscripts which came to Lambeth from Lanthony Priory in Worcestershire. Such an origin would fit in very well with what we know of the dialect in which LH. are written. Unfortunately there is no evidence either for or against such a localization.

The text of LH., as printed by Morris, has been collated with the manuscript but no serious errors have been found. Morris seems to have been an exceptionally careful editor and, although there are a certain number of corrections to be made, none of them are serious; most of them, in fact, seem to be due rather to clerical errors than to a misreading of the manuscript. Morris makes no attempt to give the exact manuscript reading but gives rather the reading which the

scribe wished to appear. Consequently letters or words deleted or dotted for erasure are, as a rule, silently omitted. Examples of this are as follows:—

- 3/17. 7 s *is dotted for erasure before mid.*
 5/32. pa: MS. *pat with t dotted for erasure.*
 7/25. for to *is dotted for erasure before al.*
 9/6. folc: MS. *floc with first l dotted for erasure.*
 19/36. uil *has been deleted before uwlche; &c.*

Similarly no notice is given where letters or words have been added above the line but the correction has been silently made in the printed text. e.g.

- 7/20. *In lewe the first e has been inserted above the line.*
 7/31. *In leorneres the first e has been inserted above the line.*
 7/34. ibede: MS. *ibide with second i dotted for erasure and e inserted above the line.*
 43/22. on *has been inserted above the line; &c.*

In the same way words added in the margin are inserted in the text in their proper place without notification. In most cases the scribe has marked the exact place where such insertions should be made. e.g.

- 37/20 on ward; 39/34 child; 47/2 3eueð reste to alle eorðe;
 55/12 to us; &c.

In these three cases the intention of the scribe is quite clear and Morris is merely giving the text which the scribe was attempting to write.

Three further points to be noted are rather more important:—

1. The punctuation marks appearing in the manuscript as ' and ? are not differentiated but both appear as ' in the printed text. But the two marks are clearly different in the manuscript and ? should be read for ' in the following cases:—
 9/36, 29/4, 83/16, 83/29, 83/34, 85/7 (second), 89/36 (both), 91/3, 93/1, 93/5 (first), 95/2, 95/7, 95/33, 95/34, 99/28, 109/6, 109/8 (first), 127/29, 155/27, 159/20.

2. After a stop in the manuscript Morris often capitalizes a following *þ* though the letter is exactly the same as the ordinary small *þ*. In the following cases no manuscript

authority can be discerned for such capitalisation:—9/1 pat, 9/8 pat, 9/13 pa, 9/17 pet, 11/24 pe, 15/8 pas, 17/34 pa, 49/8 pe, 49/12 pes, 53/18 peos, 53/26 pus, 57/29 pi, 73/3 pro, 75/11 pis, 75/19 pet, 77/26 pa, 79/5 per, 81/12 pes, 91/30 pa, 113/17 pe, 145/17 pos.

3. There is some difficulty about the foliation at the beginning of the manuscript. The first folio is unnumbered and the foliation starts on the second folio which is numbered 1. From there the foliation proceeds normally to the end of the manuscript but, because of the omission of the first folio, the numbers are throughout one behind the true numbering. Morris calls the unnumbered folio 1a but then omits the numbering of the second folio in the manuscript. The first folio ends with *stohwenness* 5/25 and the folio numbered 1 commences with the following *on*. Fol. 1a ends with *heriende* 7/12 and the folio numbered 2 starts as indicated by Morris.

Other corrections may also be noted. Many of them are obvious clerical errors as for example the occasional printing of commas for the stops in the manuscript. Others such as the omission and insertion of stops are errors which would be easily made in the transcription. A stop should be omitted in the following cases:—21/22 *after* awei; 25/5 *after* muchele; 25/7 *after* ibeten; 35/23 *after* dazes; 39/4 *after* ridebitis; 39/9 *after* uigilantibus; 49/18 *after* hames; 57/23 *after* bode; 59/7 *after* loð; 59/25 *after* onlichness; 83/35 *after* hele; 85/23 *after* þo; 87/18 *after* fordude; 103/21 *after* ufel; 105/11 *after* Largitas; 105/17 *after* zitsunge; 131/1 *after* the second iii; 139/10 *after* the first dei; 147/21 *after* Mon. A stop should be inserted in the following cases:—11/2 *after* scrift; 11/18 *after* londe; 33/15 *after* hunger; 39/14 *after* deihwamliche; 39/26 *after* þing; 47/17 *after* pet; 49/28 *after* the first pet; 49/29 *after* of; 49/31 *after* pet; 49/33 *before and after* pet; 51/12 *after* pet; 63/29 *after* ded; 65/2 *after* fode; 65/8 *after* unskile; 75/15 *after* lefulle; 83/4 *after* innepe; 87/1 *after* fitti; 91/8 *before and after* dauid; 95/32 *after* snoter-ness; 101/22 *after* UICIIS; 101/30 *after* un-halne; 103/24

after uuele; 105/7 after is; 133/9 after witene; 153/17 after wilen; 153/23 before and after Mon; 155/10 before and after dauid; 159/16 after water.

Rather more important are the following:—

- 3/4. *In oðere the first e has been dotted for erasure.*
 11/8. *Bracket the initial E of Ecce. A space was left for the illumination but it has never been carried out.*
 11/23. *For over read ouer.*
 13/11. *The last letter in a3c may be an e.*
 23/36. *In per-on, per has the usual contraction for pet.*
 29/26. *MS. biter, not bicer as Morris, note 5.*
 37/30. *For þe þus read þus þe.*
 41/18. *For wrecche sunfulle read sunfulle wrecche.*
 45/2. *For ðe read þe.*
 45/33. *For hali read halie.*
 47/24. *For Leofemen read Lefeomen.*
 51/19. *The manuscript is mutilated here but it is still possible to make out the e in pes.*
 59/22. *The word looks more like aft than like æt.*
 65/31. *pet is indicated by an abbreviation and the et should be italicised.*
 75/10. *For seggen read segge.*
 75/25. *The i of in has been altered from an o.*
 77/2. *The e of þre has been altered from an o.*
 77/7. *For but read bute.*
 77/8. *Monne; but a similar abbreviation elsewhere is expanded by Morris as Mon.*
 79/18. *For derewurð read derewurðe.*
 79/21. *No justification for the italicisation of a in lare.*
 83/16. *For Hwet read Hwat.*
 89/23. *For wittesunnedeie read -dei.*
 95/5. *The -eð in cweð is indicated by an abbreviation.*
 95/18. *For þe the manuscript has the abbreviation for þet followed by an e.*
 97/29. *þene: MS. þē with no abbreviation for e.*
 99/7. *The -eð in cweð is indicated by an abbreviation.*

- 99/33. þam: MS. þā.
 101/21. *Omit &c.*
 103/8. *Fol. 38a begins with maceð; heo is the last word on 37b.*
 103/28. *The e of ungearu altered from an a.*
 103/33. *For ihatan read ihaten.*
 109/20. *Fol. 41a begins with the -nesse of ihersumnesse.*
 113/29. *For butan read buten.*
 117/21. *For ihaldene MS. has ihaldeñe.*
 125/4. *For min read mi. There is no trace of an n in the MS.*
 127/14. *For ne read na.*
 135/26. monne; MS. mō.
 149/6. þe. *MS. has the abbreviation for þet followed by an e which is dotted for erasure.*
 149/30. *Omit Amen.*
 155/13. *Omit et cetera. Amen.*
 155/18. *Fol. 58a starts with the -ten of drihten.*
 157/21. Wume; MS. Wuñe.
 159/25. *Omit et cetera. Amen.*

R. M. WILSON.