

TWO DIFFICULT WORDS IN 'AB'

RICHARD DANCE*

*St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, CB2 1RL, U.K.
E-mail: rwd21@cam.ac.uk*

Abstract

I discuss here the etymologies of two problematic words in the 'AB Language', *keaft* and *onont*. The form *keaft* (which is preferred over the alternative reading *keast*) is found in Middle English only in one occurrence in *Ancrene Wisse*. Previous suggested derivations from OE *ciefes*, from medieval Dutch, and from ON *ákefð* are rejected in favour of a hypothetical native cognate of the latter, OE **cǣff*, which is the form most likely to lie behind the spellings of *keaft* in the manuscripts of *Ancrene Wisse*, and also provides a satisfactory sense for the word ('boldness, brazen behaviour'). The distinctive AB preposition *onont*, 'with regard to', seems to be related to the more widespread ME *anent*, but cannot be derived easily from the same source (OE *on efn*, *on emn* plus excrescent final *-t*) via phonetic changes alone. Substitution of another morpheme for OE *efn* is probable, but an earlier suggestion that this morpheme was ON *jamt* is less likely than that a form of OE *and-*, *ond-* is responsible. Introduction of this latter explains the different orthographic reflexes in the AB texts, and may have occurred relatively recently in order to make sense of the morphologically-opaque *anent*.

The 'AB Language' is the name usually applied to the early thirteenth-century, South-West Midland scribal dialect jointly attested, with only very minor differences, in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 402 ('A'), containing *Ancrene Wisse*, and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 34 ('B'), containing the 'Katherine Group'. Especially since the well-known article by Tolkien (1929), the crucial importance of 'AB' as a witness to the linguistic features of early Middle English, including its vocabulary, has been widely realized, but there remain several areas of uncertainty, and many words whose origins and senses have yet to be satisfactorily explained.¹ The first complete, critical edition of *Ancrene Wisse* based upon the text in MS A, edited by Bella Millett for the Early English Text Society, is currently in preparation. My work with Dr Millett in providing the Glossary to this new edition has offered the opportunity for a thorough re-analysis of the lexical items that feature in this important text, and I present in what follows some remarks on two interesting and difficult words whose etymologies have been the subject of previous speculation, and which require fuller discussion than the Notes to the edition will allow.



1. *Keaft*

The noun *keaft* is recorded once only in Middle English, as part of an injunction against unchaste conduct in AW. The author is describing the progeny of the Scorpion of Lechery, and his readers are warned against those situations and actions that lead to this sin, where one must be careful not to

hunti þrefter wið wohunge. wið . . . Vnhende grapunge *þet* mei beon heaued sunne.
luuie tide oðer stude forte cumen i swuch keaft.

(MS A, 55a 24–55b 1)²

Tolkien in fact reads *keast* in his diplomatic edition of MS A, but most subsequent commentators have preferred *keaft*,³ and such a form would seem to be confirmed by the witness of the other earlier thirteenth century copies as the reading of the original: so N has *kefte* (91:16), T *caft* (66:11).⁴

This *keaft* (to stick with the A form) has been variously interpreted, but no one has made satisfactory sense of its etymology. From the context, as from the offerings of other versions of the text (note especially L *peccati* (72:32)), it seems reasonable to posit a meaning like ‘sinful activity’, ‘unchaste behaviour’; the latter is that forwarded by MED, and followed by Zettersten.⁵ Derivations vary. MED offers a link with “WS *ciefes*, M *cebis*, a concubine”, whereas Jordan thought the word might originate in a Dutch cognate of the same, but offered no suitable etymon.⁶ As Zettersten rightly objects, however, neither of these suggestions can be regarded as very plausible, the former owing to phonological incompatibility (we should expect an AB **cheft* with palatalized initial consonant if the *cief-*, *cef-* root were involved), and the latter for lack of any evidence of such a word in medieval Dutch. Zettersten’s own opinion, from a suggestion to him by E. J. Dobson, is that *keaft* be regarded as an adoption from ON **kefð*, which is recorded in Scandinavian texts with the intensifying prefix *á-*, though he offers few other details.

The Old Icelandic word in question has a range of meanings from ‘speed’ to ‘eagerness, ardour’ to ‘vehemence, hotheadedness, fury’ according to the first volume of the *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog* (s.v. *ákefð*). In form, *ákefð* is to be derived in turn from the adj. *ákafri*, ‘vehement, hot-tempered’, etc. (cp. the alternative nominal form *ákafi*), which shows [a] in its second syllable from an earlier **[a:]* < **[ai]* in circumstances of reduced stress; compare the cognate Old English adjective *cāf*, ‘quick, lively, eager, bold’.⁷

ON **kefð* is indeed a better etymon for *keaft* than those proposed previously; its possible senses especially fit the bill for the Middle English word extremely well. But I think it unlikely in fact that AB *keaft* and its related forms descend precisely from this source. Apart from the

fact that the Old Norse word is not recorded without its prefix, there are problems with the phonology implied by the Middle English spellings. These unanimously point back to a late OE /æ/ (regularly coming down as sounds spelt <ea> in A, <e> in N and <a> in T), but such would be a decidedly unusual destination for ON /ɛ/ in a borrowed word with this shape in any English dialect; we should expect late OE /e/, ME /e/ (cp. for example other words in the AB Language like *eggīn*, *genge*, *menske*, *unspende*).⁸ A more feasible, and related, origin for *keaft* does however suggest itself. This is a hypothetical native cognate of ON **kefð*, i.e. a noun formed on the relatively frequent Old English adjective *cāf* (as noted above) with the same suffix as has been employed to create the Scandinavian word. The addition of this OE *-*ip(u)* (PGmc *-*ipō*; cp. Go -*ipa*, OHG -*ida*) would result in *i*-mutation of the stem vowel, and therefore produce an OE **cāfþ*. Since late OE /æ:/ tends to shorten before a (non-homorganic) consonant cluster,⁹ the resultant /æ/ would provide an exact source for the attested early ME spellings of *keaft* (*kefte*, *caft*) in the various copies of AW. And the development finally of *-*[fθ]* > -*[ft]* can be envisaged fairly easily as a dissimilatory change distancing the two consecutive spirants and facilitating pronunciation (as well as being exactly that already accepted by Zettersten in his citing of ON (*á*)*kefð* as etymon).¹⁰ As to sense, we have already noted the compatibility of the cognate form in Scandinavian, and the hypothetical Old English word could carry similar meanings, i.e. 'boldness, brazen behaviour, lack of continence (in matters sexual)'.¹¹

2. *Onont*

The distinctive AB preposition *onont*, 'concerning, with regard to', seems to be related to the more general ME *anent*, -*d(e)* which it closely resembles in form and with which it shares senses. MED (s.v. *anent(es)* prep.) derives the latter from the Old English combination *on* + *emn*, with the addition of excrescent final -*t*. *Emn* in this sequence clearly originates in earlier OE *ef(e)n*;¹² the compound must then at first have implied physical proximity, but came later by metaphorical extension to describe the connection of attributes or ideas, hence 'with regard to'. This derivation of *anent* has much to recommend it, and early Middle English forms like *onefent*, *oneuent* (AW MS T),¹³ as well as later ones like *anemp*s (1469 *Paston* 5.15) and *anempt* (a. 1500 *Hrl.* 2378 *Recipes* 98/17–18), would seem to confirm it. As regards the acquisition of final -*t*, one can of course compare the development of MnE *against* (ME *ayeines-t*), where the same thing would appear to have happened to another preposition, closely related in sense; and still other prepositions and adverbs likewise acquire a final -*t* in ME (e.g. *amidst*, *amongst*, *betwixt*, etc.).¹⁴ Dobson favours a phonetic motivation for excrescent -*[t]* after *[s]* in these words, and, given his remarks on a similar devel-

opment of [t] after [-n] in some others, one could posit the same change in *onefent*, etc.; under such circumstances, the generation of a homorganic plosive may be assigned to the effects of a late release of the [n]-sound, after the articulatory process has shifted to the oral cavity.¹⁵ Phonetic acquisition of final [t] in cases like these is, however, normally regarded as later than would be implied by its somewhat isolated appearance in these particular prepositions (it is otherwise a late Middle or early Modern English phenomenon), and some association with the form of a following definite article has therefore also been cited as a factor. Dobson concedes the need to posit some influence of this type, and this is also the opinion of MED.¹⁶

The favourite AB form *onont*¹⁷ (and others with *-o-* in the second syllable) cannot, however, be derived straightforwardly from the same source as ME *anent*, despite the fact that both MED and OED so assign it. The latter dictionary does in fact confess that “*anont*, *anond(e)*, are not explained”, and it is indeed very hard to account for the presumed combination of sounds [-ont] (non-WMidl [-ant]) if we start with [-emnt], [-ent].¹⁸ It is perhaps possible that we have to deal here with some sort of assimilation of the vowel in the second syllable to that in the prefix.¹⁹ Even assuming shifting of stress to the first element and subsequent neutralization of the vowel in the second, we should still nonetheless expect the spelling *-e-* in AB for the sound [ə]; a subsequent ‘harmonization’ of vowel heights between the two syllables might produce a more retracted sound in the second, hence [-ənt] > [-ant], WMidl [-ont], but this does not seem especially likely, and such a shifting of stress in the first place would itself be entirely out of character with comparable prepositions in Middle and Modern English (compare *against*, *upon*, *beyond*, etc., all with stress on their second elements). As the *onont* forms occur relatively early in the Middle English canon, and are almost entirely confined to the AB Group texts,²⁰ it might be more appealing to connect these forms with a locally-distinctive combination that has an immediate source slightly different from that of ME *anent*. And since purely phonological explanations for the second syllable of *onont* do not seem likely to account for it convincingly, we may get further if we posit modification of its second element by different means, i.e. by the substitution of an originally separate morpheme.

Colborn is thinking along similar lines when he suggests blending of OE *onemn* with ON *jamt*.²¹ I do not regard this idea as persuasive, however. We do not need to import foreign influence to account for final *-t*, since, as noted above, this occurs in the regular *-ent* variants too, as well as in *against*, etc. Influence from the ON vowel /a/, coming down to AB as /o/, is not impossible: /o/ is indeed the regular reflex of ON /a/ in AB when it appears before a nasal consonant,²² and there are other words which perhaps show Scandinavian phonological material

absorbed into a pre-existing native morpheme.²³ Such substitution is at best rare, however, and its probability in any one instance should therefore not be favoured if a more likely explanation can be found. The occurrence of prepositions derived from Norse in the AB Language is moreover otherwise nil. The only examples in the whole South-West Midland family of texts²⁴ are to be found in C (probably the most northerly of all the Worcestershire manuscripts of AW),²⁵ occur very rarely even there, and are of a sort extremely common in Middle English at large (viz. *til*, *fro(ward)*, once each; see C 154:1, 30v:26); these very likely therefore show influence from dialects further to the North and East, whose Norse-derived element contains significantly more penetration of such basic grammatical lexemes (compare the rather more northerly MS T of AW),²⁶ and such an explanation will not fit *onont*, which is clearly at home as an AB word and occurs frequently.

If the origin for the second element of *onont* forwarded by Colborn is considered unlikely, then can a more suitable candidate be found? An examination of the variant forms found in the South-West Midland manuscripts of the AB group may suggest that one can, and indicate further that we should be looking for a form the quality of whose final consonant could vary between [t] and [d]. Thus spellings with final *-d(e-)*²⁷ are very common:²⁸ while MSS B and R contain only *-t* forms, A has *onond* once (34b 25, as well as two cases of *on ende*),²⁹ whereas N shows three instances of *-d-* forms (beside fifteen in *-t-*), C eight (next to only seven in *-t-*) and G two (four in *-t-*). Add this distribution to the fact that, in these occurrences of these lexemes, *-t* is never found (non-word-finally) before a vowel, and it becomes very tempting to suggest that we see in operation here the devoicing of final [d] to [t] word-finally after liquids and nasals that is implied very frequently in the AB orthography itself, but which is slightly less favoured in the other manuscripts of the group (see e.g. AB words like *azeinwart*, 'backwards', *healent*, 'saviour', *feont*, 'enemy').³⁰ Whether or not AB *onont* ultimately shares an origin in common with ME *anent*, it would therefore seem sensible to look for a more immediate source for its second element with an original OE final [d].

The likeliest candidate would seem to be OE *and*, *ond*, giving expected early Middle English forms including *ond* and *ont* in the West Midlands. If this is indeed the morpheme that appears as the second element of ME *onont*, then of course the vital question remains how (and at what period) it came to occupy that position, and there may be no straightforward answer to this. To begin with etymological identification, the OE *and* in question is most likely to be that which seems to have begun life as a preposition with the sense 'before, beside, in addition to'; compare Gothic *and*, 'along, through, over'.³¹ One can imagine, if this is so, a compound formation OE **an and*, *on ond*, whose senses would

naturally be similar to those of *on efn*. It is, however, now usually not supposed that this *and* word persisted into attested Old English as a simplex with any prepositional functions.³² Accordingly, if an Old English compound **an and, on ond* existed as an originally independent formation, parallel to *on efn* but not directly influenced by it, then its creation must have taken place in the prehistoric period. If, however, ME *onont* does not simply parallel *anent*, but is instead a reworking of it with substitution of OE *and* for its second element, then it may have arrived on the scene considerably later. Certainly, OE *and* does survive throughout the Old English period with appositive senses as a prefix in compounds, when it is used as the first element of combinations like *and-saca, and-swaru*.³³ *Efn* is, what is more, used in very similar environments in Old English word-formation strategies, including instances in which it is prefixed to the same second elements as *and* (thus e.g. *efen-ettan/and-ettan, and-lang/efen-lang*). This similarity might further have aided an association between OE *and* and *efn* such as was already suggested by a closeness in sense. One can therefore imagine a combination **an and* being formed on the model of OE *on efn, emn*, a compound prepositional structure which would be supported further by the existence of other very common formations of exactly the same type, especially *on gegn* (MnE *against*). But if a substitution of *and* for *efn* were to occur at all, then it is perhaps more likely still that this should happen when OE *on emn*, ME *anent* had already acquired its excrescent final *-t*, since it would be then that the second element of the latter compound resembled the form of *and* most closely, especially the West Midland variants in voiceless [t]. It is feasible, indeed, that AB *onont* and its related forms first emerged in hypercorrect variants of ME *anent*, particularly if, as seems likely, the *-ent* of this form had by this time become too different from ME *efne, euen-* (OE *efn*, etc.) to be clearly associated with it. Under such circumstances, the substitution of a less opaque second element would be understandable, and would have the added attraction of bringing *anent* into line with the other common compound prepositions, whose second elements could still easily be analysed as separate morphemes (compare especially AB *a-buue, a-zein, a-mid, a-mong, bi-mong, bi-uore*, etc.). This theory would certainly help account for the fact that it is only in western dialects that forms of the *onont* type are found, since it was only in this region that a variant of OE *and* occurred that was similar enough to be confused with the second element of *anent*.³⁴ Lexical confusion and amalgamation of this type is, at any rate, not uncommon in the history of English,³⁵ and no less feasible a proposition than the claim for partial morphemic substitution based on a foreign lexeme during contact with Norse. The acquisition of excrescent final *-t* and consonant cluster simplification in forms of *anent* must itself reflect, indeed, a very similar sort of

lexical alienation of the second element of *on efn*, *emn* from its original simplex adjective; the two must have come to be perceived as distinct morphemes, and changes have thus befallen the former in its peculiar, compounded context that would never befall the simplex. The AB variant *onont* has thus simply gone further still in the language's attempt to clarify morphologically the elements that must have constituted a difficult sequence.³⁶

As a final point of corroboration, something very similar seems likely to account for yet another version of the *anent* compound, this time taking the variant form *anende*. This *-end(e)* could perhaps show a phonetically-motivated voicing of original /t/ after /n/ in *anent*, especially if this /t/ were itself due to purely mechanical phonetic factors; in this case, we should need to posit merely that the voicing proper to /n/ has been carried over into the new excrescent final plosive.³⁷ It seems highly likely, however, that we see here in addition the effects of confusion with the noun OE *end*, which would also have the desired effect.³⁸ Such confusion may again stem from a hypercorrecting tendency and another attempt to make more transparent morphemic sense of the elements in the *anent* sequence, whose *-[nt]*, at any rate in western dialects, could be perceived as a weakly-stressed variant of 'full' *-[nd]* (and the association with *ende* would presumably be abetted in forms of *anent(e)* that had gained final *-e*). This process might again be further aided by the fact that *ende* is also used as a prefix in certain constructs and has implications of spatial relationship analogous to those that *emn* possessed in Old English (as in e.g. OE *ende-byrd*, *ende-nēhst*), and comparable to those still present in a literal interpretation of ME *anent*.³⁹ The doggedness with which forms in *-end(e)* remain in certain later ME dialects (e.g. that of the Gawain-poet)⁴⁰ does certainly hint that such variants were perceived as more than simply the result of the sporadic voicing of *-t* in *anent*, just as the persistence of *-o-* in versions of this word in the AB texts is redolent of morphemic interference that goes beyond likely developments of a purely phonetic type.

Notes

* I am grateful to those who have read earlier versions of this piece and otherwise offered advice, especially Terry Hoad, Bella Millett and Matthew Townend.

1. On the vocabulary of AB, the most important study is Zettersten's (1965). For the details of AB more generally (especially as regards phonology and morphology), still the best account is that in d'Ardenne 1961; for a summary of other scholarship and its conclusions, see in particular George Jack's remarks in Millett 1996, pp. 17–21.

2. The abbreviations used here are: AW = *Ancrene Wisse*; A = Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 402; B = Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 34; C = London, British Library Cotton MS Cleopatra C. vi; G = Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College MS 234/120; L = Oxford, Merton College MS C. i. 5; N = London, British Library Cotton

MS Nero A. xiv; R = London, British Library MS Royal 17 A. xxvii; T = London, British Library Cotton MS Titus D. xviii. The editions used are listed in the References. Apart from the AB texts, the short title conventions of MED are followed when citing its entries.

3. See especially Zettersten 1965, p. 77. Bella Millett also informs me that she too reads *keaft* in A at this point. Salu, in her translation of this passage, is probably following Tolkien. She offers: “pursuing it and trying to bring it about, by . . . improper handlings, which may constitute mortal sin, taking pleasure in the time or place which may give rise to such things” (Salu 1990, p. 91). Compare similarly Savage and Watson (1991, p. 123) who also translate *keafilkeast* as “things”, and White (1993, p. 98) who has “situations”. Wada (1994, pp. 32–33) reads *keast* and translates “circumstances”.

4. It is particularly difficult to imagine the N redactor repeating a non-existent word that had arisen out of some previous copying error, since one of his chief characteristics is a readiness to alter the vocabulary of his exemplar whenever it appears to have struck him as necessary. The word clearly caused difficulties for some scribes, however, G reading *cast* (58:28) and C (87:9) omitting it altogether.

5. See MED s.v. *caft*, n., and Zettersten 1965, p. 77.

6. See Jordan 1974, §179.

7. See e.g. de Vries 1961, s.v. *ákaftr*, and Björkman 1904, p. 168. On the OE word, see also the ‘C’ fascicle of the *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v.

8. Compare ON *eggja*, *gengi*, *menska*, *spenna*. For general notes see esp. Björkman 1900–1902, pp. 289, 291. Lowering from late OE /e/ to /æ/ is implied by variants of some words showing ON /ɛ/ and /e/ in the AB texts, e.g. the form *þweartouer*, ‘downright’ at AW MS A 21a 11 (from ON *þvert*); but these show /e/ in a common lowering environment before a liquid (for native-derived examples of the same thing see d’Ardenne 1961, Language §§3, 5), something not matched in *keaft*.

9. See e.g. Campbell 1959, §329(1).

10. Compare the development of *sleight* (ME *slezþe*, *slezte*) from ON *slægð*. Analogy with other OE forms like *þœoft*, ‘theft’, is also possible, whose -[t] can be regarded as going back to an original stop retained as such (because added directly to the stem – note the absence of *i*-mutation); see e.g. Kastovsky 1992, pp. 359–360. *Þœoft* has itself, on the other hand, been seen as a case of dissimilation (cp. the doublets *þœoff*, *þiöfþ*, and Campbell 1959, §481(5)).

11. There are no convincing examples of an adjective derived from OE *cāf* in the A MS of AW. Despite Zettersten (1965, p. 163) and MED (s.v. *cōf*, adj.), the forms <kaue> and <caue> at A 16a 20 and 22 (with reference to someone or something stealing hens’ eggs) seem much more likely in the context of the bird imagery in this passage to depend upon the AN *kaue* (OFr *chaue*), ‘chough, jackdaw’. This is an older explanation of the form rejected by Zettersten, but followed by e.g. Salu (1990, p. 29), and also that favoured more recently by E. J. Dobson (as communicated to me by Bella Millett). That medieval readers of AW could also misinterpret <kaue, caue> as the native adjective is nevertheless implied by the variants in the other manuscripts here (cp. especially T, which has <zeape>, ‘cunning’ at 10:10 and <luðere>, ‘wicked’ at 10:12); and it would seem, therefore, that the ME descendant of OE *cāf* could be understood by some at least in the context of the audacious pursuit of a dubious activity, something very much compatible with the circumstances of *keaft*.

12. The assimilation of *-fn-* > *-mn-* is often regarded primarily as a WS change, though it is attested occasionally also in Angl contexts (as e.g. *stemn* beside *stæfn*, ‘voice’, in the Merc *Rushworth* 1; see Campbell 1959, §484).

13. *Onefent*, *oneuent* in T are not exemplified in MED (though it offers the forms under its initial list of variants), but see Mack 1963, e.g. 49:34, 28:27.

14. See e.g. MED s.v. *ayen(e)s*, prep., and also Jordan 1974, §199.

15. See Dobson 1957, §§436–437.

16. See Dobson 1957, §437, and MED s.v. *anent(es)* prep. Probably rightly, furthermore, Dobson rejects the suggestion in OED (s.v. *against*, prep. (adv.)) that *-st* in *against* is owed partially at least to confusion with the superlative *-st* ending; certainly, this explanation would be much harder to apply to the history of *anent*, and indeed OED as a result is unsure as to the origin of its final *-t*, tentatively citing 'form-assoc. with some other word' but offering no candidates (s.v. *anent*, prep. and adv.).

17. In the vast majority in the AB tradition; variants of the *anont*, *-d(en)* type with initial *a-* are however preferred in C and occur also in N.

18. AB *-ont* must represent *-[ont]* (or conceivably a version with a lengthened [o]) rather than *-[unt]*, since the use of the *o* graph to indicate [u] in the vicinity of minim letters is not one that seems to appear in the AB tradition (see e.g. d'Ardenne 1961, Orthographical Notes §11 note 3).

19. OE *ef(e)n* appears to descend from a PGmc **ebno-* (cp. e.g. Go *ibns*, OHG, OS *eban*, OFris *even*, ON *jafn*), making the appearance of /a/ (= AB /o/ before a nasal consonant) certainly unetymological.

20. The only other comparable forms cited by MED are c. 1300 *SLegMich* (Hrl) 137/241 (*anante*), c. 1390 *Castle Love* (1) 1076 (*anont*) and perhaps a. 1225 *Lamb.Hom.PaterN.* 26 (*anundes*); all these are West Midland or South-Western texts.

21. See Colborn 1940, p. 112 (note to l. 161). This is also the view followed by Zettersten (1965, p. 37). It seems to go back as far as an aside in Sievers 1886, p. 47; this is noted also in Björkman 1900–1902, p. 20.

22. Compare e.g. AB *wonte* (cp. ON *van-t*), AB *wontreaðe* (cp. ON *vandræði*).

23. See for example the comments on AB *gadien*, 'spikes', made in d'Ardenne and Dobson 1981, p. 265, who derive it from a combination of OE *gād* and ON *gaddr*. For a different view, see however d'Ardenne 1961, glossary s.v.

24. I.e. those copies of AW, the Katherine Group and members of the *Wohunge* Group made in the southerly part of the West Midlands, probably Herefordshire and Worcestershire (contained in A, B, R, N, C, G).

25. For a summary of opinions about C, see further Millett 1996, pp. 51–52.

26. On the history of T and the localization of its elements, see esp. Laing and McIntosh 1995, pp. 235–263. On the Norse-derived vocabulary of the South-West Midland AB Group texts, see further my forthcoming study in Richard Dance, *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland Texts* (Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies).

27. Final *-e(n)* seem to be the result of analogy with prepositions like OE *begeondan*, *onbūtan*, which regularly have such (originally datival) suffixes.

28. To be rejected is Colborn's suggested explanation for the *-de* in *ononde* at AW MS N 73:11, which he assigns to the influence of the following word *meidelure* (Colborn 1940, p. 112); this hardly accounts for all the other occurrences of *-d-* variants, in N as elsewhere. D'Ardenne (1942, pp. 61–62), reviewing Colborn's book, is likewise doubtful about his conclusions, and indeed goes as far as to query his derivation of final *-t* from ON *jamt* on the grounds that it fails to account for *-d-* forms.

29. At 34a 16 and 35a 21, corresponding to e.g. *anont* in N (54:36 and 56:26), though C also has *an ende* corresponding to the second instance, which presumes a similar reading also in the original copy of AW here.

30. OE *ongegn-weard*, *hælend*, *fēond*. See e.g. d'Ardenne 1961, Language §§33–35; also Jordan 1974, §200.

31. See Lehmann 1986, s.v. *and*. Despite OED (s.v. *and*, conj.¹), it is not clear that this word can be equated etymologically with the conjunction *and*, and Pokorny, for instance, treats the two as entirely separate (Pokorny 1959–69, p. 50).

32. OED (s.v. *and*, conj.¹) cites some purported examples of such prepositional use of *and*, and there are more to be found in Bosworth-Toller s.v. *and*, prep., e.g. the second 'ǰ' in "Hæfdon glēam ǰ drēam ǰ heora ordfruman", "They had joy and mirth before

their creator" (*Genesis* I. 13), where *and* is read as a preposition taking either the accusative or the dative. These instances are however all rejected in the entry for *and* in the recently published 'A' fascicle of the *Dictionary of Old English*, where it is claimed that 'prepositional *ond* (more usually the Tironian note) is best regarded as the inverted spelling for *on*, prep.', and in some cases (including that from *Genesis* cited above) 'ǰ' could indeed be read as the conjunction.

33. Cognate are Go *anda-*, ON *and-*, OS *and-*, *ant-*, OHG *ant-*, etc., probably < PGmc **anda*, < IE **anta*; see Lehmann 1986, s.v. *and*.

34. When it is not represented by the Tironian 'ǰ', the conjunction 'and' appears in AB regularly as *ant*, but it seems clear that this is a result of this word's occurring mainly in weakly-stressed positions; under full stress, the phonological rules of AB mean that /o/ must appear before a nasal, and this is indeed the case in examples of the prepositional/prefix *ond* (see e.g. the frequent AB verb *ondswerien*, 'answer').

35. Note e.g. 'folk etymological' developments such as that in MnE *bridegroom*, which represents original OE *brȳdguma* conflated with the later more obvious element ME *grome*.

36. The development of the final sequence *-ond*, *-ont* may moreover have been encouraged by its further similarity to the coda of another native preposition still used very commonly as such in the AB dialect, i.e. *Ʒont*, *Ʒond*, 'over, through' (< OE *geond*).

37. And see Dobson 1957, §436.

38. Analogy with the ME adverbial phrase *on ende*, *an ende*, 'finally, constantly', etc., has also been suggested (see OED s.v. *anent*, prep. and adv.), though this has little in common semantically with the preposition, is relatively rare, and its influence is not necessary in order to account for the association of the latter with *end(e)*.

39. Another proposition, particularly given the appearance of *on ende* twice in A in the function of *onont* (and *anent* does not appear in AB at all), is to connect the *end(e)* component once again with earlier OE *and*, prep., which is very close etymologically to forms with *i*-mutation, including the noun OE *ende*, 'end' (cp. Go *andeis*, ON *endi*, OHG *anti*, *enti*, etc., < PGmc **andja-*; see Lehmann 1986, s.v. *andeis*). The conjunction OE *and* also has an alternative form *and*, *end* in early sources (PGmc **andi-*; cp. OFris *ande*, OHG *anti*). ME *anend-*, *onend-* might then be viewed as deriving originally from an early variant of *onont*. But this suggestion must remain dubious.

40. See e.g. *Pearl* (ed. Gordon 1953), ll. 186, 697, 1136.

References

Editions cited

- d'Ardenne, S. R. T. O. Ed. *Pe Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Iulienne*. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège lxiv. Liège: Librairie E. Droz, 1936. Reprinted with corrections as EETS OS 248. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- d'Ardenne, S. R. T. O. and Dobson, E. J., Eds. *Seinte Katerine, Re-Edited from MS Bodley 34 and the Other Manuscripts*. EETS SS 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Day, Mabel Ed. *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwe, edited from Cotton MS Nero A. xiv, on the basis of a transcript by J. A. Herbert*. EETS OS 225. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Dobson, E. J. Ed. *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwe, edited from B. M. Cotton MS Cleopatra C. vi*. EETS OS 267. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- d'Evelyn, Charlotte Ed. *The Latin Text of the Ancrene Riwe, edited from Merton College*

- MS 44 and British Museum MS Cotton Vitellius E vii*. EETS OS 216. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Mack, Frances M. Ed. *Seinte Marherete, Pe Meiden ant Martyr*. EETS OS 193. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Mack, Frances M. Ed. *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle, edited from Cotton MS Titus D. xviii (together with The Lanhydrock fragment, Bodleian MS Eng. th. c. 70, edited by A. Zettersten)*. EETS OS 252. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Millett, Bella Ed. *Hali Meidhad*. EETS OS 284. London: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Thompson, W. Meredith Ed. *Pe Wohunge of Ure Lauerd*. EETS OS 241. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. Ed. *Ancrene Wisse, The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle edited from MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 402*. EETS OS 249. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Wilson, R. M. Ed. *Sawles Warde, An Early Middle English Homily edited from the Bodley, Royal and Cotton MSS*. Leeds School of English Language, Texts and Monographs 3. Kendal: Titus Wilson, 1938.
- Wilson, R. M. Ed. *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle, edited from Gonville and Caius College MS 234/120*. EETS OS 229. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Dictionaries

- An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*, edited and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller. London: Oxford University Press (Humphrey Milford), 1898 [= Bosworth-Toller].
- Dictionary of Old English: C and A*, Eds. A. C. Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: Published for the Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto by the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988, 1994.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary. Based on the Third Edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*, with bibliography prepared under the direction of Helen-Jo J. Hewitt. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986.
- Middle English Dictionary*, Eds. Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn and Robert E. Lewis. Ann Arbor (University of Michigan Press) and London (Oxford University Press), 1956– [= MED].
- Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog/A Dictionary of Old Norse Prose. 1: a – bam*, Eds. Helle Degnbol, Bent Chr. Jacobsen, Eva Rode, Christopher Sanders, Þorbjörg Helgadóttir. Copenhagen: the Arnamagnæan Commission, 1995.
- Pokorny, Julius. *Indogermansiches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Two Volumes. Bern and Munich: Francke Verlag, 1959–69.
- The Oxford English Dictionary* (first published as *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*), Eds. James A. H. Murray, Henry Bradley, W. A. Craigie and C. T. Onions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Second edition, prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, 1989 [= OED].
- de Vries, Jan. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Other references

- d'Ardenne, S. R. T. O. Review of Colborn 1940. *English Studies* 24 (1942): 58–62.
- Björkman, Erik. *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English*. Studien zur englischen Philologie 7, 11. Two Volumes. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900–1902.
- Björkman, Erik. "Etymologiska småbidrag", *Nordisker Studier tillegnade Adolf Noreen på hans 50-Årsdag den 13 mars 1904 af Studiekamrater och Lärjungar*. Uppsala: Appelberg, 1904, pp. 168–174.

- Campbell, A. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Colborn, A. F. Ed. *Hali Meiðhad*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1940.
- Dobson, E. J. *English Pronunciation 1500–1700*. Two Volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Gordon, E. V. Ed. *Pearl*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Jordan, Richard. *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. Eugene Joseph Crook. *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica* 218. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974 (first edition 1925, as *Handbuch der mittelenlischen Grammatik, 1. Teil: Lautlehre*).
- Kastovsky, Dieter. "Semantics and Vocabulary", *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. 1: The Beginnings to 1066*. Ed. Richard M. Hogg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 290–408.
- Laing, Margaret and McIntosh, Angus. "The Language of *Ancrene Riwe*, the Katherine Group Texts and *Pe Wohunge of ure Lauerd* in BL. Cotton Titus D. xviii." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96 (1995): 235–63.
- Millett, Bella. *Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature Volume II: Ancrene Wisse, The Katherine Group and the Wooing Group*, with the assistance of George B. Jack and Yoko Wada. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1996.
- Salu, M. B. Trans. *The Ancrene Riwe (The Corpus MS: Ancrene Wisse)*, with an Introduction by Dom Gerard Sitwell and a Preface by J. R. R. Tolkien. *Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1990 (first published London: Burns and Oates, 1955).
- Savage, Anne and Watson, Nicholas Trans. *Anchoritic Spirituality. Ancrene Wisse and Associated Works*, with a Preface by Benedicta Ward. *The Classics of Western Spirituality*. New York & Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991.
- Sievers, E. "The Etymology of *endemes(t)*". *Modern Language Notes* 1 (1886): 47–48.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. "*Ancrene Wisse* and *Hali Meiðhad*". *Essays and Studies* 14 (1929): 104–126.
- Wada, Yoko Ed. and Trans. "*Temptations*" from *Ancrene Wisse. Volume One*. Kansai University Institute of Oriental and Occidental Studies, Sources and Materials Series 18. Osaka: Kansai University Press, and Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994.
- White, Hugh Trans. *Ancrene Wisse: Guide for Anchoresses*. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Zettersten, Arne. *Studies in the Dialect and Vocabulary of the Ancrene Riwe*. *Lund Studies in English* 34. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1965.