QVAESTIO INSVLARIS

Selected Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic

Volume 12 · 2011

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

ArchJ	*Archaeological Journal*
ASE	*Anglo-Saxon England*
BAR	British Archaeological Reports (Oxford)
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna)
EETS	Early English Text Society
EME	*Early Medieval Europe*
ES	*English Studies*
HER	Historic Environment Record
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
JEPNS	*Journal of the English Place-Name Society*
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
rer. Germ.	rerum Germanicarum
MLR	*Modern Language Review*
MÆ	*Medium Ævum*
NM	*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*
N&Q	*Notes and Queries*
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*
PQ	*Philological Quarterly*
RES	*Review of English Studies*
SBVS	*Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research*
SP	*Studies in Philology*
SS	*Scandinavian Studies*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Revisiting the 'Welsh Dictator' of the Old English Orosius

Dr Paul Russell

Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, Cambridge

> Whoever the translator of the Old English Orosius may have been, the evidence of the extant manuscripts appears to be that the text as we have it acquired its present form as a result of dictation not by a man of 'Romance culture' but by a Welshman of Latin education to a scribe with an Anglo-Saxon background.

In concluding her 1966 paper on the question of dictation in the Old English Orosius thus, Janet Bately not only consolidates the general and long-held opinion that the Old English Orosius was the product of dictation, but suggests the crucial refinement that the dictator was a Welshman.[1] The final sentence of the footnote added to that concluding sentence also raises the tantalising possibility that we

---

[1] J. M. Bately, 'The Old English Orosius: the Question of Dictation', *Anglia* 84 (1966), 254–304, at p. 304; *The Old English Orosius*, ed. *ead.*, EETS ss 6 (Oxford, 1980), pp. cix–xvi. The standard edition of the Latin Orosius is *Pauli Orosii Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, ed. C. Zangemeister, CSEL 5 (Vienna, 1882); cf. also *Orose: Histoires (Contre les Païens)*, ed. M.-P. Arnaud-Lindet, 3 vols. (Paris, 1990–1). A recent English translation of the Latin text is A. T. Fear, *Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, Translated Texts for Historians 54 (Liverpool, 2010), which is based principally on the Arnaud-Lindet edition. Janet Bately, Fred Biggs, Richard Dance and Malcolm Godden all read drafts of this paper, and I am grateful for their helpful comments and suggestions – not that they might all agree with what I have done with them. I am also grateful to Georgia Henley for her painstaking editorial work which has made this a better paper. This version has also benefited from the comments made after the original presentation of this work at the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic in 2011.

know who that Welshman was: 'At King Alfred's court the most famous Welshman was of course Asser'.[2] With occasional probing and suggested minor modifications, this view of the creation of the text has now generally become embedded in the scholarship;[3] for example, Michael Lapidge takes it as given and ties it into Asser's knowledge of Orosius: '[…] it may have been Asser himself who dictated the Old English translation of the Latin Orosius'.[4]

The evidential basis of argument rests primarily on two features observable in the spelling of names of peoples and countries in the text: first, they show irregularities in the spelling of internal stops in relation to the spellings found in the Latin version, so as to suggest

---

[2] Bately, 'The Old English Orosius', p. 304, n. 293; the full note reads: 'For a Celtic secretary working with Æþelweard, cf. Sisam, *PBA*, 39 (1953), 320–321. At King Alfred's court the most famous Welshman was of course Asser'.

[3] For probing by Peter Clemoes (as reported by Peter Kitson), see P. Kitson, 'The Dialect Position of the Old English Orosius', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 30 (1996), 3–35, at pp. 5–6. For other modifications and suggestions (focusing on the possibility of a Cornish dictator), none of which shakes the foundations of Bately's core proposal, see A. Breeze, 'Cornwall and the Authorship of the Old English Orosius', *N&Q* 38 (1991), 152–4; *id.*, 'Cornish *Donua* "Danube" and the Old English Orosius', *N&Q* 39 (1992), 431–3; *id.*, 'Cornish *Ligore* "Loire" and the Old English Orosius', *NM* 93 (1992), 271–3 (with re-assertions in *id.*, 'The Old Cornish Gloss in Boethius', *N&Q* 252 (2007), 367–8; *id.*, 'Orosius, the Book of Taliesin, and *Culhwch and Olwen*', *Studia Celtica* 45 (2011), 203–9, at p. 207). For observations on Breeze's view, see Kitson, 'The Dialect Position', pp. 3–4. Curiously, Breeze talks of the nationality of the translator, when Bately's argument relates to the dictator, not the translator (Breeze, 'Cornwall and the Authorship of the Old English Orosius'; *id.*, 'Cornish *Donua*', p. 432); in the quotation at the top of this paper and elsewhere, Bately explicitly declines to comment on the translator.

[4] M. Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 119–20 (quotation on p. 120).

that the dictator not only voiced internal unvoiced stops, but also turned internal voiced stops into fricatives. This had been observed from the late nineteenth century onwards and was explained by the process of dictation; thus, e.g., *þ > b, t > d, b > v, d > þ/ð*; e.g., *Tribulitania* (*Tripolitana*), *Lampida* (*Lampeto*), *Galua* (*Galba*), *Leoniþa* (*Leonidas*).[5] Secondly, some names also show irregularity in the spelling of initial stops, e.g. *Clafrione* (*Glabrione*), which, Bately suggested, may have to do with the Brittonic propensity to mutate initial stops.[6] The dictator, so the argument goes, a non-native speaker of Old English, was pronouncing the Old English text in front of him (and so also the names of peoples and places in the texts) in such a way that the scribes coped with the rendering of the Old English narrative perfectly well (for there seem to be no errors in the copies which scholars have attributed to dictation errors), but in some instances they apparently struggled with the spelling of the names. To account for these features, two inter-related hypotheses were developed: first, that the text was produced by dictation, and secondly, that the accent with which the dictator pronounced the names (derived mainly from

---

[5] In these examples and throughout, the first form comes from the Old English text and the form in brackets from the Latin; to avoid burdening the argument with numbers, full references can be traced through the compendious Index of Names in *The Old English Orosius*, ed. Bately, pp. 407–33. Note also that at this stage I am referring to this variation as variation in spelling, thus *þ* and *b*, etc.; later in the discussion, when referring to sounds, I use /p/ and /b/. For earlier discussions, see H. Schilling, *König Ælfreds Angelsächsische Bearbeitung der Welt-geschichte des Orosius* (Halle, 1886), p. 58; A. Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im altenglischen* (Strassburg, 1888), §§ 247n, 310, 317, 325, 329, 340n; N. H. P. Bøgholm, *English Speech from an Historical Point of View* (Copenhagen, 1939), p. 19; A. Kirkman, 'Proper Names in the Old English "Orosius"', *MLR* 25 (1930), 1–20, 140–51.

[6] Bately, 'The Old English Orosius', pp. 274–81.

Latin and Greek) in his Old English text could reveal the nationality of the dictator. With regard to the latter, while some of these features might be regarded as reflecting Romance or Germanic pronunciation (thus earlier scholars[7]), the combination of the spelling of both intervocalic and initial consonants suggested to Bately that the dictator was a speaker of a Brittonic language. Thus, for Bately the dictator was Welsh (with Asser springing to mind as the most likely candidate). More recently, Andrew Breeze has proposed, on the basis of the spelling of a handful of names, that the dictator was not a Welshman but a Cornishman, though he does not rule out the possibility that he was a Breton.[8]

There are then two distinct questions which can be asked of the Old English Orosius: first and more generally, was it at some point during its transmission the product of dictation? Secondly and more

---

[7] For the work of earlier scholars, see the references in n. 5.

[8] Breeze, 'Cornish *Donua*', p. 432. Surprisingly, no strong arguments have been presented for a Breton dictator – surprising in that no one has attempted systematically to connect the alleged Brittonic character of the Old English text with the Breton provenance of several manuscripts of the Latin Orosius. The following five Orosius manuscripts are known to contain Old Breton glosses: Venice, Bibliotheca Marciana, Zanetti, Lat. 349 (s. ix); Rome, Vatican Library, Regina 296 (s. ix); Berne, Stadtbibliothek 160 (s. xi); Rome, Vatican Library, Lat. 1974 (s. xii); Rome, Vatican Library, Regina 691 (s. xii); see L. Fleuriot and C. Evans, *A Dictionary of Old Breton / Dictionnaire du Vieux Breton: Historical and Comparative*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1985) [the first vol. reprinted from L. Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire du Vieux Breton* (Paris, 1964)], I, 4–7. On the Breton term *Ormesta* to refer to Orosius, see A. Anscombe, '"*Ormesta*"', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 4 (1903), 462–3; C. Cuissard, '"*Ormesta Britannae*"', *Revue Celtique* 5 (1881–3), 458–60; and most recently P. Sims-Williams, 'Some Functions of Origin Legends in Early Medieval Wales', in *History and Heroic Tale: A Symposium*, ed. T. Nyberg *et al.* (Odense, 1983), pp. 97–131, at p. 116. The likely Breton (or more generally Brittonic) origin of *Ormesta* seems to have eluded Fear, *Orosius*, p. 24.

specifically, can we tell from the variation in the spelling of the names whether the dictator was speaking Old English with a Welsh accent? As indicated above, both questions have been answered in the affirmative, the former since the nineteenth century and the latter since the mid-sixties of the twentieth century. However, there are good reasons for thinking it timely to re-open both questions and to re-visit the evidence. With regard to the general question of dictation, it is well known that identifying dictated texts is a notoriously difficult business, but recent linguistic analyses of 'slips of the ear', and in particular Peter Bierbaumer's work on Old English, might be able to cast some new light on this issue.[9] Secondly, Bately's work in identifying the dictator as Welsh was reliant on the ground-breaking work of Kenneth Jackson on the historical development of Brittonic phonology, and it is also clear from various comments in her work that Jackson took a close interest in her analysis of the names in the Old English Orosius.[10] However, since then, important work has been done by Anthony Harvey, in particular, to improve our understanding

---

[9] P. Bierbaumer, 'Slips of the Ear in Old English Texts', in *Luick Revisited*, ed. G. Bauer, D. Kastovsky, and J. Fisiak, Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 288 (Tübingen, 1988), 127–37. For other recent work on 'slips of the ear', etc., see C. Browman, 'Perceptual Processing: Evidence from Slips of the Ear', in *Errors in Linguistic Performance: Slips of the Tongue, Ear, Pen and Hand*, ed. V. Fromkin (New York, 1980), pp. 213–30; M. Celce-Murcia, 'Meringer's Corpus of "Slips of the Ear"', in *Errors in Linguistic Performance*, ed. Fromkin, pp. 200–11; S. Garnes and Z. S. Bond, 'A Slip of the Ear: a Snip of the Ear? A Slip of the Year?', in *Errors in Linguistic Performance*, ed. Fromkin, pp. 231–9; B. Voss, *Slips of the Ear: Investigations into the Speech Perception Behaviour of German Speakers of English* (Tübingen, 1984).

[10] K. H. Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain* (Edinburgh, 1953). I am grateful to Janet Bately for showing me a copy of a letter from Kenneth Jackson discussing aspects of the spelling of the names in the Old English Orosius.

of the relationship between phonology and spelling in the early medieval Celtic languages.[11] Furthermore, ongoing work by Roger Wright has changed our understanding of the nature of the development of, and the relationship between, the Romance languages and late Latin.[12] In other words, it might pay us to re-consider aspects of the arguments about the Romance, and indeed Germanic, features alleged to be visible in the spellings of the names in the Old English Orosius.

WAS THE DICTATOR WELSH?

We may begin with the specific question of whether it is possible to decide if the dictator was Welsh, and then proceed to the more general question of whether we can tell if a text has been dictated. However, it may be worth first reminding ourselves of some of the established facts concerning the manuscript transmission of the Old English Orosius, and in this, as so much else to do with this text, we are reliant on the work of Janet Bately.[13] The two earliest manuscripts containing a complete text of the Old English Orosius are:

---

[11] A. Harvey, 'Retrieving the Pronunciation of Early Insular Celtic Scribes: Towards a Methodology', *Celtica* 21 (1990), 178–90; *id.*, 'Retrieving the Pronunciation of Early Insular Celtic Scribes: the Case of Dorbbēne', *Celtica* 22 (1991), 48–63; *id.*, 'Reading the Genetic Code of Early Medieval Celtic Orthography', in *LautSchriftSprache: Beiträge zur vergleichenden historischen Graphematik*, ed. E. Glaser, A. Seiler and M. Waldispühl, Medienwandel – Medienwechsel – Medienwissen 15 (Zurich, 2011), 155–66. Harvey's work forms the backdrop to what follows.

[12] R. Wright, *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1991).

[13] Bately, 'The Relationship between the MSS of the Old English Orosius', *ES* 48 (1967), 410–16; *ead.*, 'King Alfred and the Latin MSS of Orosius' History', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 22 (1961), 69–105.

L   Lauderdale (Tollemache) MS: London, British Library, Additional 47967 (s. x^{in})

C   London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i (s. xi)

The spelling variation discussed by Bately and argued to be diagnostic of a Welsh dictator is found in both manuscripts; according to Bately, L, on which her edition is based, is at least three removes from the original translation of Orosius' 'History'.[14] There are also a few more instances of spelling variation in C than in L. It is clear, therefore, that whatever was going on to create the variation in the spelling of the names happened between the translation and the archetype of the surviving manuscripts, L and C.

Bately discusses a wide range of spelling features exhibited by the names in the Old English Orosius. However, the clearest diagnostic feature concerns variation in the spelling of consonants, and that will be the focus of this discussion. Vocalic variation is a less secure guide to the kind of linguistic interference perpetrated by a dictator, since the perception of vowel quality by a scribe can be influenced by a number of conditions, such as the extent to which a vowel might be affected by the quality of the flanking consonants (e.g., rounding of vowels adjacent to labial consonants, etc.), or whether the syllable is stressed or unstressed. The latter issue itself raises an interesting question: if, for the sake of argument, we accept that the dictator was a Welshman, he would presumably have still pronounced Old English with an initial stress, but how would he have treated the unfamiliar personal and place names? Is it possible that in some instances, perhaps where the name was least familiar, he reverted to a Brittonic

---

[14] Bately, 'The Relationship'; *ead.*, *The Old English Orosius*, pp. xxxi–ix.

pattern of penultimate stress?[15] In my survey of the names in the Old English Orosius, I found no correlation between spelling alternations and variation in the possible position of the stress accent, whether a classical Latin pattern varying between an ante-penultimate and a penultimate position, a later Latin pattern, an Old English initial pattern, or a Brittonic penultimate pattern. In comparison, systematic variation in consonantal spelling may prove more helpful, not least because it may be clearly visible in the spelling.

At this point a brief digression into early Brittonic phonology may be of use. From the earliest contacts between Latin and British speakers, Latin words borrowed into Brittonic underwent the same changes as native lexical items, one of the most distinctive of which was the voicing of intervocalic unvoiced stops, and the change of intervocalic voiced stops into fricatives, thus -/p/- > -/b/-, -/m/- > -/μ/- (later -/v/), -/t/- > -/d/-, -/k/- > -/g/-, -/b/- > -/β/- (later -/v/-), -/d/- > -/ð/-, -/g/- > -/γ/-; in the last case, the voiced guttural disappeared completely within the history of Welsh, but traces of it survived in the other Brittonic languages.[16] Thus, for example, a borrowed Latin *medicus* 'doctor' developed into Middle Welsh *medyc*, Modern Welsh *meddyg* /meðig/, etc. We may note that in the medieval stage of the Welsh language the Latin letters *d* and *c* in the middle and end of words represented -/ð/- and -/g/-, and it is only in the later stages of the language that a more distinctive and consistent spelling was adopted. Within Latin texts surviving from early medieval Wales, there are rare, but precious, examples which indicate that, when speaking Latin, native speakers of Brittonic languages used a Brittonic accent (which involved, *inter alia*, the

---

[15] The issue is raised by Bately, *The Old English Orosius*, p. cxiii, n. 2.
[16] For a basic discussion, see P. Russell, *An Introduction to the Celtic Languages* (London, 1995), pp. 236–8.

voicing and spirantising of intervocalic consonants); for example, in the text entitled *De Raris Fabulis*, designed to teach basic Latin, preserved in a manuscript from Cornwall, Oxford, Bodleian Library 572 (s. x), we find the question *quae cubis?* where the context requires this to mean 'what do you want?', corresponding to a more classically spelt *quae cupis?*[17] It is precisely this feature that Bately argues can be detected in the spellings of the names in the Old English Orosius, thus *Tribulitania* corresponding to the Latin *Tripolitana*.[18]

In the early stages of the Brittonic languages, the same voicing or spirantising of intervocalic stops also occurred on word boundaries; for example, where a feminine noun ended in -/a:/ and the following adjective began with a consonant, e.g., */kassika: duba:/ 'a black mare', */kassika: kokka:/ 'a red mare', the initial intervocalic consonants of the two adjectives underwent the same changes as if they were word-internal, thus */kassiga: ðuva:/ and */kassiga: goχa:/. After the loss of final syllables, what had been a phonetic alternation on the word boundary developed into the pattern of initial mutation, used in the later language to mark grammatical categories; thus, Middle Welsh *cassec du*, *cassec goch*, Modern Welsh *casseg ddu*, *casseg goch*.[19] Bately has argued that such initial alternations are also detectable in the names in the Old English Orosius, e.g., *Brobus* (*Probus*); *Dissafarnon* (*Tissafernen*), and can be used as supporting evidence for the claim that

---

[17] *Early Scholastic Colloquies*, ed. W. H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1929), pp. 1–11, at p. 3, l. 3 (§ 5).

[18] Note, however, that we might have expected *Tribulidania*, or the like; for further discussion, see below.

[19] For the grammaticalization of the mutations, see Russell, *Introduction*, pp. 249–51.

the dictator was a Welshman.[20]

We may now turn to the data provided by the personal and place names of the Old English Orosius. There are 357 names listed in Bately's index which contain the relevant phonological segments, namely intervocalic consonants (also including a consonant flanked by a resonant and vowel, e.g. *Marþonius* (*Mardonius*), or vowel and resonant, e.g. *Fiþnam* (*Pydna*). Some instances also contain more than one relevant segment, such as *Tripolitana* mentioned above. All the relevant data for intervocalic consonants is presented in Appendix 1 (pp. 58–60). All instances of a spelling which is not found in the Latin version of Orosius are listed. For the sake of completeness, the Appendix also contains the instances where a variant spelling is also attested in one of the manuscripts of the Latin text, e.g. *Abulia* : Latin *Apulia* (but the variant *Aboliam* is found in MS D (Donaueschingen, Court Library 18)), *Fauius*, *Fauia*, *Uauius*, etc. : Latin *Fabius* (but forms in -*u*- are a common variant in Latin manuscripts); such cases are not counted in the statistics, since it could always be argued that such forms were present in the Latin exemplar which was translated into Old English. All these forms are presented in Bately's discussion; however, what is lacking in her data is the number of instances where the form of the name is identical to the standard Latin form; without that extra set of figures it is very difficult to gain a real sense of the significance of the cases where there is a variant spelling. Table 1 presents the summary statistics based on the forms listed in Appendix 1.

---

[20] It might be pointed out, as others have done, that if the evidence is thus interpreted, the dictator could just as well be Cornish or Breton (see the citations in nn. 3 and 5 above). It is also worth pointing out that, although I have used feminine examples above as illustration of initial mutation, mutations frequently occur in various collocations with masculine names in Welsh; for discussion, see T. J. Morgan, *Treigladau a'u Cystrawen* (Cardiff, 1952), pp. 101–28.

Intervocalic consonants:	Changed	Unchanged from Latin
-/p/- > -/b/-:	1	42
-/t/- > -/d/-:	2	50
-/k/- > -/g/-:	0	71
-/b/- > -/v/-:	4	37
-/d/- > -/ð/-:	30	47
-/g/- > -/γ/- > -/j/- > -/∅/-:	1	9
-/m/- > -/μ/- > -/v/-:	0	63
Total	**38**	**319 [= 357]**

Table 1: Summary of data presented in Appendix 1

A number of observations can be made about these data. First and most obviously, it is striking that the number of forms which do not match the Latin spellings is a relatively small proportion (10.64%) of the examples overall; in other words, 89.36% of the names in the Old English Orosius are, apart from the anglicisation of the morphology, spelt the same as the forms in the Latin version.[21] Furthermore, there are very few examples indeed of the voicing of unvoiced stops (/p/ > /b/, etc.), and some of these examples may reflect spellings of the Latin exemplar. Another striking feature is that there are no examples of -*v*- corresponding to spellings in -*m*- in the Latin text; since a Welsh dictator, who would

---

[21] Not including forms where there is a standard Old English version of the name, such as *Megelan* (Mediolanum (Milan)), *Profentse* (Provincia (Provence)) or *Magentsan* (Mogontiacum (Mainz)); see Bately, *The Old English Orosius*, p. cxiv.

have been pronouncing *-b-* as -/v/-, would certainly have pronounced *-m-* as -/μ/- or -/v/- which would probably have been written by an English scribe as *-f-*; this is a telling gap in the data.[22] It is also worth observing that there are several cases where one consonant in the word was affected but not another, e.g. *Metreþatis* (not **Medreþadis), *Sarþanopolim* (not **Sarþanobolim); in such cases it is noticeable that it is the voiced stop which has been modified to the fricative. This last feature makes it particularly difficult to see how such spellings could be the product of dictation by a Welsh dictator, as it would force us to assume that he was changing his pronunciation mid-word. As noted above, there are relatively few examples of variation; the one exception, however, is the voiced dentals: 30 out of 77 possible examples show a fricative spelling, which amounts to 39% of all the voiced dentals, and 78.9% of all consonants showing variation. Again, it is difficult to see how a case can be made that this is a product of dictation by a Welshman, when there are so few examples of variation involving the other consonants. While we would not necessarily expect an even spread of variation across all the consonants, the lack of occurrences involving other consonants is striking, and to my mind goes beyond what might be attributed either to variable pronunciation by the dictator or to a patchy awareness on the part of the scribe of the distinctive sounds in the dictator's pronunciation.

The discussion so far has focused on the spelling of intervocalic

---

[22] On the Brittonic development of the bilabial nasal -/m/- to the fricative -/μ/- and subsequently to -/v/- (merging with -/β/-, the lenited reflex of -/b/-), see Jackson, *Language and History*, pp. 413–24, 480–95; Russell, '*Rowynniauc, Rhufoniog*: the Orthography and Phonology of /μ/ in Early Welsh', in *Yr Hen Iaith. Studies in Early Welsh*, ed. Russell (Aberystwyth, 2003), pp. 25–47.

consonants, and some specific examples which have been argued to be significant have been left to one side. One particular example worth discussing is the rendering of the Latin name *Jugurtha* as *Geoweorþa*. Bately, following a suggestion from Kenneth Jackson, argues that the Old English spelling reflected an Old Welsh pronunciation of the Latin form where the dictator read *-gu-* as the Old Welsh spelling of -/w/- and so 'the underlying form **Iuwurtha* is most satisfactorily explained in terms of Old Welsh pronunciation and scribal tradition'.[23] It is not clear, however, why we should suppose that a Welsh scribe would jump to the conclusion that *-gu-* was an Old Welsh spelling when it figured in an Old English text.[24] A more satisfactory explanation is partly anticipated by Bately in her suggestion that the spelling *-weorþa* was an assimilation of the second part of the name to the Old English adjective *weorþa* 'worthy'.[25] More recently, Eric Stanley has suggested that the whole of the form of the name *Geoweorþa* can be accounted for by assuming that it represents etymological word-play on the form of the name, and can be understood as meaning 'one formerly held in high esteem' (*iu/geo* 'formerly' + *weorþa* 'worthy').[26] That an

---

[23] Bately, 'The Old English Orosius', pp. 271–2 (and n. 102).

[24] There is also a problem with the analysis of the *-gu-* of *Jugurtha* as -/w/- in that the Old Welsh use of *gu* for /w/ is found before a vowel, e.g., Old Welsh *petguar* 'four' (Modern Welsh *pedwar*); *leguenid* 'joy' (Modern Welsh *llawenydd*). It is therefore not obvious that a Welsh-speaking dictator could have read *Jugurtha* in a way to produce an internal -/w/-.

[25] Bately, 'The Old English Orosius', p. 271.

[26] E. G. Stanley, '*Geoweorþa*: "Once Held in High Esteem"', in *J. R. R. Tolkien, Scholar and Storyteller: Essays in Memoriam*, ed. M. Salu and R. T. Farrell (Ithaca, 1979), pp. 99–119 (repr. in *A Collection of Papers with Emphasis on Old English*, ed. E. G. Stanley (Toronto, 1987), pp. 31–5). It is also worth pointing out that the

alternative analysis is thinkable and plausible should give us pause before we accept that the spelling of *Geoweorþa* is the product of a Welsh dictator's mis-dictation. Stanley supplies a number of other instances of the same kind of paronomasia from Old English literature, but a relevant example, which cuts across the relevant linguistic boundary, is perhaps the spelling of some Old Welsh names in the Durham *Liber Vitae*, which suggest that a process of etymological rationalization is going on:[27] for example, the name *Cuntigeorn*, a rendering of a name which, were it attested in Old Welsh, would have been spelt **Contigern or *Cintigern* (lit. **con-/cin-* 'hound' + *tigern-* 'prince'), has seen the final syllable re-analysed as *georn* 'desirous, eager'.

So far we have been concerned with the spelling of intervocalic consonants. But an important element of Bately's argument relates to instances where there was variation in initial consonants. She argues that this variation could be understood in the light of the initial mutations used in all Celtic languages to mark grammatical categories. The data for consonantal variation in initial position are presented in Appendix 2 (pp. 61–2), and summarized in Table 2.

---

treatment of Jugurtha in Orosius, which is markedly more gentle than that of Sallust, does not readily permit this analysis; cf. Stanley '*Geoweorþa*', pp. 325–7.

[27] See Russell, '"Ye Shall Know Them by Their Names": Names and Identity among the Irish and the English', in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*, ed. J. Graham-Campbell and M. Ryan, *PBA* 157 (London, 2009), 99–111, at pp. 109–10; *id.*, 'The Names of Celtic Origin', in *The Durham* Liber Vitae*: London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A.VII*, ed. D and L. Rollason, 3 vols. (London, 2007), II, 5–8, at p. 6; *id.*, 'Commentary: A. Personal Names: A.1 Celtic names', in *ibid.* II, 35–43, at pp. 37 and 42.

Initial consonants:

Voicing:	Changed	Unchanged from Latin
/p/- > /b/-:	4	67
/t/- > /d/-:	3	40
/k/- > /g/-:	0	85
Total	**7**	**192 [= 199]**

Devoicing:		
/b/- > /p/-:	2	46
/d/- > /t/-:	2	36
/g/- > /c/-:	2	31
Total	**6**	**113 [= 119]**

No examples involving /b/- > /v/-, /d/- > /ð/-, or /g/-> /γ/- > /j/- > /Ø/-

Table 2: Summary of data presented in Appendix 2

If Bately is correct, it might be predicted that, since the voicing of initial unvoiced stops and the spirantisation of voiced stops are used as grammatical markers in Brittonic languages, the two types would be evenly distributed; furthermore, we would not expect to find significant examples of devoicing, as Brittonic languages do not devoice in mutation except for instances in Cornish and Breton involving grammatical mutation in phrases (and it is not clear how early these are).[28] However, close scrutiny of the data indicates that none of these predictions is fulfilled: there are no examples at all of the spirantisation of initial voiced stops; and there are six cases of

---

[28] Russell, *Introduction*, pp. 235–6.

devoicing. The most striking point to note is how infrequent the variation is in initial position: thirteen examples out of a total of 318 possible instances, of which there are seven cases of voicing, none of spirantisation, and six of devoicing. In other words, there is almost as much evidence for devoicing as voicing, and no evidence for voiced consonants becoming fricatives. In addition, it is worth noting that of the few examples in Appendix 2, four of them, *Blaciduses* (*Placido*); *Brobus* (*Probus*); *Clafrione* (*Glabrio*); *Craccus* (*Gracchus*), occur where the stop is followed by /l/ or /r/—a phonetic environment in which voicing is commonly neutralised. In other words, this is precisely the environment in which we might expect to find some phonetic variation (and thus spelling), but this is variation of a phonetic nature which is not uniquely Celtic, Brittonic or Welsh. In conclusion, then, it would appear that the evidence of the variation in the spelling of initial consonants can tell us very little.

Before coming to any firm conclusions, one other issue needs to be addressed. Throughout this discussion, we have observed on several occasions that the evidence is strikingly thin for the weight of argument it seeks to bear; the paucity of evidence is particularly clear when one brings into play the number of examples where variation has not occurred. 89.36% of the names in the Old English Orosius containing intervocalic consonants are spelt the same as the forms in the Latin version; for initial consonants the proportion is even greater, at 95.85%. However, it might be argued that some of the irregularities could have been ironed out in the process of transmission. It is worth recalling that there are more irregular spellings in C than in L (upon which Bately based her edition), and it is always possible, and indeed likely, that at any point in the transmission of the Old English translation, reference could have been made to a Latin version, and some of these spellings straightened out again. Another possibility was suggested by Janet

Bately herself, in response to queries from Peter Clemoes: that the dictator was shifting between his own 'Welsh' pronunciation of Latin (involving changes to all intervocalic consonants) and the new standardized Latin pronunciation.[29] However, for that to be the case, we would have to assume, somewhat implausibly, that in examples like *Metreþatis* (not **Medreþadis) or *Sarþanopolim* (not **Sarþanobolim) the dictator was changing his pronunciation between these two models mid-word. Roger Wright has argued that this standardized classical pronunciation of Latin arose in the Carolingian Empire partly as a response to the various pronunciations of Latin across the Carolingian Empire; what is not clear is how long it took for that type of pronunciation to be adopted in England. But even so, such variation within a word would be surprising.

Even if we were to accept one of these scenarios, that the spellings were secondarily tidied up, or that the dictator was varying his pronunciation, they raise their own set of problems. While the issue of the relative sparseness of the evidence might recede into the background, the unevenness of the evidence, and especially the very slight evidence for the voicing of unvoiced stops remains a problem; if the surviving manuscripts are the product of a gradual tidying-up of the aberrant spellings, it is not clear why some have remained more resistant to revision than others: why would a scribe have revised the spelling of almost all the unvoiced stops but have declined, for example, to do the same for voiced dental stops? Furthermore, as noted above, the complete absence of instances of $m > f$ is a real problem for a Welsh explanation. As the evidence stands, all we can

---

[29] Clemoes (as reported by Kitson, 'The Dialect Position', pp. 5–6). On the development of a new standardized pronunciation, see now Wright, *Latin and the Romance Languages*.

say with confidence is that a dictator, if indeed that is what was happening, may have pronounced the voiced dental stops in the names as voiced dental fricatives; the evidence is so thin that it is not even clear that the other voiced stops were spirantised. Some of the other sporadic evidence may be due to variation in the Latin exemplar; we can see in Appendices 1 and 2 several examples of such variation attested already in Latin manuscripts of Orosius. All in all, on the basis of such evidence, it is difficult to see a strong basis to the claim that the dictator was a Welshman.

WAS THE OLD ENGLISH OROSIUS DICTATED?

We may move from the specific issue of the linguistic orientation of the dictator to the more general question of whether the Old English Orosius was dictated at all. Exploration of this question is beset with difficulty. One of the principal difficulties is that we understand very little about the process of dictation.[30] There is no modern discussion of the practice of dictation and to a large extent we are still reliant on the excellent work of Skeat. His work, however, was largely concerned with the classical world, and any application of his work to medieval texts is largely a matter of guess-work. We are forced into the position of making assumptions about what might have remained the same, and what might have changed, and indeed wondering whether dictation was employed at all as a process of manuscript production. One of the difficulties is the usual assumption that dictation, as a practice, was an efficient way of generating multiple copies of a text—a dictator would read from a single copy to a

---

[30] T. C. Skeat, 'The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production', *PBA* 42 (1956), 179–208; also P. Russell, 'Scribal (In)competence in Thirteenth-century North Wales: the Orthography of the Black Book of Chirk (Peniarth MS 29)', *National Lib. of Wales Jnl* 29 (1995–6), 129–76, at pp. 160–4.

roomful of scribes—but it is not easy to think of many examples from the medieval period where such a scenario can be plausibly imagined, except arguably perhaps for the Carolingian court or the court of Alfred.[31] Moreover, we know so little about how dictation worked that we do not even know how the text was read, whether they repeated the text phrase by phrase or whether there was one long, slow, read through the text. More likely, then, is the other scenario—a single scribe read the text aloud as he copied and, perhaps intermittently, took more notice of his own voice than of the text in front of his eyes. Such a scenario might be more plausibly envisaged in cases where a scribe was reading whole sentences aloud and then repeating them to himself as he wrote them down. In such cases of what might be called 'self-dictation', the kind of errors the scribe would make might overlap with the kind of errors which he would make when he had no sight at all of the text he was copying but was solely reliant on his ears. It is also, of course, worth pointing out that an optical error can still appear in a dictated text, because the dictator may make one when reading to his scribes. In other words, evidence for dictation in the form of acoustic errors—that is, errors which we could not imagine a scribe making if he had been looking at

---

[31] Bierbaumer, 'Slips of the Ear in Old English Texts', p. 128 (cf. also pp. 134–5), argues that the demand for glossed psalters in Anglo-Saxon England might have required the speedy production that dictation allows. For a more sceptical view, see F. E. de Roover, 'The Scriptorium', in *The Medieval Library*, ed. J. W. Thompson (Chicago, 1939), pp. 594–612: 'In the Middle Ages, dictation was not often practised; and hence scribal errors, owing to imperfect hearing on the part of the copyist, are not common in medieval books' (*ibid.* p. 603). For a brief discussion of dictation in the early medieval period and a summary discussion of scholarship, see Skeat, 'The Use of Dictation', pp. 200–3. I hope to produce a more detailed study of the evidence for medieval dictation in due course.

the written text—may well be accompanied in any text by examples of optical misreadings. Conversely, a text which was dictated and thus contained acoustic errors may subsequently have been copied, as it were, optically, and the outcome would then contain both types of error. Since we have no evidence for the situations in which texts were dictated (in either sense) and lack helpful colophons stating that a particular text has been copied from dictation, we have to rely on potentially misleading and confusing features of the copied text. Moreover, in the final analysis, we have to acknowledge that, if a dictator dictated a text perfectly and the scribe(s) arrayed before him wrote down what he said perfectly, then it would be impossible to distinguish the final product from a text copied by a single scribe sat in front of his exemplar.[32]

The most compelling evidence for dictation is provided by errors which we cannot imagine could have been perpetrated if the scribe had been able to see the text, but which are explicable by hearing errors, or 'slips of the ear'. A particularly compelling example of such a slip from the classical world occurs in a recently discovered letter of the first century AD from Vindolanda, near the line of the future Hadrian's Wall. Unsurprisingly for that area the letter is preoccupied with the weather; part of the letter reads: *qui feramus tempestates etiam si molestae sint* '[…] we may endure the storms even if they are troublesome'.[33] However, *etiam* is a correction written above *et hiem* which has then been deleted. It is highly likely that the letter was being dictated to the scribe and, because of the preceding reference to

---

[32] 'if a dictator dictates accurately and a scribe accurately writes down what he says, then there will be no way of distinguishing a dictated MS from one copied visually' (Russell, 'Scribal (In)competence', p. 161).

[33] *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)*, ed. and trans. A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas (London, 1994), pp. 208–9 (*TV* II.234.ii.2).

storms, he heard *etiam* as if it were *et hiem*[*es*] 'and winter(s)' before realising his error and correcting himself. In such a case, it is difficult to see how the error could have arisen if there had been a written text before his eyes. Such clear examples are rare.

An interesting example of potential mishearing is provided by a passage from an early medieval copy of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* I, preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS Auct. F. 4. 32 (s. ix), 37r–47r, which was almost certainly copied in Wales, as it contains Old Welsh glosses copied by the main scribe. Parts of the main text of Ovid arguably show signs that at some point in its transmission it had been dictated: one section of the text (copied in Hand B of this section of the manuscript) regularly shows *-nd-* for *-nt-* and confusion between *-b-* and *-u-*, neither of which is explicable as an optical error, but which can be accounted for by assuming a dictator was reading the text aloud. More specifically, the following are also suggestive of acoustic error:[34] *atque* (43r32) for *ecce* (l. 543), *sibi bellatore* (43v9) for *siue illa toro* (l. 487), *uacuans illis* (43v13) for *uacuis illi* (l. 491), *locare* (43v22) for *loquare* (l. 500), *incedit* (45v26) for *inquit et* (l. 652). Since we cannot guarantee that an exemplar consistently and correctly marks word division, errors of mis-segmentation are only minimally helpful in this respect; they are not diagnostic by themselves, but can be useful in combination with other

---

[34] The first section of text comes from the manuscript, the second from the standard edition of Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, I (*P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*, ed. E. J. Kenney (Oxford, 1961; rev. edn. 1995)); for a facsimile of the relevant passage of text in Bodley Auct. F. 4. 32, see *Saint Dunstan's Classbook from Glastonbury*, ed. R. W. Hunt (Amsterdam, 1961); and for an online image, see the *Early Manuscripts at Oxford University* website (viewed 19 Dec., 2011):
http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msauctf432.

stronger evidence. In the context of this manuscript, where there does seem to be evidence for dictation, the segmentation errors found in *credita mens speculo* (41r20) for *crede tamen speculo* (l. 307) carry more weight than they would have done in isolation.

Tracking down examples of dictation in vernacular texts is rather more difficult. Claims have been made; for example, Dafydd Jenkins argued the case for the Black Book of Chirk (Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth 29), a mid thirteenth-century manuscript of medieval Welsh law from Gwynedd, on the basis of peculiar orthographical features: 'The conclusion seems irresistible, that the Black Book of Chirk was written from dictation by a non-Welshman'.[35] The conclusion ultimately did prove to be resistible, as it has now been shown that the orthographical vagaries of the manuscript have more to do with the varying propensities and competences of the six different scribes involved in the production of the main text (not to mention the three others who made later additions) than the dictator's native language.[36] But even in that case, the possibility cannot be ruled out that some of the scribes were more prone to 'self-dictation' than others, and were more likely to listen to their own voice than to refer constantly to the written text. As regards other instances of dictation in Old English, Bierbaumer's discussion of the Old English glosses in the Tiberius Psalter looks more promising.[37] His work was partly based on more recent work on 'slips

---

[35] D. Jenkins, 'The Black Book of Chirk: A Note', *National Lib. of Wales Jnl* 15 (1967–8), 104–6.

[36] Russell, 'Scribal (In)competence'; Jenkins thought that the main text had been copied by a single scribe.

[37] Bierbaumer, 'Slips of the Ear in Old English Texts'; for the following examples, see *ibid*. pp. 128–9 and 130. For the sigla in this paragraph used to refer to psalter texts, see *The Tiberius Psalter*, ed. A. P. Campbell, Ottawa Med.

of the ear', i.e., acoustic rather than optical errors, and he was able to suggest that the glosses in this manuscripts may have been dictated:[38] for example, the H version glosses Latin *proba* (2 sg. imperative 'try!') with *of handa* 'from a hand', while the D version seems to have the correct version, *afanda* 'try!'; the H version glosses Latin *affluant* with *hy ætflugon* 'fled together' while the D version correctly has *hy ætflowon* 'flowed together'. These examples require more examination than can be given here, but they are suggestive and least present a case based on the right kind of evidence. There may well be more examples in circulation but the claim for dictation should always be carefully scrutinized and tested.

The text of Orosius has figured previously in discussions of dictation, but it is the Latin text which provides some good examples of dictation error. In his important discussion of dictation, Skeat quoted examples from the Latin Orosius, e.g., *audisse molent* for *aut dissimulent*, *secundam* for *se quondam*, *filio melae* for *Philomela*, *malos suorum* for *Molossorum*.[39] We may also note examples from the Latin version quoted by Bately, where confusion in the Old English text has arisen through dictation error within the Latin tradition, e.g. *Sceltiuerim* (: Latin *ingens Celtiberorum*), *Anilius Mostumius* (: Latin *Aulum Postumium*);[40] *Margas* (: Latin *Sicyonem Argos* (MS D *siciona margus*)). The

---

Texts and Stud. 2 (Ottawa, 1974), xi–xii; H is the Tiberius Psalter itself (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. vi), while D refers to the Regius Psalter (London, British Library, Royal 2. B. v).

[38] Cf. Browman, 'Perceptual Processing'; Celce-Murcia, 'Meringer's Corpus of "Slips of the Ear"'; Garnes and Bond, 'A Slip of the Ear'; Voss, *Slips of the Ear*.

[39] Skeat, 'The Use of Dictation', pp. 200–2 on Orosius, and especially p. 201 for further examples.

[40] The variation between *Anilius and Aulium* also seems to involve minim-confusion, a common optical error.

last of these examples again is a segmentation error which is not itself diagnostic, but the other two examples, with -*u*- for -*b*- and the oral assimilation of -*m P*- to *M*-, are good indications of dictation at work.[41] However, when one turns to the Old English text, it is difficult to find compelling examples of the kind of acoustic mis-hearings we might expect to find. Some instances could have occurred either in the Latin or Old English text, such *Arachasihedros* (: Latin *Arachossi Chedrosque*), *Arfatium* (: Latin *carpathio/Carfatio*), where it is not possible to assign the non- or mis-segmentation to a particular language. Only one instance of mis-segmentation can be found in the Old English text, *an Nilirice* for *on Ilirice* and, in the absence of any supporting evidence, is as likely to be the result of scribal misreading as of dictation. Another striking feature of the Old English text is that the variation on which Bately focused is entirely onomastic, precisely the part of the text where the scribes would have been most likely to go astray; as far as I can see, there are no examples of acoustic error in the Old English text of the narrative itself.

In conclusion, then, while there is some variation in the spelling of names, there is no evidence in the Old English version of Orosius of any of the strong indicators of dictation, such as errors which could not have been perpetrated if the scribe could see the manuscript (and certainly none of those identified by Bierbaumer). On the other hand, there seems to be good evidence that there was a dictated text somewhere in the relatively recent transmission of the Latin Orosius, and this only serves to point up the absence of similar evidence in the Old English text. In fact, not only is there an absence

---

[41] The examples quoted by Bøgholm, *English Speech*, p. 19, are less compelling: *from Actesifonte* (a Ctesiphonte) and *Plicinius* (P. Licinio) could easily be the result of optical error.

of such evidence in the latter, but there are also some pointers in the other direction, namely, that the scribe was capable of distinguishing spelling forms which would have been indistinguishable in pronunciation. For example, while on three occasions in the Old English text the word *anfiteatrum* (or the plural form) is spelt thus, suggesting that both *f* and *ph* were pronounced as /f/ and both *th* and *t* as /t/, it is noteworthy that the scribe succeeded in getting *Philippus* and *Theodosius* right (and indeed most cases of names containing initial *Ph-* and *Th-*).[42] Similarly, he spells classical names with *-th-*, e.g., *Æthiopes* and *Agathocles*, but uses *þ* as in *Þyringas*. Likewise, he correctly spells *Æquitania* with *-qu-*, and not *Æcu-* or *Æcw-*, but the non-classical *Cwenas* 'Lapps' with *Cw-*.[43] In other words, not only does the scribe get the majority of the spelling of intervocalic consonants right (as argued above), but he also maintains a remarkable distinction between etymological spellings of other sounds. The most likely explanation is that these spellings are transmitted from the Latin text by a continuous chain of visual copying and translating.

What variation there is in the names seems not, therefore, to be the product of dictation, by a Welshman or anyone else, but could be the outcome of cumulative variation which is not then amenable to a single explanation. We still nevertheless have to acknowledge the theoretical possibility of the perfect dictator reading to the perfect

---

[42] That *ph/p* and *th/t* were used for /p/ and /t/ respectively was the standard pronunciation in north-western Europe in the early medieval period is demonstrated by Harvey, 'Some Significant Points of Early Insular Celtic Orthography', in *Sages, Saints and Storytellers: Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney*, ed. D. Ó Corráin, L. Breatnach, and K. R. McCone (Maynooth, 1989), 59–61.

[43] The consistency is striking but not absolute; there are two instances of *Cwintus* and one of *Cuintus*.

scribe producing a perfect text which would be indistinguishable from a text perfectly copied by eye. But, more pragmatically, if signs of dictation are absent, then the balance of evidence points to the text being copied in the usual way; in other words, the Old English Orosius was probably not dictated. If so, it follows that *a fortiori* nothing can be said about the linguistic competence of the 'dictator'.

Even so, we should not regard the first part of this paper as a completely destructive exercise. Useful things have emerged that require consideration. The presentation of all the data, including the very high proportion of forms where no change has taken place, highlights one important fact. While most of the variation in the spelling of names could be explained as cumulative, one-off changes or errors in either Latin or Old English, it emerges very clearly that something more systematic is going on with the spelling of the voiced dental fricative, *-þ-* or *-ð-*, where the Latin text had a voiced dental, *-d-*. That at least is in need of explanation, and this paper ends with a few suggestions to set the discussion in train.

It is noteworthy that the spelling of dental fricatives was the one area of Old English orthography where new letter forms were introduced, namely *þ* and *ð*, but before their adoption, early Old English used *d* for both /d/ and /ð/.[44] One possibility, therefore, is that the scribe of the archetype was used to introducing the new signs into his copying and, when he encountered the text of the Old English Orosius with all these Latinate style names containing *-d-*, he sporadically replaced them with *-þ-* or *-ð-* (though admittedly it is very late for this still to be happening). Bately has pointed other sporadic

---

44 P. P. O'Neill, 'The Irish Role in the Origins of the Old English Alphabet', in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*, ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan, pp. 3–22; Russell, '"Ye Shall Know Them by Their Names"'. Cf. also R. M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English, I: Phonology* (Oxford, 1992), § 2.59.

instances in other texts, such as the spelling *Dauið* beside *Dauit* in the Hatton manuscript of the *Cura Pastoralis*.[45] Another simpler possibility is that on a number of occasions the scribe just misread his exemplar's *-d-* as *-ð-*; if so, we would then have to assume that later scribes changed some of them to *þ*. A third tantalising possibility is that something more interesting is going on:[46] since a good proportion of these words refer to Greeks or places in the eastern Mediterranean, an enterprising scribe knowing that in spoken Greek the intervocalic voiced dental was a fricative simply spelt it accordingly;[47] if so, it would imply that the knowledge of spoken Greek, which we know was available in England in the seventh century, survived in some form until the late ninth century.[48]

In sum, the Welsh dictator of the Old English Orosius has been re-visited and found not to be at home. The balance of evidence makes it difficult to argue that the Old English text was dictated,

---

[45] Bately, *The Old English Orosius*, p. cxvi; cf. also A. H. Feulner, *Griechische Lehnwörter im Altenglischen* (Frankfurt, 2000), who shows that most Greek words end up in Old English with intervocalic *-d-* for Greek *-δ-*, though he notes *aðamans* (*Cura Pastoralis*) and the regular occurrence of *senoð*, *sinoð*, etc. 'synod'; cf. also A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), p. 210, n. 3.

[46] This possibility was suggested to me by Richard Dance, but in fact was anticipated by Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im altenglischen*, p. 177.

[47] On the pronunciation of Greek, see M. W. Herren, 'Evidence for "Vulgar Greek" from Early Medieval Latin Texts and Manuscripts', in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: the Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. W. Herren and S. A. Brown, King's College London Med. Stud. 2 (London, 1988), 57–84.

[48] See M. Lapidge, 'The Study of Greek at the School of Canterbury in the Seventh Century', in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. Herren and Brown, pp. 169–94.

although it is highly likely that dictation was involved at some stage in the transmission of the Latin version. If no dictator was involved in the Old English, we can say nothing about his native language.

APPENDIX 1

List of forms in the Old English Orosius showing irregular spelling of intervocalic consonants.

Textual references can be found in the Index of Names in *The Old English Orosius*, ed. Bately, pp. 407–33. The figure provided after 'Unchanged' represents the number of attested forms where the relevant segment occurs but where the spelling corresponds to what is found in the Latin text. Where variants are given from the Latin text, they come from the *apparatus critici* of Zangemeister and Arnaud-Lindet.

/p/ > /b/:
[Abulia (but Latin aboliam in D)]
Tribulitania [1]   Unchanged: 42×

/t/ > /d/:
Lampida
Parcohadras [2]   Unchanged: 50×

/k/ > /g/:
No examples [0]   Unchanged: 71×

/b/ > /v/:
Aelfe
Clafrione

[Fauius, Fauia, Fauiuses, Uauius (common variants in the Latin manuscripts)]

Galua

Surfe (cf. Surpe) [4]   Unchanged: 37×

/d/ > /ð/:[49]

Archimeðes

Argiraspiðes (C only)

Ariþeusses

Aþramentum†

Bosiriþis†

Ciþnus

Diþa

Epithaurus

Eureðica (C only)

Fiþnam

Gaþes†

Ganemeþis

[Geothulas (Latin manuscripts Gethuli)]

Haeþum

Iþasfe(s)/Iþaspe(s)

Iuþan†

Lemniaþum

Leoniþa

Liþa

Maeþe, Meþas, Meþia*

---

[49] In this section, forms marked with * indicate cases in which there are multiple examples, and all are spelt with the fricative in L; forms marked with † indicate cases in which there are multiple examples, and the fricative is the minority spelling in L.

Marþonius
Metreþatis†
Nauiþa
Numeþia, Numeðia, etc.†
Olimp(h)iaðe, etc. (C only)
Perðica† (C also)
Ponthionis (C)
Roþum
Sarþanopolim† (more common in C)
Sarþinia† (C also)
Siðonem (C only) [30]   Unchanged: 47×

/g/ > /γ/ > /j/ > /Ø/:
Cartaine, Cartainiense [1][50]   Unchanged: 9×

/m/ > /μ/ > /v/:
No examples   Unchanged: 63×

/p/ > /f/:
Escolafius
Iþasfe(s)/Iþaspe(s)

/t/ > /θ/:
Alciþen
Dameraþ
Eþna, Aeþna

Cf. also Hisdriana, Isþrie (: Istri)

---

[50] Cf. also these back-spellings: *Ueigentes*, *Aquilegia*, *Argeata(s)*.

APPENDIX 2

List of forms in the Old English Orosius showing irregular spelling of initial consonants.

Textual references can be found in the Index of Names in *The Old English Orosius* (ed. Bately, pp. 407–33). The figure provided after 'Unchanged' represents the number of attested forms where the relevant segment occurs but where the spelling is regular.

Voicing:
/p/- > /b/-:
Bachinum (C) : Pachynum
Blaciduses : Placido
Bothmose : Patmum
Brobus : Probus [4]   Unchanged: 67×

/t/- > /d/-:
Danai/Danaus, etc. : Tanais
Deprobane : Taprobane
Dissafarnon : Tissafernen [3]   Unchanged: 40×

/k/- > /g/-: none [0]   Unchanged: 85×

Devoicing:
/b/- > /p/-:
Pactriane : Bactrianos, etc.
Pulgare, etc. : Bulgari [2]   Unchanged: 46×

/d/- > /t/-:
Tardanus : Dardanus
tictator(es) : dictator(es) [2]   Unchanged: 36×

/g/- > /c/-:
Clafrione : Glabrione
Craccus : Gracchus [2]   Unchanged: 31×

No examples involving /b/- > /v/-, /d/- > /ð/-, or /g/- > /γ/- > /j/- > /Ø/-