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Abstract

King Alfred's Translation of Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae: An Investigation of the Dialect of the Cotton Manuscript's Prose

by

David Cohen

The purpose of this paper is to examine a particular dialect in the Old English language: the dialect of the writer of what is known as the Cotton Manuscript of King Alfred's translation of Boethius' famous treatise.

The main areas of emphasis center around the questions of possible Kentish influence in the text, the relative dating the text allows us to suggest, and in what manner lexical, grammatical, and phonological exceptions in the dialect can be noted and explained. A. Campbell's Old English Grammar has been used extensively in this paper as the metric for Old English dialect deviations and norms.
PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to examine a particular dialect in the Old English language. I had never done this kind of investigation before, and thus, a very important side purpose of this paper was pedagogical in nature: to familiarize myself with some of the techniques involved in investigating and describing an O.E. dialect, or -- in a sense -- making a small contribution toward a complete grammar of a language. This paper might be viewed as such a small contribution, for, with the recent expansion of linguistics into new fields of grammatical description of a language it is necessary to treat of particular dialects with all their borrowed forms. Further, my investigation of the text was such that virtually every form in its prose came under my scrutiny. Again, the slight variations in the dialect uncovered here might be viewed as a small contribution to our understanding of variations existing in dialects in general.

Therefore, my paper's purpose is to inform myself and the reader of a particular dialect, its borrowed forms, and its variations. The work involved was much the same as that undertaken by A. Campbell before he wrote his Old English Grammar. Of course, his work is on a much greater scale than mine. However, both works, I feel, help begin
the long process of creating a new kind of grammar which, eventually, seeks total description and comprehensive treatment of any particular dialect of a language.

I would not have written this paper had there been any similar work done on the text before. The standard edition of the text contains no grammatical introduction. It relies almost solely on a note written to the editor by Professor Eduard Sievers. The note is short, and I discuss below, for the most part incorrect. As a result of its lack of any grammatical introduction, no statement on the status of Early West-Saxon could be made about the text. As a result of my study, I can say some forms in the text show a maturing of dialect toward later dialects. I can say the text is late Early West-Saxon in its grammar: that is, for the most part adhering to the literary standard of Alfred's domain in the eastern portion of Wessex. I discuss this point more extensively below.

Finally, I must admit my paper makes no startling discoveries. Investigations by scholars have yielded most of what facts need to be known about the text. Its approximate date of composition can be determined by a good paleographic study. Its translator, Alfred, is well known. I am sure literary studies of his other works are
probably more valuable, for his translations of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis* and of Orosius are older than this one and in fact help form the basis of the grammatical norm known as Early West-Saxon. Nevertheless, writing this paper has been valuable to me. I have learned something of the grammar of Old English and one of its dialects. I have tried to describe part of that dialect and I would hope the reader might find my description edifying and enlightening to him.
I. General Introduction

The extant Old English version of Boethius' work, *De Consolatione Philosophiae* is recorded in three manuscripts, in part only, and in one paper transcript. The definitive attempt to gather some of these manuscripts under one edition was made by Walter John Sedgefield in 1899. His work presents the Old English version of *De Consolatione Philosophiae* as a conflation of two of the extant -- and most complete -- manuscripts: the Cotton MS. (C) Otho A. vi (Wenley, p. 217, Ker 167) in the British Museum; and the Bodleian MS. (B) (Wenley, p. 64, Ker 305).

This paper will deal exclusively with the Old English version contained in the C MS., the one A. Campbell refers to as "the only manuscript of any value...." from a linguistic viewpoint (9). My decision becomes more apparent considering this paper's aims, all of which center around that time prior to 950 A.D., i.e., e W-S. Sedgefield describes the B MS. as having been "written and corrected in a bold English hand hardly earlier than the beginning of the twelfth century" (xiv).

Sedgefield does not include in his edition a fragment from a third manuscript discovered in 1886 by Professor A.S. Napier, the N MS. Because the MS. consists of a
leaf only and is very difficult to read in parts, it is also ruled out of any discussion by this paper, though dated conjecturally by Napier from the first half of the tenth century. Finally, there exists a transcript of the B MS. "made by Franciscus Junius, with his selection of the more notable C variants in the margin" (xvii). Information from this transcript has been incorporated by Sedgefield in his presentation of the C MS. prose, for Junius' transcription was not only faithful, but done before the C MS. was damaged by fire in 1731.

The C MS. contains a prose version of the Latin prose, and an alliterating version of the Latin verse, whereas the B MS. contains a prose version of the Latin prose and verse. Though the C MS. "is in one distinct and neat handwriting" (xii), it is doubtful whether the prose and metra had their genesis in the same source. There can be little doubt that King Alfred translated Boethius' work into Old English. Sedgefield cites the testimony of various authorities. However, although there seems to be unanimity concerning Alfred's authorship of a prose version of the Latin prose and verse, such is not the case concerning the Old English alliterating version of the Latin verse -- that is, the Cotton Metra. I do not wish to reiterate Sedgefield's arguments and references for support for or against
the king's authorship of the Metra. It might be sufficient simply to point out the following observation from Professor Eduard Sievers: while the C MS. prose was "evidently copied from an e W-S source" (xxxv), the C Metra "are so full of Kentish forms that I cannot but believe that they were done in Kent" (xxxv). There is thus a strong likelihood of separate genesis of the Metra and prose. Even if Alfred composed the Metra, there is a strong likelihood that its conjectural product (the Cotton Metra) was subsequently written in Kent while the established prose product was written then, and later, in W-S. The Metra deserve a full study, but I have chosen to examine the prose version only, both for reasons of the limitations of time and space and for its separate genesis establishing it as an independent object of study.

I should note, in conjunction with the decision to examine the C MS. prose only, that Sedgefield has made this task rather convenient. His edition indicates all sources other than from the C MS. (B MS. and J transcript) in italics. Therefore, in examining the glossary (complete in C MS.) I found that some features, and words containing features, could not be used, though present in the glossary, since their referents were citing an italicized word in the text and not a "valid" word from the C MS. I avoided
words from the C MS. Metra by the simple expedient of noting Sedgefield's method of indexing them, i.e., in Roman numerals.

II. Nature of Problems

In this paper I will examine several features of the Old English dialect of the C MS. Scholars have discussed authorship, date of authorship and of manuscripts, and influences of dialect. To a great extent, I shall deal with these. But, in addition, my aim will be an introductory description of the language of the text. No general study has been made of the Old English version of Boethius' work with this aim in mind. Some points should be made now concerning the nature of such an enterprise.

It must be remembered that essentially, this is an orthographic study. I am forced to assume, first, that Sedgefield's presentation of the text represents an accurate transcription. Further, a language's orthography is much more stable than its phonology. Therefore, what is spelled might not be what is spoken. When I point out variations in the spelling of bēon and bīon, conclusions must not center solely around phonological variation of īo and ēo; in fact, the example of bēon points out yet another consideration: what might be called "word-signs."
In words of very high frequency in a language, it is possible that, at some point, little if any attention is paid to spelling, since these words might be so very common that their status could be compared to whole "word-signs," an analogous situation perhaps to that of letters which are accepted as sound-signs yet can even differ perceptibly on a phonetic level (i.e., clubbed, wrapped). Thus, I not only must contend with the multitude of problems attendant to a discussion of certain phonological features, while dealing strictly with the more conservative and less accurate spelling system of a language, I must also allow for the possibility that, perhaps, with certain very common words, no attention was paid at all concerning spelling since the mere sight of these "word-signs" would cue the Old English reader as to their "proper" pronunciation.

Whether or not such an hypotheses concerning "word-signs" proves accurate is, at all events, unimportant. I present such a concept now so that some of my discussion later may recall these remarks involving words of high frequency, for, in any statistical examination (a few small ones will be encountered), words of high frequency must be given sufficient "de-weighting" so as not to mask other valid and pertinent data.
Finally, with regard to orthographic problems, many of the commonest changes in a language are masked by etymological spelling. The example in NE of clubbed and wrapped is an excellent one of the past tense ending "-ed" surviving even though the influence of the b and the p has caused the endings to become d and t respectively. This phonological change occurred in the Middle English period by the process known as assimilation. Since the b and p are voiced and voiceless sounds respectively, their influence on the following sounds was such that the b + d remained voiced, but the p + d became voiceless + voiceless (i.e., p + t). During the M.E. period the inflectional endings, such as the past tense, lost stress, thus allowing assimilation of the following sounds to take place. A similar instance occurring in O.E. might be that of miltsung, mercy, a word akin to the O.E. mild, mild, kind. Campbell (193) points out that voiced consonants became unvoiced before the voiceless spirant s. Hoping to use this feature to point out the relative antiquity of the C MS., I was much disturbed to find Campbell soon cautioning that l W-S spellings of mildsung (note the "d" instead of the "t") exist also, due to etymological masking of what should be a phonological change. Therefore, the orthographic difficulties are considerable and I have tried to exercise caution when examining
features involving phonology with due regard to these difficulties.

III. Nature of Methods

Having mentioned A. Campbell several times already, I might discuss the major role his classic work, Old English Grammar, will play in this paper. The general method followed has been quite simple: first I examined Campbell's grammar and then the language of the manuscript, in order to see how well the manuscript's language conforms to Campbell's detailed description of O.E.

I have chosen from Campbell those features of O.E. which seem to be represented by various features in the MS. Thus, little if any attention is paid to prehistoric O.E. or other very early factors in the language, though some of these factors may be touched on in order to bring out some salient points concerning an e W-S or l W-S feature which is dependent for clarity on some earlier factors. For the most part, I was interested in sound changes, orthographic changes, and the possibility of dialect influence on W-S, all of which might enable me to place the MS. within some context in the development of O.E. and to describe better the particular dialect I was dealing with.
Concerning the differences between e W-S and l W-S, I have learned that these two classifications of dialects really are more than what their names connote, i.e., a chronological distinction. As Campbell suggests, "'Early West Saxon' [late ninth and early tenth centuries] is in many respects contrasted with 'Late West Saxon,' which is above all exemplified in the works of Ælfric (c. 1000)" (9). While this does imply of course, that e W-S was earlier in its appearance in manuscripts than l W-S, what I eventually learned was that e W-S is an entirely different dialect from l W-S. To be more accurate, e W-S represents the literary standard of Alfred's domain in the east of Wessex. L W-S represents the literary standard that supplanted that of e W-S and this dialect had its own origins and came to flourish in the west of Wessex. Thus, although closely related geographically and seeming to give way, one into the other (dating from 100 years after Alfred's death, no MSS. exist written in e W-S), these two dialects really constitute closely related but separate forms of the language. Since, however, the literary standard of O.E. did not become that of the l W-S dialect until Ælfric's times, c. 1000, I was able to infer that with fewer and fewer l W-S features the text would prove older. Ideally, if the text were to be early e W-S it
would have no W-S features. This was not so. I can only assume that by the time of its composition the literary standard was just beginning to shift, which would put the text at around 950 A.D.

This figure is in general agreement with the text's composition date given by most scholars. Sedgefield says that Sir Edward Maude Thompson, on the basis of the text's hand, believed the C MS. "to have been written after the middle of the tenth century, about 960-970 A.D." (xiii). He adds, however, that Dr. Henry Sweet, judging from the text's hand and language, placed the MS."in the beginning of the tenth century, agreeing with Wanley [who dated on the same basis] who saw it before it was injured, and referred it...to King Alfred's lifetime, or the period immediately following his death" (xiii). This would mean the MS. was written after 897 A.D., the date suggested by Wülker that Alfred translated De Consolatione (xli). Campbell, on the basis of language, suggests the MS. is "of the mid-tenth century" and Ker, on the basis of hand, concurs.

My study, of course, does not shake these estimates. In fact, as can be seen from the fairly wide space of years suggested as composition dates, the important issue is not date but dialect origin. I have used date, or words
suggesting date, such as "older" or "earlier," in my paper simply because I know that a text written in 950 A.D. is probably not 1 W-S. That dialect was to reach literary predominance in yet another 50 years. What is important is that the text should indicate its proper designation by its adherence toward Early or Late West Saxon features of the language.

I have examined grammatical features, chiefly orthographic, evident in the text and their description by Campbell; however, Campbell is in no way being "justified" (except, perhaps, to the uninitiated like myself who do not know how thorough he is). His book was of tremendous help in the writing of this paper. But it does not pretend to be a complete grammar. Therefore, some exceptions in this text's particular dialect will be encountered. Nevertheless, my study has followed the general line of taking Campbell's detailed description of a language and attempting to describe, in part, a particular dialect of that language.

Generally, what is expected from my application of Campbell's grammar to the C MS. is that the text should prove early in its composition, exhibiting features most common to e W-S. And, though Professor Eduard Sievers, in
a note to Sedgefield, suggested that some Kenticisms are
found "here and there" in the C MS., I believe the text
will also prove nearly free of Kentish influence.
(More of Sievers' observation will be discussed below.)

I have used, when seeking the earlier forms or
origins of words in the text, the O.E.D. and Campbell.

Sounds are presented in my paper with underlining
(as in eo). Spellings are presented in quotation marks
(as in "eo").

Footnotes have been omitted because citations from
Campbell are made apparent by paragraph number, and cita-
tions from Sedgefield's edition are shown in Roman numerals
(i.e., his introduction) or by my explanation of the
glossary notations (see p. 19, top).
ANALYSIS

I. Dialect Influence

a. The diphthongs ēo and īo

On the subject of the influence of other dialects on the C MS., Sedgefield is rather reticent. With regard to the Metra, he does offer the possibility of a "Kentish clerk" undertaking the versification under Alfred's name; however, with regard to the prose, he includes only a short note "kindly communicated to the Editor" from Professor Eduard Sievers, in which Sievers finds the major factor indicating Kenticisms in the text in the "Kentish īo for e W-S (or O.E.) ēo, as in swīor, ēōf..." (xxxv). ēōf does not appear in the C MS., at least not in the glossary. Perhaps Sievers was thinking of ēōd, which does display variation. However, swīor does appear in the text, as well as several other words indicating "Īo" where"ēo" would be expected. This section shall examine Sievers' observations in his note to Sedgefield. Later sections will deal with his points regarding "Kentish ē for W-S ē", and "weoruld for W-S woruld" (xxxv).

I should begin by pointing out that I am seeking variations in the text between ēo and īo. Hundreds of
words in the text, of course, do not display such variation; that is, they display "eo" where it is expected, and "io" where it is expected. I may say right now that the instances of "io" in the text, when "eo" was expected are very few when compared to the total number of instances of words containing "eo" and "io."

According to his discussion on the origins of W-S diphthongs eo and io, Campbell (§296) suggests that these diphthongs had become phonologically equivalent by the time of the earliest manuscripts. I find his entire discussion on this matter rather difficult to understand, for he adds that in Gregory's Cura Pastoralis, i.e., Alfred's translation, "eo and io heavily invade each other's domains" (§297). In order to make sense out of this, that is, in order to accept the fact that the sounds eo and io had merged in eo in W-S and the fact that in an e W-S text they "invade each other's domains," I could only assume Campbell was speaking of spelling, i.e., "eo" and "io" invading each other's domains, rather than phonology. But even this assumption, which does at least reduce confusion, does not treat of why there should have been spelling confusion when, long before even Alfred's time, the sounds eo and io had merged in eo and were written "eo" (except when there was invading, if the reader will
pardon this tiresome qualification!).

I think the matter can be resolved by making another assumption, namely, that there was a spelling tradition in W-S, prior to the earliest manuscripts, in which words coming from words with West Germanic diphthong iu, or from breaking or back umlaut of i, might very well have reflected their origins by being spelled in "io" (for io). Similarly, words coming from words with W. Gmc. diphthong eu, or from breaking or back umlaut of e, would have been spelled in "eo" (for eo). This assumption of a prior spelling tradition, it seems to me, is necessary in order to explain why W-S texts can contain "io" where "eo" would be expected due to the phonological change that had taken place earlier in the language in which these two sounds had merged in W-S into eo, spelled "eo." Of course, I am speaking here of words spelled with "io" which, due to their W. Gmc. origins, could be spelled thus, i.e., from iu or breaking or back umlaut of i. Words spelled in W-S with "io" which had their origins in eu, etc., may be explained in another way which, incidentally, finally brings me to Sievers' remark that I quoted earlier.

Campbell says "In ninth-century Kentish documents a marked tendency appears to raise the first element of eo, so that spellings occur like siolf, wiorg, drow..." (§297).
This would mean that in Kt. eo merged with io in io and was spelled "io." Thus words appearing in the text with "io" that originally had "eo" (both from their W. Gmc. origin in eu and from my hypothesis of an earlier spelling tradition with "eo") would indicate Kt. influence, as Sievers rightfully pointed out.

This entire matter involving eo and io was rather a fruitful subject upon which to embark on a discussion of the C MS.'s dialect. I am sure the reader will believe me when I say there were well over two thousand words in the text which contained the pertinent diphthong. The glossary was a veritable cornucopia for the investigator with a quantitative bent. Therefore, I hope the reader will not think me remiss when I say I limited myself to the long diphthongs "ēo" and "Īo" only. I believe I had a good reason. Campbell adds in his discussion on Kt. ēo and Īo, "ēo and Īo fell together in Īo,...but...ēo and io fell together in eo as in W-S and Mercian" (§297). I felt that, in order to examine the feature in the text's dialect, with as little possibility for variation as possible, I should eliminate the short diphthongs "eo" and "io" since, even if they were of Kt. influence, I would have no way of knowing. Still, I must admit a short diphthong spelled "io" when it should be spelled "eo" would be
almost as good an indication of Kt. influence as a long diphthong spelled similarly. The possibility of examining more than 300 citation words -- involving well over 1000 instances -- in the glossary seemed not sufficient justification in determining what could be determined better by examining the many instances of the long diphthong.

The table below lists all the instances of variation in the spelling of the citation words in the glossary. The numbers in the table are page (to the left of the decimal) and line (to the right of the decimal) numbers of instances of the words in the C MS. This form of notation is followed in Sedgefield's glossary and will be followed throughout this paper. The far column to the right in the table show what the words' W. Gmc. origins were. Remember my assumption of an earlier spelling tradition. This would be the only way to explain "invasion of domains," since the words which have "Io" from W. Gmc. iu are quite evidently not manifesting Kt. influence. When domain invading occurs Campbell does not suggest Kt. influence and I do not either. When the Cura Pastoralis, an established e W-S text with no Kt. influence, displays domain invading in this manner, I feel justified in assuming this text is not displaying Kt. influence when domain invading occurs under the same circumstances as in the Cura Pastoralis.
The W. Gmc. verb *sehan underwent the following changes: medial h was lost after breaking of e to eo occurred before h. The following a was lost with lengthening of eo to eo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>&quot;io&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;eo&quot;</th>
<th>W. Gmc. Origins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bebœdan-command</td>
<td>89.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bëon-be</td>
<td>&quot;Usual Form&quot; (Sedgefield)</td>
<td>10 p. scan, pp.11-21: 8 &quot;io&quot;</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besœn-gaze</td>
<td>116.25;102.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*-eh-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsœn-despise</td>
<td>71.31;44.31;63.3</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeSeœn-see</td>
<td>89.31;107.30;22.32</td>
<td>141.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofersœn-oversee</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deorwierda-precious</td>
<td>72.31;83.31</td>
<td>28.8;20;35.25</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.1;55.27;72.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fœond-enemy</td>
<td>48.9;54.50</td>
<td>67.24;20</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fœorða-fourth</td>
<td>139.17;102.22</td>
<td>42.1,5</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flœon-fly from</td>
<td>148.17;103.15</td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frœodom-freedom</td>
<td>140.27;30;141.2</td>
<td>142.12;9,22;143.28</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frœoliçe-freely</td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hëo-she</td>
<td>Hëo &quot;usual Form&quot;</td>
<td>*iu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lœœd-song</td>
<td>50.8;70.1;124.18;127.29</td>
<td>135.19;118.28</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plœoliç-dangerous</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šœoc-ill</td>
<td>123.13;107.29;123.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stœorleas-uncontrolled</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>&quot;io&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;eo&quot;</td>
<td>W. Gmc. Origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steorror--rudder</td>
<td>98.2;100.21</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swoor--father-in-law</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taon--pull</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taorian--grow tired</td>
<td>139.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Træow--faith</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>67.21;23.8</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unTræow--unfaithfulness</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedæode--dialect</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedæod--race</td>
<td>99.9;101.23;42.7</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedofscolu--band of thieves</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedon--thrive</td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedostrian--darken</td>
<td>121.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geæo--three</td>
<td>75.20;77.17;75.19;117.19;102.14;17</td>
<td>73.13</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedæow--not free</td>
<td>142.6;142.4</td>
<td>141.1;17.19;18.5;4.6;11;72.1;143.3</td>
<td>*-ew-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table indicates that thirty words and their related forms involved variation in spelling between "io" and "eo." However, I wish to reduce this number in order to reflect more accurately the relationship of "io" to "eo" spellings. In the first place, the reader will note that beon and hōo are reported by Sedgefield to have as their "Usual Form" in the C MS. bōon and hōo. These two words, I feel, should not be considered in the table. I base my suggestion on three counts. 1) The words' frequencies of occurrence will weight the table disproportionately; 2) the words' frequencies of occurrence in the language suggest that we are dealing with "word-signs" which I mentioned earlier. Perhaps a scribe copying the text cared very little regarding the spelling of these two very common words, since they would be recognized and understood immediately by a reader, and, more important, suffered very little chance of being confused semantically with any other words, as perhaps a less common word would. I cannot defend this kind of judgement, although the notion of "word-signs" is an interesting one to me; 3) the third count is by far the most valid. It allows me to remove three more words from consideration as well. Regarding hīo, frīond, frīo, and fīond, Campbell says: iu arose by contraction when the ending
ō became ū (§331.5) in the analogical nom. sg. fem. forms of the pronouns, OE he, sé, bes, which appear in OE as bīo, sīo, bīos, from *hiu, etc., where the feminine ending ū (♀) was added to stems in -ī. ū from contraction also occurred in the prehistoric forms of OE friond friend, fiond enemy, and frīo free... (§120).

Regarding bīon, Campbell says:

By West Germanic contraction, successions consisting of vowel and ū had become diphthongs (see §120). Now ū and ū became ū later in W-S. Naturally, this change of ū to ū is reflected in spelling both directly, ū appearing where historically ū would be expected, and also by inverted spelling, the symbol ū appearing for historical ū. (§768, d) Variations from the above paradigms including one for beon in W-S are occasioned only by normal developments, e.g., W-S still frequently ū in the forms of beon... (§238).

Thus, in the four words just discussed, and, as the origin column in the table indicates, in most of the words involved, "io" reflects not Kentish influence, but rather original spelling of these words, for certainly, the idea of there being a spelling tradition in West Saxon which would spell words as they once were spoken seems credible. Even Campbell suggests this when he points to the equivalency of the graphs "eo" and "io" in W-S but adds, "...it is difficult to decide if vestiges of an old distinction can still be traced" (§296). Here he begins to point out
the many instances of domain invading. Therefore, I too consider the words in the table which have "io" when the word came from iu, as displaying "vestiges of an old distinction."

If the reader accepts all of this, then there remain 11 words in the table which have "io" when the word came from eu, or breaking or back umlaut of e. Here too, Kt. influence is not completely established. In the quotation above concerning bēon, Campbell said, "this change of īo... to ēo is reflected in spelling both directly, ēo... appearing where historically īo... would be expected, and also by inverted spelling, the symbol īo appearing for historical ēo..." (emphasis mine) Therefore, there is as strong a likelihood of inverted spelling in these citation words (or 19 instances in the text) as there is a likelihood of Kt. influence. All I can say is that, of all the occurrences of the words containing these diphthongs which have fallen together, only 19, out of well over 1000, showed "io" where "eo" is expected. I would consider this ratio small enough to discount Sievers' contention of Kt. influence because of "Kentish swīor for W-S sweor." But I am not trying to argue with Sievers. I am trying to describe the text's dialect, and I would say -- at this
point -- it contains no Kt. influence.

b. The diphthong \( \text{i}\text{e} \) and Kentish \( \text{e} \)

Sievers leaves a slight ambiguity in his note to Sedgefield. To be sure, he does say the Cotton MS. "contains a good many Kenticisms... as in Kentish \( \text{e} \) for \( \text{e} \) W-S \( \text{i}\text{e} \)..." (xxxv). Yet he adds, "The Metra are so full of Kentish forms that I cannot but believe that they were done in Kent..." (xxxv). Since the Metra and prose comprise the Cotton MS. I can only assume he is referring to the prose when he talks of the Cotton MS., and that he specifically cites the Metra otherwise. Therefore, I may now deal with his claim regarding "Kentish \( \text{e} \) for \( \text{e} \) W-S \( \text{i}\text{e} \)."

Regarding the W-S diphthong, Campbell has this to say:

(§135)

One of the most regular changes in the West Saxon dialect is the diphthongization of front vowels after palatal consonants. This change is caused not only by original palatal i, but by the new palatales which arose from Prim. Gmc. \( \text{k} \) and \( \text{g} \) in O.E. before all front vowels....

Basically, the development of the W-S diphthong \( \text{i}\text{e} \) occurred as follows: Prim. Gmc. \( \text{e} \) → W. Gmc. \( \text{e} \) → \( \text{e} \) W-S \( \text{e} \)
(with palatal diphthongization) W-S ĭe. However, as Campbell points out, (§187) "The diphthongization of front vowels after palatals is unknown to...Kt. ..."

Thus, Prim. Gmc. ĭ > W. Gmc. ĭ > n W-S ĕ (despite the development of palatals) n W-S ĭ.

Thus, I would expect an attested West Saxon text to display few, if any, non-diphthongized front vowels following palatal consonants, their presence suggesting Kentish or Mercian influence.

After an examination of the glossary and text for relevant citation words (well over one hundred), only one instance was observed of a non-diphthongized front vowel after palatal: sceld, shield d. of scield (41.26). On the off-chance that Sievers' point of view might carry substance if the W-S diphthong ĭa were studied, I examined the glossary and text for relevant citation words (again, more than one hundred).

The W-S diphthong ĭa has its genesis from three sources: one by breaking; another by the normal development of Prim. Gmc. au; and the third by palatal diphthongization of ĭē (Campbell §188). I was concerned with the third; however, the resulting diphthong (ēa) is identical to the
diphthong from the other two sources. The development of the third diphthong occurred as follows: W Gmc. ā > W-S æe > (with palatal diphthongization) W-S ea. In Kt., W. Gmc. ā > æe > e.

When my examination was complete, no instance of an undiphthongized front vowel was observed. This finding lends support to my finding in the previous section regarding io and eo that Kentish influence is substantially absent from the prose in the C MS.

c. Origins of æel and æe2

I have decided to put off for a later section Sievers' observation of "Kentish weoruld for W-S woruld" (xxxv). Such a discussion has more to do with relative dating than dialect influence, I feel. However, there remains yet one more method whereby I can gauge the extent of Kentish influence on the C. MS. This involves an examination of the origins of O.E. æel and æe2.

West Gmc. *ā fronted to æ in Prim. O.E.; it retained this form in W-S and was raised to e in n W-S. This æ is referred to as æel. Its subsequent history is complicated and diverse: if it was subject to retraction, it became ā before u. Before x, or before loss of x between voiced sounds, and when subject to palatal diphthongization æel > e, which, again with i-mutation, became ie. When
subject to restoration, i.e., before single consonants, except dentals, plus back vowel, \( \texttt{ææ_1} \rightarrow \texttt{ă} \) once again. And, of course, when none of these phenomena acted on \( \texttt{ææ_1} \), it remained \( \texttt{æ} \) throughout W-S.

With the fronting of W. Gmc. \( \texttt{ā} \) to n W-S \( \tilde{e} \), very little change occurs. The \( \tilde{e} \) was subject only to breaking to \( \tilde{eo} \) and, as would be expected in Kt., eventual raising to \( \tilde{io} \). And, of course, breaking would occur only when expected; otherwise \( \tilde{e} \) remained in Kt.

Now, regarding \( \texttt{ææ_2} \), W. Gmc. \( \texttt{*ai} \) contracted and lengthened to \( \tilde{a} \), this occurring at about the same time \( \texttt{ææ_1} \) was taking form in W-S. However, the change for \( \texttt{*ai} \) was general throughout O.E. and all dialects developed \( \tilde{a} \). At about the same time i-mutation was affecting \( \tilde{ea} \) from \( \texttt{ææ_1} \), \( \tilde{a} \) from \( \texttt{*ai} \) underwent i-mutation and became \( \tilde{ae} \). It is this \( \tilde{ae} \), which was general in O.E., that we refer to as \( \texttt{ææ_2} \). Eventually, \( \texttt{ææ_1} \) and \( \texttt{ææ_2} \) simply merged.

Thus, while \( \tilde{ae} \) from W. Gmc. \( \texttt{*ai} \) offers no distinguishability among the dialects, \( \tilde{ae} \) from W. Gmc. \( \texttt{*ā} \) does, for in Kt. we would expect not \( \tilde{ae} \), but \( \tilde{e} \). It was with this distinction in mind that I searched the glossary for suspicious forms of words where \( \tilde{ae} \) is expected. Only the following two were found (of well over 100), and these two,
I believe, are easily explainable.

The first, awhær, anywhere, had an instance of awer (17.7). From O.E. ā (ever) plus hwær, (where), the word probably underwent loss of secondary stress, thereby making the "e" in the second syllable ē rather than e. This view is reinforced when āwer is set beside ungedwaer, discordant, (134.29), and similar forms which maintained secondary stress and thus āe. Thus, Kt. influence is ruled out here because ē rather than ē is found.

The second word is presented not so much to offer a possible instance of Kt. influence -- because there is no way of knowing this -- but because it simply remains curious to me. The word faett, fat, has an instance in the dative plural, fēttum (115.6). Although I cannot explain this solitary occurrence, I do know it is irrelevant to the issue of Kt. influence, for P. Gmc. origin of faett is *faitido -- pp. of *faitjan, to fatten. This would lead to æ₂ as the glossary citation word reflects, and thus the æe general in O.E.

In all, no evidence exists suggesting Kt. influence through an examination of W-S æ₁.

My discussion of dialect influence is complete except
for a few comments appearing in later sections when they are relevant. I shall leave any general conclusions for my summary remarks in a later chapter; however, it should be fairly evident by now what these general conclusions will be regarding dialect influence. Of course, it is always difficult to prove a negative assertion, i.e., that no Kt. influence of any significance exists in the C MS. prose. However, my general conclusions will deal less with this than with the possibility of formulating a fairly coherent view of the dialect in the C MS., a view which attempts to deal with exceptions (that is, forms not expected) in as comprehensive a way as possible, while it treats accurately the remaining features in the text.
II. Features Concerning Relative Dating

The remaining two chapters in my analysis of the text will deal with (1) features that Campbell discusses regarding relative dating of a sample of O.E., and (2) features that were examined simply to see how well they correspond to Campbell's more detailed description of their behavior. I have discussed dialect influence and have attempted to deal with exceptions in that respect. I choose to discuss relative dating now in order to determine if any exceptions or irregularities can be dealt with there too. By determining these two factors, I will be better prepared to deal with instances of non-correspondence between features in the text and their description by Campbell in the language.

a. \textit{niui} $\Rightarrow$ \textit{ny}

According to Campbell, at an early date and in all dialects, "the negative adverb \textit{ni} contracted with a following accented \underline{ui} $\Rightarrow$ to produce \textit{ny}" (§265). However, examples are provided, according to Campbell, "only by negated forms of \textit{willan}, \textit{will}, and \textit{witan}, \textit{know}, e.g. \textit{nylle}, \textit{nyllab}, \textit{nvtan}, \textit{nyte}, \textit{nyste} [\textit{e.g. ne willan, ne witan}] ...." L W-S texts display "with great frequency" \textit{ne}- instead
of ny-, although such forms "already appear in e W-S."
However, this development is found only in forms of nyllan,
with an "absence of a similar development in forms of
nytan..." Campbell suggests (perhaps because of the
auxiliary nature of the verb willan) that "these ne- forms
of nyllan are best regarded as arising in low sentence
stress."

At any rate, the text's glossary yielded the following
results regarding nyllan and nytan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nyllan</th>
<th>Nytan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ny-</td>
<td>ne-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.7 &quot;etc.&quot;</td>
<td>70.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.6 &quot;etc.&quot;</td>
<td>122.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.3 &quot;etc.&quot;</td>
<td>140.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.4 &quot;etc.&quot;</td>
<td>149.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.13 &quot;etc.&quot;</td>
<td>108.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a word in the glossary has many referents,
Sedgefield usually places an "etc." after a likely
referent, thereby indicating there are more of that form
but too many to list. Taking this into account, I found
that ny- forms of nyllan outnumber ne- forms by at least
a ration of 6 to 5 and undoubtedly much more. This fact
would suggest that we are dealing with an e W-S text with
ne- forms present but not with "great frequence" and
certainly less than ny- forms. In addition, the three
instances of ni- forms of nyton suggest the text's antiquity, as they may be conservative spellings, perhaps, of the original adverb + verb combination prior to contraction. Probably, however, they are reflexes of ny. At any rate, the absence of ne- forms of nytan corresponds with Campbell's description.

b. Vowels Between *v and *r in W-S

In §320-324, Campbell discusses an increasing tendency in W-S for *w + short vowel + *r to fall together in wur. I recall Sievers' comment now concerning Kt. "weoruld for W-S woruld." It will be evident from the examples below that Sievers simply assumed a spelling with weoruld was sufficient evidence of Kt. influence. I do not believe this is necessarily so.

Although "wear- is quite unaffected," (§320), this coalescence of *v + short vowel + *r into wur is seen in wear-, wyr-, and wor-. Although, Campbell adds, spelling evidence is meager, he points to extensive wyr- for wear-spellings, and the reverse, which he states indicates that the groups had coalesced in wur-. The examples listed below from the C MS. substantiate this hypothesis; however, the apparent preservation of many wear-, wyr, and wor- forms would imply that Campbell's notation of an
"increasing tendency" for this coalescence to occur had not been under way too long, and, in fact, the text again displays its e W-S characteristics. I have omitted page and line numbers in this table because I was seeking mixture by word and not any quantitative value of the number of instances of mixtures. Therefore, the words below are glossary citation words which either showed or were free of mixture.

1) **Weor-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no spelling mixture</th>
<th>extensive spelling mixture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weordfullic, honorable</td>
<td>weordan, happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordfulice, honorably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordgeorn, ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordian, honor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordalic, valuable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordmynd, dignity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weordscipe, dignity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweord, sword</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc, work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorpan, throw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bweorh, adverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Wyr-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no spelling mixture</th>
<th>extensive spelling mixture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wvrtuma, root</td>
<td>wyrćan, make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tvrť, vegetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gevérčad: pst. 3 pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geworht: pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worhtest: pst. 2 s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worhte: pst. 3 s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also wyr-, wir- extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If upon examination or woruld and its derivatives in the text, one were to notice the extensive occurrences of weor-, then perhaps this would prove strong evidence of Kt. influence. However, in the light of the more general phenomena of w + short vowel + r coalescing in wur-, I would discount the first impulse in favor of Kt. influence and allow that this is, as Campbell describes, a W-S text displaying the increasing tendency of coalescence of w + short vowel + r. With words such as weordan, wyrcan, and woruld displaying such an admixture of spelling, one cannot doubt that orthography is here misleading; that is, as far as the "eo" spellings determining the word to be Kentish, the admixture of spelling would suggest the common pronunciation, wur, and not different pronunciations; therefore the orthography is not a true reflection of the word's pronunciation.
c. Late West Saxon Smoothing

In §311-314, Campbell discusses a feature appearing "In l W-S..." affecting the falling diphthong ēa (which itself arose by palatal diphthongization of front vowels or of mutated vowels). Before c, g, and X, and after ġ, sc, and ĕ, ēa became ē, or smoothed. This feature of smoothing is to be noted in e W-S to some extent, but l W-S is rich in it.

Below are listed some examples from the C MS. which will highlight the sought-after feature:

1. hēah, high  ēa 99.12  62.24;50.12;  
                      52.22 etc.90.7;  
                      100.14;77.25;18.9
2. ēaēen, eye  121.30;129.30;133.13;  0  
                      122.6;44.14;145.25
3. ēēaf, he gave  142.9  0
4. ēēceas, he chose 20.13;66.28  0
5. scēal, shall  about ten times  to  1
6. ēēare, yearly  44.25;64.14;92.15  65.23
7. The below showed no variation:

   gesceafaet, creation  
   ēaeh, though  
   sāah, he saw  
   sēard, inlet  
   sēarp, sharp  
   sēarpsiene, keen sighted  
   sēate, spread  
    ēsēcaewise, sub. prs. of scean, see

As can be seen, with the notably important exception of
hēah, 1 W-S smoothing appears in little evidence in the text. Campbell, however, cautions one with the following:

The operation of these changes seems to have been limited by factors no longer recoverable, for they are not indicated with anything approaching consistency by the spelling system of any manuscript, [with the exception, perhaps, of this one?] although W-S spelling is fairly quick to allow for phonetic development down to 1000....

Thus, the lack of apparent smoothing cannot be taken as a single proof of the text's relative earliness, since -- again -- we cannot trust our orthography completely. However, we should not completely ignore evidence either. In short, what I can say is that the orthography reveals little 1 W-S smoothing having occurred and this alone will, by the examination of previous and subsequent evidence, be borne out or refuted depending upon the final, general view of the text's relative antiquity. However, with regard to hēah, I believe its status as the only word in the list obviously exhibiting smoothing may be explainable. I believe the spirant h before the diphthong ēa in hēah is conducive to smoothing. When a feature such as smoothing comes into a language it probably acts first on those words most susceptible to the change. It would seem to me that it would be difficult for a diphthong to maintain
its quality existing between a voiceless and a glottal
spirant such as in heæh. This might, therefore, explain
the "exception" in this dialect. No doubt 1 W-S texts would
have smoothing in the other words in the list as well
since that dialect appears in MSS. at a later date than
this one, i.e., when smoothing has had an opportunity to
work on more sound combinations. But, it would seem
that in the text's dialect, smoothing is found where it
might most easily take place first: after h and before X.

d. The Group Sel

In §325-6, Campbell discusses another feature develop¬
ing "after the period of the group of manuscripts regarded
as 'early'...." He says that, in 1 W-S, sel- developed
to syl- or sil-, presumably through siel-.

The items below, representing all the possibilities
offered by the text, show no other spellings than those
presented:

1. self, self, or compounds of self: selflice, etc.
2. sellan, sell
3. selra, good, better
4. selldan, seldom
5. seldcud, rare

Whereas with 1 W-S smoothing, orthography could be
misleading, here it would appear unable to mislead. Of
course, it is possible, I suppose, for an early West Saxon speaker to say \[i\] or \[y\] but spell the word with "e." But this seems unlikely, since e is lower than \[i\] or \[y\] and, when a speaker spelled his word with "e" he probably was not saying it with \[i\]. Therefore, it would seem the development of this l W-S feature had not occurred in the C MS. and, by inference, the MS. may be "regarded as 'early'...."

e. Some Additional Features Regarding Dating

I conclude this chapter with a few additional features relevant to my discussion. I group them in this section because the text offers only meager evidence, forcefully, in either direction, and, because of this, I would hope to convey only a pattern through grouping these unrelated features, much as one gathers circumstantial evidence to prove a case. Of course, I am aware that circumstantial evidence never really proves without doubt, and the reader will be aware of this too.

In §180, Campbell mentions the development of a glide vowel after the new palatal sc. In e W-S, scā, and scō were already appearing with scēa-, scēo-. However, scū- was not to develop the glide until the appearance of "later texts." Campbell offers the word sceocca, demon, as an example of glide plus ū being written ęo. The C MS.,
however, offers *succena*, (g. pl. 129.6) and would thus indicate no glide plus ū present.

In §446-7, Campbell discusses the unvoicing of final spirants, mainly in connection with h coming into increasing use as a symbol for final g. He states that in 1 W-S, "the use of h for West Gmc. final g is frequent," and e W-S has a "few examples" of this as well. The C MS. has *wah*, wall (110.23) beside *waga* (11.27 g. pl.); *beag*, ring, crown (113.3; 112.25) shows no h; nor at syllable end (where Campbell suggests the change also occurred) do we find an h, i.e., *fuglum*, bird (121.15). (I should point out that Cambell's example from the "O.E. Boethius" *dahum*, days, occurs at 10.10 in the text and is not from the C MS.) These are Campbell's concluding remarks regarding unvoicing:

The unvoicing in finality dealt with in §§446-50 evidently began prehistorically, for the early glossaries already have some spellings indicating the change. The changes are very open to analogical removal and there may be purely orthographic as well as phonological removal. It is therefore difficult to determine the precise phonological history of these changes (§451).

In §§735, 752, Campbell discusses early and late dialectal forms of verbs in O.E. In examining these two
sections, I found that it was possible to isolate three features of both strong and weak verbs, and to use these features as a measure of what I may call the decay of verb inflection in a language. This, of course, would be also a measure of the relative age of a dialect.

The three features involve three forms of a verb: infinitive, present subjunctive plural, and present plural indicative. Campbell's discussion reveals that the normal W-S forms of these features were: infinitive, -an, prs. subj. pl -en, and prs. pl. ind. -ab. The unusual W-S forms of these features were: infinitive, -on (-en), prs. subj. pl. -an, -on (generally), and prs. pl. ind. -eb (generally).

As would be expected from my preceding sections, very scant "decay" was observed in the text. Of the several hundred verbs and their forms in the glossary, only six possible "decays" were found. They are listed below.

1. cweðan-(137.18) sub. prs. pl. of cweban, to speak
2. forweordan-(89.19) sub. prs. pl. of forweordan, to perish
3. sprecan-(137.18) beside sprecan (84.3)-subj. prs. pl. of sprecan, to speak
4. to tellene-(56.10) beside to tellanne, to state the case
5. to todaelenne-(92.28) to divide
6. weordan-(122.6) beside weorden, subj. prs. pl. of weordan, happen
The final short feature to be examined appears in §474, 477 of Campbell, concerning the loss of consonants. All the words cited below were those suggested by Campbell as displaying the pertinent change. The reader will note that none of the 1 W-S forms of these words bear corroboration from the C MS.

Regarding "the suffix -ing being reduced to -ing, -eg after n," Campbell offers 1 W-S cynegas, king's, while the text offers cyninges, cyningas.

Regarding the "Loss of t between s and another consonant" in 1 W-S, Campbell offers 1 W-S wæsm, fruit, and blōsma, blossom. The text offers wæstm, blōstma.

This completes the examination of the C MS. with emphasis on features pertinent to relative dating. As we saw from the several examples offered, the text may be described as e W-S since characteristically 1 W-S features are either absent entirely or apparently just beginning to be evident.

In another respect now, we are informed of the text's dialect. Little mixture between e W-S and 1 W-S features were found. Furthermore, my assertions earlier in the chapter on dialect influence are reinforced by the consistency found in this chapter regarding relative dating.
It remains now to examine various features in general in the text and compare them with Campbell's over-all assertions regarding their behavior in O.E.
III. Features in General

a. Palatal Umlaut

In §§304-311, Campbell discusses the feature, palatal umlaut, which was to cause the diphthongs eo and io to become i before the consonant groups Xr, Xs, and Xb in absolute finality, "and perhaps followed by e." In addition to the above-mentioned diphthongs, the e monophthong was supposed to have undergone the same change to i; however, in W-S the e had already been broken to eo before X; thus none were present at the time of palatal umlaut. Interestingly enough, Kentish forms with e before X underwent a mutation, according to Campbell, from ea, "e.g. *hlehb, he laughs." The C MS., as would be expected, has hleahtre (d.36.2).

At any rate, palatal umlaut proved to be an interesting feature to investigate in the C MS. Campbell provided two criteria: 1) monophthongization of eo and io to i under the appropriate circumstances, and 2) palatal umlaut was not to be expected when the pertinent consonant groups were not final, or before back vowels, "since consonant groups were not palatal before back vowels." My investigation yielded some exceptions to Campbell's description. Below are listed representative examples of expected forms and unexpected as well.
As expected, I found cniht, boy (78.18) from *kniuht) and gesihd, sight (145.24 from seon with loss of medial X and by analogy). However, in addition to riht, rightly (11.30, etc. from *riucht) I found one instance of rehte (135.10). Either this is a scribal error, or an isolated incident of Mercian influence whose normal form of the word was reht, or perhaps even a borrowed spelling from Kt. Since nothing thus far in any investigation has even hinted at Mercian influence, I must view this one instance of rehte as a scribal error, or a borrowed Kt. spelling.

An interesting ramification, possibly, to Campbell’s view concerning no palatal umlaut with back vowels following the consonant groups, is found in tyht, training (20.10 from *teuh-). Campbell points out that gefeoht, fight, displays no palatal umlaut because the form of feohtan, to fight, was followed by analogy. The back vowel caused the diphthong to remain, and this is seen, by analogy, in gefeoht, which contains no back vowel following Xt. However, in tyht we find tyhtan, to incite, persuade, teach. Now in a verbal we find no diphthong, despite the back vowel following Xt. Evidently, because the verb was formed from the noun, which had already undergone palatal umlaut, there was no opportunity for the
verb to exist with eo and thus no opportunity for tyht to follow the analogy as gefeohht did. Therefore, tyhtan, though possessing a back vowel remains with palatal umlaut. Here, I think, its exceptional form may thus be explained.

Finally, in wiht, thing, person, I found a wholly unexpected form: wuht (12.22, etc., the "usual" form in the C MS.) I could not find this word's origins; however, since Campbell lists it as one of his examples (wiht) of palatal umlaut, I will assume the word had either *-eu- or *iu- origins. But palatal umlaut does not explain the word's form in the C MS. Wyht or wiht would be acceptable, but not wuht by palatal umlaut. My only explanation rests on an assumption that wiht was meant phonologically, but it was spelled wuht to indicate the high, back roundedness of the i due to the labial w preceding and glottal spirant following.

With the few exceptions listed above, the text agreed with Campbell's description of palatal umlaut. No relative dating could be obtained since this feature had "affected all possible short sounds by 900." Long eo and io, as predicted by Campbell, displayed no palatal umlaut.
b. Vocalization of \( \digamma \)

In §266-69, Campbell discusses "a marked tendency in early O.E. for \( \digamma \) to be vocalized and...combine with a front vowel belonging to the same syllable to form a diphthong, \( \text{a}\text{ei} \), \( \text{ei} \), or \( \text{i} (\text{<} \text{ii}) \)." When \( \digamma \) did not belong to the same syllable as the front vowel preceding it (as in inflected case, i.e., \( \text{weges} \), \( \text{ways} \)) analogy often caused these forms to keep the \( \digamma \) though now belonging to the same syllable as the preceding front vowel, i.e., "\( \text{weg}, \text{way, wæg, war}. \)" Because this tendency is rare in e W-S and more common in l W-S, I would expect its occurrence in the C MS. to be infrequent. Only one instance, in fact, indicating vocalization of \( \digamma \) was discovered: \( \text{hlīsan} \), reputation (41.17).

Whereas Campbell suggested \( \text{liðā} \), 3 s. prs. of to lie, \( \text{menīu} \), multitude, and \( \text{dysī} \) or \( \text{dysīe} \), foolish, the text yielded \( \text{līgēd} \) (42.8), \( \text{menīgon} \) (30.23), and \( \text{dysīg} \) (122.11) or \( \text{dysīge} \) (68.10).

Other forms found included: \( \text{unscylldīg} \), innocent (122.31), \( \text{æghwæér} \), everywhere (148.26), \( \text{ægdrēs} \), either (93.13), and \( \text{ægder} \), either (38.13 etc.).

The text proved regular insofar as not displaying the
expected orthography, i.e., "I" alone. However, since such a spelling is quite common in W-S, this would appear to be a good instance of the dependability of orthography in drawing conclusions. But, although an early West Saxon speaker might spell his words with "g" it seems highly unlikely he said them this way. I have tried to unvocalize the "g" in menigon and find this exceedingly difficult to do. Therefore, if "g" were really i, even in W-S, I believe the reader will agree that the orthography consistently tries to mask this fact in the text.

c. Short Additional Features

This final section, like the final section in the previous chapter, will group features that Campbell discusses (some warranting more space than I give) because the material in the text was found not to be sufficiently plentiful to give Campbell's description a full measure of validity. However, again I would hope that a pattern may arise in which features in the text will reflect on Campbell's predictions of their prevalence or absence.

Discussing the early changes in consonant groups (§419,422), Campbell indicates two tendencies which developed in W-S: bl > tl (stops developing from spirants before liquids); and bl > dl (bl after a long vowel became
dl, not tl). The words in the text reflecting these descriptions are setl, seat (19.14); waēdle, poor man (28.24 etc.), and ædre, vein (93.4).

Regarding the simplification of consonants (§457,8) we are told "already before 900 heavy medial syllables resulting from adding -ne, -re, -ra, -lic, -nes, -dom lost stress, and this led to the simplification of double consonants...." The text offers: gyldenne (112.23), golden, beside gyldenu (35.5); bysses, bisses, -um (37.31), etc., 60.17, etc., 66.4), this, beside bisum (99.6), 19.2); ḍerra (32.10), other and æftera (35.5), after. Perhaps we see again, by the numerous double consonants still evident, a measure of the text's antiquity. Of course, the spellings could also be etymological.

Metathesis (§459-60) is a phenomenon in a language which occurs sporadically and to only certain combinations of sounds, usually involving r. By full metathesis is meant the moving of a consonant from immediately before a vowel to immediately after it, or the reverse. Few words in the text reflected full metathesis and those that did, only sporadically. In fact, when Campbell suggests the metathesized l W-S word hīrda, third, the text offers in
all instances dridda. Regarding metathesis of consonants in a consonant group, i.e. the sporadic occurrence in a language when consonants reverse positions (usually involving the group ks), the text contains about equal instances of metathesized and unmetathesized forms: ascab, asks, appears five times with -sk- and six times with -ks-; claensian, to clean, appears as śeclaensung (123.25) and śeclaesnod (120.14).

Regarding the intrusion of consonants (§478-9) Campbell suggests ml > mbl in W-S, offering simble, always, beside simle as an example of this feature. The text, perhaps due to its earliness, displays not one instance of simble; however, it does offer around fifteen instances of simle and sixtv instances of symle.

In §315-19, Campbell discusses the unrounding of y to i, and the rounding of i to y in W-S. The former, he suggests, occurs very seldom in e W-S, offering a few instances in forms of such words as cyning, king, dysigan, foolish, and unsycldig, innocent. He adds, y "was becoming unrounded by isolative change," and this occurred in l W-S in some areas only. In addition, and again occurring in l W-S, "y" had a tendency to be written "i" before h, c, and ã and groups containing them.
Regarding this latter, the rounding of ı to ɐ, he points out that this often occurred mainly in 1 W-S (and occasionally in e W-S) and in the neighborhood of labials and before r.

Cyning was found four times (35.1; 65.11; 66.17; 36.6) and cining twice (66.15; 102.28). Dysigan was found 17 times, disigan none. Similarly, unscyldig was found six times and unscildig none. In the neighborhood of labials and r, as was expected, the percentage of rounding ı to ɐ increased, but only slightly. Dryhten, daughter, dryke, dry, gewyscan, wish, wyrca, work, and mycel, much, were about even in their distribution of ɐ and ı spellings. Notably, swibe, great, remained stolidly with the ı spelling (about 20 to none), indicating that the mainly 1 W-S tendency of rounding ı to ɐ in the neighborhood of labials had not been prevalent in the text.

The last feature I shall discuss concerns the assimilation of consonants (§480-84). I recall now my remarks in this paper's introduction regarding the problems of orthography. Although my findings substantiate the view that the text is e W-S, I offer this last feature as a member only of a group of features, in this last section, because of Campbell's following caution: many of the
assimilations "are often disguised by etymological spellings."
Because of this, i.e., no clear cut evidence either way whether the word under examination is e W-S or l W-S, my findings are diminished in their validity and I reserve them to this last section of what would have to be called tentative features.

In the assimilation of all consonants becoming voiceless before t, Campbell cites mettrum, metrum, infirm (from med + trum). The text has medtrymnesse, (132.12), ill-health. Similarly, with the assimilation of all consonants becoming voiceless before voiceless spirants s and b, Campbell cites miltsian, to pity, brincst, -cə, 2nd and 3rd s.prs. of to bring; and latteow, leader, (from lad + deow). The text offers both méldsung (123.31) and miltsige (123.30). But it presents laddeow, and more important, only forms of bringan with gə, not əd.

From the phonological development of bs to ss (evidently occurring before the above assimilations) we do find cwyst, 2nd s. prs. of cweəan, to speak, from earlier. *cwibist. But the later phonological development of bd to dd occurring in l W-S is not found. Campbell offers cydde, declared; the text has cýdde (43.8).
Although the above results are to be expected, I reiterate my earlier comments concerning etymological spellings. Campbell himself cites instances of milds, ladtēov, ledācov, cīde, and bringā in 1 W-S. It is for this reason that a rigorous examination concerning this feature cannot be made.
IV. Summation

In summarizing the results of my investigation of the C MS.'s dialect, I will try to form a coherent view of the text's language based on the single views encountered throughout this paper. Generally, I can divide this summation between features that were consistent in their appearance in this text — both in terms of that particular feature and terms of other related features — and features that either included exceptional forms or were exceptional with regard to Campbell's detailed description of their behavior in the language.

We found many features in the text which showed that by their consistent appearance in an expected form they could shed light on such questions as dialect influence or relative dating. The absence of any variance in words containing $ae$ indicates no Kt. influence, for Kt. forms would have $e$. The facts that: ny- forms of ne willan outnumber ne- forms; coalescence of the sounds weor-, wyr-, wor-, into the common sound wur has occurred; only sel- groups appear in the text; decay of verb inflections is very scant; no loss of consonants is found; orthographic tradition preserves the "g" though it is vocalized and spelled "i" in W-S; e W-S ml is not written "mbl"
which is 1 W-S; and rounding of \( \hat{\frac{1}{2}} \) to 1 W-S \( \hat{\frac{1}{2}} \) or unrounding of \( \hat{\frac{1}{2}} \) to 1 W-S \( \hat{\frac{1}{2}} \) has not occurred; all these facts indicate that the text is e W-S and contains no Kt. influence.

However, more important is simply the description of these features. In a practical sense, they tell us something about the text. In a grammatical sense, that is, in their existence as a description of features, they tell us something about the text's language. And, as I said in my paper's introduction, such a description of the language was my aim. In terms of writing a more complete grammar of O.E. this paper would be of some use.

Now, with regard to features in the text which showed variation in their forms with other features we found several examples as well.

In examining the text for the presence of Kt. influence, we found 19 instances of "io" where "eo" is expected. Since the 19 instances compare negligibly with the 1000 or so instances of these words in the text, and since reverse spellings -- in which no historic basis exists for the spelling of a word a certain way except by analogy -- is as good an explanation for these 19 instances as Kt. influence is, I concluded that no Kt. influence is present in the text. But, the 19 instances still must be accounted
for in the text's dialect. As such, they must stand as exceptions. Similarly, the one instances of sceld must stand as an exception with regard to the feature palatal diphthongization. All other words in the text displayed the W-S diphthong ðe or ða from palatal diphthongization except sceld. Here again the one instance of sceld must be accounted for in the text's dialect. But for its existence, all other words within the feature displayed no Kt. influence. Thus, I can only say the evidence is too meager to allow of wholesale Kt. influence. However, since I can offer no W-S explanation for its existence in its particular form, I must say sceld indicates a borrowed spelling from Kt. This applies as well to rehte under the feature palatal umlaut. Its form is Kt. and, whereas I explain the unusual forms of wuht and tyhtan, I cannot offer a tenable explanation for the one instance of rehte in the text. Therefore, it too must be viewed as a borrowed spelling.

The exceptional form of heah under the feature W-S smoothing bore on the question of relative dating. I explained this one example in the text of a characteristic-ally W-S feature by discussing the influence of the initial h on the diphthong ea. The reader may note that
my explanations for the exceptional forms of certain words rested on the assumption that the text was e W-S. While this assumption is not essential to my aim, i.e., description of the text's language, it has proved helpful in formulating explanations for these words' exceptional forms. In other words, I used inductive methods to place the text within the context of the development of O.E. Once I adduced the context, many reasonable explanations could be put forth when exceptions arose, such as heah, wuht, the 19 instances of "io" for "eo," and tyhtan. I would think this is a good example of the use of such a study as mine. With a more thorough study perhaps even the admitted borrowed spellings could be "explained" within the context of a more comprehensive grammar.

Finally, we saw many features examined which, because of the text's lack of sufficient examples, had to be grouped in a short discussion of their behavior. Not very much is gained from the examination of these features. I included them simply because they helped broaden my base of study. However, the orthography could not be trusted in the cases of assimilation, simplification of double consonants, and the unvoicing of final spirants
(g > h). And evidence was too meager to show the workings of the features metathesis, bl > tl or dl, or the development of a glide vowel in scu to sceo. These features would have to be examined within the context of several manuscripts in order for us to reach any meaningful conclusions regarding their behavior. However, at least they are described for this MS. It must remain for others to carry out additional studies.

To this point, I believe a useful beginning has been made. Additional studies would amplify and clarify many of my findings. Any comprehensive grammar of O.E. would depend on such additional studies, for, like any language, O.E. has its dialects with aberrant forms. If we are to understand the workings of the language we must understand its parts. I suppose I can claim only to have tinkered with some of those parts in this paper. But perhaps the reader will allow me a measure of success in my tinkering.
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