

Gotelind's premonition has never, as far as I know, been related to *The Wife's Lament*, yet there are several intriguing connections between the Old English poem and the Middle High German passage. In both works, a female speaker describes being commanded by her husband to dwell permanently in an unwelcoming space. The narrative background to *The Wife's Lament* is unclear, but it is clear enough that the speaker has been commanded by her husband (*Hēt mec hlāford mīn*, l. 15a) to take up residence in a dwelling described variously as a 'grove-enclosure' (*herheard*, l. 15b), an 'earth-hall' (*eorðsele*, l. 29a), and an 'earth-cave' (*eorðscraef*, ll. 28b, 36b).<sup>6</sup> It is likewise clear that the speaker does not wish to be in this 'dwelling deprived of joys' (*wīc wynna lēas*, l. 32a), where she feels entirely afflicted with longing (*eal ic eom oflongad*, l. 29b). A similar confinement of a female speaker is envisioned in Gotelind's premonition, where Rudiger commands her (*dā hiez er mich*) to inhabit a dark room, which she cannot leave and in which she does not wish to dwell (*ungerne was ich drinne*).

In both texts, moreover, the theme of lovers' separation is associated with inclement weather. At the beginning of her premonition, Gotelind describes seeing Rudiger and his men covered in snow and afflicted by torrential rain. At the end of *The Wife's Lament*, the speaker similarly envisions her husband in a desolate hall (*drēorsele*, l. 50a) that is chilled by storm (*storne behrīmed*, l. 48b) and surrounded by water (*wætre beflōwen*, l. 49b). The salient difference between the two texts, of course, is that whereas the speaker of *The Wife's Lament* remains separated from her husband at the end of the poem, Gotelind is reunited with her husband in the dark room where they will permanently dwell together. Gotelind's premonition foretells the imminent death from grief that she will experience shortly after learning that Rudiger is dead; the dark room in which she is reunited with Rudiger is evidently the grave. One must wonder if the speaker of *The Wife's Lament* is not similarly waiting in her joyless dwelling to be reunited one day there with the husband from whom she has been separated. Several scholars have argued that the speaker is a revenant, who delivers her lament

<sup>6</sup> The text of *The Wife's Lament* is cited throughout by line number from George Philip Krapp and Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie (eds), *The Exeter Book* (New York, 1936), 210–11; translations are my own.

from the grave.<sup>7</sup> Even if this interpretation is not correct,<sup>8</sup> the poet certainly appears to capitalize on the ambiguous possibility that the speaker is dead and in her tomb. When the speaker reflects ruefully on the 'living' (*lifgende*, l. 34a) lovers who enjoy each other's company, while she walks alone around her earth-dwelling at dawn (ll. 33b–36), there is a suggestion that the speaker feels that she is dead, even if she is not literally dead. If the passage from *Diu Klage* does not confirm the revenant interpretation of *The Wife's Lament*, it at least strengthens the supposition that the Old English poet plays with the possibility of a deceased speaker in this enigmatic elegy.

LEONARD NEIDORF

Nanjing University, China

<https://doi.org/10.1093/notesj/gjad049>

© The Author(s) (2023). Published by Oxford University Press.

All rights reserved. For permissions, please email:

[journals.permissions@oup.com](mailto:journals.permissions@oup.com)

Advance Access publication 31 July, 2023

<sup>7</sup> See Elinor Lench, 'The Wife's Lament: A Poem of the Living Dead', *Comitatus* i (1970), 3–23; and Raymond P. Tripp, 'The Narrator as Revenant: A Reconsideration of Three Old English Elegies', *Papers on Language and Literature* viii (1972), 339–61; and William C. Johnson, Jr, 'The Wife's Lament as Death Song', in Martin Green (ed.), *The Old English Elegies: New Essays in Criticism and Research* (Rutherford, 1983), 69–81. See also A. C. Bouman, *Patterns in Old English and Old Icelandic Literature* (Leiden, 1962), 43–89.

<sup>8</sup> For objections to the revenant interpretation, see Joseph Harris, 'A Note on *Eorðscraef/Eorðsele* and Current Interpretations of *The Wife's Lament*', *English Studies* lviii (1977), 204–08; and Karl P. Wentersdorf, 'The Situation of the Narrator in the Old English *Wife's Lament*', *Speculum* lvi (1981), 492–516. See also Emily Jensen, 'The Wife's Lament's *Eorðscraef*: Literal or Figural Sign?', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* xci (1990), 449–57.

#### FURTHER EVIDENCE OF SUBJECT-TYPE EFFECTS ON VERBAL MORPHOLOGY IN OLD NORTHUMBRIAN

The present-tense verbal systems of northern Middle English and Older Scots marked a distinction between subject types in the verb. The present-tense plural marker in the indicative and imperative was *-s* unless the verb had an immediately adjacent personal pronoun subject, in which case the marker was the reduced or zero ending (*-e/∅*). This resulted in a paradigm whereby *we sai* 'we say', *ye sai* 'you say', *þai sai* 'they say', *sai* 'say!' occurred in juxtaposition to *storis sais* 'stories says', *ye þat sais* 'you that says' and *þai tel and sais* 'they tell and says'. This grammatical

constraint is commonly referred to as the ‘northern subject rule’.

In the categorical system described above typical of early northern varieties, the crucial environment for determining morphological differentiation involves pronominal adjacency; adjacent personal pronoun plural subjects are distinguished from all other plural subject types. The constraint, however, is usually understood as involving two syntactic conditions on agreement: an adjacent-pronoun constraint and a subject-type constraint that distinguishes a personal pronoun (regardless of position) versus non-personal pronoun subject constraint in the verb, i.e., *þai tel and sai* ‘they tell and say’ versus *storis saís* ‘stories says’. The adjacent-pronoun constraint is not a consistent feature of later varieties of northern and Scottish English and does not exhibit the same diachronic stability as the subject-type constraint.<sup>1</sup> Even in northern Middle English there is evidence to suggest that the adjacent-pronoun constraint was never as robust as the subject-type constraint.<sup>2</sup> The diatopic distribution of the subject-type constraint also extends beyond the north into varieties of Midlands Middle English and Early Modern London English, rendering the geographical categorization associated with the label ‘northern subject rule’ misleading.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. Wolfram and D. Christian, *Appalachian Speech* (Arlington, 1976); M. Montgomery, ‘Making Transatlantic Connections between Varieties of English: The Case of Plural Verbal -s’, *Journal of English Linguistics* xxv (1997), 122–41; L. Pietsch, ‘“Some do and some doesn’t”: Verbal Concord Variation in the North of the British Isles’, in B. Kortmann et al. (eds.), *A Comparative Grammar of British English Dialects. Agreement, Gender, Relative Clauses* (Berlin, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> N. de Haas, *Morphosyntactic Variation in Northern English: The Northern Subject Rule, its Origins and Early History* (Utrecht, 2011), 172–3; J. Fernández-Cuesta, ‘The Northern Subject Rule in First-Person Singular Contexts in Early Modern English’, *Folia Linguistica Historica*, xxxii (2011), 106–7.

<sup>3</sup> A. McIntosh, ‘Present-Indicative Plural Forms in the Later Middle English of the North Midlands’, in A. McIntosh and M. Laing (eds), *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems* (Aberdeen, 1989), 116–22; H. Schendl, ‘The Third Person Present Plural in Shakespeare’s First Folio: A Case of Interaction of Morphology and Syntax’, in C. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt (eds), *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function: A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky* (Berlin, 2000), 263–76; L. Wright, ‘Third Person Plural Tense Markers in London Prisoners’ Depositions 1662–1623’, *American Speech*, lxxvii (2002), 242–63; de Haas, *Morphosyntactic Variation*, 84–108. For an overview of the constraint from Middle English through to Present-Day English including overseas varieties and non-northern modern varieties, see M. Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax in Old Northumbrian and the (Northern) Subject Rule* (Amsterdam, 2014), 35–86.

Nor does the constraint presuppose a suffixal -s versus uninflected alternation but rather syntactically conditioned variation between competing forms. The surface realizations of the constraint in Middle English displayed morphological variation independent of the suffix in -s, and subject type has been shown to determine variation between forms of the verb *to be* in both modern and older varieties of English.<sup>4</sup> The effects of the constraint are also recorded in 1SG and 3SG environments.<sup>5</sup>

The traditional dating of the emergence of the constraints in the northern dialects to the early Middle English period has also been challenged by the finding that subject-type and adjacency effects condition verbal morphology in late Old Northumbrian (ONbr), the Old English ancestor dialect of northern Middle English. The distribution of plural and 3SG present-tense verbal endings in -s and -ð in the mid-tenth century ONbr glosses in the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, British Library Cotton MS Nero D. IV) is conditioned by statistically significant subject and adjacency effects, in addition to priming, phonological and lexical factors.<sup>6</sup> Personal pronoun subjects, particularly adjacent person pronoun subjects, favour -s in contrast to non-personal-pronoun subjects (and non-adjacent person pronouns) which favour

<sup>4</sup> McIntosh, ‘Present-Indicative Plural Forms’, 116–22; de Haas, *Morphosyntactic Variation*, 84–108; Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 38–9. For subject effects and the verb *to be*, see G. Forsström, *The Verb “to be” in Middle English: A Survey of the Forms* (Lund, 1948), 193–207; M. Montgomery, ‘The Evolution of Verb Concord in Scots’, in A. Fenton and D. McDonald (eds), *Studies in Scots and Gaelic: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Languages of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1994), 81–95; D. Schreier, ‘Past *be* in Tristan de Cunha: The Rise and Fall of Categoricality in Language Change’, *American Speech*, lxxvii (2002), 70–90.

<sup>5</sup> For 1SG environments, see Fernández-Cuesta, ‘The Northern Subject Rule’, 89–114; M. N. Rodríguez-Ledesma, ‘The Northern Subject Rule in First Person Singular Contexts in Fourteenth-Fifteenth-Century Scots’, *Folia Linguistica Historica*, xxxiv (2013), 149–72. For 3SG environments, see G. Bailey, N. Maynor and P. Cukor-Avila, ‘Variation in Subject-Verb Concord in Early Modern English’, *Language Variation and Change* i (1989), 285–300; E. W. Schneider and M. Montgomery, ‘On the Trail of Early Nonstandard Grammar: An Electronic Corpus of Southern U.S. Antebellum Overseers’ Letters’ *American Speech* 76 (2001), 388–410; Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 105–6.

<sup>6</sup> Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 87–157; M. Cole, ‘Subject and Adjacency Effects in the Old Northumbrian Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels’, *English Language and Linguistics* xxiii (2019), 131–54.

-*ð*. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate the general pattern.<sup>7</sup>

- (1) MkGl (Li) 2.18  
 ONbr *ðine uttedlice ðegnas ne fæstað*  
 Latin *tui autem discipuli non ieiunant*  
 ‘but your disciples don’t fast’
- (2) JnGl (Li) 14.4  
 ONbr *gie ongeattas hine & geseað hine*  
 Latin *cognoscitis eum et uidistis eum*  
 ‘you know him and have seen him’

These findings fit well with Pietsch’s suggestion that remorphologization based on subject type is likely when levelling and erosion have resulted in extreme person/number neutralization. In such situations, a system based on a distinction between personal pronoun and non-personal pronoun subjects may become “cognitively more salient in processing than the person/number distinction, and a re-structuring of the agreement system along these dimensions may be the long-term consequence”.<sup>8</sup> The elimination of distinctive person and number marking in early northern English dialect is well underway in late ONbr. The early ONbr present-tense system that distinguished 1SG *-e*, 2SG *-es*, 3SG *-eð*, and PL *-að* in the indicative, and plural imperative *-að*, is obscured in late ONbr by the weakening of the inflectional vowel and the gradual encroachment of *-es/-as* to all persons (except 1SG). From this perspective, the tendency towards remorphologization based on subject type detected in the late ONbr Lindisfarne gloss developed in response to the elimination of person and number distinctions caused by the levelling of *-s* and the loss of inflectional vowel contrasts in the present-tense paradigm.<sup>9</sup>

Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir (2019) argue that a subject-type constraint does not, however, operate in the ONbr glosses and additions to the Durham Collectar (Durham Cathedral Library A. IV.19), written c. 970, and subject-type conditioning was therefore not a general characteristic of ONbr.<sup>10</sup> The finding is all the more unexpected

given that both sets of glosses are widely believed to have been written by the same scribe.

A study of subject and adjacency effects in the Durham Collectar (*DC*) is problematized by the fact that personal pronoun subjects are severely underrepresented in the 3SG and 3PL. There are only two 3SG pronoun tokens, *gisendeð* and *giondetað*, both at DurRitGl 1 [85.4], f.40v, and both involve the non-adjacent personal pronoun subject *he*, as illustrated in (3). In the 3PL there are just two personal pronoun subjects: *hia wniad* at DurRitGl 1 [61.8], f.29v and *hia onfoeð* at DurRitGl 1 [92.9], f. 44r.<sup>11</sup>

- (3) DurRitGl 1 [85.4], f.40v  
 ONbr & **he** svoelce smolt regn l **gisendeð**  
*giriado <snutr> his giondetað driht’*  
 Latin *et ipse tanquam imbres mittet eloquia*  
*sapientiae suae et in oratione confitebitur*  
*domino*  
 ‘and he like mild rain sends forth his words of wisdom and in prayer praises the Lord’

In *DC* 1PL contexts have 93 adjacent personal pronoun subjects and two non-adjacent personal pronoun subjects versus four non-personal pronoun subjects. 2PL INDICATIVE contexts have eight (adjacent) personal pronouns but just one non-personal pronoun subject. In contrast, 3SG contexts involve two (non-adjacent) personal pronoun subjects versus 148 non-personal pronoun subjects and 3PL contexts involve two (adjacent) personal pronoun subjects versus 58 non-personal pronoun subjects. In other words, in 1PL and 2PL INDICATIVE environments, non-personal pronoun subject types are under-represented, while in the 3SG and 3PL personal pronoun subjects are under-represented.

Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir code the relatively small *DC* dataset ( $N=385$ ) of present-tense and imperative verbal forms in *DC* simultaneously for person, number, and subject type (e.g. 3SG PERSONAL PRONOUN, 3SG NOUN PHRASE, 3SG RELATIVE PRONOUN ANTECEDENT, etc.).<sup>12</sup> This creates small samples which do not provide the personal

<sup>7</sup> Text abbreviations are those employed by A. DiPaolo Healey et al. (eds), *Dictionary of Old English Electronic Corpus* (Toronto, 2009) <<https://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>>. Modern English translations render the Old English text rather than the Latin and are the author’s own.

<sup>8</sup> Pietsch, “‘Some do and some doesn’t’”, 198.

<sup>9</sup> See L. Rupp and D. Britain, *Linguistic Perspectives on a Variable English Morpheme: Let’s Talk About -s* (London, 2019) for a discourse-pragmatic analysis of the northern subject rule.

<sup>10</sup> J. Fernández-Cuesta and C. Langmuir, ‘Verbal Morphology in the Old English Gloss to the Durham Ritual’ *NOWELE* lxxii (2019), 134–64.

<sup>11</sup> The third instance of a 3PL personal pronoun identified by Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir, *hii* ... *iornað* ‘they ... run’ (*Ibid.*, 140, Table 2) has transposed Latin *hii* and should read *ða ða ðe* ... *iornað* ‘those who ... run’ L. *hii qui* ... *currunt* DurRitGl 1 [5.18], f.3r.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 141–3.

pronoun versus non-personal pronoun contrast required to test for subject effects.

In variable terms the ‘northern’ subject rule predicts a higher usage of a competing morphological variant with personal pronoun subjects (particularly in adjacent position) than with non-personal pronoun subjects. It does not mark grammatical person, and subject effects are not necessarily restricted to plural environments in ONbr. This supports categorizing verb tokens according to whether they have a personal pronoun or non-personal pronoun subject type regardless of person and number marking. Based on this premise, the present study provides a reconsideration of present-tense verbal morphology in *DC* based on the *Dictionary of Old English Electronic Corpus*’s transcription of Thompson and Lindelöf’s edition checked against the digitalized version of the manuscript.<sup>13</sup> All instances of 3SG, 1PL, 2PL, 3PL INDICATIVE, and 2PL IMPERATIVE present tense verbal forms in *-ð* and *-s* were gathered. This provided a dataset of  $N=385$ . Suffixal *-ð* occurs at an overall rate of 87.3 per cent ( $N=336/385$ ) and suffixal *-s* at 12.7 per cent ( $N=49/385$ ).

Verb tokens were coded for SUBJECT TYPE: an ‘adjacent personal pronoun’ category (AdjPP), comprising adjacent personal pronoun subjects, and an ‘other’ category, comprising all other subject types including non-adjacent personal pronouns, as they would be expected to pattern similarly to non-personal pronouns subjects in a northern English system.<sup>14</sup> This approach produced reasonably-sized subsets of adjacent personal pronoun subjects ( $N=134$ ) versus other subject types ( $N=251$ ), thus creating the personal pronoun versus non-personal pronoun contrast needed to test for subject-type conditioning. *DC* does not lend itself to a separate analysis of adjacency

effects given that there are only five non-adjacent personal pronoun subjects out of a total of 139 personal pronoun tokens.<sup>15</sup> In order to control for the potential methodological difficulties involved in determining adjacency in glossarial data, two further analyses were carried out: one which collapsed adjacent and non-adjacent personal pronouns into the same group to test for a broad personal pronoun versus ‘other subject’ type constraint independent of adjacency, and another which excluded non-adjacent personal pronouns from the dataset. The potential effects of grammatical NUMBER and PERSON were also considered.

Verb tokens were also coded for STEM ENDING. The literature indicates that phonotactic conditioning factors played an essential role in shaping the replacement of *-ð* by *-s* in both ONbr and Early Modern English.<sup>16</sup> There is evidence of dissimilatory effects across the inflectional syllable.<sup>17</sup> For ONbr, Blakeley suggested that stem-final dentals /t, d, ð/ in the Lindisfarne gloss favoured the occurrence of *-s* endings in contrast to vocalic stems and stems ending in the sibilant /s/.<sup>18</sup> Cole’s analysis of the Lindisfarne data found that high percentages of suffixal *-s* occurred with verb stems involving dental elements: /d/ at 75 per cent ( $N=218/292$ ) and /ð/ at 74 per cent ( $N=117/158$ ), but rates of suffixal *-s* following stem-final /t/ were relatively modest at 54 per cent ( $N=112/208$ ).<sup>19</sup> Preliminary analyses of *DC*

<sup>15</sup> These comprise: *gisendæð* and *giondetað* at DurRitGl 1 [85.4], f.40v, cited above in example (3); *gitiþbrað* in *gifroefrað gie bitivn & gitiþbrað on ba halfa* (L. *consolamini inuicem et edificate alterutrum*) ‘encourage each other and edify one another’ at DurRitGl 1 [28.21], f.14r; *niomað* in *ve biseno niomað* (L. *immittemur*) ‘we take example’ at DurRitGl 1 [62.12], f.30r, and *soecas* in *ve ondreðes ðec & soecas onsione ðin* (L. *timemus te et querimus faciem tuam*) ‘we fear you and seek your face’ at DurRitGl 1 [125.7], f.61r.

<sup>16</sup> E. Holmqvist, *On the History of the English Present Inflection, Particularly -ð and -s* (Heidelberg, 1922); D. Stein, ‘Old English Northumbrian Verb Inflection Revisited’, in D. Kastovsky and A. Szwedek (eds), *Linguistics Across Historical and Geographical Boundaries: Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics* (Berlin, 1986), I, 637–50; M. Kytö, ‘Third Person Present Singular Verb Inflection in Early English and American English’, *Language Variation and Change*, v (1993), 113–39; T. Nevalainen and H. Raumolin-Brunberg, ‘The Third-Person Singular -(E)S and -(E)TH Revisited: The Morphophonemic Hypothesis’, in C. Dalton-Puffer and N. Ritt (eds), *Words, Structure, Meaning, Function* (Berlin, 2000), 235–48.

<sup>17</sup> L. Blakeley, ‘The Lindisfarne s/ð Problem’, *Studia Neophilologica* xxii (1949/50), 20.

<sup>18</sup> Blakeley, ‘The Lindisfarne s/ð Problem’, 20.

<sup>19</sup> Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 129–33.

<sup>13</sup> DiPaolo Healey et al. (eds), *Dictionary of Old English*, (last accessed 9 May 2022); A. H. Thompson and U. Lindelöf, *Rituale ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, Surtees Society 140 (Durham, 1927). The digitalized version of the manuscript is available at <<https://iiif.durham.ac.uk/index.html?manifest=t2m0p096691f&canvas=t2tkw52j8750>>, (last accessed 9 May 2022).

<sup>14</sup> Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 120; Cole, ‘Subject and Adjacency Effects’, 144–6; Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir’s reconsideration of non-adjacent pronoun contexts in Lindisfarne applies a stricter coding methodology than Cole and excludes double glosses and instances in which the Old English word order is constrained by the Latin original. Nevertheless, the non-adjacency effect holds with non-adjacent pronoun subjects favouring *-ð* at 59.5% ( $N=25/42$ ) and *-s* at 40.5% ( $N=17/42$ ) (Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir, ‘Verbal Morphology’, 150–2).

Table 1. Multivariate analysis of factors selected as significant to the probability of suffixal *-s* (as opposed to *-ð*) in *DC* ( $N = 385$ )

STEM ENDING ( $p < 0.001$ )				
	<i>-ð</i> /total	<i>-s</i> /total	Log odds	Factor weight
dental /d, ð/	40/62 (64.5%)	22/62 (35.5%)	0.871	0.705
other	296/323 (91.6%)	27/323 (8.4%)	-0.871	0.295
SUBJECT TYPE ( $p < 0.05$ )				
	<i>-ð</i> /total	<i>-s</i> /total	Log odds	Factor weight
AdjPP	109/134 (81.3%)	25/134 (18.7%)	0.332	0.582
other	227/251 (90.4%)	24/251 (9.6%)	-0.332	0.418

also indicated that stem endings in /d, ð/ stand out as favouring suffixal *-s* at 35.5 per cent ( $N = 22/62$ ), whereas all other stem endings had a collective rate of 8.4% *-s* ( $N = 27/323$ ). Verb tokens were therefore coded according to whether they had a dental /d, ð/ stem or 'other'.

Statistical multivariate analyses using *Rbrul* were applied to the data.<sup>20</sup> All three logistic regression analyses selected STEM ENDING at the  $p < 0.001$  level and SUBJECT TYPE at the  $p < 0.05$  level as the most significant explanatory variables in determining the probability of suffixal *-s*. Table 1 summarizes the results of the first logistic regression analysis in which the Adj PP category comprises adjacent personal pronoun subjects and the 'other' category comprises all other subject types, including non-adjacent personal pronouns.

Phonotactic considerations are clearly in play with stems in /d, ð/ favouring suffixal *-s*.<sup>21</sup> Adjacent personal pronoun subjects also favour suffixal *-s* significantly more so than other subject types. Despite the relatively low overall rate of *-s* in *DC*, suffixal *-s* is approximately twice as common with adjacent personal pronoun subjects (18.7 per cent,  $N = 25/134$ ) as with other subject types (9.6 per cent,  $N = 24/251$ ).

<sup>20</sup> D. E. Johnson, 'Getting off the GoldVarb Standard: Introducing Rbrul for Mixed-Effects Variable Rule Analysis', *Language and Linguistics Compass*, iii (2009), 359–83.

<sup>21</sup> Lexical conditioning might also apply (Cole, *Verbal Morphosyntax*, 145–6; Fernández-Cuesta and Langmuir, 'Verbal Morphology', 142); nine out of the 22 verb forms with dental stems ending in *-s* involve the verb *biddan*, but phonotactic effects are operative regardless of lexical item, e.g. eight out of the fifteen 3SG tokens in *-s* involve dental stems independent of *biddan*.

Table 2. Distribution of grammatical person, number, subject type and suffixal *-s*

Person/ number	AdjPP/total	other/total	<i>-s</i> /total
1PL	93/99 (93.9%)	6/99 (6.1%)	21/99 (21.2%)
2PL IND	8/9 (89%)	1/9 (11%)	3/9 (33.3%)
2PL IMP	31/67 (46.3%)	36/67 (53.7%)	5/67 (7.4%)
3PL	2/60 (3.3%)	58/60 (96.7%)	5/60 (8.3%)
3SG	0/150	150/150	15/150 (10%)

PERSON and NUMBER were not selected as significant factors. At first sight, the comparatively higher rates of *-s* in 1PL and 2PL INDICATIVE contexts suggest that grammatical person is an important factor, but the raw frequencies of the distribution of AdjPP subjects and *-s* according to grammatical person and number in Table 2 indicate a correlation between contexts that favour the use of personal pronoun subjects and higher rates of *-s*. 1PL and 2PL IND contexts have high rates of suffixal *-s* because they are environments that mainly involve personal pronoun subjects. Note how the less frequent use of personal pronoun subjects in 2PL IMPERATIVE contexts correlates with a far lower rate of *-s*.

In sum, Blakeley's suggestion that dissimilation processes triggered the generalization of suffixal *-s* in ONbr is corroborated by the findings of the present study. The results also indicate that the resulting variation between *-s* and *-ð* is syntactically governed by the verb's subject type. Adjacent personal pronoun subjects favour suffixal *-s*, whereas other subject types favour *-ð*, a finding that is in line with usage in the Lindisfarne gloss. The findings provide further evidence that the present tense

verbal system of ONbr was conditioned by subject-type effects.

MARCELLE COLE

Utrecht University, The Netherlands

<https://doi.org/10.1093/notesj/gjad052>

© The Author(s) (2023). Published by Oxford University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the

Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Advance Access publication 27 July, 2023

## WERE THE ANNALS OF WINCHESTER DEDICATED TO ADAM OF DRYBURGH?

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 339, a late twelfth-century book locatable to Winchester, contains the earliest extant copies of two texts, both written in the same hand: the *Annals of Winchester* (fols. 1r–24v) and the *Chronicle of Richard of Devizes* (fols. 25r–43v).<sup>1</sup> Internal evidence suggests that work on the *Chronicle* began after 1191 and was completed by c. 1200.<sup>2</sup> On the basis of external and internal evidence, both the *Annals* and the *Chronicle* have been attributed to Richard of Devizes, a Benedictine monk of St. Swithun's, Winchester, and CCC MS 339 is likely his holograph.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1912), II, 170–2. CCC MS 339 comprises two parts: the first contains the *Annals of Winchester* and the *Chronicle* (fols. 1r–43v), and the second part contains a fourteenth-century copy of Peter of Ickham's chronicle (fols. 43v–94v). Hereafter references to CCC MS 339 refer to the first part alone. On provenance, see N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London, 1964), 199; Pamela Robinson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 737–1600 in Cambridge Libraries*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1988), I, 56; Honor McCusker, 'Books and Manuscripts Formerly in the Possession of John Bale', *The Library*, 4th ser., xvi (1935), 146–9; and Timothy Graham and Andrew G. Watson (eds), *The Recovery of the Past in Early Elizabethan England: Documents by John Bale and John Joscelyn* (Cambridge, 1998), 79.

<sup>2</sup> See Robinson, I, 56; Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, vol. 1, c. 550 to c. 1307 (London, 1974), 247; and John T. Appleby (ed. and trans.), *Cronicon Richardi Divisensis de tempore Regis Richardi Primi* (London, 1963), xviii.

<sup>3</sup> See Appleby (ed.), xviii–xxiii; Robinson, I, 56; Joseph Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon Ricardi Divisensis de rebus gestis Ricardi Primi Regis Angliae* (London, 1838), vii; Richard Howlett (ed.), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, 4 vols. (London, 1884–9), III, Ixvii–Ixx; Geoffrey Martin and Rodney M. Thomson, 'History and History Books', in Nigel J. Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 2, 1100–1400 (Cambridge, 2008), 415; John Gillingham, 'Richard of Devizes and "a rising tide of nonsense": How Cedric Met

Most of what is known about Richard of Devizes has been deduced from CCC MS 339 and its texts, especially the *Chronicle*, which contains Richard's only express claim of intimacy with a contemporary. The first few lines of the *Chronicle* include a dedication to 'Robert, formerly prior of Winchester', (*Roberto, olim priori Wintoniensis ecclesie*) by the 'I' of the *Chronicle*, its self-identified author, '[Robert's] servant Richard, called "of Devizes"', (*suus Ricardus dictus Diuisiensis*).<sup>4</sup> 'Robert, formerly prior of Winchester' is almost certainly Robert fitzHenry, who in 1187 began his tenure as St. Swithun's prior.<sup>5</sup> In 1191, as the *Chronicle* records and external documents confirm, Robert left Winchester for the Charterhouse at Witham, Somerset, where he appears to have remained for the rest of his life.<sup>6</sup>

While the *Annals* in CCC MS 339 contain neither an identification nor a dedication comparable to those in Richard's *Chronicle*, the outer margin of the first folio of the *Annals* (1r) does preserve, in its torn upper corner, a remnant of what appears to be a personal inscription in the text hand. It reads: 'Magistro ade; suus d <e> | Meo malo mirum mu ... | temporibus accidit. ut etiam fi ... | placeant sapientibus'. A few scholars have noted the presence of these lines and rued their opacity.<sup>7</sup> This note offers evidence that the inscription's 'Magistro ade' may have been the theologian and erstwhile

King Arthur', in Martin Brett and David A. Woodman (eds), *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past* (Burlington, VT, 2015), 141–8; Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017), 128–9; and Marisa Libbon, 'The Function of Twelfth-Century Form in the Chronicle of Richard of Devizes', *Viator*, lii (2021), 171–210.

<sup>4</sup> Appleby (ed.), I. Hereafter text and translation of the *Chronicle* are taken from Appleby's edition.

<sup>5</sup> See H. Arthur Doubleday and William Page (eds), *The Victoria History of the County of Hampshire* (London, 1903), II, 108–15.

<sup>6</sup> See Appleby (ed.), 26; William Page (ed.), *The Victoria History of the County of Somerset* (London, 1911), II, 123–8; and Adam of Eynsham, *Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis*, ed. and trans. Decima L. Douie and Hugh Farmer, 2 vols. (London, 1961 and 1963), I, 88–9, and 88n1, where Robert's death is dated to c. 1206. On Witham's foundation in 1178/9, see E. Margaret Thompson, *A History of the Somerset Carthusians* (London, 1895), 6–30; and *Syon Abbey*, edited by Vincent Gillespie, with *The Libraries of the Carthusians*, edited by A. I. Doyle (London, 2001), 629–30.

<sup>7</sup> See Stevenson, (ed.), viii; and H. R. Luard, *Annales Monastici*, 4 vols. (London, 1864–9), II, xi. Among editors who have transcribed the partial lines, including those whose work preceded that of Luard, Luard alone inserts '[votus servus]' after 'Magistro ade, suus de', but does not indicate the source or logic of his conjecture.