

Ælfric's Afterlives

(Leiden University: 26-27 June, 2025)

Day 1 (26 June)

[Lipsius building](#) / room 1.47 (1st floor)

9:30–9:55 – Doors open; coffee/tea

9:55–10:00 – Welcome by organisers

Keynote (10:00–11:15)

These Things of Darkness I Do Not Acknowledge Mine: Liminality and Legitimacy in Ælfric's Afterlives

Aaron J Kleist (Biola University)

11:15–11:30 – Brief coffee/tea break

Session 1: Copying Ælfric (11:30–13:00)

Ælfric's Early Copyists: The Intriguing Case of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 340 and 342

Jonathan Wilcox (University of Iowa)

Updating Ælfric: Introducing the COPYCÆT Corpus

Amos van Baalen (Leiden University)

The Afterlives of Ælfric's Hand

Paul Vinhage (Cornell University)

Lunch (13:00–14:00; on-site)

Session 2: The Afterlives of Ælfric's Homilies in Medieval England and Scandinavia (14:00–15:30)

On Some Eleventh-Century Reuses of Ælfric's Homily on the Paternoster and his Authority as a Homilist

Winfried Rudolf (University of Göttingen)

Did Augustinians Read Ælfric? Post-Conquest England and the Development of Scandinavian Writing Culture

Aidan Conti (University of Bergen)

The Ælfric of the North: The Uses of Old English in Twelfth-Century Scandinavia

Michael Lysander Angerer (University of Oxford)

15:30–16:00 – Coffee/tea break

**Session 3: Using, Glossing and Punctuating Ælfric in the Early Middle English Period
(16:00–17:30)**

The Use of Ælfric's Grammar in the Early Middle English Period

Claudio Cataldi (University of Palermo)

***Mon mæg giet gesion hiora swæð*: Living and Learning after Ælfric**

Kathryn A. Lowe (University of Glasgow)

Getting the points: The Tremulous Hand's Punctuation in Ælfrician Texts

Kristina Kähm (University of Rostock)

17:30 – Conclusion of Day 1

Conference Dinner (18:30–)

Day 2 (27 June)

[Leiden University Library](#) / Vossius room (2nd floor)

10:00–10:30 – Doors open; coffee/tea

Session 4: Ælfric's Miracles, Doctrines and Saints (10:30–12:00)

[Invented of Paschasius: The Miracle Stories of Ælfric's *Sermo de Sacrificio in Die Pascæ* in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" \(1570\)](#)

Ellen Gallimore (University of York)

[Which Ælfric Is It and Whose? Identifying Ælfric and His Religious Doctrines in the 19th Century](#)

Lucas Gahrman & Thijs Porck (Leiden University)

[A History of Gender Scholarship and the Writings of Ælfric of Eynsham](#)

Fran Ash (University of Birmingham)

Flash Exhibition in the Leiden University Library / Heinsius room (12:00–13:00)

Lunch (13:00–13:30; on-site)

Session 5: Ælfric and Seventeenth-Century Antiquarians (13:30–15:00)

[William L'Isle's 1623 Saxon Treatise: Looking Backwards at Ælfric's Letter to Sigeweard](#)

Rebecca Brackmann (Lincoln Memorial University)

[Translating Ælfric Collaboratively: London, British Library, Harley 438](#)

Tristan Major (University of Toronto)

[Somner's Ælfric and Its Afterlives](#)

Rachel Fletcher (Leiden University)

15:00–15:30 – Coffee/tea break

Session 6: Ælfric's Legacy (15:30–17:00)

[Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Its Afterlife in the Teaching of \(Latin and\) Old English](#)

Mark Atherton (University of Oxford)

[Ælfric in Early Printed Books](#)

P. J. Lucas (University of Cambridge)

[Ælfric's *Homilies* and the Old English Canon: The Bumpy Road from Script to Print](#)

Kees Dekker (University of Groningen)

17:00 – Conclusion of conference and closing drinks

These Things of Darkness I Do Not Acknowledge Mine: Liminality and Legitimacy in Ælfric's Afterlives

Aaron J Kleist (Biola University)

In the beginning there were the firstborn, the *Catholic Homilies*, the first set of writings firmly attributable to Ælfric, and of their textual integrity he was famously protective. Other offspring followed—the *Grammar*, the start of the *Heptateuch*, the *Lives of Saints*, and so on. Then another generation arose—*Erat quidam languens Lazarus*, *In natali domini*, the phases and archetypes of the *Catholic Homilies* themselves—as Ælfric, revising and repurposing, formed new works from old. In so doing, he unwittingly prefigured a future ancient as the ages, in which his descendants would move ever further from their father. Along axes of time and known authorship they traveled, through concentric circles flowing out from the core corpus. Wulfstan was one of the first, likely with Ælfric's knowledge and approval, to reshape Ælfrician material in a dozen possible cases. In a similar or later span, composite works of Ælfrician parts appeared—every word written by Ælfric but not necessarily assembled by his hand. Increasingly liminal compilations were created of which Ælfric certainly would have disapproved, amalgamations of his carefully-crafted prose with that of less exacting authors. And then—moving forward in time but back to a known author—came the Ælfrician quotations of Matthew Parker that would have given Ælfric apoplexy: as word for word as Ælfric could have hoped, but used out of context for conclusions contrary to Ælfric's own. Just as Ælfric's writings posthumously escaped from his grasp, however, at least in one case—Trinity College Dublin 248—Parker's Ælfrician annotations somehow escaped his own, eluding the archbishop's bequest of his library to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Racing through the centuries, this paper will seek to trace this movement on the edges of Ælfric's corpus, exploring liminality and legitimacy in Ælfric's afterlives.

Ælfric's Early Copyists: The Intriguing Case of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 340 and 342

Jonathan Wilcox (University of Iowa)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Bodley 340 and 342 are a fascinating pair of manuscripts, bringing together for the first time Ælfric's two series of Catholic Homilies into a single sequence, copied (probably) at Canterbury early in the eleventh century, but traveling from there to Rochester by the middle of the eleventh century (fortunately so, in view of the Canterbury fire of 1067) and receiving additions in Rochester in the eleventh, twelfth, and fourteenth centuries. The basic combined series has been well studied by Sisam, Clemoes, Godden, and others, but the interesting implications of some of the additions have not yet been fully realized, as I will demonstrate in the case of a reference to Ælfric's laziness added into this copy! Also of considerable interest are the additions of multiple further Rochester pieces – including two lives of St Andrew – in an added section at the end of Bodley 342. One of these additions uncovers the work of one of the correctors of the whole set, with significant implications for understanding their use in Rochester. The other additions provide yet more clues to the use and care of the collection at Rochester. Close attention to this pair of manuscripts will provide new evidence about the practicalities of copying Ælfric's works and about the significance that those works achieved in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and beyond.

Updating Ælfric: Introducing the COPYCÆT Corpus

Amos van Baalen (Leiden University)

Although Ælfric of Eynsham is best known as a prolific author of the Old English period, his writings were still appreciated after his death. Ælfric's works were frequently copied over a period of about two centuries, c. 1000–c. 1200, which traditionally includes the end of Old English and the beginning of Middle English (usually dated to c. 1100 or 1150). The twelfth-century scribes who copied Ælfric did not always reproduce the exact form of their exemplars, but could engage with the material in various ways, which included updating the grammar by changing or removing inflectional endings and replacing words which they felt to be archaic or obsolete. In other words, studying these late copies of Ælfric's texts may give us unprecedented insight into the linguistic development of English in this crucial period, especially since new writing in English was on the wane in favour of works in Latin and French (Faulkner, 2022).

Twelfth-century copies of Ælfric's works are often not part of digital corpora (one major exception being Aaron J Kleist's *The Digital Ælfric*). For this reason, the present paper will focus on a newly created corpus of eleventh- and twelfth-century copies of one of Ælfric's most enduring works: his *Catholic Homilies*. Copies of ten of these homilies across eleven different manuscripts (spanning the period 1050–1200) were selected for transcription and collation as part of my PhD project, funded by the Dutch Research Council, "Old English Renewed: Tracing Transitional English in the Twelfth Century". These transcriptions and their collations make up the COPYCÆT corpus (**C**opies of **P**ost- and **Y**ears-before-**C**onquest **Æ**lfrician **T**exts). This paper will discuss the creation of the COPYCÆT corpus with the help of the automatic collation software *CollateX*, as well as present the lexical updates found in late copies of the *Catholic Homilies* as a case study, in order to show how corpora such as these may be used to study the linguistic development of English in the twelfth century.

References

- Birnbaum, D. J. & Haentjens Dekker, R. (14 November 2023). *CollateX* [Python], ver. 2.3.
<https://pypi.org/project/collatex/>.
- Kleist, Aaron J, ed. (2016). *The Digital Ælfric: Eight Catholic Homilies*. Scholarly Digital Editions. <http://www.sd-editions.com/aelfric/index.php>.
- Faulkner, M. (2022). *A New Literary History of the Long Twelfth Century: Language and Literature between Old and Middle English*. Cambridge University Press.

The Afterlives of Ælfric's Hand

Paul Vinhage (Cornell University)

The sole surviving example of Ælfric of Eynsham's hand is extant in British Library, Royal 7.C.xii. It is a fine example of English Vernacular Minuscule (EVM) and is used to write both OE and Latin. Another example of EVM used for both Latin and English comes from St Dunstan's Classbook (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F.4.32) and from the manuscript of Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* (Bodleian, Ashmole MS 328). While Latin texts had been written in Insular Minuscule scripts from the eighth century onward, during the Benedictine Reforms of the later tenth and early eleventh centuries, English Caroline Minuscule (ECM) became reserved for Latin and EVM for OE. The strict, *de jure* separation of the scripts in many manuscripts (e.g. CCCC, MS 191, The Rule of Chrodegang in Latin and OE) led David Dumville to declare that a kind of "alphabetic apartheid" existed between the two scripts.¹ Given that scribes trained in the Reform environment often knew EVM first and learned ECM second, it is surprising to find two of the most fervent proponents of the Reform using EVM for Latin and English, while the differentiation in script proliferated around them. It is the intention of this paper to interrogate the rigid distinction proposed by Dumville and show that in certain contexts EVM survived as a script used for Latin and OE. Besides the examples mentioned above, there is a copy of Ælfric's *Grammar* written entirely in EVM (Oxford, St John's College, MS 154) and other copies of the *Grammar* that do not strictly adhere to the differentiation of scripts. More importantly, why does EVM appear so prevalently in educational manuscripts tied to the major figures of the Reform, from whom we might expect a greater commitment to the graphical distinction between Latin and OE?

¹ Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, p. 19.

On Some Eleventh-Century Reuses of Ælfric's Homily on the Paternoster and his Authority as a Homilist

Winfried Rudolf (University of Göttingen)

Ælfric of Eynsham is widely celebrated today as the most eminent English prose author of his time. Yet this exposed recognition seems at least partly anachronistic, especially with regard to Ælfric's authority as a homilist. While his contemporaries seem to have recognized him primarily as a grammarian and translator, not a single pastoral text under a title *sermo* or *homilia Ælfrici* has survived in any of the known manuscripts. In other words, Ælfric was surely not deemed an *auctor* of homilies in the medieval sense, which is further evident in the widespread neglect of his personal wish for verbatim transmission of his homilies. This paper will touch on the homiletic afterlives of Ælfrician materials in the eleventh century, specifically the reuses of his first series Catholic Homily on the Paternoster (*CH* I, xix). Looking at texts such ECHOE nos. 56.5 (Bethurum VIIIb), 283.5 (Lambeth 489 catena), and 331.52 (Bazire-Cross 8). I will analyse the techniques of reuse of the Ælfrician source and reassess the potential Wulfstanian influence, aiming to emphasize that it is the text in the hands of the performing homilist that should matter most in absence of any clear authorial function.

Did Augustinians Read Ælfric? Post-Conquest England and the Development of Scandinavian Writing Culture

Aidan Conti (University of Bergen)

This paper explores the possibility of Augustinians' reading of Ælfric as part of research endeavouring to reconcile the demonstrable links between Scandinavian religious writing, which develops in the twelfth century, and the English homiletic material of the tenth-century Benedictine reform. The catalyst for this examination will be Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (s. xii² [Ker 310]), which has long been recognized as an important twelfth-century collection of Ælfrician and other homiletic material. Among its collection of Wulfstan and Ælfric, the manuscript preserves four Ælfric homilies not elsewhere recorded. While the 'remarkably conservative' linguistic features manuscript have been noted, the origin of the manuscript remains uncertain and its use perhaps even less explored. This paper suggests potential motivations for the compilation of the manuscript based on additions found in the codex itself. As Ker noted, details on folios iii and 173 suggest that the manuscript is from the West Midlands, although the identification of a specific writing centre, such as Worcester, has proven elusive. Susan Irvine noted that St Wulfhad, for whom the rhymed antiphon on folio iii was written, was associated with the Augustinian priory of Stone in Staffordshire, which was (re)founded in the reign of Henry I (1100-1135). This association with Stone is suggestive as Latin items found in Bodley 343 are also found in a twelfth-century lectionary (Oslo, NRA, lat. fragm. 706 [2-12] and 714 [1-3] [s. xii²]) that can now be traced to the Norwegian Augustinian house of Halsnøy (1163-1164), a foundation with significant English connections.

When considered in tandem with Old Norse versions of English material found in twelfth-century manuscripts, such as Ralph d'Escures' homily on the assumption of Mary and Ælfric's *De falsis diis*, I will argue that Bodley 343 and other post-Conquest manuscripts serve to bridge the temporal gap between the recording of Scandinavian religious writing and the original composition of Ælfric's (and other Old English) homilies.

The Ælfric of the North: The Uses of Old English in Twelfth-Century Scandinavia

Michael Lysander Angerer (University of Oxford)

The works of Ælfric of Eynsham and their afterlives have been central to studies of the use of Old English in the twelfth century. Comparatively little attention, however, has been paid to the Old Norse translation of Ælfric's sermon *De falsis diis* in this context. In his recent parallel-text edition, John Frankis takes this translation to be an isolated effort completed in England, since he assumes that Old English would have had little reach in Scandinavia. Yet *De falsis diis* is not only an important witness to extensive English influence on early Old Norse homily-writing (as noted by Christopher Abram) but must also be set alongside the use of Old English vernacular genealogies in twelfth-century Icelandic historiography. Along with slightly later Anglo-Scandinavian literary exchanges, this illustrates a much broader pattern of continued interactions across the North Sea.

Ælfric's Old English sermon euhemerises Roman gods, and in doing so it strikingly equates them with Norse gods such as Óðinn, avoiding associations with the pre-Christian English god Woden, who features heavily in English royal genealogies. But this euhemerisation clearly found fertile ground in Scandinavia. As Diane Elizabeth Szurszewski shows, the Old Norse translation that survives in the Icelandic Hauksbók reframes the sermon as an exploration of pre-Christian history from a distinctly Scandinavian perspective. In this, it parallels the use of Old English vernacular genealogies in twelfth-century Icelandic genealogies, which also underlie the euhemerisation of Norse gods in Snorri's *Edda*. Set alongside similarly historicising translations of Anglo-Latin material in Iceland, this reveals a much more varied and sustained network of literary exchange in Latin and in English. It thus attests to the continuity of Anglo-Scandinavian interactions between the Norman Conquest and the translations of Anglo-Norman texts commissioned by King Hákon IV Hákonarson of Norway in the thirteenth century.

The Use of Ælfric's Grammar in the Early Middle English Period

Claudio Cataldi (University of Enna "Kore")

This essay will explore the continuing use of Ælfric's *Grammar* from the end of s. xi to the beginning of s. xiii. The popularity of the *Grammar* is testified by the sixteen medieval manuscripts in which it is preserved, either in full or in part. The early Middle English records demonstrate that Ælfric's *Grammar* was still deemed a useful tool for the acquisition of Latin, with a shift of focus from morphology and syntax to lexicon. Within a century of its publication, two glossaries derived from the *Grammar* were copied in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 35. Further evidence that bilingual pairs from the *Grammar* entered lexicographic collections comes from the fourth Bodley Glossary, preserved in the early-thirteenth-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 730. In the twelfth century, the *Grammar* was enriched by annotations in English, French, and Latin in no less than four manuscripts; this study will focus on the least studied of the four, Cambridge, Trinity College, R.9.17. In this copy, a glossator edited the English text by omitting secondary interpretamenta and expanded the lexicon by including French loanwords; additionally, he occasionally adapted the structure of the Old English text to that of the Latin sentences, thus producing word-by-word translations. Collectively, the evidence offered by early Middle English glossators and annotators parallels the editing and updating of the *Grammar* and the *Glossary* in Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 174, which was copied by the renown 'Tremulous Hand' of Worcester.

Selected bibliography

- Butler, Marilyn S. "An Edition of the Early Middle English Copy of Ælfric's 'Grammar' and 'Glossary' in Worcester Cathedral MS F. 174". PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1981.
- Cataldi, Claudio. "The Ælfrician Glossaries in MS Barlow 35. A New Edition and Commentary." *Anglia* 138 (2020): 213–233.
- Hall, Thomas N. "Ælfric as a Pedagogue". In: Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan (eds). *A Companion to Ælfric*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009), pp. 193–216.
- Hill, Joyce. "Ælfric's Grammatical Triad". In: Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari and Maria Amalia D'Aronco (eds.). *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence* (Turnhout: Brepols. 2007), pp. 285–308.
- Hunt, Tony (ed.). *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Brewer, 1991.
- Kornexl, Lucia. "From Ælfric to John of Cornwall: Evidence for Vernacular Grammar Teaching in Pre- and Post-Conquest England". In: Lucia Kornexl and Ursula Lenker (eds). *Bookmarks from the Past. Studies in Early English Literature in Honour of Helmut Gneuss* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), pp. 229–260.
- Manzer, Melinda J. "Multilingual Glosses, Bilingual Text: English, Anglo-Norman, and Latin in three Manuscripts of Ælfric's Grammar". In: Joyce Tally Lionarons (ed.). *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*. Medieval European Studies 5 (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2004), pp. 95–119.
- Pagan, Heather, and Annina Seiler. "Multilingual Annotations in Ælfric's Glossary in London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x: A commented edition". *Early Middle English* 1 (2019): 13–64.
- Zupitza, Julius (ed.). *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1880. Repr. 2001 with a new introduction by Helmut Gneuss. Hildesheim: Weidmann).

Mon mæg giet gesion hiora swæð: Living and Learning after Ælfric

Kathryn A. Lowe (University of Glasgow)

The Tremulous Worcester scribe, working in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, glossed over twenty manuscripts connected with Worcester Cathedral Priory, most containing copies of Old English homiletic material, in particular the work of Ælfric. He worked diligently on these, passing back over certain texts on a series of occasions. The level of glossing is not even across books: some material receives little or no attention, other texts are very heavily worked on. Franzen notes that in general he appears less interested in Wulfstan's sermons, likely at least initially because, as she notes (1991: 34), his prose is substantially more difficult. Ælfric's temporale collections may also have suited his purpose better, as I have discussed elsewhere (Lowe, forthcoming). In this paper, I look in detail at his glosses to a text he worked on in three manuscripts, Ælfric's first series homily on Pentecost (ÆCHom I, 22), found in Hatton 114, ff. 131v–140r, CCCC 198 ff. 253v–9v, and the manuscript he worked on most extensively, CCCC 178, pp. 263–70. The homily is incomplete in CCCC 178, with about a third of the text missing; comparison is therefore drawn from the same tranches in the other two manuscripts, around 2000 words in total. Of these, just under three hundred are glossed in one or more manuscripts. This analysis highlights the development of the Tremulous scribe's working methods and his comprehension of Old English, as well as the centrality of Ælfric in his endeavour.

Bibliography

- Franzen, Christine. 1991. *The tremulous hand of Worcester: A study of Old English in the thirteenth century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lowe, Kathryn A. forthcoming. Preaching by exemplar: The Tremulous Worcester hand. In *Philology reimaged: English in transmission*. Eds. Joanna Kopaczky et al. Cambridge: CUP.

Getting the points: The Tremulous Hand's Punctuation in Ælfrician Texts

Kristina Kähm (University of Rostock)

One of the most 'visible' students of Ælfric's writings is a 13th-century scribe famously known as the 'Tremulous Hand of Worcester' (= 'TH'). Having left his traces in more than 20 manuscripts linked to Worcester, TH strikingly prefers annotating Ælfrician material.² While his glosses and annotations have attracted substantial scholarly attention in the past (see e.g. Franzen 1991 and Collier 1992), his peculiar – and at times not easily discernible – ancillary punctuation is still awaiting systematic examination.³

My exemplary study of TH's punctuation in Ælfric's Admonition to a Spiritual Son in MS Hatton 76 has yielded novel results on the form and logic behind his interventions (Kähm forthc.). The intensity of pointing is dependent on several factors such as text-pragmatic cues, TH's use of a Latin source and the state of his hand. Most notably however, one can clearly trace a strong interest in the alliterative rhythm of the Admonition since TH regularly places his idiosyncratic punctus elevati where one would expect a caesura within the alliterating line. This strongly suggests that the aural and oral aspects of Ælfric's Old English alliterative prose are noted and appreciated by our industrious annotator.

The present paper will take the observations of the above case study as the point of departure and systematically substantiate them by means of studying a representative corpus including as many manuscript witnesses of Ælfrician texts marked by TH as possible.⁴ The contribution will explore his punctuating activities in other alliterating (e.g. SH I.4) and non-alliterating texts by Ælfric (e.g. CH I.1) not only qualitatively but also quantitatively and compare them against non-Ælfrician manuscripts (e.g. MS Hatton 20 or CUL Kk.3.18). This will generate fresh insights on TH's punctuating patterns and the overall motives underlying his editorial undertaking. An additional examination of other Early Middle English manuscripts from the 12th and 13th centuries may further shed light on the origins of TH's unique way of marking Ælfric. TH's interest in and his knowledge of the principles of Old English alliterative prose may have been not only influenced by Latin liturgical material, but also by the knowledge of and engagement with Middle English alliterative verse and the copying thereof.

Works Cited:

- Collier, Wendy E. J. 1992. *The Tremulous Worcester Scribe and his Milieu: A Study of his Annotations*. Unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of Sheffield.
- Franzen, Christine. 1991. *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Johnson, David F. 2019. "The Micro-Texts of the Tremulous Hand of Worcester: Genesis of a Vernacular liber exemplorum". In: Ursula Lenker and Lucia Kornexl (eds.). *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts*. Berlin/Boston, MA: De Gruyter. 225–265.
- Kähm, Kristina. Forthcoming. *Ælfric's Old English Admonition to a Spiritual Son. Text and Contexts*. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- Schipper, William. 1997. "The Worcester Tremulous Scribe and the Ælfric Manuscripts". *Journal*

² TH for example has glossed Ælfric's sermons much more heavily than the ones by Wulfstan. This is simply because they were easier to read as regards vocabulary and syntax, since TH made use of Ælfric's Old English *Grammar and Glossary* as a reading aid (cf. Franzen 1991: 33–34). A list of Ælfric's homilies glossed by TH is provided in Schipper (1997: 191–193).

³ Johnson (2019) has done pioneering work on establishing different indicators for the identification of TH's punctuation interventions.

⁴ This lends itself well to the fact that several of the most significant manuscripts containing Ælfric and TH have been made available online as high-quality digital copies in the past few years (e.g. MSS Hatton 113, 114, 116, and Junius 121).

of English Linguistics 25: 183–201.

Invented of Paschasius: The Miracle Stories of Ælfric's *Sermo de Sacrificio in Die Pascæ* in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" (1570)

Ellen Gallimore (University of York)

The ambiguous passages on transubstantiation in Ælfric's *Sermo de Sacrificio in Die Pascæ* made the homily integral to sixteenth-century scholars looking to identify Protestant doctrine in the pre-Conquest Church. As recent scholars have demonstrated (Leinbaugh 1982), Ælfric's homily underwent significant editing from the sixteenth century onwards, with two miracle stories receiving particular attention. Described by Matthew Parker as "infarced" in 1566/7, the miracle stories were treated as inauthentic insertions to Ælfric's original homily by Protestant editors until Benjamin Thorpe's 1848 edition of the *Catholic Homilies*. While Jeane Claude (1665) is often cited as the first editor to consider Paschasius Radbertus' *De Corpore et Sanguine Domine Cristi* (c.850) as one of Ælfric's sources for the homily (Leinbaugh 1986), this paper will argue that John Foxe identified Paschasius Radbertus as the source material for at least one of the miracle stories in his 1570 edition of the *Actes and Monuments*.

Prior to Thorpe, the miracle stories in Ælfric's homily were interpreted as potentially nullifying the Protestant reading and were thus often glossed as spurious or removed entirely, with Foxe doing the latter. Building on the work of Theodore Leinbaugh (1982 & 1986), Aaron Kleist (2007), Allen Frantzen (1990), and Hugh Magennis (2015), this paper will demonstrate that Foxe recognised the miracle stories as originating in Paschasius Radbertus' work while simultaneously striving to promote a theory of Norman scribal tampering with Ælfric's homily to bely any possible Roman Catholic reading in the miracle stories. This paper will consider the implications of Foxe identifying the miracle stories on his choice to also remove them from the text, and how this impacted his presentation of Ælfric's work.

Which Ælfric Is It and Whose? Identifying Ælfric and His Religious Doctrines in the 19th Century

Lucas Gahrmann & Thijs Porck (Leiden University)

The *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* (PASE) database lists over 200 individuals named 'Ælfric'. It is little wonder, therefore, that the exact identity of the prolific Old English author remained shrouded in mystery for a long time. Indeed, much of early Ælfric scholarship was devoted to tracing the ecclesiastical career of "Ælfric munuc" and establishing whether or not he had remained a mere abbot or had become bishop or even archbishop (Reinsma 1987, pp. 9–43). This quest for the 'real' Ælfric reached its apex during the 19th century, when some even argued that the ambiguity surrounding Ælfric's identity was the result of "his literary and theological assassination" by the hands of "Anglo-Norman prelates [...] imposing the new Romish doctrines relating to transubstantiation" (Anon. 1850, p. 150). This 19th-century 'conspiracy theory' reflects how debates surrounding Ælfric's identity were connected to his stance on transubstantiation and other matters of doctrinal importance. The long-standing debate on Ælfric's religious affiliation also flared up in the 19th century, with prominent roles played by Protestant and Catholic church historians ascribing either proto-Protestant or Catholic-orthodox opinions to Ælfric (see Gahrmann 2025). In this paper, we will outline how the debates regarding Ælfric's identity and doctrinal position developed in the 19th century and how both were eventually resolved by the "unparteiische Darstellung" of the German scholar Franz Eduard Dietrich (1855, p. 577). We will also discuss the reception of Dietrich's work in the second half of the 19th century, evaluating the claim by Caroline Louise White that "his work is rarely noticed by English writers" (White 1898, p. 4).

References

- Anon. *Lives of Eminent Anglo-Saxons; Illustrating the Dawn of Christianity and Civilization in Great Britain. Part II* (London: 1850).
- "Ælfric [1-205]". *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*, <https://www.pase.ac.uk>, accessed 6 March 2025.
- Dietrich, Franz Eduard. "Abt Aelfrik. Zur Literatur-Geschichte der angelsächsischen Kirche". *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 25 (1855): 487-594.
- Gahrmann, Lucas. "'My object is truth': An Old English Homilist and Religious Polemics in Nineteenth-Century Britain". *Leiden Medievalists Blog* (2025), <https://www.leidenmedievalistsblog.nl/articles/my-object-is-truth-an-old-english-homilist-and-religious-polemics-in-nineteenth-century-britain>
- Reinsma, Luke M. *Ælfric: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York & London: 1987).
- White, Caroline Louise. *Ælfric: A New Study of his Life and Writings* (Boston, New York & London: 1898).

A History of Gender Scholarship and the Writings of Ælfric of Eynsham

Fran Ash (University of Birmingham)

This paper seeks to offer a history of the last fifty years of gender scholarship on the works of Ælfric of Eynsham, with particular focus on the Lives of Saints. Since its emergence in the 1970s, the field of gender studies has undergone rapid and essential changes. Particularly in terms of literary analyses, there are now interdisciplinary approaches with areas such as queer studies and the concept of gender as a performative social construct. I propose to divide this paper into three sections, to explore how these developments in gender studies have been applied to Ælfric's writings.

Between 1970 to 1990, the second wave of feminism and rising popularity of women's studies can be observed in Ælfric scholarship. There is an influx of scholarship on women in Ælfric's writing during this period. Analyses at this stage are largely based in heteronormative and binary gender roles.

In the 1990 to 2000 period, we notice the impact of Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* on early medieval scholarship. Scholarship questions how far saints such as Eugenia and Æthelthryth are performing masculinity and femininity in Ælfric's Lives.

Between 2000 to 2010, the topics of female martyrdom, the construction of masculinity, and chaste marriage in Ælfric's Lives are particularly popular. During this time, scholarship paves the way for a more interdisciplinary approach towards gender and sexuality studies.

Lastly, from 2010 to the present, there is an increase in queer theory and trans readings brought to the Lives of Saints. Similarly, we can trace the development of earlier ideas on Ælfric's literary construction of gender, with themes of vision, physicality and exposure all of particular interest.

To conclude, I wish to suggest where gender scholarship on Ælfric may go next, with a new approach. To summarise, whilst people in the Anglo-Saxon period clearly thought of themselves as man and woman, we cannot assume that our own understanding of binary gender, and what it means to transcend this, is the same as Ælfric's. Therefore, an examination of Ælfric's saints as exemplary models of men and women reveals that gender binary paradigms in Ælfric are far from clear or stable.

William L'Isle's 1623 *Saxon Treatise*: Looking Backwards at Ælfric's *Letter to Sigeweard*
Rebecca Brackmann (Lincoln Memorial University)

In 1623, William L'Isle brought out *A Saxon Treatise on the Old and New Testament*, the first published edition and translation of Ælfric's "Letter to Sigeweard"; the volume also included a reprint of Archbishop Matthew Parker's 1566 *Testimonie of Antiquity* (consisting primarily of Ælfric's Paschal homily). John D. Niles points out that in some ways L'Isle's book is "backwards-looking" in its facing-page organization and its focus on vernacular translation of scripture. Niles even cautiously speculates that the work might not be L'Isle's own but that of an earlier antiquary.⁵ This paper argues instead that L'Isle's edition and his discussion of scriptural translation fits as well in a Jacobean context as the Elizabethan one Niles postulates. First, the layout of L'Isle's volume probably stemmed more from financial considerations than ideological ones. His focus on English biblical translation not only publicizes his planned edition of the Old English gospels, but resonates with Protestant discourses about editorial approaches, and in particular with the practices of the team which produced the "Authorized Version" (also known as the "King James Bible") in 1611. This text represented a moment when James had succeeded in unifying various factions within the English church. As the aging James agonized in the summer of 1623 over the safety of his son and his favorite in Madrid, his dreams of the Spanish Match disintegrating and his power obviously in decline, such a reminder would have been welcome—and timely. The *Saxon Treatise* is indeed backward-looking; not to the reign of Elizabeth but to 1611 and the monumental translation which James had set in motion.

⁵ John D. Niles, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England 1066-1901* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 135-139.

Translating Ælfric Collaboratively: London, British Library, Harley 438

Tristan Major (University of Toronto)

London, British Library, Harley 438 is a seventeenth-century foul copy of a transcription of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 190 (itself a miscellany of Latin and Old English ecclesiastical institutes including all of Ælfric's pastoral letters). According to standard publishing practice of the time, the Old English texts of Harley 438 were translated into contemporary Latin, in this case by the almost completely unknown scholar Henry Some together with a certain Richard Retchford, who, as a relative of the slightly better known William Retchford, had likely learned Old English under the tutelage of Abraham Wheelock, first professor of Old English at Cambridge. Significantly, Richard and Some seem to have undertaken the translation afresh, without recourse to previously published facing-page editions. Interestingly, they even seem to ignore Wheelock's own Latin translation of Ælfric's letter for Wulfsgie, published in a 1644 reprint of William Lambarde's *Archainomia*. This tendency to novelty, however, was not shared by the rest of the editorial team; not only is the Latin translation altered at certain places by William, who seems to have corrected as he transcribed it, but also by a series of *castigationes* appended to the back of the manuscript. In their corrections, both William and the author of the *castigationes* not only place greater emphasis on conforming the translations of Harley 438 to those of previous editions, but also reveal a tendency to contextualize the entire work in the broader subject of ecclesiastical institutes. Although the publishing venture behind Harley 438 ultimately failed, the manuscript is important for revealing the nature of the scholarly effort that went into trying to produce an edition that would appeal to seventeenth-century readerly expectations of England's past ecclesiastical and legal documents.

Somner's *Ælfric* and Its Afterlives

Rachel Fletcher (Leiden University)

Ælfric's famous *Grammar* was first made available to modern scholarship in 1659, when it was printed (from London, British Library MS Royal 15.B.xxii) in William Somner's *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, the first published dictionary of Old English. It was accompanied by a glossary erroneously attributed to *Ælfric* (actually material taken from the Antwerp-London glossaries: Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum MS 16.2 and London, British Library MS Add. 32246). With the exception of a fragment of *Ælfric's Glossary* printed by John Leland in 1715, Somner's dictionary remained for more than a century the only printed work demonstrating *Ælfric's* role as a teacher of Latin. For this reason, it was valued as an edition even after it had been superseded as a dictionary.

This paper explores this surprisingly lasting legacy of Somner's *Ælfrician* and pseudo-*Ælfrician* texts, which were not only consulted but also transformed by some of their readers. Somner's printing of *Ælfric* served as an intellectual and a physical foundation for at least two collations of *Glossary* variants (one the work of the philologist Francis Junius), both produced long before the publication of Julius Zupitza's now-standard *Text und Varianten* (1880). By investigating these and other engagements with Somner's *Ælfric*, I will demonstrate how this seventeenth-century antiquarian publication remained relevant into the nineteenth century – and even beyond.

Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Its Afterlife in the Teaching of (Latin and) Old English

Mark Atherton (University of Oxford)

Ælfric's *Colloquy* belongs to a long tradition of teaching Latin vocabulary and grammar and the skills of speaking and listening through conversation and role play. As far as Ælfric's *Colloquy* is concerned, such a text was clearly intended to supplement Ælfric's *Grammar*, the first grammar of Latin to be written in English, and in terms of vocabulary it taught the kind of Latin that would be needed for the everyday life and practical work of a large Benedictine monastery with its accompanying farm, fields, woodland and sea shore (as well as also conveying a feel for the Benedictine ideals). Ælfric's *Colloquy* was then taken up and adapted by later users, notably Ælfric Bata, who extended the vocabulary items to be used with it and adopted and wrote his own lively amusing and scurrilous colloquies based on the monastic *Alltag*. It is difficult to be certain how these colloquies were used: perhaps they were dictated by the *magister* and written up on wax tablets with an Old English gloss, in order to be learnt by the students and then performed, in which case we have an early example of amateur dramatics in an early medieval Benedictine educational setting! In the late 19th century, the medievalist, philologist and phonetician Henry Sweet became interested in the *Colloquy* and its uses in the contemporary 'Direct Method' movement for the reform of language teaching in school and university. His adaptation of the Old English gloss in Ælfric's *Colloquy* – turning what was once a word-for-word gloss into a piece of naturalistic dialogue – has had a long afterlife, so much so that it is often regarded and cited as the 'original', rather than the Latin teaching-text on which it was based.

Ælfric in Early Printed Books

P. J. Lucas (University of Cambridge)

This paper will survey Ælfric's appearances in early printed books from 1566 onwards. The first appearance of Ælfric in print is in *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* produced by and for Matthew Parker, Elizabeth I's archbishop of Canterbury. The same material was much repeated in subsequent publications. More extensive use of Ælfric was made by Abraham Wheelock in his famous edition of Bede, and others also cited him. The first attempt at a full edition of the *Catholic Homilies* was made by Elizabeth Elstob but while some were printed the project had to be abandoned in 1715 for want of funds.

Bibliography

- Graham, Timothy, 'Abraham Wheelock, Agent of Anglicanism, and the Deployment of Old English Texts in the 1643 Edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*', in *Textual Identities in Early Medieval England, Essays in Honour of Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe*, edd. Jacqueline Fay, Rebecca Stephenson and Renée R. Trilling (Cambridge: Brewer, 2022), 170–204.
- Kleist, Aaron J, *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).
- Lucas, Peter J., 'Elizabeth Elstob and the Printing of Anglo-Saxon', *Anglia*, 141 (2023), 197–233.
- Lucas, Peter J., *Printing Anglo-Saxon from Parker to Hickes and Wanley, With a Catalogue of Early Printed Books containing Anglo-Saxon 1566–1705* (Leiden: Brill, 2024).
- Magennis, Hugh & Mary Swan, *A Companion to Ælfric* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Ælfric's *Homilies* and the Old English Canon: The Bumpy Road from Script to Print

Kees Dekker (University of Groningen)

Ælfric of Eynsham (c. 955 – c. 1010) is not only our most prolific author of Old English prose; he was also the first author whose work was printed, in the sixteenth century, and at the same time one of few major authors who had to wait until the nineteenth century for printed publications of his *magna opera*: the *Catholic Homilies*, including the *Lives of the Saints*. The presence of Ælfric's homily *in die Sancto Pascæ* in Matthew Parker and John Joscelyn's *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, printed in London in 1566/7, with specially designed Anglo-Saxon types, indicates how manuscripts of Ælfric's *Homilies* and the contents of some of these texts were part of the forces that drove Old English studies forward in the times of the pioneers. Whereas from then on, the name of Ælfric loomed large over Old English studies, the same cannot be said for the *Catholic Homilies* and *Saints' Lives*. In the slow process of canon formation that took place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these texts seem to be remarkably absent until the Oxford saxonist George Hickes catalogued various manuscripts of Ælfric's *Homilies* in his *Institutiones grammaticae* (Oxford, 1697). In the subsequent decade, Hickes, his collaborator Humfrey Wanley, the Saxonist William Elstob, and his sister Elizabeth, contributed variously to an *editio princeps* of the *Homilies*, but their plans never materialised. The first edition of Ælfric's *Homilies* was published only in 1844, 'in the original Anglo-Saxon, with an English version' as the first volume printed for the Ælfric Society.

In this contribution, I review the apparent discrepancy between Ælfric's stardom and the bumpy road of Ælfric's works from script to print, with special attention to the *Homilies*. Where do we find evidence of the use of Ælfric's *Homilies*, and what does that evidence tell us about Ælfric as a brand name in the history of Old English studies?