



# Corrections and Glosses in *Textus Roffensis*: The Kentish Laws and the Laws of Alfred and Ine\*

MIKHAIL V. ZEMLYAKOV

**Abstract:** The paper is dedicated to *Textus Roffensis*, the manuscript copied c. 1122 x 1124 and containing one of the most important collections of Anglo-Saxon laws. The author studies corrections, emendations, glosses, and other signs in the main text and in the margins of the two earliest legal texts included into *Textus Roffensis*: the laws of 7<sup>th</sup>-century Kentish kings Æthelberht, Hlothhere and Eadric, and Wihtred, and the law-code of Alfred of Wessex (the late 9<sup>th</sup> century) which, in turn, had incorporated the laws of Ine (the late 7<sup>th</sup> century). The analysis of those corrections and glosses as well as the comparison with the text of the laws of Alfred and Ine in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 383 leads the author to a conclusion that the editorial work of the scribe was mainly of two kinds: the scribe either copied archaic word-forms and then emended them to more up-to-date ones, or re-read the laws in order to find mistakes or lapses. Due to this, the concentration of corrections differs much in different pages of *Textus Roffensis*. The most significant difference is between the Kentish laws and the laws of Alfred and Ine. The latter contain much more corrections and glosses than the former, and that may reflect their perception as somewhat actual for the legitimization of the Anglo-Saxon clergy in early 12<sup>th</sup>-century England.

**Key words:** Anglo-Saxons, Kent, Wessex, *Textus Roffensis*, Æthelberht, Alfred the Great, laws, Norman Conquest, palaeography, codicology, Old English language

---

\* A preliminary version of this study has been published in Russian: Земляков 2014a. С. 23–31.

М. В. Земляков  
**Исправления и глоссы в *Textus Roffensis*:  
 Законы кентских королей и Альфреда–Ине**

**Аннотация:** Статья посвящена одному из наиболее полных и важных собраний англо-саксонского права VII–XI вв. – Рочестерскому кодексу (*Textus Roffensis*), составленному приблизительно в 1122–1124 гг. и долгое время хранившемуся в библиотеке Рочестерского кафедрального приората. В качестве исследовательской проблемы анализируются исправления, дополнения, глоссы, особые обозначения и пометы в основном тексте и на полях древнейших памятников англо-саксонского права VII–IX вв., входящих в состав этого кодекса – законов кентских королей VII в. Этельберта, Хлотхере и Эдрика, Виктреда и уэссекском судебнике Альфреда Великого (конец IX в.), включившем в свой состав законы Ине (конец VII в.). Анализируя указанные исправления в *Textus Roffensis*, а также привлекая кодекс Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 383, автор приходит к выводу о том, что редакторская работа писца на разных листах была подчинена двум принципам: копирование более архаических вариантов древнеанглийского текста с последующей «нормализацией» языка рукописи при помощи исправлений и параллельная с перепиской Рочестерского кодекса «вычитка» источника на предмет ошибок и неточностей, что приводило к огромным различиям в количестве поправок в разных частях кодекса. Также предпринята попытка проанализировать причины различий в написании отдельных лексем (в том числе связанных с социальным строем) в более ранних кентских законах VII в. и более позднем судебнике Альфреда IX в. с опорой на их значение для легитимации положения англо-саксонского духовенства Рочестера в нормандской Англии 1120-х гг.

**Ключевые слова:** англо-саксы, Рочестерский кодекс, Этельберт, Альфред Великий, законодательство, Нормандское завоевание, палеография, кодикология, древнеанглийский язык

**For citation:** *Žemlyakov, Mikhail V.* Corrections and glosses in *Textus Roffensis*: The Kentish laws and the laws of Alfred and Ine // *Graphosphaera*. 2021. Vol. 1. P. 41–56. URL: <http://writing.igh.ru/index.php?id=corrections-and-glosses>

**DOI:**

© М. В. Земляков, 2021.

The analysis of the physical appearance of manuscripts plays an important role in the recent studies of Anglo-Saxon law-codes (see, e. g., Lisi Oliver and Stefan Jurasinski's edition of early English laws: Oliver 2002; Jurasinski, Oliver 2021). The present paper is dedicated to the physical appearance of the two earliest complexes of Old English laws: the 7<sup>th</sup>-century laws of Kentish kings Æthelberht (601 x 604), Hlothhere and Eadric (685 x 686), and Wihtried (695 or 696) (on those datings see: Земляков 2014b. С. 265–267), and the law-code of Alfred the Great (890 x 901) which, in turn, had incorporated the laws of Ine of Wessex (688 x 695, see: Die Gesetze 1916. S. 34). I will study the corrections and glosses made in the text of those laws

in one of the most important manuscripts (and for the Kentish laws, the only surviving manuscript), early 12<sup>th</sup>-century *Textus Roffensis* (*TR*).

The book is so called due to the place it used to be kept: the Rochester Cathedral Library (MS. A.3.5, on the history of the library see: Richards 1988. P. 1–21). In 1969 the manuscript was moved to the Kent Archives, Maidstone (now part of the Kent History and Library Centre), and from 2002 it is kept in the Medway Archive and Local Studies Centre. I have not worked with the manuscript *de visu*; this study is based upon the digital facsimile of the book (<https://luna.manchester.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/Man4MedievalVC~4~4~990378~142729> [15.07.2021]) as well as the facsimile edited by Peter Sawyer (*Textus Roffensis* 1957–1962).

*TR* consists of two parts, originally independent from each other. The first part (f. 1r–116v) is a collection of royal laws of the 7<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries supplemented with 10<sup>th</sup>- to 11<sup>th</sup>-century juridical compilations as well as genealogies and lists of kings and ecclesiastics. The second part (f. 119r–230r) contains a Rochester cartulary, several liturgical texts, and lists of books (see: Ker 1957. P. 443–447; for a grammatical and palaeographical analysis see: Hough 2014. P. 216). The size of leaves of *TR* is 225–230 x 150–155 mm (written space being 170 x 95 mm). Many of the glosses in the margins and even in the text itself are partly lost due to the cutting of leaves. According to Neil Ker, the main body of the text in the first part of the manuscript is written by “a well-known Rochester scribe”<sup>1</sup> soon after 1122 (the death of Archbishop Rodulf of Canterbury on the 20<sup>th</sup> of October, 1122, is mentioned) but before 1124 (the colophons in f. 1r and 1r mention Bishop Ernulf of Rochester who died in that year: “Textus de ecclesiae Roffensis per Ernulphum episcopum”) (Hough 2014. P. 141). Small inserts by other hands are numerous throughout the manuscript (Ker 1957. P. 446–447).

The laws included into *TR* have been studied in recent years in various aspects, such as their language and origin (Gendre 1992. P. 7–21; Wormald 1999a. Vol. 1. P. 244–253; Vol. 2. P. 79 ff.; 1999b. P. 201–223; Jurasinski 2001. P. 1–15), the structure and essence of particular legal norms, e. g. those concerning women (Hough 1994. P. 19–34; 2001. P. 554–578; 2007. P. 207–230; Oliver 2008. P. 125–126), the making of royal peace and social order (Jurasinski 2010. P. 129–147), the penalties for bodily injuries and crimes against persons (Rubin 1995. P. 19–25; Jurasinski 2006. P. 51–71; Oliver 2011; Rabin 2016. P. 516–521), as well as the perception of those laws in post-Conquest England (Karn 2015. P. 49–68). However, the editorial activity of the scribe of *TR*, traces of which can be found both in the text and in the margins, is still not fully studied. Only some atten-

<sup>1</sup> See a list of manuscripts in which we find this hand: The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 // <https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.RCL.htm> [6.07.2021]).

tion has been paid to the editorial aspect of the scribe's work (see: Richards 1989. P. 1–22; Jurasinski 2015. P. 83–101; Hough 2014. P. 216–251; Hough 2015. P. 137–156). Those scholars have been interested mainly in the late interpolations in the text of the laws, as well as in the palaeography, phonetics, and grammar of the Kentish laws in comparison with other Old English literary texts. The editorial work of the scribe has never become a special object of research although it seems to have been large-scale, systematic, and deliberate.

I will try to follow the main kinds of editorial work of the scribe of *TR* (such as alteration, crossing out, highlighting, etc.). I will try to find out if such traces of activity tend to concentrate in certain folios, and, finally, to explain this editorial activity. I will analyze only f. 1r–31v of *TR* which contain the laws of the 7<sup>th</sup>- to 9<sup>th</sup>-century Anglo-Saxon kings (f. 1r–8v contain 7<sup>th</sup>-century Kentish laws, and f. 9r–31v contain the laws of Alfred and Ine). I will compare this material with Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383 (*CCCC 383*, the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century), f. 16r–30v of which contain the laws of Alfred and Ine (see electronic facsimile: <https://parker.stanford.edu/parker/catalog/mv34oty8592> [17.07.2021]).

**Table 1. Traces of the editorial activity of the scribe of *Textus Roffensis* (f. 1–31)**

folio	additions and alterations in the text (single letters or morphemes + lexemes + combinations of words)	Interlinear and marginal glosses (original + late)	Special notes in the text and the margins (dots, strokes, drops of wax)
1r	0+0+1	1+1	
1v	2+1+0		1
2r	3+0+0		2
2v	2+0+0		
3r	3+1+0		
3v	1+1+0		
4r	7+1+0		
4v	1+0+0		1
5r	1+0+0	0+1	2
5v	1+0+0		
6r	1+0+1		2
6v	2+0+0	0+1	
7r	2+0+0	0+1	1
7v	3+0+0		
8r	2+5+0		
8v	4+0+4		
9r	34+8+1	0+1	
9v	26+3+0		
10r	43+10+0		
10v	22+5+0		

11r	2+0+0	0+2	
11v	0+0+0		
12r	2+0+0		
12v	2+1+0		
13r	2+0+0		
13v	5+0+0		
14r	34+13+1		
14v	37+5+1	1+0	1
15r	35+5+0	0+1	
15v	41+7+0		
16r	1+0+0		
16v	0+0+0		1
17r	32+8+0	1+0	1
17v	32+10+1		
18r	33+7+0		
18v	32+4+3		
19r	31+5+0		
19v	49+4+0	1+0	2
20r	42+5+0		
20v	28+4+0		
21r	26+6+0		
21v	33+4+2		
22r	34+3+1		
22v	32+1+0	1+0	
23r	32+6+0		
23v	49+4+0		
24r	51+2+0		
24v	30+1+0	0+1	
25r	28+1+0	2+0	1
25v	29+6+0		
26r	24+2+0		
26v	18+4+4		1
27r	26+9+0		3
27v	38+4+0		
28r	34+8+0		
28v	44+2+0		
29r	47+1+0		
29v	32+4+3		1
30r	22+6+0		1
30v	25+7+0		2
31r	29+3+0		
31v	30+5+0		

Table 1 gives some idea of the scale of the editorial activity of *TR*'s scribe. It demonstrates that the concentration of editorial interventions into the text of the laws was uneven (from 1 up to 53 cases per page). While isolated alterations can be explained in terms of correcting of slips of pen in the course of copying, the presence of dozens of corrections in one page implies a later, deliberate editorial activity. Such an activity had to have some purposes and practical reasons. To understand them, we must analyze in detail those corrections.

It is obvious from the chart that corrections are much more numerous in the laws of Alfred and Ine (from f. 9r) than in the Kentish laws. For example, in the laws of Alfred and Ine, the root vowel is altered in many words; in the Kentish laws, the same words often are written in a different way, and without any corrections.

In the Kentish laws, the scribe preferred personal forms of the verb *beon* ('to be') with *-ie-* or *-io-*: f. 2r, ln. 10, 19; f. 5v, ln. 8 (*sien*); f. 6r, ln. 11 (*sion*); f. 2r, ln. 18; f. 4r, ln. 23; f. 4v, ln. 3–4, 6, 23; f. 5v, ln. 19; f. 6r, ln. 7 (*sio*); f. 2v, ln. 16–18, 23; f. 4r, ln. 14; f. 5v, ln. 15, 24; f. 6r, ln. 1, 8–9 (*sie*). There are some exceptions (*sy* – f. 3r, ln. 16, 20–21; f. 3v, ln. 7; f. 7r, ln. 10; f. 7v, ln. 7), but in those cases the root vowel was originally written so, not as a result of corrections. On the contrary, in the law-code of Alfred the root vowel often was altered to *-y-* (*sy*, *syn*, *synt* – f. 11v, ln. 1, 7, 13, 20, 22; f. 12r, ln. 2, 9, 15, 21; f. 12v, ln. 4–5, 9, 12–14, 19; f. 13r, ln. 3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 21, 24; f. 13v, ln. 19; f. 14r, ln. 10; f. 15r, ln. 16; f. 16r, ln. 7, 10, 23; f. 16v, ln. 6, 21; f. 17r, ln. 8, 20, 24; f. 17v, ln. 9, 23; f. 18r, ln. 11, 14; f. 18v, ln. 2, 15–16; f. 19r, ln. 1; f. 19v, ln. 11, 13, 15, 17; f. 20r, ln. 23; f. 20v, ln. 1, 3, 9; f. 21r, ln. 9, 17; f. 21v, ln. 2–3, 23; f. 22r, ln. 23; f. 22v, ln. 8–9; f. 23r, ln. 5; f. 23v, ln. 7, 12–13, 17, 20; f. 24r, ln. 5, 10, 21–22; f. 24v, ln. 21, 23–24; f. 25r, ln. 3, 8–9, 11, 14, 16, 23; f. 25v, ln. 1, 19, 21; f. 26r, 3–4; f. 26v, ln. 6, 9, 12; f. 27r, ln. 17; f. 27v, ln. 1, 7, 16; f. 28r, ln. 1, 18–20; f. 29v, ln. 1, 4, 7; f. 31r, ln. 10, 12; f. 31v, ln. 13, 15, 20). Alternation of the forms *bip*, *byþ* (with emended *-y-*) and *beop* (with emended *-e-* or *-eo-*) also is present in the laws of Alfred and Ine, but the emendation is made not always, the form of *beon* with *-i-* prevails: f. 13r, ln. 7; f. 22v, ln. 16; f. 23r, ln. 9–10, 12, 15, 18–24; f. 23v, ln. 1, 3, 5–8, 10, 15–16; f. 24r, ln. 1–2, 4, 15; f. 26r, ln. 2, 16–17, 19; f. 27r, ln. 5, 18; f. 28r, ln. 7; f. 28v, ln. 3, 7, 15, 22–23; f. 29v, ln. 15; f. 30r, ln. 13–16, 23; f. 30v, ln. 1, 3 (*bip*). There are also some cases of the correction of the root vowel to *-y-* or *-eo-*: f. 12r, ln. 16; f. 12v, ln. 16; f. 22v, ln. 15; f. 28v, ln. 17 (*byþ*); f. 22v, ln. 13; f. 23r, ln. 16 (*beop*).

There was a regular correction of root vowels *-e-/-i-* to *-y-* in the verb (*ge*)*sellan* ('to sell, to give') in the laws of Alfred and Ine (f. 17v, ln. 14; f. 19v, ln. 1; f. 21r, ln. 1; f. 21v, ln. 8, 19; f. 22r, ln. 5–6; f. 22v, ln. 9–10, 14–16, 19, 21–22; f. 23r, ln. 9; f. 23v, ln. 4, 6, 10–12, 17; f. 24r, ln. 6, 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 23; f. 24v, ln. 1, 4; f. 25r, ln. 3; f. 25v, ln. 2, 4–5, 10, 17, 19; f. 26v, ln. 22; f. 27r, ln. 9; f. 28r,

ln. 5; f. 28v, ln. 11; f. 29r, ln. 13; f. 29v, ln. 3, 19; f. 31r, ln. 23). This lexeme, however, only once is used in the Kentish laws (f. 6v, ln. 3, 7) which prefer *gebetan* or *forgyldan*. In the laws of Alfred there are rare exceptions when the scribe left *sellan* uncorrected (f. 22r, ln. 7, 9, 14, 15).

Much the same can be said of the pronouns *hie* ('they') and *his*. In the Kentish laws (f. 1r–8v), they are uncorrected (f. 2r, ln. 4; f. 5r, ln. 8, 10–11, 16; f. 6r, ln. 5, 13, 15; f. 6v, ln. 4, 10, 11, 15). In the laws of Alfred and Ine, they are altered to *hy* and *hys*, respectively: f. 13r, ln. 24; f. 13v, ln. 10–11, 22; f. 14v, ln. 10, 12–13; f. 15r, ln. 3, 18, 20, 22; f. 15v, ln. 3, 8, 10; f. 17r, 6; f. 18r, ln. 14–15; f. 19r, ln. 8; f. 20r, ln. 21, 23–24; f. 20v, ln. 20; 21r, ln. 1; f. 23r, ln. 7; f. 25v, ln. 6; f. 29r, ln. 11 (*hy*); f. 11v, ln. 16, 18–19; f. 12r, ln. 4, 11, 22; f. 16r, ln. 11 (*hys*). However, this alteration was much less regular than with the verbs *beon* and (*ge*)*sellan*: forms *his* and *hi* are still numerous in the laws of Alfred and Ine: 16r, ln. 12; f. 19v, ln. 23; f. 21v, ln. 13, 16; f. 22r, ln. 11, 18–21; f. 23v, ln. 1; f. 25v, ln. 6; f. 26r, ln. 9, 16; f. 26v, ln. 2, 13, 23; f. 27r, ln. 1, 17; f. 27v, ln. 15; f. 28r, ln. 3, 5, 8, 22; f. 29r, ln. 7–8, 16; f. 30r, ln. 8; f. 30v, ln. 3, 5, 8; f. 31v, ln. 16 (*his*); f. 16v, ln. 21; f. 19r, ln. 1; f. 29r, ln. 12; f. 31r, ln. 14 (*hi*). In the case of the form *hiom* ('them'), the Kentish laws contain this variant side by side with *heom*, and the laws of Alfred and Ine contain only the second variant, which is once emended to *hym*: f. 11r, ln. 18; f. 11v, ln. 2; f. 12v, ln. 20; f. 14r, ln. 22; f. 16r, ln. 2; f. 28r, ln. 18 (*heom*); f. 16r, ln. 10 (*hym*); compare in the Kentish laws: f. 1r, ln. 9; f. 7r, ln. 8 (*heom*); f. 4r, ln. 21; f. 4v, ln. 2 (*hiom*).

In other lexemes, the emendation of *-i-* or *-e-* (or even *-ie-*) to *-y-* was made from time to time, not systematically. It took place in the roots of verbs, adjectives, nouns, and demonstrative pronouns. Sometimes the scribe, firstly, wrote *-i-* or *-e-*, and then, with the same ink, corrected the root vowel to *-y-* (either without erasing or having erased the original vowel): f. 3v, ln. 18 (*ðissum* corrected to *ðyssum*, compare f. 6r, ln. 24 – *ðissa* without correction); f. 4v, ln. 7; f. 5v, ln. 9; f. 16r, ln. 18; f. 27v, ln. 11; f. 31r, ln. 23; f. 31v, ln. 8 (*nillan* corrected to *nyllan*, compare f. 11v, ln. 9; f. 13v, ln. 1; f. 22r, ln. 3; f. 25r, ln. 10 – *nelle* not corrected); f. 11v, ln. 24 (*willan* corrected to *wyllan*, compare f. 6r, ln. 2; f. 16v, ln. 16; f. 17r, ln. 23–24; f. 17v, ln. 3–4; f. 19r, ln. 1, 5, 17, 21; f. 20v, ln. 22; f. 22r, ln. 5; f. 27r, ln. 5–6; f. 27v, ln. 9, 17; f. 30v, ln. 13; f. 31v, ln. 3 – *willan* without correction); f. 2v, ln. 11 (*litlan* corrected to *lytlan*, compare f. 23v, ln. 1 – *litlan*); f. 3r, ln. 9 (*micle* corrected to *mycla*; f. 3r, ln. 12 – *mycclan* was written originally). Much the same can be observed when the scribe dealt with *fioh* which could be corrected to less archaic *feoh* ('property, cattle'): f. 3v, ln. 4; f. 14r, ln. 9 (*fioh*); f. 4r, ln. 14–15; f. 5r, ln. 2, 10; f. 9r, ln. 10; f. 13r, ln. 14, 18; f. 13v, ln. 1; f. 25v, ln. 13; f. 26r, ln. 13; f. 26v, ln. 18; f. 27r, ln. 17; f. 29v, ln. 7 (*feoh*).

Similar corrections were made in quantitative and ordinal numerals: for example, *syxhundum* ('600' – f. 21v, ln. 19, 24; f. 22r, ln. 1), *sixtan*

(‘sixth’ – f. 5r, ln. 17) / *syxtan* (f. 7r, ln. 2; f. 7v, ln. 2), in the roots *twe-* (‘twice’ – f. 5r, ln. 3) / *twy-* (in *twyfealdum* and *twybot* – f. 13r, ln. 9, 15; f. 21v, ln. 3; f. 23v, ln. 23; f. 27v, ln. 12; f. 29v, ln. 15; *twyhundum*, ‘200’, – f. 31r, ln. 3–5), *ðreo* (‘three’ – f. 5r, ln. 3; f. 6v, ln. 13–14), *ðrym* and *ðry-* (‘trice’ – f. 2v, ln. 4; f. 12v, ln. 7; f. 29r, ln. 14).

Vowel *-o-* was corrected to *-a-* in prefixes, roots, and endings, and such cases are even much more numerous than the interchange of *-i-/-e-* and *-i-/-y-*. This is not surprising because it is technically very easy to make *a* from *o*: one should only add one vertical stroke to the right from *o*. Such corrections can be observed in all kinds of morphemes, most often in nouns *mon* (f. 1r, ln. 9; f. 3r, ln. 21; f. 3v, ln. 4; f. 4r, ln. 12; f. 4v, ln. 12; f. 6r, ln. 13; f. 9r, ln. 5–6, 9, 23; f. 9v, ln. 4–5, 10, 13; f. 10r, ln. 1–2, 5, 7–8, 10, 12–15, 18, 24; f. 10v, ln. 4, 6–7, 9, 12–14, 17, 23; f. 14r, ln. 9, 14, 17; f. 14v, ln. 21; f. 15r, ln. 10, 12; f. 16r, ln. 16; f. 16v, ln. 17; f. 17r, ln. 7, 17; f. 17v, ln. 3, 10, 20–21; f. 18r, ln. 6–7, 10, 13–14, 18, 21, 23; f. 18v, ln. 2, 5, 8, 16, 19; f. 19r, ln. 7–8, 12, 15, 20, 24; f. 19v, ln. 7, 9, 13, 21, 24; f. 20r, ln. 1, 3, 8–9, 11, 13, 20; f. 20v, ln. 1, 5–6, 14–15, 17, 22–23; f. 21r, ln. 12, 16, 23; f. 21v, ln. 1, 3, 6, 9, 14; f. 22r, ln. 4, 6, 12–13, 16–17, 23–24; f. 22v, ln. 9, 10, 19; f. 23r, ln. 2–3, 6, 8, 10, 13; f. 23v, ln. 3–4, 6, 10, 12, 16; f. 24r, ln. 3, 5, 7–8, 10–12, 15–16, 20, 22–24; f. 24v, ln. 1, 11, 16; f. 25r, ln. 2, 14; f. 26r, ln. 1, 14–15, 22; f. 26v, ln. 7, 16–18; f. 27r, ln. 8–9, 11–12, 14–16, 18, 23; f. 27v, ln. 3, 8, 16, 18–19, 22–24; f. 28r, ln. 4, 10; f. 28v, ln. 4, 9, 14, 16, 18, 24; f. 29r, ln. 2–6, 8, 13, 16–17, 21; f. 29v, ln. 3–4, 6, 10, 22; f. 30r, ln. 1, 8, 23; f. 30v, ln. 1, 9, 18, 23; f. 31r, ln. 3, 15, 20; f. 31v, ln. 5, 7, 13–14), *hond* (f. 17v, ln. 3–4; f. 19r, ln. 22; f. 19v, ln. 8, 18; f. 21v, ln. 16; f. 23v, ln. 20; f. 24r, ln. 5, 11; f. 26r, ln. 15; f. 27v, ln. 21; f. 29v, ln. 4, 8, 12; f. 30r, ln. 5; f. 30v, ln. 4; f. 31r, ln. 21; f. 30v, ln. 6, 10), *lond* (f. 10v, ln. 9, 12, 14; f. 18r, ln. 24; f. 21v, ln. 6; f. 27r, ln. 18; f. 28r, ln. 13; f. 28v, ln. 17; f. 29r, ln. 22–23; f. 30v, ln. 13–16, 18); in conjunction *ond* (f. 2v, ln. 2, 14; f. 10r, ln. 19; f. 14r, ln. 2, 5, 7–8, 14; f. 14v, ln. 5, 11, 14, 16, 19–20, 22–24; f. 15r, ln. 2, 4, 8–9, 19, 21; f. 15v, ln. 7–8, 12–14, 22; f. 17r, ln. 11, 18; f. 17v, ln. 5; f. 19r, ln. 8, 17, 23; f. 19v, ln. 16–17, 19, 21–22; f. 20r, ln. 7; f. 20v, ln. 12, 18; f. 21r, ln. 5, 8; f. 21v, ln. 17, 19; f. 22v, ln. 3; f. 24v, ln. 13; f. 25v, ln. 13); in prepositions *buton* (‘without, out of’ – f. 9r, ln. 3, 10; f. 10v, ln. 3; f. 17r, ln. 10; f. 17v, ln. 13–14; f. 18r, ln. 5; f. 18v, ln. 14; f. 19r, ln. 12; f. 20v, ln. 16, 20; f. 21r, ln. 1; f. 22r, ln. 18, 24; f. 24v, ln. 5, 24; f. 25r, ln. 4, 6; f. 26r, ln. 19; f. 27v, ln. 16; f. 30r, ln. 9; f. 31v, ln. 3), *from* (f. 7v, ln. 12; f. 15r, ln. 8; f. 26r, ln. 1; f. 28r, ln. 3); in pronoun *þom* (‘that’ – f. 14v, ln. 6; f. 28v, ln. 3); in adverbs *þon* (f. 23v, ln. 18), *þonne* (‘then’ – f. 29v, ln. 10). Those corrections, nevertheless, were not systematic either. For example, both in the laws of Kent and of Alfred and Ine, one can meet uncorrected forms *mon* и *buton*: f. 17r, ln. 17; f. 19r, ln. 17; f. 20r, ln. 2; f. 23r, ln. 9; f. 24r, ln. 17; f. 27v, ln. 13; f. 28v, ln. 18; f. 29v, ln. 20; f. 30v, ln. 1, 6; f. 31r, ln. 13–14; f. 31v, ln. 6 (*mon*); f. 5v, ln. 4, 21–22; f. 6r, ln. 9; f. 6v, ln. 12, 21; f. 19r, ln. 9, 18; f. 31v, ln. 10 (*buton*). The vast majority



of corrections of *mon* to *man* are situated in the laws of Alfred and Ine, sometimes dozens of examples in one folio (e.g., 24 times in f. 10r–v, in the index of articles; compare *lond* which is corrected to *land* 5 times in the same folio, and *ond* twice corrected to *and*).

Changes of *-o-* to *-a-* in prefixes and endings are more seldom. Combinations *-on-* and *-no-* were often emended to *-an-* and *-na-*, e.g., f. 2r, ln. 12 (*nawiht*, ‘nothing’); f. 9v, ln. 17; f. 10r, ln. 2 (*gefangen*, ‘seized’); f. 14r, ln. 7, 18; f. 14v, ln. 3; f. 26v, ln. 6 (*na*, ‘not, never’); f. 15r, ln. 2; f. 17r, ln. 20 (*naman*, ‘name’); f. 15v, ln. 9, 18 (*settan* or *gesettan*, ‘to put, to place, to occupy’); f. 17r, ln. 23 (*Gangdæg*, ‘Rogation day’); f. 17r, ln. 20; f. 18v, ln. 3; f. 19v, ln. 10; f. 31v, ln. 11 (*andettan* or *geandettan*, ‘confess, praise’; *andetta*, ‘one who confesses’); f. 25r, ln. 2 (*sunnan*, ‘sun’); compare: f. 17r, ln. 21 (*Sunnanniht*, ‘Sunday’); f. 30r, ln. 5 (*nihta*, ‘night’); f. 19v, ln. 19 (*anwite*, ‘single fine’); f. 20r, ln. 1 (*gewintredan*, ‘adult, aged’); f. 22v, ln. 20 (*opstandan*, ‘to stand fixed’); f. 23r, ln. 1 (*stand*, ‘to remain’); f. 23v, ln. 7, 9 (*forad*, ‘broken’); f. 24r, ln. 5 (*utan*, ‘from outside’); f. 24r, ln. 20–21, 23 (*gelacnian*, ‘to heal’); f. 24v, ln. 5 (*witan*, ‘wise’; *gereccan*, ‘to judge, to reckon’); f. 26r, ln. 22, 24 (*ofslagenan*, ‘killed’); f. 27r, ln. 13 (*agenan*, ‘own’); f. 28r, ln. 12 (*habban*, ‘to have’), 15 (*gemænan*, ‘commune’); f. 28v, ln. 10 (*gestandan*, ‘to stay’), 18 (*ansacan*, ‘to contest, dispute’); f. 30v, ln. 7 (*forstandan*, ‘to present’). There are some exceptions here too: the scribe left intact the original *-o-*: f. 21v, ln. 10 (*gestrindon*, ‘to waste’); f. 31r, ln. 11 (*gefengon*, ‘to take, to seize’), 18 (*magon*, ‘may, can’).

The scribe of *TR* also added prefixes and endings *-ge-* which he had earlier omitted in verbs, nouns, and participles: f. 9r, ln. 14; f. 17v, ln. 7 (*gefeohtan*, ‘to fight’); f. 9v, ln. 14 (*gelandan*, ‘kinsman’); f. 10r, ln. 5 (*gemetten*, ‘waged’); f. 11v, ln. 2 and f. 25r, ln. 6 (*freoge* and *frigea*, ‘free’); f. 14r, ln. 6 (*gewendan*, ‘to turn’); f. 15r, ln. 18 (*geleafa*, ‘faith’); f. 17v, ln. 8 (*gefon*, ‘seized’); f. 19v, ln. 8 (*foregepingian*, ‘to plead for’); f. 20v, ln. 14 (*gefunden*, ‘is provided, considered’); f. 23r, ln. 4 (*gebetan*, ‘to emend’), 12 (*gedon*, ‘to make’); f. 23r, ln. 13; f. 23v, ln. 18; f. 24r, ln. 4 (*gewounded* or *-od*, ‘wounded’); f. 28r, ln. 21 (*gehealdan*, ‘hold’).

Unfortunately, not so many regularities can be seen in this picture. The scribe was not likely to have altered one particular lexeme more often than others. Moreover, two variants of the same lexeme often alternate, both in the laws of Kent and of Alfred–Ine.

I have tried to look at this editorial work from the point of view of social categories (ŽEMLYAKOV 2013. C. 109–110, without an analysis of the distribution of corrections). The following social terms for free people are used in the Kentish laws: *ceorl* (f. 3r, ln. 24; f. 3v, ln. 1, 9; f. 1v, ln. 2–3, 18; f. 4r, ln. 11; f. 5r, ln. 3; f. 5v, ln. 15; f. 6r, ln. 8), *frig(ea)* and *fri(g)man* (f. 1r, ln. 15, 19; 1v, ln. 17; 4r, ln. 1, 6; f. 6r, ln. 13; f. 6v, ln. 12). Words with the root *frig-* as well as the

forms *freoh* and *freogan* also are present in the laws of Alfred–Ine (f. 10v, ln. 22–23 [index]; f. 11v, ln. 17, 23; f. 12v, ln. 2 [prologue]; f. 25r, ln. 6; f. 25v, ln. 18–19; f. 29r, ln. 19; f. 29v, ln. 10; f. 31v, ln. 1–2, 4 [laws of Ine]). The terms *freoman* (f. 6r, ln. 6) and *freols* (f. 5v, ln. 23–24) are used each only once in the Kentish laws. In the laws of Alfred–Ine, the word *ceorl* prevails, with one or two root vowels corrected: *ciorl* (f. 9r, ln. 20; f. 10r, ln. 23; f. 10v, ln. 1; f. 19v, ln. 20; f. 28r, ln. 6, 12; f. 27v, ln. 22–23; f. 30r, ln. 7, 19), *ciorlisc man* (f. 10r, ln. 1; 10v, ln. 23; f. 21r, ln. 15–16; f. 26r, ln. 14; f. 27v, ln. 18), *cierlisc man* (f. 9r, ln. 20; f. 9v, ln. 5, 13; f. 10r, ln. 15, 24; f. 18v, ln. 18; f. 21r, ln. 19; f. 27r, ln. 11), *cyrilisc man* (f. 18r, ln. 8–9); *-eo-* in root is, rather, exceptional (e.g. f. 16v, ln. 24; compare lexemes *freo* and *freoman* in the laws of Alfred: f. 22r, ln. 23; f. 31v, ln. 1).

The composite word *ealderman* is corrected sometimes in the laws of Alfred–Ine (only *eorl* and *eorlcund man* occur in the Kentish laws); however, in both parts the lexeme *aldor* is used (when speaking of abbots and king’s councilors: f. 3v, ln. 17; f. 6r, ln. 16; f. 17v, ln. 14). In other cases, the scribe used *-eo-/-ea-* in the first part of the composite word, and *-a-/-o-* in the second part: f. 1v, ln. 1; f. 17r, ln. 1 (*eorl*); f. 3v, ln. 19 (*eorlcund man*); f. 18v, ln. 7; f. 22r, ln. 2 (*ealdorman*); f. 9v, ln. 11; f. 16v, ln. 17; f. 20v, ln. 23–24; f. 21r, ln. 8, 10–13, 23; f. 24v, ln. 11, 16; f. 25r, ln. 19; f. 27v, ln. 16; f. 29r, ln. 17 (*ealderman*)).

Turning to categories of dependent people, the spelling *ðeow* is a norm both in the laws of Kent and Wessex (sometimes *-man* is added: f. 1r, ln. 22; f. 1v, ln. 4–5; f. 6r, ln. 14; f. 7r, ln. 3, 7; f. 9v, ln. 24; f. 10r, ln. 20; f. 10v, ln. 9; f. 11v, ln. 3, 8, 15; f. 12r, ln. 15, 17; f. 12v, ln. 1, 13; f. 19v, ln. 22; f. 22r, ln. 24; f. 22v, ln. 8; f. 24v, ln. 19; f. 25r, ln. 2, 4; f. 25v, ln. 18; f. 26v, ln. 14–15; f. 29r, ln. 3–4; f. 29r, ln. 18; f. 29v, ln. 21, 23; f. 31v, ln. 2, 4); however, in the laws of Wihtried *-eu-* occurs in the root (f. 6r, ln. 12; f. 6v, ln. 4, 17), and the word *þeo* (without final *ƿ*) is used in the laws of Æthelberht (f. 3v, ln. 13; the last letter, the rune *ƿynn*, was nevertheless added later by another scribe).

Some ethnic and social terms are spelled in one way throughout the laws of both, Kent and Wessex: *esne* (f. 3v, ln. 8–10, 12, 19, 24; f. 6r, ln. 2, 5; f. 6v, ln. 1, 8–9; f. 12r, ln. 15; f. 27r, ln. 7), *wealh*: f. 10r, ln. 6; f. 27r, ln. 21 (*horswealh* ‘equerry’); f. 10v, ln. 22; f. 31r, ln. 20 (*ðeowwealh* ‘slave of Welsh origin’). The laws of Alfred treated all Welsh living in Wessex as a low stratum (*wilisc man*: f. 10r, ln. 4; f. 27r, ln. 18; f. 28v, ln. 23; f. 29v, ln. 22; in this term the root vowel was not corrected). Also, the laws of Alfred and Ine mention *englisc* (‘Englishmen, as opposed to Welsh and Scandinavians’: f. 29v, ln. 24; f. 31r, ln. 20). Thus, even when dealing with such frequent terms as *ceorl* and *ealderman* the scribe of *TR* was not ready to choose one spelling for all the laws.

Now I will turn to the interlinear and marginal glosses. It is more difficult to follow them systematically than corrections of letters analyzed above. In the Kentish laws, glosses are few, never more than one or two per

page. In the laws of Alfred and Ine, glosses are much more frequent: from 1 up to 14 per page (and only three pages have no glosses, f. 11v, 13r, 16v; four pages, f. 11r, 12r, 13v and 16r, have only one gloss). The biggest concentration of glosses is in f. 27r (14 glosses) and f. 28r (12 glosses). It is not possible to comment here on each gloss, so, I will speak of those that point at a certain editor's interest to one of the topics treated by the laws.

For example, one can see an interest to punishments applied to unfree members of the society for such misdeeds as worshiping of pagan gods, rape, or Sunday works not authorized by the lord: f. 6r, ln. 12 (flogging for slave's worshiping of pagan gods marked by a long stroke in the margin); f. 18v, ln. 23 (rape of a female slave – another hand inserted near the text: *alias eo굱ede*, 'otherwise – castration'); f. 25r, ln. 5 (Sunday work – it is written in the margin: *oððe hydgyld*, 'or fine for his skin'), as well as thegn's and ceorl's oath on altar (f. 6r, ln. 23: *s굱ylte cyninges ðegn. Ceorlisc man hine feo굱ra sum his heafodgemacene on weofode*, 'king's thegn [clears himself] in the same manner. Churl [clears himself] at the altar, with three companions [i.e. churls]'). In the article of the laws of Alfred dedicated to the escape of an Anglo-Saxon previously made slave due to a crime, his capture and punishment, there is a long marginal gloss (f. 22r, ln. 21: *oððe mid his s굱wister æ굱umborenre*, 'or with his lawfully born sister'). Large fragments of text concerning the punishment of a slave-debtor (*witeðeo굱*) for a murder of an Anglo-Saxon and the price of life of *wealh* (f. 26v, ln. 15: *7 ne gylde his hlaforde. Gif hine man ofslea, ne gylde hine man his magum, gif hy hine on twelf monþum ne alysdon. Wealh, gif he hæfd fif hyda, he byð syxhinde*, 'and nothing will be paid to the owner [of the slave-debtor in case of his theft and execution]. If someone kills another man, there will be no payment to his kinsman, if they haven't ransom him within 12 months. If a Welsh owns 5 hides, he will have [the wergeld] of 600 shillings') as well as the deposit given before ordeal (f. 30v, ln. 2: *nah þonne sylf nane wiht to gesylanne beforan ceace*, '[and if] he has nothing to pay to avoid the ordeal') were inserted into the laws of Ine. Other marginal additions are a fragment of West Saxon regnal list mentioning Æthelberht III and Æthelred I (they reigned in 860–871) (f. 8v, ln. 3: *Ða feng Æðelbyrht [...] 7 heold V gear, æfter him Æðelred V gear*, 'Then began [to reign] Æðelbyrht... and [he] held [the kingdom] for 5 years, after him Æðelred [held the kingdom] for 5 years'; the text is partly cut) and a gloss to the prologue to the laws of Alfred (when it is said of the envoys sent to Antiochia, Syria, and Cilicia) (f. 14v, ln. 13: *[æ]rendgewrit to him. [Ð]is is ðonne þæt*, '[and apostles] sent them the epistles. That was those epistles which...'). Some of those glosses show an interest to dependent strata of the population of Wessex and Kent (three of them are dedicated to slaves, and one to *wealh*), I will return to this below.

All those data give some basis for a hypothesis explaining the editorial work. It is important to look at the structure of the manuscript itself. The 1<sup>st</sup>

quire (f. 1r–8v) contains the Kentish laws together with *Hadbot* (a text on compensation of injuries to priests ascribed to Wulfstan) and a royal genealogy – to accommodate all this in one quire it became necessary to make 27 lines instead of 24 in f. 8v. The laws of Alfred and Ine occupy all the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> quires as well as the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup>. The 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> quires consist of 8 leaves each, the 4<sup>th</sup> quire has 12 leaves; f. 12–13 (in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quire) and f. 32 (in the 4<sup>th</sup> quire) are supply leaves.

It is probable that the scribe tended to place each juridical text (or compilation) into its own quire, and to use small texts like *Hadbot* as “space-fillers” at the ends of quires (see: Wormald 1999a. Vol. 1. P. 246–247). Felix Liebermann, due to this, came to a conclusion that there was a common exemplar for several juridical compilations which he labeled *hbq* and dated to 920 x 1080. Liebermann’s *hb* dated to 1020 x 1090 was a derivative of *hbq* and the common exemplar of *CCC 383* (*B* in Liebermann’s stemma) and *TR* (*H* in Liebermann’s stemma). The exemplar of the Latin translation of Anglo-Saxon laws known as *Quadripartitus* (*Q*, the 11<sup>th</sup> century) was another derivative of *hbq* (see stemma in: Die Gesetze 1916. S. 31–32).

Patrick Wormald, generally agreeing with this scheme, located the non-extant exemplar of *TR* in the library of Canterbury, Christ Church, basing on the fact that *TR* contains royal genealogies and lists of archbishops and bishops. Wormald noted that the scribe of *TR* had demonstrated two approaches to the editing of the laws of Alfred: 1) the adaptation of the language to the norms of early 12<sup>th</sup>-century phonetics by corrections when re-reading the text already written (most of folios); 2) changing elements of the language in the course of copying, according to post-Conquest practices of English orthography (f. 11r–13v, 16r–v). Wormald convincingly showed that the index of titles of the laws of Alfred (written in two columns in f. 9r–10v) was inserted later than the prologue (starts at the top of f. 11r): a fragment of index, for which there was not enough space in f. 10v, was inserted at the top of f. 11r, as two lines and a half above the initial *D* of the prologue (Wormald 1999a. Vol. 1. P. 249, 252).

Yes, Canterbury would have been a natural place for the copying and preserving of the 7<sup>th</sup>-century Kentish laws. However, Wormald’s hypothesis does not explain the fact that corrections of language in *TR*, so numerous in the text of the laws of Alfred and Ine, almost did not touch the archaic language of the Kentish laws. Why the scribe, having turned from the Kentish to the Wessex laws, changed so radically his approach to the language of the text he was copying? This question cannot be answered with certainty until we find out which was the intermediary manuscript between *TR* and the hypothetical Canterbury manuscript (the common ancestor of *TR* and *CCCC 383*).

Thomas Gobbit’s attempt to explain the corrections and orthography of *TR* with the help of the analysis of *CCCC 383* (Gobbit 2015. P. 70, 74–76) is

not fully convincing. Firstly, Alfred's laws in *CCCC 383* lack the beginning (up to *Af. 3*), and so we know nothing of the scribe's editorial work in the index and the prologue to Alfred's laws (if at all they had been in the manuscript from which the quire now in *CCCC 383* was taken). Secondly, contrary to *TR*, there are no numbers of articles in *CCCC 383*, but (again contrary to *TR*) some of them have headings. Therefore, there must have been at least one intermediate text between *TR* and the exemplar of *CCCC 383* in which those changes originated. Thirdly, in *CCCC 383*, corrections, interlinear and marginal glosses are much less numerous than in *TR*, and mostly they are not the same and not in the same places as in *TR*. For example, in *CCCC 383* the biggest concentration of corrections and glosses is in f. 22v (22 cases); compare pages with 14 corrections (f. 24v, 25v, 29r), 13 corrections (f. 22r), 12 corrections (f. 20r), 11 corrections (f. 16v), 10 corrections (f. 17r–v, f. 19r, f. 28v) – down to one correction in f. 26v.

Not numerous are corrections of vowels, so characteristic to *TR*. Rarely vowels in roots or endings are emended from *-o-* to *-a-*: *CCCC 383*, f. 25r, ln. 7 (*magas*); the form *hond* occurs only once (*CCCC 383*, f. 28v, ln. 3), otherwise we see *hand* with the root vowel not corrected; *land* is always with *-a-*, and the forms *mon* and *man* alternate, often in the same article (and only once we see a correction from *-o-* to *-a-* in this word: *CCCC 383*, f. 26r, ln. 11).

At the same time, in *CCCC 383* we find *gyf* instead of *gif* characteristic to *TR* (at the beginning of almost each article of the laws), *wylisc* instead of *wilisc* (*CCCC 383*, f. 26r, ln. 4; f. 27v, ln. 13; f. 30r, ln. 3), *ealdorman* instead of *ealderman* (*CCCC 383*, f. 16r, ln. 1; f. 17v, ln. 24–25; f. 20r, ln. 20; f. 20v, ln. 4–5, 7, 21; f. 23r, ln. 9–10, 15; f. 23v, ln. 19; f. 26v, ln. 3–4; f. 27v, ln. 4; f. 28r, ln. 7; only in one heading one finds a younger form *aldormen* characteristic to *Quadripartitus*: *CCCC 383*, f. 20v, ln. 3). Contrary to the scribe of *TR*, the scribe of *CCCC 383* never missed *-e-* in the demonstrative pronoun *heora*. So, it is impossible that the corrections in the two manuscripts were based upon the same (non-extant) manuscript. The very approaches to the editorial work of the two scribes were different. One must also keep in mind the local features of both, the reflection and the writing down of legal Anglo-Saxon tradition (Richards 1989. P. 9).

Therefore, the only explanation of the editorial work of *TR*'s scribe is his desire to update the language. Why was this desire strong in respect to the laws of Alfred and Ine, and not strong at all in respect to the 7<sup>th</sup>-century Kentish laws? The laws of Alfred–Ine were hardly perceived as a functioning juridical text in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century. However, as Wormald argued, the scribe of *TR* could regard the book as a kind of “legal encyclopedia” capable to protect the Anglo-Saxon clergy against the claims of the Normans, as “memorial to the past and instrument of its adaptation in a new world” (Wormald 1999a. Vol. 1.

P. 252–253). The above-noticed attention of the scribe of *TR* and of those who handled the book later to categories of dependent Anglo-Saxons and Welsh supports this hypothesis: the dependent population of the church lands easily could be an object of claims of the Norman aristocracy in the times of the first Anglo-Norman kings and the Domesday survey.

At the same time, in spite of the presence of remarks concerning the protection of the church property in the Kentish laws (especially, *Abt.* 1), it is hardly probable that the scribe/editor of *TR* regarded this text as juridically actual in any sense. The law-code of Alfred could rather be regarded as actual in another sense: Alfred's appeal to the Divine source of the legislation (*Af.* 49; see: Wormald 1999a. Vol. 1. P. 481) could play a certain role in the understanding of this code as something still actual and helping to protect the property and status of Anglo-Saxon clergy in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century.

*Translated by Timofey V. Guimon*

#### ABBREVIATIONS

*Abt.* – Æthelberht's law-code

*Af.* – Alfred's law-code

*CCCC 383* – Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 383

*TR* – Rochester, Cathedral Library, A.3.5 (*Textus Roffensis*)

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА / REFERENCES

- Земляков М. В.* Категории зависимости в древнеанглийских правовых источниках VII – начала X в. (анализ *Textus Roffensis*) // Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. М., 2013. [Вып.] XXV: Экономические основы формирования государства в древности и средневековье. С. 108–113. [*Zemlyakov M. V.* Kategorii zavisimosti v drevneangliyskikh pravovykh istochnikakh VII – nachala X v. (analiz *Textus Roffensis*) (The Categories of Dependence in Old English Legal Sources of the 7<sup>th</sup> – Early 10<sup>th</sup> Centuries (the Analysis of *Textus Roffensis*)) // Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. Moscow, 2013. [Vol.] XXV: Ekonomicheskiye osnovy formirovaniya gosudarstva v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. S. 108–113.]
- Земляков М. В.* Законы кентских королей VII в. в Рочестерском кодексе (*Textus Roffensis*): Обстоятельства появления и структура // Источниковедческие исследования. М., 2014. Вып. 6. С. 9–31. [*Zemlyakov M. V.* Zakony kentskikh koroley VII v. v Rochesterskom kodekse (*Textus Roffensis*): Obstoyatel'stva poyavleniya i struktura (The Laws of the 7<sup>th</sup>-Century Kings of Kent in *Textus Roffensis*: The Origin and Structure) // Istochnikovedcheskiye issledovaniya. Moscow, 2014. Вып. 6. С. 9–31.] (a)
- Земляков М. В.* Становление законодательства в раннесредневековой Англии: законы кентских королей VII в. // Средние века. 2014.

- Вып. 75 (1–2). С. 262–272. [*žemlyakov M. V. Stanovleniye zakonodatel'stva v ranne-srednevekovoy Anglii: zakony kentskikh koroley VII v. (The Making of Legislation in Early Medieval England: the Laws of Kentish Kings of the 7<sup>th</sup> Century)* // *Srednie veka*. 2014. Vyp. 75 (1–2). S. 262–272.] (b)
- Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen / Hrsg. F. Liebermann. Halle a/Saale, 1916. Bd. 3: Einleitung zu jedem Stück; Erklärungen zu einzelnen Stellen.
- Gendre R.* Le leggi di Aethelberht: “iuxta exempla Romanorum” e “iuxta consuetudines Germanorum” // *Testi giuridici germanici. Atti del XVII Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana di Filologia Germanica, Potenza, 24–25 maggio 1990* / A cura di L. Lazzari. Potenza, 1992. P. 7–21.
- Gobbit T.* The Other Book: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Ms. 383 in Relation to the *Textus Roffensis* // *Textus Roffensis. Law, Language, and Libraries in Early Medieval England* / Ed. by B. O'Brien and B. Bombi. Turnhout, 2015. P. 69–82.
- Hough C.* The Early Kentish “Divorce Laws”: a Reconsideration of Æthelberht, Chapters 79 and 80 // *Anglo-Saxon England*. 1994. Vol. 23. P. 19–34.
- Hough C.* Two Kentish Laws concerning Women: A New Reading of Æthelberht 73 and 74 // *Anglia: Journal of English Philology*. 2001. Vol. 119. Iss. 4. P. 554–578.
- Hough C.* Women and the Law in Seventh-Century England // *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies*. 2007. Vol. 51. P. 207–230.
- Hough C.* “An Ald Reht”: Essays on Anglo-Saxon Law. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014.
- Hough C.* The Earliest English Texts? The Language of the Kentish Laws Reconsidered // *Textus Roffensis. Law, Language, and Libraries in Early Medieval England* / Ed. by B. O'Brien and B. Bombi. Turnhout, 2015. P. 137–156.
- Jurasinski S.* The Continental Origins of Æthelberht's Code // *Philological Quarterly*. 2001. Vol. 80. P. 1–15.
- Jurasinski S.* Germanism, Slapping and the Cultural Contexts of Æthelberht's Code: A Reconsideration of Chapters 56–58 // *Haskins Society Journal*. 2006. Vol. 18. P. 51–71.
- Jurasinski S.* Sanctuary, House-Peace, and the Traditionalism of Alfred's Laws // *The Journal of Legal History*. 2010. Vol. 31. P. 129–147.
- Jurasinski S.* Scribal Malpractice and the Study of Anglo-Saxon Law in the Twelfth Century // *Textus Roffensis. Law, Language, and Libraries in Early Medieval England* / Ed. by B. O'Brien and B. Bombi. Turnhout, 2015. P. 83–101.
- Jurasinski S., Oliver L.* The Laws of Alfred. The *Domboc* and the Making of Anglo-Saxon Law. Cambridge, 2021.
- Karn N.* Textus Roffensis and its Uses // *Textus Roffensis. Law, Language, and Libraries in Early Medieval England* / Ed. by B. O'Brien and B. Bombi. Turnhout, 2015. P. 49–68.

- Oliver L.* The Beginning of English Law. Toronto; London, 2002.
- Oliver L.* Æthelberht's *fedesl* Revisited // Notes and Queries. 2008. Vol. 55. P. 125–126.
- Oliver L.* The Body Legal in Barbarian Law. Toronto [et al.], 2011.
- Parker Library on the Web // <https://parker.stanford.edu/parker/catalog/mv34oty8592> (17.07.2021).
- The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220 // <https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.RCL.htm> (06.07.2021).
- Rabin A.* Gang Violence in the Laws of Alfred the Great: The Problem of Hloð-Sliht // Notes and Queries. 2016. Vol. 63. № 4. P. 516–521.
- Richards M. P.* Texts and Their Traditions in the Medieval Library of Rochester Cathedral Priory. Philadelphia, 1988.
- Richards M. P.* Elements of a Written Standard in the Old English Law // Standardizing English: Essays in the History of Language Changing in honour of J.H. Fisher. Knoxville, 1989. P. 1–22.
- Rubin S.* Æthelberht 36. A Medico-Linguistical Discussion on the Word *Hion* // Nottingham Mediaeval Studies. 1995. Vol. 39. P. 19–25.
- Textus Roffensis. Rochester Cathedral Library, ms. A. 3. 5 / Ed. by P. H. Sawyer. Copenhagen, 1962–1957. Vol. 1–2.
- The University of Manchester Library (LUNA) // <https://luna.manchester.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/Man4MedievalVC~4~4~990378~142729> (15.07.2021).
- Wormald P.* The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century. Oxford, 1999. Vol. 1. (a)
- Wormald P.* In Search of King's Offa "Law-Code" // *Wormald P.* Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image and Experience. London; Rio Grande, 1999. P. 201–223. (b)

### Информация об авторе

МИХАИЛ ВЯЧЕСЛАВОВИЧ ЗЕМЛЯКОВ  
 Кандидат исторических наук, доцент Школы исторических наук Факультета гуманитарных наук НИУ ВШЭ, Москва  
 Российская Федерация, 101000, Москва, ул. Мясницкая, д. 20  
 e-mail:  
 Der-Schwarze-Obelisk@yandex.ru

### Information about the author

MIKHAIL V. ZEMLYAKOV  
 PhD, Assistant Professor, School of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, National Research University, Higher School of Economics  
 Russian Federation, 101000, Myasnitskaya str. 20  
 e-mail:  
 Der-Schwarze-Obelisk@yandex.ru