Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma*

Zelotes and *elnvnges*: The Extension of Genitive Singular -*es* in the Gloss to the Durham Collectar

Abstract: The aim of this article is to study the extension of genitive singular -*es* from the *a*-stems to other noun classes in the gloss to the Durham Collectar (Durham, Cathedral Library, A.iv.19). To this end a quantitative analysis of sixty-five nouns has been carried out in contexts where they gloss a Latin genitive form. The nouns have been selected on the basis that their etymological inflection for the genitive singular is other than -*es*, and they consist of feminine nouns (nouns ending in -*ung*, nouns ending in -*ness*, *ō*-stems, *i*-stems), kinship *r*-stems and weak nouns or *n*-stems. The results of the analysis of the Durham Collectar are compared with those found in the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, British Library, Nero D.iv) with three main purposes: first, to determine the degree of similarity between the two glosses; second, to establish whether Durham is more conservative or not with regard to this feature, and finally, to contribute to the discussion on the question of authorship.

1 Introduction

1.1 Glosses to the Durham Collectar and to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Authorship and Relationship

Some scholars have argued that the Aldred that glossed the Lindisfarne Gospels is not the same as the one who glossed the Durham Collectar. Skeat (1877–1879), for example, does not think that all the glosses in the latter are in one hand and remarks that "there is nothing to connect this Aldred with the Aldred, son of Tilwine, who glossed the Lindisfarne MS" (55).[1] Similarly, Lindelöf (1927) notes

---

[1] With regard to the date of the Durham Collectar, Skeat notes that it cannot be later than the close of the tenth century. In a footnote he adds that Dr. Murray and Mr. Maunde Thompson

Corresponding author: Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma, University of Sevilla
E-Mail: nrodriguez@us.es

that there are differences in the writing of some letters, such as <ð>, as well as sufficient divergences in spelling, use of abbreviations, grammar and vocabulary "to render it highly improbable that they could be the work of the same man" (lii). Ker (1943), however, remarks that "the similarities are obvious" (8), the linguistic differences "slight" (10), and that the differences in appearance may be attributed to the formality of the gloss to the Gospels (9). Based on palaeographical evidence, he concludes that the gloss to the Gospels and the gloss to the Ritual [Durham Collectar] are the work of the same scribe, and he identifies Aldred the son of Alfred with Aldred the Provost (11–12).[2] Other scholars who identify Aldred as the glossator of both Lindisfarne and Durham include Brown et al. (1969), Jones (1970), Ross (1970, 1978, 1982) and, more recently, Jolly (2016) and Roberts (2016).

Although written later, the gloss to the Durham Collectar has been shown to be more conservative than that to the Lindisfarne Gospels. Ross describes five points in which Durham is more conservative: the retention of the dative singular in -e in what he refers to as the 'Type α' declension (Ross 1960: 39); the maintenance of the distinction between the third person singular present indicative and the plural present indicative (*gefeð*, -*es* vs. *geafað*, -*as*), and between the infinitive and the present subjunctive as regards the vowels of the inflections (*geafa* vs. *gefe*); the absence of *ðy* for the feminine form of the demonstrative; the retention of -*ð* (vs. -*s*) in the third singular and plural present indicative of the verb,[3] and the virtual absence of -*e*- in the preterite of verbs of the second weak class, -*a*- being the normal form (Ross 1970: 363–364). On the other hand, he mentions two features in which Durham is less conservative than Lindisfarne: in the *n*-stems, -*e* for -*a* is much more frequent than in Lindisfarne, and in the present subjunctive -*a* for -*e* is also more frequent (365). As a possible explanation, he argues that some of the conservatisms may be due to West Saxon influence, since the colophon to Durham was written at Oakley, between Salisbury and Blandford, and others to the fact that, when glossing Durham, Aldred had "settled down" and decided which variants to favour among those he had at his disposal (365–366).

---

conclude that the glosses are not by the same hand and that the Ritual gloss is "somewhat *earlier* than that of the Gospels" (1877–1879: 55).

2 For a more detailed account of the controversy concerning the identity of the glossator, cf. Brown et al. (1969: 23–29).

3 Although *s*-forms are also found in Durham, they are proportionately much rarer than in Lindisfarne. Ross (1970: 364) gives the following figures, based on Blakeley (1949–1950): 1519 *ð*-forms and 1441 *s*-forms in Lindisfarne, as against 331 *ð*-forms and 48 *s*-forms in Durham. See also Cole (2014) for the distribution of these forms in Lindisfarne.

1.2 Previous Studies on the Genitive

Previous studies on the gloss include general remarks on the genitive. In his study on the development of the grammatical category of gender in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and to the Durham Collectar, Jones (1967) focuses on modifiers, rather than nouns. He remarks that the theory of 'neutralization' put forward by Ross (1936) to account for the unhistorical use of the *þ* form in these glosses is "not sufficiently powerful" (1967: 101), and observes a tendency for the inflections *-ne*, *-(e)s* and *-(u)m* to spread in the accusative, genitive and dative cases respectively, regardless of the etymological gender of the noun (102). His hypothesis is that "at this period there appears to be a developing tendency for the language to generate sentences the relation of whose parts is characterized by the use of certain inflexional types of pre and post head modifiers regardless of the gender of the head word itself in each case" (102).

With regard to the genitive, Jones (1967: 105) observes an overwhelming use of the *-(e)s* form of both pre- and post-head modifiers with historically feminine nouns in Lindisfarne, "a spread which was probably analogous to a similar one in the genitive inflexion of the head word in the nominal group itself" (105–106). Feminine forms of modifiers, however, are also attested in this gloss with historically masculine and neuter nouns so that "at least for a time, both *-(e)s* and *-re* forms were being used as markers of possessive relationships between nominal groups" (106).[4]

The situation in Durham with regard to the genitive, however, is different in two respects (Jones 1967: 108): on the one hand, the spread of the *-(e)s* form of modifiers to indicate the possessive relationship between nominal groups of all genders is found to a greater extent than in Lindisfarne. On the other, there is no spread in this gloss of genitive *-re* forms with historically masculine and neuter nouns.[5] These two factors seem to indicate that the generalization of *-(e)s* as possessive marker has advanced one step further in Durham.

---

4 The figures for the genitive singular of the definite article in Lindisfarne are the following:
a) with etymologically masculine nouns: 89 tokens of *ðæs* and 5 tokens of *ðære*;
b) with etymologically feminine nouns: 14 tokens of *ðæs* and 7 tokens of *ðære*;
c) with etymologically neuter nouns: 34 tokens of *ðæs* and 5 tokens of *ðære* (Jones 1967: 111).

5 The figures for the genitive singular of all modifiers in Durham are the following:
a) with etymologically masculine nouns: 138 tokens of *-(e)s* forms and 0 tokens of *-re*;
b) with etymologically feminine nouns: 73 tokens of *-(e)s* forms and 40 tokens of *-re*;
c) with etymologically neuter nouns: 53 tokens of *-(e)s* forms and 0 tokens of *-re* (Jones 1967: 111).

Focusing more specifically on nouns, Ross (1971: 57) remarks with regard to the *s*-genitive that "analogical extension is wide-spread in Ritual as in L[indisfarne]" and gives examples of nouns belonging to different declensions, such as: *gefes*, *frofres*, *ricsunges*, *sibbes*, *dedes*, *lichomes*, *earðes*, instead of the etymologically expected forms *gefe*, *frofre*, *ricsunga*, *sibbe*, *dede*, *lichoma(n)*, *earða(n)* (57).[6] However, he points out a difference between the two glosses regarding the nouns ending in -*ness*: in Durham the genitive singular in -*es* coexists with that in -*e*, and he remarks that "here, in contradistinction to his practice in L[indisfarne], Aldred has no feeling against -*es*" (1971: 56).[7]

1.3 Aims and Methodology

This article offers a quantitative study of the genitive singular inflection in the gloss to the Durham Collectar. In a previous work on the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels I focused on zero or uninflected genitives and on the word order of adnominal genitives, and showed that the gloss is innovative at the morphological level, as shown in the extension of genitive singular -*es* from the *a*-stems to other noun classes, including proper nouns, which tend to add -*es* regardless of the gender of the name and of the ending of the Latin original (Rodríguez Ledesma 2016).

The aim of this article is to establish the actual scale on which this phenomenon – the extension of genitive singular -*es* from the *a*-stems to other noun classes – is found in the gloss to the Durham Collectar. It is in line with Jones' work on modifiers (1967), but focuses on nouns and, although mainly descriptive, it suggests some factors which may have conditioned the choice of a particular inflection (etymological vs. innovative -*es*) in some cases.

To this end a quantitative analysis of sixty-five nouns has been carried out in contexts where they gloss a Latin genitive form. The nouns have been selected on the basis that their etymological ending for the genitive singular is other than -*es*, and they consist of feminine nouns (nouns ending in -*ung*, nouns ending in -*ness*, *ō*-stems, *i*-stems), kinship *r*-stems and weak nouns or *n*-stems. A reading of some sections of the text (Lindelöf 1927) revealed examples of the extension of genitive

---

6 With regard to Lindisfarne, Ross (1937: 99) remarks that the ending of the genitive singular -*es* "was extended to practically all classes" and gives the following examples: *lufes*, *saules*, *sibbes*, *brydes*, *oxes*, *widues*. He adds that "in all these classes this must be considered as the normal form of the gen. sg. though older forms are often preserved also" (1937: 99).
7 In her study of the reshaping of the nominal morphology in early Northern West Germanic, Adamczyk (2018) also deals with the extension of the genitive singular ending -*es* to other nouns in Old English.

singular *-es* to feminine and weak nouns, and these were supplemented by other nouns included in Lindelöf's glossary (1901) which did not originally belong to the *a*-stems and were attested in the genitive singular in the gloss.

The *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* (hereafter *DOEC*), based on Lindelöf's edition, has been used to collect the data.[8] The original idea was to collate all the tokens with the facsimile copy of the manuscript (Brown et al. 1969), but the quality of the facsimile, although good for the Latin text, is not so for the gloss and many sections are not readable.[9] All the tokens have nevertheless been checked with Lindelöf's edition (1927), which is quite faithful to the manuscript.[10] Lindelöf (1923) and Squires (1971) have also been used.

With regard to the methodology and because of the wealth of spelling and morphological variants attested in the gloss, the *DOEC* was searched for the Latin genitive form of the nouns which form the basis of the present study. Thus, for the kinship *r*-stems, the terms of search were L. *patris*, *matris*, *fratris*, *sororis* and *filiae*. In those instances in which the Latin noun has the same form for several cases (nominative and genitive *natalis*, genitive and dative *misercordiae*), a careful examination of the syntax and the context of all the examples obtained was necessary in order to identify the genitive forms. Following the *DOEC*, the examples given throughout the article offer both the Northumbrian gloss and the Latin text, to which a word-for-word translation has been added.

A problem for this study is posed by the numerous abbreviations and contractions found in Durham,[11] and by the fact that "the glossator does not seem to have followed any clear principle with regard to the PLACE he gives the waved stroke when used as a general mark of abbreviation or contraction" (Lindelöf 1927: 204). In the case of nouns ending in *-nisse*, for example, the abbreviation mark is sometimes placed over the <s>, sometimes over the <i>, sometimes over the <n>, and often it covers two or more letters (Lindelöf 1927: 204).

There are also numerous instances in which the glossator used an abbreviation mark without any apparent reason. Among the examples Lindelöf (1927: 205)

---

8 The title abbreviations and editions of all the Old English texts mentioned in this article are those employed by the *DOEC*.

9 As Campbell (1973: 259) remarks: "On the plates the Latin text is usually clear, but the gloss, which is to Anglo-Saxon scholars the most interesting item in the manuscript, is often obscure, sometimes totally illegible".

10 Cf. Squires (1971: 362): "In preparing this collation I have made a transcript of the manuscript [...] and this has shown how very reliable is the standard edition by U. Lindelöf, *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*".

11 Cf. Brown et al.'s (1969: 26) remark: "In the 'Ritual' gloss, as one would expect in a liturgical text in which formulas are often repeated, Aldred makes more use of capricious abbreviation".

gives to illustrate this "irrational use of the waved stroke", he mentions the placing of a curl over one of the last letters of some genitive singular forms ending in *-es*, such as *gidvoles* (34.14), *hæles* (35.4), *wætmes* (105.9) or *ymbstondennisses* (182.9). Squires (1973: 405) remarks that "certain forms and certain cases seem particularly prone to be misabbreviated", the genitive singular being among these, with about twenty per cent of the instances found. According to her, "the fact that the glossator seems to be selective in his errors would suggest [...] that there is some reason for his tendency to make them" (405–406), and she puts forward the hypothesis that an awareness of the variation existing in the genitive singular inflection may have caused the glossator "either to make mistakes or to express the termination as vaguely as possible, because he was uncertain of the correct form" (407).

The presentation and analysis of the data is organized as follows: feminine nouns are studied first (2), and they are subdivided into four categories: nouns ending in *-ung* (2.1), nouns ending in *-ness* (2.2), ō-stems (2.3) and feminine *i*-stems (2.4). Kinship *r*-stems are analysed in (3) and weak nouns or *n*-stems in (4). The genitive singular of some adjectives is studied in (5) and finally some conclusions are provided in (6). In each section the results of the analysis of Durham are compared with those found in Lindisfarne with three main purposes: to determine the degree of similarity between the two glosses, to establish whether Durham is more conservative or not with regard to the genitive singular inflection and, finally, to contribute to the discussion on the question of authorship.

2 Feminine Nouns

2.1 Nouns Ending in *-ung*

These nouns belong to the historical ō-stems. Hogg and Fulk (2011: 28) note that there are two important processes of derivation associated with ō-stems. The first, which is very frequent, forms deverbal nouns by adding the suffixes *-ung/-ing*. The suffix *-ung* dominates in derivatives of weak verbs of class II, and the suffix *-ing* in derivatives of strong verbs and of weak verbs of class I (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 29; see also Campbell 1959: 158).

In North Northumbrian these nouns often take *-es* in the genitive singular, with these forms outnumbering instances with *-a*, but the same is not true of South Northumbrian (i.e. Rushworth[2]) (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 111). In Lindisfarne there are also examples of nominative and accusative plural forms ending in *-as*, such as *ebolsungas* 'blasphemies' (2011: 112, n. 3). Ross (1971: 54) also notes the form *bloedsungas* in Lindisfarne.

Table 1[12] gives the list of nouns belonging to this group which are attested in the genitive singular in Durham, together with the Latin form they gloss, and the number of occurrences of the different inflections.

Table 1: Genitive singular of nouns ending in *-ung*

	n *-s*	n *-a/e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
bloedsvng (L. *benedictio*, *-onis*)	3	–	1	4
eftniwvng[13] (L. *reparatio*, *-onis*)	2	–	–	2
forescea(w)vng (L. *providentia*, *-ae*)	1	–	–	1
hvoerflvnges[14] (L. *vicissitudinis*)	1	–	–	1
ricsvng (L. *dominatio*, *-onis*)	2	–	–	3[15]
somnvng (L. *congregatio*, *-onis*)	1	–	–	1
ðingvng (L. *intercessio*, *-onis*)	1	–	1	2
ðrovng (L. *martyrium*, *-ii*, L. *passio*, *-onis*)[16]	13	–	–	13

---

12 In the Tables the forms are given in accordance with the relevant headword in Lindelöf's glossary (1901). All the examples throughout the article are actual attestations that reflect the special graphematic and spelling conventions of Durham.

13 The only examples of the spelling <*eft-*> given in Bosworth and Toller (BT) and the *Dictionary of Old English* (*DOE* s.v. *eftniwung*) are those from Durham. The form *edniwung* is attested in other texts, including Lindisfarne (gloss to Matthew) (*DOE* s.v. *edniwung*).

14 In Lindelöf's glossary (1901), based on Stevenson (1840), the headword is *echvoerflvnges*, but in his edition it is amended to *hvoerflvnges* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 28.6). The genitive form is the only attestation of this noun in Durham.

15 Besides the two inflected forms, there is also one token in which the genitive is uninflected: *in ælcvm stove ricsvng ðæs* (DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 171.9). It is found in the same context as the other two examples, glossing L. *in omni loco dominationis ipsius* 'in every place of your kingdom'. Lindelöf (1901: 179) wonders whether it is the nominative singular ("ns. (?) – 171, 9"), but I think it could be considered an example of a zero genitive, this being a feature of Northern dialects and attested, for example, in Lindisfarne (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016).

16 Seven tokens of OE *ðrovng* gloss L. gen. *passionis*, and one glosses L. ablat. *passione* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 23.3). Four tokens gloss L. gen. *martyrii*, and one glosses ablat. *martyrio* (DurRitGl

Table 1: (continued)

	n *-s*	n *-a/e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
worðvng (L. *honor*, *-oris*)	3	–	–	3
wvldrvng (L. *glorificatio*, *-onis*)	1	–	–	1
Total	**28** **(90.32 %)**	–	**2** **(6.45 %)**	**31**

As can be seen in the table, no example with the etymological inflection is attested for the genitive of these nouns in Durham, and very few instances are found with an abbreviation mark. On the contrary, they tend to take the analogical ending *-es* whenever they are found in the genitive singular: 28 out of a total of 31 occurrences (90.32 %).

Most of these nouns are found glossing Latin nouns belonging to the third declension, whose genitive singular ends in *-is*; so there is the possibility of influence of the Latin inflection (the <s> in Latin triggering an <s> in Old English). However, *-es* is also found when rendering Latin nouns ending in a vowel, as is the case with *f'esceavnges*, glossing L. *providentiae*, and *ðrovnges*, which is found four times glossing L. *martyrii*.

In a few examples the noun is modified by a possessive or a demonstrative, following Latin. In some of these instances, the analogical genitive form ending in *-es* is modified by the feminine form of the possessive, with no internal gender agreement within the noun phrase. This is the case with *somnvng*:

> (1) gimyndig voes ðv somnvnges ðinræ þ ðv gisceope fro' frvma
> *Memor esto congregationis tuæ quam creasti ab initio*
> 'Be mindful of your congregation, whom you created from the beginning'
> DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 173.2

In other instances, however, the possessive also takes the ending *-es*. This is the case with *bloedsvng*: there are three tokens of the noun phrase *bloetsvnges ðines gefe*, twice glossing L. *benedictionis tue gratiam* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 81.20, 91.19), and once glossing L. *benedictionis tuae dono* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 95.6).[17] The

---

1 [Thomp-Lind] 80.8). In the two cases in which it glosses a Latin ablative, there may have been some confusion because it is preceded by nouns in the genitive.

17 The example in which the abbreviated form is found is also modified by the possessive *ðines*: *ðines bloeds'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 121.14). In other contexts, when glossing an ablative, this

noun *forescea(w)vng* is also modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the possessive in the genitive singular: *f'esceavnges ðines*, glossing L. *prouidentie tuę* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 110.8).[18]

In Durham, therefore, *-es* has been generalized as the genitive singular inflection of feminine nouns ending in *-ung*, to the extent that no example of the etymological ending is attested in the gloss. This inflection, which originally marked jointly case and gender, is now being used as a grammatical function marker (genitive case), and can be added to both the noun and the possessive in a noun phrase (as in the last examples) or just to the noun (as in (1)).[19] The generalization of *-es* as a marker of genitive singular can clearly be seen with the example which gives the title to this article: *elnvnges*, glossing L. *zelotes* (DurRitGlAbbrev 192.4). This form is somewhat curious, since the base form *elnvng* is attested rendering L. *zelus* (DurRitGlAbbrev 192.3). There seems to have been a mistake by the scribe, since *zelus* and *zelotes* are not forms of the same noun in Latin, but are glossed as though they were, probably because in the dialect of the glossator the ending *-es* has become a marker of genitive singular, regardless of gender and declension class, and that has been applied to Latin as well.[20]

In Lindisfarne two of these nouns are attested in the genitive: *ðrouung* (3x) and *somnung* (2x),[21] and both take the analogical ending in all instances: *ðrounges*, *ðrouunges*, *ðrowunges*, *somnunges*.

2.2 Nouns Ending in *-ness*

These nouns were historically *jō*-stems, the abstract suffix *-ness* being the most frequent *jō*-stem suffix (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 33). This is the usual form in West

---

noun is also modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the adjective: *ælcvm bloedsvnge gastlicv'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 110.13).

18 When glossing an ablative, this noun is also modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the possessive: *f'esceavvnge ðinv'*, glossing L. *prouidentia tua* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 108.12).

19 This is in line with Jones's results concerning determiners and modifiers in Lindisfarne and Durham (1967 and 1987).

20 Cf. *DOE* s.v. *elnung* 3.: "in an anomalous gloss: glossing *zelotes* 'one that loves with jealousy, one that is jealous' apparently as if a form of *zelus* 'zeal, fervour' – DurRitGlAbbrev 192.4b: *zelotes* **elnvnges** (the glossator seems to have taken the Lat. as gen. of the preceding word *zelus* [...]; perhaps the *s* in *elnunges* shows the influence of the Lat. ending)".

21 The Old English forms in Lindisfarne are given in accordance with the relevant headword in Ross and Stanley's glossary (1960). The inflected forms reflect the exact spellings attested in the gloss.

Saxon, whereas -*niss* prevails in Anglian (Campbell 1959: 158; Hogg and Fulk 2011: 34). Another dialectal difference is that in West Saxon the final geminate consonants were shortened, but in Northumbrian they were regularly retained (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 116).

These nouns are declined regularly like *synn*. However, Campbell (1959: 239) notices that already in early texts, -*nesse* is sometimes extended to the nominative singular (Vespasian Psalter, early West Saxon), and later this is especially frequent in Rushworth[1] and Northumbrian. Hogg and Fulk (2011: 116) give -*nisse* as the normal form of the nominative singular in Northumbrian, and remark that "whatever the origin of this use of -*e*, it is clear and significant that the result is that the nouns are invariant in the singular, in which they mostly appear".

Table 2 gives the list of nouns belonging to this class which are attested in the genitive singular in Durham, together with the Latin form they gloss, and the number of occurrences of the different inflections:

Table 2: Genitive singular of nouns ending in -*ness*

	n -*s*	n -*e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
acennisse (L. *nativitas, -atis*, L. *natalis, -is*)	1	–	1[22]	2
arfæstnisse (L. *pietas, -atis*)	–	1	15	16
bihaldennisse (L. *observantia, -ae*, L. *continentia, -ae*)	2	–	1[23]	3
bilvitnisse (L. *sinceritas, -atis*)	1	–	–	1
brehtnisse (L. *claritas, -atis*)	1	–	–	1
eftacennisse (L. *regeneratio, -onis*)	1	–	–	1
eðnisse (L. *prosperitas, -atis*)	1	–	–	1

---

22 The abbreviated form, *acennise′*, seems to stand for -*es*; the etymological ending is -*e*, and therefore there would be no need for a mark of abbreviation.

23 The abbreviated form, *bihaldennise′*, seems to stand for -*es*.

Table 2: (continued)

	n -*s*	n -*e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
gicyðnisse (L. *testamentum*, -*i*)	1	–	1	2
gilesnisse (L. *redemptio*, -*onis*)	1	–	–	1[24]
giondetnisse (L. *confessio*, -*onis*)	1	–	–	1[25]
giscildnisse (L. *defensio*, -*onis*, L. *tuitio*, -*onis*)	3	1	–	4
giselenisse (L. *traditio*, -*onis*, L. *donatio*, -*onis*)	1	1	–	2
hernisse (L. *ministerium*, -*ii*, L. *officium*, -*ii*, L. *mysterium*, -*ii*)	1	–	2	3
hygdignisse (L. *castitas*, -*atis*)	1	–	1[26]	2
miltheartnisse (L. *misericordia*, -*ae*)	1	2	1	4
scildnisse (L. *protectio*, -*onis*, L. *defensio*, -*onis*)	2	1	2	5
soðfæstnisse (L. *justitia*, -*ae*, L. *veritas*, -*atis*)	2	–	2	4
svoetnisse (L. *suavitas*, -*atis*)	2	–	–	2
symbelcennisse (L. *natalis*, -*is*)	–	–	1[27]	1

---

24 This is the only example of this noun found in Durham and the only one included in BT.

25 As in the previous case, this is the only example of this noun found in Durham and the only one included in BT and *DOE* s.v. *geandetnes*.

26 The form with the abbreviation mark is found in a double gloss (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 77.16). The other noun also has an abbreviation mark: *clæn'*.

27 All the occurrences of this noun in Durham, except for one, are abbreviated forms.

Table 2: (continued)

	n *-s*	n *-e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
tedernisse (L. *fragilitas*, *-atis*)	1	1	2[28]	4
vnrehtnisse (L. *iniquitas*, *-atis*)	–	1	–	1
vnrehtvisnisse (L. *iniquitas*, *-atis*)	1	–	–	1
ymbstondennisse (L. *circumstantia*, *-ae*)	–	1	1[29]	2
Total	**25** **(39.06 %)**	**9** **(14.06 %)**	**30** **(46.87 %)**	**64**

As can be seen, abbreviated forms for the genitive of these nouns are the most frequent ones in Durham (46.87 %), followed by forms with *-es* (39.06 %), and finally by forms with the etymological ending (14.06 %). The extension of *-es*, therefore, is not so advanced as in the previous group of nouns, probably because of "a tendency to avoid forms in *-es* in these words with *s* in the stem" (Ross 1937: 73). However, since, as stated before, the normal form of the nominative singular of these nouns in Northumbrian is *-nisse* (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 116), the tokens of *-e* in the genitive singular could also be regarded as examples of a zero genitive.

In the case of the abbreviated forms, some could stand for either the etymological ending *-e* or *-es*, but others seem to stand for *-es*. This can be seen with *arfæstnisse*, most of the occurrences of this noun in the genitive having an abbreviation mark (15x out of 16x): *arfæstnis'* (7x), *arfæst'* (7x), *arfæstnise'* (1x). The first two can stand for either the etymological ending or *-es*, whereas the last abbreviated form seems to stand for *-es*.[30]

---

28 In one of these examples the abbreviated form is modified by the historically masculine/ neuter form of the adjective: *mennisces tedernise'*, glossing L. *humane fragilitatis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 106.7).

29 The form found is *ymbstondennisses'* (DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 182.8–9), with an abbreviation mark. Squires (1973: 407) remarks that "there are several cases of *-nis(se)* nouns being falsely abbreviated", and puts forward the hypothesis that in these instances the abbreviation might not refer to the inflection, but might be used "like the suprascript letter to give *nise uel nisse* or (perhaps more carelessly) *nisse uel nise*" (408).

30 For the problem of the interpretation of some of these abbreviations, cf. Squires (1973: 406–408).

In some instances the grammatical context seems to have conditioned the choice of a particular inflection: etymological vs. innovative *-es*. That is the case with *miltheartnisse*: the two examples of this noun which take the etymological ending *-e* in the genitive singular gloss a Latin noun phrase containing the possessive *tuæ* and are modified by the feminine form of the possessive in Old English, *ðinræ*:

(2) glædnise ł gifea ðinræ miltheartnise
    gaudium tuæ misericordiæ
    'the gladness of thy mercy'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 41.3

(3) 7 æft' monigfaldnis' miltheartnise ðinræ
    et secundum multitudinem misericordiae tuae
    'and according to the abundance of thy mercy'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 125.10

Interestingly, the only example of this noun which takes the genitive singular inflection *-es* glosses the Latin noun not modified by any possessive or demonstrative:

(4) svoelce gicoreno godes hælgo 7 gileafo innaðo miltheartnisses
    sicut electi dei sancti et dilecti uiscera misericordiæ
    'as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercy'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 13.17

This is also the case with the nouns *vnrehtvisnisse* and *vnrehtnisse*: the example with the etymological ending glosses a Latin noun phrase containing a possessive and is preceded by the feminine form of the possessive in Old English:

(5) earnvnge vsræ vnrehtvise
    merito nostrę iniquitatis
    'on account of our iniquity'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 42.14

By contrast, the token with the genitive singular inflection *-es* glosses the Latin noun without a modifier:

(6) bearn vnrehtnises
    filius iniquitatis
    'the son of iniquity'
                     DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 174.5

Examples (2) to (6) illustrate that the feminine forms of the possessive, both *ðinræ* and *vsræ*, trigger the etymological inflection *-e* as against innovative *-es*. In those cases in which there is no possessive, however, the noun takes *-es*.

As with the previous group (nouns ending in *-ung*), in some instances in which the noun is modified by a possessive, the latter takes the etymological inflection (feminine *ðinræ*), as in the following:

(7) milsa ł ðinræ arfæstnis'
     miseratio tuæ pietatis
     'the pitifulness of thy mercy'
                         DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 40.12

(8) arfæstnise' ðinræ gefe
     pietatis tuę gratiam
     'the gift of thy mercy'
                         DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 42.14

In other cases, however, the possessive takes the ending *-es*:[31]

(9) gifyll arfæstnis' ðines vnasægcgendlic clæne giryno
     inple pietatis tuæ ineffabile sacramentum
     'fill the ineffable mystery of thy mercy'
                         DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 33.4

(10) respice arfæstnis' ðines vnasægcgendlic clæne giryno
     biseh pietatis tuae ineffabile sacramentum
     'behold the ineffable mystery of thy mercy'
                         DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 35.7–8

In examples (7) to (10) it is the possessive that unambiguously marks the grammatical function of the noun phrase, since the noun takes an abbreviation mark. In Durham, therefore, when the possessive is marked for genitive case, either with etymological *-re* or with innovative *-es*, there is no need for genitive marking in the noun and an abbreviated form is often found.[32] Nonetheless, there are also instances in which both the noun and the possessive are marked for genitive and take *-es*:

---

31 In the case of *arfæstnisse*, there are 12 examples glossing a Latin noun phrase containing a possessive: *tuę pietatis* 'of your mercy'. In six of them the noun is modified by the feminine form of the possessive *ðinræ*, and in four by the historically masculine/neuter form: *ðines arfæstnis'*.

32 This also applies to the dative, as illustrated by *f'e ðinv' arfæst'*, glossing L. *pro tua pietate* 'for your mercy' (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 103.8): unambiguous marking of the dative case is provided by the possessive *ðinv'* and the noun takes an abbreviation mark, *arfæst'*.

(11) lehtv' ðines brehtnises
　　 lumine tuæ claritatis
　　 'with the light of thy brightness'
　　　　　　　　　　DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 15.4

(12) scildnises³³ ðines gefe
　　 protectionis tuæ gratiam
　　 'the gift of thy protection'
　　　　　　　　　　DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 17.15–16

(13) scildnisses ðines fvltvme
　　 protectionis tuae auxilio
　　 'with the help of thy protection'
　　　　　　　　　　DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 64.9

Not only possessives, but also adjectives may take the ending *-es* when modifying some of these feminine nouns, as illustrated in the following: *bihaldennisses halges*, glossing L. *obseruantiæ sanctę* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 16.9–10); *gicyð-niss' æces*, glossing L. *testamenti æterni* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 27.19); *aldes 7 nives gicyðnisses*, glossing L. *ueteris ac noui testamenti* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 113.8); *fadorlices giselenisses*, glossing L. *paterne traditionis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 24.19–20) or *mennisces tedernise'*, glossing L. *humanę fragilitatis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 106.7).

In some instances there is no internal gender agreement within the noun phrase, as in *heofonlices gescildnisse*, which glosses L. *cælestis defensionis* (Dur-RitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 145.12–13): the noun takes the etymological inflection *-e*, but is modified by a historically masculine/neuter form of the adjective which unambiguously marks genitive case. This lack of agreement is also found in cases other than the genitive, as in (14), where the noun is modified by historically masculine/neuter forms of the possessive and the adjective, which unambiguously mark dative case:

(14) in ðinv' scildnise [...] ecelicv' giscildnisse³⁴
　　 in tua protectione [...] perpetua defentione
　　 'in thy protection [...] in eternal protection'
　　　　　　　　　　DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 38.17–19

---

33 There are four tokens of this noun glossing L. *protectionis tuæ* 'of your protection', and in all of them the possessive is glossed as *ðines*. In two of these examples the noun takes *-es* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 17.15 and 64.9), in the other two it has an abbreviation mark: *scildnise', scildnis'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 54.5 and 97.8).

34 Similar examples are: *ecelicv' giscildnise*, glossing L. *perpetua defentione* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 62.1) and *of ðinv' giscildnise*, glossing L. *de tua protectione* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 106.8).

As with the previous group, many of these nouns are found glossing Latin forms ending in *-is*; so there is the possibility of influence of the Latin inflection (the <s> in Latin triggering an <s> in Old English). This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the following example:

> (15) no in daerstv' aldv' ne æc in dærstv' yfelgiornisse 7 vnwisnise ah on dærstv' ł on ðearfv' bilvitnises 7 soðfæstnises
> *non in fermento ueteri neque in fermento malitiæ et nequitiæ sed in azymis sinceritatis et ueritatis*
> 'not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth'
>
>   DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 25.9–11

There are four nouns in the genitive: those glossing a Latin form ending in a vowel end in a vowel as well (*-e*, the etymological inflection): *yfelgiornisse* and *vnwisnise*, glossing L. *malitiæ* and *nequitiæ*. By contrast, those glossing a Latin noun whose genitive ends in *-is* take *-es*: *bilvitnises* and *soðfæstnises*, glossing L. *sinceritatis* and *ueritatis*.

Although influence of the Latin original is clear in (15), the inflection *-es* is also found when glossing Latin nouns whose genitive does not end in *-is*. This is the case with *bihaldennisses* (L. *observantiae*, *continentiae*), *gicyðnisses* (L. *testamenti*), *hernisses* (L. *ministerii*), *miltheartnisses* (L. *misericordiae*) and *soðfæstnises* (L. *iustitiae*).

Some of the nouns included in Table 2 above are attested in the genitive in Lindisfarne: *accenisse* (2x), *cyðnisse* (3x), *hernisse* (3x), *miltheartnisse* (1x), *selenisse* (3x), *soðfæstnisse* (3x), *unrehtuisnisse* (3x). Genitive singular forms in *-es* are attested for the following: *cyðnisse* (1x), *hernisse* (3x), *selenisse* (1x), *soðfæstnisse* (2x), *unrehtuisnisse* (3x). The main difference is that the nouns *accenisse* and *miltheartnisse* do not take *-es* in Lindisfarne, whereas they do in Durham (cf. example (4)), which confirms Ross' statement (1971: 56) quoted above, in Section 1.2. The extension of *-es* to these nouns, therefore, has advanced further in Durham.

2.3 *ō*-Stem Nouns

This group consists of the historical *ō*-stem nouns, including the *jō*- and *wō*-stems, and is the chief declension for feminine nouns in Old English. In Late West Saxon they have *-e* throughout the singular, except for the nominative (*-u*/-Ø), and *-a* throughout the plural, except for the dative (*-um*). Light-stemmed nouns also show examples of extension of *-u* throughout the singular: *gifu*, *lufu*, *talu*.

Hogg and Fulk (2011: 110, fn. 2) note that all the instances found are accusative singular, except for *lufu*, which is dative singular, and remark that they have not found any examples of -*u* for the genitive singular in Late West Saxon, "and this absence is probably not accidental". There is, however, one token of *lvfv* glossing L. *dilectionis* in Durham (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 95.13), which may be considered an example of a zero genitive, this being a feature of Northern dialects in Middle English and attested in late Northumbrian as well (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016).

Hogg and Fulk (2011: 109–210) also remark that in Late West Saxon nouns of this declension may occur with the genitive singular ending of the *a*-stems in a small number of idiomatic constructions, and give examples such as *helpes biddende*, *helpes tid*, *sybbes lufu*. In Durham, however, instances of -*es* genitives for these nouns are not restricted to idiomatic constructions, but are generalized, as can be seen in Table 3 below. This confirms Hogg and Fulk's observation that "a particular characteristic of NNbr is the widespread use of -*es* as the marker of the gen.sg., such forms greatly outnumbering instances with -*e*" (2011: 111). However, they argue that "this is not to be taken as a shift in gender, but rather the generalization of the -*es* inflexion outside the original *as*-declension" (*ibid.*).

Table 3 gives the list of *ō*-stem nouns which are attested in the genitive singular in Durham (excluding nouns with the suffixes -*ung* and -*ness*), together with the Latin form they gloss, and the number of occurrences of the different inflections:

Table 3: Genitive singular of the historical *ō*-stem class, including the *jō*- and *wō*-stems

	n -*s*	n -*e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
ældo (L. *aetas*, -*atis*)	2	–	1	3
gefe (L. *gratia*, -*ae*)	4	15	5[35]	24

---

35 Although some abbreviations could stand for either the etymological inflection -*e* or -*es*, others seem to stand for -*es*. This is the case with *gefe'*, which is attested five times glossing a genitive form. In two instances the noun is modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the modifier (*ðines*, DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 16.15; *ecelices*, DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 35.9), and in another two by the feminine form of the possessive, *ðinrae* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 98.5, 123.3). There is one token with no modifier.

Table 3: (continued)

	n *-s*	n *-e* (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
hælo (L. *salus*, *-utis*, L. *salvatio*, *-onis*)	12	–	4[36]	17[37]
lar (L. *consilium*, *-ii*)	1	–	–	1
lvfv[38] (L. *fides*, *fidei*, L. *dilectio*, *-onis*)	6	–	3[39]	10
rod (L. *crux*, *crucis*)	8	1	4	13
savel (L. *anima*, *-ae*)	9	–	–	9
sibb (L. *pax*, *pacis*)	12	–	–	12
snytro (L. *sapientia*, *-ae*)	4	–	1	5
strengo (L. *fortitudo*, *-inis*)	1	–	–	1

36 The abbreviated forms are *hæl'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 28.18), *hæles'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 35.4), *hælo'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 33.15) and *hæle'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 99.8). The second and the last forms probably stand for *hæles*, with the extension of *-es*. According to Squires, the form *hælo'* "might well seem convenient shorthand to the glossator for *hælo uel hæles* or *hæle*", the abbreviation mark indicating not variant spellings, but alternative grammatical forms (Squires 1973: 407).

37 There is also one token of *hælo*. Hogg & Fulk (2011: 111) notice that in the case of light stems, "the nom.acc.dat.sg. all most frequently show *-o*, which varies with *-u*, *-a*" and argue that "it seems possible that these case forms have fallen together and that the observable vowel variation is due to confusion amongst unstressed back vowels". They do not mention, however, that this vowel is also found in the genitive singular of these nouns in Northumbrian.

38 Originally OE *lufu* was a weak noun, but it was also declined according to the strong feminine declension (cf. Campbell 1959: 251). According to Hogg and Fulk (2011: 110, fn. 1), "in WS, *lufu* generally declines as an *a*-declension noun, but there is a minority of forms from the *an*-declension, most notably in the dat.sg. In Angl it declines as a member of the *an*-declension". In Durham, however, it does not decline as an *an*-declension noun, but shows extension of *-u* throughout the singular.

39 The abbreviated forms are *lvfe'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 49.12) and *lvfv'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 93.2, 93.3). As in the case of *hælo'* discussed above (cf. fn. 36), the form *lvfv'* may indicate variation in the genitive singular of this noun: *lvfv* or *lvfes*.

Table 3: (continued)

	n -s	**n -e (Etymological Inflection)**	**n Abbreviation**	**n Total**
synn (L. *peccatum*, *-i*)	2	–	1	3
ðiostre (L. *tenebra*, *-ae*)[40]	1	–	–	1
wræððo (L. *iracundia*, *-ae*, L. *indignatio*, *-onis*)	1	1	–	7[41]
Total	**63** **(59.43 %)**	**17** **(16.03 %)**	**19** **(17.92 %)**	**106**

As can be seen, forms with *-es* for the genitive of these nouns are dominant in Durham (63x, 59.43 %), followed by abbreviated forms (19x, 17.92 %), and finally by forms with the etymological inflection (17x, 16.03 %). Looking at the results more closely, however, there is one noun which stands out and behaves differently from the others in favouring the etymological inflection over innovative *-es*: *gefe*. So the results seem to be somewhat skewed.

As with the previous class, in some instances the grammatical context seems to have conditioned the choice of a particular inflection: *-e* vs. *-es*. This is the case with *gefe*, the noun which stands out in this group: all the examples which take etymological *-e* (15x) gloss a Latin noun modified by a possessive or an adjective. There are eight tokens glossing L. *gratiæ tuæ*, four of which are modified by the feminine form of the possessive: *gefe ðinrae* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 37.1, 37.20), *gefe ðinrę* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 71.20, 100.1). As illustrated in Section 2.2 above, the feminine form of the possessive (*ðinræ*) triggers the etymological inflection *-e* as against innovative *-es*. In the remaining four examples, the noun is modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the possessive, *ðines*, with no internal gender agreement within the noun phrase: *geafæ ðines* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 4.11), *gefe ðines* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 7.10, 8.4, 23.10). There are also six instances in which the noun takes the etymological inflection *-e* and

---

40 Campbell (1959) considers *þeostru* as an *ō*-stem noun, beside strong neuter *þeostre* (1959: 237). Lindelöf (1901: 203) does not give the gender of the noun.

41 There are also five forms ending in *-o*: *wræððo* (3x), *vræððo* (2x), which may be considered examples of zero or uninflected genitives (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016). These forms have been extended throughout the singular and are found glossing Latin accusative, genitive and ablative forms, both in Durham and Lindisfarne (cf. Ross 1971: 55).

is modified by an adjective ending in -es, as in: *gefe gastlices*, glossing L. *gratię spiritalis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 99.7–8) or *godcvndes gefe*, glossing L. *diuinę gratiæ* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 121.16). In all these examples it is the modifier, either with etymological -*re* or with innovative -*es*, that unambiguously marks the grammatical function of the noun phrase.

As against the 15 tokens of *gefe* with the etymological inflection in the genitive singular, there are four examples with -*es*: *gefes*. Two of them are modified by an adjective: *gefes heofonlices*, glossing L. *gratiæ celestis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 17.4), *heofonlic gefes*, glossing L. *caelestis gratiæ* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 69.7), and the other two have no modifier: *giselenise gefes*, glossing L. *donatione gratie* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 52.5), and *ðing gefes*, glossing L. *munus gratie* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 63.11).

In the case of *wræððo*, the six examples which take a vowel (as against -*es*) in the genitive singular gloss a Latin noun modified by the possessive *tuae*.[42] Four gloss L. *iram tuæ indignationis* and are modified by the feminine form of the possessive, *ðinræ* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 40.18, 41.8, 42.17, 43.12). The remaining two gloss L. *flagella tuae iracundiæ* and are modified by the historically masculine/neuter form of the possessive, *ðines*, with no gender agreement within the noun phrase (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 8.18, 15.13). As in the case of *gefe*, in these examples it is the possessive, either with etymological -*re* or with innovative -*es*, that unambiguously marks genitive singular.

Interestingly, the only instance of this noun which takes the genitive singular inflection -*es* glosses a Latin noun not modified by the possessive *tuae*:

(16) in tide wræððes
      in tempore iracundię
      'in time of wrath'
                          DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 88.4

As with *gefe* and *wræððo*, in the case of *rod* the only token with -*e* occurs when glossing a Latin noun modified by *tuae*, the possessive *ðinræ* triggering etymological -*e* (as against innovative -*es*):

(17) tacne ðære hælga rode ðinræ
      signo sanctę crucis tuae
      'with the sign of thy holy cross'
                          DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 120.5

---

42 The only token of genitive singular *lvfv* (ending in a vowel) is also found glossing a Latin noun modified by the possessive *tuae*: *lvfv ðinre*, glossing L. *dilectionis tuae* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 95.13).

As with the previous classes, the Latin original may have conditioned the choice of *-es* with some of these nouns, the <s> in Latin triggering an <s> in Old English. That could be the case with *hælo*, *rod* or *sibb*, which gloss Latin nouns whose genitive ends in *-is*: *salutis*, *crucis* and *pacis* respectively. In this line, it could be claimed that the high number of occurrences of etymological *-e* with *gefe* (15x) may be due to the fact that it does not gloss a Latin form ending in *-is*, but in a vowel (*gratiae*). However, as explained above, the grammatical context does play a role, since all these tokens are modified by a possessive or an adjective ending in *-re* or *-es* which unambiguously mark genitive case. Another reason for the high number of instances of etymological *-e* with *gefe* could be its frequency of occurrence, since frequent nouns tend to preserve historical forms and resist analogical processes.

Although *-es* has been generalized as the genitive singular marker of these nouns, they retain the etymological inflection ending in a vowel in the nominative and accusative plural, as illustrated by *lar*, which takes the ending *-o*; *savel*, with the forms *savlo*, *savelo*; *sibb*, with the form *sibba*; and *synn*, with the forms *synna*, *synno* (cf. Lindelöf 1901, s.vv.).

Seven of the nouns included in Table 3 above are attested in the genitive in Lindisfarne: *hælo* (2x), *lar* (1x), *lufu* (3x), *rod* (1x), *sauel* (3x), *sibb* (3x), *synn* (2x). Except for *lar*, genitive singular forms in *-es* are attested for all of them: *hælo* (*hæles* 1x, *hælo* 1x), *lufu* (*lufes* 2x, *lufæ* 1x), *rod* (*rodes* 1x), *sauel* (*saules* 3x), *sibb* (*sibbes* 2x, *sibb* 1x), *synn* (*synnes* 2x) (cf. Ross and Stanley 1960). Although the number of tokens is much lower than in Durham (15x vs. 65x), there is also a preference for *-es* in Lindisfarne: 11 instances, as against one of the etymological inflection, and three of uninflected genitive forms. Unfortunately, *gefe*, the noun which behaved differently from the others in favouring the etymological inflection over *-es* in Durham, is not attested in the genitive singular in Lindisfarne.

2.4 Feminine *i*-Stems

Although historically belonging to a different stem class, at a very early date the masculine and neuter *i*-stems adopted the inflections of the *a*-stems, and the feminines adopted the inflections of the ō-stems so that "even in early Old English, their membership in that stem class is primarily an historical fact rather than an indication of their structure in OE" (Hogg and Fulk 2011: 37).

Table 4 gives the feminine *i*-stems which are attested in the genitive singular in Durham, together with the Latin form they gloss, and the number of occurrences of the different inflections.

Table 4: Genitive singular of feminine *i*-stems

	n -s	n -e (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
æ (L. *lex*, *legis*)	2	–	–	2
ded (L. *actio*, *-onis*)	1	–	–	1
mæht (L. *potentia*, *-ae*, L. *virtus*, *-utis*)	3	–	1	4
portcvoen(e) (L. *meretrix*, *-icis*)	1	–	–	1
tid (L. *tempus*, *-oris*)	1	–	–	1
worvld (L. *saeculum*, *-i*)	2	–	1	4[43]
Total	**10** **(76.92 %)**	**–**	**2** **(15.38 %)**	**13**

Although few tokens of these nouns in the genitive singular are attested in Durham (13x), most of them take *-es* (10x, 76.92 %), no example having been found with the etymological inflection. Forms with abbreviation mark are also very scarce (2x, 15.38 %).

With regard to æ, Campbell notices that it has an indeclinable singular and nominative and accusative plural, genitive plural *æa*, and also accusative, genitive and dative singular *æwe*. Late Northumbrian has genitive singular *æs*, and in late West Saxon the form *æys* is once found (Campbell 1959: 244). Two forms are attested in Durham for the genitive singular of this noun: *æes* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 6.19) and *aes* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 100.7).

As with the previous classes, influence of the Latin original may be adduced to account for the *-es* tokens of some of these nouns, since most of them gloss Latin forms ending in *-is*. However, *-es* is also found glossing Latin nouns whose genitive ends in a vowel, as in the case of *vorvldes* (L. *seculi*) or *mæhtes* (L. *potentiae*).

---

43 There is also one token of a zero genitive: *in worvlde vorld*, glossing L. *in sæculum sæculi* (DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 169.3).

Four of these nouns are attested in the genitive in Lindisfarne: *ae* (19x), *maeht* (1x), *tid* (6x) and *uorold* (11x), and all of them take genitive singular forms in *-es*. In fact, all the tokens are with *-es* (36x), except for one instance of uninflected *ae*. In Lindisfarne the number of tokens is much higher than in Durham (37x vs. 13x), but in both glosses there is widespread extension of the genitive marker *-es* with these nouns, no example being attested with the etymological inflection.

3 Kinship *r*-Stems

In Durham only two nouns belonging to this declension are attested in the genitive singular: *moder* and *fæder*. The first is found only once, glossing L. *matris*, with the abbreviated form *moder'*. There are 17 occurrences of *fæder* glossing L. *patris*. In six instances the noun takes the ending *-es*: *fadores*. One example of a zero genitive, the etymological inflection for these nouns, is attested in Durham: *fador* (163.15) (Lindelöf 1923: 278). The remaining 10 tokens are abbreviated forms: *fador'* (7x), *fædor'* (1x), *fado'* (1x), *fęder'* (1x). Different variants alternate in the same contexts, as illustrated by the following:

> (18) on nome fador' 7 svn' 7 gast hal'
>   *in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*
>   'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit'
>   DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 116.6

> (19) on nome fadores 7 svnv' 7 gastes halges
>   *in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*
>   'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit'
>   DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 117.18

In Lindisfarne four nouns belonging to this declension are attested in the genitive: *fæder* (36x), *moder* (5x), *broðer* (10x), *sweoster* (1x). Genitive singular forms in *-es* are dominant for all except for *sweoster*: *fæder* (30x), *moder* (5x), *broðer* (8x) (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016: 217). Although with fewer occurrences and many more examples of abbreviated forms, there is also extension of the inflection *-es* to these nouns in Durham. With regard to the vowel of the unstressed syllable in the genitive singular forms of *fæder*, <o> is the norm in Durham (16x, as against 1x of <e>), as is the case in Lindisfarne as well (23x, as against 4x of <e>) (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016: 217). This confirms Hogg and Fulk's claim that in northern Northumbrian the usual form of the genitive singular of *fæder* is *fadores*, "with occasional syncopated forms and a few forms without inflexion" (2011: § 3.68, n. 3).

4 Weak Nouns or *n*-Stems

The genitive singular inflection of weak nouns was *-an*, but in late Northumbrian the final consonant was lost, with the result that forms ending in a vowel are found throughout the singular and in the nominative and accusative plural of these nouns. There is great fluctuation with regard to the vowel, and all <a, e, u, o, æ> occur. Hogg and Fulk also note that in Northumbrian weak nouns may acquire endings of the *a*-stems, such as *-as* in the nominative/accusative plural and *-es* in the genitive singular, the latter being "the commonest ending by far for the gen.sg. in both masc. and fem. nouns" (2011: 126).

Table 5 gives the weak nouns which are attested in the genitive singular in Durham, together with the Latin form they gloss and the number of occurrences of the different inflections. The first three nouns are feminine and the other three masculine.

Table 5: Genitive singular of weak nouns

	n *-s*	n Vowel (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
cirica (f.) (L. *ecclesia*, *-ae*)	2	4	1	7
earðe (f.) (L. *terra*, *-ae*)	4	5	1	10
nedre (f.) (L. *serpens*, *-tis*)	1	–	–	1
gidvola (m.) (L. *error*, *-is*, L. *ignorantia*, *-ae*)	3	–	1[44]	4
erendvreca (m.) (L. *apostolus*, *-i*)	1	–	–	1[45]
gileafa (m.) (L. *fides*, *-ei*)	2	–	–	2

---

44 The attested form is *gidvoles'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 34.13), with a "puzzling" abbreviation mark at the end which seems to be a mistake of the glossator; cf. remarks by Lindelöf (1927) and Squires (1973) above, in Section 1.3.

45 There are 18 tokens of the Latin genitive singular *apostoli* in Durham: 11x are not glossed, 6x are glossed with an abbreviated form of the borrowing (*apostol'* (2x), *apl'* (3x), *apost'* (1x)), and only one is glossed with the native word: *erendvrecæs* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 79.8).

Table 5: (continued)

	n *-s*	n Vowel (Etymological Inflection)	n Abbreviation	n Total
lichoma (m.) (L. *corpus*, *-oris*, L. *caro*, *carnis*)	16	1[46]	3	20
noma (m.) (L. *nomen*, *-inis*)	1	6	8	15
Total	**30** **(50 %)**	**16** **(26.66 %)**	**14** **(23.33 %)**	**60**

As can be seen in the table, forms with *-es* for the genitive of these nouns are the most frequent in Durham (30x, 50 %), followed by forms with the etymological ending (16x, 26.66 %), and finally by abbreviated forms (14x, 23.33 %). As in previous classes, some abbreviated forms seem to stand for the *-es* inflection: *gidvoles'* (1x), *earðe'* (1x) and *nome'* (6x), whereas others could stand for either the etymological or the *-es* ending: *nom'* (2x), *lichom'* (1x). With regard to forms like *nome'*, Squires (1973: 406–407) remarks that, although normally interpreted as *nomes*, genitive singular *nome* is also frequent in Durham, and therefore she considers the abbreviated mark as having the same effect as *nome*ˢ, signalling alternation, *nome uel nomes*, and producing variant inflectional forms (407).

Looking at the results more closely, not all nouns behave in the same way: those which are more frequent in the gloss favour the etymological inflection over *-es* (*cirica*, *earðe* and *noma*), the only exception being *lichoma*, with an overwhelming number of *-es* forms in the genitive (16x out of 20x). Another factor conditioning the choice of inflection may be the gender of the noun: the extension of *-es* may have taken place in masculine nouns earlier than in feminine ones. That could explain the behaviour of *cirica* and *earðe* (feminine), but not that of *noma* (masculine), with only one token of *-es*.[47]

As in previous classes, in some instances the grammatical context seems to have conditioned the choice of a particular inflection: etymological vs. innovative

---

46 The only token of the etymological form is found rendering a Latin noun modified by a possessive: *mið vser lichome bisene*, glossing L. *cum nostrę carnis substantia* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 4.13–14). In the same context the inflection *-es* is also found: *in vnstondennisse vser lichomes*, glossing L. *in substantia nostre carnis* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 2.9).

47 However, if the six tokens of *nome'* are interpreted as *nomes*, the instances of the etymological inflection and innovative *-es* would be roughly the same (6x vs. 7x).

-es. This is the case with *cirica*: in two of the examples with the etymological ending the noun is modified by the feminine form of the demonstrative, *ðære*:

>(20) f'e sibbe 7 haelo ðære cirica
>*Pro pace et sanitate æclessiæ*
>'For the peace and health of the church'
>   DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 176.6

>(21) ymb hadvm ðære cirica
>*De gradibus æclessiæ*
>'About the ranks of the church'
>   DurRitGlCom [Thomp-Lind] 193.19

By contrast, the two tokens of *-es* genitive, *cirices*, are not modified by a demonstrative: *to cirices*, glossing L. *ad ecclesię* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 108.14) and *crist' ci<ri>ces*, glossing L. *christi ecclesie* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 109.10). Examples (20) and (21) illustrate that the feminine form of the demonstrative (*ðære*) triggers the etymological inflection as against innovative *-es*.

As with the previous classes, influence of the Latin original may be adduced to account for the *-es* instances of some of these nouns, since four of them gloss Latin forms ending in *-is*: *nedres* (L. *serpentis*), *gidvoles* (L. *erroris*), *lichomes* (L. *corporis*, *carnis*), *nomes* (L. *nominis*). However, *-es* is also found glossing Latin nouns whose genitive ends in a vowel, as in the case of *cirices* (L. *ecclesie*), *earðes* (L. *terræ*), *erendvrecæs* (L. *apostoli*), or *gileafes* (L. *fidei*). So the influence of Latin may have reinforced an existing trend in the language, the extension of *-es* as genitive singular marker, but not be fully responsible for it.

Three of the nouns included in Table 5 are attested in the genitive in Lindisfarne: *eorðe* (11x), *geleafa* (2x), *leafa* (1x), *lichoma* (9x), and all of them take *-es* in all cases. The attested forms are the following: *eorðes* (9x), *earðes* (1x), *eardes* (1x); *geleafes* (1x), *geleafas* (1x), *leafes* (1x); *lichomes* (3x), *lichomæs* (3x), *lichomas* (3x) (cf. Ross and Stanley 1960, s.vv.). The noun *earðe* behaves differently in both glosses: in Durham it shows variation (4x of *-es* vs. 5x of *-e*), whereas in Lindisfarne it always takes *-es*. However, it must be pointed out that there are differences not only in the genitive singular of this noun, but also in its nominative, to the extent that Ross (1970) concludes that some of the variants found in Lindisfarne cannot have the same origin. He argues that the forms *eorðu* (21x), *eorðo* (61x), *eordo* (L 2, 14), *earðu* (Mk 4, 31), *earðo* (6x) cannot correspond to the weak West Saxon *eorðe*, and traces them to the strong paradigm of Gothic *aírþa* (1970: 365). By contrast, he states that in Durham there are no forms in *-ðu*, *-ðo*, and the attested forms (*earðe* 11x, *eorðe* 6x) may correspond to West Saxon *eorðe* (1970: 365). This may account for the different behaviour of the genitive singular of this noun in both glosses.

5 Adjectives

In the previous sections, I have studied the extension of *-es* from the *a*-stems to nouns belonging to other declensions in Durham, together with the addition of this inflection to possessives, demonstratives and adjectives modifying feminine nouns.

Another instance of the generalization of *-es* as a marker of genitive singular in Durham can be seen with the adjective *eadig*, which is frequently found in this gloss modifying a proper name and glossing L. *beatus, -a, -um*. The genitive Latin forms *beati* (m.), *beatae*, *beate*, *beatæ*, *beatę* (f.) are normally glossed by *eadges*, regardless of the gender of the name. There are nine instances of this adjective modifying feminine proper nouns in the genitive singular: six modify *marie*, two, *agnes/agnetis*, and one, *prisce*. Eight of them take the ending *-es* (*eadges*), and the remaining one is an abbreviated form, *eadg'* (*eadg' mari'*, glossing L. *beatæ mar-iæ* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 74.14). The following are some examples:

(22) hehstallic' hall eadges marię
      virginalem aulam beatę mariæ
      'the virginal hall of blessed Mary'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 66.1

(23) ða ðe eadges priscæ ðroveres ðines symbeltido ve bigeongað
      qui beate prisce martyris tuæ natalicia colimus
      'we who celebrate the birth of blessed Prisca, thy martyr'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 49.10–11

(24) eadges agnes ðrovres ðines
      beate agnetis martyris tuæ
      'of blessed Agnes, thy martyr'
                     DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 50.10

Lindelöf notices this usage and remarks: "the gender of nouns in D[urham] R[itual] is very uncertain. [...] Curious are some instances where the noun is a common feminine proper name; e.g. *beate agnetis martyris tuæ cuius*, eadges agnes ðrovres ðines 50, 10" (1927: lvii–lviii). Squires (1973: 407) observes that these combinations "would suggest that any gender distinction (whether grammatical or sex) in this termination has been lost, or at least is of little importance", and hypothesizes that the occasional abbreviation mark might indicate the glossator's hesitation about which inflection to use, as happened also with nouns.

The behaviour of *halig*, however, is different. This adjective, which glosses L. *sanctus*, is not so frequent in the gloss, but there are four examples modifying feminine proper nouns: two modify *marie*, one *lvc'*, and one *cecil*. None of them

takes the ending *-es*. There is one token of the feminine ending, *halgae marie'*, and three of abbreviated forms: *hælg' lvc'*, *hæl' mari'*, *halga' cecil'*, as illustrated by the following:

(25) halgae marie' ðingvnge
sanctę marię intercessio
'through the intercession of Holy Mary'
DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 69.10

(26) hæl' mari' symle hehstald' fvltv'mv'
sanctę mariæ semper uirginis subsidiis
'with the help of Holy Mary, always Virgin'[48]
DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 74.19

These examples illustrate that *-es* has become a marker of genitive singular in Durham, not only for nouns, but also for adjectives, and that this is an uneven process, not all forms being affected at the same time or to the same degree.

6 Conclusions

The study of the genitive singular inflection in the gloss to the Durham Collectar has shown the extension of *-es* from the *a*-stems to other nouns and has revealed that *-es* is used as a marker of genitive singular in this gloss regardless of gender and declension class.[49] These results are in line with Jones' (1967) and show that, in the case of the genitive, his claim applies not only to pre- and post-head modifiers, but also to the head noun itself, in that the earlier gender/case indicative function of the *-es* inflection has been "waived in favour of one purely of case" (Jones 1967: 104). Hogg and Fulk agree with this interpretation: "the lNbr system must be seen not as a (partial) switch from grammatical to natural gender, but rather as the evolution of a different system of marking a variety of grammatical features which is permitted by the loss of distinctive gender markers but in which nevertheless the system of grammatical gender remains intact" (2011: 141).

---

48 Cf. L. *sanctę crucis* 'of the holy cross', which is glossed in three different ways: *ðære ilca hælga rodes* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 94.5), *ðære hælga rode* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 120.5), *halges rod'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 94.7). In the first two instances, the noun is modified by the demonstrative, and therefore the weak form of the adjective is used (*hælga*). In the third example the noun has an abbreviation mark and it is the adjective, with the inflection *-es*, that marks genitive case.
49 As indicated throughout the article, this applies not only to nouns, but also to adjectives, possessives and demonstratives.

In all the declensions studied in this article, forms with *-es* for the genitive singular are more frequent than forms with the etymological inflection. However, there are three with a widespread generalization of *-es*: nouns ending in *-ung* (Table 1), feminine *i*-stems (Table 4) and *ō*-stems (Table 3).

The frequency of occurrence does not play a crucial role in the choice of a particular inflection. The *-es* ending is found not only with 'new' formations (nouns in *-ness*, for example, some of which seem to have been formed on the model of Latin),[50] but also with very frequent nouns, such as *lichoma* (*n*-stem), *hælo*, *sibb*, *savel* or *rod* (*ō*-stems, Table 3). However, other frequent nouns in the gloss favour the etymological inflection. This is the case with the *n*-stems *cirica*, *earðe* and *noma* (Table 5), or the *ō*-stem *gefe* (Table 3). This variation is typical of a change in progress, not all forms being affected at the same time or to the same degree.

In this light Squires' (1973) interpretation of some "misabbreviated" forms, such as *hæles'* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 35.4), seems quite plausible: the abbreviation mark in these instances might indicate grammatical alternation, both the etymological inflection and innovative *-es* being alternative grammatical forms: *hæles uel hæle*. They may also indicate the glossator's awareness of the variation existing in the genitive singular inflection and his hesitation about which form to use.

Many of these forms are found glossing Latin nouns belonging to the third declension whose genitive singular ends in *-is*; so there is the possibility of influence of the Latin inflection, the <s> in Latin triggering an <s> in Old English. However, as has been shown throughout the article, *-es* is also found glossing nouns ending in a vowel. Therefore, influence of the Latin original may have reinforced an existing trend in the language, the extension of *-es* as genitive singular marker regardless of gender and declension class, but not be fully responsible for it.

In some instances the choice of a particular inflection for the genitive singular is conditioned by the grammatical context. Thus, the feminine forms of the possessive (*ðinræ*, *ðinre*) and of the demonstrative (*ðære*) trigger the etymological inflection *-e* as against innovative *-es*. In the absence of these modifiers, nouns favour *-es* (cf. examples (2) to (6)). There are also many instances in which the noun takes an abbreviation mark in the genitive singular, and it is the possessive that unambiguously marks genitive case, either with etymological *-re* or with innovative *-es* (cf. examples (7) to (10)).

In some examples there is no internal gender agreement within the noun phrase: the noun takes the etymological inflection, but is modified by a histori-

---

50 Ross (1982: 197), for example, remarks that a considerable number of rare words in Lindisfarne and Durham are derivatives ending in *-ness*.

cally masculine/neuter form of the adjective or possessive, as in *heofonlices gescildnisse*, which glosses L. *cælestis defensionis* (DurRitGl 2 [Thomp-Lind] 145.12–13), or *gefe ðines* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 7.10, 8.4, 23.10), which glosses L. *gratiæ tuæ*. These examples illustrate that *-es* has become a marker of genitive singular in Durham not only for nouns, but also for adjectives and possessives, and that this inflection can be added to any element in a noun phrase (or to all of them) to unambiguously mark genitive case.[51] These results are in line with Jones' work on modifiers (1967 and 1987) and with his claim that they do no longer signal gender, just grammatical function.

Finally, with regard to Lindisfarne, examination of the glossary (Ross and Stanley 1960) has revealed extension of genitive singular *-es* from the *a*-stems to other declensions in this gloss, the results being similar to those found for Durham.[52] Thus, as in Durham, there are three classes with a widespread generalization of *-es*: nouns ending in *-ung*, feminine *i*-stems and *ō*-stems. In the case of nouns ending in *-ness*, there is variation in both glosses, forms with *-es* alternating with forms with the etymological inflection. However, as claimed by Ross (1971: 56), the extension of *-es* to these nouns has advanced further in Durham (cf. Section 2.2). Finally, with regard to the *n*-stems, only three of the nouns discussed in this article are attested in the genitive singular in Lindisfarne: two behave similarly in favouring *-es*, and one behaves differently: *earðe*. In Durham *-es* alternates with the etymological inflection, whereas in Lindisfarne it always takes *-es*. However, as already noted, there are differences in the nominative singular of this noun as well, to the extent that Ross traces some of the variants found in Lindisfarne to a strong noun in Gothic (1970: 365).

These results support the now generally accepted attribution of both Lindisfarne and Durham to the same scribe, Aldred (cf. Jolly 2016 and Roberts 2016, among others). My findings also reveal that, contrary to the conservatism found in Durham with regard to the verbal morphology, which shows West Saxon influence (cf. Ross 1970: 363–364 and Fernández Cuesta and Langmuir, forthcoming), this gloss is innovative with regard to the genitive singular inflection (in the direction of Middle English). In fact, the extension of *-es* as genitive singular

---

51 Another example illustrating that *-es* has become a genitive singular marker in Durham is the genitive of *rose*, *rosæs* (DurRitGl 1 [Thomp-Lind] 65.17): the form has been influenced by the vowel of the original (L. *rosæ*), but *-s* has been added to indicate clearly that this is a genitive form.
52 A more detailed quantitative study of the genitive singular inflection in Lindisfarne, focusing on nouns belonging to different declensions, will be the subject of another paper. I propose to study next the genitive singular inflection in the Rushworth Gospels (Tamoto 2013) in order to establish to which extent the generalization of the *-es* ending can be seen in other texts and dialects.

marker has advanced further in Durham than in Lindisfarne, as illustrated by nouns ending in -*ness*. This feature can be added to two others mentioned by Ross (1970: 365) in which Durham is also more advanced: -*e* vs. -*a* in the *n*-stems, and -*a* vs. -*e* in the present subjunctive. These findings reveal that the language of the gloss is far from homogeneous, and that different features develop in different directions, some following the prestigious southern standard, West Saxon, and others moving in the direction of Middle English.[53]

Works Cited

Adamczyk, Elzbieta. 2018. *Reshaping of the Nominal Inflection in Early Northern West Germanic.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.

Blakeley, Lesley. 1949–1950. "The Lindisfarne s/ð Problem". *Studia Neophilologica* 22: 15–47.

BT = Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller (eds.). 1882–1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* London: Oxford University Press. Supplement by T. Northcote Toller. 1921. Oxford: Clarendon.

Brown, T. J., F. Wormald, Alan S. C. Ross and E. G. Stanley. 1969. *The Durham Ritual: A Southern English Collectar of the Tenth Century with Northumbrian Additions: Durham Cathedral Library A.IV.19.* EEMF 16. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Campbell, A. C. 1973. Review of Brown et al. 1969, *Medium Aevum* 42: 259–260.

Cole, Marcelle. 2014. *Old Northumbrian Verbal Morphosyntax and the (Northern) Subject Rule.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia and Christopher Langmuir. Forthcoming. "Verbal Morphology in the Durham Ritual: A Possible Case of West-Saxonisation".

DOE = *Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form, A–H.* 2016. Ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Universtiy of Toronto. <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>.

DOEC = *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. 2007. Ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: University of Toronto. <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/pub/webcorpus.html>.

Hogg, Richard M. and R. D. Fulk. 2011. *A Grammar of Old English.* Volume 2: *Morphology.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Jolly, Karen. 2016. "The Process of Glossing and Glossing as Process: Scholarship and Education in Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.iv.19". In: Julia Fernández Cuesta and Sara M. Pons-Sanz (eds.). *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context.* Berlin: De Gruyter. 361–375.

Jones, Charles. 1967. "The Functional Motivation of Linguistic Change". *English Studies* 48: 1–6, 97–111.

Jones, Charles. 1970. "Some Features of Determiner Usage in the Old English Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 75: 198–219.

Jones, Charles. 1987. *Grammatical Gender in English, 950–1250*. London: Croon Helm.

Kendrick, T.D. et al. (eds.). 1956–1960. *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, Musei Britannici Codex Cottonianus Nero D. IV*. 3 vols. in 2. Olten/Lausanne: Graf.

Ker, N. R. 1943. "Aldred the Scribe". *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 28: 7–12.

Lindelöf, Uno. 1901. *Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*. Bonn: Hanstein. 105–220.

Lindelöf, Uno. 1923. "A New Collation of the Gloss of the Durham Ritual". *The Modern Language Review* 18: 273–280.

Lindelöf, Uno (ed.). 1927. *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis: The Durham Collectar*. London: Surtees Society.

Roberts, Jane. 2016. "Aldred: Glossator and Book Historian". In: Julia Fernández Cuesta and Sara M. Pons-Sanz (eds.). *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 37–59.

Rodríguez Ledesma, Mª Nieves. 2016. "*Dauides sunu* vs. *filii david*: The Genitive in the Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels". In: Julia Fernández Cuesta and Sara M. Pons-Sanz (eds.). *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 213–238.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1936. "Sex and Gender in the Lindisfarne Gospels". *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 35: 321–330.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1937. *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels*. Leeds: University of Leeds.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1960. "Standard Paradigms". In: Kendrick et al. (eds.). *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, Musei Britannici Codex Cottonianus Nero D. IV*. Book II. Olten/Lausanne: Graf. 37–42.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1970. "Conservatism in the Anglo-Saxon Gloss to the Durham Ritual". *Notes & Queries* 215: 363–366.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1971. "Aldrediana XXIII: Notes on the Accidence of the Durham Ritual". *Leeds Studies in English* 5: 53–67.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1978. "A Point of Comparison between Aldred's Two Glosses". *Notes & Queries* 223: 197–199.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1982. "Rare Words in Old Northumbrian". *Notes & Queries* 227: 196–198.

Ross, Alan S. C. and Eric Stanley. 1960. "Index Verborum Glossematicus". In: Kendrick et al. (eds.). *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, Musei Britannici Codex Cottonianus Nero D. IV*. Book II. Olten/Lausanne: Graf. 45–176.

Skeat, Walter W. 1877–1879. "Collation of the Durham Ritual; with Notes". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1 (Issue 3. Appendix II): 49–72.

Squires, Ann. 1971. "Collation of the Anglo-Saxon Gloss to the Durham Ritual". *Notes & Queries* 216: 362–366.

Squires, Ann. 1973. "Some Curious Abbreviations in the Durham Ritual". *Notes & Queries* 218: 403–409.

Stevenson, Joseph (ed.). 1840. *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*. London: Surtees Society.

Tamoto, Kanichi (ed.). 2013. *The MacRegol Gospels or The Rushworth Gospels*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.