

Early Medieval Correspondence and Peritexts

B.EP.301 / B.EP.11b / M.EP.02b / M.EP.05b / M.EP.05d

Revision of October 20, 2021

Term:	Winter 2021/2022	Instructor:	Dr P. S. Langeslag
Time:	Tuesdays 10:15–11:45	Office:	SEP 2.306
Room:	BigBlueButton via Stud.IP	Office hours:	By appointment (office or online)
Credits:	see module description	E-mail:	planges@uni-goettingen.de
Prerequisites:	B.EP.204 or M.EP.02c		

This syllabus comprises an **Overview** (p. 1), a **Schedule** (p. 2), and an annotated **Bibliography** (p. 14).

Overview

Course Description

Medieval prefaces and notes to the reader claim to stand above the body of a work and speak directly from the author to their medieval audience. The modern reader may be tempted to take this dynamic, and the content of such peritexts, at face value, but this is often a mistake: prefaces in particular are replete with rhetorical devices and are just as much in need of interpretation as the works they accompany. It is much the same with personal letters, which suggest intimacy but are often a hit of subtext dressed up in a fig leaf of formulaic commonplaces. In this course, we will study a range of early medieval letters as well as prefaces and other peritexts both in translation and in Old English. In addition, we will learn about the individuals identified in these letters, as well as the texts the peritexts accompany, in order to develop an understanding of the circumstances of their transmission. Students will spend time honing their reading proficiency of Old English, but the more central aim will be to examine rhetorical structures, authorship claims, audience claims, and networks of correspondence in order to gain a better understanding of the production and functions of early medieval literature.

Assessment

For students of B.EP.301, an online **exam (60 minutes, 15 February 2022 at 10:15 via Stud.IP)** covers the seminar material. (In a departure from earlier practice, the associated **lecture course** will be assessed in a separate exam to be administered by its convenor; you'll want to register separately for each of the two exams.) The seminar exam will consist of questions on the material discussed: the *ars dictandis*; epistolary models; the rhetorics of letters and prefaces alike; specific authors, letters, and peritexts; etc. Some of the questions will require direct engagement with seen or previously unseen passages of Old English. Detailed exam specifications will follow in the second half of the term. Weekly readings, translation work, and (a)synchronous instruction will serve alongside active class participation to prepare you for the exam.

Students of B.EP.11b, M.EP.02b, M.EP.05b, and M.EP.05d will do extra readings in the course of the term, present on these readings, and write a **term paper (due 25 March)**; see module description for length requirement) on a topic related to medieval correspondence and/or peritexts.

Diversity

This course is run with the understanding that students bring a variety of backgrounds into the classroom in such domains as socioeconomics, appearance, culture, religion, ability, gender, age, home/family situation, and sexual identity. With different backgrounds come different needs and sensitivities. If you feel your needs or those of a fellow student require special attention or are being compromised, please feel free to make this known to me by whatever channel seems most appropriate. (For more serious concerns, the **Faculty** and the **University** each have their own points of contact as well.) I will treat all requests seriously and with confidentiality, and will seek to make accommodations within my abilities and reason. At the same time, you too owe it to your fellow students to treat them with respect regardless of their background and identity. Do not stand in the way of anyone's well-being.

Tutorials

If you want extra practice with translation from Old English, look for tutorials and reading groups on **Stud.IP**.

Schedule

Please prepare the following readings *ahead* of the corresponding webinar session, and take notes for in-class discussion. When multiple sources are given for a primary text (e.g. an edited text and online manuscript images, or a translation and a Latin original), the choice is yours whether to consult one or both, but the easier option (i.e. the first option given) is assumed. Anything listed as further reading is, of course, optional and not assessed. Readings are generally on the [Stud.IP](#) file server, either under “Texts” or under “Scholarship,” but some sources are freely available online and hyperlinked below.

Your answers to study questions are *not* to be submitted in writing; instead, these questions help you prepare for in-class discussion, while also guiding your exam preparation if applicable. You won’t be able to answer every last question, and quite a few don’t have “correct” answers at all; questions marked “bonus question” are especially labour-intensive and need only be taken on if they spark your interest.

Session 1 (26 October): Notes and Scribbles / Old English Refresher

While you are not required to prepare the first session, you could do worse than to review Old English grammar and practise your reading and translation skills over the summer. The [Bibliography](#) (p. 14) lists textbooks and resources that may be useful to this end; but you may also choose to look over the following collection of scribbles, which we’ll translate in class this week:

- [Brief Notes and Scribbles \(Stud.IP\)](#)

Reading note:

1. (#11:) Ælfric’s note to the reader is contained in his first series of *Catholic Homilies*, which consists of sermons arranged in the order of the liturgical year. The note is situated in between homilies for Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday to mark Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and Holy Saturday, collectively known as the Paschal Triduum, i.e. the time corresponding to the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, and the Harrowing of Hell. An edited text of Ælfric’s note (but not Coleman’s) may be found in Clemons’s edition of the *Catholic Homilies*, first series (p. 298); Hill 1985 and Hill 2019 contain both, along with scholarly discussion on Ælfric and Coleman’s notes as well as the concept of the Silent Days.

If you have the time, it also can’t hurt to start on next week’s reading!

Session 2 (2 November): The *ars dictaminis*

Read:

- [Perelman, “The Medieval Art of Letter Writing”](#) (19 pp.; [Stud.IP](#))
Takeaway: Offers an overview of the high medieval tradition of *ars dictaminis* and indicates in what respects it differs from classical models.

Reading notes:

1. Errata: On p. 98, for “millennia” read “millennium”; on p. 103, for “Isadore” read “Isidore”; and pay no attention to the author’s capitalization policy. Also, the OCR of the digital document is imperfect, sometimes reading *c* for *e*.
2. Although Perelman claims Cicero’s *De inventione* uses a sevenfold rhetorical structure, it’s plainly six: “Eae partes sex esse omnino nobis videntur: exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, conclusio” ([Latin Library](#)).

Study questions:

1. What historical developments explain the shift in interest from the rhetorics of public speaking to those of letter-writing?
2. What can we infer from the observation that the medieval tradition deemphasized argumentation, which had been an important part of classical rhetoric?

- The [Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia](#) entry on Ælfric of Eynsham (1 p., ed. Lapidge et al; [Stud.IP](#))

Translate:

- From [Ælfric’s letter to Sigeward](#) (also known as the *Libellus* on the Old and New Testament): Marsden ll. 2–7, 924–936

- Edition: Marsden ([Stud.IP](#));
- Facsimile: No complete facsimile currently online

Reading note:

1. The *Libellus* is really a synopsis of the entire Catholic Bible. We are skipping the extensive content proper, focusing instead on a few formal and personal details.

Study questions:

1. Why would an abbot have to summarize the content of the Bible for a layman like Sigeward?
2. What motives might Sigeward have had to commission such a synopsis?
3. What motives might Ælfric have had in complying with the request?
4. What does the final section of the letter suggest about Ælfric and Sigeward's relationship?

Further reading (facultative):

- [Patt, "The Early *ars dictaminis* as Response to a Changing Society"](#) (21 pp., [Stud.IP](#))

*Takeaway: Argues that letters were collected for dictaminal-instructional purposes before any manuals on the conventions of letter-writing appeared, and that the *ars dictaminis* thus arose simultaneously in at least Italy, Germany, and France before men like Alberic of Monte Cassino wrote on the matter.*

Reading note:

1. The most valuable part of this article is the second part, after Patt's deconstruction of traditional views, where he sketches out the evidence for a dictaminal tradition predating the theoretical manuals.

Study questions:

1. Why could Albert Samaritani never have "invented" the *ars dictaminis*?
2. What is the most plentiful type of manuscript evidence Patt adduces as a medieval precursor to the dictaminal manual?

- [Lanham, "Freshman Composition in the Early Middle Ages"](#) (17 pp., [Stud.IP](#))

*Takeaway: Proposes that the high medieval *ars dictaminis* tradition arose out of exercises in rhetoric from the Greek tradition, which would have been incorporated into general grammar teaching in the Latin West.*

Reading note:

1. Digs further into the past than Perelman, and picks up where Patt leaves off, but is accordingly more speculative in its argument.

- [Cubitt, "Ælfric's Lay Patrons"](#) (28 pp., [Stud.IP](#))

Takeaway: Investigates the careers of Æthelweard and Æthelmær, for whom Ælfric claims to have produced several of his translations, and speculates on the backgrounds of his correspondents Sigeward, Sigefyrth, and Wulfgeat.

Session 3 (9 November): Epistolographical Models

Read:

- [St Paul's Letter to the Colossians](#), including introduction and notes as found with the translation in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible* (6 pp., [Stud.IP](#))

Reading note:

1. Please note that this letter normalizes the institutions of patriarchy and slavery.

Study questions:

1. How does the structure of this letter and of the typical Pauline epistle (as summed up in the Oxford introduction) compare to that typical of the *ars dictaminis* (i.e. *salutatio*, *exordium*, *captatio benevolentiae*, *narratio*, *petitio*)? Can you identify any of these elements in the letter to the Colossians?
2. With what other text type(s) or genre(s) does this epistle overlap? How can we explain this?
3. Esp. ch. 4: What can we learn from this letter about the function of epistles in the early Church?

- A selection of [Pliny the Younger's letters](#) (7 pp. in all):

- No. 7.27 to Sura (on ghosts; [Melmoth and Bosanquet 249–253](#));

- No. 8.16 to Paternus (on slavery; [Melmoth and Bosanquet 282](#)); and
- No. 10.117 to Trajan (on dealing with Christians; [Melmoth and Bosanquet 393–396](#))
- Translation: [Melmoth and Bosanquet](#) (additionally on [Stud.IP](#))
- Latin text: [Hinge](#)

Reading note:

1. Salutations in Roman letters were very brief: letters opened with simply the name of the sender (in the nominative), that of the addressee (in the dative), and the words “salutem dat” (“salutes”) or similar; they closed simply with “vale” (“be well”). If one or other of these elements is absent from the translations, this is because the translators deemed them so routine as to be metadata rather than content.

Study questions:

1. Pliny’s express purpose with his letters to Sura and Trajan is to ask for their opinion. Can you think of other reasons he may have had to pen one or other of these letters?
 2. What is it that leads Pliny, first, to have established the arrangements he describes near the top of the letter to Paternus and, second, to mourn his deceased servants?
 3. But then what leads him to set conditions on their wills?
- [Jerome’s letter 57](#) to Pammachius on the best method of translating
 - Translation: [Fremantle](#) (7 pp.; additionally on [Stud.IP](#)); and/or
 - Latin Text and translation: Fremantle placed alongside Migne by [Marlowe](#)

Takeaway: Jerome defends his method of translation with reference to a range of authorities.

Reading note:

1. The text as edited and translated lacks a *salutatio*, but one imagines there would have been one in its original form.

Study questions:

1. §1: In your own words, what rhetorical lesson does Jerome draw from St Paul?
 2. §2: What does Jerome’s description of the popularity of Epiphanius’s letter tell us about the function of letters in the fourth century?
 3. §2: Remembering the high medieval *ars dictandis*, what can we infer from the allegation that Jerome used the incorrect form of address in his translation?
 4. §5: Why does Jerome claim not to translate sense for sense when translating from the Bible?
 5. Which would you say is Jerome’s most authoritative (set of) argument(s) in favour of sense-for-sense translation?
 6. §13: What do you make of the reference to women and looms?
 7. Would you say this letter reads like one addressed to a single recipient? Why?
- The [Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia](#) entry on Alfred, king of Wessex (1 p., ed. Lapidge et al; [Stud.IP](#))

Translate:

- From the [Preface to the Pastoral Care](#)
 - Edition: [Baker](#) sentences 20–28 ([Stud.IP](#)); or
 - Edition: Mitchell and Robinson ll. 40–63; and/or
 - Facsimile (variant): [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 12](#) from line 18 on fol. 2r to line 4 on fol. 3r

Reading notes:

1. You have ideally translated this text before in module [B.EP.204](#) or [M.EP.02c](#). This time, acquaint yourself with the language, then focus on the text’s rhetorical argument. You may also want to use the opportunity to see if you can read the text directly from the manuscript images.
2. The *Pastoral Care*, written by Gregory the Great (d. 604) c. 590 shortly after he became pope, instructs bishops on spiritual leadership. Its translation into English was long attributed to King Alfred personally on the authority of its preface, but scholars today are more sceptical (see esp. [Godden 2007](#)).

Study questions:

1. What rhetorical devices can you identify?

2. If the plans set out at the end of the passage were not fully realized in Alfred's lifetime, would you therefore say the letter failed to have its intended effect?

Further reading (facultative):

- Pliny the Younger's letters 6.16 and 6.20 to Tacitus (on the eruption of Mount Vesuvius; 8 pp. in all)
 - Translation: Melmoth and Bosanquet (193–198, 200–204; additionally on Stud.IP)
 - Latin text: [Hinge](#)
- Adams, "Paul's Letter Opening" (23 pp., [Stud.IP](#))
Takeaway: Discusses Saint Paul's salutations and opening strategies against the background of Greek epistolography.

Session 4 (16 November): Churchbuilding

Read:

- From Higham, *The Convert Kings*: pp. 25–28 (4 pp., [Stud.IP](#))
Takeaway: A little background reading on rulers' motivations for allowing the Church a degree of power.

Reading notes:

1. The book uses endnotes, which in the PDF appear following the excerpt but before the title page.
2. The reference to Horton's concepts of microcosm and macrocosm (25, 27–28) is explained earlier in the chapter as follows: "[Pre-Christian African] cosmologies characteristically have, Horton suggested, two tiers, a lower one peopled by lesser spirits of importance to the local community and its microcosm, and a higher one which was the property of a supreme being and of relevance to the macrocosm. Where the intellectual needs of a society are characterised by a need to explain the microcosm, then the lesser spirits tend to dominate the cosmology. In Horton's view, it is the expansion of the limited horizons of a microcosmic world outwards towards the macrocosm which leads to the marginalisation of lesser spirits, the elaboration of theory concerning the supreme being and the development of a battery of new rituals by which to approach that figure and direct its influence, new moral codes conditioned by the man/supreme being relationship and a growing distinction between man and the divine" (20–21).

Study questions:

1. Can you explain "[t]he appropriation of divine-descent" (25) in your own words? Are you aware of the evidence for this practice in early medieval England?
 2. Esp. 26–27: Can you sum up concisely and in your own words what interest seventh-century English kings might have had in the adoption of Christianity?
- The *Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia* entries on Augustine, Boniface, Gregory the Great (4 pp. in all, ed. Lapidge et al; [Stud.IP](#))
 - **Selected letters from the period 595–773** (10 pp. in all; [Stud.IP](#) under Whitelock):
 1. Gregory to Candidus (595, trans. Whitelock §161)
 2. Gregory to Theoderic and Theodebert (596, trans. Whitelock §162)
 3. Gregory to Eulogius, excerpt (598, trans. Whitelock §163)
 4. Aldhelm to Wilfrid's clergy, excerpt (691x706, trans. Whitelock §165)
 5. Daniel to Boniface (722x732, trans. Whitelock §167)
 6. Boniface to Eadburh (735x736, trans. Whitelock §173)
 7. Boniface to the English (738, trans. Whitelock §174)
 8. Boniface to Daniel (742x744, trans. Whitelock §175)
 9. Eanwulf to Charlemagne (773, trans. Whitelock §186)

Takeaway: This selection of letters should give you a sense of the religious epistolary scene up to the later eighth century.

Study questions:

1. §162: If this letter is addressed to young children, how are we to read the references to its addressees?
2. §162: How do you suppose the assertion that "the English nation [...] desires to be converted" would realistically have to be qualified?

3. §§173–175: Observe the editor’s footnotes; what rhetorical device can we see at work here?
4. §§173–175: What do these letters tell us about the infrastructure and social dynamics of the Church?
5. §175: When Boniface writes that his letter is mostly intended to ask the bishop to intercede with God on his behalf, and furthermore to ask for his advice, and thirdly to send a manuscript, can you think of other, psychological functions?
6. §§173, 175: What does it mean that Boniface not only requests books from England, but furthermore declares he is unable to acquire the books he seeks on the Continent?
7. §175: Can you find a manuscript online that answers to Boniface’s description, fits the timeframe, and ideally is in an English hand, perhaps even in a Continental library? (bonus question)
8. §175: Why do authors itemize the gifts they send along with their letters?
9. §186: How is an abbot able to address a king (not yet emperor) in this way?

Session 5 (23 November): Pastoral Care

Translate:

- From *Ælfric’s first Old English letter for Wulfstan*: Fehr’s witness O, §§2–8, 81–85, 157–171, and if possible 201–209
 - Edition: Fehr ([Stud.IP](#)); and/or
 - Facsimile: [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 190, pp. 320–336](#)

Reading notes:

1. The terminology used to refer to Ælfric’s pastoral letters is deeply confusing. The “first Old English letter for Wulfstan” is also known as his “second Old English letter,” because his first was to Wulfsig; and there are Latin versions of some of these letters as well, which are labelled “Ælfric’s first Latin letter” etc. Finally, the letter is sometimes referred to as a letter “for” rather than “to” Wulfstan because Ælfric wrote it on Wulfstan’s behalf for the benefit of Wulfstan’s clergy.
2. Fehr’s edition prints three witnesses side by side, and these are occasionally printed on different parts of the page face as witnesses merge in and out. You’ll just want O, which normally occupies the leftmost column but takes up the entire page in §§201ff.
3. Please skip any Latin unless you’re keen to take it on.

Study questions:

1. §§82–85: Why might the letter touch on this subject matter?
2. §§157–171: Where do you think the resources for all these necessities were supposed to come from?
3. §§166–171: Come prepared to discuss the rhetorical logic of this passage.
4. Why would an archbishop like Wulfstan rely on some abbot to write his letters of instruction for him?

Read:

- The *Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia* entries on Monasticism and Wulfstan the Homilist (3 pp. in all, ed. Lapidge et al; [Stud.IP](#))
- From *Ælfric’s letter to the monks of Eynsham*, §§1–2, 62–64, 70–80 (5 pp. in all):
 - Translation: Jones ([Stud.IP](#)); and/or
 - Latin text: Jones ([Stud.IP](#))

Reading notes:

1. In terms of its content, this “letter” is in fact a *consuetudo* or customary, i.e. a document prescribing the rules by which a monastic community was expected to abide. In Ælfric’s day, English monasteries were either “reformed,” meaning they had, in the later tenth century and thus in Ælfric’s youth, undergone a tightening of conformance to the Benedictine Rule, which at the time was the only widely observed set of rules for monastic life; or they were “unreformed,” which could take a number of shapes but was defined by the absence of such tightening. The English Benedictine Reform produced a customary known as the *Regularis concordia*, a briefer document adding further instructions to the Benedictine Rule for use in English institutions. About the year 1005, Ælfric took up the abbacy of a newly reformed monastery at Eynsham, which thus was subject both to the Benedictine Rule and the *Regularis concordia* (though Ælfric in §1 indicates the monks aren’t yet familiar with the latter document),

but Ælfric wrote an additional customary specific to the monastery presumably when he took the job, and that is what this letter is. It is mostly concerned with what hymns are to be sung on what occasions, but it contains some other instructions as well.

2. §62: The *maundy* is the liturgical foot-washing. The Benedictine Rule mentions it as taking place among the monks themselves on Saturdays (BR §35.9), and to be carried out separately in the service of all guests as they arrive (BR §53, esp. 12–13). Monasteries generally had certain domains accessible only to the monks (cf. §64 of Ælfric's letter), while others were open to guests, whose accommodation was part of the monasteries' charitable mission.
3. §70–78: The readings were to be read in the Night Office (als known as Matins, Vigils, or Nocturns), the nocturnal and most reading-heavy of the daily services. Whereas the 150 Psalms were to be sung to completion each week divided over the eight daily offices, the complete Bible was to be read in the Night Office over the course of each year. As §78 makes clear, not every monastic community managed to do so, so mealtimes were used to catch up, or else for the reading of other works. In both settings, one person would read aloud while the others listened.

Study questions:

1. §2: Ælfric mentions children. What do you know about the place of children in monasteries at this time?
2. §63: What is the prohibition against the lay ownership of monasteries meant to achieve? And why is the king exempt?

Session 6 (30 November): Translation

Read:

- Jerome's letter to Damasus (preface to his translation of the gospels, 1012 words):
 - Translation: [Edgecomb](#); and/or
 - Latin text: [Early Church Texts](#)

Reading note:

1. Jerome served as a secretary and counsellor to Pope Damasus during the latter's final years; six letters between the two survive. It is by Damasus's commission that Jerome began work on a new Latin text first of the gospels and then (after Damasus's death) of the entire Bible.

Study questions:

1. What dangers does Jerome see in the task of translating Scripture?
2. Jerome is addressing the Pope concerning a difficult matter. Do you consider his rhetorical strategies well-chosen? What choices can you single out for evaluation?
3. Explain the "lists" of Eusebius in your own words.

- Jerome's prologue to his translation of the Pentateuch (890 words):

- Translation: [Edgecomb](#); and/or
- Latin text: [Latin Library](#); or in the [Stuttgart edition](#) of the Vulgate

Takeaway: An accompanying letter discussing matters of translation.

Reading notes:

1. Edgecomb: the prologue in question is the [website](#)'s first following the introduction.
2. Compare with the content of this preface Jerome's letter to Pammachius, read for session 3, as well as Ælfric's preface to his Old English Genesis, listed below.

Study questions:

1. Explain the wordplay of the opening sentence in your own words.
2. Does the *ars dictaminis*, or rhetorics in general, shed any light on Jerome's choice of epistolary opening?

- Ælfric's preface to the Old English Genesis (3 pp.)

- Translation: Langeslag ([Stud.IP](#)); and/or
- Old English text: Marsden ([Stud.IP](#))

Takeaway: Ælfric's most extensive discussion of the dangers of translation.

Reading notes:

1. As it says on the tin, this letter accompanies Ælfric's translation of the first half of Genesis.
2. Cf. Jerome's prologue to the Pentateuch and his letter to Pammachius for session 3 above.
3. §12: This passage is open to more as well as less precise translations inasmuch as Ælfric's taxonomy of grammar and syntax may differ subtly from our own, though both are much indebted to the same tradition. Ælfric's *endebyrdnes* clearly means "order," as he uses it in that sense in his *Grammar*, but "word order" might be too narrow an interpretation, as that is precisely one of the central differences between Latin and English, and Ælfric asserts he dare not change the *endebyrdnes* of the Latin when translating. Thus word order may instead be understood as a subset of "order" that falls within the domain of *fadung*, here rendered narrowly as "syntax"; a noncommittal "arrangement" would leave the reader more room for interpretation. Ælfric doesn't use the word *fadung* in his *Grammar*. The third term of interest is *wise*, generally "way, mode," used widely with a general sense in the *Grammar*, but arguably in a specific linguistic sense here. It could be rendered "idiom" if not for the fact that Ælfric first uses it in combination with *fadung*, and after that probably as a shorthand for the latter, hence "syntax."

Study question:

1. §§3–6: What are the three eras Ælfric refers to with regard to the "law"? Can you explain them in different words?
2. §§7, 12: Why does Ælfric switch to the first person plural here?
3. How much do you know about the system of typological interpretation Ælfric describes?
4. If Ælfric is so opposed to the translation of material from the Hebrew Bible, what justifies his agreement to translate Genesis? Is his logic internally consistent?

- Wilcox, "A Reluctant Translator" (12 pp.; [Stud.IP](#))

Takeaway: Demonstrates with reference to Maccabees how Ælfric dealt with his repeatedly asserted reluctance to translate material from the Hebrew Bible.

Reading note:

1. You are unlikely to have heard of the Books of Maccabees unless you have ties of some sort with the Catholic tradition, as these books are deuterocanonical, i.e. only contained in the Catholic Bible. Originally written in Hebrew and Greek, they tell of a Judaic faction rebelling against the Seleucid Empire in Judaea. They are fairly entertaining texts by the standards of the Hebrew Bible, if you don't mind a little violence, and may be found in any Catholic Bible or Bible "with apocrypha."

Study question:

1. How does Wilcox answer the fourth study question on the preface to Genesis above? What justifies a "translation" like Ælfric's *Maccabees* despite his conviction that one should not translate from the Hebrew Bible?

Further reading (facultative):

- Andrew Cain, *The Letters of Jerome* (286 pp.; [library](#))

Takeaway: An accessible book on Jerome's correspondences, including a section on his exchanges with Damasus.

- Wilcox, "Introduction" to *Ælfric's Prefaces* (85 pp.; [library](#))

Takeaway: An excellent biography and profile of this important author.

Session 7 (7 December): Imagery I

Translate:

- Preface to the Old English *Soliloquies*

– Edition: Carnicelli ([Stud.IP](#)); and/or

– Facsimile: [London, British Library MS Cotton Vitellius A. xv, fols. 4r–5v](#) (ends at "ne meahte," halfway through 5v)

Reading notes:

1. This preface uses an image of house construction to represent the creation of florilegia. Florilegia (lit. "bouquets," singular *florilegium*) were manuscripts into which one copied out selected readings. Asser's biography of King Alfred asserts that the king carried such a collection on him (Keynes and Lapidge §88).

2. The preface accompanies an Old English translation of the *Soliloquies* by Augustine of Hippo (d. 430, not to be confused with Augustine of Canterbury). One aspect of Augustine's immense influence on Western theology consists in his reliance on Neoplatonic philosophy; his *Soliloquies* adopt the common philosophical dialogue form, in a manner strongly reminiscent of Plato, and later found in Boethius, to explore the nature of such concepts as knowledge and the soul in a Christian framework.
3. As Carnicelli's footnote somewhat coily suggests, the beginning of the preface is lost.
4. No other texts on the specific subject of house construction survive in Old English (but cf. *Gerefa*, ed. and trans. Liebermann 1.453–455, on the tasks and tools involved in running a farming estate). This brief preface accordingly contains several *hapax legomena*, i.e. words that are not elsewhere attested and whose meaning may be unclear. Don't spend too much time trying to figure them out unless you're keen to.

Study questions:

1. Reflect on this preface's fit with the text it accompanies. (Do a little reading up on the *Soliloquies* if you like.)
2. What is this preface meant to convey about its author?
3. Can you find Modern English reflexes or Modern German(ic) cognates for some of the Old English words for the carpenter's tools? (bonus question; hint: in addition to regular dictionaries, you may want to look into etymological resources such as Holthausen or [Wiktionary](#).)

Session 8 (14 December): Sin and Consequence

Read:

- **Selected letters from the eighth century** (14 pp. in all; **Stud.IP** under Whitelock):

1. Boniface to Nothhelm (736, trans. Whitelock §171)
2. Federated missionaries to Æthelbald of Mercia (746x747, trans. Whitelock §177)
3. Alcuin to Ethelred (793, trans. Whitelock §193)
4. Alcuin to Higbald (793, trans. Whitelock §194)
5. Alcuin to Osbert (797, trans. Whitelock §202)

Takeaway: Various letters touching on questions of sin.

Study questions:

1. §171: What rhetorical purpose can you discern in the seafaring image (second paragraph)?
2. §177: What rhetorical strategy was chosen for this delicate message?
3. §§193–194: How would you summarize the wider political landscape of Anglo-Saxon England at the time of the Lindisfarne raid?
4. §193: What do you imagine Alcuin means when he refers to a hair fashion resembling that of the pagans? What does Alcuin know of pagan hair styles, and how do you imagine these fashions spread?
5. §193: Why does the letter to King Æthelred of Northumbria address the latter's "chief men" as well?
6. §193: Can you discern a degree of "class warfare" in the letter to Æthelred? What can you say about the social background of someone like Alcuin? How might his profession have shaped his social views?
7. §193: What powers does Alcuin believe the king has at his disposal? What measures would *you* say he could take? How do you explain any differences between these perspectives?
8. §194: Do you feel Alcuin's letter to Higbald is more centrally concerned with incrimination and redress or with consolation?
9. §194: Alcuin's letter to Higbald mentions Judas Maccabeus, leader of the Maccabees (see reading note for Wilcox under session 6 above). Why is he adduced as a model?
10. §194: Who is the Charles mentioned at the end of the letter to Higbald? What is the aid Alcuin hopes he might be able to offer by way of Charles?
11. §§193–194: Whose sins does Alcuin suspect? What is the relationship between those he implicates and those most directly affected?
12. §§193–194: What differences in tone can you discern between Alcuin's letters to King Æthelred of Northumbria and Bishop Higbald of Lindisfarne?
13. §§193–194: Going by Alcuin's warnings, which moral flaws do you think were common among monks? Which at the royal court? How do you explain the difference?

14. §194: Should Alcuin, by his own reasoning, be concerned that he might himself bear some guilt for the Viking raid?

Translate:

- From *Ælfric's letter to Brother Edward*: ll. 14–30.
 - Edition: Clayton; and/or
 - Facsimile: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Hatton 115, fols. 60r–61r (the online image picks up at Clayton's l. 17; see Stud.IP for the missing image)

Takeaway: Ælfric follows up an instructional letter on the dietary laws with personal admonition.

Reading note:

1. For reasons offered in Clayton's introduction, the addressee may have been Ælfric's brother by blood relation. There are, however, other ways of reading their relationship, and the letter's authorship likewise is not entirely beyond doubt.

Study questions:

1. When was this letter written? Do you think it is accurate to depict the Danes as heathens at this time still?
2. What business do you imagine Edward has "upcountry with women"?
3. Do you imagine it is the cited offence that was gendered, or Ælfric's bias? (In other words, do you imagine it was just women who committed this offence?)
4. Where else have we seen a concern with hair styles, and what does it mean that this issue comes up more than once across a span of two centuries?

Session 9 (21 December): Imagery II

Translate:

- The *verse epilogue to the Pastoral Care* (30 verse lines)
 - Edition: Irvine and Godden (Stud.IP); or
 - Edition: the uncritical HTML edition based on Dobbie; and/or
 - Facsimile (variant): Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 12, fols 224v–225r from line 6 on fol. 224v to the end of fol. 225r

Reading note:

1. See reading note 2 on the *Pastoral Care* under session 3 above.

Study question:

1. Can you explain the symbolism of this epilogue in your own words?
2. Does it bear any specific relevance to the work it accompanies, as far as you can tell?

Session 10 (11 January): Learning

Read:

- *Alcuin's letter to Charlemagne* (3 pp.)
 - Translation: Colby (additionally on Stud.IP)
 - Latin text: Dümmler/MGH

Study questions:

1. Critically read Colby's introduction and his Martin quotation. If you were asked to revise it, what would you change?
2. Why teach astronomy?
3. ". . . as a stately house is adorned with a painted roof" (p. 17). Where have we seen similar imagery used? Do you think there might be a connection between the two?
4. Alcuin claims to have had better access to books in England, and asks for the import of English books. Where have we seen a similar motif? Do you think there might be a connection between the two?
5. For what biblical books was King Solomon held responsible? Can you sum up in a few words what they contain?

· *Ælfric's Latin preface to his Grammar* (1 p.)

- Translation: Wilcox, *Ælfric's Prefaces* p. 130 ([Stud.IP](#)); and/or
- Latin text: Wilcox, *Ælfric's Prefaces* pp. 114–115 ([Stud.IP](#))

Takeaway: Ælfric explains his reasons for translating selections from Priscian's grammars into Old English.

Study questions:

1. What cultural context lies behind Ælfric's assumption that some will blame him for providing a grammar in the vernacular?
2. Ælfric provided an Old English as well as a Latin preface for his *Grammar*. Why?

Translate

· The *verse epilogue to the Old English Bede* (10 verse lines)

- Edition: Irvine and Godden ([Stud.IP](#)); or
- Edition: the uncritical [HTML edition](#) based on Dobbie; and/or
- Facsimile: [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 41, p. 488](#) (the last two lines)

Study question:

1. What category of peritext would you call this?

Session 11 (18 January): Projecting Power

Translate:

· From the *prose Preface to Gregory's Dialogues*: the first paragraph according to MS C

- Edition: Hecht (additionally on [Stud.IP](#)), p. 1; and/or
- Facsimile: [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 322 fol. 1r](#) down to l. 12 "þa heofonlican"

Reading notes:

1. Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* narrate miracles conducted by Italian saints in dialogue form.
2. The edition prints two witnesses side by side; the third witness has a different preface to the same work, in verse, though here printed in regular paragraphs at the top of p. 2.

Study questions:

1. What differences can you spot between MSS C and H?
2. What role does the preface describe for King Alfred?
3. Who do you imagine composed the preface?

· The *verse prologue to Gregory's Pastoral Care* (16 verse lines)

- Edition: Irvine and Godden ([Stud.IP](#)); or
- Edition: the uncritical [HTML edition](#) based on Dobbie; and/or
- Facsimile (variant): [Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 12, fols 3v–4r](#) from the red initial on fol. 3v up to and including the first line of fol. 4r.

Reading note:

1. See reading note 2 on the *Pastoral Care* for session 3 above.

Study questions:

1. Can you identify all the alliteration?
2. Who is the speaker (i.e. to whom do the first-person pronouns apply)?

Session 12 (25 January): Politics

Read:

- The *Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia* entry on Alcuin (2 pp., ed. Lapidge et al; **Stud.IP**)
- **Selected letters** from the turn of the eighth century (3 pp. in all; **Stud.IP** under Whitelock):
 - Alcuin to Charlemagne (801, trans. Whitelock §206)
 - Alcuin to Eanbald II (801, trans. Whitelock §207)

Reading note:

1. Alcuin retired from his court appointment in 796 to become abbot of Marmoutier Abbey, and by 801 he had given up this responsibility as well (cf. §206 “your pensioner”). Thus when he writes to Charlemagne at this time, his relation to the emperor is somewhat more that of an informal advisor.

Study question:

1. What purposes can you discern in §207?
- **Ælfric’s “Beadsmen, Labourers, and Soldiers”** (2 pp.):
 - Translation and edition: **Skeat** (additionally on **Stud.IP**)
Takeaway: Ælfric explains the division of society into those who work, those who pray, and those who fight.

Reading notes:

1. This essay survives as an appendix to Ælfric’s *Maccabees*, on which see the reading note to Wilcox’s “Reluctant Translator” for session 6 above. You’ll additionally want to bear in mind that Ælfric wrote his *Maccabees* for his *Lives of Saints*, a collection of texts mostly on holy men and women which, according to his own prefaces, he translated from Latin in order to make them available to the laity although the saints in question were normally venerated only by monks and nuns.
2. I’ve retained Skeat’s title so as not to confuse you, but Skeat’s translation and title are not just archaic, they are archaistic. By *beadsmen* Skeat means “those who pray,” from Old English *biddan* “pray.” His *eke* means “also,” from Old English *eac*.
3. The Latin terminology is *oratores*, *laboratores*, and *bellatores*, i.e. those who pray, those who work, and those who fight, which last category should be understood broadly to include rulers as well as soldiers broadly understood. The division became traditional, and similar divisions had a history prior to Ælfric, but this precise configuration is not known to predate him.

Study questions:

1. Why does Ælfric include this political essay here, as an appendix to his *Maccabees* in a collection of saints’ lives?
2. What political background and discourse may we suppose for Ælfric’s essay? Whom is he defending against whom against what, and in the face of what political developments?
3. Do you believe Ælfric’s argument would have been considered persuasive in his day? What parts of society might have been easier to sway, and which harder?

Session 13 (1 February): Admonition

Read:

· *Ælfric's Admonition* (1 p.):

- Translation: Wilcox (Stud.IP); and/or
- Old English text: Wilcox (Stud.IP)

Takeaway: A rant against drunkenness.

Reading note:

1. This brief admonition was prefaced to the second series of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, a volume of sermons from which it was his intention priests would preach to the general population.

Study questions:

1. Considering the intended audience of the *Catholic Homilies* and your own understanding of early medieval society, do you think Ælfric had any parts of society particularly in mind with this admonition? Can you think of any professions or circles that might have been especially affected by alcoholism?
2. How does the recognition that the admonition was written in Latin, for a work in English, change your answer to question 1?

· *Ammonitio amici* (4 pp.):

- Translation: Langeslag (Stud.IP); and/or
- Latin text: Napier (additionally on Stud.IP)

Takeaway: Urges an unidentified addressee to spiritual purity.

Reading note:

1. The forms of address in particular are difficult to translate without bringing in connotations of the terms in the target language that may not adhere to the terms used in the source language.

Study questions:

1. §6: Are you familiar with the four “pillars” Ælfric discusses? What is their origin?
2. §§9, 11: Why might the author switch to the first person singular and express his own fear and address his own sins? And perhaps it is worth inverting the question: why does he stop short of doing so in other sections of the text?
3. Most corpus taxonomies to date have classified this brief text a homily. What suggests it might be a personal letter instead?

Translate

· Ælfric's “preface” to his letter to Sigefyrth (12 lines of alliterative prose)

- Edition: Assmann (ll. 1–12; additionally on Stud.IP); and/or
- Facsimile: London, British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, fol. 6v (now incomplete)

Reading note:

1. As Assmann's edition makes clear, the subject matter and form of the letter and its preface are pretty well continuous; the main reason scholars have generally distinguished between the two is that most copies omit these first twelve “lines.”

Study question:

1. Assmann has printed the preface and the letter in alliterative lines. Do you consider this justified? Explain why.

Session 14 (8 February): Wrap-Up

- **Exam-takers:** prepare for the exam and bring questions;
- **Paper-writers:** bring a preliminary outline.

Bibliography

§1: Language Aids

Baker, Peter S. *Introduction to Old English*. 3rd ed. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell, 2012.
The standard current textbook.

———. “Old English Aerobics.” Accessed October 19, 2021. <http://www.oldenglishaerobics.net>.
Old English grammar and translation exercises.

Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al., eds. *Dictionary of Old English: A to I Online*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018. <http://han.sub.uni-goettingen.de/han/dictionary-of-old-english/>.
The best, if incomplete, dictionary of Old English. Accessible to Göttingen students via [this address](#).

Campbell, Alistair. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
The standard reference grammar. Just in case you have the stomach for that kind of thing.

Clark Hall, J. R., ed. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 14. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.
An affordable paperback dictionary, if outdated.

Hasenfratz, Robert, and Thomas J. Jambeck, eds. *Reading Old English*. Revised edition. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2011.
A current and especially user-friendly introduction to Old English.

Holthausen, Ferdinand, ed. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934.
Just in case you should want to look into the origins of specific words; but you may find [Wiktionary](#) is more complete.

Mitchell, Bruce, and Fred C. Robinson. *A Guide to Old English*. 8th ed. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
A good standard textbook now gradually aging out of use.

Toller, Thomas Northcote, ed. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of Joseph Bosworth*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973. With revisions and enlarged addenda by Alistair Campbell, <https://bosworthtoller.com>.
The most complete dictionary of Old English to date, if rather outdated (the main dictionary was published in 1898). Please note that the online surrogate represents the 1898 edition, not the 1973 edition with Campbell's revisions and addenda.

“Wiktionary.” <https://www.wiktionary.org>.
A pretty robust resource for its etymological and inflectional sections.

§2: Manuscripts and Databases

“British Library: Digitised Manuscripts.” Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/>.
Portal to the digitized manuscripts of the British Library.

“Digital Bodleian.” Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>.
Portal to the digitized manuscripts of Oxford's Bodleian Libraries.

Fox, Peter, John Hatcher, John Haeger, et al., eds. “Parker Library on the Web: Manuscripts in the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.” Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://parker.stanford.edu>.
Digital home of a large library, including many Old English manuscripts.

“Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England.” Accessed October 19, 2021. <http://www.pase.ac.uk>.
Information on individuals named in early English documents.

§3: Editions and Translations

- Carnicelli, Thomas A., ed. *King Alfred's Version of St. Augustine's "Soliloquies"*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Edgecomb, Kevin P. "Biblicalia." Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://bombaxo.com>.
Among various other content, this website translates all of Jerome's prologues to his biblical translations.
- Ferrante, Joan, ed. and trans. "Epistolae: Medieval Women's Latin Letters." Accessed October 19, 2017. <https://epistolae.columbia.edu/>.
- Fremantle, W. H., trans. *St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works*. In collaboration with G. Lewis and W. G. Martley. The Principal Works of St. Jerome 6. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1893. <https://archive.org/details/selectlibraryofn06scha>.
A priceless collection of mostly letters and prefaces, though several compositions are summarized rather than translated.
- Godden, Malcolm R., and Susan Irvine, eds. *Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's "De Consolatione Philosophiae"*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Compared to Irvine and Godden, this is the more scholarly edition, which furthermore prints the B (prose) and C (prosimetrical) redactions separately.
- Hilberg, Isidorius [Isidor], ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi opera 1: Epistulae*. Vol. 1. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 54. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1910.
- Irvine, Susan, and Malcolm R. Godden, eds. and trans. *The Old English Boethius: With Verse Prologues and Epilogues Associated With King Alfred*. Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
Compared with Godden and Irvine, this is the user-friendlier (and more affordable!) of the two current editions and translations, but it also differs for including the various verse prologues of the period.
- Jones, Christopher A., ed. and trans. *Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
A study, edition, and translation of Ælfric's Eynsham "customary."
- Keynes, Simon, and Michael Lapidge, trans. "Asser's 'Life of King Alfred.'" In *Alfred the Great*, 65–110. London: Penguin, 1983.
A translation with lots of endnotes, here printed alongside other resources on Alfred.
- Liebermann, F[elix], ed. "Ælfred." In *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 1:26–89. Halle: Niemeyer, 1903.
Still the standard edition of Anglo-Saxon law.
- Mynors, R. A. B., R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, eds. and trans. *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Skeat, Walter W., ed. and trans. *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. 2 vols. EETS, 76, 82, 94, 114. Reprinted in 2 physical vols 1966. London: Trübner, 1881–1900.
- Sweet, Henry, ed. and trans. *King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's "Pastoral Care"*. Early English Text Society 45. London: Trübner, 1871.
- Weber, Robert, ed. *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. 5th ed. Revised by Roger Gryson. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
The leading critical edition of the Latin Vulgate Bible.
- Whitelock, Dorothy, trans. "c. 500–1042." In *English Historical Documents*, vol. 1. London: Methuen, 1979.
An important collection of translated texts.
- Wilcox, Jonathan, ed. *Ælfric's Prefaces*. Durham Medieval Texts 9. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, 1994.
An edition of Ælfric's Latin and Old English prefaces, with translations of the former. Incorporates a strong biography and introduction to Ælfric's works, and takes on such questions as why Ælfric repeatedly appears to change his mind about the translation of biblical texts.

§4: Scholarship: Required Reading

Higham, N.J. *The Convert Kings: Power and Religious Affiliation in Early Anglo-Saxon England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Studies the nature of conversion through the lens of early English kingship.

Lapidge, Michael, John Blair, Simon Keynes, and Donald Scragg, eds. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Wiley, 2014.

The definitive subject-specific encyclopaedia for the field, and one of very few encyclopaedias you should ever cite (alongside RdgA and KLNm).

Perelman, Les. "The Medieval Art of Letter Writing: Rhetoric as Institutional Expression." In *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*, edited by Charles Bazerman and James Paradis, 97–119. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

An excellent overview article, with a primary focus on the high medieval tradition but with some attention to prior models.

Wilcox, Jonathan. "A Reluctant Translator in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Maccabees." *Enarratio* 2 (1993): 1–18.

Offers an explanation of why Ælfric seems repeatedly to break his repeated vow to stop translating.

§5: Scholarship: Further Reading

Cain, Andrew. *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

An accessible study of Jerome's correspondences.

Cherewatuk, Karen, and Ulrike Wiethaus, eds. *Dear Sister: Medieval Women and the Epistolary Genre*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Cubitt, Catherine. "Ælfric's Lay Patrons." In *A Companion to Ælfric*, edited by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, 165–192. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Studies the careers of Æthelweard and Æthelmær, for whom Ælfric claims to have produced several of his translations, and speculates on the backgrounds of his correspondents Sigeward, Sigefyrth, and Wulfgeat. Understands Æthelweard and Æthelmær's patronage of Ælfric in the context of lay piety and the need for expert instruction.

Earl, James W. "King Alfred's Talking Poems." *Pacific Coast Philology* 24, nos. 1/2 (November 1989): 49–61.

Notwithstanding Earl's express attribution of these texts to Alfred, the article is worthwhile for its discussion of prosopopoeic peritexts, which he distinguishes from the prosopopoeia used in riddles inasmuch as it is the text itself that speaks, which also makes them natively written works.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Cambridge University Press. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

A seminal study on the pragmatics and interpretation of texts issued along with a book's main text in modern editions.

Gittos, Helen. "The Audience for Old English Texts: Ælfric, Rhetoric and 'the Edification of the Simple.'" *Anglo-Saxon England* 43 (2014): 231–266.

Proposes that texts were often written in, or translated into, Old English not to open them up to the laity but because the vernacular was a practical medium both for specified audiences and for secondary audiences, while Latin was more of a status symbol and less of a lingua franca among monastic communities.

Godden, Malcolm R. "Did King Alfred Write Anything?" *Medium Ævum* 76, no. 1 (2007): 1–23.

An influential article proposing that Alfred approved the circulation of the Pastoral Care, but had no hand in its translation or preface, while he may have had nothing to do with the Consolation and Soliloquies.

Griffith, Mark. "Ælfric's Preface to Genesis: Genre, Rhetoric and the Origins of the *ars dictaminis*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 29 (January 2000): 215–234.

———. "Ælfric's Use of his Sources in the Preface to Genesis: Together with a Conspectus of Biblical and Patristic Sources and Analogues." *Florilegium* 17 (2000): 127–154.

Hawk, Brandon W. "Isidorian Influences in Ælfric's Preface to Genesis." *English Studies* 95, no. 4 (2014): 357–366.

Hill, Joyce. "Ælfric's 'Silent Days.'" *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 16 (1985): 118–131. <http://digital.library.leeds.ac.uk/208/>.

Discusses Ælfric's notes in both series of Catholic Homilies to the effect that there should be no preaching during the Paschal Triduum.

———. "Micro-Texts in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*." In *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts*, edited by Ursula Lenker and Lucia Kornexl, 131–141. Buchreihe der ANGLIA 67. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.

Offers thoughts on two medieval reader responses to Ælfric's decision not to disseminate homilies for the last three days of Holy Week and his position that no preaching ought to take place on these days.

Irvine, Susan. "The Alfredian Prefaces and Epilogues." In *A Companion to Alfred the Great*, edited by Nicole Guenther Discenza and Paul E. Szarmach, 143–170. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 58. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

A guided tour of prefaces and epilogues, prose and verse, associated with Alfred's reign. Includes quotations and translations from all these peritexts.

Letter Writing 5, no. 2 (2004).

A special issue on the pragmatics of letter-writing in the 14th to 18th centuries.

Kleist, Aaron J. *The Chronology and Canon of Ælfric of Eynsham*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 37. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2019.

A study of the literary production and dissemination of Ælfric of Eynsham, as well as their chronology.

Kylie, Edward, trans. *The English Correspondence of Saint Boniface*. London: Chatto / Windus, 1911.

Lanham, Carol Dana. "Freshman Composition in the Early Middle Ages: Epistolography and Rhetoric Before the *ars dictaminis*." *Viator* 23 (1992): 115–134.

Looking for forerunners of the high medieval ars dictamini, conjectures that a Greek tradition of exercises in composition may form the missing link with classical rhetoric.

Magennis, Hugh. "Ælfric of Eynsham's Letter to Sigeward." In *Metaphrastes; or, Gained in Translation: Essays and Translations in Honour of Robert H. Jordan*, edited by Margaret Mullett, 210–223. Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2004.

A translation, with a brief introduction aimed at non-experts.

Magennis, Hugh, and Mary Swan, eds. *A Companion to Ælfric*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.

Marsden, Richard, ed. *The "Old English Heptateuch" and Ælfric's "Libellus de veteri testamento et novo"*. Vol. 1. EETS 330. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Menzer, Melinda J. "The Preface as Admonition: Ælfric's Preface to Genesis." In *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, edited by Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers, 15–39. Publications of the Richard Rawlinson Center. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications / Western Michigan University, 2000.

Murphy, James J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974.

Nichols, Ann Eljenholm. "Ælfric's Prefaces: Rhetoric and Genre." *English Studies* 49 (1968): 215–223.

Patt, William D. "The Early *ars dictaminis* as Response to a Changing Society." *Viator* 9 (1978): 133–155.

Argues that letters were collected for dictaminal-instructional purposes before any theoretical manuals appeared on the practice, and that the ars dictaminis thus arose simultaneously in at least Italy, Germany, and France before men like Alberic of Monte Cassino wrote on the matter.

Stephenson, Rebecca. *The Politics of Language: Byrhtferth, Ælfric, and the Multilingual Identity of the Benedictine Reform*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

An excellent reflection on presentation, aims, and audiences in the Benedictine Reform.

Swan, Mary. "Identity and Ideology in Ælfric's Prefaces." In Magennis and Swan, *A Companion to Ælfric*, 247–269.

Vaughn, Sally N. *St. Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A Study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women*. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Wallis, D. Patricia. "Feminine Rhetoric and the Epistolary Tradition: The Boniface Correspondence." *Women's Studies* 24 (1995): 229–246.

Wolff, Luella M. "A Brief History of the Art of *dictamen*: Medieval Origins of Business Letter Writing." *International Journal of Business Communication* 16 (2 1979): 3-11.

An overview article lacking some finesse, with a strong focus on Italy.