The Old English Materials of Northern German Scholars and the *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latinum* of John Joscelyn and John Parker – A Preliminary Study

Melanie Vollbrecht, Göttingen

I.   Introduction

Systematic research into Old English in England began in the sixteenth century. Modern scholarship has sufficiently documented early English lexicographers of Old English such as Laurence Nowell (1515–1571), John Joscelyn (1529–1603), Simonds D'Ewes (1602–1650), and William Somner (1598–1669), to name but a few.[1] The study of Old English in Germany is usually tied to the names of Jacob Grimm and Wilhelm von Humboldt and therefore to the first half of the nineteenth century. However, modern scholarship has largely ignored those manuscripts that bear witness to a scholarly interest in Old English in Northern Germany as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century. A major figure in this regard is the Hamburg scholar Friedrich Lindenbrog (1573–1648), who copied the important *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latinum*, drawn up by John Joscelyn and John Parker (1548–1618).[2] Abraham Hinckelmann (1652–1695), Dietrich von Stade (1637–1718), and Johann Georg von Eckhart (1664–1730) later reproduced and amended Lindenbrog's copy.

What motivated English scholars like Nowell and Joscelyn to study early medieval English documents? How did scholars in Northern Germany first get in touch with Old English? How did they begin to survey and study the language and which resources did they use? This article will try to answer these questions, first by outlining the historical backgrounds that shaped European scholars' interests in Old English, secondly by paying special attention to the scholars who wrote the *Dictionarium* and its copies. This paper will then investigate their motivations and their academic networking. A description of the manuscript dictionaries and a brief examination of their affiliations with each other will conclude this article.

---

[1] *Rosier* (1966), pp. 295-302; *Gneuss* (1990), pp. 41-43; *Gneuss* (1996) pp. 40-42.
[2] John Parker was the son of Matthew Parker, who was Archbishop of Canterbury under Queen Elizabeth I.

II.   Early Modern Interest in Old English in England, Germany, and the Netherlands

During the aftermath of the English Reformation, the newly formed Anglican Church was in continuous need of legitimization and academic support, which led to a scholarly interest in early English religious texts. Eleanor Adams writes, "All those interested in Old English were […] Oxford and Cambridge men, and in the thick of Reformation-troubles."[3] Researchers in support of the Reformation wished to find precedent for their Protestant beliefs in order to justify them, eagerly examining medieval religious and legal texts to find arguments in support of their views.[4]

The dissolution of the monasteries during the 1530s and 1540s saw the outright destruction of library collections, but it also opened up the remnants of these libraries to scholars. King Henry VIII (1491–1547) tasked his personal chaplain, librarian, and antiquary, John Leland (1503–1552), with the search for old documents. Leland's own interest, as well as the King's commission, drove him to create catalogues of monastic libraries' holdings with the aim of reconstructing from these documents a comprehensive and continuous history of Britain from as early as possible.[5] Rebecca Brackmann demonstrates that Leland, and after him Matthew Parker (1504–1575), Laurence Nowell, and William Lambarde (1536–1601), used their research into Old English to work towards a unified national Anglican identity in sixteenth-century England that had its roots in such a continuously traceable heritage.[6]

A political-historical interest immediately followed the theological interest and was to serve the Protestant agenda.[7] Rudolf von Raumer argues that law codes were especially interesting sources for these early scholars because they were testaments to the cultural practices of their ancestors. Together with religious texts, law codes in the Old English vernacular presented the most tangible evidence of an identity that the Roman Catholic Church did not dictate. They were inherently different from Roman law due to their Germanic origin, and, for that very reason, may have held a special cultural value in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[8] The English common law, especially in the Elizabethan period "could serve as a point of pride, inspiring loyalty to an English identity that men such as Cecil

---

[3] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 41.
[4] *Von Raumer* (1870), p. 96; *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 11.
[5] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 12; *Buckalew* (1978), pp. 149, 153; *Brackmann* (2012), pp. 89, 116-117.
[6] *Brackmann* (2012), pp. 22-25.
[7] *Von Raumer* (1870), p. 96.
[8] *Hetherington* (1980), p. 59.

wished to foster in Elizabeth's subjects."[9] The consequences of this cultural othering of England from the Continent can still be seen in various manifestations today.

Most early researchers into Old English were actually trained lawyers. Before there were proper university posts, it was primarily the newly founded Society of Antiquaries in London, which encouraged the study of early medieval English history.[10] Many of its members practiced law and wished to consult and use medieval texts for legal precedent. They "needed to understand the wording of the laws and their cultural background."[11] It is therefore impossible to separate the antiquarian philological interest of English scholars from the legal one at this early stage.[12]

The need for legitimizing Protestant beliefs against Roman Catholic dogmas continued into the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1533–1603). She appointed Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559, and he became Elizabeth's principal collector of books and manuscripts, especially after the Privy Council granted him authority to examine monastic libraries.[13] The Privy Council's broadsheet limited him to the study of texts and clearly stated that he had to return all materials to their respective libraries.[14] However, Parker evidently added manuscripts from numerous different monasteries to his possessions, which eventually passed into the library of Corpus Christy College in Cambridge after his death. It seems that Parker intentionally kept his objects of study for lengthy periods and was apparently not inclined to return them.[15]

Parker's practices of conservation are equally questionable from the point of view of a 20th century conservationist. He favoured complete texts and manipulated medieval manuscripts to his likings. Raymond Page cannot help himself but to conclude poetically about Parker's methods, "Like the wild West Wind he was both 'destroyer and preserver.'"[16] Parker and his employees, among them John Joscelyn, bound lose manuscripts into collective volumes. If they could, they provided openings and/or endings for manuscripts that lacked these parts by copying them from other manuscripts. Unfortunately, whenever such collations were not possible, Parker and his circle used methods even more radical: they removed incomplete text, or rather did not include these incomplete portions in the binding process.[17]

---

[9] *Brackmann* (2012), pp. 77, 190-192. William Cecil (1521–1598) was Queen Elizabeth I's Secretary of State and Laurence Nowell's employer.
[10] Chapter 3 treats the Society of Antiquaries and its role in early modern studies of Old English in more detail.
[11] *Considine* (2008), p. 11.
[12] *Schoeck* (1958), p. 104; *Brackmann* (2012), pp. 212, 217.
[13] *Page* (1993), p. 2.
[14] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 18.
[15] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 19.
[16] *Page* (1993), p. 52.
[17] *Page* (1993), p. 48.

In contrast to this disruptive treatment of manuscripts, Matthew Parker was instrumental in the preservation of medieval texts through the printed publication of Old English materials. He financed the specific type for printing Old English for John Day's (1522–1584) workshop and encouraged other scholars to print their research there. Among those publications was, for example, Lambarde's *Archainomia* (1568), a collection of early medieval English laws.[18] With the help of his secretary John Joscelyn, Parker also published historical documents, among them some in Old English. Joscelyn worked extensively with Cottonian, Harleian, Royal and Lambeth Palace manuscripts where his hand can still be seen. He underlined Old English text, added marginal notes and/or assigned numbers to words and passages he considered interesting.[19] The most renowned result of the cooperation between Matthew Parker and his secretary is *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* (1566), which presents Ælfric of Eynsham's (died ca. 1010) Easter homily as a precedent for Anglican communal practices.[20] The Old English version of the text appears side by side with a translation into sixteenth-century English.[21] This display bridges the gap between the historic example and contemporary practices, strengthening the ties between early medieval past and sixteenth-century present. Parker encouraged his readers to identify with their early English heritage as well as Protestant beliefs, which, according to him, were not new but as old as these ancestral texts.

Joscelyn published Old English materials in collaboration with other authors, such as the 1571 edition of the Old English gospels, which he published with John Foxe (1516–1587).[22] They put their edition to the press in John Day's workshop with Matthew Parker acting as the principal patron.[23] These early prints of Old English have in common that they are theological or judicial in nature. The antiquarian interest appears as a byproduct of the other two, and lexicographical endeavours like the ones described below, are a means to the end of understanding ancient documents relevant to the researchers' primary interests.

When Laurence Nowell and Joscelyn/Parker began their work of collecting Old English lemmata and compiling them into dictionaries, scholars lacked tools for the systematic study and understanding of Old English. As Brackmann puts it, "The language of the Anglo-Saxons […] had to be learned with difficulty and labor – an undertaking which, at the start of Elizabeth's reign, could not be supported by widely available grammars or

---

[18] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 28; *Brackmann* (2012), pp. 16-17.
[19] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 38; *Graham* (2000), pp. 99, 101-102; *Brackmann* (2012), p. 13.
[20] *Brackmann* (2012), p. 47.
[21] *Parker* (1566).
[22] *Foxe* (1571). cf. Graham (2000), p. 84.
[23] *Graham* (2000), p. 84.

glossaries".[24] Facing this issue, Nowell compiled his *Vocabularium Saxonicum*[25] of approximately 7,000 entries in the 1560s, a good portion of which ended up in Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latinum*. This larger manuscript dictionary of the 1580s and its copies in Northern Germany will be the subject of the second part of this paper. Joscelyn/Parker marked those lemmata imported from Nowell's *Vocabularium* with the source references 'Lau.' or 'Laur.'.[26] This first name basis abbreviation may suggest a personal acquaintance between Joscelyn and Nowell.

However, Joscelyn did not only make use of Nowell's lexicographical work. Both scholars closely studied the different manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, as Angelika Lutz has demonstrated.[27] Only a close working relationship can explain the depth of their cooperation on the chronicles, otherwise Joscelyn would probably not have had such extensive access to manuscripts in London, where Nowell worked, nor Nowell to Matthew Parker's manuscripts in Cambridge. Lutz assumes that there must have been ample exchange between the two, at least of their personal notes, perhaps even of the actual medieval manuscripts. She dates this collaboration to the middle of the 1560s. This means that both men were already working on their dictionaries when they began studying the chronicles since Nowell's *Vocabularium* and Joscelyn's Lambeth Palace lists, which are precursory word collections to his more elaborate *Dictionarium*, all date to the 1560s.[28]

Their collaboration ended when Nowell left England for the Continent in 1567 "to look for more manuscripts".[29] He had already spent some time in Frankfurt am Main during the five-year reign of Queen Mary I (1516–1558). Like other English exiles, Nowell had fled from the religious persecution of Protestants.[30] Perhaps he returned to the Continent to reconnect with contacts he had made during his stay in the 1550s. He died abroad in 1570 or 1571 and Lambarde, who was Nowell's student, inherited his books.[31] Lambarde made additions to Nowell's *Vocabularium*, which potentially affected Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*.[32] Did Joscelyn copy from Nowell's *Vocabularium* before or after Lambarde inherited it? It seems curious that the *Dictionarium* also uses the abbreviation 'La.' in source references in addition to the abbreviations 'Laur.' and 'Lau.'.[33] This ambiguous 'La.'

---

[24] *Brackmann* (2012), p. 2.
[25] now Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Selden supra 63
[26] *Hetherington* (1980), p. 38; *Graham* (2000), p. 94.
[27] *Lutz* (1982), pp. 304-310.
[28] *Lutz* (1982), p. 310. Chapter 4 of this article treats the manuscripts in more detail.
[29] *Brackmann* (2012), p. 15.
[30] *Marckwardt* (1952), pp. 2-3.
[31] *Hetherington* (1980), p. 23.
[32] *Marckwardt* (1952), p. 7.
[33] For example MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 155va.

abbreviation could refer either to 'Laurence' or to 'Lambarde'. However, it only occurs in John Parker's portions, and he only used it from letter *G* onwards. Only a close comparison of the *Vocabularium* and Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* can show if he further shortened the extant abbreviation 'Laur.', or actually meant to distinguish between the contributions of Nowell and those by Lambarde.

In continental Europe, the motivation for research into Germanic antiquity was slightly different from the interests that English scholars of medieval English history and languages held. The Renaissance period and Humanism had brought a renewed interest in classical Latin authors, and they, in turn, had stimulated research into Greek texts as well. This new humanist approach then led to the study of so-called barbaric, non-Roman sources of antiquity.

Whereas English scholars aimed at justifying their own Anglican confession against traditional Catholicism and strove to build a national identity around an heirless queen, the continental scholars were keener on exploring the life, customs, politics, and religion of their Germanic ancestors. As in England, scholars on the continent also considered the vernacular languages direct links to a presumed age-old identity.[34] Unlike their Mediterranean colleagues, German and Dutch scholars could not locate this identity within the classical Latin and Greek authors, so they had to turn to 'barbaric' texts to trace their ancestors. Von Raumer states that continental scholars, especially in the Netherlands, had a broad understanding of the concept of native language so that their research into the origins of the vernacular included all Germanic languages.[35] Without much written record of early Dutch, for example, scholars had to turn to other Germanic languages and comparative methods. They collected and collated texts in Old English, Old High German, Old Frisian, Gothic, and sometimes even Old Norse to compare the languages to their contemporary Dutch. By this, they aspired to trace linguistic similarities and reconstruct language developments.[36]

Yet continental Europe was not free from religious troubles. The Reformation was taking place in Northern Germany and the Netherlands as well, which caused theological, legal and social friction. The Dutch universities, however, remained open to scholars from different confessions and facilitated inter-confessional discourse.[37] The example of the University of Leiden shows that universities in the Netherlands were part of an "open [scholarly] community, from sternly Lutheran Holstein in the far north to re-Catholicised

[34] *Dekker* (2006), p. 187.
[35] *Von Raumer* (1870), pp. 91-92.
[36] *Bremmer* (2008), p. 144.
[37] *Horváth* (1988), pp. 7-9, 13-16.

Bavaria in the south"[38] Numerous young men from Northern Germany, Hamburg especially, received their education in Leiden.[39]

Friedrich Lindenbrog was one of those young intellectuals from Hamburg, who studied at the University of Leiden. His most important teacher was the French Huguenot Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), a scholar of philology, history, and culture.[40] As one of the most influential scholars of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Scaliger had a wide network of contacts, from which Lindenbrog profited. Via Scaliger, he made the acquaintance of Francois Pithou (1543–1621), a French lawyer and humanist, with whom he published the *Lex Salica* in 1602.[41]

In 1613, Lindenbrog published an expansion of the *Lex Salica*, the *Codex Legum Antiquarum*, which included Germanic laws from several different regions. It contained an extensive glossary of 156 pages, explaining unfamiliar terms in the edition.[42] Apparently, Lindenbrog had adopted this practice of providing a glossary from his previous collaboration with Pithou on the *Lex Salica*.[43] Kees Dekker calls Lindenbrog the "first scholar to pay serious attention to the vernacular terminology of not only the *Lex Salica*, but also *Leges Barbarorum* as a whole".[44] Perhaps it was during his collaboration with Pithou that Lindenbrog had first contact with Old English lexicography, since Pithou owned a transcript of parts of Ælfric's *Glossary*, which Lindenbrog copied.[45]

Lindenbrog returned to Hamburg in 1608 to practice as a lawyer.[46] Six years later, in 1614, the Hamburg Senate sent Lindenbrog to London to participate in discussions on trade relations between Hamburg and London.[47] Lindenbrog used his time there to study manuscripts, as he had done on previous travels to England, Switzerland and Italy.[48] His long-term Swiss-French friend and teacher at Leiden University, Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), introduced him to the English historian William Camden (1551–1623), which is how Lindenbrog made contact with scholars of Old English in England.[49] It was presumably

---

[38] *Evans* (1984), p. 258.
[39] *Horváth* (1988), pp. 8, 19.
[40] *Wilckens* (1723), pp. 11, 18; *Dekker* (2006) p. 193.
[41] *Pithou/Lindenbrog* (1602), pp. 1-90.
[42] *Lindenbrog* (1613), pp. 1331-1497; *Dekker* (2006), p. 194.
[43] *Pithou/Lindenbrog* (1602), pp. 90-137.
[44] *Dekker* (2006), p. 192.
[45] Hamburg, Staatsbibliothek Cod. philol. 263, fols. 16-19; *Buckalew* (1978), p. 154. The manuscript resided in Berlin when Ronald Buckalew worked with it, hence he lists the signature with the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, but it has since returned to Hamburg with the same signature.
[46] *Horváth* (1988), p. 28.
[47] *Neef* (1985), p. 596.
[48] *Horváth* (1988), pp. 26-27.
[49] *Wilckens* (1723), p. 22.

through Camden that Lindenbrog then gained access to the Society of Antiquaries' materials in Robert Cotton's (1570–1631) library, including Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*.

He then brought his copy of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* as well as his thorough knowledge of Old English to Hamburg, and heavily influenced subsequent German scholars with an interest in Old English. Lindenbrog and his copy of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* mark the beginning of systematic lexicography of Old English in Northern Germany.

Johann Georg von Eckhart transcribed Lindenbrog's copy of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* in the early eighteenth century. He was secretary to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716), who held an interest in etymology. By comparing words in different languages in his *Collecteana Etymologica* (published posthumously in 1717), of which von Eckhart was co-author,[50] Leibniz firmly established that the Germanic languages were so similar as to constitute a language family.[51] In 1711, von Eckhart had already published his own etymological work, the *Historia studii etymologici linguae Germanicae*.[52] Von Raumer calls it a "trefflicher literaturhistorischer Ueberblick über alles, was bis dahin für die Erforschung der germanischen Sprachen sowohl in Deutschland, als in England, Skandinavien und den Niederlanden geleistet worden war".[53] Von Eckhart succeeded Leibniz as royal librarian and historiographer of the House of Guelph. In 1723, he left Hanover due to financial troubles, converted to Catholicism in 1724, and became the court's historiographer at Würzburg.[54]

Apparently, von Eckhart had been almost forgotten by the end of the eighteenth century. In 1781, von Eckhart's first biographer, Georg Will, bemoans that there was neither a biography of von Eckhart, nor a comprehensive catalogue of his works.[55] He therefore undertook efforts to collect information about von Eckhart. However, Will's biography needs to be taken with a grain of salt since his research heavily relied on indirect accounts and memories. His main witness was Daniel Eberhard Baring (1690–1753), von Eckhart's cousin and assistant librarian in Hanover, whose anecdotes Will collected and edited.[56]

It is, however, interesting that this first biographer of von Eckhart names von Stade as one of his contacts. Will lists a letter from von Eckhart "an D. von Staden über die Erklaerung

---

[50] *Leibniz/von Eckhart* (1717), Title Page.
[51] *Von Raumer* (1870), p. 161.
[52] *Von Eckhart* (1711).
[53] *Von Raumer* (1870), p. 171. "splendid literary-historical overview over all the research into the Germanic languages achieved in Germany as well as England, Scandinavia and the Netherlands up until then." [Author's translation]
[54] *Wegele* (1877), pp. 627-629; *Brill* (1959), pp. 270-271.
[55] *Will* (1781), p. 130.
[56] *Will* (1781), p. 131; *Meyer* (1953), p. 589.

etlicher deutschen Wörter, so Mart. Luth. in Uebersetzung der Bibel gebraucht"[57] in an overview of von Eckhart's writings. This shows that these two copyists of Lindenbrog's Old English glossary knew each other personally. Furthermore, an entry for von Eckhart's incomplete works reads "*Codex legum antiquarum Germaniae Frid. Lindenbrogii*".[58] Von Eckhart was evidently aware of Lindenbrog's scholarly work. However, it is still unclear who first copied Lindenbrog's Old English glossary, von Eckhart or von Stade, but it is likely that one did point the other in the direction of this manuscript. Did both travel to Hamburg to copy it or was the manuscript sent to them? These are just a few questions, which must be the subject of further research on the manuscripts, their time of production, and their authors.

While the when and how of the copies remains unanswered for now, Will reveals some information as to why von Eckhart would have copied Lindenbrog's *Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum*: He argues that proper tools for etymological studies were rare and might only have been available through personal connections, like the one von Eckhart and von Stade entertained. Furthermore, Will recounts an anecdote of von Eckhart reading a dictionary to his first employer, Count Flemming (1667–1728), on their travels. The close and systematic study of a dictionary appears to emerge as an established method of learning a language.[59]

The fact that von Stade, too, made a copy of Lindenbrog's Old English glossary clearly shows that he had an interest in Old English. However, the exact nature of this interest is unclear because so little information about him is available. Von Raumer informs his readers that von Stade was born in 1637, studied in Helmstedt, and returned to Hamburg in 1668.[60] Edward Schröder fills the ten-year gap between von Stade's times in Helmstedt and Hamburg: He moved to Sweden where he studied contemporary Swedish, Old Norse, Old English, Old Frisian and contemporary Dutch. In 1711, he became royal archivist in Bremen and Verden until political changes forced him from that position in 1712. Von Stade is most famous for his contributions to German and Scandinavian studies but his involvement with Old English usually remains unmentioned. Schröder alludes to von Stade's broad knowledge of old Germanic languages and claims that "St. ist der erste deutsche Gelehrte, der über den antiquarischen Dilettantismus hinaus […] zu der klaren Erkenntnis und Forderung vorgeschritten ist, für jeden germanischen Einzeldialekt und für jede Epoche zunächst eine

---

[57] *Will* (1781), p. 155. "to D. von Staden about the explanation of several German words, which Luther used in his Bible translation" [Author's translation]
[58] *Will* (1781), p. 155.
[59] *Will* (1781), pp. 132, 137.
[60] *Von Raumer* (1870), pp. 173-174.

feste grammatische Grundlage zu schaffen."[61] Perhaps he wished to integrate Old English with his knowledge of other Germanic languages. However, due to the scarce information available, if he pursued a more profound purpose, such as an edition of Old English text or a comparison of Old English with Old Norse. The analysis of his Old English manuscript glossary can no doubt shed some light on von Stade's intentions.

Today, scholarship mostly remembers Lindenbrog, von Eckhart and von Stade for their work outside of Old English lexicography. Von Raumer speaks of Joscelyn/Parker, Lindenbrog, von Eckhart und von Stade but does not connect the German scholars to studies of Old English or to each other.[62] Sue Hetherington mentions that Lindenbrog was in contact with Pithou and Camden, and that he wrote an Old English glossary; von Eckhart and von Stade remain unnamed.[63] Overall, modern scholarship of Old English lexicography has treated these German scholars marginally at best.

III.   European Networks

Joscelyn and Lindenbrog never met in person. So how did Lindenbrog gain access to Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* in London? It is known that the manuscript passed into the possession of Robert Cotton after Joscelyn's death in 1603, where it must have received its current shelf marks Cotton Titus A.xv and A.xvi. It is further known that Cotton gave it on loan to Camden in 1612.[64] It is therefore most likely that Lindenbrog gained access to Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* and other manuscripts in the Cottonian library through Camden, most probably in the context of the Society of Antiquaries.

This society, formed in 1586 and disbanded in 1607, continued Parker's work of collecting and preserving old manuscripts but also held meetings to study these records. Cotton offered his library as their meeting place.[65] Other members, such as John Joscelyn, then bequeathed their collections to the Cottonian library.[66] Probably the most influential figure in the Society was Sir Henry Spelman (1563–1641). Adams calls him a "worthy

---

[61] *Schröder* (1893), "St[ade] is the first German scholar who, moving beyond the antiquarian amateurism, reached a clear understanding of a sound grammatical basis of each Germanic dialect at each period in time, and he also demanded the implementation of such bases." [Author's translation]

[62] *Von Raumer* (1870), pp. 49-50, 97-98, 168-176.

[63] *Hetherington* (1980), pp. 77-79.

[64] *Graham* (2000), p. 84. The loan included a grammar of Old English by Joscelyn, which has been lost since.

[65] *Lutz* (2000), pp. 8-9, 16, 25; *Brackmann* (2012), p. 218. King James I (1566–1627) disbanded the Society in 1607 because its members used Cotton's library and its records not just for historical research but as resources for their legal and parliamentary work, which did not always find the king's favour.

[66] *Lutz* (2000), pp. 8-9, 16.

successor to Parker as a patron of Old English".[67] In 1638, he endowed the first ever lectureship of studies in Old English language and literature at a university, namely at the University of Cambridge.[68] Until then the study of the early medieval past had lain mainly with these members of the Society of Antiquaries, men trained as lawyers rather than historians.[69]

The lectureship's first holder was Spelman's friend Abraham Wheelock (1593–1653), an Arabist and librarian at the University of Cambridge.[70] Hetherington shows that Spelman had already encouraged Wheelock to learn Old English prior to 1638, so that he would be proficient in the language once the university installed the lectureship.[71] Wheelock even started compiling his own dictionary of Old English, which Somner then incorporated into his *Dictionarium*.[72] However, this collection of lemmata covered only letters *A* and *B*, and the dictionary was never finished.[73]

Members of the Society of Antiquaries were in contact with like-minded scholars on the continent. Camden was acquainted with Casaubon, and later on with Lindenbrog.[74] Spelman knew Scaliger and Jan de Laet (1581–1649), a Leiden-based Dutch lexicographer of Old English.[75] However, it seems unlikely that Lindenbrog made Spelman's acquaintance in Leiden. He still needed Casaubon to introduce them in 1614, but Spelman and Lindenbrog remained in contact after Lindenbrog's return to Hamburg, as a letter from Lindenbrog to Spelman, dated November 1, 1616 attests.[76] In a warm and familiar tone, Lindenbrog reminisces about his stay in England, and the friendship he shared especially with Spelman and Camden. He invites Spelman to visit Hamburg. Furthermore, he offers to acquire a printing license in Germany for Spelman's legal glossary, of which Spelman had sent him a sample. This sample was most likely part of Spelman's preparatory work for his *Archæologus* (printed 1626) since he gives thanks to Lindenbrog in its preface.[77] Lindenbrog in turn, sent an exemplar of the *Lex Salica* attached to the letter with which Spelman was able to add to his glossary.[78] This letter not only proves Lindenbrog and Spelman's friendship, it also witnesses

---

[67] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 47.
[68] *Bremmer* (2008), p. 138.
[69] *Schoeck* (1958), p. 104.
[70] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 52; *Bremmer* (2008), p. 138.
[71] *Hetherington* (1980), p. 80.
[72] *Rosier* (1966), p. 296. Wheelocke's unfinished dictionary is now London, British Library MS. Harley 761.
[73] *Considine* (2008), p. 193
[74] *Horváth* (1989), p. 24.
[75] *Lutz* (2000), p. 28.
[76] *Horváth* (1988), p. 24. Lindenbrog's letter to Spelman is now SUB Hamburg, LA Lindenbruch, Friedrich : 1-2, Image 1.
[77] *Spelman* (1626), Authoris de se et opera suo, Praefatio [p. iii].
[78] SUB Hamburg, LA Lindenbruch, Friedrich : 1-2, Image 1.

the exchange of books and manuscripts. It was common for scholars to send each other samples of their work or books they thought useful for the other's endeavour, no matter the material's age. Medieval manuscripts travelled across borders and over great distances to serve scholars in their studies.[79]

Spelman also acted as a mediating figure between de Laet in Leiden, and Simonds D'Ewes, another lawyer-scholar of the Society of Antiquaries, who both worked on Old English dictionaries.[80] Initially, Spelman discouraged de Laet from compiling a dictionary since he knew of D'Ewes' lexicographical work and apparently did not want a stranger to publish an Old English dictionary before an Englishman did.[81] However, the Dutch scholar had access to manuscripts that scholars in England were unable to consult. Lexicographers in England had until then mainly worked with religious texts as well as glossed texts that contained both Latin and Old English. As Rolf Bremmer puts it, "they were fishing in the same pond all the time."[82] De Laet, on the other hand, excerpted poetry, a genre largely untouched by English researchers, as well as a medical book that Patrick Young (1584–1652), a Scottish scholar of Ancient Greek, had given him.[83] In 1641, de Laet travelled to England to meet with Spelman and D'Ewes. Even before their meeting, de Laet and D'Ewes seem to have exchanged samples of their projects to ask for the other's opinion. After the meeting, they collaborated even more closely, as Hetherington concludes from the lack of any animosity in their further correspondence.[84] Unfortunately, neither de Laet nor D'Ewes ever published their work. De Laet's manuscript was lost in a fire at the library of the Royal Academy in Copenhagen in 1728.[85] D'Ewes' dictionary was never finished but passed into the possession of Somner who, according to Adams, used it and other materials provided by D'Ewes as sources for his 1659 *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*.[86]

It is possible to conclude that both the Society of Antiquaries and the school of philologists in Leiden emerge as the two important centres through which the early lexicographers of Old English connected. They provided material for lexicographical studies for each other as well as a collective expertise that these scholars could draw from. In the case of Lindenbrog, his lexicographical and legal interests mirrored that of the members of the

---

[79] *Horváth* (1988), p. 45.
[80] *Bremmer* (2008), pp. 136, 150, 155-156.
[81] *Adams* (1970:1917), p. 52.
[82] *Bremmer* (2008), p. 151.
[83] *Bremmer* (2008), p. 151. De Laet excerpted poetry from the manuscript that is now Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Junius 11.
[84] *Hetherington* (1980), pp. 99-100.
[85] *Hetherington* (1980), p. 101.
[86] *Somner* (1659); *Adams* (1979:1917), p. 63.

Society of Antiquaries, and his connections with Casaubon and Scaliger in Leiden facilitated Lindenbrog's introduction to his English colleagues. Lindenbrog, therefore, has to be perceived as the key scholar in Early Modern Europe who transmitted comprehensive knowledge of the Old English language to Germany.

IV.   The Manuscripts – Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latinum* and its Northern German copies

No editions exist of either Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*, or Lindenbrog's copy, titled *Glossarium Saxonico-Latinum*. Scholarship on and editions of von Eckhart and von Stade's copies of the *Glossarium* are equally missing. This chapter provides brief descriptions of the manuscripts as well as first insights into their affiliations with one another.

IV.a   Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* – London, British Library MS. Cotton Titus A.xv and A.xvi[87]

This dictionary survives in two volumes. However, it is unclear whether Joscelyn and Parker intended the dictionary to appear in two volumes. Since Matthew Parker, the principal financial investor in Joscelyn's work, died before Joscelyn and Parker could put their dictionary to print, it is only possible to speculate about their intentions for the dictionary beyond the stage of production that it did reach.

The volumes stand in 1950s bindings of the British Museum. MS. Cotton Titus A.xv consists of 304 pages while MS. Cotton Titus A.xvi counts 308 pages. Both volumes have a two-column layout. The pages are now 225x150mm but this is not their original size.[88] The edges show evidence of later trimming which severely impairs the reading of marginal additions. A close comparison of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* and its Northern German copies will therefore restore a good portion of the lost content.

The entries follow a precise alphabetical order down to the fourth letter. Numerous spaces indicate that the authors left room for further entries. However, it seems that Joscelyn had not yet perfected the system of later additions to the main text, since he started a new

---

[87] *Smith/Wanley* (1984:1696), p. 122; *Ker* (1957), pp. iii, 508.
[88] *Graham* (2000), p. 86.

batch of entries for *A*; after *ayrne* he resumes the letter with *abidan*.[89] He might have excerpted these entries from manuscripts at a later point in time. This shorter list at the end of letter *A* shows the same careful alphabetical order as the rest of the *Dictionarium*. The exact reason why he started this new batch rather than add the entries to the proper places in letter *A* is still elusive.

The *Dictionarium* as a whole appears as a work in progress rather than a manuscript version ready for printing. Numerous additions, deletions, and corrections speak for an intermediate stage rather than a finished product. Timothy Graham identified Joscelyn's vocabulary lists in London, Lambeth Palace Library MS. 692 as a preparatory step towards the compilation of the larger *Dictionarium*.[90] The Lambeth Palace lists are not as meticulously ordered as the *Dictionarium*. They distinguish between different alphabetical blocks, but the entries for one letter do not themselves follow an alphabetical order. For Graham, this is one of several indicators that the Lambeth Palace lists are an intermediate step between the initial collection of words from original manuscripts and the compilation of the *Dictionarium*.[91] Furthermore, he dates the watermark of the Lambeth Palace lists to the 1560s and that of the dictionary to the 1580s so that a clear chronology of production emerges.[92] He also identifies some of the sources for entries in the Lambeth Palace lists.[93] These sources should be the same for the corresponding entries in the later *Dictionarium* and therefore offer an immensely helpful starting point for research into its sources.

The entries in the *Dictionarium* usually consist of the Old English lemma, the Latin interpretament, and a source reference. More often than not, entries show more than one interpretament as well as several source references. Quite frequently, interpretamenta in sixteenth-century English stand side by side with Latin translations. Numerous entries even have more than one lemma. These additional lemmata can be spelling variants of the initial headword, inflected forms, phrases that show the lemma in use, synonyms or (less frequently) antonyms. It appears that the two Titus volumes were subject to proofreading since marginal notes indicate where a wrong sequence of entries occurs. Perhaps these were to ensure a correct order in subsequent (printed) versions. Preliminary analysis shows that the two lexicographers corrected their own mistakes but also proofread the other's work. However, Parker annotated Joscelyn's parts more frequently, than vice versa. This suggests that Parker

---

[89] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 29r.
[90] Graham calls Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* the Titus dictionary. cf. *Graham* (2000), p. 124.
[91] *Graham* (2000), pp. 104-105.
[92] *Graham* (2000), p. 124.
[93] *Graham* (2000), pp. 134-138.

not only wrote the larger sections of the dictionary but also proofread his co-worker's portions more thoroughly.

Some entries show other interesting features whose exact function is not yet clear, such as the use of a marginal x marking a number of entries. Perhaps a subsequent edition was to omit these entries but the reason for this remains hypothetical so far. Other entries or portions of entries were underlined. Parker seems the most likely candidate for this mark up so far, but the purpose of it is still unclear. Perhaps this is an alternative way of marking entries or parts of entries for deletion. However, he does not always supply alternatives for marked portions so that the underlining cannot be clearly understood as a means of deleting a previously given reading. Did Parker mark these entries (and parts of entries) for deletion even if he was not able to provide a substitute for the underlined parts? Were they a memory aid to indicate that Joscelyn and Parker needed to work further on these specific entries? Did they wish to find more or better fitting interpretamenta or other source references? Only a full survey will be able to answer these questions to satisfaction.

Graham estimates that the two Titus volumes together contain more than 20,000 entries. This makes it the most extensive dictionary of Old English in the sixteenth century.[94]. The author's transcription of MSS. Cotton Titus A.xv and xvi has revealed that the *Dictionarium* contains roughly 23,150 entries, which exceeds Graham's estimate by several thousand entries.

Joscelyn collected lemmata and compiled these entries whereas Parker quickly became the main scribe for their dictionary.[95] The Lambeth Palace lists are in Joscelyn's hand, as are letters *A*, *B*, *E*, and *F* in MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, and the *Ma* portion in MS. Cotton Titus A.xvi. Although Parker wrote most of letters *C* and *D*, Joscelyn occasionally took over. In the middle of letter *C*, Joscelyn wrote around 20 pages, which contain entries for lemmata beginning with *cr* and *cpem*.[96] Parker continued on folio 82ra with entries for *cpen* and finished the entries for letter *C*. In letter *D*, Joscelyn relieved Parker at the end of folio 96ra with entries for *dr* and then finished letter *D*.[97] These changes occur in the middle of folios, which suggests that the two cooperated continuously on a regular basis in writing the dictionary.

Even for a paleographically untrained eye, it is easy to distinguish the hands of the two lexicographers. For one, Joscelyn usually used a darker ink whereas Parker's ink is of a red-

---

[94] *Graham* (2000), p. 93; *Rosier* (1960), p. 29.
[95] *Graham* (2000), p. 93.
[96] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fols. 70r-81v.
[97] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 99vb.

brownish hue. Parker usually capitalised lemma, interpretament and source reference, a habit Joscelyn partially adopted for his entries in letter *D*. In letter *E*, Joscelyn returned to his own habit of writing miniscule. Throughout his portion of letter *M*, Joscelyn consistently capitalised the lemmata, but he mostly wrote interpretamenta and source references in his minuscule. For the latter, Joscelyn used his Latin secretary script with frequent abbreviations of *-que*, *-us*, *-per*/*-pro* (for which he used the same abbreviation of a *p* with a stroke through its descender), *-prae*, and nasals. Parker also used a Latin secretary script, but only for Latin interpretamenta and source references. He wrote early modern English interpretamenta in an italic script to present a visible difference between the languages. Parker used fewer abbreviations than Joscelyn did and provided more interpretamenta in early modern English. Overall, his layout as well as his entries appear more orderly and structured. Graham also judges Parker's hand to be the more professional and legible one.[98] Both, Joscelyn and Parker, mimicked quite successfully the Old English vernacular minuscule, including abbreviation markers, for the Old English lemmata, which they copied faithfully from their models. Thus, the spelling in the *Dictionarium* can reliably indicate the source manuscripts from which Joscelyn/Parker most probably extracted them.

IV.b   Lindenbrog's copy – Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Cod. germ. 22[99]

No profound scholarship on this manuscript exists. One reason is that Neil Ker gave a wrong shelf mark for the "collection of OE material formed by Friedrich Lindenbrog […] now in the Hamburg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS. Germ. 32".[100] The faulty first digit could be a typing error or a misreading of the first handwritten number in the manuscript. No matter the cause, this error meant that scholars were led astray if they tried to find the manuscript based on Ker's information.

Another reason is that the manuscript was long considered lost. During World War II, the Hamburg library was evacuated and its collection dispersed.[101] Many items returned to the library after the war but Lindenbrog's copy of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* was not among them. In 1980, Hetherington still mourns the loss of Cod. germ. 22. Interestingly, she gives the correct shelf mark and yet relies on Ker for information about the manuscript. In a

---

[98] *Graham* (2000), p. 93.
[99] *Münzel* (1905), pp. 38-39; *Ker* (1957), pp. 141, 507; *Horváth/Storck* (2002), p. 157.
[100] *Ker* (1957), p. 141. The SUB Hamburg has graciously reminded me that the designation Cod. germ. is now preferable. Thus, I have used it in this article unless it appears in a direct quote, as is the case here.
[101] *Krawehl* (1997), p. 237; *Alessandrini* (2016), p. 47.

footnote, she explains that she received her information about the shelf mark in a 1971 letter by Thilo Brandis, who was the curator of manuscripts in the SUB Hamburg at the time.[102]

Approximately 2,800 manuscripts returned to Hamburg between 1989 and 1990, Cod. germ 22. among them.[103] Thus, the collection of Lindenbrog's materials was not available to scholars such as Hetherington and Horváth. After the restitution of the manuscripts in 1989/90, the librarians in Hamburg had to inventory the 'new' arrivals, "eine mühsame und umständliche Arbeit, deren Abschluß noch nicht abzusehen ist".[104] Yet, Cod. germ. 22 was not in high demand after Horváth had finished her thesis, either. Lindenbrog is only a marginal figure in Hetherington's study, and Horváth mentions Lindenbrog's *Glossarium* in passing since her dissertation mainly focuses on his activities as a book collector and editor of law codes.[105] It was only in 2016, that Oliver Bock of Jena University asked the library for Lindenbrog's collection, having traced the correct shelf mark in early nineteenth-century materials of the London Record Commission. He was surprised to find Cod. germ. 22 restituted and under the shelf mark that Brandis had already given to Hetherington some forty years earlier.[106] Bock then informed Winfried Rudolf of Göttingen University about this find, who in turn recently identified a hitherto unrecorded copy of Lindenbrog's *Glossarium* in Cod. germ. 23, which this paper will treat separately below.

Cod. germ. 22 consists of 391 pages and is ca. 300x200mm in size. Lindenbrog very probably wrote his copy on English paper during his visit from 1614–1616 as the jar watermarks in Cod. germ. 22 suggest.[107] His copy of the *Dictionarium*, which he calls *Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum*, makes up the bulk of the manuscript from pages 1 to 325.[108] His copy has a two-column layout with an average of 45 to 50 entries per page. The author's transcription has shown that it amounts to ca. 16,300 entries in total.

This difference between the number of entries of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* and Lindenbrog's *Glossarium* exists because Lindenbrog did not simply copy the *Dictionarium* in a strict fashion. Whereas the latter often has numerous entries surrounding the same lemma, Lindenbrog's *Glossarium* is often more concise. For example, both have entries for *ængel* but Cod. germ. 22 omits six more entries that MS. Cotton Titus A.xv has for different declensions

---

[102] *Hetherington* (1980), pp. 77, 259.
[103] *Krawehl* (1997), p. 272.
[104] *Horváth* (1988), p. 6, "a tedious and cumbersome task the end of which is not yet in sight [author's translation]."
[105] *Horváth* (1988), pp. V-VI, 110-111.
[106] *Rudolf* (2017), pp. 177-178.
[107] *Heawood* (1950), pp. 143-144.
[108] Several smaller glossaries fill the remaining pages. cf. *Pelle/Rudolf* (2020), forthcoming.

of the word.[109] Furthermore, Lindenbrog usually omitted the early modern English interpretamenta. Apparently, the Latin translations were sufficient for him. This might indicate that he wished to publish his *Glossarium* in Germany, where a scholarly audience would not have required contemporary English translations.

On the other hand, Lindenbrog separated lemmata that Joscelyn/Parker treated in one entry, e.g. *æbera*, *æbere morð*, and *æbera ðeof* are in one entry in MS. Cotton Titus A.xv but the entry for *Æbera ðeof* follows the entry for *Æbera* in Cod. germ. 22.[110] Lindenbrog also shortened many entries by reducing the number of interpretamenta. For example, MS. Cotton Titus A.xv gives *pellat in exiliū* and *relegate* for *adrife* whereas Cod. germ. 22 only has *pellat in exilium*.[111] This example also shows that Lindenbrog resolved the abbreviations found in Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*. Sometimes Lindenbrog gives his own translation of Old English lemmata. MS Cotton Titus A.xv has no interpretament for *æbȳld* while Cod. germ. 22 provides *offensio* as translation[112] On top of these intriguing divergences, Lindenbrog seems to have added entries of his own. For example, the Cod. germ. 22 has an entry for *Ægðer onbutan*, which is not in MS. Cotton Titus A.xv.[113] Where exactly he extracted these extra entries remains to be resolved.

Lindenbrog, like Joscelyn and Parker, used some unconventional markings, such as an asterisk he placed with some entries. These entries correspond to entries, which Joscelyn and Parker also marked in their *Dictionarium*. Joscelyn/Parker's entries for *ecilmehti*, *frena*, *fyligean*, and *fȳrena gramre* (*Fyrena gramþe* in Cod. germ. 22) all have an asterisk in Cod. germ. 22 and show a marginal x as well as underlining in Titus A.xv.[114] The entry for *cearricgge* has no x in the *Dictionarium*, but a portion of the entry is underlined.[115] Lindenbrog has marked this entry with an asterisk nevertheless. Interestingly, the entry for *ecilma* shows underlining and marginal x in the *Dictionarium* but no asterisk in Lindenbrog's copy.[116] It seems Lindenbrog marked some of the same entries, which have markings in Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*, but not all of them. The system behind his selection is for now as unclear as the reason behind Joscelyn and Paker's initial markings.

---

[109] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 6va; Cod. germ. 22, p. 8b.
[110] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 4ra; Cod. germ. 22, p. 5b.
[111] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 5va; Cod. germ. 22, p. 5a.
[112] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 6ra; Cod. germ. 22, p. 5b.
[113] Cod. germ. 22, p. 7b.
[114] *ecilmehti*: MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 107va; Cod. germ. 22, p. 65b; *frena*: MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 145rb; Cod. germ. 22, p. 88b; *fyligean*: MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 148rb; Cod. germ. 22, p. 91a; *fȳrena gramre*: MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 149vb; Cod. germ. 22, p. 91b.
[115] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 72ra; Cod. germ. 22, p. 45b, reads *Cearricge*.
[116] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 107va; Cod. germ. 22, p. 65a.

Lindenbrog did not only invent his own way of marking entries, he also deviated from Joscelyn/Parker's use of Old English vernacular minuscule for Old English lemmata. He used his italic script throughout the entire entries. Nevertheless, he faithfully copied Old English special characters like *æ* and *ð*, although he frequently misread *ð* for regular *d*. On the other hand, he consistently substituted *p* with *w*. Lindenbrog sometimes misread Joscelyn's Old English vernacular minuscule *r* for *s*, for example *abẏrgod* in MS. Cotton Titus A.xv becomes *Abyrgod* in Cod. germ. 22.[117] Like Parker, Lindenbrog habitually capitalised Old English lemmata and source references, but he did not capitalise interpretamenta.

IV.c   A copy by Abraham Hinckelmann? – Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Cod. germ. 23[118]

An entry on the inside of Cod. germ. 22's book cover reveals the existence of another copy of Lindenbrog's copy. The entry reads, "cf. Cod. ms. Morgenweg nr. 172."[119] Right beneath it, a Hamburg librarian noted that this manuscript, i.e. Lindenbrog's collection in Cod. germ. 22, was not the one referred to by this entry about Morgenweg's catalogue.[120] It indicated another copy of the *Dictionarium* with the shelf-mark Cod. germ. 23. Indeed, a manuscript with that shelf mark still exists, equally transported to the USSR after World War II and returned from there in 1990.[121]

This manuscript's origin is not yet clear and requires further research. There is a marginal remark on Cod. germ. 23's title page that reads "man[us] B. Hinckelmanni", most likely in the hand of Johann Christoph Wolf (1683–1739), a German Hebraist and theologian.[122] It is not yet entirely clear to whom this note refers. A potential connection is Abraham Hinckelmann (1652–1695), who was an Orientalist, preacher, and book collector in Lübeck and Hamburg. In 1675, he married Hermann Nottelmann's (1626–1674) widow, whose young son went by the name Bernhard Nottelmann (born 1672).[123] Perhaps Wolf referenced him with his stepfather's last name. As an Orientalist, Abraham Hinckelmann

---

[117] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 2ra; Cod. germ. 22 1r, Image 2. Unfortunately, the author could not acquire a license from the British Library to reproduce images of MS Cotton Titus A.xv and xvi. Thus, images from these manuscripts cannot be attached here.
[118] *Horváth/Storck* (2002), p. 157.
[119] Image 3
[120] Joachim Morgenweg (1666–1730) was a preacher and bibliophile in Hamburg.
[121] *Krawehl* (1997), p 272.
[122] *Bertheau* (1898), pp. 545-546.
[123] *Dittmer* (1859), pp. 65-66.

owned a large collection of Hebrew and other philological volumes, which Joachim Morgenweg (1666–1730) acquired after the former's death.[124] Wolf in turn bought large portions of Morgenweg's oriental collection.[125] He then bequeathed his personal library, possibly including Cod. germ. 23, to the Stadtbibliothek Hamburg, which in 1919 became the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (SUB) Hamburg.[126]

The manuscript's authorship is as mysterious as its journey into the holdings of the SUB Hamburg. It is clear that the hand that wrote the title page did not write the actual copy of the dictionary. Upon preliminary inspection, it seems very likely, however, that Cod. germ. 23 is a direct copy of Cod. germ. 22 since the first folios are an exact match in number of entries as well as layout. Cod. germ. 23 has an empty space at the top of the page where Cod. germ. 22 has the title *Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum.* Whoever wrote Cod. germ. 23 left room for the title since the entries only start a quarter of the page down, exactly as Cod. germ. 22 has it. An enlarged capital highlights the first entry in both versions. In multiple-line entries, Cod. germ. 23. indents lines following the first one just like Cod. germ. 22 does. Also, Cod. germ. 23 has the same uncorrected misreading of Old English vernacular minuscule *s* for *r* that Cod. germ. 22 shows. A preliminary viewing revealed that it marks the same entries with an asterisk as Cod. germ. 22. All this speaks for Cod. germ. 23 as a direct copy of Cod. germ. 22, but more work is needed to reveal the exact relation between the two and other later copies.[127]

IV.d   von Eckhart's copy – Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, MS. IV.495[128]

This manuscript's pages measure 167x97mm in size, and it contains 588 leaves. Like Lindenbrog's manuscript Cod. germ. 22, it is a collection of several glossaries. The first 511 leaves contain the *Glossarium*. A professional copyist wrote the main bulk of MS. IV.495. However, the first folio of the *Glossarium* and the smaller glossaries at the end of the volume are in von Eckhart's curly italic handwriting whereas the main body of the *Glossarium* is in a neater and more orderly hand.[129] Like Lindenbrog, neither von Eckhart nor the copyist retained features of Old English vernacular minuscule. The scribe of the main dictionary

---

[124] *Von Melle* (1885), p.234.
[125] *Storck* (2014), pp. 16-17.
[126] *Horváth/Storck* (2002), pp. 7, 12.
[127] Image 4
[128] *Bodemann* (1867), p. 85; *Ker* (1957), p. 507.
[129] Image 5 shows a sample of von Eckhart's hand.

copied a decorative little flower in the same spot, where Lindenbrog marked the transition from *Ayrne* to *Abidan* with that same feature.[130] Nevertheless, this manuscript's layout differs from Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* as well as the other Northern German copies, probably due to its small leaf size. It has only a single column, whereas all the other manuscripts have a two-column layout. Perhaps von Eckhart intended it as a personal reference book.

IV.e   von Stade's copy – Göttingen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, 2 Cod. MS. philol 249[131]

The Göttingen manuscript has 199 leaves, is 320x200mm in size, and shows no sign of trimming. The content largely mirrors that of Cod. germ. 22. Wilhelm Meyer noticed the difference in number of entries between Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* and the copies by Lindenbrog and von Stade. He reasoned that this Göttingen manuscript could be the lost original to Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* since the latter has more entries, which he interprets as Joscelyn/Parker having added entries to their copy.[132] Apparently, Meyer could not conceive of the way in which Lindenbrog manipulated the *Dictionarium'*s content when he copied it in England. Considering the valuable research that Graham has done on the Lambeth Palace lists, it is clear that none of the Northern German copies could have been an unknown original dictionary that Joscelyn/Parker then expanded, but rather that Joscelyn compiled vocabulary lists, which culminated in the production of the *Dictionarium*, as portrayed above.

That von Stade mentions von Eckhart's collection in his bibliography, even though he copied from Lindenbrog, indicates that both, von Eckhart and von Stade produced their manuscripts before von Stade's death in 1718.[133] It is likely that von Eckhart began with his research into Old English after Leibniz employed him in Hanover in 1694. Further research, especially into the watermarks, will lead to a more accurate dating of both manuscripts within that timeframe.

2 Cod. MS. philol 249 is an exact copy of Lindenbrog's copy of Joselyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*. It has the same two-column structure with an identical entry distribution. As mentioned above, Cod. germ. 22 usually shows indented lines where an entry reaches over

---

[130] Cod. germ. 22. p. 23b, Image 6; MS. IV.495 40r, Image 8.
[131] *Meyer* (1893:1980), pp. 64-66; *Ker* (1957), p. 507.
[132] *Meyer* (1893:1980), pp. 65.
[133] 2 Cod. MS. philol 249, fols. 198v-199r.

several lines. Von Stade's Göttingen manuscript shows those same indentations as well as the exact same content of each line. Lindenbrog quite frequently wrote the first lemma of the following folio on the bottom of the previous one. The Göttingen manuscript shows these same catchwords, which von Stade must have copied from Cod. germ. 22. At the end of letter *A*, all copies show the same feature as Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium*; they all copy the renewed list of entries for *A* that were not integrated into the first alphabetical section of letter *A*.[134] Where Joscelyn/Parker left some empty space, Lindenbrog marked this transition by a small flower decoration. Von Stade did not copy the flower as such but drew the same cloud shape that he used elsewhere in the manuscript to mark the end of a section.

Von Stade's copy has the same misreading of Old English vernacular minuscule *s* for *r* as can be found in the copies of Lindenbrog and von Eckhart. However, it shows later corrections back to *s*.[135] Perhaps von Stade amended these mistakes himself since the letters seem similar to his usual style. Furthermore, the ink in these corrections looks very much the same as the one in the main text. Further analysis will determine the correcting hand more reliably.

V.   Conclusion

Though modern scholarship is not entirely ignorant of the early modern Northern German lexicographers of Old English, this paper has attempted to show that their materials merit much more attention than has hitherto been paid to them. These scholars were productive in the copying and collation of Old English glossaries because they lacked access to printed dictionaries that could have helped them in learning this ancient cousin of their own native language. Regardless of their individual intentions, surviving documents show that early modern scholars of Old English (and other Germanic languages) connected across Europe and collaborated on their research. Important centres were the Society of Antiquaries in London and Leiden University in the Netherlands. Members of these two circles cooperated with each other as well as other European scholars; they exchanged ideas as well as resources as the examples of de Laet and D'Ewes, Spelman and Lindenbrog demonstrate. Most importantly, Lindenbrog's copy of Joscelyn/Parker's *Dictionarium* and its transport to Northern Germany mark the key moment at which knowledge of Old English is introduced to that region. Von

---

[134] MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, fol. 29rb; Cod. germ. 22, p. 23b, Image 6; 2 Cod. MS. philol 249, fol. 14rb, Image 7; MS. IV.495, fol. 40r, Image 8.

[135] 2 Cod. MS. philol 249, fol. 3rb, Image 9.

Eckhart and von Stade then show that German scholars pursued a serious interest in Old English even before the nineteenth century and its dubious invention of the national philologies.

VI.   Outlook – The Author's Dissertation Project

Despite their evident importance, the Anglo-Saxonica of these scholars are still only available in manuscript form. An xml-transcription-based edition of these manuscript dictionaries and research into the scholars' network and exchange, which are at the heart of the author's dissertation project, aims at closing this gap in the history of Old English lexicography and the history of English Studies on the European continent as a whole. This preliminary report marks the beginning of the author's research and therefore important questions must remain unanswered for now. In her project, the author will analyse the manuscripts' content to: 1) further explore the exact sources available to Joscelyn and Parker; 2) better understand the affiliations between the Northern German copies; and 3) compare the Old English lemmata to the current *Dictionary of Old English* to filter out potential new spelling variants or even lemmata.[136] This procedure will hopefully bring to light some Old English vocabulary hitherto unknown or unrecorded and might reveal traces of formerly extant manuscripts that might be lost today. The results will no doubt prove to be most valuable for the study of the origins of the present-day world language of English.

VII.   Appendix – Images[137]

Image 1: Lindenbrog's letter to Spelman, November 1, 1616 (Staats- und
     Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, LA Lindenbruch, Friedrich : 1-2).

Image 2: Lindenbrog's misreading of Old English vernacular minuscule *s* for *r* in column b
     (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Cod. germ. 22. p. 1).

Image 3: Directions to Cod. germ. 23 (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Cod.
     germ. 22. inside of book cover).

Image 4: Similarities to Cod. germ. 22 p. 1 (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Cod.
     germ. 23. 1r), compare to Image 2.

---

[136] https://doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html

[137] Gratitude and credit go to the libraries in Göttingen, Hamburg, and Hanover for providing the images.

Image 5: von Eckhart's hand and one-column layout (Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover, MS. IV.495 1r).

Image 6: Inked flower between sections of letter *A* (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg Cod. germ. 22 p. 23b).

Image 7: Inked flower between sections of letter *A* (Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover, MS. IV.495 40r).

Image 8: Inked cloud between sections of letter *A* (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2 Cod. MS. philol 249 14r).

Image 9: Corrected misreading of *s* for *r* (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2 Cod. MS. philol 249 3r), compare also to Image 2.

VIII. Works Cited

VII.a   Manuscripts

Hinckelmann, Abraham(?): Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Cod. germ. 23, mid-seventeenth century.

Joscelyn, John/John Parker: Dictionarium. Saxonico-Latinum. 1. ps., London, British Library, MS. Cotton Titus A.xv, ca. 1580s.

Joscelyn, John/John Parker: Dictionarium Saxonico-Latinum. 2. ps., London, British Library, MS. Cotton Titus A.xvi, ca. 1580s.

Lindenbrog, Friedrich: Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Cod. germ. 22, ca. 1614-1618.

Lindenbrog, Friedrich: Letter to Sir Henry Spelman, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, LA Lindenbruch, Friedrich : 1-2.

Nowell, Laurence: Vocabularium Saxonicum, Bodleian Library Oxford, MS. Selden supra 63.

von Eckhart, Johann Georg von: Glossarium Anglo-Saxonico-Latinum, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover, MS. IV.495, ca. 1694-1718.

von Stade, Dietrich von: Glossarium Anglo- Saxonico-Latinum, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, 2 Cod. MS. philol 249, not after 1718.

VII.b   Secondary Literature

Adams, Eleanor: Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800, New Haven & London 1917 (Reprint 1970).

Alessandrini, Jan L.: Bombs on books: allied destruction of German libraries during World War II, in: Lieve Watteeuw/Mel Collier (eds.), What do we lose when we lose a library? Proceedings of the conference held at KU Leuven 9-11 September 2015, Leuven 2016, pp. 45-54.

Bodemann, Eduard: Die Handschriften der Koeniglichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover. Beschrieben und herausgegeben von Eduard Bodemann, Hannover 1867.

Brackmann, Rebecca: The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England. Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde and the Study of Old English (= Studies in Renaissance Literature, vol. 30), Cambridge 2012.

Bremmer, Rolf H. Jr.: "Mine is Bigger Than Yours'": The Anglo-Saxon Collections of Johannes de Laet (1581–1649) and Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–1650), in: Thomas N. Hall/Donald G. Scragg (eds.), Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss' Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. Kalamazoo 2008, pp. 136-174

Buckalew, Ronald E.: Leland's Transcripts of Ælfric's Glossary, in: Anglo-Saxon England 7 (1978), pp. 149-164.

Considine, John: Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe. Lexicography and the Making of Heritage, Cambridge 2008.

Dekker, Kees: Ancient Laws and Early Modern Identities. The Myth of the Lex Salica, in: Rudolf Suntrup/Jan R. Veenstra (eds.), Building the Past / Konstruktion der Vergangenheit (= Medieval to Early Modern Culture / Kultureller Wandel vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit, vol. 7), Frankfurt am Main 2006, pp. 187-211.

Dittmer, G.W.: Genealogische und biographische Nachrichten über Lübeckische Familien aus älterer Zeit, Lübeck 1859.

Evans, Robert John Weston: Rantzau and Welser: Aspects of later German humanism, in: History of European Ideas 5 (1984), pp. 257-272.

Foxe, John: The Gospels of the Four Evangelists, London 1571. [STC 2961]

Gneuss, Helmut: Die Wissenschaft von der englischen Sprache: Ihre Entwicklung bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts, München 1990.

Gneuss, Helmut: English Language Scholarship: A Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century. Binghamton, NY 1996.

Graham, Timothy: John Joscelyn, Pioneer of Old English Lexicography, in: Timothy Graham (ed.), The Recovery of Old English. Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Kalamazoo 2000, pp. 83-140.

Heawood, Edward: Watermarks mainly of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Hilversum 1950.

Hetherington, M. Sue: The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography, Spicewood, Texas 1980.

Horváth, Eva: Friedrich Lindenbruch, Späthumanist und Handschriftensammler des 17. Jahrhunderts, Hamburg 1988.

Horváth, Eva and Hans-Walter *Storck*: Von Rittern, Bürgern und von Gottes Wort. Volkssprachige Literatur in Handschriften und Drucken aus dem Besitz der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg (= Schriften aus dem Antiquariat Dr. Jörn Günther, Hamburg, vol. 2), Kiel/Hamburg 2002.

Ker, Neil R.: Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon, Oxford 1952.

Krawehl, Otto-Ernst: Verlagert – verschollen – zum Teil restituiert. Das Schicksal der im 2. Weltkrieg ausgelagerten Bestände der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, in: Zeitschrift des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte 83 (1977), pp. 237-277.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm and Johann Georg *von Eckhart*: Collectanea etymologica, illustration linguarum, veteris celticæ, germanicæ, gallicæ, alarumque inservientia. Cum præfatione Jo. Georgii Eccardi, Hannover 1717.

Lindenbrog, Friedrich: Codem legum antiquarum, Frankfurt 1613.

Lutz, Angelika: Das Studium der angelsächsischen Chronik im 16. Jahrhundert: Nowell und Joscelyn, in: Anglia 100 (1982), pp. 301-356.

Lutz, Angelika: The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in the Universities, in: Timothy Graham (ed.), Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Kalamazoo 2000, pp. 1-82.

Marckwardt, Albert H.: Laurence Nowell's Vocabularium Saxonicum, Ann Arbor 1952.

Meyer, Wilhelm: Die Handschriften in Göttingen. vol. 1. (=Verzeichnis der Handschriften im Preussischen Staate. 1 Hannover. 1 Göttingen, vol. 1.), Berlin 1893 (Reprint Hildesheim 1980).

Münzel, R.: Philologica Hamburgensia. Für die Mitglieder der 48. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner, Hamburg 1905.

Page, Raymond L.: Matthew Parker and his Books. Sandars Lectures in Bibliography. Delivered on 14, 16, and 18 May 1990 at the University of Cambridge, Kalamazoo 1993.

Parker, Matthew: A Testimonie of Antiquitie, London ca. 1566. [STC 159 and 159.5]

Pelle, Stephen and Winfried *Rudolf*: The Northern German Copies of the Old English Dictionary by John Joscelyn and John Parker Rediscovered, in: Anglia (2020), forthcoming.

Pithou, Francois and Friedrich *Lindenbrog*: Liber Legis Salicæ. Glossarium sive interpretatio rerum & verborum obscuriorum quæ in ea lege habentur, Paris 1602.

Rosier, James L.: The Sources of John Joscelyn's Old English-Latin Dictionary, in: Anglia 78 (1960), pp. 28-39.

Rosier, James L.: Lexicographical Genealogy in Old English, in: JEGP. Journal of English and Germanic Philology 65 (1966), pp. 295-302.

Rudolf, Winfried: Uuaregat selfiu uuaregot – A Personal Note on Anglo-German Philological Relations Past and Present, in Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik (LiLi) 47.4 (2017), pp. 167-180.

Schoeck, Richard J.: Early Anglo-Saxon studies and legal scholarship in the Renaissance, in: Studies in the Renaissance 5 (1958), p. 102-110.

Smith, Thomas and Humfrey *Wanley*: Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library 1696. (Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae), London 1696 (Reprint Woodbridge 1984).

Somner, William: Dictionarium Saxonico-latino-Anglicum, Oxford 1659. [Wing S4663]

Spelman, Henry: Archæologus. In modum glossarii ad rem antiquam posteriorem, London 1626. [STC 23065 and 23065.5]

Storck, Hans-Walter: Geschichte der Hebraicasammlung – The History of the Hebraica Collection, in: manuscript cultures 6 (2014), pp. 13-27.

von Eckhart, Johann Georg: Historia studii etymologici linguæ Germanicæ hactenus impensi, Hannover 1711.

von Raumer, Rudolf von: Geschichte der germanischen Philologie vorzugsweise in Deutschland, München 1870.

Wegele, Franz Xaver: Von Eckhart, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie vol. 5, Leipzig 1877, pp. 627-631.

Wilckens, Nicolaus: Leben Der Berühmten Lindenbrogiorum Nebst einer Nachricht Vom Leben Geverharti Elmenhorstii, Joachimi Moersii, Heliae Pvtschi, Und Cornello Dalii, Hamburg 1723.

Will, Georg Andreas: Anekdoten zur Lebensgeschichte des berühmten Historiographs Johann Georg von Eckhart, in: Historisch-diplomatisches Magazin für das Vaterland und angrenzende Gegenden 1 (1781), pp. 130-168.

VII.c   Online Resources (Access October 2019)

Bertheau, Carl: Wolf, Johann Christoph, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 44 (1898), pp. 545-548, URL: https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz86038.html

Brill, Richard: Eccard, Johann Georg von, in: Neue Deutsche Biographie 4 (1959), pp. 270-271, URL: http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118958461.html

Meyer, Gerhard: Baring, Daniel Eberhard, in: Neue Deutsche Biographie 1 (1953), p. 589-590, URL: https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz11333.html

Neef, Friedhelm: Lindenbrog, Friedrich, in: Neue Deutsche Biographie 14 (1985), pp. 596-597, URL: http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd11901484X.html

Schroeder, Edward: Stade, Dietrich von, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 35 (1893), pp. 353-355, URL: http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117194778.html

University of Toronto: The Dictionary of Old English, URL: https://doe.utoronto.ca/pages/index.html

Von Melle, W.: Morgenweg, Joachim, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 22 (1885), p. 234, URL: https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz65460.html