"Mine is Bigger than Yours": The Anglo-Saxon Collections of Johannes de Laet (1581–1649) and Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–1650)

Bremmer Jr., Rolf H.; Hall T.N., Scragg D.

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	[Leiden University Non-exclusive license](https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14081)
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14081

"Mine Is Bigger Than Yours": The Anglo-Saxon Collections of Johannes de Laet (1581–1649) and Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–50)

Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr.

Today the community of Anglo-Saxonists is a global affair. Their presence at the yearly conferences in Kalamazoo and Leeds and the biennial gatherings of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists gives a lively testimony to this simple observation. Though the scale of this international community today is no doubt unprecedented, it is remarkable that Anglo-Saxon studies have almost from the start attracted the interest of scholars who were not English. In this essay I shall focus on two early Anglo-Saxonists, the Dutchman Johannes de Laet and the Englishman Sir Simonds D'Ewes, both of whom were involved, as competitors and collaborators, in the compilation of an Anglo-Saxon dictionary in the 1630s and 1640s. Both men played a remarkable role in the growth of Anglo-Saxon studies, yet their dictionaries shared a similar tragic fate in that they never made it to the printer's press. Hence, the lexicographical efforts of these two pioneers regrettably remained virtually without effect upon the immediately succeeding generations of Anglo-Saxonists. My concern will especially be directed toward the sources, both manuscript and printed, which de Laet and D'Ewes collected as source material for their dictionaries.[1]

Despite brief mentions in the body of her text, Eleanor N. Adams included neither D'Ewes nor de Laet in the Index to her ground-breaking book *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566–1800*.[2] Not wholly surprisingly either, in view of its scope, the names of D'Ewes and de Laet are looked for in vain in Helmut Gneuss's rather comprehensive survey of

---

1. This article has been long in the making, and I gratefully acknowledge the editors' patience. I would also like to thank Kees Dekker and Sophie van Romburgh for their knowledgeable support and especially an anonymous reader who saved me from a number of minor and major slips and whose expertise I have greatly profited from.

2. Eleanor N. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566–1800*, Yale Studies in English 55 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917; repr. London: Archon Books, 1970), pp. 53, 55 (on D'Ewes), 52–53, 56 (on de Laet).

English studies from early modern times to around 1900.[3] A scholar who did devote detailed attention to both D'Ewes and de Laet was M. Sue Hetherington, in her monograph on the early years of Old English lexicography. However much she has helped advance our knowledge of the work of early Old English lexicographers, Hetherington's information and conclusions cannot always stand the test of critical appraisal.[4] Whether my contribution will induce Professor Gneuss to secure a place for these two proto-scholars of the English language in a future second edition of his *English Language Scholarship* remains to be seen, but I shall make a concerted effort. After a brief sketch of the infant years of Anglo-Saxon studies in England and the Netherlands, I shall proceed to a comparison of the aims, methods, and motivations of D'Ewes and de Laet.

The history of the beginnings of Old English studies in England has enjoyed much renewed attention during the past decade or so. The collecting and publishing activities of Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–75), his secretary John Joscelyn (1529–1603), and such pioneers as Laurence Nowell (d. ?1570) and William Lambarde (1536–1601) have been fairly well covered.[5] But with the death of the first generation of Elizabethan Anglo-Saxonists, it would seem that their activities had lost coherence. For

3. Helmut Gneuss, *English Language Scholarship: A Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, MRTS 125 (Binghamton: MRTS, 1996).

4. M. S. Hetheringon, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography* (Spicewood, Tex.: privately printed, 1980), reviewed by Eric G. Stanley, *N&Q*, n.s. 29 (1982), 238–40; Gilda Cilluffo, *Schede medievali* 2 (1983), 127–29; Basil Cottle, *RES*, n.s. 33 (1983), 446–47; Manfred Görlach, *Colloquia Germanica* 15 (1983), 257–58; Martin Lehnert, *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 31 (1983), 53–55; Johan Kerling, *English Studies* 65 (1984), 174; Angelika Lutz, *Archiv*, 221 (1984), 160–63; Susan Cooper, *MÆ* 54 (1985), 291–92.

5. Janet Bately, "John Joscelyn and the Laws of the Anglo-Saxon Kings," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1992), pp. 435–66; Timothy Graham, "The Old English Prefatory Texts in the Corpus Canterbury Pontifical," *Anglia* 113 (1995), 1–15; Raymond J. S. Grant, *Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde and the Laws of the Anglo-Saxons*, Costerus, n.s. 108 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996); Patrick Wormald, "The Lambarde Problem: Eighty Years On," in *Alfred the Wise: Studies in Honour of Janet Bately*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson with Malcolm Godden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 237–75; Carl Berkhout, "Laurence Nowell (1530–ca. 1570)," in *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline. Vol. 2: Literature and Philology*, ed. Helen Damico with Donald Fennema and Karmen Lenz (New York and London: Garland, 1998), pp. 3–17. See also Kees Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 92 (Leiden: Brill, 1999); and *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000).

the next two decades, the study of Old English was carried on by *Einzelgänger*. One of these was William L'Isle (?1569–1637), who, building on the foundation laid by Parker, published his *A Saxon Treatise Concerning the Old and the New Testament* in 1623. L'Isle was a relative (some sources say a cousin, others a son-in-law) of Sir Henry Spelman (ca. 1560–1641), who had carried the flag of Saxon studies from the Elizabethan London Antiquaries to the 1630s.[6] It was Spelman who initiated the foundation of a Lectureship in Anglo-Saxon studies at Cambridge in 1638, to be occupied by his protégé, the Arabist and university librarian, Abraham Wheelock. It was Spelman, too, who served the discipline by publishing valuable Latin and Old English documents pertaining to the common history of the church and state of England, the *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones, in Re Ecclesiarum orbis Britannici*, in 1639. Spelman was also the driving force behind the publication by his son John of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter in 1640, the edited text of which was based on more than one manuscript (as the title page proudly announces)—in fact the first Old English text edition to be treated that way.[7] Finally, we owe it to Spelman's encouragement and financial support that Wheelock brought out the Old English Bede in 1643. One might therefore, with some justification, speak of a Spelman circle of Anglo-Saxonists in the 1630s and early 1640s.[8]

Before the end of the sixteenth century, several scholars in the Low Countries had embarked, if modestly, on the study of Old English, mainly for linguistic purposes. In the Spanish Netherlands, in Antwerp to be precise, the lexicographer Cornelis Kiliaan had busily excerpted Lambarde's *Archaionomia* of 1568, in order to include Old English cognates in his 1599 edition of the *Etymologicum Teutonicae linguae*. This book was the first comparative etymological dictionary of Dutch, and indeed of any Germanic language, and

---

6. On L'Isle, see Timothy Graham, "William L'Isle's Letters to Sir Robert Cotton," in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser, MRTS 252 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp. 353–79; the essays by Phillip Pulsiano, "William L'Isle and the Editing of Old English," and Stuart Lee, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 381: William L'Isle, Ælfric, and the *Ancrene Wisse*," in *The Recovery of Old English*, ed. Graham, pp. 173–206 and 207–42 respectively; and Timothy Graham, "Early Modern Users of Claudius B. IV: Robert Talbot and William L'Isle," in *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000), pp. 271–316.

7. *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus. A Johanne Spelmanno D. Hen. fil. editum. E vetustissimo exemplari Ms. in Bibliotheca ipsius Henrici, & cum tribus aliis non multo minus vetustis collatum* (London: R. Badger, 1640).

8. On Henry Spelman, see the entry by S. Handley in *ODNB* 51:791–93.

was to be avidly consulted by many a contemporary and later Anglo-Saxonist.[9] Slightly further to the north, in the young Republic of the Dutch United Provinces, a similar interest in Old English can be observed, even predating that of Kiliaan and probably an important source of Kiliaan's inspiration.

One way of assessing the interest that early modern Dutch scholars fostered for matters Anglo-Saxon is by analyzing the auction catalogues of their libraries. Selling private libraries at public auctions was a new phenomenon in Holland at the end of the sixteenth century, and we are fortunate that booksellers' printed catalogues to attract potential purchasers survive. Many such auction catalogues—not infrequently annotated with the prices that the items listed had fetched—have, sometimes uniquely, been preserved in libraries throughout Europe. The ongoing project "Book Sales Catalogues of the Dutch Republic, 1599–1800," which has made and is still making microfiche facsimiles of these catalogues, enables the interested scholar to discover online whose library was publicly sold, where a particular catalogue can be found, and whether the catalogue is available in microfiche.[10]

The first auction catalogue ever printed in the Netherlands features the library of Phillips Marnix, lord of St. Aldegonde (1540–98), a humanist scholar, militant Calvinist, and one-time secretary of William the Silent. Marnix was one of the first humanists to have seen the Codex Argenteus and to have copied the Lord's Prayer from this sixth-century Gothic Gospel manuscript for further study and polemical material.[11] Marnix's scope was wider than Gothic and also included Old English—witness his possession of Parker's edition of Ælfric's sermon on the Sacrifice on Easterday, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* (London, 1566).[12] Likewise, the auction catalogue of the library of the famous philologist Joseph Scaliger, who worked at Leiden from 1591 to 1609, reveals that Scaliger owned several books related

9. Kees Dekker, "'*Vide Kilian* . . .': The Role of Kiliaan's *Etymologicum* in Old English Studies between 1650 and 1665," *Anglia* 114 (1996), 514–43.

10. General editors J. A. Gruys and H. W. de Kooker. The microfiche facsimiles are published by ICD, Leiden. Each item in the online catalogue includes the item's number in the ICD Catalogue as well as the microfiche number.

11. Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, p. 41.

12. *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae nobilissimi clarissimique viri piae memoriae D. Philippi Marnixii Sancto-Aldegondii* (Leiden: C. Gujot, 1599), repr. with an introduction by G. J. Brouwer, *Catalogue of the Library of Philips van Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde: Sold by Auction (July 6th) Leiden, Christophorus Guyot, 1599* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1964). IDC-cat. 2569; mf. 3975. The *Testimonie* is found in the catalogue on p. C3.

to Anglo-Saxon England: Parker's edition of Bishop Asser's Life of King Alfred and Parker's history of the English Church, as well as three titles by William Camden.[13]

Printed evidence of interest in Old English among Dutch philologists is readily available in Bonaventura Vulcanius's *De lingua et literis Gothorum* of 1597. In this fairly slim volume, Vulcanius, the Leiden professor of Greek and ancient history, presented a survey of specimens of Old Germanic languages in Gothic, Old High German, Old English, Icelandic, and "Runic" as well as samples of sixteenth-century Frisian and the various Scandinavian languages, and he audaciously extended his view to include Persian and even Coptic. For most of these languages, special typefaces had been cast, and the book's additional purpose seems to have been to provide a showcase for the Leiden University printer, Franciscus Raphelengius, a son-in-law of the famous Antwerp printer Christopher Plantin. Immediately following the language specimens of Gothic and Old High German, Vulcanius proceeded with Old English. He informed the reader that the Old English characters differed considerably from both the Dutch (*Belgica*, as he called it) and the Latin ones, and that he had heard of many Anglo-Saxon manuscripts still extant in English archives and libraries. The text that Vulcanius had chosen to print was Alfred's *Preface to the Pastoral Care*, one of many texts, he told the reader, which King Alfred had ordered to be translated from Latin into English. Vulcanius had found this text in Matthew Parker's *Ælfredi regis Res gestae* of 1574.[14] Despite his ample stock, the printer Raphelengius apparently did not possess any Anglo-Saxon typefaces, and Vulcanius apologized for the fact that the text so carefully printed in Anglo-Saxon characters by John Day, notably the *f, g, r, s, t,* and *z* (by the last of which he meant the *yogh*), as well as a number of abbreviations,[15]

---

13. *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae illust. viri Josephi Scaligeri [. . .]* (Leiden: Thomas Bosson, 1609); facsimile edition with introduction by H. J. de Jonge, *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J. J. Scaliger* (Utrecht: H. & S. Publishers, 1977), p. 17: [Parker,] *Ælfredi res gestæ literis Saxonicis. Londini*, [Parker,] *De antiquitate Britann. Eccles. Frankf. 1605*, and Camden, *Anglica, Hibernica, etc. Frankft. 1601*; p. 19: Camden, *Britannia. Lond. 94*; p. 46: Camden, *Britannia. Lond. 94* (2nd copy). IDC-cat. 2572, mf. 3978.

14. Vulcanius's library was sold in two separate auctions in 1610 and 1615: *Bibliotheca Bon. Vulcanii* (Leiden: Jan Bouwensz, 1610), IDC-cat. 1160; mf. 1945; and *Catalogvs librorvm* (Leiden: Henrick Lodewijcxsoon van Haestens, 1615), IDC-cat. 1730; mf. 2922. Neither auction catalogue lists *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. In all likelihood, Vulcanius had borrowed his colleague Scaliger's copy for the long quotation.

15. In the list of "Saxon Caracters or letters" printed at the end of *A Testimonie*, the *yogh* is keyed to the *z*. The abbreviations concern the Tironian mark for *and* and the cross-barred thorn (þ) for *þæt*.

had to be substituted in his specimen by ordinary Latin characters. Vulcanius concluded his introduction by saying that Alfred's letter (in his printed source, that is) was provided with an interlinear translation into English "as it is used today" (*quae hodie est in vsu*), and that he had added a Latin translation so that "the studious Reader will be able to compare the old [Anglo-]Saxon with the English and our Dutch language" (*vt studiosus Lector Saxonicam veterem cum Anglica & nostrate Teutonica lingua conferre possit*).[16]

One studious reader who took up Vulcanius's invitation was one of his own students, Johannes de Laet.[17] De Laet matriculated at Leiden University in 1597, the year that Vulcanius's book on the Gothic language had appeared, and attended lectures not only with Vulcanius but also with Joseph Scaliger, who imbued him with a love for medieval history. After he had finished his studies, de Laet went to live in London in 1603, presumably for mercantile reasons. During his three years in London, Scaliger maintained a lively correspondence with his former student, from which we learn, for instance, that both men were engaged in studying Carolingian authors such as Walafrid Strabo.[18]

From an exchange of letters in 1616 between de Laet and William Camden concerning Foxe's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, we learn that de Laet had borrowed Camden's copy of the book and had been slow in returning it.[19] From this year onwards we hear nothing about his Anglo-Saxonist activities until the middle of the 1630s. Meanwhile, de Laet had long since become a respectable citizen of Leiden and had gained recognition for his achievements in various fields. As an elder of the Leiden congregation, he had been delegated to the Synod of Dordt in 1618–19, an international Calvinist council that assembled to settle certain theological

---

16. Vulcanius, *De lingua et literis Gothorum*, p. 72.

17. On de Laet, see J. A. F. Bekkers, *Correspondence of John Morris with Johannes de Laet (1634–1649)* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1970); J. A. Jacobs, "Johannes de Laet en de Nieuwe Wereld," *Jaarboek van het Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* 50 (1996), 108–30; the contributions to *Johannes de Laet (1581–1649): A Leiden Polymath*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Paul Hoftijzer, special issue of *Lias: Sources and Documents Relating to the Early Modern History of Ideas* 25.2 (1998); J. A. Gruijs, "De reeks 'Republieken' van de Elzeviers en Joannes de Laet," in *Boekverkopers van Europa: Het zeventiende-eeuwse uitgevershuis Elzevier*, ed. B. P. M. Dongelmans, P. G. Hoftijzer, and O. S. Lankhorst (Zutphen: Walburg Press, 2000), pp. 77–106; and R. H. Bremmer, Jr.'s contribution to *ODNB* 32:207.

18. Joseph Scaliger, *Epistolae omnes, quae reperiri potuerunt, nunc primum collectae*, ed. David Heinsius (Frankfurt: Aubriori and Clemens Schleichius, 1627), Ep. 444.

19. *Gulielmi Camdeni, et illustrium virorum ad G. Camdenum epistolæ. Cum appendice varii argumenti* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1691), no. 122.

controversies that had arisen in the Netherlands. He was actually involved
in the editing and publication of its *Acta;* most likely, he wrote the *Praefatio*
to these proceedings himself.[20] De Laet had also published and would con-
tinue to publish a great number of books on various topics, ranging from
a thorough discussion, based on a wide choice of patristic and early medi-
eval sources, of the heretical ideas of the early Christian Pelagius and his
followers (1617) to a massive and lavishly illustrated work on the New
World (1625, in Dutch; 1633, in Latin; 1640, in French—the last two in his
own translation), a splendid edition of Pliny's *Historia naturalis* (1635),[21]
various smaller and larger geographical and historical works, a compendious
history of the world (1643), and a lavishly illustrated edition of Vitruvius's
De architectura (1649)—all in Latin, of course.[22] Finally, de Laet was one of
the founding Directors of the Dutch West Indies Company (1621), and as
a successful merchant he had made a considerable fortune, with landed
possessions in Holland and as far away as in New Netherland, near present-
day Albany, New York.

Sir Simonds D'Ewes, in contrast, was a man of (modest) noble birth.[23]
He studied at Cambridge and soon afterwards came into his maternal grand-
father's inheritance, a large estate near Sudbury, Suffolk, which freed him
from the need to work for an income. This fortunate situation enabled

---

20. Henk Florijn, "Johannes de Laet (1581–1649) and the Synod of Dordt, 1618–1619,"
in *A Leiden Polymath*, ed. Bremmer and Hoftijzer, pp. 165–76, at 173–76.

21. "Its beauty is a theme of extraordinary commendations by the French bibliog-
raphers," according to Thomas F. Dibdin, *An Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable
Editions of the Greek and Latin Classics [. . .]*, 2 vols. (London: Harding and Lepard, 1827),
2:333–34; "Sehr saubere Ausgabe u. einer der schönsten Elzevirschen Drucke," according to
F. L. A. Schweiger, *Handbuch der classischen Bibliographie*, 2 vols. in 3 (Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer,
1830–34), 2B:790.

22. For a concise list of de Laet's published and unpublished works, see Bekkers,
Correspondence, Appendix V. For more details, see Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., "The Correspondence
of Johannes de Laet," in *A Leiden Polymath*, ed. Bremmer and Hoftijzer, pp. 139–64; and
Johannes de Laet, *De Pelagianis et Semi-Pelagianis commentariorum ex veteris Patris scriptis, libri
duo* (Hardewijk: Thomas Henricus, 1617).

23. On D'Ewes, see *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, During the
Reigns of James I and Charles I*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, 2 vols. (n.p.: Richard Bentley, 1845);
Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, pp. 102–24; *The Journal of Sir Simonds
D'Ewes from the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London*,
ed. Wilson H. Coates ([New Haven]: Yale University Press, 1942); *The Diary of Sir Simonds D'Ewes
(1622–1624): Journal d'un étudiant londonien sous le règne de Jacques 1er*, ed. Élisabeth Bourcier
(Paris: Didier, 1974); Andrew G. Watson, *The Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, British Museum
Bicentenary Publications (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1966); and J. M. Blatchly
in *ODNB* 16:1–4, with hardly a word on his Anglo-Saxon studies.

him to devote most of his time and energy to the leisurely study of the history of Suffolk, the results of which he intended to turn into a book. D'Ewes's antiquarian interests, like those of so many other antiquaries, confronted him with the necessity to master the Anglo-Saxon language. Late in his fairly short life, D'Ewes started to play a role on the public scene when, in 1640, he was appointed high sheriff of Suffolk, and two years later in 1642, when he became a member of the Long Parliament for Sudbury, Suffolk. From then on his active study of Anglo-Saxon started to diminish, if not his concern for this topic. In parliament, he treated his fellow members with long quotations from Anglo-Saxon texts. In short, D'Ewes's interest in and study of Anglo-Saxon did not differ significantly from that of his fellow English antiquaries. It was mainly practical in purpose, because he needed to know the language in order to read the historical documents that were relevant to his historiography of Suffolk. Like de Laet, D'Ewes wrote much, notably extensive diaries, but unlike de Laet, he published very little. All that appeared in print were some speeches delivered in parliament and an essay in defense of the Protestant Church.[24] In their adherence to orthodox Calvinism, D'Ewes and de Laet were kindred souls.

No one, to my knowledge, has posed the question of why the Dutchman de Laet developed an interest in Old English, or why he took a fancy to Middle English (Geoffrey Chaucer) and Middle Scots (Gavin Douglas).[25] Unlike English antiquaries such as William Camden and Simonds D'Ewes, de Laet was not really concerned with the recovery of the Anglo-Saxon past, nor was he in any way involved in a religious debate defending the Church of England against the Church of Rome, as Matthew Parker was. What then was it that started his fascination with Old English?

---

24. *The Primitive Practise for Preserving Truth. Or an Historical Narration, shewing what course the primitive church anciently, and the best reformed churches since have taken to suppresse heresie and schisme, etc.* (London: Henry Overton, 1645).

25. He owned a copy of Thomas Speight's 1602 edition of Chaucer's works (Angl. 2°, 38) and a copy of Gavin Douglas, *The XIII Bukes of Eneados of the Famose Poete Virgill* (London: William Copland, 1553), listed as "Virgilius, *Anglice*, 1553" (Misc. 4°, 131) in the auction catalogue of his library (see nn. 27 and 30 below) but as "Vergilii *Aeneidos Scotse veersen*" in the list of books bought at the auction by Johannes Thysius, now Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Archief Thysius 100, fol. 322, with thanks to Esther Mourits. On the reception and study of Chaucer by seventeenth-century Dutch scholars, see my "Franciscus Junius Reads Chaucer: But Why? and How?," in *Appropriating the Middle Ages: Scholarship, Politics, Fraud*, ed. Tom Shippey with Martin Arnold, Studies in Medievalism 11 (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2001), pp. 37–72, at 38–42.

As early as 1616, de Laet intimated in a letter to Sibrandus Lubbertus, a professor of theology at the University of Franeker in Frisia, that he was spending his leisure time studying the history of the Dutch language. To this end he had taken up mastering "ancient" Frisian, because this language enabled him to illumine many etymological questions that he could not otherwise solve with his contemporary Dutch.[26] Middle Dutch, at the time, had hardly been explored from a scholarly point of view, probably because the distance to Renaissance Dutch was fairly easy to bridge. Only one significant edition of an early Middle Dutch text had been printed, a thirteenth-century verse chronicle recounting the history of the County of Holland from its beginnings up to 1300.[27] In the absence of Dutch texts of much greater age, Dutch scholars, including de Laet, had perused Old High German, or "Theotiscan" as they called it, for information that could enlighten them on the etymology of Dutch. For this purpose, they turned to Otfrid's rhymed Gospel harmony and Willeram of Ebersberg's treatise on the Song of Songs.[28] However, during his three-year stay in London, de Laet had been introduced to some prominent English antiquaries, most notably Camden. He had also gained a solid knowledge of English and German—a rarity at the time among Dutch scholars. When he took up studying the history of Dutch in the mid-1610s, he took advantage of his network and approached Camden for a copy of the edition of the Old English Gospels, as we have seen. As with his slightly later compatriot Franciscus Junius, de Laet's interest in and study of Old English (and Old Frisian) must have originated in his curiosity about the history of the Dutch language.[29]

---

26. London, BL, MS Additional 22961, fol. 161, letter from de Laet to Lubbertus (6 June 1616).

27. [Melis Stoke,] *Hollandtsche Riim-kroniik inhoudende de gheschiedenissen der graven van Hollandt tot het iaer M. CCC. V. / Door enen wiens naeme noch onbekent is, voor 286. iaren beschreven. Met een voorrede des Jonkh. Ian vander Does, here tot Noordtwyk . . . by gevoeght de moort van graef Floris, ende Gherrit van Velsens wedervaren, zangs gewijs* (Amsterdam: Barendt Adriaens, 1591).

28. Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Otfridi evangeliorum liber veterum Germanorum grammaticae, poeseos, theologiae, praeclarum munimentum. Evangelienbuch in alt frenkischen Reimen / durch Otfrid von Weissenburg / münch zu S. Gallen / vor sibenhundert Jahren beschriben* (Basel: n.p., 1571) (Nederd-duytsche en Hoochduytsche Boeken 8°, 212); Paullus Merula, *Willerami abbatis in Canticum canticorum paraphrasis gemina: Prior rhythmis Latinis, altera veteri lingua Francica. Addita explicatio, lingua Belgica; & notae quibus veterum vocum Francicarum ratio redditur* (Leiden: Christopher Raphelengius, 1598) (Theol. 8°, 212). For the catalogue references, see n. 33.

29. On Junius's motivation, see Sophie van Romburgh, "Why Francis Junius (1591–1677) Became an Anglo-Saxonist, or, the Study of Old English for the Elevation of Dutch," in *Appropriating the Middle Ages*, ed. Shippey, pp. 5–36.

By 1637, de Laet had made significant progress toward compiling an Anglo-Saxon dictionary, but he realized that the sources he had been using until then were insufficient. Using the combined information from his correspondence and from the auction catalogue of his library, which was sold shortly after his death in 1650, we are now able to reconstruct the printed sources de Laet will have had available in his study room (or "Museum" as he proudly called it on one occasion).[30] His auction catalogue features over 1800 items, but it certainly does not contain all of his books.[31] For example, there is no category "Libri Iuridici," which is odd for someone who was often involved in legal matters since de Laet was one of the Directors of the Dutch West Indies Company. One looks in vain, therefore, for a copy of Hugo Grotius's famous *Mare librum* (Leiden, 1609; 3rd ed. 1633) and for the rejoinder written by John Selden, *Mare clausum* (London, 1635). The latter book contained a fair amount of Old English printed in Anglo-Saxon type.[32] Much to my surprise, however, de Laet did possess practically all the printed books containing Old English that had appeared before his death, ranging from complete text editions to books with only a smattering of Old English words.[33] These include the *Archaionomia sive De priscis Anglorum legibus libri*, William Lambarde's edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws (London: John Day, 1568), which contains a useful list of Old English legal terms explained in Latin. Although the book is conspicuously absent from the auction catalogue, de Laet certainly owned a copy. In fact, he had planned as early as 1638 to

30. *Catalogus bibliothecae amplissimi & clarissimi viri D. Joannis de Laet, Antwerpiani, dum viveret Societatis Indiae Occidentalis praefecti, in qua varii ac rarissimi in qualibet scientia ac lingua libri continentur, quorum auctio habebitur in aedibus Francisci Hackii, bibliopolae in de Choorsteech, 27 Aprilis, Anno 1650. Die Mercurii, stylo novo* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1650), 4°, 50 pp. Five copies have been located thus far: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, shelf mark Q 2137; Antwerp, Stadsbibliotheek, shelf mark B 133091; Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotheket, shelf mark 7911 72; Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, shelf mark 2/60556; Strassbourg, Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire, shelf mark A 105484. The Paris copy, with prices paid for the books, has been published in microfiche, ICD-Cat. no. 1667, mf. 2847. On de Laet's reference to his "Museum," see Paul Hoftijzer, "The Library of Johannes de Laet (1581–1649)," in *A Leiden Polymath*, ed. Bremmer and Hoftijzer, pp. 201–16, at 207 n. 30.

31. For a first analysis and evaluation of de Laet's library, see Hoftijzer, "The Library of Johannes de Laet."

32. Adams, *Old English Scholarship*, Appendix III, gives a list of books printed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries containing Old English in an Anglo-Saxon type-face.

33. For ease of reference—the titles are not always immediately recognizable—I have added the auction catalogue numbers where relevant. Both the titles of books that follow and the manuscripts he used serve to correct and supplement the list given by Bekkers, *Correspondence*, pp. XIX–XXI.

produce an improved and extended edition.[34] Other books owned by de Laet include John Foxe's edition of the West Saxon Gospels, entitled *The Gospels of the Fower Euangelistes Translated in the Olde Saxon Tyme out of Latin into the Vulgare Toung* (London: John Day, 1571; Angl. 4°, 60), which, as we have seen, de Laet previously had to borrow from Camden but which he had apparently managed to obtain for himself since then; William L'Isle's *A Saxon Treatise* (London: John Haviland, 1623; Angl. 4°, 55); William Camden's *Remaines of a Greater Work* (London, 1605; Angl. 4°, 52), featuring two versions of the Lord's Prayer in Old English and three in Middle English; Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent* (2nd ed., London, 1596; Angl. 4°, 47); a rare first edition of John Caius's *De antiquitate Academiae Cantabrigiensis libri duo* (London: Henricus Bynneman, 1568; Misc. 8°, 74), claiming King Alfred's foundation of the University of Cambridge;[35] and Matthew Parker's *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae* (Hanover: Claudius Marnius, 1605; Theol. 2°, 106). As for the works of King Alfred, de Laet could also read the king's *Preface to the Pastoral Care* in Thomas Walsingham's *Historia breuis ab Eduardo primo ad Henricum quintum* (London: H. Binneman, 1574; Misc. 4°, 68).[36] For lexicographical assistance, he was able to rely on Richard Verstegen's *A Testimonie of Decayed Intelligence* (London, 1628; Angl. 4°, 11 [two copies!]), with an Old English–English glossary of over 900 entries;[37] as well as the magnificent *Ductor in varias linguas* by John Minsheu (London: John Brown, 1617; Misc. 2°, 78), a multi-language dictionary; and Henry Spelman's *Archaeologus in modum glossarii* (London: John Beale, 1624; Misc. 4°, 117), a dictionary of medieval Latin terminology focusing on legal matters found

---

34. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, pp. XXV–XXVII. Perhaps the book was not included in the sale because it was full of annotations.

35. *De antiquitate* contains a dozen Old English words and phrases printed in Day's type; see Peter J. Lucas, "'A Testimonye of Verye Ancient Tyme': Some Manuscript Models for the Parkerian Anglo-Saxon Type-Designs," in *Of The Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, Their Scribes and Readers. Essays presented to Malcolm B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 147–88, at 168–69. Some of the Old English passages in *De antiquitate* were taken from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, e.g., pp. 300–01, an early sign of interest overlooked in the otherwise exhaustive essay by Angelika Lutz, "The Study of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in the Universities," in *The Recovery of Old English*, ed. Graham, pp. 1–82.

36. Asser's *Life of King Alfred*, printed by John Day in the Anglo-Saxon character, and Walsingham's *Ypodigma Neustriæ*, also printed by Day in 1574, are always bound with the *Historia breuis*; see *STC* 1, no. 25004.

37. On Verstegen's book, first published in 1605, see my "The Anglo-Saxon Pantheon According to Richard Verstegen (1605)," in *The Recovery of Old English*, ed. Graham, pp. 141–72.

mainly in English sources, with plenty of remarks on Old English legal terms. De Laet appears not to have owned a copy of Parker's 1566 *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, but the text of Ælfric's sermon on Easter, contained therein, was available to him with an accompanying translation in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, or *Book of Martyrs*, in the edition of 1596–97 (Angl. 2°, 1), and was also available, for that matter, in L'Isle's *A Saxon Treatise* (Angl. 8°, 55), which he also owned, as we have seen.[38] Bede's *De ratione temporum*, which he had excerpted for the names of the days and the months,[39] was available to him in the impressive multi-volume folio edition of Bede's complete works (Basel, 1563; Theol. 2°, 106). He also possessed John Selden's edition of Eadmer's *Historiae novorum sive sui saeculi Libri VI* (London, 1623; Misc. 2°, 35), to which Selden had appended an edition of the interlinearly glossed Preface and Epilogue to the *Regularis concordia*,[40] together with several pieces of Anglo-Saxon law both in Old English and Latin. In 1639, Henry Spelman sent him hot from Beale's press in London a copy of the *Concilia* (Theol. 2°, 149), a folio volume with a superabundance of Old English (and Latin) documents relating to the Anglo-Saxon Church; in 1640, John Spelman's edition of the Old English Psalter (London, 1640) went the same route to Leiden; and in 1643, he was presented with Wheelock's edition of the Old English Bede, followed in 1644 by Wheelock's re-edition of Lambarde's *Archaionomia* (bound together, Theol. 2°, 66). De Laet will have smiled with satisfaction when he saw his name mentioned in Wheelock's address to the reader:

> Foreign, excellent authors also investigate our Saxon antiquities: the widely renowned Gerard Vossius, formerly of Leiden, now of Amsterdam, and the widely renowned Johannes de Laet from Leiden (an intimate friend of Sir Henry Spelman) both know the Saxon accurately.[41]

---

38. De Laet may well have been guided in his acquisition of books containing Old English by L'Isle's introduction to his *A Saxon Treatise* of 1623; see Pulsiano, "William L'Isle and the Editing of Old English" (n. 6 above), pp. 177–83.

39. London, BL, MS Additional 34600, fol. 118, letter from de Laet to Spelman (28 August 1638), slighting Verstegen for presenting these names without any authority or annotations or even mentioning his source.

40. *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, ed. Lucia Kornexl, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 17 (Munich: W. Finck, 1993), pp. clvi–clvii.

41. Abraham Wheelock, *Historiae ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum libri V. a venerabili Beda presbytero scripti . . . quibus in calce operis Saxonicam chronologiam . . . contexuimus* (Cambridge: R. Daniel, 1643), p. Bv, "Ad Lectorem": "Exteri quoque antiquitates nostras *Saxonicas* perscrutantur

Wheelock had every reason to put de Laet, who had followed the pre-liminaries toward the publication with great interest, in the limelight. In June 1641, for example, Sir Henry had shown him the newly designed Anglo-Saxon type for the printing of the book.[42]

In December 1637, de Laet's friend William Boswell, the English ambassador in The Hague who was himself interested in Anglo-Saxon, wrote letters of introduction for de Laet, like this one for Sir Henry Spelman:

> The Bearer if you have not happily [= by chance] knowne him allready, is M[r] Johannes Latius of whom Joseph Scaliger made so great account as you see by his Epistles unto him. His Excellent Workes allready published, I know, you know as well as my selfe. For w*hich*, & particularly, because hee is my speciall friend, I would intreate you, to use him, as yours, with Affection, and free-dome: for hee loues that manyfold and abundant Knowledge off Antiquityes, ioyned with all good Learning, in you, w*hich* hath so much honoured y*our* owne and endeared so many of other Na-tions unto you. And it is my remembrance of your Auncient fa-uours, that makes mee thus Confident with you, as it shall for Euer oblige mee to bee, what I am—Your most assured Friend, and Humble Seruant—   Will: Boswell

Clearly, de Laet's reputation was well established in England as a result of his many publications and his friendship with Scaliger. Boswell needed only tickle Spelman further by pointing out de Laet's regard for Spelman's work in English antiquities and appealing to earlier favors bestowed on Boswell to make the doyen of Anglo-Saxon studies take the bait. The next spring, Boswell wrote a letter to thank Spelman for his hospitality toward de Laet, which had led to "so happy a meeting" that de Laet wanted to make another voyage to England "cheifly to enioy (when he may fitly)

---

praeclari autores; Clariss. *Gerardus Vossius* dudum *Leidensis*, hodie *Amstelodamiensis*: & clariss. *Joh. Laetius Leidensis*, (D. *Hen. Spelmanni* amicus intimus) uterque *Saxonicè* accuratè norunt." Vossius, a brother-in-law of Franciscus Junius and an opponent of de Laet in matters ecclesiasti-cal, used examples from Lambarde's *Archaionomia* in his *De vitiis sermonis, et glossematis Latino barbaris libri quatuor* (Amsterdam: Elzevier, 1645); see Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, pp. 221–22.

42. London, BL, MS Additional 6395, fol. 120r, letter from de Laet (London) to Boswell (The Hague).

your company & conversation."[43] In his letter to L'Isle, Boswell praised de Laet's deep knowledge of German and Dutch.[44] A meeting with L'Isle, unfortunately, did not materialize since the latter passed away before the end of 1637.

In January 1638, de Laet set off to England and stayed there for about five months, most of which he spent networking and diligently studying and copying Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Thanks to his good credentials, to the letters of introduction from Boswell, and to some London friends and relatives, he was able to gain access to the Cottonian library through the services of John Selden. There he copied, among other texts, one of the five Cotton manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This text was excerpted especially for proper names, because Boswell had insisted that de Laet include names in his dictionary.[45] Through Patrick Young, the Royal Librarian, de Laet managed to borrow an Ælfric manuscript,[46] as well as an unspecified manuscript on medicine that I have now identified as London, British Library, MS Royal 12. D. XVII, a volume of medical treatises including Bald's *Leechbook*.[47] As a special favor, de Laet was allowed to take the Royal manuscripts with him to Leiden for further study.

It proved impossible for de Laet during his stay in England that summer to borrow or transcribe Bodleian manuscripts, but his visit to Cambridge turned out successful. Here, thanks to the recommendations of Sir Henry and William Boswell, and with the help of the Cambridge librarian Abraham Wheelock, he either copied or arranged to have copied a number

---

43. BL Add. 34600, fols. 101 and 114 respectively.

44. BL Add. 6395, fol. 20.

45. Which of the five Cottonian *Chronicle* manuscripts is not certain.

46. Two manuscripts offer themselves as candidates: London, BL, MS Royal 7. C. XII, a voluminous copy of the first series of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (s. xex; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 257; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 472), and London, BL, MS Royal 15. B. XXII, a copy of Ælfric's *Grammar* with some annotations by Matthew Parker (s. xi²; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 269; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 494). Less likely is a third possibility, the fragmentary copy of Ælfric's *Grammar* in London, BL, MS Royal 12. G. XII, fols. 2–9 + Oxford, All Souls College MS 38, fols. 1–12 (s. x^med; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 265; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 480).

47. Cf. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, p. XXI (s. x^med; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 264; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 479). Evidence is provided by the list of eighty-four Old English plant names which de Laet had been unable to identify. He had sent this list to the Danish scholar Ole Worm with an accompanying letter asking him for assistance; see *Olai Wormii et ad eum doctorum virorum epistolae, medici, anatomici, botanici, physici & historici argumenti: Rem vero literaria, linguasque & antiquitates boreales potissimum illustrantes*, ed. Hans Gram, 2 vols. (Copenhagen: n.p., 171), 2, no. 781. For example, *betoce* "betony" (de Laet's ninth item) occurs only in Bald's *Leechbook*. In fact, all eighty-four names must have been taken from this source.

of manuscripts, either whole or in part. These included the first pages of three tracts in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 466, a medical collection that he wanted to check for Old English words ("*an in illo sint nomina Anglosaxonica*").[48] One year later, he reminded Boswell of his kind services in procuring transcripts of CCCC, MS 466, and now asked for a similar job ("*eadem opera*") with respect to Theodore's *Penitential*, in particular "*cap. 33, de idolatria et sacrilegio etc. totum illud Capitulum.*"[49] In the Summer of 1641, during a short visit to London, he finally managed to borrow the Old English *Herbarium Apuleii*, fulfilling a wish he had first expressed to John Morris in 1639.[50]

Not only was de Laet resourceful when it came to finding influential men through whom he could gain access to Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, but he also successfully employed his son Samuel (1619/20–52) for his project. Like his father, and probably on the latter's advice, Samuel had gone to England to learn the mercantile trade. From about 1638, he enjoyed board and lodging in the house of Timothy Cruzo or Cruso(e), a Dutch merchant in London, whose daughter Rebecca he was to marry in 1643.[51] In that respect, too, he was also following in his father's footsteps since Johannes had also married the daughter of a Dutch London merchant during his "internship" there.

In the late summer of 1639,[52] Samuel paid a visit to Sir Henry and received from him a letter of introduction addressed to Wheelock:

> This Bearer Mr Samuel de Laet sonne of my greatly esteemed freinde Mr John de Laet of Leyden in Holland is cominge to your Uniuersitie to see the libraries and to have somewhat by him selfe or his frende transcribed. I desire that he should haue all curtesie that any frendes of myne can show him and in that sorte doe com-

---

48. BL Add. 6395, fol. 27, letter from de Laet to Boswell (14 June 1638). See M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 2:397–99 (no. 466). The manuscript is of the thirteenth century and, no doubt much to de Laet's dismay, is all in Latin and contains no Old English.

49. BL Add. 6395, fol. 36, letter from de Laet to Boswell (13 July 1639).

50. London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C. iii (s. x[1]; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 219; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 402); BL Add. 6395, fol. 125, letter from de Laet (London) to Boswell (The Hague) (6 August); cf. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, pp. XX–XXI.

51. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, p. XVII, letter no. 6 n. 6, and Appendix III.

52. Morris reports Samuel's absence from London in the autumn of 1639; see Bekkers, *Correspondence*, no. 10.

mende both him and his frende to your extraordinary care and doe pray you to further them in all thinges what you can. . . .

The ink of this letter had barely dried, when he reiterated his message three days later:

I wrote also to you . . . on Wedensday laste my Mr Samuel de Laet (sonne of him beyonde sea whome you knowe) desiring that you would do him all the curtesies you can in your Uniuersities and both to helpe him to the sight of the MSS. and also to transcribe what he desireth. I pray faile not. . . . [53]

It may well be that Wheelock's letter, with information on a number of Old English manuscripts in Cambridge University Library, was written for Samuel (see Appendix I), for the contents of the letter correspond with Samuel's errand.

De Laet's choice of manuscripts was rather unusual as compared to that of the English antiquaries. However, a letter to Sir Henry written in Leiden in late October 1638 allows us a glimpse of the motivation underlying it. Having informed Spelman that his dictionary had increased to well over three thousand entries, de Laet went on to say that he was particularly intrigued by the medical book that Patrick Young had lent him. He gently pointed out to Spelman: "I believe that such books which have no translation have been left untouched by your lexicographers: but I find many words and names which I have not hitherto noticed."[54] What de Laet was aware of is that the English lexicographers had been using mainly those Old English texts and glossaries that had been translated out of Latin; hence they were fishing in the same pond all the time. He was confirmed in this opinion when his son Samuel sent him from London a transcript of Joscelyn's glossary, if only some quires ("*quaterniones*"). Again to Spelman, he wrote: "I have browsed through it [i.e., Joscelyn's dictionary] but found little until now with which I could have been helped. However, I work hard on the words which the medical manuscript (which the widely

---

53. Spelman to Wheelock, CUL Dd. 3. 12, fol. 25r (17 September 1639) and fol. 26r, respectively.

54. BL Add. 34600, fol. 126, letter from de Laet to Spelman (30 October 1638): "Credo eiusmodi libros, qui versionem nullam habent, Lexicographis vestris hactenus intactos: sed multa verba et nomina invenio quae ante hac non observavi."

renowned man, Patrick Young, has lent me for the occasion) makes use of, of which I have not been able to cull one from Joscelyn's dictionary."[55] De Laet, unlike the English Anglo-Saxonists, ventured into the unknown, thus showing the same exploratory attitude that had also marked his studies of the New World. Moreover, his choice of subject reveals an interest in the natural world of the Anglo-Saxons rather than in their religious opinions. It reflects the same interest that he had shown in his edition of Pliny's *Historia naturalis.* De Laet was fascinated especially by plant names. He was a skilled botanist, and in his published works on North and South America he devoted a good deal of attention to the flora.

Another sign of his adventurous attitude is the fact that de Laet excerpted poetic texts for his dictionary. To this end, Archbishop Ussher had sent the "Caedmon" Manuscript, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11, to him in Leiden. Perhaps Ussher had made this generous gesture in return for de Laet's procuring books in Holland for the archbishop's never-ending desire for old and new books.[56] Ussher's lending of this invaluable manuscript to de Laet betrays the esteem he had for the latter's deep knowledge of Old English. De Laet did not disappoint Ussher in this respect, for not only was he the first to realize that the texts contained in this manuscript were Old English verse rather than prose, but he also drew from the poems to include words in his dictionary. Moreover, as de Laet mused to Worm, the text of *Genesis* in this manuscript contained what looked like interpolations—he was the first to be dimly aware of what we now call *Genesis B.*[57]

His visit in 1638 to Sir Henry had been pleasant, and barely back in Leiden, de Laet received the first six quires of the printed edition of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter that Sir Henry had begun but which was published under his son John's name in 1640. De Laet greatly appreciated Sir Henry's gesture of respect for his expertise, and he immediately started to read the sheets "diligently and to study individual words and endings: and what I have noted," he wrote, "I am sending here included with this [letter]. If I receive more quires and you approve of my work, I shall continue to study them

---

55. London, BL, MS Additional 34601, fol. 88, letter of 16 December 1640: "Lustravi obiter sed parum adhuc inveni quo iuvari possim; laboro enim maxime in vocabulis quae medicus MS (quem Clariss. Vir Patricius Iunius e Regia Bibliotheca mihi ad tempus concessit) usurpat, quorum adhuc nullum in Jocelini dictionario potui deprehendere."

56. BL Add. 6395, fol. 146, letter from Ussher to de Laet (1641).

57. Benno J. Timmer, "De Laet's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary," *Neophilologus* 41 (1957), 199–202.

in the same way."[58] Sir Henry must have been frowning when he received the list of some forty items of comment for the first twenty-three psalms. De Laet's observations allow us to gain insight into how he proceeded in his critical reading of the edited Psalter text.

In the list, which is edited and discussed in Appendix II below, de Laet sometimes points out simple printing errors, such as *beod* for either *beoð* or *bið* "he will be," "because both forms are found in the manuscripts" (Psalm 1:4), or *foþlice* for *soþlice* "truly" (Psalm 5:7). Usually, the Latin text will have guided de Laet in suggesting that Spelman should correct a form, for example *þusealnest* to *þu seallest* "you give" (Psalm 4:7) or *meardas* to *ineardast.* In the latter instance he added an explanation: "*eardan* et *eardian* habitare ['to inhabit']." When in Psalm 3:3 he found *underphang* spelled with <ph>, he suggested reading *underfang* with an <f> as in Psalm 17:3 "because 'ph' was not to be found in the old manuscripts." To this remark, he added a further reference to verse 5, where the text has *onfeng me*, again with an *f.* On several occasions de Laet corroborated his suggestion by adducing Dutch cognates, as, for example, "*gegwipen* read *gegripen,* in Dutch 'grypen' *prendere* ['to seize']" (Psalm 9:17).

From the examples given here we can see that de Laet followed a well-established procedure for textual improvement that he had been taught at the university and that he had practiced, for instance, in his edition of Pliny. This procedure consisted of making corrections based on the principle of *emendatio ope codicum,*[59] that is making emendations based on "the opulence of the manuscripts." In other words, if unusual forms of a word could be eliminated by replacing them with forms found more frequently in the same manuscript or in other manuscripts, such an emendation was fully justified. The other rationale for improving a textual reading involved the principle of *emendatio ope ingenii,* or emending with "the wealth of the clever imagination." In this case, both ingenious and imagInative linguistic arguments, usually based on cognates, provided the evidence for improve-

---

58. BL Add. 34600, fols. 126–27, letter from de Laet to Spelman (30 October 1638). See also Appendix II below.

59. De Laet used this term himself in a letter to Spelman (1 August 1640) in which he criticizes Lambarde's editorial policy for the *Archaionomia*. He blames Lambarde's edition for ignorance and perverse and corrupt negligence and thinks the text is hard to establish "without the opulence of manuscripts" ("*sine MSorum Codicum ope*"): London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 1742, fol. 137r.

ment.[60] For the proper interpretation of a text in manuscript, therefore, a scholar was expected to be able to rely on a wide knowledge of the vocabulary of cognate languages as well as on one's insight into which manuscript was pure and which was corrupt. His efforts to reach a better understanding of Old English texts, linguistically rather than literarily, make clear how much de Laet tried to live up to this standard in his commentary on Spelman's Psalter edition. Unfortunately for de Laet, and for three centuries of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, Sir Henry did not follow up on de Laet's suggestions. Had he done so, some seventy-five percent of these would have led to a considerable improvement of the Psalter text. Nevertheless, the list must have made Sir Henry realize that de Laet was a scholar with a keen eye and also that de Laet's native Dutch meant a considerable asset for a proper understanding of the Old English language.

It has scarcely been observed in the historiography of Anglo-Saxon studies that de Laet was also familiar with the *Textus Roffensis*, that massive twelfth-century collection of Anglo-Saxon laws in both Old English and Latin.[61] This manuscript includes the earliest laws, issued by King Æthelberht of Kent around A.D. 603, and those of his later successors Hlothere and Eadric. De Laet possessed the text of the first seven folios of this manuscript. He had in all likelihood obtained this text in transcript in 1638 with the consent of the then dean of Rochester, Walter Balcanquhall (ca. 1585–1645), whom he had met at the Synod of Dordt in 1618–19, to which Balcanquhall had been delegated as a representative of the Scottish Church. Not only did de Laet make a Latin translation of these early Anglo-Saxon laws, he also provided them with explanatory notes ("*observationes*"), in the latter of which he showed his great familiarity with the Carolingian *leges barbarorum*.[62] He drew his knowledge of these early Germanic laws es-

---

60. John F. D'Amico, *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus between Conjecture and History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), p. 16; cf. Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, pp. 12–13.

61. Only Bekkers, *Correspondence*, p. XXVI, briefly mentions it; Felix Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903–16), 1:XLVI, makes an unsubstantiated claim that Sir Henry had sent de Laet a transcript of *Textus Roffensis*, of which the latter would have provided a Latin translation in Antwerp in 1640.

62. Lambeth Palace 1742, fols. 137–49, mostly written on the recto side only, autograph; fols. 139–43: "Leges Æthelberti Regis, latinè. / versae a Cl. Viro J. de Laet"; fols. 144–46r: "J. de Laet / Observationes ad LL. Ethelberti"; fols. 147–48: "Hæc sunt judiciorum Decreta quæ / Hlotharius et Eadricus Cantuariorum Re-/ges statuerunt"; fols. 148r–49: "J. de Laet / Notæ ad Leges Hlotharij et Eadrici / Regum." These papers once belonged to Edmund Gibson (1669–1748), bishop of London, and were purchased by Lambeth Palace Library in 1960; see

pecially from Lindenbrog's collective edition, while for his frequent references to the *Lex Frisionum*, a Carolingian capitulary drafted in 802, he preferred Siccama's amply annotated edition of 1617 over the plain text as Lindenbrog had given it.[63]

It is interesting to see, for example, how de Laet struggled with the word *locbore* in the Laws of Æthelberht long before Benjamin Thorpe presented the first edition of this law in 1840 (and left this hapax untranslated!):[64]

> I translate *loc bore* with "having hair," hair after all was a sign of being of free birth. Hence in the *Laws of the Burgundians*, Tit. 6. § 4, to make hair for a slave, that is to make his hair grow so that he seems to be freeborn. And in the *Laws of the Longobards*, Bk II, tit. 14, and elsewhere: To have a daughter in the house "in hair," and in the *Gothicarum rerum scriptores* mention is often made of men having hair: but shaving someone's hair involuntarily is counted amongst the crimes. *Loc* and *locca* "hair," *bore* is from the verb *beren* "to bear."[65]

E. G. W. Bill, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library, MSS. 122–1860* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), no. 1742.

63. Friedrich Lindenbrog, *Codex legum antiquarvm, in qvo continentvr Leges Wisigothorvm, Edictvm Theodorici regis, Lex Burgvndionvm, Lex Salica, Lex Alamannorvm, Lex Baivvariorvm, Decretvm Tassilonis Dvcis, Lex Ripvariorvm, Lex Saxonvm, Angliorvm et Werinorvm, Frisionvm, Longobard-orvm, Constitvtiones Sicvlae sive Neapolitanae, Capitvlare Karoli M. et Hlvdowici Impp. &c.: quibus accedunt Formulae solennes priscae publicorum privatorumque negotiorum; nunc primum editae: et glossarivm sive interpretatio rerum vocumque difficilium & obscuriorum* (Frankfurt: J. and A. Marnius, 1613; Misc. 2°, 78); Sibrandus Siccama, *Lex Frisionvm sive antiqvae Frisiorvm leges: A reliquis veterum Germanorum legibus separatim, editae & notis illustratae* (Franeker: J. Lamrinck, 1617; Incomp. [= Libri incompacti "unbound books"] 4°, 4). On Siccama's book, see Kees Dekker, "Sibrandus Siccama's editie van de *Lex Frisionum*: Actie en reactie," in *Speculum Frisicum: Stúdzjes oanbean oan Philippus H. Breuker*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., Lammert G. Visser, and Piet Visser (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy, 2001), pp. 95–116. Siccama's edition was also used by William Somner (Dekker, p. 104); and Kees Dekker, 'Sibrandus Siccama on the *Lex Frisionum* (1617): Frisian Identity as a Philological Construct,' in *Advances in Old Frisian Philology*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Stephen Laker, and Oebele Vries (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007), pp. 65–90.

64. See Christine Fell, "A *friwif locbore* Revisited," *ASE* 13 (1984), 157–65. On pp. 157–58, Fell surveys the critical heritage of this word, beginning with Thorpe. Counter to the received interpretation of *locbore* as "long-haired," Fell proposes to interpret the word as meaning "in control of the keys."

65. "Ad leg. 72. loc bore verti *capillatam*, capillus enim Ingenuitatis signum erat: hinc in Leg. Burgund. Tit.6.§.4. capillum servo facere, id est capillum ei alere ut ingenuus videatur. Et in Leg. Longobard. lib. 2. tit. 14, et alibi Filiam in casa in capillo habere: et capillatorum

As further evidence of his capabilities, he sent the result of his work on the laws to Sir Henry.[66] Although the commoner de Laet always remained modest in his letters to the English nobleman—if certainly not half as humble as Abraham Wheelock when he corresponded with his patron—the signal he gave in sending such exercises to the *éminence grise* of Saxon studies at the time is clear: "I'm as good in this subject as any of your English scholars."

In 1640, Sir Henry received a letter from Sir Simonds D'Ewes informing him of the latter's plans to compile an Anglo-Saxon dictionary. In his reply, Sir Henry mentioned the progress that de Laet had made in Leiden with a similar project, and he tried to dissuade D'Ewes from carrying on with his lexicographical plans. Perhaps intrigued by Sir Henry's reference to de Laet's activities, or perhaps because D'Ewes was already somewhat acquainted with de Laet's efforts as an Anglo-Saxonist, D'Ewes started a correspondence that was to last until de Laet's death in 1649. In their first letters, the two scholars drew on each other's expertise and exchanged samples of their respective Old English dictionaries-in-progress, shared information and discussed methods of lexicography. Thus D'Ewes told de Laet that he wanted to include German and Dutch cognates with the Old English words. D'Ewes had long been aware of the close similarities between English and Dutch. Even in 1626, when he attended a dinner at the house of Albert Joachimi, the Dutch ambassador in London, D'Ewes had heard one of the guests maintain that "the languages of either nations have the same radicall wordes, and may induce the persuasion of one original."[67] He also had his ideas about the relevance of Frisian for his project, no doubt because of the prevailing opinion at the time that English and Frisian were closely related:

> I am of the opinion, that the Frisian dialect differs only a little from Hollandish or Ripuarian [the half-German, half-Dutch dialect spoken on the Rhine from Cologne downstream]: otherwise I would delete the German words and replace them by Frisian ones. We would beseech you to be our guide with regard to this change. And because it is difficult here for us to get hold of a Latin–Dutch

---

crebra mentio in Gothicarum Rerum Scriptoribus: Tondere autem invito capillum, inter crimina numeratur. Loc et locca capillus, bore à verbo beren gestare."

66. Lambeth Palace 1742; see n. 62 above.

67. *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, ed. Halliwell, 2:182.

dictionary and a Latin–Frisian one, I beg you buy them for me in Leiden or elsewhere at my expenses and to send them to the ambassador [William Boswell], whom I shall repay whatever costs.[68]

De Laet realized that D'Ewes—even though the latter claimed his paternal ancestry to have come from Guelders in the Netherlands where Ripuarian was spoken—had a beginner's knowledge of the linguistic situation in the Low Countries. He first referred D'Ewes to Kiliaan's Latin–Dutch *Etymologicum* and next seized the opportunity to exhibit his knowledge of Frisian:

Concerning the Frisian language, about which you enquire, the matter is as follows: our Dutchmen speak different dialects according to the various provinces, in such a way, however, that they may understand one another without difficulty (aside from a few words used to a greater or lesser extent by some, and certain words that are familiar to some and at times to just one, but unfamiliar to the others) and thus the Frisian dialect differs a little from Hollandish, more from the Brabant and Flemish dialects; however, in Frisia itself in a few places an old and obsolete dialect persists which even the neighbors and fellow provincials do not understand, of which variety very few texts have been published and very many are hidden in libraries, which texts correspond greatly with the old Anglo-Saxon.[69]

68. London, BL, MS Harley 377, fol. 212 (4 July 1640): "Opinor enim Frisicam a Batavica et Sicambrica non longe abhorrere dialectum: sin minus Germanica inducerem vocabula et Frisica eorum loco substituerem. Cuius apud me mutationis tuo consilio ut sis pararius quaesimus: et quia Vocabularium Latino-Belgicum et Latino-Frisicum heic vix nancisci possimus, sis exoratus ut ea Lugduni Batavorum vel alibi meis impensis acquiras et Domino Legato transmittas, cui ego quicquid expendas eius refundam."

69. London, BL, MS Harley 374, fol. 154 (24 August 1640): "De lingua Frisica quod quaeris, res ita se habet: Belgae nostri varijs utuntur dialectis pro provinciarum diversitate ita tamen ut se invicem haud difficulter intelligunt (praeter pauca vocabula alijs minus aut magis usitata, quaedam etiam alijs familiarie et interdum uni, caeteris insolita) atque etiam Frisica dialectus nonnihil differt ab Hollandica, magis a Brabantica et Flandrica, verum in ipsa Frisia adhuc paucis in locis obstinet dialectus antiqua et obsoleta quam ne vicini quidem et conprovinciales intelligunt, cuius generis paucissima monumenta edita sunt, plurima in Bibliothecis latent, quae cum vetustis Anglosaxon. multum conveniunt." It appears that de Laet is using the term *dialectus* now in the sense of a regional "accent," now in the sense of a "real" dialect. In the seventeenth century, there was no standard Dutch as yet, but the language as spoken in the province of Holland (with important economic and political centers such as

D'Ewes's knowledge of German and Dutch was poor and derivative, culled mainly from dictionaries. He tended to fall into the same trap many of my students do when I ask them to give the Dutch cognate for an Old English word: they usually come up with the Dutch translation for the word rather than with the cognate, which has often changed its semantic content. In view of this weak spot in D'Ewes's knowledge, de Laet recommended him to let go of his intention of adding Dutch and German cognates to his entries.[70] A specimen of his approach survives in a letter from Spelman to D'Ewes, in which the former tries to dissuade the latter from his lexicographical enterprise. The sample consists of one sheet with twelve entries, headed in D'Ewes's hand as follows: "Dictionarium Saxo-Anglo-Latino-Anglico-Germano-Belgicum. &c. vbi; id genus signum ¶. istis praeponitur vocabulis veteribus Saxo-Anglicis quae cum hodiernis cum exactè tum aliqualiter conveniunt."[71] The specimens themselves are in somebody else's hand, presumably that of D'Ewes's amanuensis. For example, the entry "¶. Aad" [= *ād* 'funeral pile, pyre'] reads as follows: "Congeries. An heaping adding, or laying together it comes neare the English word add. Germ. Gesamleten. Belg." First, a Latin translation is given, followed by the English sense with a speculative etymological explanation. The German word resembles the past participle of the verb *sammeln* 'to gather, collect,' which seems to serve as a translation of English "add," while the Dutch component remains absent. Only two entries have a Dutch cognate: "Abd" for "Abbas," and "Abdisse" for "Abbodesse."

D'Ewes's work on his Anglo-Saxon dictionary has been adequately analyzed by Sue Hetherington. She has shown that the core of the completed dictionary, preserved as London, BL, MSS Harley 8 and 9, consists of entries copied from the dictionary that John Joscelyn had compiled some fifty years earlier. To these were added entries taken from a variety

---

Amsterdam and The Hague) was rapidly spreading to the other provinces of the federal Republic. Hence, when de Laet writes that Frisian differs little from Hollandish, he means Hollandish spoken with a Frisian accent. By "the old and obsolete Frisian dialect," however, he means the Frisian language itself, which had by then receded from the Frisian cities to the countryside.

70. On this episode, see Bekkers, *Correspondence*, pp. XXII–XXIII; Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, p. 99; Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., "Late Medieval and Early Modern Opinions on the Affinity between English and Frisian: The Growth of a Commonplace," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 9 (1988), 167–92, at 176–77; and Bremmer, "The Correspondence of Johannes de Laet" (n. 22 above), p. 157.

71. BL Add. 34600, fol. 7. "Anglo-Saxon–Latin–English–German–Dutch Dictionary, etc. where this sign ¶. is placed before those old Anglo-Saxon words which concur with the present-day [words] either exactly or in some respect."

of other, hand-written dictionaries and vocabularies, to wit those of Lawrence Nowell, the Elizabethan antiquary, and Richard James, Sir Robert Cotton's librarian. In the late 1640s, when he realized that de Laet was about to complete his dictionary, D'Ewes secured the help of Sir William Dugdale (1605–86), a rising star in the field of Anglo-Saxon antiquarian studies. Dugdale had already compiled his own Old English vocabulary, which he gladly lent to D'Ewes.[72]

We are in the fortunate situation that we can also more or less establish what books and manuscripts pertaining to the field of Anglo-Saxon studies were owned by D'Ewes. In 1687, a certain R. H. paid a visit to D'Ewes's library in Stowe House and copied the catalogue or inventory there. A number of later lists and documents relating to his collection, including others of the manuscripts that ended up in Sir Robert Harley's collection, help us in assessing the breadth and width of D'Ewes's bibliophilia.[73]

When it comes to printed books with Old English on their pages, D'Ewes possessed a fair number that overlap with those which de Laet had on his shelves. In this respect, these two early Anglo-Saxonists had access to the same sources. I shall not repeat them here. Conspicuously absent compared to de Laet's collection is Lambarde's *Archaionomia* (1568), but the text was available to D'Ewes in Wheelock's re-edition of 1644 (A494a). This item is interesting because it contains in Franciscus Junius's hand collations with the *Laws of Edgar and Cnut* as found in London, BL, MS Harley 55,[74] formerly belonging to D'Ewes (M71). Absent too are *De antiquitate Academiae Cantabrigiensis* (1568), of minor significance, and Spelman's *Archaeologus* (1624), an important tool. Even when it comes to dictionaries of contemporary Germanic languages, D'Ewes and de Laet concurred. Both owned Joannes Frisius, *Dictionarium Latino-Germanicum* (Zürich, 1543 [A406], and the edition of 1561 [Misc. 4°, 44], respectively), as they did Kilaan's Dutch–Latin *Etymologicon* (Amsterdam, 1620 [A66a], and Alkmaar, 1605 [Misc. 8°, 16] respectively). But, and here comes the catch, even though he had had Kiliaan since 1634, when Albert Joachimi, the Dutch ambassador in London,

---

72. Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, pp. 102–24, and her "Sir Simonds D'Ewes and Method in Old English Lexicography," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 17 (1975), 75–92. I kindly thank Tom Hall for sending me a copy of this article, which was not available to me in the Netherlands.

73. Watson, *The Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, pp. 63–73. Numbers added to a title refer to the various lists given by Watson.

74. Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 225–26 (s. xi[1] and xii[med] respectively); Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 412. Further references to these two books are included in the running text of my essay.

presented it to him, D'Ewes proved unable to use it, as we have seen. De Laet, moreover, cast his linguistic net a little wider in matters Germanic to include Danish with an unidentified *Vocabularius Danicus* (Copenhagen, 1579; Misc. 8°, 135) and Old Norse with Ole Worm's *Danicorum monumentorum libri sex: e spissis antiquitatum tenebris et in Dania ac Norvegia extantibus ruderibus* (Copenhagen: Joachim Moltke, 1643; Misc. 2°, 190). The title page of the latter book, still in Leiden,[75] bears the dedication "Nobilissimo Viro Domino Joanni de Laet, mittit autor, O. W." Its annotated pages testify to de Laet's efforts to come to terms with the runic alphabet. D'Ewes appears not to have been interested in Old High German either, unlike de Laet, who besides the editions of Willeram and Otfrid owned practically all the works of Beatus Rhenanus, Melchior Goldast, and Marquard Freher.

Clearly, when it comes to printed books necessary for the practice of Anglo-Saxon lexicography in a comparative context, D'Ewes was less well equipped than de Laet. For manuscript sources, however, D'Ewes proved to have been in a better position by far. He had collected nine Old English charters [A466] and a handful of manuscripts, including four leaves with recipes and the *Laws of Edgar*, now BL, MS Harley 55 (M71), and, bound with these, the *Laws of Cnut*. Most important for the study of Old English was Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*, now London, BL, MS Harley 107 (B225; s. xi[med]; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 227; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 414). The other three Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, now London, BL, MSS Harley 110, 208, and 526, were of insignificant use, as they contained only Latin texts with a scattering of Old English glosses (A257, B165, A246; s. x[ex], s. x/xi?, and s. x/xi, respectively; Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 228–30; Gneuss, *Handlist*, nos. 415, 417 and 419). For the purposes of compiling a dictionary, his most useful item was the aforementioned transcript of Joscelyn's Anglo-Saxon dictionary bound together with a transcript from a Cambridge manuscript of Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*, now BL, MSS Harley 8 and 9. However, in view of the limited original additions to this transcript of Joscelyn's dictionary, D'Ewes cannot be said to have been really active in working on a dictionary of his own design.

The best move that D'Ewes made for his dictionary project—I wholly agree with Hetherington[76]—was inviting both William Somner and Franciscus Junius to help him complete his dictionary. Somner had already begun to

---

75. Universiteitsbibliotheek, Bibliotheca Thysiana, Thysia 921: 2.
76. Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, p. 123.

make a name for himself as an Anglo-Saxonist, while Junius had only barely begun his Germanic studies. Like de Laet, Junius was still interested in Old English only as a key to the etymology of Dutch.[77] From 1648 to 1650, the two scholars did what D'Ewes expected them to do and helped him finish his dictionary, augmented with a version of Ælfric's *Grammar*. So far as I know, de Laet remained ignorant of Junius's part in the competition, but he was informed about Somner's assistance. John Morris, a lifelong London correspondent of de Laet and the latter's advocate and helper when it had come to borrowing manuscripts from the libraries of Cotton and the King, reported this but then also informed de Laet of the dormant state of D'Ewes's project and his low opinion of it. Morris introduced Somner as "somebody else who is very expert in the Anglo-Saxon language, formerly organist or at least one of the cantors of the Canterbury church," known for his book on the antiquities of Canterbury (1640). "His name is Sumner, whom I first began to love from his book, next ran into in D'Ewes's house, where I once had lunch."[78] In response to de Laet's news that the Leiden dictionary was as good as ready for the press, Morris wrote in the same letter, a month before de Laet would suffer a fatal stroke:

> I rejoice in your already seriously thinking about the publication of the Saxon Lexicon, I'd say almost too late, not because I would much fear from that other one by your Sir D'Ewes, but because I have been expecting this one [i.e., yours] already for a long time very eagerly. Nor do I hear indeed anything about his Lexicon, because he has been in the country, since he with his 200 colleagues [i.e., members of Parliament] was kept out of Parliament by force of arms.[79]

---

77. On Junius's stay with D'Ewes, see Sophie van Romburgh, *'For My Worthy Freind Mr. Franciscus Junius': An Edition of the Correspondence of Franciscus Junius F. F. (1591–1677)*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 765 n. 12.

78. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, no. 100: "Est etiam alius linguae Saxonicae callentissimus qui fuit olim organista vel saltem unus ex cantoribus ecclesiae Cantuariensis, cuius etiam Antiquitates, ut et urbis, abbatiae, etc. [. . .] publicavit. Sumnerus ei nomen, quem primum ex libro suo amare caeperam, dein offendi in aedibus semel D. d'Ewes, ubi semel pransi sumus. . . ."

79. Bekkers, *Correspondence*, no. 100: "Gaudeo te iam tandem de editione Lexici Saxonici serio cogitare, fere dixerim sero, non quod abs isto altero D. D'Ewes tuo valde timeam, sed quod illud iam diu avidissime expectaverim. Nec audio sane aliquid de eius Lexico, rusticatur enim, ex quo cum ducentis suis collegis vi et armis parlamento abstentus est."

Morris's justified impatience with the appearance of de Laet's dictionary was as right as his estimation of D'Ewes's progress on his. Just as Death had visited de Laet in 1649, so he came to D'Ewes in 1650, frustrating his advanced plans for publication.

Two men had each been working for a decade and a half on an Anglo-Saxon dictionary, and both men had managed to complete it. But whose was bigger? We still have D'Ewes's hand-written copy. That of de Laet, however, was entrusted after his death by his (adult) children to Marcus Zwerius Boxhorn, a Leiden professor of history and a friend of de Laet's, with the idea that he would see the dictionary through the press. Boxhorn in turn lent the dictionary to a young and keen Danish student, Peder Resen, who took it with him from Leiden to Copenhagen after Boxhorn died in 1653. There it was destroyed when the university library caught fire in 1728.[80] So even though it has disappeared, I am quite convinced that de Laet's dictionary must have been bigger in more than one respect: it was to a large extent original, based on his own reading of a wide range of, especially, unpublished texts. D'Ewes's dictionary, on the other hand, was essentially compilatory and derivative.

According to Hetherington, most of the early lexicographers of Old English "were not what modern scholars call linguists."[81] This is an easy claim, because the linguist in the modern sense of the word still had to be invented in the seventeenth century. Who of the few lexicographers could qualify for this category Hetherington does not say. However, when she maintains that de Laet "was a businessman with a scholarly avocation,"[82] she is underrating de Laet's qualities. De Laet was typically a Dutch merchant-scholar, with a list of some twenty publications—books, that is—to his name. Some of these books, whether in English, French, Spanish, or Portuguese, are still in print. Others have been covered by the dust of time. Nine of these books were published between 1638 and 1649, that is in the years

---

80. For details concerning the fate of de Laet's dictionary in 1649 and later, see Bremmer, "The Correspondence of Johannes de Laet," pp. 161–62, where I erroneously attribute the fire of 1728 to an English bombardment. The English Navy under Nelson in fact bombarded Copenhagen only in 1807, by which time the dictionary had long since perished.

81. Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, p. 181. The term *linguist* is first recorded in 1591 (Shakespeare) in the sense of "one who is skilled in the use of languages; one who is master of other tongues besides his own." The sense of "a student of language, a philologist" is attested for the first time in 1649 but only became popular from the eighteenth century onwards; see *OED* s.v. *linguist* 1 and 2.

82. Hetherington, *The Beginnings of Old English Lexicography*, p. 181.

during which he was so deeply engaged in his Anglo-Saxon dictionary project. By 1639 his reputation as a student of "Old" languages had spread abroad. In the preface to his edition of the twelfth-century German *Annolied*, Martin Opitz mentioned de Laet in one breath with Henry Spelman, Ole Worm, and Johann Elichmann as the most prominent scholars of Old (High) German, Anglo-Saxon, and Gothic (= Old Norse).[83] De Laet's broad philological studies stood him in good stead when in 1643 he refuted the serious claim, made by no less a scholar than Hugo Grotius (de Groot), that the native Indians of North America descended from Norwegian settlers, and hence supported the Swedish (!) presence in that part of the New World. With a detailed comparison of the various native American languages with Romance, Welsh, and various Germanic languages (including Old English), de Laet demonstrated that language dissimilarities clearly spoke against such an assumption.[84] When he needed to, de Laet was ready to make his leisure studies a socially and politically relevant affair: at the time, the Swedes were trying to expand their territory in New Jersey at the expense of the Dutch colony of New Netherland.[85]

"Mine is bigger than yours"—the race that both D'Ewes and de Laet had been running in hindsight—was a lost race, for neither saw the final result of the other. While they were busily compiling their material from assiduously borrowed or collected manuscripts and printed books and were writing their dictionaries, they had failed to take yet another contestant into account who eventually proved to be the fastest runner: Death.

83. *Incerti poetae Teutonici Rhythmus de Sancto Annone Coloniensis Archiepiscopo, ante 99 aut circiter annos conscriptus* (Danzig: Andr. Hünefeld, 1639), fol. 5+v. Elichmann (1600–39) was an orientalist and had postulated a close relationship between German, Persian, and Greek.

84. On the Grotius-de Laet polemic in general, see Benjamin Smith, "Space, Time, Travel: Hugo de Groot, Johannes de Laet, and the Advancement of Geographic Learning," in *A Leiden Polymath*, ed. Bremmer and Hoftijzer, pp. 177–99. On the linguistic argument, see George J. Metcalf, "A Linguistic Clash in the Seventeenth Century," *German Life and Letters* 23 (1969), 31–38; and Daniel Droixhe, "'Más ignorante que hereje': De Laet, Acosta et l'origine linguistique des Américains," in *Kontinuität und Innovation: Studien zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachforschung vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für W. Bahner zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Gerda Haßler and Jürgen Storost (Münster: Nodus, 1997), pp. 73–88.

85. On this conflict, see C. A. Weslager, *The Swedes and Dutch at New Castle* (New York: Middle Atlantic Press, 1987).

APPENDIX I
A LIST OF CAMBRIDGE ANGLO-SAXON MANUSCRIPTS IN TRESOAR
(PROVINSJALE BIBLIOTEEK FAN FRYSLÂN)
WRITTEN BY ABRAHAM WHEELOCK

Among the many interesting holdings of Tresoar (*olim* Provincial Library of Friesland), Leeuwarden, is a folder (call number Tresoar, 149 Hs.) with documents of antiquarian philological interest, once owned by the Frisian philologist Joost Hiddes Halbertsma (1789–1869) and bequeathed by him after his death to that library. Fortunately, we have some first-hand information on how Halbertsma acquired these documents: he had bought them at the auction of Professor Jona Willem te Water's library in Leiden in 1823. Halbertsma had studied theology in Amsterdam, and he was minister of the Mennonite congregation in Bolsward (in the Dutch province of Friesland) at the time of the auction. Like so many other clergymen in those days, he devoted much of his leisure time to the study of Frisian language and literature within the broader context of Germanic philology, with a special interest in Anglo-Saxon. For example, Halbertsma had already read and commented on Thorkelin's 1813 edition of *Beowulf* before anyone else in the Netherlands was even aware of it.[86] For that reason, when he got hold of te Water's auction catalogue,[87] his mouth must have started watering when, in volume two, he read the description on p. 39 of lot no. 86: "Glossarium Latino-Theotiscum. Manu alia est adscripta vocum interpretatio Anglo-Saxonicorum. Accedit catalogus Librorum Saxonicorum, qui in Bibliotheca publica Cantabrigiæ asservantur."[88] Halbertsma made a bid and obtained the lot for the price of twenty Dutch florins, a considerable amount of money. Great was his disappointment when he

---

86. See *Beowulf: The Critical Heritage*, ed. T. A. Shippey and A. Haarder (London: Routledge, 1988), no. 26. On Halbertsma's contribution to Joseph Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, see E. G. Stanley, "J. Bosworth's Interest in 'Friesic' for his Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language (1838): 'The Friesic Is Far the Most Important Language for My Purpose,'" in *Aspects of Old Frisian Philology*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., Geart van der Meer, and Oebele Vries (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1990), pp. 428–52.

87. *Bibliotheca Te Waterana, sive Catalogus librorum selectorum . . . , epistolarum autographarum, etiam magnae copiae numorum [sic] veterum ac recentiorum . . . / quae omnia . . . collegit . . . Jona Guilielmus te Water . . . : Publica huius bibliothecae distractio fiet . . . die XIII Octobris et seqq. A. MDCCCXXIII . . . .*, 2 vols. (Leiden: S. and J. Luchtmans, [1823]).

88. "Latin–Old Dutch/German Glossary. In another hand the Anglo-Saxon interpretation of the words has been added. To this is joined a catalogue of Anglo-Saxon books preserved in the Public Library of Cambridge."

opened the parcel, for the contents were not half of what the catalogue description had promised. Much to his surprise, however, the lot included an item not mentioned in the auction catalogue, now item (a). These are the contents of Tresoar, 149 Hs.:

(a) A late sixteenth-century transcript of the first three psalms of the *Wachtendonck Psalter*, now known as "The Leeuwarden Fragment," with a tenth-century interlinear Old Dutch running gloss (fols. 1–4).[89]

(b) A late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century copy of a *Glossarium Theotiscum* (fols. 5–8). Originally, fols. 5–8 seem to have belonged to another collection. In the top left-hand corner of fol. 7, the figure 320 is crossed out with two strokes. Just below this figure is a sticker with the number "86.," the auction's lot number. The folio numbers "5" to "8" are not in Halbertsma's hand. Rather than being "Dutch" or "German"—the term *Theotiscus* was not very precise—the *Glossarium* is actually an abridged version of Ælfric's *Glossary* that was copied from a Bede manuscript by the French antiquary François Pithou (1543–1621) in Oxford in 1572.[90] Pithou sent versions of this glossary to the German scholars Friedrich Lindenbrog (1573–1648) and Marquard Freher (1565–1614), both of whom were active in the recovery of the Germanic past, and to the Swiss scholar Jacques Bongars (1546–1612) in Bern.[91] Lindenbrog's brother Henry provided a copy to Johannes Frederich Gronovius (1611–71), a townsman of his who had settled in the Dutch Republic and eventually became professor of Classical Languages at Leiden. From Gronovius's copy, now lost, Jan van Vliet (or Janus Vlitius, 1622–66) made a transcript in Leiden in 1659, now preserved in London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 783, fols. 248r–253v. Kees Dekker has demonstrated that van Vliet's transcript is not based on the Leeuwarden copy, which cannot therefore be identical with

---

89. Published and commented upon by Halbertsma, "De oudste vertaling der psalmen in het Nederlandsch" ["The Oldest Translation of the Psalms into Dutch"], *Overijsselsche Almanak voor Oudheid en Letteren* 1838 (Deventer: J. de Lange, 1837), pp. 274–321. Halbertsma's very personal account of his acquisition of these documents is to be found on pp. 279–80.

90. Pithou's transcription surives as London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C. ix, fols. 208–13 (Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 405). See R. E. Buckalew, "Nowell, Lambarde, and Leland: The Significance of Ælfric's *Grammar* and *Glossary*," in *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries*, ed. Carl T. Berkhout and Milton McC. Gatch (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982), pp. 19–50, at 26–27 (the Q version).

91. Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 405 (p. 470).

Gronovius's copy.[92] The Leeuwarden version was not known to either Neil Ker or Ronald Buckalew, and it is therefore a welcome addition to our knowledge of the proliferation of the early testimony of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. An additional bonus of the Leeuwarden version is that it carries Franciscus Junius's hand—something Halbertsma had failed to recognize. Junius, after he had seen Gronovius's version, complained to the latter that the Old English words had been terribly mutilated. His dissatisfaction with the corrupted Old English also appears from the pages of the Leeuwarden copy, for over each Old English word Junius has written the "proper" equivalent in his characteristic imitation Anglo-Saxon minuscule. Thus the first entry, *Paterfamilias*, appears in the Leeuwarden glossary as "Hiredes hlaford." Over these words, Junius wrote not one but three glosses, in ascending order: *hiredes fæder, hiredes ealdor,* and *hiredes hlaford.*

(c) A letter without proper address or sender, on large sheets (19.5 cm. x 31.5 cm.), listing five Old English manuscripts kept in the Public (now University) Library of Cambridge. Each item begins with an introduction and is followed by an incipit in Old English using Insular characters and accompanied by a Latin translation underneath each line of Old English. Occasionally, transliterations of Old English words or individual characters appear between the Old English line and the Latin translation as if to provide a key for someone who is not yet accustomed to reading Insular script. The list concludes in the same hand with some information on the Anglo-Saxon psalter which Spelman was in the process of editing and the mention of a beautiful Anglo-Saxon gospel book in Cambridge plus some historical background on these seven manuscripts. This is followed by some additional remarks in Latin written by Halbertsma. The hand of this letter was identified for me as belonging to Abraham Wheelock by Professor Ray I. Page, then librarian of Corpus Christi College, and afterwards independently confirmed for me by Mr. Timothy Graham in 1992. There is also circumstantial evidence in support of this identification in that

---

92. Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies*, pp. 133–35.

Wheelock was the university librarian at the time.[93] Now that I have seen many specimens of Wheelock's hand myself, I have no reason to find fault with this identification. Halbertsma, however, without hesitation, erroneously attributed the hand to Franciscus Junius, both at the end of Wheelock's list, and in print in his 1838 article.

In what follows, I give an edition of this list without the Old English incipits and their Latin translation, followed by explanatory notes. I conclude with some final observations.

Transcription of Leeuwarden, Tresoar, 149 Hs., fols. 9r–10v:

Fol. 10v:
In gratiam Doctissimj, præstantissimiq*ue* Domini mei Germani

Fol. 9r:
Libri Saxonici in publica Bibliotheca Cantabrigiae
1. Liber pastoralis sti. Gregorij papæ R. et (vt aiunt) Angloru*m* Apostoli, quia hic Augustinu*m* monachu*m*, Iustu*m*, mellitu*m*, &c. ad gentem convertenda*m* misit. Sic incipit. [. . .]
   (In the left-hand margin separated by a squiggly line from the main text: Quem R. Aluredus dedit Saxonicè ante an*n*os 700.)
2. Historia Angloru*m* scripta p*er* Venerabile*m* Beda*m* Anglo-Sax. et p*er* eundem macaritam R. Aluredu*m* versa Saxonicè. [. . .]
3. Sermones Catholici in Ecclesia Anglo-Sax.[94] per annu*m* recitand*orum* . per Ælfricu*m* monachu*m*. [. . .]
4. homiliæ, numero, 34. Cum descendisset ihs De monte . &c. [. . .]

Fol. 9v:
5. De Vitis Sanctoru*m* quorunda*m*. at incipit cu*m* 24. capitib*us* libri Geneseos. p*er* Ælfricu*m* monachu*m*. [. . .]
   habentur hic quoq*ue* psalmi Saxonicè, quos D*ns* Henricus Spelman*n*us in luce*m* edit, et fere compleuit. Vt litteris ad me datis, no*n* ita pridem, significabat.

---

93. A. Hamilton, in *ODNB* 58:444–47. Wheelock became librarian in 1629 and remained in this office until his death in 1653. During his librarianship the collection increased from 1000 to 12,000 volumes.

94. *Anglo-Sax.* written over deleted *Catholica*.

Nec non—Euangelia quatuor Sax. Vetustissimu*m*, et apprimè pul-
cherrimu*m* Monumentu*m*.

Libros hos M*anuScript*os Sax*onicos* cu*m* permultis alijs Lat*inis* è
Monasterijs abreptos, reponendos hic curauit Matheus Parkerus
Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus ante an*nos* .80. et multo plures,
cum Lat*inos* tu*m* Sax*onicos* Collegio Corporis Christi (cuius ipse
alumnus fuit) in archivis suis custodiendos tradidit.

Addition in Halbertsma's hand:

Mattheus Parkerius natus est aᵒ 1504 Norwici, denatus aᵒ 1575. Fac
eum MSS. reposuisse in bibliotheca Cantabrigiæ aᵒ 1565, hæc
annotaio enarrata fuit a Junio aᵒ 1645.

Haud longe aberravi. Henricus Spelmannus Psalterium edidit aᵒ
1640.

TRANSLATION, EXCLUDING THE OLD ENGLISH INCIPITS WITH WHEELOCK'S
LATIN TRANSLATION OF THESE:

Fol. 10v:
"For the sake of my very learned and very excellent, true lord"

Fol. 9r:
"Anglo-Saxon books in the Public Library of Cambridge.
1. The Pastoral Book of St. Gregory, Pope of Rome, and (as they
    say) the Apostle of the English, because he sent hither Augustine
    the monk, Justus, Mellitus, etc., to convert the nation. It begins as
    follows: [. . .] (*In margin*: Which King Alfred translated into
    Anglo-Saxon 700 years ago.)
2. The History of the English written by the Venerable Bede the
    Anglo-Saxon, and by the same blessed King Alfred turned into
    Anglo-Saxon. [. . .]
3. Catholic Sermons to be recited in the Anglo-Saxon church
    through the year, by the monk Ælfric. [. . .]
4. Homilies, number 34. When Jesus had descended from the moun-
    tain, etc. [. . .]

Fol. 9v:
5. Of the Lives of Certain Saints, but it begins with twenty-four
    chapters of the book of Genesis, by the monk Ælfric. [. . .]

We also have here the Psalms in (Anglo-)Saxon, which Sir Henry
Spelman is publishing, and which he has almost completed, as he
has indicated in a letter given to me not very long ago.

And also—The four Gospels in (Anglo-)Saxon. A very old and
exceedingly beautiful manuscript.

These handwritten (Anglo-)Saxon books with very many other Latin
ones, seized from the monasteries, Matthew Parker, archbishop of
Canterbury, took care to deposit here 80 years ago, and he
handed over many more, both in Latin and in Saxon, to Corpus
Christi College (of which he was himself an alumnus) to be kept
safe in its archives."

TRANSLATION OF HALBERTSMA'S ADDITION:

"Matthew Parker was born at Norwich in 1504, died in 1575. Suppose
that he (i.e., Parker) deposited these manuscripts in the Cambridge
Library in 1565, this annotation was drawn up by Junius in 1645."

And, added on a new line, as an afterthought:

"I was by no means far from the mark. Henry Spelman published the
Psalter in the year 1640."

Since the list contains items from the Cambridge Public Library, now com-
monly known as the University Library, they are identifiable without much
difficulty:

1. There are three copies of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* in Old English
now present in Cambridge (Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 19, 30, 87; Gneuss, *Hand-
list*, nos. 14, 37, 180). The *incipit* that Wheelock provided helps us to
identify which of the three is referred to in the Leeuwarden list: "Ælfred
kyning hateð gretan Wulsige bisceop his worðum luflice 7 freondlice.
&c." Only one of the three copies gives the name of Wulfsige, bishop
of Dorset, in the Preface. This is CUL Ii. 2. 4 (s. xi$^{3/4}$; Ker, *Catalogue*,
no. 19; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 14). Alfred's Preface in this copy has an
interlinear sixteenth-century English translation on fols. 3v–4v and a

running interlinear English gloss of the same period on fols. 5–7.[95] The identification is confirmed by the form *worðum* instead of the expected *wordum,* which is also found only in this particular manuscript. The Preface and translation were published in 1574 in Matthew Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestæ,* and from there it became one of the most accessible Old English texts on account of its frequent reprints.[96] Wheelock wrote on the front pastedown that he began to read this text on 3 September 1638 and finished reading it on 17 July 1639.

2. There are two copies of the Old English Bede in Cambridge: one is University Library, MS Kk. 3. 18 (s. xi[2]; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 23; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 22), the other Corpus Christi College, MS 41 (s. xi[1]; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 32; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 39). Both were used by Parker and his circle. The University Library copy was used by Wheelock as the source for his Bede edition of 1643, but he also included variants from the Corpus manuscript as well as from Cotton Otho B. xi.

3. Of the many Cambridge manuscripts containing copies of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies,* only Corpus Christi College, MS 162 (s. xi[in]; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 38; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 50) and Corpus Christi College, MS 178 (s. xi[1]; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 41; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 54) begin with the sermon "De initio creaturae." However, neither of these two manuscripts begins with the Latin and Old English preface in which Ælfric identifies himself as the author, which is only to be found in CUL Gg. 3. 28. Ælfric's preface is followed here by the sermon "De initio creaturae" (s. x/xi; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 15; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 11). Further confirmation is found in Wheelock's annotation on the outer margin of CUL Gg. 3. 28, fol. 3, which echoes the description in the Leeuwarden list: "Incipit liber catholicorum sermonum Anglice in Ecclesia per annum recitandorum."

4. CUL Ii. 4. 6 (s. xi[med]; Ker, *Catalogue,* no. 21; Gneuss, *Handlist,* no. 18). Used by Wheelock in his edition of the Old English Bede (1643) and there referred to by him as "Hom. 34."

---

95. See R. I. Page, "The Sixteenth-Century Reception of Alfred the Great's Letter to His Bishops," *Anglia* 110 (1992), 36–64, at 48–52; and Timothy Graham, "Matthew Parker and the Conservation of Manuscripts: The Case of CUL Ii.2.4 (Old English Regula pastoralis, s. xi¾)," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10.5 (1995), 630–41.

96. Francis P. Magoun, "King Alfred's Letter on Educational Policy According to the Cambridge Manuscripts," *MS* 11 (1949), 113–22.

5. CUL Ii. 1. 33 (s. xii²; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 18). Wheelock referred to this manuscript in his edition of Bede (1643) as "Hom. 51."

Finally, Wheelock draws attention to two further manuscripts that he thought worthwhile mentioning. The "Saxon Psalms," no doubt, is CUL Ff. 1. 23 (s. xi^med; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 13; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 4). This manuscript was collated for the edition by Spelman with the psalter texts in the so-called "Eadwine Psalter," now Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 17. 1 (s. xii^med; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 91) and in London, BL, MS Stowe 2 (s. xi^med; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 271; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 499). The *imprimatur* for the publication was given on 17 May 1638, as appears from a note on Stowe 2, fol. 180v, and the edition was published under Henry's son John's name in 1640.[97]

Cambridge has two Anglo-Saxon Gospel Books: University Library, MS Ii. 2. 11 (s. xi^{3/4}–xii¹; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 20; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 15), and Corpus Christi College, MS 140 (s. xi¹–xii; Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 35; Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 44). The former manuscript was given to Parker in 1566 by Gregory Dodde, dean of Exeter, while Parker in turn donated it to the University Library in 1574. The latter manuscript was bequeathed to Corpus Christi College by Parker in 1575. The University Library copy is written in one hand throughout, whereas in CCCC, MS 140 each Gospel is written in a different hand, all of them, according to Ker, "uncalligraphic." Wheelock's words "very beautiful manuscript" therefore confirm the identification of the University Library copy.

There remains a problem with the date that Wheelock gives for the Parkerian donation. According to him, Parker donated his manuscripts "ante an*n*os .80." We know that Parker made his major donations in 1574 and 1575, which, added with eighty years, should date this list to 1654 or 1655. In view of Wheelock's death in 1653, this is impossible. The other cue for an approximate date of the list is Wheelock's statement that Spelman has "fere compleuit" his edition of the Psalter, in combination with the remark that Spelman this Psalter "in lucem edit." On account of the present tense (*edit*) rather than the perfect (*edidit*), I conclude that the final publication had not yet materialized. Rather it refers to Spelman having completed the manuscript version that was to be sent to the publisher. In this respect, the word *fere* is ambiguous as it can mean both "just" and "almost." It would

---

97. *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus* (as n. 7 above).

seem to me that Wheelock's information on the final stage of the Psalter edition is a better indication for the date of this list than is his mention of eighty years having gone by since Parker donated his manuscripts to the libraries of the University and Corpus Christi College, respectively.

What remains puzzling is Halbertsma's additional annotation claiming that the list ("hæc annotatio") was drawn up by [Franciscus] Junius in 1645. This date clearly stands in relation to the earlier remark that Parker donated his manuscripts to the Cambridge Library in 1565, the difference between 1565 and 1645 being exactly eighty years. However neat such a calculation may be, Halbertsma was clearly aware of the fact that the Spelman Psalter was published in 1640 and that this fact somewhat messed up his sum. He must have realized from the Latin that the Psalter had not yet been published, and therefore commented that he was "not far from the mark" with his arithmetical exercise.

Several arguments may serve to dismiss the suggestion that Junius had a part in this list. First, it is certainly written in Wheelock's hand and not in that of Junius. Second, as far as can be established, Junius had not yet, or perhaps only barely, begun his study of the Old Germanic languages by 1645.[98] Finally, as far as we know, Junius never corresponded—see the remark on the letter that informed the author of the state of the edition of the Psalter—with Sir Henry Spelman, who died in 1643, that is, before Junius had embarked on his Germanic studies.[99] The only one who was actively engaged in Anglo-Saxon studies in Holland between 1638 and 1640—if my dating of Wheelock's list is correct—was Johannes de Laet. Wheelock was familiar with both de Laet and with the latter's son Samuel. There is no indication whatsoever that Junius had ever been in touch with Wheelock.

---

98. Ph. H. Breuker, "On the Course of Franciscus Junius's Germanic Studies, with Special Reference to Frisian," in *Franciscus Junius F. F. and His Circle*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., DQR Studies in English Literature 21 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), pp. 129–57, at 139–40.

99. For an edition of Junius's correspondence and a reconstruction of his circle of correspondents, see van Romburgh, *'For My Worthy Freind Mr. Franciscus Junius'* (n. 77 above).

<div align="center">

Appendix II

De Laet's List of Corrections and
Emendations to Spelman's Psalter Edition

</div>

NB. With "C." and "T.," de Laet uses the same sigla as in Spelman's edition, viz. "Liber Academiæ Cantabrigiensis" and "Liber Collegii S. Trinitatis in Cantabrigia." The obelisk he writes in his note on Psalm 13:1 refers to a variant reading in the margin of Spelman's edition.

quædam sunt tantu*m* Breves quædam notæ ad textu*m* Anglo-saxonicu*m*
errata typograph.[100] et varias lectiones

Psal. 1. v. 1. Omnino legendum cwyldes nam cwyld clades, pestis.
neque in veterib*us* m*anu*scrip*t*is obseruaueris usum literæ Q vnde
Codicem Coll. S. Trinitatis ex hoc et alijs indicijs recentioris
notæ existimo. Sic lauorde pro laford etc.
v. 2 bið smead leg*e* smeaþ. est meditatio eius. aut forte
abundat bið nam smeað alibi occurrit pro meditabitur a
verbo smeagan.
v. 4 beod gesunfullude. lege beoþ vel biþ erit, nam vtroq*ue*
modo reperitur in m*anu*scrip*t*is.
Psal. 2. v. 1. grymtydon alibi grymdon. belg*ice* 'grimmen' fremere.
v. 4. irpeþ *ve*l hyseþ. primam vocem nondum obseruaui; nisi
forte legendum irreþ irascitur. altera cognata est nostrati
verbo 'hissen' vel 'hisschen' sibilare exsibilare.
Psal. 3. v. 3 underphang leg*e* underfang (ut psal. 17. v. 3) non enim
reperitur ph
in veterib*us* m*anu*scrip*t*is v. 5 onfeng me; suscepit me.
In ORAT*ione* nostræ in te esse non negant. expunge *non*
et sensus est commodus.
Psal. 4. v. 7. dusealnest legendu*m* þu seallest.
v. 9 legendu*m* on sibbe on þæt sylfe. in pace in id ipsu*m*.
Psal. 5. v. 6 hutudest legend*um* hatudest. hatunga odium.
C. feodust. hinc vocem *Faida* orta*m* credo quæ sæpe in leg*ibus*
Saxon*um* et aliaru*m* gentiu*m* occurrit.

---

100. "quædam . . . typograph.": in margin.

v. 7. foþlice leg*e* soþlice. v. 10. brace leg*e* hrace.

v. 13 T C meardas. lege ineardast. eardan et eardian
habitare.

Psal. 6. v. 8 gewitað puto legend*um* gewicað. bel*gice* 'wijckt.'

Psal. 9. v. 17. gegwipen leg*e* gegripen. bel*gice* 'grypen' prendere. Sic
mox altera parte v. 2 hi beoþ gegripene, comprehenduntur.
part*e* altera. v. 16. beceapast opinor et hic scriptu*m* fuisse besceawast
nam facilis lapsus in p et w.

v. 18 *earm. nota* ponenda ante synfulles.

Psal. 10. v. 1. geeweðað leg*e* gecweðað.

v. 9 þe omnino legendum we.

Psal. 12. v. 5 earforþigeð lege earfoþigeþ ut psal. 9.9. earfoþnysse
tribulatio. earfoþe difficilis.

Psal. 13. v. 1. † T. unsnotræ legend*um* unsnotre.

v. 5. T. ciolan legendu*m* ceolan. ut alibi passim.

Psal. 14. v. 4 nogeanes legend*um* togeanes.

Psal. 15. v. 4 gederige credo leg*e* gaderige.

v. 6 fefellon leg*e* gefellon.

v. 10 geborsnunga. leg*e* gebrosnunga.

Psal. 16. v. 3 C. foþyppaþ leg*e* foryppaþ.

v. 6. fotswaþu mine leg*e* fots paþu mine.

v. 13 T. hlow. lege hloþ ut in legib*us* Anglosax*onicis*

Psal. 17. 10 sinic leg*e* smic. hodie smooc.

v. 13. wolon leg*e* wolcn. bel*gice* 'wolken'

v. 16 he to stenete leg*e* stencte a stencian.

v. 36. boga lyft decepit interpretem vox æreum et legit äerium.
nam lyft est äer.

v. 41. C. gescrenctyst legend*um* gestenctyst. vt paulo post getostenctyst.

Psal. 18. v. 1 T. fesnesse leg*e* festnesse.

v. 13 ara C. spara. atq*ue* ita legend*um*

v. 19 ungeþæmmed leg*e* ungewæmmed.

Psal. 21. v. 9. ne gewit þú opinor legend*um* gewic þú.

Psal. 22 v. 3 T. siþfæt legend*um* siþpæt. bel*gice* 'sijdpadt' semita.

Psal. 23. v. 9. underigende. belgæ dicerent 'ondeerende.' 'deeren'
ipsis est nocere: Sed et altera lectio proba unscytende 'onscae-dende,'
a 'scaeden' nocere. Sic alibi unscæþþingnysse innocentia.

v. 6. C. T. cneowris legendu*m* cneorysse ut in Euangelijs et passim.