ON THE NOTION OF CONTINUITY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE*

By H. L. ROGERS

I N 1931 the late R. W. Chambers, Quain Professor of English and Fellow of University College, London, wrote a classic essay "On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School". If it seems strange that a newly-appointed Professor of the University of Sydney should choose to deliver his Inaugural Lecture on much the same topic more than thirty-five years later, let me explain first that there has been renewed interest in the subject of "continrity" recently; secondly that there are close links between R. W. Chambers and the study of early English in this University. Professor A. G. Mitchell, now Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University, who held the Chair of Early English Literature and Language from 1947 to 1961, studied under Chambers; Mitchell and his successor Professor G. H. Russell (now of the Australian National University, Canberra) are still carrying on Chambers's work of editing *Piers Plowman*. Here is one kind of continuity, a tradition of scholarship, which I am happy to have the opportunity of acknowledging.

Chambers in his *Continuity* (as I shall refer to his essay) attempted to prove the thesis of W. P. Ker, his mentor and predecessor at University College, London, that "the literary like the political history of England is continuous", and to give a resolute Anglo-Saxon answer to the assertion of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch: "From Anglo-Saxon Prose, from Anglo-Saxon Poetry, our living Prose and Poetry have, save linguistically, no derivation." Some elements of that controversy, I suggest, should be excluded from any inquiry claiming to be disinterested.

This is not altogether as easy as it might sound—though it is not, I believe, as difficult as it was thirty-five years ago. The political, social, ecclesiastical and economic historians are now better informed and less partisan about the Norman Conquest and its effects; and whatever justice there was in Chambers's criticisms of "the real animus which many historians show against the England of the Confessor and of Harold", there is no animus obvious today, one way or the other. Literary critics and historians, on the other hand, remain more subject to prejudice, mostly (one suspects) because they are often professionally concerned with the teaching of English literature. Compare, for example, Mrs. Q. D. Leavis's *Scrutiny* essay, "Professor Chadwick and English Studies", and Professor C. L. Wrenn's recent *Study of Old English Literature*. Mrs. Leavis quotes from H. M. Chadwick's

The Study of Anglo-Saxon:

> there are serious objections, however, to any scheme which involves an exclusive or even primary connection of Anglo-Saxon with English studies. The latter do not afford a good training for the former; and in Universities where this connection has ceased it is found that the majority of our best students come from other subjects than English. For Anglo-Saxon studies some inclination for the acquisition of languages and a wider historical outlook are desirable; English studies are too limited in their scope. Indeed, the two subjects appeal to different kinds of mind.

Mrs. Leavis comments: "It is all too true, in fact indisputable, but how unprofessional to admit, even to notice, anything of the sort, in what bad taste to announce it from the house-tops!" Mrs. Leavis was writing in 1947; in 1967 Professor Wrenn, Emeritus Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford, wrote:

> The superficially modern look of Chaucer's work, along with the apparent foreignness and remoteness of Anglo-Saxon . . . still encourage the belief— though it is not seriously maintained by most responsible scholars—that the study of English literature must begin with Chaucer, with the implication that what went before Chaucer has little of properly literary importance or value. But Anglo-Saxon literature is in fact an all-important section of a continuing stream: and there is a sense in which the spirit which still animates English civilization has a derivative unity with Anglo-Saxon literature. Its study is part of that of the English developing *mind* in its wholeness. As R. W. Chambers put it, we may "dream of all our literature, whether in prose or verse, in modern English, in early English or in Latin, as the work of one spirit".

Of course these quotations offer only partial illustrations of the opposing viewpoints; Chadwick was surely right when he insisted that Anglo-Saxon is more fruitfully studied in connection with early medieval European civilizations than with later English literature, and indeed one of the Oxford syllabuses allows this. The point at issue, rather, is whether Anglo-Saxon literature is such "an all-important section of a continuing stream" that it is indispensable to the study of later English literature. On this, Dr. and Mrs. Leavis on the one hand, and Professor Wrenn on the other, would not agree.

I do not wish to pursue the argument, beyond adding that no English student in the University of Sydney is now compelled to learn Anglo-Saxon, or phonetics, or the history of the English language, though a remarkably high number *choose* these things. What I do wish to do, if I can, is to detach the question of "continuity" from its teaching implications (if any), though I realize that this too may betray a prejudice in that it puts the scholarly question first and the teaching question second. But it is a defensible prejudice; good education can never be based on bad scholarship.

Chambers in his *Continuity* traced the development of English prose from King Alfred (died 899), through "the cultured prose of Ælfric; the utterly different eloquence of Wulfstan . . . and many competent writers who contributed to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles". He denied the alleged decadence of Anglo-Saxon prose before the Norman Conquest, and emphasized that good historical prose continued to be written for a time after the Conquest. But "the noble record of historical writing in English prose ends, and ends nobly" with the entry for the year 1154 in the *Peterborough Chronicle,* and Chambers found the "continuity of English prose . . . in the sermon and in every kind of devotional treatise". He argued that

> When we turn to this religious prose, it is no question of leaping over the centuries, as we have to do in passing from the historical prose of the Peterborough monk about 1155 to the humble beginnings of historical prose in the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries. On the contrary, there is a series of links, sometimes working very thin, but never broken.

In the tradition of religious prose Chambers placed particular emphasis upon certain devotional texts written in the West Midlands—the "Katherine Group", the lives of St. Katherine, St. Margaret, and St. Juliana; *Holy Maidenhood; Soul's Ward;* and, "above all", the *Ancrene Riwle,* a manual for the guidance of three women recluses. The *Riwle,* Chambers says (quoting Miss Hope Emily Allen), "enjoyed a prodigious popularity in medieval England for at least three hundred years". It "occupies a vital position in the history of English prose"; it influenced Rolle and Hilton, who belonged to this tradition and whose work influenced Sir Thomas More:

> So, when Thomas More determined to be an author, not merely in Latin, but in English also, he had not to make an English prose. He found it ready to hand: not in Chaucer's *Parson's Tale,* not even in Malory, whose book he may perhaps never have opened, but in the living tradition of the English pulpit, and in the large body of devotional vernacular literature dating from the Fourteenth Century and the early Fifteenth.

In this way Chambers established "the continuity of English prose" from King Alfred to Sir Thomas More.

The thesis was persuasively presented and illustrated with a wealth of skilfully-chosen quotation; few scholars then or now could match Chambers in breadth of reading in this field. Yet *Continuity* has some weaknesses that now seem obvious, and to which increasing attention has been drawn in recent years. For example, the secular, often practical and business-like prose that flourishes in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries must occupy an important place in prose history. As Professor Norman Davis remarks, however, "business men of the fifteenth century would not seek models for their letters in devotional writers like Love any more than they would form their grammatical usage on a court poet like

Chaucer". As Professor Wrenn has noted, the devotional prose of the *West* Midlands is not in the main stream of the language of literary English, which has its sources in the *East* Midlands and in London. Most serious of all, however, are the telling objections now made against the placing of the *Ancrene Riwle*—a placing which, in Chambers's opinion, was "vital"—within the tradition of Alfred and Ælfric. Professor G. V. Smithers has lately written in the Oxford *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*:

> the ornamented exuberance of the *Ancrene Riwle* and the dazzling clarity, polish, and urbanity of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* belong to different worlds. . . . The dogma that the *Ancrene Riwle* is a main example of the "continuity" of Old and Middle English prose is thus a major error of literary history. The author's warm, intimate, easy tone and his conversational syntax are as novel in our prose as his apparatus of style.

This, I must add for those who are not familiar with recent scholarship in this field, is by no means an aberrant opinion, though Chambers does still have his supporters. For example, Professor Ian Gordon of the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, whose recent book *The Movement of English Prose* is a most interesting and valuable contribution to the subject, insists that the *Ancrene Riwle* is "a direct development (written in the west of England where the tradition is strongest) of Alfredian prose".

One fundamental objection to Chambers's thesis—an objection made in various ways by various critics—must however be met if that thesis is now to be defended. The objection is that Chambers never made clear what "continuity" is. As Professor Davis has commented:

> What Chambers meant when he described it [the prose of Hilton or of Love] as the direct descendant of Old English prose like Ælfric's, he never made sufficiently clear. One would suppose that he meant that in spite of the far-reaching changes in the content and operation of the *language*—in vocabulary, inflexion, syntax, and rhythm—the essential qualities of *style,* whatever they might be in isolation from these elements, persisted. Professor Prins has objected that even in the *Ancrene Riwle,* and much more in Love, there are so many Latin and French words, phrases, and constructions that "they cannot but have affected the author's style". I believe this to be entirely true. . . .

Davis concludes that "Chambers admitted far too much to his approbation of 'simple lucidity'." Good prose with "a certain tone of self-possession", "noble in its simple lucidity", with a "plain and open style" may be written in more than one tradition, and in more than one language for that matter. One surely cannot infer "continuity" from such imprecise (if not irrelevant) indices. But I am driven to go further, and to state more bluntly what I take to be the implications of

Professor Davis's argument, namely that the concept of "continuity" itself is indefinable and inoperable, and therefore better done without, at least in this context.

Professor Ian Gordon, in the book already referred to, has squarely faced the need for a precise definition of "continuity". If I understand him correctly, and I hope I do, his thesis is roughly as follows: the history of English prose may be regarded as a succession of movements away from, and back towards, the spoken language. For example, "More is a greater writer of prose, but he is part of the general movement of his century, one of those periods of adjustment when the writing of English moved once again closer to the spoken tongue." The "real continuity" is that of speech:

> Continuity there was, and it rests on a basis broader than Chambers proposed. It does not depend simply on the preservation of Alfredian prose in manuscripts of Middle English homilies. Continuity is the result of the only way in which language is transmitted, by a kind of oral indoctrination . . . the basic structures of English have changed very little, and if a foreign element (introduced from French or elsewhere) is to be viable, it must conform rapidly to English speech habits. The segmented English sentence . . . plus the continuity of the original structural words, has ensured an underlying stability in English speech, and in the prose which is based upon it.

Gordon analyses this "continuity" of language in some detail, discussing the vocabulary of Germanic origin, the Germanic pattern of stress in words and sentences, the segmentation of English sentences into word-groups, and such features of the English sentence as subject-verb-object word-order and the use of co-ordination and parataxis. His repeated conclusion is that the "continuity of English prose is a continuity of spoken English".

What has happened here, surely, is that *linguistic* "continuity" (analysed in fairly crude and general terms) has been substituted for *literary* "continuity". But apart from anything else, I doubt whether the "continuity of spoken English" is much help to us in this context. It is true, of course, as a shrewd colleague in the Department of English in the University of Sydney once remarked, that there has never been a time since the Anglo-Saxon settlement of England when English has not been spoken there; in this sense there is continuity, as there has not been continuity of Celtic speech in Cornwall; beyond that, however, what does the "continuity of spoken English" mean? Any piece of earlier English will contain some features that may be characterized as "continuous" or "potentially continuous", and others that may not; but to classify the whole piece as anything but "continuous" is by definition impossible (since the piece would not then be English at all).

In general, I find that reading Anglo-Saxon and Middle English prompts two sorts of surprise: first, that the language has changed so little through the

centuries; secondly, that it has changed so much. In a given specimen, that is, "continuity" and "discontinuity" exist simultaneously. One can recognize that they do so in varying degrees from specimen to specimen, time to time, dialect to dialect; and this may imply that one piece can be distinguished from another as more or less "continuous" (or "discontinuous"). We may feel that there is a greater degree of "continuity" between our English and (say) Chaucer's than (say) that of the North-West Midland poem *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight*; we are more familiar with Chaucer's English mainly because Chaucer's language was that of fourteenth-century London, and it is from this dialect of English that our own descends. This, however, immediately raises a difficulty when we turn back to the history of English prose, for much of this history (indeed most of it in the Old and Middle English periods) is written in the less "continuous" dialects.

In a linguistic context, the term "continuity" seems, at best, to be like the term "drift". If we take a macroscopic view of the English language throughout its known history and reconstructed pre-history, certain broad trends are discernible. As examples one might cite the complex of changes related to the fixing of stress upon the first syllables of Germanic words, associated with the weakening and loss of inflexional endings and the emergence of a more fixed word-order in the sentence. Such large and fundamental changes are often, and quite usefully, attributed to the historical "drift" of the language, to what seems to be an underlying tendency operating over a long period of time. If we change focus, however, and begin to regard the language minutely, we notice a wide range of variations within the general pattern.

One might be tempted to hope that all such variations could be related to the whole. In a way, of course, they are—but not in any simple way. Analogies of the great river of English flowing through the centuries, or of the language as a branching tree, are not helpful; and indeed they have long been abandoned by linguists. Modern studies in dialect geography amply reveal the futility of viewing the historical development of a language as a straight line between two points. I am not overlooking the fact that the comparative method of linguistic reconstruction has proved a most powerful tool, or forgetting that the method depends upon the working assumption of a language free from dialect variation and developing in a straight line. The working assumption there, in short, is of a simple "continuity"; for its proper purposes it is a perfectly valid assumption; but as Bloomfield long ago observed, "the comparative method cannot claim to picture the historical process".

For these and other reasons it seems clear that the "continuity of spoken English", though this may appear to contain a self-evident and universal truth, is not equally meaningful in all contexts. Our records of earlier English are notoriously uneven in their historical and geographical distribution. Strictly regarded, they do

not provide direct evidence about *spoken* English; in the Old and Middle English periods—the periods where "continuity" is most in question—we have only a rough idea of what spoken English sounded like. Written prose (as Professor Gordon is well aware) is not merely written speech. But most important, to quote Professor Barbara Strang, it is "abundantly clear that English is not a simple entity, but one of extreme complication . . . made up, not of just one uniform linguistic system, but of countless hosts of systems". It is this above all that reveals the notion of the "continuity of English speech" as a simplification too crude to be of use in any but the most general discussions. At any one time English would exist in a variety of media, styles, registers; we must assume "extreme complication", even though we have not documentary evidence of it. "Continuity" and "extreme complication" obviously belong to different frames of reference.

Is it not possible then, you may ask—as I have asked myself—that the term "continuity" applied to English speech or to the history of English prose has a use and a value; and that to object to Chambers's and Gordon's employment of it is merely niggling? You may ask further—as again I have asked myself—what the point is of talking so much about "continuity" in a purely negative way. I have come to think, however, that "continuity" is quite seriously misleading as soon as it is pressed to mean anything more than the Englishness of English. As used by Chambers and Gordon it inevitably suggests, even when they do not intend it to, that the emphasis is always more upon conservatism than upon development and innovation, more upon the language and literature as a simple entity than as an extreme complication. "Continuity" is too one-sided and too emotive a term.

So far as the history of English prose is concerned, a term like "tradition" would be better. Certainly, as Chambers showed, King Alfred deserves his place as a founder of English literary tradition. Abbot Ælfric records that Alfred's books were available to him, and we know that Anglo-Saxon literary traditions survived the Conquest at least in some centres, notably Worcester and Peterborough. At Peterborough in the East Midlands the traditions of Anglo-Saxon historical prose were cultivated until the middle of the twelfth century; at Worcester in the West Midlands the traditions of Anglo-Saxon homiletic writing were strong. It was in this area that the *Ancrene Riwle,* the work upon which both Chambers and Gordon lay so much stress, was written in the thirteenth century. I have already suggested that the weight of the best and most recent opinion is against the view that the *Riwle* forms a kind of bridge between the prose of Ælfric and that of the fifteenth century, but I doubt whether anyone would be disposed to assert that the author of the *Ancrene Riwle* owed nothing to Anglo-Saxon literary traditions. The *Riwle,* I believe, affords a good example of how misleading either the assertion or the denial of "continuity" can be; and I prefer to regard it as one of those works of literature which draw upon traditions older and newer, native and foreign, and which themselves create or help to create a new tradition. This suggests a partial

and qualified defence of Chambers's case for the importance of the *Riwle* and of devotional prose, but it does not engender any compulsion (as the thesis of "continuity" tends to do) to reject the case of those who, like Professor Davis, emphasize the importance of French example upon the development of secular English prose styles in the late Middle and early Modern periods. The *Ancrene Riwle,* it seems, is as good an example as one can find of a co-existent continuity and discontinuity.

The term "continuity" has also been applied to the history of English poetry; as Chambers had an essay "On the Continuity of English Prose", Professor Wrenn has one "On the Continuity of English Poetry". Wrenn's essay is an "attempt . . . to indicate some of the threads of differing kinds that may be seen running throughout English poetry from the seventh to the twentieth century". Professor Wrenn does not seek to minimize the significance of Chaucer, and the "continuity" he finds is of a quite general sort, appearing in the forms, subject-matters, and thought patterns used and exhibited by poets from the anonymous poet of *Beowulf* to T. S. Eliot. The essay as a whole is suggestive and interesting, though some of the alleged "continuities" seem strained. For example, Anglo-Saxon poetry was alliterative, and English speakers do readily employ alliteration, but that Swinburne so abandoned his mind to the following hardly places him in the alliterative tradition:

> Could you hurt me, sweet lips, though I hurt you?
>   Men touch them, and change in a trice
> The *l*ilies and *l*anguors of virtue
>   For the *r*aptures and *r*oses of vice.[1]

If we use the term "continuity" of poetry, as Chambers used it of prose, we have to admit—as Professor Wrenn does—that Chaucer marks a new beginning. To say this is not to lose sight of the fact that Chaucer, too, was a man of his age, and that he must have had considerable acquaintance with the older traditions of alliterative verse. But the central tradition of modern English poetry *begins* with Chaucer, and it owes very much less to Anglo-Saxon traditions than to Middle English romance and to Latin, French, and Italian literature.

As you know, however, the Anglo-Saxon traditions did live on after the Norman Conquest, appearing most notably in such fourteenth-century poems as *Piers Plowman* and *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight.* In the second half of that century, in the north and in the West Midlands of England, there was an astonishing flowering of alliterative poetry—and this, let me emphasize, three centuries after the Norman Conquest. Earlier, again from the West Midlands, we have Lawman's *Brut,* an alliterative poem of some 30,000 lines on the legendary history of Britain. The author, as he himself tells us, was a priest living near Radstone in Worcester-

---

[1] When this lecture was delivered, I claimed that "this must surely be the worst poetry ever quoted in an Inaugural Lecture". It was a rash claim, which I must now withdraw after hearing the choicer specimens quoted by my colleague, Professor Leonie Kramer, in her Inaugural Lecture.

shire; the date of his work is about 1200. While the chief source Lawman used was Wace's Norman French *Roman de Brut,* his verse-technique derives, not from French, but from Anglo-Saxon.

It should not surprise us that Anglo-Saxon poetic traditions survived best and longest in the remoter parts of England, in the north and west, while they died out more rapidly in the south and east. Chaucer, you may recall, has the Parson of his *Canterbury Tales* say that he is a southern man, who does not know how to compose alliterative verse, "rum, ram, ruf". Actually the east-west division of England is in many ways more important than the north-south; even today, the West Midlands where they border on Wales are amongst the most unspoiled English counties, though the modern blessing of motorways may be changing that.

While the general picture of alliterative survival is clear enough, there are many puzzling patches. For example, the verse-form of Lawman's *Brut* is alliterative, but it is (to quote Professor Bennett from the Oxford *Early Middle English Verse and Prose* again)

> markedly different from the verse of *Beowulf* and of Cynewulf . . . there are indications that a looser, simpler, and more "popular" alliterative line had begun to develop in the late Old English period.

The opinion that a "popular" style developed is well-established, but I confess I feel uneasy about it. It is really an inference from Middle English texts like the *Brut*; there is no good evidence from the late Old English period. Some short and late poems in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* are usually adduced as evidence, but their infelicities and irregularities of form may be signs of plain incompetence in the Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition, rather than safe indications of "popular" style. The earliest known post-Conquest alliterative verse, fragments found in a manuscript of the Chapter Library of Worcester (note the West Midlands again), also seems to me to be of uncertain significance. The fragments differ among themselves in style; they may have been composed at a date considerably earlier than that of the manuscript in which they are contained (*c.* 1180). Possibly there is evidence here of "a development of the Old English alliterative line . . . perhaps derived from the freer and looser type, as developed in oral tradition"; but there are other possibilities. I wonder, in fact, whether the "oral tradition" readily conjured up by modern scholars was so dominant in the late Old and early Middle English periods, and whether at least some of the surviving verse from this time is not better attributed to learned, antiquarian, or modernizing authors.

Of course, Lawman's *Brut* has to be explained; but here again I wonder how *literary* a work this is. Lawman, as he tells us himself, was a bookish man; the story he recounts derives largely from a Norman French written source. Many acute readers of the *Brut* have been struck by features of Lawman's style which are hard to reconcile with its alleged derivation from oral tradition. For example,

the late Dorothy Everett observed that even when Lawman seemed most reminiscent of Old English poetry "he gives an impression of only half-recalling what he reminds us of". Professor Bennett notices that "he uses little of the older poetic vocabulary and formulae, but has his own supply of similes, stock phrases. . . ." This is strange; one would expect a living oral tradition of alliterative verse to depend more rather than less heavily upon the formulas and stock phrases of Old English verse.

I am not firmly proposing any new theory about Lawman's *Brut*. What I am suggesting is that possibilities other than theories of "continuity" by oral tradition may be worth exploring. We must beware, in this connexion as in others, of laying too much emphasis upon the survival of Anglo-Saxon traditions, and not enough upon the post-Conquest innovations and the development of new Middle English forms. And it does seem somewhat too convenient in the case of Lawman that we appeal now to the known survival of Anglo-Saxon *literary* traditions at Worcester, and now to the supposed existence of *oral* traditions.

Problems of another sort are presented by the poetry of the so-called "alliterative revival" of the fourteenth century. The unrhymed alliterative long lines of this verse, its regular and confident rhythms, cannot well derive from the loose forms of Lawman. Because this poetry makes so sudden an appearance about the middle of the fourteenth century—a century and a half after Lawman—the term "revival" has been used in relation to it. The suddenness of the appearance, however, must be misleading; we cannot believe that such assured and sophisticated and controlled poetry as the best of this (for example, *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight*), containing so many echoes of Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition, could have been a fourteenth-century antiquarian invention. No doubt, we should assume, failing evidence to the contrary, that the practice of "classical" rather than the presumed "popular" alliterative verse had never been lost in the north and west of England, and that the old traditions had been gradually modified to treat new subjects and to suit new tastes. Here, if you will, is a kind of "continuity", though I should still prefer not to use the term, because it tends to focus the attention upon what is old, not upon what is new. Although *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* is an alliterative poem, it differs from Anglo-Saxon verse in more important ways than it resembles it. "Continuity" carries with it the suggestion that the historical antecedents of this fourteenth-century verse, antecedents about which we can only speculate, were of an improbably simple kind. What contribution, we may reflect, did the Norse settlers of this part of England make to the evolution of this verse? What part was played by the various literary influences current during the three centuries after the Conquest? What levels of society, what provincial courts, fostered the growth of the various poems? Questions such as these may remain for ever unanswered because we lack evidence; but a simple "continuity" of Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition provides no effective answer either.

I conclude, therefore, that the very term "continuity" should be employed with the greatest caution, if at all; as I have said already, my own preference is for its abandonment in this context. Of course, the linguistic and literary history of English does begin with the oldest Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; of course the Norman Conquest does not completely break all Anglo-Saxon traditions. But an exact view of English linguistic and literary development requires the inclusion of a vast amount of matter which does not originate from the Anglo-Saxons, or which was not produced within the Anglo-Saxon tradition. Study in depth of any period, any work, quickly suggests the complexity of medieval culture, and it is this complexity which is the proper object of our attention.*

* Some references:
1. R. W. Chambers, "On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School", extracted from the Introduction to Nicholas Harpsfield's *Life of Sir Thomas More*, edited by E. V. Hitchcock and R. W. Chambers, separately printed by the Early English Text Society (London, 1932).
2. Norman Davis, "Styles in English Prose of the Late Middle and Early Modern Period", *Actes du VIIIᵉ Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes* (Liège, 1961).
3. I. A. Gordon, *The Movement of English Prose* (London, 1966).
4. C. L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature* (London, 1967).
5. J. A. W. Bennett, G. V. Smithers and Norman Davis, *Early Middle English Verse and Prose* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1968).
6. Dorothy Everett, *Essays on Middle English Literature*, ed. Patricia Kean (Oxford, 1955).