# MEDIUM ÆVUM

## TELLING A HAWK FROM AN *HERODIO*: ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD ENGLISH WORD *WEALHHAFOC* AND ITS RELATIVES

The Old English word *wealhhafoc* poses two unresolved problems. The first is the etymology of the word itself, while the second is why the word so often appears in Old English glossaries as a gloss for Latin *herodio* 'heron (?), stork (?)' when it seems that it should refer to a bird of prey (often taken to be the peregrine falcon).[1] This article argues that both of these problems can be resolved by understanding how the word came into being – that is, not simply its etymology, but the actual circumstances in which an Anglo-Saxon invented the word. While we cannot identify the precise individual who undertook this act of lexical invention, it will be shown that this individual worked with Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury in the later seventh century, and that one or other of these figures was also involved in the invention of the word *wealhhafoc*. The application of the term to birds of prey appears to be a slightly later development, arising perhaps in the eighth century, that reflects movement of birds into Anglo-Saxon England through trade or tribute. This context may explain the Old Norse word *valr* and Welsh *gwalch*, which both seem likely to be loanwords from Old English. In the case of *valr*, however, it is possible – although by no means certain – that the original application of the term to a water-fowl also influenced its potential meanings in Old Norse. If this is the case, it has the potential to yield some surprising new insights into the aeronautical garments of the goddess Freyja.

Herodio ≠ wealhhafoc*?*

The word *wealhhafoc* is typically glossed 'falcon' in modern glossaries and dictionaries of Old English. It has therefore appeared rather surprising to

scholars that early Anglo-Saxon glossaries employ this term to gloss Latin *herodio*.[2] The forms *uualhhebuc* and *uualhhaebuc* gloss *horodius* (*sic*) in the Épinal and Erfurt glossaries, respectively.[3] The Corpus Glossary follows the Épinal–Erfurt tradition in glossing *herodius* as *walch habuc*, but also glosses *falc*[*o*] with the same word, in the form *walhhabuc*.[4] The glossary of names of animals prohibited in Leviticus xi.19 in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 913 glosses *erodionem* with *ualuc haebuc* (pp. 140f.). The *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* cuts the Gordian knot by assuming that the word *herodio* already in the glossaries means 'goshawk or sim.', but this is not the sense that *herodio* usually has in biblical or patristic sources, so there seems little reason to assume that it already had this sense when first glossed in seventh-century England.[5] Pheifer seeks to explain the apparent anomaly as the result of confusion on the part of the glossator: the phrase 'herodii et accipitris' in Job xxxix.13,[6] he argues, might have prompted a confusion of the *herodio* with a bird of prey, as *accipiter* refers to birds of prey.[7] Ingenious as this suggestion is, I do not think it can be right. The fact that this gloss occurs in the St Gall 913 glossary suggests the involvement of Theodore and/or Hadrian in the construction of this gloss, even if only as an occasional corrector or amplifier of someone else's glossing.[8] It is hard to imagine either of these individuals being confused about the nature of the *herodio*, but, as we shall see, there are good reasons to suppose that one or both of them would have been aware of narratives about the *herodio* that provide a very satisfactory explanation for the glossing of this term by the Old English *wealhhafoc*.

## Wealhhafoc ≠ *'foreign hawk'?*

Before turning to the ornithological background of Theodore and Hadrian, however, we should also consider the other side of the gloss. The term *wealhhafoc* is itself something of an etymological conundrum. It does not, to the best of my knowledge, have any cognates in Germanic languages other than Old English: as Suolahti points out, the instances of this word in Old High German glosses all derive from an Anglo-Saxon original (and, as noted above, there are reasons to connect this with glossarial traditions stemming from the teaching of Theodore and Hadrian).[9] The supposed Old High German cognate recorded in some dictionaries is a red herring.[10] The Old Norse word *valr* 'falcon', however, has been taken to be related to the first element of *wealhhafoc*. Thus Suolahti treats *valr* as having the sense 'der Wälsche', a widely accepted interpretation.[11] De Vries, in attempting to provide an etymology for *valr*, rejects the apparently transparent etymological relationship of the first element of the compound *wealhhafoc* with *wealh* 'foreigner', on the grounds that falcons are native to Scandinavia and would not, therefore, have been called 'foreign' in Old Norse.[12] He prefers to derive *valr* from an Indo-European root *$\u{ǧ}el$- 'reissen', interpreting the Old English word as the result of folk-etymological reshaping of a putative Old Norse *$valhaukr$.[13] Rübekeil adopts this interpretation, but takes the slightly more cautious approach of treating the Old English form as reflecting 'volksetymologische Kontamination', without assuming that the Old English

word need be a borrowing from Old Norse.[14] De Vries's objection to falcons being termed 'foreign' in Scandinavia is implicitly countered by Magnússon in his suggestion that the original sense of *valr* was 'hawk which is sold abroad'.[15]

A rather different etymological theory is proposed by Kitson, who argues that Old Norse *valr* and the *wealh-* of Old English *wealhhafoc* derive from a Germanic word that is either cognate with or borrowed from the etymon of Welsh *gwalch*.[16] The putative Germanic *\*walhaz* 'falcon' would therefore be of very early origin in the Germanic languages. Kitson then argues that Germanic *\*falcon-* pre-dates and is the source of Latin *falco*, and appears to suggest that Germanic *\*falcōn-* may itself represent a 'folk-etymological reshaping of *\*walh-*'.[17] Whether Latin *falco* is borrowed from Germanic, or the Germanic word from Latin, lies beyond the scope of this article, but we should simply remark that it is very difficult to arrive at a firm conclusion on this question. As will be shown, however, there is good reason to think that Old English *wealhhafoc* was coined in seventh-century Canterbury and does not contain an ancient Germanic word *\*walhaz* 'falcon'. The Welsh and Old Norse words are therefore best explained as borrowings from Old English, and any folk-etymological reshaping that has taken place operated in the opposite direction from that hypothesized by Kitson. This also disposes of De Vries's proposed etymology for Old Norse *valr*.

### *Glossing* herodio *at the school of Theodore and Hadrian*

As Bischoff and Lapidge have shown, a number of manuscripts preserve traces, often in glossarial form, of biblical commentaries deriving from Theodore and Hadrian's teaching at Canterbury in the later seventh century.[18] Among the glosses are a number that seek to explain biblical bird-names, and one of these explicitly names Hadrian as the source of a gloss; but Hadrian was clearly not solely responsible for the whole entry, as this gloss is presented as an alternative to another vernacular gloss: 'laru(m) hragra adrianus d(ici)t meum e(ss)e'.[19] This note seems to imply that the entry was compiled by an individual who obtained information from Hadrian. In this instance their first thought apparently disagreed with Hadrian's opinion as to how the bird-name in question should be interpreted. This process of negotiation of meaning of ornithological names provides a fascinating window into the intellectual life of late seventh-century Canterbury. However, reading the St Gall glossary with an eye to such negotiations of meaning also allows us to understand better the origins and development of the Old English word *wealhhafoc*, and its relatives in other Germanic languages.

If we were to attempt to reconstruct how the entry for *larus* was produced, we would have to suppose that Hadrian did not simply write the entry, given that his gloss is only one of the two given. The word *larus* has given trouble to modern lexicographers – Lewis and Short manage no more precise gloss than '*a ravenous sea-bird*, perh. *the mew*' – and it seems also to have given trouble to the individual involved in producing the gloss *hragra*.[20] Bischoff and Lapidge note that the commentator's gloss was 'later qualified' by Hadrian, but do not discuss

how the commentator arrived at the gloss with which Hadrian disagreed.[21] Perhaps this individual was prompted by contextual clues to the conclusion that the *larus* was, as Lewis and Short would put it, 'ravenous', and that it was a water-fowl. Alternatively, they may have asked someone more expert, whose vague answer amounted to the same characteristics: greed and aquatic habits. Such characteristics would readily suggest the heron (Old English *hragra*). The commentator apparently then checked their deduction, or the vague information supplied by their original informant, with Hadrian, as a more reliable informant. Hadrian, it appears, was able to supply considerably more information about this bird, from which it was possible to identify it as the seagull (Old English *mæw*, here appearing, as Bischoff and Lapidge note, in a Latinized form).[22] We should hardly be surprised to find Hadrian providing detailed ornithological information: another case where he or Theodore appears to have supplied similar detail is furnished by the description of the ibis 'qui mittit aquam de ore suo in culum suum ut possit degerere' ('it sends water from its mouth up its anus so that it can digest its food'), a description that Bischoff and Lapidge point to as indicating the origin of the gloss in question in the school of Theodore and Hadrian.[23]

It is worth asking, then, what sort of information Hadrian or Theodore might have provided when asked about the *herodio*. The answer, it seems to me, must have been some form of narrative about the *Diomediae aves*, found on an island off the Adriatic coast of Italy. A representative example is Isidore of Seville's version of the narrative:

> Diomedias aves a sociis Diomedis appellatas, quos ferunt fabulae in easdem volucres fuisse conversos; forma fulicae similes, magnitudine cygnorum, colore candido, duris et grandibus rostris. Sunt autem circa Apuliam in insula Diomedia inter scopulos litorum et saxa volitantes; iudicant inter suos et advenas. Nam si Graecus est, propius accedunt et blandiunt; si alienigena, morsu inpugnant et vulnerant, lacrimosis quasi vocibus dolentes vel suam mutationem vel regis interitum. Nam Diomedes ab Illyriis interemptus est. Haec autem aves Latine Diomediae vocantur, Graeci eas ἐρωδιούς dicunt.[24]

> (The birds of Diomedes are named from the companions of Diomedes, who, according to legend, were transformed into these same birds; they are shaped like coots, the size of swans, bright white in colour, with large, hard beaks. Around Apulia on the island of Diomedes they fly between the cliffs of the shores and the rocks; they discriminate between locals and incomers. For, if it is a Greek, they draw nigh and court him; if a foreigner, they attack him with their beaks and wound him, lamenting as if with tearful voices either their own transformation or the killing of their king. For Diomedes was killed by the Illyrians. These birds are called *Diomediae* in Latin, while the Greeks call them ἐρωδιούς.)[25]

If Theodore or Hadrian provided some version of this as an explanation of what the *herodio* was, his interlocutor, in trying to establish characteristics from which an attempt at identifying the bird might be made, might well have seized on two very striking facts: this is a bird with a large, hard beak and it attacks foreigners. Birds with large, hard beaks that attack other creatures would have

been well known to an Anglo-Saxon, and a common way of referring to such birds in Old English is by a compound word whose first element is the name of a prey animal, and whose second element is the word *hafoc* 'hawk': the *Thesaurus of Old English* lists *gōshafoc* 'goshawk' ('goose' + 'hawk'), *mūshafoc* 'kestrel, buzzard?' ('mouse' + 'hawk') and *spearhafoc* 'sparrowhawk' ('sparrow' + 'hawk').[26] An Anglo-Saxon who was trying to encapsulate the information presented in Isidore's description, or a description very like it, might naturally create a PREY-*hafoc* compound with the sense 'foreigner hawk': i.e. *wealhhafoc*. Far from being an erroneous gloss based on misunderstanding of what an *herodio* was, this represents an economical and effective way of conveying the key characteristics of this bird.

One might, however, object that Isidore also describes these birds as resembling swan-sized, white versions of coots (*fulicae*). The objection does not seem a strong one. If Theodore or Hadrian did give this information, it would hardly outweigh the characteristics discussed above, especially given that it would be obvious that these birds did not exist in Anglo-Saxon England. Moreover, it is not particularly unlikely that Theodore or Hadrian omitted this information. Isidore is by no means the first or the only author to have described the *Diomediae aves*, and Theodore's or Hadrian's knowledge of them may have come from other sources. Augustine, in book 18, chapter 16 of *De civitate Dei*, notes their attacks on foreigners and gentle behaviour towards Greeks, as well as the fact that they 'duris et grandibus rostris satis ad haec proelia perhibentur armatae' ('are said to be armed with hard and large beaks that are suited to this violence'), but makes no mention of their colour or form.[27] Pliny also discusses these birds, providing details of their nesting habits, their white coloration, and a brief account of their behaviour towards Greeks and non-Greeks, but no explicit statement about the size and hardness of their beaks, or their resemblance to the *fulica*.[28] Interestingly, neither of these sources claims, as Isidore does, that the *Diomediae aves* are called ἐρωδιούς in Greek, but other pre-Isidorean sources do. Aelian makes this equivalence in his *De natura animalium*, and it is also to be found in Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*, although in this account the birds flee non-Greek ships, rather than attacking their occupants.[29] Clearly, we are not obliged to think that Theodore or Hadrian was drawing on Isidore's description of these birds, as the narrative had considerable currency from at latest the third century AD onwards. The fact that Theodore or Hadrian responded to a request for information about the *herodio* by discussing the habits of the *Diomediae aves* affords a confirmation of the identification of the name given to these birds in Greek. As Greek speakers, Theodore and Hadrian could be expected to treat Latin *herodio* in line with their understanding of Greek ἐρωδιός, and we can therefore see this gloss, with its implications of a narrative about the *Diomediae aves*, as reflecting the kind of milieu from which Aelian, Servius, and Isidore might have drawn their information about the Greek name for these birds. The circulation in Italian Greek circles of a piece of folkloric knowledge about the ἐρωδιός, a bird found on the Adriatic coast of Italy (uniquely so, according to Pliny),[30] is eminently plausible, and it may well be that we need not seek a specific

source for Theodore's or Hadrian's knowledge: such information might well have been transmitted orally as well as textually.

The etymology of the word *wealhhafoc* and its application to the *herodio* in Anglo-Saxon glossaries turn out to be two sides of the same problem: if the interpretation of *wealh-* in terms of the word meaning 'foreigner' is problematic, it is so because the connection between *herodiones* and foreigners has not been noticed; if the reason for glossing *herodio* as *wealhhafoc* is opaque, its opacity derives from the same unrecognized connection. As we have seen, the word *wealhhafoc* in fact makes perfect sense as a gloss for *herodio*, with the literal meaning 'foreigner hawk' relating to the fact that an individual involved in the production of probably the earliest Anglo-Saxon glossary would have identified the *herodio* as a bird that attacked foreigners. This clarifies the etymology of the word *wealhhafoc*, confirming that it does indeed derive its first element from the word *wealh* 'foreigner', while also disposing of the objections to this etymology based around the fact that the falcon is native to north-western Europe. Given that the word *wealhhafoc* was not coined to refer to the falcon, however, it remains to be considered how it came to be so applied in Old English.

### *How does* wealhhafoc *come to be applied to the falcon?*

Since the word *hafoc* in Old English is usually applied to birds of prey, it is perhaps not entirely surprising that the word *wealhhafoc* was transferred from the *herodio* to the falcon. The speed with which this occurred is worth remarking, however. The glossarial tradition arising from the teaching of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury (and reflected in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 913) appears to have been one of the sources for the larger Épinal–Erfurt–Corpus tradition, and this must be the source of the *herodio* ~ *wealhhafoc* entries in these glossaries.[31] As noted above, however, the Corpus Glossary, unlike the Épinal and Erfurt glossaries, which reflect an earlier stage of the tradition, also glosses *falc*[*o*] as *walhhabuc*.[32] This means that the word *wealhhafoc* was being applied to the falcon within around a hundred and fifty years of its invention in the school of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury. The Corpus Glossary is probably to be dated to the early ninth century.[33] The part played by Theodore or Hadrian in the creation of the word must have taken place sometime in the later seventh century. This suggests that within the hundred and fifty years or so that separate Theodore and Hadrian from the Corpus Glossary, the copyists of this glossarial tradition became unaware of the underlying sense of *wealhhafoc*, reinterpreting it as a word that should apply to a bird of prey, although not willing to give up the inherited use as a gloss for *herodio*. Given that the uses of the word *herodio* that are likely to have been most salient for medieval readers – one thinks particularly of its biblical occurrences (Job xxxix.13; Deuteronomy xiv.16; Psalms ciii.17; Leviticus xi.19) – lack detailed description of the bird,[34] it is not surprising that the tradition of using *wealhhafoc* to gloss *herodio* at some point led to the interpretation of *herodio* as having the sense 'falcon', with some instances referring to a specific kind of falcon.[35]

It is perhaps significant in this context that the earliest manuscript recording the decisions of the Concilium Germanicum of the early 740s, a council prompted by Boniface's concerns, uses the form *uualcones*, apparently for Latin *falcones*, in prohibiting clerical falconry.[36] This form seems unlikely to be a scribal error: the substitution of <uu> for <f> through litteral confusion is unlikely, as is the possibility that this form arose through interactions between Old English speakers and continental individuals. While <u> (representing [v]) and <f> (representing [f], but also [v] in Old English) might be confused by an insular scribe or through interaction between Old English speakers and a continental scribe, <uu> seems to have been an unambiguous representation of [w] and is therefore not likely to have been a feasible representation of the initial sound of *falco*, even if it was realized as something like [v]. It is simpler to suppose that Boniface or another Englishman with him actually used a form *\*uualco*. This could be a Latinization of an Old English *\*wealh*, derived from shortening of *wealhhafoc*: such a form would help to account for Old Norse *valr* and Welsh *gwalch* (if we treat them as loanwords from Old English: on which, see below), which lack the second element of the compound *wealhhafoc*. If we accept this as evidence for the use of a shortened form of *wealhhafoc* to refer to birds of prey, then we can date the transfer of *wealhhafoc* to refer to the falcon to no later than the 740s, within a matter of decades of the original creation of the word. As we shall see, Boniface is also closely connected with evidence that may help to identify the particular kind of falcon first termed a *wealhhafoc* in Old English.

Although the development of *wealhhafoc* to apply to a bird of prey may be unsurprising, it may not be immediately obvious why a falcon should be the bird in question. One possibility that suggests itself is that falcons were identified by some Anglo-Saxons as foreign birds. There is some evidence for this possibility, furnished by a well-known letter of Æthelberht II of Kent to Boniface in which he requests two *falcones*, noting that 'perpauci huius generis accipitres in nostris regionibus, hoc est in Cantia, repperiuntur' ('very few birds of prey of this sort are found in our regions, that is in Kent').[37] This suggests that some Anglo-Saxons at least might feel it necessary to obtain *falcones* from foreign parts. That an eighth-century king of Kent regarded *falcones* as best obtained abroad may offer some indication of the kind of context in which *wealhhafoc* could have been reinterpreted as meaning 'foreign hawk', in reference to the falcon. While it seems unlikely that the falcon was entirely absent in England at this date, it is, as Kitson points out, ornithologically likely that it was comparatively rare in Kent, and it therefore seems reasonable to suppose that this scarcity prompted Æthelberht's request.[38] In the context of such importation of falcons, someone who had come across the term *wealhhafoc* might well conclude that it was a reasonable way of referring to imported birds of prey. Moreover, the involvement of Boniface with Æthelberht's request for falcons (despite his involvement with prohibiting their use to clerics) is suggestive of the kind of interchange between the monastic and the royal or aristocratic spheres that would allow for the spread of the word *wealhhafoc* beyond the glossarial tradition.

*The* wealhhafoc *and the* falco peregrinus

There is, however, another possible explanation for the extension of the term *wealhhafoc* to the falcon. The Latin *falco peregrinus* and its offspring (such as English *peregrine falcon* and romance forms such as French *faucon peregrin*) have been explained as relating to the practice of catching these birds for the purposes of falconry during their migration.[39] The medieval Latin sense of *peregrinus* as 'pilgrim' seems to prompt such explanations. Yet the adjective *peregrinus* had in classical Latin – and continued to have in medieval Latin – the sense 'foreign'.[40] It is perfectly possible, then, to interpret *falco peregrinus* as having the sense 'foreign falcon'. Indeed, this is the sense Chaucer appears to envisage in 'The Squire's Tale', when he describes a bird as 'a faucon peregryn … of fremde lande'.[41] The adjective *fremde* here clearly plays on the possible sense 'foreign' for *peregrinus*.

Given that *falco peregrinus* could mean 'foreign falcon', and was probably so interpreted by some medieval individuals (as Chaucer's testimony suggests), we might propose that *wealhhafoc* was reinterpreted as a loan-translation of the Latin collocation. This would be analogous to the loan-translation of the names of the days of the week from Latin into Old English, where, for instance, Latin *dies solis* 'day of the sun' becomes Old English *sunnandæg* 'day of the sun'.[42] A similar process would readily derive *wealhhafoc* from *falco peregrinus*. When we turn to the evidence for the collocation *falco peregrinus*, however, we encounter a problem. The earliest instances of this term in Latin appear to date from around the late twelfth century: the earliest known to the present author is in Alexander Neckam's *De nominibus utensilium*.[43] The reference in *Guillelmus falconarius* to 'falcones qui vocantur peregrini' ('falcons which are called *peregrini*') would, if that text genuinely originated in the court of Roger II of Sicily, be a potentially earlier reference, dating to the early twelfth century.[44] Since the relevant passage occurs only in two fifteenth-century manuscripts of the text, however, one of which is a copy of the other, it seems likely that this was in any case a later interpolation.[45] In Old French the term does not, to the best of my knowledge, appear in any earlier texts: the examples noted in Tobler and Lommatzsch all date from the thirteenth century or later.[46] In the other romance vernaculars, the relative paucity of material from as early as the twelfth century renders it unlikely that the word would be recorded, even if it existed this early. In English, the earliest use of *peregrine falcon* appears in the *Canterbury Tales*.[47]

In comparison to *wealhhafoc*, *falco peregrinus* seems something of a Johnny-come-lately – and this raises the chicken-and-egg (or falcon-and-falcon?) question of which gives rise to which. There is no obvious bar to a loan-translation of an English word into Latin in medieval England, as is the case with, for instance, *caput porci* translating *hogshead* (probably a development of around the beginning of the fifteenth century) or *lupinum caput gerens* translating *wolfshead* 'outlaw', a development that must belong to the late Old English period.[48] Kitson argues from the chronological priority of *wealhhafoc*, and his belief that *falco peregrinus* is first attested in an English source, that the Latin term is a loan-translation of the Old English word.[49]

The question of dating is also important to understanding the development of the name *falco peregrinus*. If Kitson is right to see the Latin term as a translation of Old English *wealhhafoc*, then the translation must presumably have taken place either late in the Anglo-Saxon period or early in the Anglo-Norman period, since there is no trace of the term *wealhhafoc* in Middle English.[50] This would be consistent with the earliest evidence for other names of falcons in Anglo-Latin, such as *girfalco*, from around the middle of the twelfth century onwards:[51] these appear to be the result of borrowing in the context of Anglo-Norman falconry, and we might look to the same context for the loan-translation of *wealhhafoc*. It is unclear why there should be a loan in this direction, given that Anglo-Norman falcon names seem otherwise to reflect Latin/Romance influence: *girfalco* probably derives from Old Norse *geirfalki*, but may have reached England via the Continent, to judge from Middle English and Anglo-Latin spellings (the latter from as early as the twelfth century) showing the vocalization of /l/ typical of French;[52] and terms such as *falco gentilis* and *tiercel* are of Latin/Romance origin (leaving aside the vexed question of the origin of the word *falco* itself). Nevertheless, it seems likely that the loan was in this direction.

### *What is a* valr*?*

The Old Norse word *valr* has been noted above as a possible relative of Old English *wealhhafoc*. As mentioned previously, Kitson treats the Old Norse word and the first element of the Old English word as deriving from a common Germanic ancestor *\*walhaz* of very considerable antiquity.[53] If we are correct to see *wealhhafoc* as the result of glossarial activity in seventh-century Canterbury, however, Kitson's view cannot be accepted, as the first element of *wealhhafoc* is simply the Old English word *wealh* 'foreigner'. It seems unnecessarily complicated to treat *valr* as an unrelated word, and quite plausible that it is a borrowing from Old English. Phonologically, this is unproblematic, since Old Norse speakers who had lost *-h-* in the sequence *-lh-* would naturally borrow this sequence as *-l-*. Alternatively, it is possible that the borrowing took place before loss of *-h-* in this sequence in Old Norse, as will be discussed below. There is also an obvious context for the transfer to have taken place. As Kitson points out, in Æthelberht II of Kent's letter to Boniface, discussed above, Æthelberht requests falcons that have been trained for hunting cranes.[54] Kitson links this with the fact that cranes were usually hunted with gyrfalcons in later medieval falconry, and with the fact that gyrfalcons are native to Scandinavia.[55] Taking all of this together with explicit identifications of gyrfalcons as 'Norwegian' birds from Domesday Book onwards, Kitson sees Æthelberht's request as pointing to importation of gyrfalcons. While Birkhan suggests that importation of gyrfalcons from Scandinavia did not take place until 'comparatively late', citing Giraldus Cambrensis's *Topographia hibernica* (II, 13) as providing the earliest reference to their importation from Iceland, this is simply a *terminus ante quem*.[56] Kitson's interpretation of Æthelberht's request, while not the only possible interpretation, is highly plausible: it is consistent with later, better-documented

falconry practices, and it is perfectly feasible that an eighth-century king of
Kent might have looked to the Continent as the source of birds traded south
from Scandinavia.

In the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms facing the North Sea, we might expect more
direct trade with Scandinavia, and later, during the Anglo-Scandinavian period,
we should also expect direct importation of falcons from Scandinavia. It is in
the context of direct trade in falcons with Scandinavia that borrowing of *valr*
from Old English might plausibly have taken place. It is worth noting, moreover,
that there are a number of borrowings of animal names into Danish from Old
English which Gammeltoft and Holck identify as 'words for game animals',
whose borrowing perhaps relates to 'the royal pastime of hunting'.[57] The
connections between high-ranking ecclesiastics and royal courts might provide
a plausible avenue for the transmission of a word developed in the Canterbury
school into technical use in relation to high-status hunting activities. The
borrowing into Old Norse would imply either an unattested Old English simplex
\**wealh* 'falcon', or a borrowing process that extracted the first element of the
compound *wealhhafoc*. A more recent example of the latter process is furnished
by the English word *brandy*, borrowed from Dutch *brandewijn*, literally 'burnt
wine', and first attested in the form *brand wine* (around 1640), but with use of
the form *brandy* attested within twenty years of the first attestation (1657).[58] The
Welsh *gwalch* appears to represent a similar borrowing, in similar circumstances:
birds of prey were apparently exported from Wales to England in the late Anglo-
Saxon period, to judge from the tribute of 'uolucres quae aliarum auium predam
per inane uenari nossent' ('birds of prey skilled in pursuing other birds through
empty air') that, according to William of Malmesbury, Æthelstan extracted from
the Welsh.[59] The reference in *The Fortunes of Men* to a 'heafoc on honda' (line 86)
as 'se wælisca' (line 90) may well also point towards importation from Wales.[60]
Since both Welsh and Old Norse have a simplex loanword, it seems likely that
Old English did in fact have a simplex \**wealh* 'falcon'. As noted above, such a
simplex would also help to account for the spelling *uualcones* for Latin *falcones* in
the Vatican manuscript of the provisions of the Concilium Germanicum.

There is, however, one potential obstacle to the interpretation of *valr* as a
borrowing from Old English in the context of trading links in the ninth or tenth
centuries. Birkhan notes the Saami word which, he claims, must derive from a
Proto-Scandinavian form \**walh-* rather than a form without *-h-*.[61] The logic of
this claim is not explored in detail, but presumably Birkhan had in mind the
sort of reasoning Koivulehto applies to Saami *val'le fiel'lu*: Proto-Saami lacked the
Proto-Scandinavian \*/x/, and therefore substituted /ll/ for /lx/ in borrowing
the word.[62] A similar process may lie behind Saami *miel'li* < Proto-Scandinavian
\**melha-* (Old Norse *melr*).[63] One wonders, however, if it is not also possible
that the Proto-Scandinavian sound change involved an intermediate stage in
which the reflex of *-lh-* was *-ll-*, before simplification to *-l-*: this would provide
another way of accounting for the Saami form. In any case, on the basis of the
Saami form (and presumably on the assumption that it requires a Proto-Norse
form with *-h-* for its origin) Birkhan argues that \**walh-* must have reached

Scandinavia by the seventh century AD.[64] Again, the reasoning is not spelt out, but Birkhan must have in mind the fact that there is evidence for the loss of -*h*- in Scandinavia from this period onwards.[65] Clearly, if correct, this would be difficult to reconcile with the origin of *wealhhafoc* in late seventh-century Canterbury – but it seems to the present author that Birkhan's dating is more precise than the evidence allows.

The reflexes of the Proto-Scandinavian sequence */lx/ are not very frequently attested in the earliest records of the Nordic languages. The loss of -*h*- is attested from at latest the seventh century onwards in a number of inscriptions: for instance, in forms such as **wurte** 'made' (on the first Tjürko bracteate) and -**sba** 'prophecy' (on the Björketorp stone).[66] However, both of these inscriptions also contain forms in which the sequence -*lh*- occurs: **walhakurne** 'foreign grain, gold' on the Tjürko bracteate and, with a parasite vowel intruding into the sequence, **falahak** 'I concealed' on the Björketorp stone.[67] The evidence from these early sources, therefore, does not suggest that -*h*- was necessarily lost in the sequence -*lh*- at this early date. Indeed, as far as the present author is aware, we have to wait until considerably later for clear cases of loss of -*h*- in this particular sequence: for instance, the by-name *selshǫfuð* 'seal's head' appears in the form **sīlshofoþ**, clearly showing loss of -*h*-, in a runic inscription on a strap-end of around the eleventh century.[68] A less clear-cut case is the name *Váli* – attested in the form **uala** on a Norwegian runestone of perhaps the end of the eleventh century – which may derive from */walx-/*.[69] There is, then, something of a gap between the seventh-century evidence and the later Viking Age evidence, and it is not clear that -*h*- was lost in the sequence -*lh*- as early as it was in other sequences: what little evidence there is (namely the forms on the Tjürko bracteate and the Björketorp stone) actually suggests that loss of -*h*- may have occurred earlier in other sequences. It seems possible, then, that the sequence -*lh*- continued in existence after the seventh century, and we can only be sure that loss of -*h*- in this sequence took place some time before the late tenth century or thereabouts.

There is, then, no pressing reason to suppose that a Proto-Scandinavian *\*walh*- existed already in the seventh century AD. Treating Old Norse *valr* as a loan from Old English that took place at some point in the eighth to early tenth centuries need not be inconsistent with the development of Saami *fál'li* from this Old Norse word. We can therefore posit a development of Old English *wealhhafoc* from its origin as a term with the sense 'foreigner hawk', describing the habits attributed to the *herodio* by those who identified this bird with the *Diomediae aves*, through a fairly rapid folk etymologization of the word as meaning 'foreign hawk' and thus referring to imported birds of prey. Since both Scandinavia and Wales seem likely to have been exporters of falcons to late Anglo-Saxon England, it is not surprising that the word *wealhhafoc* gave rise to loanwords in Old Norse and Welsh. Before turning to the uses of the word *valr* in Old Norse, however, a brief excursus on Welsh *gwalch* is necessary, to answer doubts that have been raised about its borrowing from Old English.

*Welsh* gwalch

The Welsh word *gwalch* is not reckoned by all commentators to be a borrowing from Old English. Jenkins argues that this is an early Celtic word, and suggests that Old English *wealhhafoc* is a separate formation, in his view probably deriving from Latin *falco peregrinus*.[70] His argument rests in large part on an identification of *gwalch* as referring to hawks in general, or perhaps particularly to goshawks, while the Welsh word *hebog*, he contends, refers to the falcon.[71] Since *wealhhafoc* refers to falcons, Jenkins sees the identification of *gwalch* as referring to hawks as evidence against a connection between the English and the Welsh words. His grounds for identifying *hebog* as referring to falcons and *gwalch* as referring to hawks do not, however, seem to be conclusive. He is forced to admit that Latin *accipiter* 'hawk' often translates *hebog* in Latin versions of Welsh legal texts, an inconvenient fact that he seeks to explain away as the result of the translators' ignorance of the technical vocabulary of falconry.[72] He notes also evidence of the *hebog* being employed against herons, arguing that this shows that this bird was 'a more powerful hunter than any hawk', as even goshawks have been thought by some falconers medieval and modern to be unsuited to attacking herons.[73] Yet there is also some evidence for use of goshawks against herons during the Middle Ages, so this use of the bird referred to as a *hebog* is not decisive as to its identity.[74] Finally, Jenkins also appears to suggest that the higher valuation of the *hebog* than the *gwalch* in legal materials indicates that the former is a falcon, while the latter is a hawk.[75] This argument assumes, however, that falcons were invariably valued higher than hawks: an assumption that is certainly untrue in relation to the recorded purchases of birds for Henry II of England, which suggest that some goshawks were valued even higher than some gyrfalcons, and well in excess of the prices paid for other falcons.[76] We should not, of course, assume that the same scales of value would have applied in Welsh contexts, but the fact that this well-evidenced English scale of value does not tally with the one that Jenkins assumes tends to suggest that all assumptions as to the relative valuation of birds in medieval contexts are decidedly unwise. There is, on balance, some evidence Jenkins presents (the use of *accipiter* to translate *hebog*) that might incline us slightly towards identifying *hebog* as meaning 'hawk', and nothing that compels us to suppose that *gwalch* could not refer to falcons.

In addition to the evidence around the word *gwalch*, Jenkins points to personal names in which *gwalch* occurs as a name element, including possibly the name *Catuvolcus*, recorded by Caesar.[77] Jenkins allows that the latter name could, however, be explained as a form of a Germanic personal name.[78] Leaving aside *Catuvolcus*, then, the names that we can safely identify as containing Welsh *gwalch* are not early enough to preclude *gwalch* having been borrowed from Old English and then used as a name element. Perhaps the earliest certain example is the name *Riuualch*, from the *Durham liber vitae*, which would suggest borrowing by around the mid ninth century at the latest.[79] Were Jenkins right in identifying the name of the father of St Guthlac, *Penwalh*, as a name containing Welsh *gwalch*, then borrowing of *gwalch* from Old English *wealhhafoc* would be chronologically impossible. The identification is by no means certain, however: some manuscripts

of Felix's *Vita sancti Guthlaci* record this name in a form that appears to contain the deuterotheme -*wald*, which is plainly incompatible with an identification of it as containing the element *gwalch*.[80] Moreover, since Jenkins's evidence for the identification of the name as Celtic is its use of the prototheme *Pen-*, his argument for Celticity relies on an assumption that hybrid Celtic-Germanic personal names could not have existed. Yet it is by no means inconceivable that the Old English name element *wealh* might have been combined with a Celtic element in a hybrid name-form: there are, for instance, examples of combination of Latin names with Germanic name-elements to form hybrid names such as *David-pertus* in Lombard Italy.[81] A similar process of creation of hybrid name-forms in early Anglo-Saxon England seems entirely possible. There does not, then, seem to be a clear case for the existence of Welsh *gwalch* before perhaps the ninth century at the earliest. This does not, of course, entirely rule out the possibility that, as Jenkins argues, *gwalch* is an inherited Celtic word in Welsh, whose only connection with Old English *wealhhafoc* lies in the ultimate derivation of the Old English word *wealh* from the tribal name of the Volcae. The evidence for such a line of development seems slight, however: in view of the objections to Jenkins's arguments raised above, it seems that borrowing from Old English is at least plausible, and perhaps even the better interpretation of the available evidence.

*Flying with Freyja*

While borrowing in the context of the trade in falcons from Scandinavia clearly provides a plausible context for the development of the Old Norse word *valr*, we might consider the possibility that the application of *wealhhafoc* to a water-fowl also influenced Old Norse usage. In *Grágás* as represented in Konungsbók (Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum, Gl. kgl. Sml. 1157 fol.), there is a list of birds that are prohibited for human consumption:

> Fogla eigv meN at æta. þa er a vatni fliota. Klö fogla scolo meN eigi nýta. þa er hræ klo er á. Örnv oc hrafna eþa vali. eþa smyrla.[82]

> (Men may eat birds that swim. People are not to eat taloned birds, those with carrion claws, eagles, ravens, falcons, and hawks.[83])

In this context, alongside other birds of prey, it is clear that *valr* refers to a bird of prey, and there is no reason why the gnomic reference elsewhere in this manuscript to the flight of a *valr* as part of the natural order of the world should contradict this identification.[84] While the same uses of *valr* occur in the same places in the text in the Staðarhólsbók version of *Grágás* (Reykjavík, Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum, AM 334 fol.),[85] there is an additional passage in this manuscript, towards the end of the text, detailing what birds one may and may not hunt on another's land:

> Rétt er manne at veiða i aNars manz lande. Örno oc Rafna. smyrla oc lör. oc spóa oc alla smá fugla þa er eigi fliota a vatni nema riupor. Vale scal eigi veiða oc álptir oc gǽs oc andir.[86]

(On someone else's land a man may lawfully catch eagles and ravens, merlins and plovers and curlews and all small birds that do not float on water other than ptarmigan. Falcons are not to be caught, nor swans, geese and ducks.[87])

The occurrence of *valr* in a list that otherwise comprises of water-fowl is striking. It may simply be that falcons, like edible water-fowl such as ducks and geese, are of high economic value, and thus landowners would wish to have them protected from hunting by others. On the other hand, since *wealhhafoc* starts life as a term for a water-fowl, we should at least consider the possibility that *valr* could have both senses: falcon and water-fowl. While this list of birds does not prove this possibility, it does raise it.

If we hypothesize that *valr* could refer to a water-fowl in Old Norse as well as meaning 'falcon', this has some interesting ramifications. Probably the earliest extant use of the word *valr* occurs in a *lausavísa* attributed to Torf-Einarr Rǫgnvaldsson in *Orkneyinga saga*:

> Ey munk glaðr, síz geirar
> (gótt 's vinna þrek manni)
> bǫðfíkinna bragna
> bitu þengils sun ungan;
> þeygi dylk, nema þykki,
> (þar fló ár at sǫrum
> hræva nagr) of holma
> holunda val sem gœlak.[88]

> (Ever happy live I
> For the keen warriors' blades
> Have bitten the King's son.
> 'Tis good for a man
> To do manly deeds.
> In the isles, o'er the hollow wounds
> I make the raven sing.
> To them but now, meseems,
> The carrion kite flieth.[89])

The phrases 'hræva nagr' and 'holunda val' here appear to refer to the same bird. In the first case, 'hræva nagr', we plainly have a kenning for one of the birds associated with plundering corpses after battles: 'magpie of corpses' referring to a carrion bird (hence Taylor's 'carrion kite'). This is consistent with Snorri's stipulation in *Skáldskaparmál* that eagles and ravens can be referred to using the names of other birds in conjunction with terms for blood or corpses.[90] If we treat *valr* as meaning 'falcon', 'holunda val' refers to a 'falcon of mortal wounds', which could conceivably be a similar kenning for a bird that takes carrion from the battlefield (here Taylor's translation is odd in treating *holunda* separately as 'hollow wounds', yet translating *val* as 'raven'). In kennings for the birds of battle involving terms meaning 'wound', however, the bird-name that forms the base-word is more often than not a water-fowl of some sort: consider, for instance, kennings such as 'gǫgl … sára' ('gosling of wounds'), 'sárlóms' ('of the wound-loon'), 'unda már' and 'már … sára' ('seagull of wounds'), and 'svan

… bens' ('swan of the wound').[91] It is, of course, not always the case that the base-word refers to a water-fowl: note, for instance, *benþiðurr* 'wound grouse' in a *lausavísa* of Þórmóðr Kolbrúnarskáld and *sárgamms* 'of the wound vulture' in Þórðr Kolbeinsson's *Eiríksdrápa*.[92] The use of a base-word referring to a water-fowl is, however, a common pattern, and one that is perhaps related to the use of terms relating to the sea and waterways as base-words in kennings for 'blood' whose determinants are terms meaning 'wound'.[93] Both the birds of battle kennings and the blood kennings can plausibly be envisaged as functioning within an imaginative construction of the wounded human body as a waterscape, with the birds of battle standing in for the water-fowl that haunt watery areas. If 'holunda val' meant not 'falcon of mortal wounds' but 'heron/crane of mortal wounds', drawing on the more usual sense of classical and patristic Latin *herodio* or Greek ἐρωδιός, this would constitute a kenning that follows the same pattern of use of water-fowl terms in kennings for 'wound'. Nothing compels us to adopt this interpretation, but it represents a possibility that ought to be borne in mind in interpreting some skaldic kennings involving the term *valr*.

The possibilities opened up by treating *valr* as potentially referring to a water-fowl (perhaps the heron), as well as to the falcon, are most apparent in the treatment of the flying forms of mythological figures. Old English literature has only the general-purpose *feðerhama* 'feather covering', apparently implying a device that one puts on in order to fly.[94] Old Norse, on the other hand, has a rather richer range of flying gear or flying forms for mythological figures, with the accompanying vocabulary. Gods, goddesses, giants, and valkyries transform into, or wear the *hamr* ('skin' or 'form') of, eagles and swans. There is a fair number of cases where this is explicitly presented as involving a *hamr*: for instance, in the prose introduction to *Vǫlundarkviða* we have valkyries with *álptarhamir* 'swan skins/forms', while the giant Hræsvelgr in *Vafþrúðnismál* stanza 37 is described as being 'í arnar ham' 'in eagle's shape', a description that seems to chime with the *arnarhamr* of Óðinn in *Skáldskaparmál*, in which he escapes from Suttungr (who flies after him in the same form), and the *arnarhamr* of Þjazi, who pursues Loki in the same text.[95] McKinnell notes that the idea of 'a flying suit which can be tied on to someone without transformation into bird-form' is particularly associated with literary influences on Scandinavia from the British Isles and the Continent, and that the Old Norse *fjaðrhamr*, which parallels Old English *feðerhama*, usually appears with this sense.[96]

In relation to the word *valr*, however, it is interesting to note that there are two cases in Old Norse literature of the use of a *valshamr*, both in *Skáldskaparmál*. In the narrative of Loki's rescue of Iðunn from Þjazi, Freyja lends Loki her *valshamr* in order to fly to *Jǫtunheimar*.[97] In the similar situation in *Þrymskviða*, Freyja lends Loki a *fjaðrhamr* (stanzas 3-5), leaving open the question of which bird the *hamr* relates to.[98] Freyja is apparently not the only goddess to possess a *valshamr*, moreover, and Loki apparently makes a habit of borrowing goddesses' plumage, as Snorri claims later in *Skáldskaparmál* that he was captured by the giant Geirrøðr while using Frigg's *valshamr*.[99] The term *valshamr* is usually glossed as 'falcon cloak' or similar, but if we allow for the possibility that it might in

fact be a water-fowl cloak, this may add extra point to Freyja's loan. The giants and gods noted above transform into eagles, and we might, therefore, expect this to be the natural transformation for Loki. In contrast, in *Vǫlundarkviða*, as noted above, valkyries transform into swans.[100] The evidence is clearly sparse, and we should be wary of reading too much into it – such as it is, however, it appears to show a gender divide in terms of the birds into which mythological figures transform. Male figures typically transform into eagles, while female figures tend to transform into water-fowl. Perhaps, then, the *valshamr* is in fact a cloak deriving from a water-fowl of some sort. This would clearly fit with Loki's tendency to take on female form in Old Norse mythological texts, as evidenced in the accusations in *Lokasenna* stanzas 23 and 33 and *Hyndluljóð* stanza 41 that he has given birth as a woman, and in his intervention in the form of a giantess in Snorri's account of Baldr's death.[101]

The foregoing discussion of uses of the term *valr*, which suggest that it could refer to some sort of water-fowl as well as to the falcon, is necessarily tentative. Interpreting *valr* in this way seems to provide some satisfying readings of individual uses of the word in a range of texts, but there is no conclusive evidence for this dual sense. It is clear that *valr* did mean 'falcon', and the derivation from Old English *wealhhafoc* is, in my view, the most satisfactory reading of the available evidence. That *wealhhafoc* was borrowed with the sense 'water-fowl' as well as 'falcon', however, may not be susceptible of proof, and must remain simply a possibility that should be borne in mind in interpreting the Old Norse word *valr*.

*Conclusions*

The story of the development of the Old English word *wealhhafoc* is evidently a complex one. If we are right to identify the school of Theodore and Hadrian as the originary milieu of this word, then we must discard previous attempts to establish its etymology as founded on misconceptions as to its original meaning. Instead we must suppose that in the first instance it had the meaning 'foreigner hawk', appropriately describing a bird that attacks foreigners. The use of the word *hafoc* in forming this compound, however, meant that it was inherently likely that it would be reinterpreted as referring to a bird of prey, and this reinterpretation appears to have taken place within a relatively short time – at least by the time the Corpus Glossary was written, and perhaps in the course of the eighth century. At this stage, what evidence there is suggests the importation of gyrfalcons into Kent, probably ultimately from Scandinavia, and it may well be that *wealhhafoc* was interpreted in this context as having the sense 'foreign hawk', referring to imported gyrfalcons. As we move later in the Anglo-Saxon period, we begin to find some evidence for the import of birds of prey from Wales into Anglo-Saxon England. This trade may well have focused on peregrine falcons, which may have been commoner in some of the mountainous parts of Wales than in some of the comparatively flat regions of England. There is some direct evidence for a further reinterpretation of *wealhhafoc* as meaning

'Welsh hawk' – an interpretation of the word that would treat it as specifically applicable to birds imported from Wales, probably peregrines.

The Old Norse *valr* and Welsh *gwalch* can be plausibly explained as loanwords borrowed in these two contexts of movement of falcons from Scandinavia and Wales into Anglo-Saxon England. In the case of *valr*, however, it seems possible – though by no means certain – that the use of *wealhhafoc* to refer to an ill-defined water-fowl may also have influenced Old Norse usage. This possibility offers an attractive reading of perhaps the earliest attested use of the Old Norse word, in one of the *lausavísur* attributed to Torf-Einarr Rǫgnvaldsson in *Orkneyinga saga*. The phrase 'holunda val' in this verse can perhaps be read as a kenning referring to a carrion bird, using a word for a water-fowl as the base-word, rather than as an explicit reference to a bird of prey, or as a kenning using a word for a bird of prey as the base-word. The *valshamr* of the goddesses Frigg and Freyja in the *Prose Edda* might also be usefully reinterpreted in this light. We can hypothesize that female mythological figures usually transform into water-fowl in Old Norse mythology, in contrast to the transformations of male figures into eagles. Freyja's *valshamr* may, therefore, be her means of transformation into a water-fowl, and her loan of it to Loki could represent yet another example of Loki's cross-gender shapeshifting.

While the interpretation of the Old Norse word *valr* as having two senses, 'falcon' and 'water-fowl', is necessarily speculative, it is clear that the glossarial use of *wealhhafoc* for Latin *herodio* remained current, causing *herodio* itself to be reinterpreted as meaning 'falcon'. The glossarial activities of the school of Theodore and Hadrian can thus be seen as casting a long shadow over the development of the Latin word as well as the vernacular translation of it devised in this milieu. There are implications here for the ways in which we read Latin–Old English glossaries, which clearly require careful attention not only to the texts from which *glossae collectae* are gathered, but also to the kinds of wider reading or general knowledge that glossators brought to their tasks. At the same time, we should note the ways in which this account of the development of *wealhhafoc* impacts upon our understanding of linguistic interchange between Germanic and non-Germanic languages. If Welsh *gwalch* is to be identified as a loan from Old English, then we can be reasonably certain that this loan cannot pre-date the eighth century. More significantly, the Proto-Scandinavian loans that have been identified in Saami might, in view of the development of Old Norse *valr*, be datable to the eighth century or later. The impact of such a dating on views as to the historical development of Saami is, however, a question that must be left for Saami specialists to explore. This article demonstrates the complexity and the difficulty of establishing the historical development of some lexical items, and the importance of paying careful attention to the range of witnesses to a word across different languages. By doing so, we can solve the twin problems of the Old English word *wealhhafoc*, but we also raise new questions about loanwords in the wider Germanic-speaking area and its neighbours.

University of Leicester                                                        PHILIP A. SHAW

## NOTES

[1]  D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, new edn (London, 1936), pp. 102f. identifies Greek ἐρωδιὸς as usually meaning 'heron', with occasional instances of the meaning 'stork'; *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10 (Cambridge, 1994), p. 539 offers both possibilities for the Latin word.

[2]  See, for instance, *Old English Glosses in the Épinal–Erfurt Glossary*, ed. J. D. Pheifer (Oxford, 1974), p. 92; *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and Lapidge, p. 539.

[3]  *Old English Glosses*, ed. Pheifer, p. 27 (no. 497); see also facsimiles of Épinal fol. 99ʳ and Erfurt fol. 7ʳ in *The Épinal, Erfurt, Werden, and Corpus Glossaries*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff et al., Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 22 (Copenhagen, 1988).

[4]  *The Corpus Glossary*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Cambridge, 1921), pp. 89 (no. H 83) and 73 (no. F 10); see also facsimile of Corpus fols 32ᵛ and 28ʳ in *The Épinal*, ed. Bischoff et al.

[5]  D. R. Howlett et al., *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (Oxford, 1975–), *s.v.* 'erodius, ~ion' (hereafter abbreviated as *DMLBS*).

[6]  *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robertus Weber et al., 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1969), I, 763.

[7]  *Old English Glosses*, ed. Pheifer, p. 92.

[8]  *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and Lapidge, p. 536.

[9]  Hugo Suolahti, *Die deutschen Vogelnamen: Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Straßburg, 1909), p. 331 (n. 1).

[10]  See for instance Joseph Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford, 1898), *s.v.* 'wealhhafoc'; Jan De Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1962), *s.v.* 'valr' 2 (hereafter abbreviated as *ANEW*).

[11]  Suolahti, *Die deutschen Vogelnamen*, p. 331. This interpretation is accepted by, for instance, Frank Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen*, Palaestra 85 (Berlin, 1909), p. 13, F. Holthausen, *Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1934) *s.v.* 'wealh' 1. m., Assar Janzén, 'De fornvästnordiska personnamnen', in *Personnavne*, ed. Assar Janzén, Nordisk kultur 7 (Stockholm, 1947), pp. 22–186 (p. 92), and Vladimir Orel, *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology* (Leiden, 2003), *s.v.* '*walxaz' I.

[12]  *ANEW*, *s.v.* 'valr' 2.

[13]  *ANEW*, *s.v.* 'valr' 2. De Vries refers in this entry to a brief discussion of Indo-European *u̯el- in Julius Pokorny, 'Keltische Etymologien', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, 46 (1914), 150-5 (p. 151). Pokorny discusses this root as a source for Old Norse *valr* 'the slain' and Old English *wæl* 'slaughter'. Orel, *Germanic Etymology*, *s.v.* '*walxaz' I also refers to Pokorny's discussion.

[14]  Ludwig Rübekeil, *Suebica: Völkernamen und Ethnos*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 68 (Innsbruck, 1992), p. 64.

[15]  Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon, *Íslensk Orðsifjabók* (Reykjavík, 1989), *s.v.* 1 'valur'.

[16]  P. R. Kitson, 'Old English bird-names (II)', *English Studies*, 79 (1998), 2–22 (pp. 12f.).

[17]  Ibid., p. 13.

[18]  *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and Lapidge, pp. 286–94.

[19]  St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 913, p. 143; *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and

Lapidge, pp. 288 and 535. Bischoff and Lapidge also note (p. 543) that a fragmentary form of the same entry is also preserved in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Grimm 132,2.

[20] Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879), *s.v.* 'lărus'.

[21] *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and Lapidge, p. 541.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid., pp. 364f.; see p. 483 and p. 541 on the Canterbury origin of this gloss.

[24] *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911–13), I, XII, vii, 28f. [unpaginated: cited by book, chapter, and section].

[25] My translation.

[26] Flora Edmonds, Christian Kay, Jane Roberts, and Irené Wotherspoon, *Thesaurus of Old English Online* (Glasgow, 2005) <http://libra.englang.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus/> (accessed September 2011).

[27] *Sancti Aurelii Augustini episcopi de civitate dei libri XXII*, ed. Bernardus Dombart and Alfonsus Kalb, 5th edn, 2 vols (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1993), II, 276; my translation.

[28] *Pline L'Ancien: Histoire naturelle livre X*, ed. and trans. E. de Saint Denis (Paris, 1961), p. 72.

[29] Thompson, *Greek Birds*, pp. 88f.; W. Geoffrey Arnott, *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z* (London, 2007), p. 48; *Aelian: On the Characteristics of Animals*, trans. A. F. Scholfield, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols (London, 1958–9), I, 14; *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, ed. Georgius Thilo and Hermannus Hagen, 3 vols (Hildesheim, 1961), II, 512f.

[30] *Pline L'Ancien*, ed. Saint Denis, p. 72.

[31] *Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bischoff and Lapidge, pp. 536 and 177–9.

[32] *Corpus Glossary*, ed. Lindsay, p. 73 (no. F 10).

[33] *The Épinal*, ed. Bischoff et al., surveys previously proposed datings (pp. 24f.), and argues for a dating to the 'second quarter of the ninth century' (p. 25).

[34] See *Biblia sacra*, ed. Weber et al., I, 763, 255, 900, and 148.

[35] *DMLBS*, *s.v.* 'erodius, ~ion'; *MED*: *s.v.* 'gerfaucoun' n.; this may also account for the Old High German interpretations of *herodio* as referring to some sort of falcon noted in Thompson, *Greek Birds*, p. 102.

[36] Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palatinus Latinus 577, fol. 4ᵛ; the editions of this text in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica all confuse matters by printing *walcones* instead: see *Leges*, ed. Georgius Heinricus Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Leges [in Folio] 1 (Hanover, 1835), p. 17; *Capitularia regum Francorum*, ed. Alfredus Boretius, 2 vols, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Leges 2 (Hanover, 1883), I, 25; *Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. Albertus Werminghoff, 2 vols, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Leges 3, Concilia 2 (Hanover, 1906), I, 3.

[37] *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. Michael Tangl, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae Selectae 1 (Berlin, 1916), p. 231; my translation.

[38] Kitson, 'Bird-names (II)', p. 12.

[39] *OED*: *s.v.* 'peregrine' *adj.* and *n.*; *Li Livres dou tresor par Brunetto Latini*, ed. P. Chabaille (Paris, 1863), pp. 202f.; but see also the cogent critique of this explanation in Kitson, 'Bird-names (II)', pp. 13f.

[40] Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, *s.v.* 'peregrinus'; *DMLBS*, *s.v.* 'peregrinus'.

[41] *Canterbury Tales*: Squire's Tale, V.428f., in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd edn (Boston, Mass., 1987), p. 174.

[42] For discussions of the loan-translations of the days of the week, see D. H. Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 243–53 and Philip Shaw, 'The origins of the theophoric week in the Germanic languages', *Early Medieval Europe*, 15 (2007), 386–401.

[43] *A Volume of Vocabularies Illustrating the Condition and Manners of our Forefathers, as well as the History of the Forms of Elementary Education and of the Languages Spoken in this Island from the Tenth Century to the Fifteenth*, ed. Thomas Wright ([n.p.], 1857), p. 100.

[44] *Dancus rex, Guillelmus falconarius, Gerardus falconarius: Les plus anciens traités de fauconnerie de l'Occident publiés d'après tous les manuscrits connus*, ed. Gunnar Tilander, Cynegetica 9 (Lund, 1963), p. 172; my translation. On the dating and provenance of the text, see *Dancus rex*, ed. Tilander, pp. 6 and 10f.

[45] On the dating and interrelationships of the manuscripts, see *Dancus rex*, ed. Tilander, pp. 118 and 130.

[46] Adolf Tobler and Erhard Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 11 vols (Wiesbaden, 1915–2002), *s.v.* 'pelerin'.

[47] *MED*: *s.v.* 'peregrin(e' adj.

[48] *MED*: *s.v.* 'hogges-hēd' n., 'wŏlfes-hēd' n.; R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London, 1980), *s.v.* 'caput', 'lupus' 1.

[49] Kitson, 'Bird-names (II)', pp. 13f. Kitson was unable to find the earliest attestation in Neckam's *De natura rerum*: as noted above, it is in fact in Neckam's *De nominibus utensilium*.

[50] The single instance of *wolc* in a Middle English lyric is generally taken to be derived from Welsh *gwalch*, and therefore does not provide evidence for continuing use of either *wealhhafoc* or a shortened form based on its first element: see *MED*: *s.v.* 'wolc' n., and Dafydd Jenkins, '*gwalch*: Welsh', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, 19 (1990), 55–67 (p. 61).

[51] *DMLBS*, *s.v.* 'girfalco, ~us'.

[52] *DMLBS*, *s.v.* 'girfalco, ~us'; *MED*: *s.v.* 'gerfaucoun' n.

[53] Kitson, 'Bird-names (II)', pp. 12f.

[54] Ibid., p. 11.

[55] See also Robin S. Oggins, *Kings and their Hawks: Falconry in Medieval England* (New Haven, Conn., 2004), p. 13.

[56] Helmut J. R. Birkhan, 'Falcons and Catuvolcus', *Studia Celtica*, 3 (1968), 106–26 (pp. 121f.); *Giraldi Cambrensis Topographia hibernica et Expugnatio hibernica*, ed. James F. Dimock, Rolls Series 21, vol. 5 (London, 1867), p. 96.

[57] Peder Gammeltoft and Jakob Povl Holck, '*Gemstēn* and other old English pearls: a survey of Early Old English loanwords in Scandinavian', *NOWELE*, 50/51 (2007), 131–61 (pp. 146, 155). See also the discussion of contexts for loaning between Old Norse and Old English in Dietrich Hofmann, *Nordisch-Englische Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit*, Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana, 14 (Copenhagen, 1955), pp. 257–61. Older, but still useful, discussions of loanwords in Old Norse are Fischer, *Die Lehnwörter* and Otto Höfler, 'Altnordische Lehnwörtstudien', *Arkiv för Filologi*, 47 (1931), 248–97 and Otto Höfler, 'Altnordische Lehnwörtstudien', *Arkiv för Filologi*, 48 (1932), 1–30 and 213–41.

[58] *OED*: *s.v.* 'brandy' n.

[59] *William of Malmesbury: Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998–9), I, 216 (book II, c. 134).

[60] *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*, ed. Bernard J. Muir, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Exeter, 2000), I, 247. Kitson, 'Bird-names (II)', p. 12 glosses 'se wælisca' as 'the Welsh one', arguing from this that 'historical Old English speakers understood [*wealhhafoc*] as "foreign falcon"'.

[61] Birkhan, 'Falcons', pp. 123f. Birkhan's form *val'le* is in fact a rare dialect form in an older orthography: the normal North Saami form would now be *fál'li*.

[62] Jorma Koivulehto, 'Contact with non-Germanic languages II: relations to the east', in *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*,

ed. Oskar Bandle et al., 2 vols, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 22 (Berlin, 2002–5), I, 583–94 (I, 589).

[63] Ante Aikio, 'On Germanic–Saami contacts and Saami prehistory', *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 91 (2006), 9–55 (p. 14).

[64] Birkhan, 'Falcons', pp. 123f.

[65] If not somewhat earlier; see Joseph B. Voyles, *Early Germanic Grammar: Pre-, Proto-, and Post-Germanic Languages* (San Diego, Calif., 1992), p. 106.

[66] Adolf Noreen, *Altnordische Grammatik I: Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*, 5th edn (Tübingen, 1970), §230; Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen, *Gammeldansk grammatik i sproghistorisk fremstilling II: Konsonantisme*, 2nd edn (Copenhagen, 1957), §273.1.

[67] Noreen, *Altnordische Grammatik*, §230; Brøndum-Nielsen, *Gammeldansk grammatik*, §273.1.

[68] Michael P. Barnes, Jan Ragnar Hagland, and R. I. Page, *The Runic Inscriptions of Viking Age Dublin*, Medieval Dublin Excavations 1962–81, series B, 5 (Dublin, 1997), pp. 50-3. See also Lena Peterson, *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon*, 5th edn (Uppsala, 2007), *s.v.* 'Selshǫfuð'.

[69] *Norges innskrifter med de yngre runer*, ed. Magnus Olsen et al., Norges indskrifter indtil reformationen 2 (Oslo, 1941–), I, 75f.; Peterson, *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon, s.v.* 'Váli'. Peterson also points out (*s.v.* 'Alvēr/Ǫlvēr') that the name *Alvér*, which appears in a number of Viking Age runic inscriptions in forms without -*h*-, could derive its first element from a cognate of Gothic *alhs* 'temple' and Old English *ealh* 'sanctuary', though it is far from certain that it does.

[70] Jenkins, '*Gwalch*', pp. 57–67.

[71] Ibid., pp. 57–63.

[72] Ibid., p. 59.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Oggins, *Kings and their Hawks*, p. 16.

[75] Jenkins, '*Gwalch*', p. 58.

[76] Oggins, *Kings and their Hawks*, p. 56.

[77] Jenkins, '*Gwalch*', pp. 62f.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Ibid., p. 63.

[80] *Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1956), p. 176.

[81] Maria Giovanna Arcamone, 'Die langobardischen Personennamen in Italien: Nomen und Gens aus der Sicht der linguistischen Analyse', in *Nomen et Gens: Zur historischen Aussagekraft frühmittelalterlicher Personennamen*, ed. Dieter Geuenich, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Jörg Jarnut, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 16 (Berlin, 1997), pp. 157–75 (p. 174).

[82] *Grágás: Islændernes lovbog i fristatens tid, udgivet efter det kongelige Bibliotheks Haandskrift*, ed. Vilhjálmur Finsen, 2 vols (Copenhagen, 1852) (reprinted as *Grágás: Konungsbók*, 1 vol. (Odense, 1974)), I, 34.

[83] *Laws of Early Iceland: Grágás: The Codex Regius of Grágás with Material from Other Manuscripts*, ed. and trans. Andrew Dennis, Peter Foote, and Richard Perkins, 2 vols (Winnipeg, 1980-2000), I, 48.

[84] *Grágás: Islændernes lovbog*, ed. Finsen, I, 206; *Laws of Early Iceland*, ed. and trans. Dennis, Foote, and Perkins, I, 185.

[85] See *Grágás: efter det Arnamagnæanske Haandskrift Nr. 334 fol., Staðarhólsbók*, ed. Vilhjálmur Finsen (Copenhagen, 1879) (reprinted as *Grágás: Staðarhólsbók* (Odense, 1974)), pp. 43 and 407.

[86] *Grágás: Arnamagnæanske Haandskrift*, ed. Finsen, p. 507.

[87] *Laws of Early Iceland*, ed. and trans. Dennis, Foote, and Perkins, II, 320f.

[88] *Den Norsk-Islandske Skjaldedigtning*, ed. and trans. Finnur Jónsson, 2 parts in 4 vols (Copenhagen, 1912–15), B, I, 28 (cited by part, vol., and p. no.).

[89] *The Orkneyinga Saga: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes*, trans. Alexander Burt Taylor (Edinburgh, 1938), p. 143.

[90] *Snorri Sturluson: Edda: Skáldskaparmál*, ed. Anthony Faulkes, 2 vols (London, 1998), I, 90.

[91] *Skjaldedigtning*, ed. Jónsson, B, I, 396, 569, 191, 193, and 224.

[92] Ibid., B, I, 265 and 204.

[93] For instance, *sárflóðs* ('of the wound-tide'), 'bens bára' ('the wave of the wound') and 'bens … fen' ('the fen of the wound') (*Skjaldedigtning*, ed. Jónsson, B, I, 426, 538, and 502).

[94] *Dictionary of Old English: A to G Online*, ed. Angus Cameron et al. (Toronto, 2007), *s.v.* 'feþer-hama'; see also *s.v.* 'fiþer-hama', a variant that may result from a folk-etymological reshaping of *feðerhama*.

[95] *Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern*, ed. Gustav Neckel and Hans Kuhn, 3rd edn (Heidelberg, 1962–8), I, 116 and 51; translation from *The Poetic Edda*, trans. Carolyne Larrington (Oxford, 1996), p. 46; *Skáldskaparmál*, ed. Faulkes, I, 4f. and 2.

[96] John McKinnell, 'Myth as therapy: the usefulness of *Þrymskviða*', *MÆ*, 69 (2000), 1–20 (p. 2). See also John McKinnell, 'Eddic poetry in Anglo-Scandinavian northern England', in *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21–30 August 1997*, ed. James Graham-Campbell, Richard Hall, Judith Jesch, and David N. Parsons (Oxford, 2001), pp. 327–44 (p. 334).

[97] *Skáldskaparmál*, ed. Faulkes, I, 2.

[98] *Edda*, ed. Neckel and Kuhn, I, 111.

[99] *Skáldskaparmál*, ed. Faulkes, I, 24.

[100] For another example of a female transforming into a swan, see *Hrómundar saga Gripssonar*, c. vi, in *Fornaldarsögur Norðurlanda*, ed. Guðni Jónsson and Bjarni Vilhjálmsson, 3 vols (Reykjavík, 1943–4), II, 280.

[101] *Edda*, ed. Neckel and Kuhn, I, 101, 103, and 294; *Snorri Sturluson: Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning*, ed. Anthony Faulkes (London, 1988), p. 48.