1. Introduction

The lexical field of BREAD in the language of the Ormulum is made up of four lexemes, namely BRÆD, LAF, KECHELL, and *CRUMME (only attested in the plural form crummess). Orm’s language, just like Modern English, had different words for bread as a substance (BRÆD) and as a unit of production (LAF). Old English, by contrast, had only the single word HLĂF corresponding, just like Latin PANIS, to both of these.

From an etymological point of view, Orm’s LAF is a continuation of OE HLĂF, with a narrowing of sense as indicated above. Orm’s BRÆD derives formally from OE BRĒAD «piece», ¹ «fragment» which underwent a change of sense in late OE via «fragment of bread» to «bread», possibly under the influence of ON BRAUÐ. Orm’s KECHELL derives from OE COECIL «little cake», only attested in glossaries, where it renders Latin TORTUM. Orm’s *CRUMME, finally, is a continuation of OE CRUMA «crumb», corresponding to Latin MICA.

The relationships among these four lexemes can be provisionally represented as in Figure 1: LAF and KECHELL stand in a unit-of relationship to BRÆD, and *CRUMME stands in a meronymic relationship to the other three.

![Figure 1. Basic semantic relations within the lexical field of BREAD in the Ormulum.](image)

In this paper these lexemes will be considered partly as they are used by Orm in renderings of Latin forms in his source texts, partly against the background of the narrative and descriptive context in which they occur, in order to achieve a fuller understanding of their senses. The four lexemes will be discussed in four separate sections (BRÆD in section 2, LAF in section 5, KECHELL in section 6, and CRUMMESS in section 8). Three phrases with BRÆD and LAF as head will also be discussed: ÞERRFLINNG BRÆD «unleavened bread» in section 3 (which deals, more generally, with Orm’s selective interpretations of the use of bread as part of Old Testament sacrifices), SUR BRÆD «leavened bread» in section 4, and SCORRCNE D LAF «rusks» in section 7. When appropriate, the presentation of these forms in major dictionaries will be considered. Finally, the evidence gathered from the scrutiny of Orm’s use of «bread» words will form the basis for a more complex representation of the semantic relations within the lexical field of BREAD in the Ormulum than the provisional one in Figure 1 above.

¹ The symbols « » surrounding modern English words and passages are used in this paper to enclose representations of senses as well as translations of shorter or longer passages. For their use in quotations from the Ormulum, see footnote 3.

² The term unit-of relationship is used in this paper to refer to the relationship between a mass noun denoting a substance (such as bread) and a count noun which denotes a unit of that substance.

2. Bræd

Apart from the accounts of bread as used in Old Testament sacrifices (see section 4, below) Orm uses BRÆD to refer to the actual article of food in two contexts only. In Homily xiv, Orm describes how Elijah asked the widow of Zarephath for a morsel of bread (1 Kings 17:11, Vu ‘adfer mihi obsecro et buccellam panis in manu tua’, AV ‘Bring me, I pray thee, a morsel of bread in thine hand’): ‘& he badd tatt þo sholde himm ec; / An bite brædess brinnem.’ (H8639f.), where An bite breadess renders buccellam panis of the Vulgate. In Homily xx, the Devil’s suggestion that Christ should turn stones into bread (Mt 4:3, Vu ‘dic ut lapides isti panes fiant’, AV ‘command that these stones be made bread’) is rendered as ‘Macc bræd off pise staness’ (H11340).

But BRÆD is also used in the Ormulum to render Latin PANIS in many figurative contexts. The bread of life (cf. Jn 6:35, Vu ‘Ego sum panis vitae’, AV ‘I am the bread of life’) is rendered as lifess bræd (H3534), used about the Eucharist. The doctrine of the Transubstantiation is presented in terms of priests turning bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ:

\[ \text{The fourth prayer that is said in the} \]
\[ \text{Pater Noster} \text{ is that the Lord now today} \]
\[ \text{should give us by His grace our daily} \]
\[ \text{bread.} \]

The name Bethlehem is interpreted in the medieval exegetical literature as domus panis, «the house of bread», which is then related to the birth of Christ there, e.g., ‘Bethlehem vero domus panis interpretatur, quia panis angelorum ibi natus est, ...’ ⁶. Orm uses the word bread to render panis, but in a relative clause rather than a genitive construction: ‘Forr beþþleæm bitacneþþ uss; / Þatt hus þatt bræd iss inne.’ «For Bethlehem signifies the house in which there is bread.» (H7022f.)

In his exposition of the Lord’s Prayer in Homily ix Orm uses bread in his rendering of «our daily bread» (Vu Lk 11:3 ‘panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis cotidie’, AV Mt 6:11 ‘Give us this day our daily bread’), interpreting «our daily bread» as God’s help:

\[ \text{«The fourth prayer that is said in the} \]
\[ \text{Pater Noster} \text{ is that the Lord now today} \]
\[ \text{should give us by His grace our daily} \]
\[ \text{bread.} \]

The textual passages from the Ormulum quoted in this article have been newly edited by the author from MS Junius 1. In this context I would like to thank Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield, Senior Assistant Librarian, Bodleian Library, for generously granting me access to MS Junius 1 (henceforth J1) in 1997 and 2002. The text quoted is Orm’s original text (before his later corrections). Contractions in the manuscript have been expanded and are given in italics. Erased characters or passages in the text (i.e., those scraped off with the knife) are shown in single angle brackets (e.g., ‹o›); deleted characters or passages (i.e., those covered with ink) are shown in double angle brackets (e.g., «niss.»). New text replacing erased or deleted text is shown in raised half-parentheses (e.g., ⎧& inn⎫). Unlike Holt (1878) I print Orm’s paragraphus, a sign of the shape ⎧& (with more elaborate variants such as ⎧& and ⎧& ) which marks the beginning of a paragraph in J1. Verse numbers, however, refer to the numbering in Holt (1878), since this is still the most recent complete edition that is generally available.

3 The textual passages from the Ormulum quoted in this article have been newly edited by the author from MS Junius 1. In this context I would like to thank Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield, Senior Assistant Librarian, Bodleian Library, for generously granting me access to MS Junius 1 (henceforth J1) in 1997 and 2002. The text quoted is Orm’s original text (before his later corrections). Contractions in the manuscript have been expanded and are given in italics. Erased characters or passages in the text (i.e., those scraped off with the knife) are shown in single angle brackets (e.g., ‹o›); deleted characters or passages (i.e., those covered with ink) are shown in double angle brackets (e.g., «niss.»). New text replacing erased or deleted text is shown in raised half-parentheses (e.g., ⎧& inn⎫). Unlike Holt (1878) I print Orm’s paragraphus, a sign of the shape ⎧& (with more elaborate variants such as ⎧& and ⎧& ) which marks the beginning of a paragraph in J1. Verse numbers, however, refer to the numbering in Holt (1878), since this is still the most recent complete edition that is generally available.

4 Altered to ⎧& & inn⎫ till ‘cristatus’ flash, 7 blod.

5 All the translations from Latin, Old English and Middle English in this article are the author’s. Passages from the Vulgate (Vu) are accompanied by corresponding passages from the Authorized Version (AV).

6 «Bethlehem is in truth to be interpreted as *the house of bread*, because the bread of the angels was born there». Enarrationes in Matthaeum, PL vol. 162, col. 1253C.
bread. This bread is God’s help, and it is food for the life, and food for the soul, and God gives it to all those who obey His laws."

In a couple of passages in Homily i/ii Orm originally described the table with shewbread in the Temple in Jerusalem. He did not, however, render the Vulgate expression for the shewbread, *panis propositionis*; instead, he used the phrases *hali3 bræd* «holy bread» and *hall6edd bræd* «consecrated bread», which are renderings of expressions like *panes consecratos* «consecrated bread», found in the exegetical literature as a way of referring to the shewbread. Orm later removed these passages and replaced them with references to the Mercy Seat, but enough of the original text can still be made out for the readings *hali3 bræd* (J1, columns 31, 43) and *hall6edd bræd* (J1, columns 31, 44) to be certain.

### 3. Sur Bræd

Jan van Vliet, owner of the *Ormulum* manuscript from 1659 until his death in 1666, made excerpts from the text and prepared a first draft of a glossary for the *Ormulum*. This material has been preserved in van Vliet’s notebook, now Lambeth Palace Library MS 783 (henceforth L783). Ker (1940) published text passages from pages in J1 which have been lost since van Vliet copied the passages; a promised second article providing a commentary on the text seems never to have materialised. Burchfield (1961) produced a list of words preserved by van Vliet which do not occur in J1 in its present shape, culling both the transcribed text passages on ff. 51–88 and the draft glossary and the odd additional word lists on ff. 42–50. However, Burchfield seems only to have considered the word forms when he selected words for inclusion in his article, without taking the sense of the word into account. Thus on folio 50r of L783 the word *sur* (translated as Dutch *suyr*) is noted as occurring in column 47 (lost) and column 348 (extant) of the *Ormulum* manuscript, hence not a *hapax legomenon* and hence excluded by Burchfield. In column 348 *sur* is used with the sense of «unpleasant» about suffering or pain: ‘For pain is *sur* & biteþþ wiþþ. / 7 cwennkeþþ erþli3 kinde.’ («For pain is unpleasant and hurts and overcomes [your] worldly nature»; H15208f). This example is used to illustrate sense II.5 a. s.v. *sour* in the *OED*.

In its other occurrence, however, the word *sur* has a markedly different sense. Column 47 was written on the lost first folio of quire II of J1 (the folio that originally followed folio 22 in the extant manuscript). Fortunately, however, van Vliet copied a few verses in which the word *sur* occurs:

7 ele 7 bræd nu þerf nu *sur*
Nu starc 7 hard nu neshe
Swile lac was swipe unorne lac
(L783 fol. 63v; J1 col. 47)

«And oil and bread, now unleavened, now sour,
Now unyielding and hard, now soft;
Such an offering was a very humble offering.»

The sense is here «leavened», «fermented», applied to bread. Judging from the scattered references to column 47 in L783, it is clear that this text column contained text towards the end of the exposition of Homily i/ii. In column 44, the last extant column before this lacuna, Orm discusses various aspects
of the Old Testament sacrifices and their relevance to twelfth-century Christians; in column 47 he was clearly discussing the sacrifice of bread and oil. The passage seems to be based on the description of the peace offering in Leviticus 7:11–13, the only place in the Old Testament where leavened bread is represented as part of a sacrifice.

The earliest example of sur with this sense attested in the MED is dated from the late fourteenth century:

2. ... (b) of dough: fermented; of bread: leavened; ~ bred (lof) (Bod 959) Ex. 12:19: Seuen days soure brede [L fermentum] schall not be founden in your houses. ... a1400(a1325) Cursor 6166: To moyes þan our drightin cald, Quat wise þai suld pair paskes huld, And neuer mar þat dai til ete, Ne surbrede ne nanoþer mete. (MED s.v. sōur a.)

The OED gives the same example from Cursor Mundi but dates it a1300 (OED s.v. sour a. and n. 11 (a)). On the basis of van Vliet’s evidence, however, the earliest known occurrence of sur with the sense of «leavened», «fermented» can be pushed back to the second half of the twelfth century.

4. Patt Lac Wass Bræd

In Homily i/ii Orm devotes an 18-verse paragraph to a summary of «the people’s sacrifice» as prescribed by the Lord after the children of Israel had left Egypt:

4...sacrificium coctum in clibano: de simila, panes scilicet, absque fermento conspersos oleo et lagana azyma oleo lita 5 si oblatio tua fuerit de sartagine similae conspersae oleo et absque fermento 6 divides eam minutatim et fundes supra oleum 7 sin autem de craticula sacrificium

¶ And if thou bring an oblation of a meat offering baked in the oven, it shall be unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil.

¶ And if thy oblation be a meat offering baked in a pan, it shall be of fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil.

¶ Thou shalt part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it is a meat offering.

¶ And if thy oblation be a

13 Gospel text iii (Lk 1:26–38) started at the bottom of column 49, judging from the fact that words which must stem from Lk 1:26 are reported as occurring in the lower part of column 49 (‘Awnen f. senden, openbaeren. 49. pr. 85. f. 86. m.’, L783 folio 44r) and line 5 of column 50 (‘He33l hail, ave 50 l. 5’, L783 f. 45v l. 29; cf. Burchfield 1961: 100).

14 Vu ‘11 haec est lex hostiae pacificorum quae offertur Domino 12 si pro gratiarum actione fuerit oblatio offerent panes absque fermento conspersos oleo et lagana azyma uncta oleo coctamque similam et collyridas olei admixtione conspersas 13 panes quoque fermentatos cum hostia gratiarum quae immolatur pro pacificis’; AV ‘11 And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which he shall offer unto the Lord. 12 If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried. 13 Besides the cakes, he shall offer [for] his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offerings.’

15 For the date of the Ormulum, see Parkes (1983) and Johannesson (2004: 71, footnote 1).

16 The letters A, B, and C mark the passages where Orm presents the three types of sacrificial bread that will be discussed below.
Forr mikell þi to tacnenn.\textsuperscript{17} (H988–1005) aequæ simila oleo conspergetur (Vu, Leviticus 2:4–7) meat offering baken in the fryingpan, it shall be made of fine flour with oil. (AV, Leviticus 2:4–7)

This paragraph reads like a combination of items from various places in Leviticus. The first two verses seem to reflect Leviticus 1:10 (sheep and goat), 1:5 (ox), and 1:14 (pigeon and turtle-dove). The next two and a half verses are based on Leviticus 16:6 (the bull), 16:7 (the two he-goats (\textit{bukkess})) and 16:12–13 (the incense), except that Orm introduces a lamb instead of the ram of 16:5, 15. In the next seven and a half verses Orm describes three kinds of bread, of which more presently. Following this are two verses (H1000f.) describing the burnt offering, which may tentatively be seen as based on Leviticus 2:9 (which comes after an account of three types of bread sacrifices, in the Authorized Version called «meat offerings»). In the next two verses Orm points out that salt was part of each sacrifice, which reflects Leviticus 2:13 (AV ‘with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt’).

With the various sacrifices in the paragraph H988–1005 consistently based on types of sacrifice in Leviticus, it would be reasonable to expect that the three types of sacrificial bread described by Orm would be based on the descriptions of the «meat offerings» in Leviticus 2:4–7. If so, Orm took great liberties with his material, as a comparison of the three passages marked A, B and C above with the corresponding verses in the Vulgate and AV will show.

As described in the Vulgate, sacrificial bread of all types is unleavened and made from the best flour (\textit{simila}); the shape does not vary greatly; they are all treated with oil, and consequently soft. What enables us to recognise three types are the different utensils used, and hence different methods of preparation, as shown in Table I below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>best flour (\textit{simila})</th>
<th>panis</th>
<th>laganum</th>
<th>oblatio</th>
<th>sacrifìcum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unleavened</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>wafer (flat, thin)</td>
<td>?pancake cut in pieces</td>
<td>cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil</td>
<td>sprinkled</td>
<td>smeared</td>
<td>sprinkled/poured</td>
<td>sprinkled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>made in/on</td>
<td>oven (\textit{in clibano})</td>
<td>oven (\textit{in clibano})</td>
<td>frying-pan (\textit{de sartagine})</td>
<td>gridiron (\textit{de craticula})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contrast between oven, frying-pan and gridiron is indeed the distinction that was seized upon by medieval Latin commentators:

\textit{¶ Moraliter} · Si autem etc. Similam offert · qui in aliquibus communis uitæ vsibus bene conuersari studet. Hæc oleo conspergenda est : quia omnis anima oleo eget misericordiæ nec vitam presentem euadere potest: nisi misericordia celestis affuerit Clibanus autem pondus tentationis exprimit. Sartago constantiam et robur animi · craticula multiplicem impugnationem.\textsuperscript{18} (\textit{Glossa Ordinaria: Leviticus. GO Lev 213})

\textsuperscript{17} «The sacrifice for the people was sheep and goat, and ox and pigeon and turtle-dove, and their sacrifice was bull and lamb, and two he-goats together, and the smoke of incense and bread made from sifted flour that was baked in the oven and smeared well with oil and made fat and soft. And at other times the sacrifice was unleavened bread without yeast, and at other times it was baked very hard and rigid in the oven. And at other times the sacrifice was burnt and turned all to ashes. And salt was always offered with each sacrifice, and that was done as you should know to signify a great thing.»

\textsuperscript{18} «Morally, fine flour is sacrificed by anyone who attempts to live well in community life. The oil is to be sprinkled, because every soul needs the oil of mercy, nor can anyone escape the present life unless the heavenly mercy is near. The oven expresses the weight of temptation, the frying-pan the soul’s constancy and strength, the grid-iron the multiple attack [by the devil].»
Orm’s three types of bread are differently described. Only type A is described as bulltedd bræd, i.e., made from sifted flour; a reader will infer that the other two were made from coarser flour. Only type B is described as unleavened; a reader will infer that the other two were leavened. Types A and C are baked in an oven; a reader will infer that type B is not. Only type A is treated with oil, which makes it soft; type C is explicitly described as hard; no inferences can be drawn about type B with respect to oil and hardness. These properties of Orm’s sacrificial bread are summarised in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sifted flour</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>(–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unleavened</td>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in oven</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil (hence soft)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard (firm)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for Orm’s seemingly capricious handling of the three types of bread become apparent when, later in the same homily, he begins to explain how his audience is to understand the description of the Old Testament sacrifices, more specifically, how they as Christians are to sacrifice bread spiritually (rather than literally). In his accounts of the three types of sacrificial bread he simply chose to emphasise those features of the bread that can be interpreted in terms of the properties of a Christian life that he wished to preach, namely, mercy, purity and endurance. Thus, the feature of the type A bread sacrifice that he focuses on in the exegesis is the oil, signifying mercy:

«And if your heart is merciful, and mild and soft and gentle, so that you are capable of showing mercy to him who has trespassed against you, and spare him the vengeance of just judgement; whenever you cease to harbour wrath and a wish for vengeance, then through your manners you make a spiritual sacrifice to God of bread that has been smeared well with oil and made soft.»

We should note that the type A bread is no longer called bulltedd bræd, but is referred to as lafpatt iss wiþþ elesæw. All smeredd wel. 7 nesshedd. (H1460–71)

The paragraph H1460–71, which shows how to sacrifice type A bread spiritually (gastlike), is followed by a short paragraph (H1472–75) which introduces a new type of bread, scorrcnedd laf, representing unrelenting justice. This is not sacrificial bread, however, and will be discussed on its own terms in section 7, below. This is followed by another short paragraph (H1476–79) which repeats that mercy, mildness, gentle manners and a forgiving disposition make up the loaf that is smeared with oil and made soft.

In a later paragraph (H1584–95), Orm provides an account of how to make a spiritual sacrifice of type B bread, here called þerrflinng bræd «unleavened». The focus is on the fact that the bread is unleavened (unnberrmedd) (cf. Table 2). Since leaven typically represents sins in the type of exegetical
literature that Orm relied on, it follows that unleavened bread represents purity (... iss clene bræd): we sacrifice unleavened bread spiritually by means of a pure life, pure manners, pure thoughts, pure words and pure actions:

```plaintext
Y & 3iff þu ledesst clene lif.
Onn alle kinne wise:
Pa lakesst tu ðin drihhtin swa.
Gastlike i þine þæwess.
Wipþ þerflining bræd. swa þatt tu miht:
Drihhtiness are winenn.
Forr þerflining bræd iss clene bræd:
Forr þatt itt iss unnberrmedd.
7 itt bitacneþþ clene lif:
7 alle clene þæwess.
7 clene þohht. 7 clene word:
7 alle clene dedess. (H1584–95)
```

«And if you lead a pure life in all possible ways, then through your manners you make a spiritual sacrifice to God of unleavened bread, so that you may gain God’s grace. For unleavened bread is pure bread, because it contains no yeast; and it signifies a pure life and all pure manners, and pure thought, and pure word, and all pure actions.»

In the next paragraph (H1596–1605), Orm explains how his audience is to make a spiritual sacrifice of type C bread, here called fasst. & findi3 «a firm and solid loaf». The focus is thus on the hard and firm qualities of the bread (cf. Table 2). Endurance in the face of hardship is the spiritual quality that corresponds to a sacrifice of firm bread:

```plaintext
Y & 3iff þin he‹o›rrte iss harrd. & starrc.
7 stedefasst o criste.
To þolenn forr þe lufe off himm.
All þatt tatt iss to dre‡enn:
Pa lakesst tu þin drihhtin swa.
Gastlike i þine þæwess.
Wipþ fasst. 7 findi5 laf. 7 harrd:
Wiþþinnenn. 7 wiþþutenn.
Swa þatt itt ma33 wel hellpenn þe.
To winnenn godess are; (H1596–1605)
```

«And if your heart is hard and strong and steadfast in Christ, to endure for the love of Him all that is to be borne, then through your manners you make a spiritual sacrifice to God of bread that is firm and solid and hard inside and outside, so that it may well help you to attain God’s grace.»

We may note that bread of types A and C is individuated as laf; this confirms the inference mentioned above that these types were leavened, since fermentation is required for the dough to rise and form a loaf. Unleavened bread would typically be baked as flat cakes.

5. Laf

Between his interpretations of type A and type B bread sacrifices, Orm interpolates a 104-verse digression (H1480–1583) on the making of a loaf, obviously prompted by the fact that the type A bread has just been described as a loaf. In an introductory ten-verse paragraph Orm lists the different stages in the making of an actual loaf (threshing, winnowing, gathering, grinding, kneading, and «hardening with heat», i.e., baking);20 the rest of the digression is taken up with accounts of how a Christian can carry out each of these steps spiritually to produce a loaf worthy to be sacrificed to God.

---

19 E.g., ‘Excludendum ergo omne fermentum peccati de cordibus nostris est’ ‘Thus all the leaven of sin is to be excluded from our hearts’ (Rabanus Maurus, Homiliae in Evangelia et Epistolas. Homilia III. In Die Sanctae Paschae, PL vol. 110, col. 0140B); ‘Aegyptus quae interpretatur tenebrae, significat tenebras infidelitatis: fermentum significat peccatum.’ «Egypt, which is interpreted darkness, signifies the darkness of disbelief; leaven signifies sin.» (Haymo Halberstatensis, In Divi Pauli Epistolas Expositio. In Epistolam I Ad Corinthios. PL vol. 117, col. 0537).

20 Orm may well have been inspired by a sermon by Petrus Cellensis (Sermo LVI, PL vol. 202, col. 0808C) which depicts Christ as pastor («shepherd») and pistor («miller», «baker») and in which a similar (but more
If you wish to make a loaf, you thresh your sheaves, and then you winnow your corn, and separate it from the chaff, and thus gather the clean corn away from the chaff, and you grind it, and knead it, and then you can make a pleasing sacrifice of it to the Lord.

The pronoun reference in H1486f. is somewhat imprecise, in a way that is typical of recipes and other kinds of text where clauses describe drastic changes to noun phrase referents: the itt of grindesst itt refers back to be clene corn of two lines before, but the itt of cenedesst itt can only refer to the flour resulting from the grinding to which, furthermore, water and leaven must have been added, and the itt of harrdnesst itt must refer to the loaf shaped from the kneaded dough.

Even if we accept the imprecise pronoun reference, the fact still remains that Orm omits all mention of the addition of water and leaven to the flour before the dough is kneaded. No doubt he regarded the addition of water to the flour as self-evident; this is furthermore suggested by the interpretation of the kneading (baptism, dipping under water: ‘Þurrh þatt tu læresst he hemm. / unnderr waterr dippesst’ H1550f.). The lack of mention of the addition of the leaven could possibly be due to Orm seeing the kneading as necessarily accompanying the addition of the leaven to the dough; for unleavened bread the flour and water need only be mixed, not kneaded together (cf. the quotation from Cleanness in section 6, below). The tenth-century Northumbrian glossators Aldred (Lindisfarne Gospels, Li) and Owun (Rushworth Gospels, Ru) clearly regarded Latin FERMENTARE as referring to an action that involved both the addition of leaven and kneading, which they took pains to render even when kneading was not mentioned in the Latin text. The woman of Mt 13:33 and Lk 13:21 is only said to have hidden the leaven in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened; it is never said that she kneaded the dough. Both Aldred and Owun, however, give Old English counterparts of «leavened» and «kneaded» as alternative glosses for the Latin word for «leavened»: ‘fermentum / gedærsted l gecneoden’ (Mt 13:33, Li), ‘fermentaretur / gedaersted vel gecnoeden’ (Lk 13:21, Li), ‘fermentum / gidaerstad l cneden’ (Mt 13:33, Ru). Orm’s text would have gained in clarity if he had used *berrmesst itt21 as well as cenedesst itt to express the addition of leaven and kneading respectively, rather than rely on cenedesst to suggest both activities.

In his interpretation of the last stage of the production of a loaf, the baking, Orm finally uses bakesst as a synonym of harrdnesst ... þurrh hæte. The «hardening» involves the formation of a hard crust on the loaf, which can subsequently be softened by the application of oil (cf. section 4 above):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Þurrh þatt} & \text{ tatt tu læresst hemm.} \\
& \text{To þolenn ilce umnsellþe.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

«And by teaching them to endure each misfortune with fervent heart and true (comprehensive) list of the stages in the process of bread production is given. The main difference between the ways Orm and Petrus Cellensis use the image of bread-making is that Orm applies the image metaphorically in a tropological (moral) interpretation describing the tasks of a priest («if you … succeed so well with your preaching that they accept it and turn to Christianity …, then you winnow your threshed corn»), whereas Petrus uses the image for an allegorical (spiritual) presentation of the actions of Christ («The Lord selected the good grain when He said, … He winnowed it when He said, … He ground it when He said, …He mixed the flour with water when He baptized and taught others to baptize …» Orm’s use of the four modes of interpretation (historical (or literal), allegorical, tropological, and anagogical (relating to the heavenly afterlife)) agrees with that described in Expositio In Cantica Canticorum by Honorius Augustodunensis (PL vol. 172), a work which we know that Orm used: it provides the source for the metaphor of the gospels as a four-wheeled quadriga on folio 9 of J1.

21 The only form of the verb *BERRMENN «to cause to ferment» attested in the Ormulum is the negated past participle unberrmedd (H1591).

22 Altered to *þær ‘þurrh þ _u ...
The object of *bakesst, goddess laf*, is curious, to say the least. The sense must surely be «you bake a loaf for God», but unless we assume this is an error for *gode luf*, we would have to interpret this as a *genitivus commodi*, a use of the genitive case not recognized in traditional grammar. A *genitivus possessivus* would be absurd; in Latin, PANIS DEI can only be used to refer to Christ; cf. Jn 6:33, Vu ‘Panis enim Dei est, qui de coelo descendit: et dat vitam mundo.’, AV ‘For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.’ There are sufficient remnants of dative forms in Orm’s original text to make an original *gode luf* plausible, corresponding to a Latin *dativus commodi* PANIS DEO; cf. ‘panem calidum et suavissimum Deo Patri offeret’. But if that was the form that Orm used in his original draft, he abandoned the dative form even before he wrote this verse into J1.

6. Kechell

Orm uses the noun KECHELL twice in the extant parts of the *Ormulum*, both in the same context: the prophet Elijah has reached the city of Zarephath and asks a widow for a morsel of bread; she answers that she has only a handful of flour left in a jar and a little oil, and that she is going to prepare a meal for herself and her son, after which they will die from hunger. Elijah tells her first to make a little cake for him, and her supply will never fail. The Vulgate uses the phrase *subcinericium panem parvulum* «a small cake baked under ashes» to express what Elijah requested; Orm apparently felt that his lexeme KECHELL was sufficiently close to the sense of the Latin phrase to justify his using it in this context:

> And she would then straightaway fetch him what he desired. And he asked that she should also bring him a morsel of bread … Go forth, lady, and do not dread, but do as you said, but first of all you should make of [your flour] a little cake for me. … She went and did what he asked, and brought him a small cake.»

We cannot tell whether the denotatum of Orm’s KECHELL was actually baked under ashes, but assuming the correspondence to the Latin form was good enough, it was flat and unleavened so that it could have been baked in that manner. The very fact that Orm chose not to use LAF to render *subcinericium panem parvulum* suggest that a KECHELL was different from a LAF in essentials:

23 The two s’s are clearly part of the original text, and not a later modification of a dative form felt to be too old-fashioned; cf. the datives in footnote 24.

24 E.g., 7 he wass «gode» cweme. *(alt. to ‘godd full’) (H5201); Amang þatt iudewisshe þeowdr: / Þatt ta wass gode cweme. *(alt. to go ‘d full’) (H6042f.); similarly H7772.

unleavened, hence flat. Further supportive evidence can be gleaned from the fourteenth-century poem *Cleanness*, in which the story is told of how God visits Abraham in the shape of three men; Abraham tells Sara to make cakes under the hot ashes (Genesis 18:6 Vulg *subcinericios panes*), which the *Cleanness* poet renders as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Þre mettez of mele menge & ma kakez; } & \quad \text{\`Mix three measures of meal and make} \\
\text{Vnder askez ful hote happe hem bylieue;} & \quad \text{\`cakes; cover them quickly with very hot}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(\text{Cleanness 625f.; Lancashire (1998))}\]

\[
\text{\`re mettez of mele menge & ma kakez; Vnder askez ful hote happe hem byliue;}
\]

The result of Sara’s exertions is described as ‘þre þerue kakez’ (*Cleanness* 635) i.e., three unleavened cakes. Since the cakes are unleavened and baked under the ashes it follows that they must be flat, to make sure they are baked through while the ashes are hot. If the *Cleanness* poet interpreted *subcinericios panes* in this way, I see no reason to believe that Orm would have interpreted the phrase differently.

### 7. Scorrcnedd Laf

In his discussion of the Christian interpretation of Old Testament sacrifices in the exposition of *Homily i/ii*, Orm provides the following simile about just judgement and just vengeance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pe rihhte dom iss starcc. 7 harrd.} & \quad \text{\`Just judgement is unyielding and hard,} \\
\text{7 all þe rihtte wraeche.} & \quad \text{and so is just vengeance, just as if it were}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Swa — summ itt ware scorrcnedd laf:} \quad \text{rusks, that are without crumbs.} \text{\`}
\]

\[(\text{H1472–75)}\]

This description of just judgement comes in the middle of a passage whose moral is that justice should be tempered with mercy, which is represented in the Old Testament sacrifices by the oil with which the sacrificial bread was smeared. By contrast, then, the just judgement is untempered with mercy; it is severe and hard (*starcc. 7 harrd*) and is likened to *scorrcnedd laf*.

The participle *scorrcnedd* occurs on one other occasion in the *Ormulum*, at H8626, as part of the description of the land of Judea after a drought lasting for three and a half years:

\[
\begin{align*}
7 \text{ ta wass wel hallf feoørpe ðer:} & \quad \text{\`And then for three and a half years there} \\
\text{Þatt comm na reɔ̃n omn eoørpe.} & \quad \text{fell no rain on the ground. And then there}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{7 ta wass i tudisskern land:} \quad \text{\`was in Judea as a consequence a great}
\]

\[\text{Þær ðurrh full hefɪs hunngerr.} \quad \text{famine, because the land was all dried}
\]

\[\text{Forr þatt te land wass driŋgɛd all:} \quad \text{\`out and scorched because of the}
\]

\[\text{7 scorrcnedd þurrh þe druþhpe.} \quad \text{drought.} \text{\`}
\]

\[(\text{H8621–26)}\]

Here, *scorrcnedd* can be translated as «scorched» or «parched». But if the noun phrase *scorrcnedd laf* were intended to refer to scorched bread, perhaps even to the burnt offering (‘7 ɔ̃ err stund tatt lac wass brend: / 7 turnedd all till asskes’ «At other times the sacrifice was burnt and turned all to ashes» H1000f.), then the insistence on the absence of *crummess* would be very odd. If the bread has been burnt to ashes, it is beyond the stage where it is reasonable to comment on the fact that there are

---

26 This passage is based on James 5:17 (specifying the drought as being the outcome of Elijah’s prayer) and the anonymous *De Promissionibus Et Praedictionibus Dei*, chapter 28 (*PL* vol. 51) (providing the localisation of the famine to Judea) rather than 1 Kings 17–18:2 (both James 5:17 and *De Promissionibus* agree, as against 1 Kings, about the length of the famine), which provides the source of the story of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath which follows at H8627–88, but which presents the drought as ending in its third year and the famine as affecting Samaria.

27 Altered to ... na ...
no *crummess*, regardless of the sense of this word (see further 8, below). For the comment on *crummess* to make sense, the bread, although scorncnedd, should still be edible. For this reason I suggest that *scorncnedd laf* should be interpreted as «rusks», i.e., bread that has been allowed to dry slowly at a low heat in the oven.

The base form of *scorncnedd*, the unrecorded infinitive *SCORRCNENN*, is in the *ODEE* (s.v. scorch) tentatively derived from ON SKORPNA «to be shrivelled», which fits in very nicely with Orm’s use of the word about bread (cf. Swedish SKORPA «rusk»).

8. *Crummess*

What may seem puzzling to anyone who has eaten ru sks is that Orm seems to claim that eating this type of bread does not generate crumbs (*iss wiþþutenn crummess*). The example is, after all, used in *OED* s.v. crumb to illustrate sense 1, ‘A small particle of bread (or other friable food), such as breaks or falls off by rubbing, etc.’. The solution to this puzzle, I submit, lies in a reinterpretation of the noun *crummes*.

The Latin noun *mica* was used in the types of text employed as source material for Orm and other Old and Middle English homilists in two different senses:

1. tiny fragments of bread (or some other material, such as salt), e.g., ‘nam et catelli edunt de micis quae cadunt de mensa dominorum suorum’ (Vu Mt 15:27, AV ‘yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters’ table’).
2. the soft inner parts of a loaf, as opposed to the hard crust, e.g., ‘Mica vero, quae interior pars panis est, spiritualem intelligentiam in Scripturis designat’ «the crumb, which is the interior part of the bread, denotes the spiritual understanding of the Scriptures» (Haymo Halberstatensis, *Homilia xxxv. Dominica Secunda In Quadragesima*, PL vol. 118) In this sense, *mica* ought to be regarded as a mass noun and be used only in the singular, but plural forms do occur occasionally: ‘Non ergo crustas, sed micas de pane puero rum edunt catelli, quia conversi ad fidem, qui erant despecti in gentibus, non litterae superficiem in Scripturis, sed spiritualium medullam sensuum, qua in bonis actibus proficere valeant, inquirunt’ «Not the crust, but the crumb of the children’s bread, is what the dogs eat, because converts to the faith, who were disdained among the Gentiles, seek not the literal surface of the Scriptures, but the marrow of the spiritual sense, through which they are capable of doing good deeds» (Beda, *In Marci Evangelium Expositio*. Liber Secundus. Caput vii. PL vol. 92, col. 0203A).

The first of these senses is recorded and well documented for OE *cruma* and its ME and ModE descendants. The second sense, however, is attested in the *OED* and the *MED* only from the early 15th century onwards:

3. a. The inner part of a loaf, not hardened in baking, and capable of being easily crumbled; the soft part of bread. Opposed to crust.
   *c1430* Pilgr. Lyf Manhode I. xli. (1869) 25, I entermeted me neuere to make cruste ne cromme.
   *c1440* Anc. Cookery in Househ. Ord. (1790) 441 Pare away the cruste, and stepe the crome in vynegur.
   *1605* SHAKES. Lear I. iv. 217 He that keepes nor crust nor crum. (*OED* s.v. crumb n.; further exx. from 1721 and 1869)
2. The soft inner part of a loaf; *cruste ne* (nor) ~, any part of the bread.
   ?a1425 *Chauliac(1) 25b/b: Recipe medulle panis fermentatus i. crommez of leuen brede [*Ch.(2): pe pibpe of soure brede].
   ?c1425 Arun. Cook. Recipes 441: Take faire light bred, and pare away the cruste, and stepe the crome in vynegur, and grinde hit.
   ?c1425 *Chauliac(2) 41b/b: Plastre with cromes of brede [L medulla panis] dypped in wyne.
   *c1450* Burg. Practica 232/17: Take smalache and crummes of sowre-brede.
   *c1450* Hrl.Cook.Bk.(2) 98: Kut hit with a knyle...and kepe þe crust þat þou kuttest,
and pike [vr. pile] all þe cremes [vr. cromes] within togidre; and pike hem small with thi knyfe. c1450 Med.Bk.(2) 130: Take crownes of whit-sour bred, smal myed on a gratour, & do hit in a skeleton.

\( \text{MED s.v. crójme n.} \)

There are nevertheless examples from the Old English period where the noun \( \text{cruma} \) is used with the second sense of Latin \( \text{mica} \), «the soft inner part of a loaf». In the following example the sense is particularly clear, since the noun is used as a mass noun in the singular:

Gyf hwylc stiðnes on lichoman becume genim þas wyrte þe man lapatium & oðrum naman wudu docce nemmeð & eald swyuen smeru & ðone cruman of ofenbacenum hlafæ, cnuca tosomne þam gemete ðe ðu clyðan wyrce, lege to ðam sare. «If stiffness in the body should befall a person, take the herb called lapatium or by another name sorrel and old swine-lard and the soft interior of oven-baked bread, pound [them] together in a suitable quantity for the poultice you wish to make, [and] put it on the sore part»; Pseudo-Apuleius: \( \text{Herbarius} \) (de Vriend 1984: 34)

In Old English, just as in Latin and in Middle English, we can find examples where a plural form is used to represent the inner part of the loaf; in the following example the sense is made clear by the contrast to the crust of the bread:

We hedæð þæra crumena ðæs hlafes. and ða Iudeiscan gnagað þa rinde. for ðan ðe we understandað þæt gastlice andgit þæra boca. and hi rædað þa starelican gereccednysse buton andgite; ... «We eat the soft interior of the bread, and the Jews gnaw the crust, because we understand the spiritual sense of the books, and they read the literal story without understanding»; Ælfric, Catholic Homilies II: Second Sunday in Lent (Godden 1979: 70)

We are now in a position to reinterpret Orm’s relative clause \( \text{patt iss wiþþutenn crummess} \), with \( \text{scorrcnedd laf} \) as its antecedent. There is ample evidence to show that \( \text{crummess} \) here must be used in its second sense, «the soft interior of a loaf». What Orm says, then, is that true justice is severe and hard, just like rusks, which lack a soft interior.

It is clear that the standard dictionaries should be revised with respect to the \( \text{terminus a quo} \) of the second sense of \( \text{crumalcrójme} \).

9. Conclusion

On the basis of the evidence presented in this paper, we can draw the following conclusions as regards the lexical field of \( \text{BREAD} \) as shown in the \( \text{Ormulum} \):

- the lexeme \( *\text{CRUMME} \) is polysemous, having both the sense \( *\text{CRUMME}^1 \) «small fragment of bread» and the sense \( *\text{CRUMME}^2 \) «soft interior of a loaf» (as opposed to the hard crust, which Orm never names);
- the sense \( *\text{CRUMME}^2 \) «soft interior of a loaf» is recorded in the \( \text{Ormulum} \) as well as in OE texts;
- a \( \text{SCORRCNEDD LAF} \) lacks the soft interior;
- an ordinary \( \text{LAF} \) has a soft interior;
- a \( \text{LAF} \) is leavened, thus high;
- the phrase \( *\text{SUR BRÆD} \) «leavened bread» was in all likelihood used by Orm;
- a \( \text{LAF} \) is baked in an oven, not under the ashes;
a LAF can be made from sifted flour (bulltedd braed = laf batt iss wippl elesæw / All smeredd wel), or may be made from coarser flour (fassst findig laf)\textsuperscript{28};

- LAF cannot be used to render SUBCINERICIUS PANIS;
- KECHELL is used to render SUBCINERICIUS PANIS;
- a KECHELL is flat, thus unleavened.

This leads to the following modification of the figure shown in the Introduction representing the relationships within the lexical field of bread and some properties of the lexemes LAF and KECHELL. A central position is accorded to *CRUMME\textsuperscript{1}: all bread crumbles when it is broken or eaten, even the soft interior part of a LAF (*CRUMME\textsuperscript{2}).

![Figure 2. Basic semantic relations within the extended lexical field of BREAD in the Ormulum.](image_url)

**Abbreviations**

AV. The Authorized Version, 1611. See The Holy Bible.


H. Precedes line numbers in Holt (1878).


Jn. The Gospel according to St. John.

L783. London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 783.


MED. Middle English Dictionary.

Mt. The Gospel according to St. Matthew.

ODEE. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology.

OED. The Oxford English Dictionary.

PL. Patrologia Latina.

Vu. The Latin Vulgate version of the Bible. See The ARTFL Project.
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