

Geert De Wilde and Heather Pagan, 2013, 'Editing the Editor: Editorial Policy at the Anglo-Norman Dictionary (2013). in Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (eds.). *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century*, Texts and Transitions 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 373-383.



EDITING THE EDITOR: EDITORIAL POLICY AT THE ANGLO-NORMAN DICTIONARY

Heather Pagan and Geert De Wilde

The *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (AND), apart from providing definitions that map the semantic range of a word, also illustrates these with selected citations taken mainly from edited texts.¹ Its *List of Source-Texts*, which is continually expanding, currently contains more than eight hundred items and includes publications dating from the eighteenth century to the present.² It is therefore faced with a variety of editing styles in its sources and the way in which the dictionary has dealt with this inevitable absence of homogeneity has undergone a number of changes through the years.

¹ For the first edition, see *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, ed. by William Rothwell and others, Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association, 8, 7 vols (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1977–92). The second edition of the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (AND2), currently complete from A to L (with M forthcoming in 2012), is published digitally and available online: <www.anglo-norman.net> [accessed 25 June 2013]. A printed version was prepared for the section A–E: *Anglo-Norman Dictionary: Second Edition*, ed. by William Rothwell and others, Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association, 17, 2 vols (London: Manley for the Modern Humanities Research Association, 2005).

² The current *List of Source-Texts* used for AND2 can be found online at <<http://www.anglo-norman.net/lot.shtml>> [accessed 25 June 2013].

Heather Pagan is an assistant editor at the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, Aberystwyth University. She has recently edited the *Prose Brut to 1332* for the Anglo-Norman Text Society.

Geert De Wilde is an editor at the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, Aberystwyth University. He has published on stanza forms in Anglo-Norman and Middle English verse.

To give a brief (and historic) overview, there are mainly three editing styles that have been used for handling the particularities of Anglo-Norman texts which can be placed at different stages on the spectrum between critical and diplomatic editions.³ As we will demonstrate, the choice of style often depends on the type of material edited, with editors of historical documents generally favouring a different approach to those editing literary texts.

The first approach, which can be found mainly in older editions, and, as it seems, particularly in those of historical material, is to view Anglo-Norman texts in the continuum of insular or English writings, and to present it in virtually the same way. No overreaching editorial policy is apparent in these publications, and there is a fair amount of variability in the level of editorial intervention. This is illustrated by the different volumes in series like the Selden Society and the Surtees Society. The first Anglo-Norman work edited by the Selden Society is *The Court Baron* (volume IV) published in 1890,⁴ in which Frederic W. Maitland and William P. Baildon adhere to a policy of minimal intervention: while suspensions and contractions are expanded when possible, no distinction is made between 'u' and 'v' or 'i' and 'j'; and generally all of the apparent manuscript readings are preserved. There is no use of diacritical marks (i.e. accents, cedilla, tréma), and parts of speech that are normally elided are not separated by an apostrophe (i.e. *lenpirement* is not changed into *l'empirement*). Nearly all the works edited by the Selden Society would follow a similar procedure. Interestingly, as editor of the first volume of the *Year Books* (published in 1903), Maitland comments at length on the language of the law books, which, according to the prevailing perspective of those times, he qualifies as 'a debased jargon' or 'a queer slang'.⁵ He is exasperated by the sheer variety of spellings

³ One type of edition which is ignored here is the critical edition which tries to 'reconstruct' the language, either in an attempt to rid it of its Anglo-Norman 'anomalies' or to create a more 'original' version of the text. This can be found in early editions, such as *La Vie seint Edmund le Rei, poème anglo-normand du XI^e siècle*, ed. by Hilding Kjellman (Göteborg: Elanders, 1935), or *Zwei altfranzösische Reimpredigten, mit Benutzung der Ausgabe Hermann Suchiers*, ed. by Walter Suchier (Halle: Niemeyer, 1949). Unless the original reading is also provided, which in the two aforementioned editions is fortunately the case, the edition is not used by the AND.

⁴ *The Court Baron, Being Precedents for Use in Seignorial and Other Local Courts, Together with Select Pleas from the Bishop of Ely's Court of Littleport*, ed. by Frederic W. Maitland and William P. Baildon, Publications of the Selden Society, 4 (London: Quaritch, 1891).

⁵ *Year Books of Edward II, vol. 1: 1 & 2 Edward II, A.D. 1307–1309*, ed. by Frederic W. Maitland, Publications for the Selden Society, 17 (London: Quaritch, 1903), pp. xxxiii and xxxiv.

of common words ('Consistency is not to be expected'), and expresses difficulty in expanding abbreviations ('It is only at a roughly correct result that we or the like of us can aim when jots and tittles must be made into letters').⁶ Despite the editor's hesitance in this matter, he turns to the French style of editing, mainly following Meyer and Paris: u/v and i/j are modernized, as are punctuation and capitalization.⁷ However, more recent editions of historical material in the series, like Paul Brand's *The Earliest English Law Reports*, have not followed Maitland in this, preferring the reduced level of editorial intervention.⁸ The same approach can also be found in more literary texts, such as Julia Marvin's edition of the chronicle of the *Prose Brut*.⁹

The second approach is the one used for the greatest portion of Anglo-Norman literature, which utilizes an editorial style based on principles laid out by the Anglo-Norman Text Society (ANTS). Without entering into a discussion of the relationship between Anglo-Norman and the French school of editing, the policy adopted by the ANTS, starting in 1939, is very close to that proposed by the École Nationale des Chartes in their *Conseils pour l'édition des textes médiévaux*, which in turn was influenced by the editing done by Paris and Meyer in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.¹⁰ This editorial policy specifies the use of diacritical marks as well as punctuation and capitalization according to modern French standards. In addition, 'i' and 'j' and 'u' and 'v' are distinguished according to modern usage. The enormous variation in spelling characteristic of Anglo-Norman is left unaltered and only emended if there is a clear indication of scribal error, for example in *La Lumere as Lais*, the manuscript's reading *sascrement* is changed into *sacrement* for the edition (l. 8701).¹¹ The ANTS also allows for very small stylistic corrections, such

⁶ *Year Books of Edward II, vol. 1: 1 & 2 Edward II*, ed. by Maitland, pp. xlii and xliii.

⁷ For more on this, see Brian Merrilees, 'Anglo-Norman', in *Editing Medieval Texts: English, French, and Latin Written in England*, ed. by A. G. Rigg (London: Garland, 1977), pp. 86–106.

⁸ *The Earliest English Law Reports*, ed. by Paul A. Brand, Publications for the Selden Society, 111, 112, 122, 123, 4 vols (London: Selden Society, 1995–2007), which distinguishes i/j and u/v but does not use accents or separate elided words.

⁹ *The Oldest Anglo-Norman Prose Brut Chronicle: An Edition and Translation*, ed. and trans. by Julia Marvin, Medieval Chronicles, 4 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006).

¹⁰ *Conseils pour l'édition des textes médiévaux*, 3 vols (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques: École nationale des chartes, 2001–05).

¹¹ *La Lumere as Lais*, ed. by Glynn Hesketh, ANTS, 54–58, 3 vols (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1996–2000).

as consistency of tense and, if relevant, reconstruction of metre or rhyme. All rejected readings are clearly indicated.

Finally, the third approach to editing Anglo-Norman texts, which is used less frequently, is the purely diplomatic one. In this case, the text is presented as it is found in the manuscript: no diacritical marks are used, and there is a minimal amount of punctuation. Furthermore, u/v and i/j are not distinguished, word division is left as present in the manuscript, and, in some cases, abbreviation marks are reproduced and remain unexpanded. This approach was used in two early nineteenth-century publications that are heavily cited by the AND: *Rotuli Scotiae* and *Statutes of the Realm*.¹² The virtually diplomatic presentation can also be found in the two Anglo-Norman *Ancrene Riwele* texts, published by the EETS,¹³ and more recently in Laura Wright's *Sources of London English*.¹⁴

How does the AND bring together these three different approaches under one editorial policy? In other words, to what extent does it alter edited texts or undo changes an editor has made — not because it does not believe in a variety of editing styles, but because a certain type of editing is best for the purpose of the dictionary? As we will demonstrate, two factors play a role: one, the *readability* of a phrase (or part of a phrase) without a wider context and, two, particularly in the online version of the dictionary, the *usability* of that phrase for a variety of search-possibilities.

The editorial policy of the earliest volumes of the AND is outlined in the 'Introductory Note' to the first fascicule, and follows the rules for editing laid out by the ANTS in their *Instructions to Editors*.¹⁵ It diverged from these guidelines, in that the grave accent was used only sparingly (and not always to distinguish homographs), and that the letter 'y' was nearly always regularized to 'i' (primarily in order to save printing space by reducing the number of variants per entry). As a result, while there was usually little need to alter material published by the ANTS, other source texts which did not follow the same edi-

¹² *Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londonensi et Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi Asservati*, ed. by David Macpherson, John Caley, and William Illingworth, Record Commission, 10, 2 vols (London: Eyre and Strahan, 1814–19); and *Statutes of the Realm*, ed. by Alexander Luders and others, Record Commission, 11 vols in 12 (London: Eyre and Strahan, 1810–28), 1–11 (1810–16).

¹³ *The French Text of the 'Ancrene Riwele'*, ed. by John A. Herbert, EETS, o.s., 219 (1944); and *The French Text of the 'Ancrene Riwele'*, ed. by William H. Trethewey, EETS, o.s., 240 (1958).

¹⁴ Laura Wright, *Sources of London English: Medieval Thames Vocabulary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

¹⁵ This is an unpublished brochure, written by Alfred Ewert.

torial conventions often required more substantial alterations. Those changes made by AND editors occurred on two levels. Firstly, there was the addition of diacritics, punctuation, the expansion of abbreviations, capitalization, and *i/j* and *u/v* distinction — emendations which were generally made silently. These turned a citation such as :

Et come ap's la mort le dit Counte de Lancastr' & des aut's gauntz, nr'e Seignr le Roi q'ore est, & ma dame Isabele Roine Denglet're sa miere, de la volunte le dit Roi Edward, & p' c'mun conseil du roialme, alassent es p'ties de France de p'curer bien de pees entre les deux roialmes de Fraunce & Denglet're

(*Stats* i 251, with the different abbreviation signs here represented by an apostrophe)¹⁶

into

Et come [...] nostre Seigneur le Roi q'ore est et ma dame Isabele Roine d'Engleterre sa miere [...] alassent es parties de France de procurer bien de pees entre les deux roialmes de Fraunce et d'Engleterre [...]

On a second level, emendations were made to the source text, wherever the AND editors questioned, reinterpreted, or rejected a reading as presented by the original editor. For example, the first edition of the AND still has an entry for the word *juyeux*, solely attested in the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*. The context made it clear that what was talked about were young cows, but there is no known word with this meaning and beginning with 'j' in any language that could give such a spelling. The AND editors suggested a possible reading of *juyenx*, which they hypothetically linked to *juvence*. With the revision of J for the second edition, it became clear that this word was merely an editorial misreading of the minims: instead of *juyeux*, we must read *viyeux*, which is the plural form of *veel*, that is, 'veal', and the citation was corrected and moved accordingly.

These more substantial changes, made by the AND editors, were always clearly indicated as such, with additions (usually) placed in square brackets and suggested alternate readings placed between round brackets in a *legitur*, or, in case of a complete rejection of the original editor's reading, inserted in the main citation with the edition's reading following again between round brackets: 'estrielle (*l. estoille*)' or 'foudres (*ed. soudres*)'. Occasionally, when a word was considered to be a phantom-reading, it was still included in the AND, albeit

¹⁶ *Statutes of the Realm*, ed. by Luders and others, I, 251.

with its headword surrounded by round brackets to signal its doubtfulness: for example, the entry '(scolatizer)', which is attested once in a citation from Richardson's edition of Anglo-Norman letters, but which is probably an editorial misreading of 'scolarizer'.¹⁷ Evidently, citations were shortened for inclusion in the AND, with the ellipsis indicated by '...' and with further explanatory editorial comments again in round brackets, for example, 'sulum ceo k'ici (=on earth) meins firent penance De peines la (=purgatory) ert agregance'.¹⁸ Purely as a space-saving measure, all personal names as well as occurrences of the headword form were reduced to their initial letter in the citations.

The final fascicule of the first edition of the AND was published in 1992, and almost immediately work began on its second edition, which would concentrate on a digital online format as its primary platform. This change, which coincided with the arrival of new AND editors and a considerable expansion of the text corpus, as well as some changes in modern editing conventions, inevitably led to an overhaul of the editorial procedure. A new Reader's Guide (written in 2005) accompanied the newly revised section (A–E), both in print and online, and indicated some changes in the editing protocol: in the second edition, the grave accent is no longer used and the dieresis (or tréma) is used much more sparingly than before.¹⁹ Variants with 'y' are now presented alongside 'i' variants, for example, both *main* and *mayn* would be listed as variants. Smaller changes included replacing initial 'ff' with a capital 'F' (i.e. *ffaire* becomes *Faire*, if a capital is required), the uses of square brackets '[...]' to indicate ellipses, the omission of 'cf.' in favour of direct hyperlinks to the relevant dictionary article, and the use of English for editorial comments rather than a mixture of English and French. The introduction of a more unambiguous tagging system for the digital version of the AND also required a stricter and more consistent use of the different types of editorial comments (which appear in different colours) in citations.

The use of diacritical marks in medieval French editing is sometimes decried as too modern and too much of a deviation from the medieval practice.²⁰ While

¹⁷ Henry G. Richardson, 'Letters of the Oxford Dictatores', in *Formularies Which Bear on the History of Oxford, c. 1204–1420*, ed. by Herbert E. Salter, W. A. Pantin, and H. G. Richardson, Oxford Historical Society, n.s., 4, 5, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), II, 360–416.

¹⁸ *La Lumere as Lais*, ed. by Glynn Hesketh, ANTS, 54–58, 3 vols (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1996–2000), II, 12693–94 (II, 163).

¹⁹ AND2, I, pp. xxiv–xxvi. Also online at <www.anglo-norman.net/sitedocs/main-intro.html#sec3> [accessed 25 June 2013].

²⁰ Marvin argues that all Anglo-Norman editing should follow the style established by

diacritics have been used more sparingly in the second edition of the AND, their use remains essential both for the correct understanding of a citation and for the differentiation of what would otherwise be homographs. The grave accent, which was applied in older editions, such as Francisque Michel's edition of the Oxford Psalter, where it brought words more into line with their modern spelling, and differentiated, for example, the preposition *à* from the verbal form *a*, was already rejected as inappropriate in the first edition of the AND.²¹ The second edition is more rigorous in removing all of them. The dieresis (or tréma), on the other hand, was used extensively in the earliest editions in the ANTS series, normally to highlight diphthongs or to correct what were seen as 'defects' in syllable count of Anglo-Norman verse, and this was mostly preserved in the first edition of the AND. The second edition removes most of these as, rather than signalling spelling variants, they usually serve to indicate the pronunciation of the lemmas — something to which the AND does not intend to make any claim. There are still a small number of cases where the dieresis is kept to distinguish between two homographs, for example, *air* (fierceness) versus *air* (air or heir), or where the etymology clearly would reflect a vowel in hiatus such as in *envair*. This policy continues to evolve, with the dieresis falling more out of favour: there are no uses of it in the post-G section of the second edition, and those that are currently in headwords are likely to be omitted in future.

Finally, the acute accent used on the letter 'e' in Anglo-Norman editing has two purposes: to distinguish between homographs, for example, *apreste* (loan) and *apresté* (bitterness, harshness), and to signal the distinction between the silent and pronounced 'e'. Differentiating homographs such as these can be challenging, as they may completely alter the grammatical structure of the sentence (with the e-acute often being a marker of a past participle or participle as adjective) or determine which lemma a given citation belongs to. For example, the AND2 has two separate entries for *fosse* (with a short and unstressed 'e') and *fossé* (with a long and stressed 'e'), even though their meaning is virtually identical (ditch, moat etc.). The legitimacy of both forms is confirmed either by the use of the word in a rhyming position (for example, rhyming with

Maitland, rejecting any use of modern punctuation or diacritical marks, as she lays out in her article, 'The Unassuming Reader: F. W. Maitland and the Editing of Anglo-Norman', in *The Book Unbound: Editing and Reading Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. by Siân Echard and Stephen Partridge (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 14–36.

²¹ *Libri Psalmorum versio antiqua gallica*, ed. by Francisque Michel (Oxford: E Typographeo Academico, 1860), pp. 1–260.

'grosses') or, in the case of *fossé*, by more transparent variants, such as *fossee* or *fosset*. However, a great number of citations using the word 'fosse' remain inconclusive, and it is left to the AND editor either to add or to remove the acute accent. As in the ANTS series, the accented 'é' continues to be used heavily in the second edition of the AND.

All of the above editorial modifications towards consistency benefit the *readability* of a citation, while keeping the citation as short and at the same time as transparent as possible. The second factor of editorial consistency is the *usability* of a text, both for the editors of the AND when they are gleaning an edition for new material, and for users of the AND when they are using the different online search options.

There are several ways for a word or citation to be selected and added to the AND, ranging from electronic concordances of texts in digital form,²² to single citation paper slips prepared by previous editors,²³ to glossaries in editions, and to reading through texts and gleaning words, all of which usually produce a list of words in alphabetical order. To run an electronic concordance of a text which is not edited following the ANTS protocol, specifically one with a more diplomatic approach, immediately highlights the problem, with words often appearing out of their alphabetical order. For example, in French, before a word beginning with a vowel, the definite article (though the phenomenon occurs as well with possessive articles, personal pronouns, relative pronouns, indefinite pronouns, conjunctions, and demonstrative pronouns) elides, leaving only the consonant. In modern French, this elision is marked by an apostrophe to separate the definite article from the corresponding noun or verb (e.g. *l'abri*, *l'absolu*, etc.), and it is also the policy for most editors of medieval French and Anglo-Norman to insert the apostrophe where needed.²⁴ Thus the two separate units, lexicographically and grammatically, are also presented that way. Evidently, even in this case an electronic concordance search must be set up in such a way that the apostrophe is read as a word divider, and not (as it usually is in modern English) as part of the word.

It has been argued in diplomatic editions that such an intervention is unnecessary, with the elision being 'intelligible in context to any reader of French

²² The online AND provides fully accessible digital versions of seventy-six of its source-texts. These can be found at <www.anglo-norman.net/sources/> [accessed 25 June 2013].

²³ Most noticeably, AND2 incorporates unpublished material compiled by the late Prof. J. P. Collas (Queen Mary College, London)

²⁴ The advice of the École des Chartes is that 'l'éditeur doit insérer, selon l'usage moderne, une apostrophe' (*Conseils pur l'édition des textes médiévaux*, 1, 43).

who has spent a few minutes getting acclimated to the text,²⁵ and that the use of an apostrophe incorrectly alters our understanding of medieval word separation. However, multiple graphies, such as *leglise*, *l'eglise*, or *le glise* (which can appear in one and the same text without any semantic differentiation) are not only prone to cause confusion in modern readers (and editors) who mistake them for different lexical units than they really are (and they look for a dictionary entry for 'glise'), but also cause significant problems for electronic text concordances in that they can scatter different instances of a given word all over the alphabet.

Another aspect of elided forms for which the AND2 has to find a practical editorial solution is word separation, when the two lexical units written together have really become one, which would then warrant a separate dictionary entry. This is the case in an expression like *lendemain* (tomorrow) which began its evolution as *endemain* but then lexicalized the definite article to it. The first edition of the AND ended up writing two entries for the same word, both under E and under L. In the second edition, this duplication has been resolved by presenting the L-variant as a cross-reference to the main entry which is under E, and which now provides variants and citations for both E-forms and L-forms.

Word division in general produces other similar practical problems: Anglo-Norman, as is common in medieval manuscripts, often has two or more words written as a single string, like, for example, *qili* (for *q'il li*), *ilia* (for *il i a*), *troi-foiz* (three times), or *mauputois* (vicious polecat). In modern editions this frequently leads to confusion about when to preserve them as a single lexical unit and when to separate them. Whereas all of the above examples are separated in the AND2, adverbs and adjectives like *tres* and *mal*, which are frequently attached to a following adjective or substantive, are seen as functioning like a prefix, so that expressions such as *tresgrant* or *malaventure* are listed as separate entries in the AND. These entries are then hyperlinked to the non-prefixed word entry as well (e.g. *grant* and *aventure*). For the negative prefix *nun*, which can precede almost any substantive, adjective or verb in Anglo-Norman, the first edition of the AND lists several pages of possible combinations (e.g. *nun-forcer*, *nunpaiement*, *nunsage*) as locutions in the *nun* entry. The second edition, however, once it reaches N, will probably treat them as separate entries. Other instances where there is some hesitation between the expression as a single word or as two, such as *lieutenant* or *franc tenant*, are normally listed under

²⁵ Marvin, 'The Unassuming Reader', p. 25.

their fused form. For the citations in the body of those entries, however, the source-edition's treatment of them is usually preserved, illustrating the validity of either interpretation. Generally, these compound words are also linked to their component parts in the dictionary, where the expression is then also listed a locution with a direct cross-reference (and hyper-link) to the compound entry: for example, the entry *liu*¹ lists the locution *liu tenant*, which cross-references directly to the entry *lieutenant*.

Again, the writing together (or not) of two words causes fundamental problems for an electronic concordance or any alphabetical approach to text material, in that a great number of attestations of a given word might be 'hidden' in the second half of a word string. Evidently, this is more acute for the diplomatic approach to editing Anglo-Norman texts, which will leave all such words strings intact.

Similar difficulties arise with electronic concordances when no distinction is made between u/v or i/j. Although it may be anachronistic, by distinguishing the vowel from the consonant the AND2 avoids confusion at the lexicological level, for modern readers, especially in French, who are less familiar with the idea that one letter can be both vowel and consonant, and makes a concordance search more consistent and therefore more reliable. The lack of use of diacritics and of distinction between i/j and u/v can also impair the understanding of the text. If the editor presents the reading *liuer*, the reader must then filter through the options available to him: is this word *l'iver* (the drunk), *l'iver* (the winter), *liver* (lip), *liver* (book), *liver* (rabbit), *liver* (pound), *luier* (to hire), *luier* (league), possibly *liner* (to line), or some newly attested variant of *liur*, *lieure*, or *luire*. The use of diacritics can at least narrow the field of possibilities.

With a significant portion of Anglo-Norman source material only available in these sorts of diplomatic editions, their inclusion into the list of texts dealt with through an electronic concordance has been inevitable. In case of the online source-texts, the decision was made (for reasons not only of copyright but also of time) not to re-edit the material but to preserve the printed edition's presentation. As a result, a citation lifted from the AND's online texts base can look different when presented within an article, for example, the line 'Lescriven de la Carrak' (from *The Port Books of Southampton*) is cited in the dictionary entry for *escrivein* as 'L'escriven de la Carrak'.²⁶ One exception was

²⁶ *The Port Books of Southampton, or (Anglo-French) Accounts of Robert Florys, Water-Bailiff and Receiver of Petty-Customs, A.D. 1427-1430*, ed. by P. Studer, Publications of the Southampton Record Society, 15 (Southampton: Cox and Sharland, 1913), p. 106.

made in the case of the abovementioned *Statutes of the Realm*, where it was felt necessary that the printed edition's great number of original abbreviations and contractions had to be expanded for its inclusion among the online source texts. Nevertheless, text material edited in this way continues to pose a challenge for electronic concordance-based analyses, and it is only through inventive use of the facilities of the online concordancer (for example, by doing a search, not just for the word *estrange* but for 'words ending with' *estrange* and thus also including attestations of *lestrange*), or, ultimately, by going through the entire alphabet, that this kind of text can be processed satisfactorily for the dictionary.

It is not just for the AND editors that this particular approach to editing Anglo-Norman text material simplifies matters and increases the *usability* of a given publication: the users of the online version of the dictionary benefit from this unified method as well. With the online AND offering a whole range of search facilities beyond merely searching by headword, it is essential that its body of text material, created by all the citations used throughout, follows the same editorial system as much as possible. It is, for example, an option now to search all of the AND2's citations for any given word in a separate concordance section. Thus, when a user searches for the word *lettré* (lettered, educated), he or she is offered eight more attestations of the word, other than the ones in the *lettré* article. These are clearly separated from the 254 attestations of the word *lettre* (without the accent) in the dictionary citation base. As another example, within any given AND2 entry, it is possible to click on any word in any citation, and a box will appear with the relevant dictionary entry for that word, together with further attestations of the same form in other citations throughout the dictionary. Again, a consistent editorial system enables this search facility to be as accurate as possible.

The main goal of the online edition of the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* is to facilitate the readability and usability of the Anglo-Norman text fragments it cites. To this end, it has favoured a unified approach to editing texts, whereby punctuation, word division, and capitalization are modernized, and diacritics are used only where they aid comprehension of a word. The role of the editor is to guide the reader to the best interpretation of the text, removing any barriers. As we have argued, the removal of these barriers also simplifies not only the making but also the use of the dictionary, allowing the user to search in a variety of parameters, without concern to word division, elision, or other hindrances, and allowing us to focus on the use of the language rather than scribal idiosyncrasies.