

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

*Published for The Old English Division
of the Modern Language Association of America
by The Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University
and its Richard Rawlinson Center for Anglo-Saxon Studies*

Editor: Jonathan Wilcox

Associate Editors: Carl T. Berkhout
Joseph B. Trahern, Jr.

VOLUME	30
NUMBER	2
WINTER	1997

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

VOLUME XXX NUMBER 2

Winter, 1997

Editor: Jonathan Wilcox
Department of English
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Associate Editors:

Joseph B. Trahern, Jr.
Department of English
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
Knoxville, TN 37996

Carl T. Berkhout
Department of English
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Publisher: Paul E. Szarmach
Medieval Institute
Western Michigan University
1201 Oliver Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3801

Assistant to the Editor: Mariah Steele
Assistant to the Publisher: Joshua A. Westgard

NOTE: The following subscription information is effective beginning with volume 32.

Subscriptions: The rate for institutions is \$20 US per volume, current and past volumes, except for volumes 1 and 2, which are sold as one. The rate for individuals is \$15 US per volume, current, future, and past volumes, but in order to reduce administrative costs the editors ask individuals to pay for volumes 32-33 at one time at the discounted rate of \$25.

General correspondence regarding *OEN* should be addressed to the Editor. Correspondence regarding the *Year's Work in Old English Studies* and the Annual Bibliography should be sent to Professors Trahern and Berkhout respectively. Correspondence regarding business matters should be sent to the Publisher.

Scholars can assist the work of *OEN* by sending two offprints of articles to the Editor and two notices of books or monographs to him.

The *Old English Newsletter* is a refereed periodical. Solicited and unsolicited manuscripts (except for independent reports and news items) are reviewed by specialists in anonymous reports.

With Volume 24 the *Old English Newsletter* moved to four issues per (American) academic year, Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer. *OEN* is published for the Old English Division of the Modern Language Association by the Richard Rawlinson Center for Anglo-Saxon Studies and Manuscript research at the Medieval Institute at Western Michigan Univ. The Departments of English at the University of Arizona, the University of Iowa, and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville support *OEN*. *OEN* receives no financial support from the MLA.

Copyright © 1998
The Board of the Medieval Institute
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3801

Editorial Offices:

E-mail: jonathan-wilcox@uiowa.edu
FAX: 319-335-2535
PHONE: 319-335-1913

Business Offices:

E-mail: mdvl_news@wmich.edu
FAX: 616-387-8750
PHONE: 616-387-8832

WWW site: <http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/oen/index.html>

Guide to the Contents of this Issue

	Page
Year's Work in Old English Studies	3
Research in Progress Report Form	
How to Reach <i>OEN</i>	

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

1995

by

John David Cormican (Utica College)
Susan E. Deskis (Northern Illinois University)
Nicole G. Discenza (University of Notre Dame)
Janet Schrunk Ericksen (Vanderbilt University)
R.D. Fulk (Indiana University)
Timothy Graham (The Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University)
J.R. Hall (University of Mississippi)
David F. Johnson (Florida State University)
Catherine E. Karkov (Miami University of Ohio)
Theodore H. Leinbaugh (University of North Carolina)
Roy M. Liuzza (Tulane University)
Matthew Marino (University of Alabama)
David A.E. Pelteret (University of Toronto)
Paul G. Remley (University of Washington)
Mary P. Richards (University of Delaware)
Kathleen D. Turner (Oklahoma Panhandle University)
Kelley Wickham-Crowley (Georgetown University)

Edited by
Joseph B. Trahern, Jr.
The University of Tennessee

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES 1995

THIS IS THE TWENTY-NINTH ISSUE of the Year's Work in Old English Studies; it is also the present editor's last. While I may at some future date offer a brief history of YWOES as an essay in the *Old English Newsletter*, I would prefer here to exit as unobtrusively as I entered upon the untimely death of founding editor Rowland Collins, whose editorial practices have been largely retained during my tenure as editor. I trust I can speak for the readership in thanking those dozens of reviewers who have contributed over the years; the bulk of the effort has been theirs, and the credit should be theirs as well.

Although I am the last of those who were present at the creation when YWOES 1967 was issued in *OEN* 2, under the aegis of Jess Bessinger, Stanley Kahrl, and Collins, with Fred Robinson as bibliographer, it should be noted that John Cormican, Milton McC Gatch, J.R. Hall, Matthew Marino, and Robert Farrell each contributed for more than twenty years, and three of them continue on the team. Carl Berkhout has performed heroically for many years in providing the bibliography from which we work, and Paul Szarmach, as editor of *OEN*, has been splendid to work with and for. I am pleased that Peter Baker of the University of Virginia, who reviewed work on *Beowulf* for us for several years and has in recent years provided layout, enhanced typography, and double-column format for the project, will succeed me as editor.

This year's supplement, History '94, was written by Timothy Graham, David A.E. Pelteret, and Dr. Nicole Discenza and coordinated by Graham. Graham will also coordinate History '95, which will appear next year along with History '96, the first essay by Richard Abels of the United States Naval Academy.

The contributors to YWOES are named on the title page, and the authorship of individual sections is indicated by initials at the end of each section. Authors work from the *OEN* bibliography of the previous spring, marking with an asterisk items not included in that bibliography and occasionally adding items from the previous year's list of "Works Not Seen." Dissertations, redactions, and summaries are occasionally omitted, and their absence in no way constitutes negative judgement. Comments and suggestions, as well as review copies of articles and books, may henceforth be sent to Professor Peter S. Baker, Department of English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903.

CONTENTS

<p>1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. History of Anglo-Saxon Studies 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Old English Studies in Spain and Germany 7</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. Language 8</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">d. Bayeux Tapestry 9</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">e. <i>Lazamon's Brut</i> 9</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">f. <i>Varia</i> 10</p> <p>2. Language 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Lexicon, Glosses 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects 13</p> <p>3. Literature 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. General and Miscellaneous 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Individual Poems 27</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. <i>Beowulf</i> 44</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">d. Prose 57</p> <p>4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works 63</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Early Anglo-Latin 63</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Aldhelm 76</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. Bede 78</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">d. Alcuin 85</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">e. Tenth and Eleventh Centuries 89</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">f. Comprehensive Works 98</p> <p>5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters 101</p>	<p>6. History (to be printed with YWOES 1996)</p> <p>7. Names 111</p> <p>8. Archaeology 114</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Excavation Reports 114</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Theory and Archaeology 121</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. Regional Studies 123</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">d. Architecture and Engineering 124</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">e. Inscriptions 125</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">f. Sculpture 127</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">g. Metalwork 128</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">h. Pottery 129</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Numismatics 130</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">j. Miscellaneous Artefacts 131</p> <p>Appendix: History and Culture 1994 131</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. <i>Stenton's Anglo-Saxon England</i> 131</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Collected Studies 132</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. General and Theoretical Studies 134</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">d. Southumbria in the Early Anglo-Saxon Period 134</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">e. Northumbria, the Celtic World, the Continent 136</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">f. The Scandinavian Connection 138</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">g. Late Anglo-Saxon England and the Conquest 141</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">h. Regional, Local, and Church Studies 143</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Historiography 146</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">j. Anglo-Saxon Law 147</p>
--	---

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. History of Anglo-Saxon Studies

WHEN DID “Old English” come to refer to the language of the Anglo-Saxons? While following the *OED* in pointing to Henry Sweet’s 1871 example as the first real equation of the terms, E.G. Stanley points out three earlier, similar examples. In “Old English = ‘Anglo-Saxon’: the Modern Sense for the Language Anticipated by Archbishop Matthew Parker in 1567, and by John Strype in 1711, Camden’s Use in *Remaines* (1605) for the Anglo-Saxon People Noted; Together with Notes on How *OED* Treats Such Terms” (*N&Q* 42: 168–73), Stanley extends the history of the term to the mid-sixteenth century, and he provides contextualizing quotation for each example. Both Parker and Strype refer to the language as old English; Camden uses the term for the people and for the language of “olde English-Saxon.” Stanley then offers an expansion and correction of the *OED* treatment of the terms Old English and Middle English; he notes, for instance, that the first use of the term *mittelenglisch* was by Jacob Grimm in 1819, not 1822.

To his initial three citations, Stanley appends one more, in “Old English = ‘Anglo-Saxon’: William Lambard’s Use in 1576” (*N&Q* 42: 437). Lambard, in a side-note in *A Perambulation of Kent*, refers to “the Saxon speach” as “the old English tongue.”

William Lambarde’s works on the Elizabethan rather than the Anglo-Saxon legal system are the subject of Wilfrid Prest’s “William Lambarde, Elizabethan Law Reform, and Early Stuart Politics” (*Jnl of Brit. Stud.* 34: 464–80). The essay does not directly deal with any of Lambarde’s antiquarian work, but does provide a fuller picture of what Lambarde perceived as the judicial ideal and his attitudes toward his contemporary legal system. Prest contextualizes Lambarde’s views and discusses how in particular Lambarde’s comments on the corruption of the Elizabethan judicial system played out in Tudor politics.

In “The Structural Plan of Camden’s *Britannia*” (*Sixteenth Century Jnl* 26: 829–41), William Rockett sets out to correct what he deems a widespread erroneous assumption concerning the focus of William Camden’s *Britannia*. The work is not primarily concerned with Roman Britain, but with a much more extensive English history. Rockett cites Camden’s own prefatory assertion of his objectives—in phrasing that was changed in the final, sixth edition of the *Britannia*, which was then translated into English in 1610—to argue that the work is neatly divided into three sections. The first section focuses on British history from Caesar to the Norman Conquest; the second and third sections attempt to identify place histories by way of a topographical survey of England, Wales, and Scotland, then of Ireland. Rockett lays out the divisions within each of these sections and argues that the *Britannia* is “unified by the closely related concepts of national origins and territorial distribution” (840). Camden’s wide ranging collection of data helped, moreover, to expand the approaches to the study of history.

Antiquaries in the period between the first publication of Camden’s *Britannia* in 1586 and the publication of a revised and enlarged *Britannia* in 1695 are the focus of Graham Parry’s *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press). Indeed, the first chapter is devoted to Camden himself and the last to the revised *Britannia*. The intervening ten chapters are mostly assigned to individual scholars; these include Richard Verstegan, Sir Robert Cotton, John Selden, James Ussher, Sir Henry Spelman and William Somner, John Weever, the group of Thomas Browne, William Burton, and Thomas Fuller, and, finally, a chapter on John Aubrey before turning to a chapter on the idea that Britain was first settled by Phoenicians. The chapters on the antiquarians themselves cover biographical material, positioning each man in the political and intellectual climate, as well as discussing their research and publications. On James Ussher, for instance, Parry provides not only thorough discussion of Ussher’s publications—including a helpful outline and analysis of both the genre context and the contents of the *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti*—but also lays out the Catholic/Protestant divisions in Ussher’s family and career; though he does not list the manuscripts with which Ussher had contact, Parry does note the prominence of Ussher’s collection, which included what is now MS Bodleian Junius 11. Parry’s individual studies of these scholars and his assessments of connections among them persuasively demonstrate that “antiquarian enquiry was the most productive area of historical research in the seventeenth century” (359).

Perhaps the antiquarian Richard Verstegan is experiencing a brief revival countering Parry’s claim of his modern obscurity, for he is also the subject of Maria Amalia D’Aronco’s, “La ‘riscoperta’ delle origini della nazione inglese: gli anglosassoni di Richard Rowland Verstegan” (*SchM* 24–25 (1994 for 1993): 52–76). D’Aronco introduces her discussion of Verstegan with background on the loss of knowledge of and the revival of interest in the Anglo-Saxon past. Though the period of 1575–1628 is, D’Aronco notes, often seen as a fallow interlude in the progression of Anglo-Saxon studies, in 1605 appeared both Camden’s *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine* and Verstegan’s *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*. Verstegan’s work, which for the first time offered to the English public a non-Brutus based history of its origins, is even more laudatory of the Saxon history of the English than is Camden’s work; Verstegan, in a move tied to the vision of the German humanists, treats only the Saxon aspect. D’Aronco further defines Verstegan as a key figure in promoting the perception of the Germanic origins of English and making it an issue of national pride. Verstegan’s published description of Old English and his glossary of terms show his facility with language study and, according to D’Aronco, are remarkably accurate. She asserts that, in fact, Verstegan’s work is scientifically superior to Camden’s, but because it appeared just after Camden’s and because Verstegan was a Catholic

supporter, it was not duly popular in its own time.

Albert H. Tricomi's edition of Robert Knightley's *Alfrede or Right Reinhron'd: a Translation of William Drury's Aluredus sive Alfredus* (Med. & Renaissance Texts & Stud., 99. Binghamton: MRTS, 1993) presents, for the first time, the 1659 play itself with an extensive introduction as well as textual notes and a bibliography. Knightley's play translates Drury's *Aluredus sive Alfredus* of 1619, for the most part, "scene-for-scene and idea-for-idea" though he modifies and updates the language (23). The translation is dedicated to Lady Mary Blount, Knightley's half-sister, but since the author signs himself only "R.K.," Tricomi's first task was to verify authorial identity. In doing so, a process he explains in the introduction, he corrects the Bodleian Library *Summary Catalogue's* entry for the sole manuscript of the translation, where it is attributed tentatively to "R. Kirkham." Tricomi demonstrates, too, the family's Catholicism and royalism, both of which inform the play. *Alfrede* is of interest in large part because of its characters and topics—drawn substantially from Asser's *Life of King Alfred*—in relation to English Catholicism at the end of Commonwealth rule. The cast includes St. Cuthbert, who serves as both a kind of chorus-like commentator and as a character, reflecting, notes Tricomi, the play's "transcendental, pietistic, royalist belief system" (49). Also present are Alfred and his household, set up against Gothurnus, King of the Danes, and his military entourage, whom Alfred stunningly defeats.

In introducing and reprinting "Eight Letters from Elizabeth Elstob" (in *The Endless Knot: Essays on Old and Middle English in Honor of Marie Borroff*, ed. M. Teresa Tavormina and R.F. Yeager (Cambridge) 241–52), Fred C. Robinson gives us Elstob's own optimistic voice in what remains a gloomy account of female scholarship cut short by a lack of economic and intellectual support. Robinson prefaces the letters with a brief biography of Elstob, who began her study of Old English at the age of fifteen, and a review of her publications. The letters themselves are all from Elstob's post-scholarly days, after the death of her primary academic supporters—her brother and George Hicks—and when she is grateful to find employment as a governess; their dates range from 1739 to 1753. Elstob downplays her desire for books and emphasizes instead the joys in her current situation, and only one letter makes direct reference to her scholarly work.

In "Owen Manning 1. On Old English *æstel* and 2. On the Aldbrough Inscription." *N&Q* 42: 10–13), E.G. Stanley calls attention to two details of eighteenth Anglo-Saxon scholarship, both drawn from letters written by Owen Manning to Richard Gough in the 1770s. Manning in the first instance connects the OE word *æstel* with "stylus," apparently referring, in none too clear phrasing, to the *æstel* entry in E. Lye and Manning's edition of the *Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum* and linking it to the relationship between the Welsh word *astel* and the eighteenth century use of *stile* as a joinery term. While Stanley notes that the correct history of *æstel* stems from the Latin *bastula*, he suggests that Manning's

interpretation of the Aldbrough memorial stone inscription might be in part more plausible than modern scholars think. The now established reading of *banum* in the inscription is as an ON reflexive pronoun; Manning (and others) read the word as a proper name. Stanley suggests that the lack of corroborative evidence and the relative simplicity of reading the word as a late OE form of the name *Hana*, meaning "cock," might make Manning's claim worth further investigation.

Wonderment is the primary response that Andrew Wawn's account of George Stephens inspires ("George Stephens, Cheapinghaven, and Old Northern Antiquity" *Stud. in Medievalism* 7: 63–104). To say that Stephens (1813–95) was a medievalist or a philologist, born in England but a resident of Sweden then Denmark, is but a small part of the story. Stephens published widely, and Wawn discusses briefly his pamphlet on an artifact known as the Dagmar Cross; his other publications range from an edition of the Old English *King Waldere's Lay* and his English translation of the Icelandic *Friðþjóf's saga* to a study text for six Shakespeare plays and a translation of a Swedish treatise on Pan-Scandinavianism. The focus of Wawn's discussion is, however, Stephens's *Revenge, or Woman's Love* (1857), a Viking play set in tenth-century Sweden and Mercia, and the ways in which it reflects and interacts with political and philological issues raised in Stephens's other works and in Victorian culture. Those issues, in particular, include: "the nature of nobility, the significance of Mercia as a setting, the role of religion, the value of popular literary tradition, and, overarching everything, the idea and ideal of the Old North" (75). Stephens was not a Morris-like romantic about the Scandinavian past, but he nevertheless saw an "Old Northern Glory" that had been transmitted to England, which he saw as Scandinavia's primary cultural colony while Iceland was its secondary colony.

A take on English medievalism contemporary with Wawn's is examined by Clare A. Simmons in "Anglo-Saxonism, the Future, and the Franco-Prussian War" (*Stud. in Medievalism* 7: 131–42). Simmons focuses on the 1860s and 1870s, when the idea of significant Saxon survivals in English culture was newly being argued as provable by linguistic and philological study and was being addressed to the future rather than the past. This stress on England's Germanic connections came just after, and in part in response to, the Franco-Prussian War, when arguments were also being made for a Roman-like Germanic world dominance. Simmons cites as one popularizer of these ideas in Britain the German philologist Max Müller, whose lectures encouraged both the identification of the English (and the Americans) with their Anglo-Saxon heritage and their connection with contemporary Germany. Simmons then turns to a few literary instances in which these ideas found support, notably in Edward Bulwer-Lytton's *The Coming Race*, a science fiction novel dedicated to Müller.

Taken from an oral presentation to the British Association for Local History, H.R. Loyn's "Anglo-Saxon Studies: a Comment" (*Local Historian* 25.1: 3–6) is an overview of the

field from the mid-1940s to 1994, during Loyn's own career and from a personal perspective. He begins with Stenton and Whitelock and recounts a succession of particular areas of strength within Anglo-Saxon studies, from numismatics to archaeology and, most recently, to diplomatic studies, on charters and literature, both in Latin and Old English.

Loyn offers a more extensive account of Whitelock's career, and indeed her whole life, in his biographical essay, "Dorothy Whitelock (1901–1982)" in *Medieval Scholarship*, 1, ed. Helen Damico and Joseph B. Zavadil (New York and London) 289–300. From her *Anglo-Saxon Wills* in 1930, through her edition of Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, *The Audience of Beowulf*, *English Historical Documents*, and numerous articles, to an edition of church related documents, *Councils and Synods*, edited with M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke in 1981, Loyn traces Whitelock's work and friendships (with people such as Frank and Doris Stenton). Her significant contributions to Anglo-Saxon studies stem, Loyn concludes, from her blend of linguistic and historical work.

The same collection of essays includes James Campbell's biography of "William Stubbs (1825–1901)" (77–87). Less personal than the coverage of Whitelock, the Stubbs biography positions this Victorian historian among his contemporaries and explains both his place in the rise of history as a university field and the decline of his reputation. Stubbs' strength in medieval studies was his textual focus, evidenced in the volumes he published in the Rolls Series. Not until the 1960s was his reputation seriously undermined by re-evaluation of both his arguments and his perspective; until then, his *Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History* was a widely used undergraduate text and, despite contemporary attacks from historian Frederic William Maitland, Stubbs' *Constitutional History of England in Its Origins and Development* enjoyed long prominence. Campbell asserts that Stubbs' work still merits some attention.

Part of the publication history of Anglo-Saxon studies is addressed by Hans Sauer in "Anglistik im Max Niemeyer Verlag" (in *Beiträge zur Methodengeschichte der neueren Philologien*, ed. Robert Harsch-Niemeyer (Tübingen) 193–203). Both the Max Niemeyer publishing house and the German university designation of English as a separate field of study appeared in 1870. Sauer surveys both the journals published by Niemeyer Verlag, primarily *Anglia*, from Moritz Trautmann's early association on, and the books that illustrate the publishing house's promotion of the study of Old English grammar and literature and of historical linguistics. Among its earliest publications is Eduard Sievers' *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, which first appeared in 1882, and continues, with Karl Brunner's revisions, to be a useful reference.

John P. Hermann brings the history of Old English studies up to date with his discussion of "Why Anglo-Saxonists Can't Read: Or, Who Took the Mead out of Medieval Studies?" (*Exemplaria* 7: 9–26). While his focus is on recent scholarship, Hermann first positions current approaches in relation to those of the past; both he sees as largely

governed by the same basic impulses. These he categorizes as "the three commandments of Old English criticism: *Reflect*—allow yourself to become the ideal reader of the text, as preparation for *Eulogy*—always praise the text, author and period, and *Defend* when necessary" (13). All hinder the kind of detached literary/cultural examinations Hermann would promote. Hermann then briefly catalogues and critiques recent critics and their efforts to utilize post-structuralist literary theory in Old English studies, and, in an appendix, documents responses to those efforts. Those critics whose theoretical readings still tend to "eulogize" Hermann finds unsuccessful. He is hopeful, however, that a few contemporaries along with those for whom theoretical approaches are not new or alien will guide the future.

b. Old English Studies in Spain and Germany

THREE COLLECTIONS of material from Spain indicate that Anglo-Saxon studies are thriving there. *Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, *Cursos e congresos*, 74 (Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1993), edited by Teresa Fanego Lema, includes thirty papers, in English, from the 1991 conference. Those papers on Old English subjects are covered under the appropriate headings below; the remainder, more than half, primarily deal with Middle English. One essay relevant to both areas is that by Santiago Gonzalez Fernández-Corugedo and Fernando García García, who argue that it is time to impose order on computerized medieval texts as we work towards creating a database of all Old English texts and all literary Middle English texts. In proposing "A Set of Guidelines for Editing and Encoding Old and Middle English Machine-Readable Texts" (125–41), the writers' aim is to help make texts readable in a wide variety of computer programs and systems. To this end, they suggest using ASCII characters with a standard set of textual markers and producing absolutely minimally edited texts.

A. Bravo, F. Galván, and S. González offer *Old and Middle English Studies in Spain: a Bibliography* (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, SELIM, 1994), which begins with an overview of the field's history in Spanish universities. The entries are preceded by an alphabetical list of authors, then broken down into topics ranging from Ælfric and Wulfstan through Theatre, including area studies such as Translation and Epic as well as specific authors and texts.

Antonio Bravo and María José Mora provide a prose expansion on the bibliography in their review of the state of "Anglo-Saxon Studies in Spain" (*OEN* 29.1: 23–27). Bravo covers the history of teaching OE in Spain, beginning with the first university offering in 1952 at Salamanca and the creation of a position in Germanic philology at Madrid in 1953. Medieval English Literature has grown to be a compulsory component of some English Studies programs, and Bravo includes in his discussion of Old English offerings the textbooks both in English and Spanish most often used. Mora

focuses on Old English scholarship in Spain and notes both its high percentage of studies utilizing contemporary literary or linguistic theory and its recent rapid rise of more traditionally-focused studies as the field has gained surer footing. The emphasis on newer approaches, she suggests, may be due in part to the relative newness of the field, and the corresponding scarcity of resources available for studying it, in Spain. Programs such as the Spanish Society for the Study of Medieval English are helping improve the status of the field in Spain, but Mora argues that scholars themselves need to, and generally want to, do more.

Hans Sauer divides his review of the state of "Old English Studies in Germany, ca. 1965-95" (*OEN* 28.3: 11-22) into six short sections. The first three outline the structure, degree system, and noted scholars and emphases of German universities, including those in former East Germany. The fourth summarizes the means of public academic exchange, including associations, conferences, and publishing houses, and the fifth section makes note of the areas that Sauer has left out his survey. Finally, a selective bibliography, in large part drawn from references in the preceding sections, suggests both the range and extent of Old English studies in Germany in the last thirty years.

c. Language

THE LACK of influence that spoken language forms have had on the development of written forms is traced by N.F. Blake in "Speech and Writing: an Historical Overview" (*YES* 25: 6-21). Blake's survey—which may provide a concise reference for history of the language teachers—begins with Old English and a discussion of the role of Latin and translation from Latin. The elevated status of Latin accounts in part for the modelling in English of Latin prose style, but in addition Old English texts translated from Latin were the Anglo-Saxon educational core. The result is that "[a]ll users of English were exposed to a constant bombardment of texts in a translated English" (10), and these patterns, not those of spoken Old English, provided the prose standard. The Latin model remains forceful as French influence rises in English, and Blake points out that even even a lack of French or Latin forms in a piece of writing does not necessitate or clearly suggest that spoken forms were instead being used. His examples from "The Knight's Tale" and "The Reeve's Tale" demonstrate that even when written language appears to utilize elements, from dialect, for instance, of spoken language, audience demands lead to simplification and stylization of language difference. Shakespeare's plays provide Blake's next period examples of the literary untrustworthiness of dialect and colloquialism representation. Editorial practice, Blake suggests, often unintentionally magnifies minimal distinctions in language. The survey then moves through a discussion of the eighteenth century relationship between morals and language and nineteenth century levels of style as language moves away from the Latin model. Despite increased individualism in written language, Blake concludes that "the

difference between speech and writing has become more marked rather than the reverse" (20).

An Invitation to Old English and Anglo-Saxon England (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell), offered by Bruce Mitchell, is fairly enticing, but is primarily extended to non-Anglo-Saxonists and those who are not yet, nor may ever intend to be, serious students of the field, though certain undergraduate classes might certainly make use of the book. The *Invitation* is organized as an unthreatening five-course menu, and Mitchell encourages readers to taste just what appeals to them and in any order. Sections I and II, in a manner often identical to Mitchell and Robinson's *Guide to Old English*, present an outline of OE language and grammar, and Section V offers the traditional paradigms; Section III provides an historical introduction to Anglo-Saxon England; and Section IV switches from the menu motif to that of a literary "garden," with "Plants from the Prose" and "Blooms from the Poetry." Accompanying these sections are thirty-six illustrations, a chronology, a bibliography, a glossary that supplements the glosses and notes provided alongside the literature, and indices. The book stresses connections among sections, often providing, for instance, in addition to introductory material for each reading, cross-references to translated passages in other sections of the book. It appears for the most part an easy to use text, though Mitchell's discussion of punctuation may prove somewhat baffling, particularly for anyone trying to read texts other than those in the *Invitation*. Mitchell sets up, in brief form, his own system of punctuation, involving pointing, double commas, and equal signs marking *apo koinu* constructions; he continues to argue for this system, and his proposal has so far sparked interesting discussion of editorial procedure (including at the 1997 Leeds Medieval Congress). The author's well-conveyed enthusiasm for his subject, though it will be part of a larger, dated, and perhaps less attractive attitude to some readers, may work as he hopes, to draw in new students or at least readers of Old English; his material may more immediately also prove of use as a reference for teachers.

Studies on Frisian philology from a 1994 symposium are collected in *Friesische Studien II* (Odense: Odense Univ. Press), edited by Volkert F. Faltings, Alastair G.H. Walker, and Ommo Wilts. Most of the ten essays are reviewed under the appropriate heading below; the exceptions are Nils Arhammar's work "Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Nordfriesen und des Nordfriesischen," Martin Richards et al. on "Mitochondrial DNA and the Frisians," and Horst H. Munske's "Bemerkungen zu Situation und Perspektiven der Frisistik in Deutschland," as well as Elmar Seebold's "Wer waren die Friesen—sprachlich gesehen?" Seebold's essay (1-17) does not ultimately offer an answer to the question his title poses; instead, it reviews the overlapping backgrounds of the Germanic dialects (especially Saxon) and the peoples associated with them, and offers Seebold's hypothesis on the original language of Frisia. Seebold searches for the origins and explanations of the speech barrier between the Frisians

and Franks and Saxons, doing so in part by comparing what medieval authors mean by terms such as "Angles," "Euten," and "Saxon." If a Frisian person, asks Seebold, can be an "Euten," can "Frisian" language refer to "Euten" language? If the original language of Frisia was Germanic, it was a variety of Low Frankish; if, however, it came from "Euten," then it may not have been Germanic. Seebold's short answer to his title question is that he does not know, but one possibility is that they were "die nordwestlichsten Kontinentalgermanen, überlagert von eutischen Sachsen" (16).

d. Bayeux Tapestry

ROUBEN CHOLAKIAN's discussion of "Eating and Drinking in the Bayeux Tapestry" (*Medieval Food and Drink*, ed. Mary-Jo Arn, Acta, 21 (Binghamton) 99-125) develops from his contention that the various pieces and perspectives in the borders and central narrative were not necessarily constructed as "a unified political vision" but instead might reflect the numerous impulses of those who worked on the embroidery. Two scenes of eating and drinking both interrupt the primary political account and suggest ways of reading from, for instance, an anthropological, religious, or socio-economic perspective. The bulk of the article is Cholakian's description in rather conversational detail (with accompanying photographs) of the components of both scenes, the more elaborate of which shows the Normans bringing food from France to England, then the feast on English soil before battle. This banquet and its position in the narrative, he suggests, might be figured eucharistically, imparting both spiritual and physical strength before battle.

Though he, too, acknowledges the multiple embroidering hands at work in the Bayeux Tapestry, Daniel Terkla's study of the interactions of the borders and central frame of the Tapestry suggest a single, overseeing designer, to whose master plan individuals might have added their own flourishes. "Cut on the Norman Bias: Fabulous Borders and Visual Glosses on the Bayeux Tapestry" (*Word and Image* 11: 264-90) is a careful, thorough study of the intratextual interactions between the border images of Norman chevrons and Aesopic fables and the main narrative presentation. The article begins with a summary of the Tapestry narrative, then positions that narrative in relation to the English regnal conflict; the central argument of the article focuses on the visual presentation of Harold's treacherous actions. Terkla's reiterated thesis, supported by examination of the pattern of chevron appearances and by full analysis of each of the nine fables illustrated, is that while the main frame can be read without reference to the borders, an integrated reading emphasizes the Norman bias of the piece and provides commentary on events in the primary narrative. Extensive illustration in the form of good line drawings accompanies the article, with references throughout to the color plate numbers in D.M. Wilson's reproduction of the Tapestry.

e. *Lazamon's Brut*

The Text and Tradition of Lazamon's 'Brut', in *Arthurian*

Studies, 33 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1994) contains seventeen essays which, according to their editor, Françoise Le Saux, "may be said to give an accurate image of the present state of *Lazamon studies*" (x); the essays, which stemmed from the *Brut* conference at the University of Lausanne in 1992, provide both review of and reference to widely accepted research as well as present newer and more controversial readings.

Perhaps the most immediately useful part of Carole Weinberg's discussion of "The Latin Marginal Glosses in the Caligula Manuscript of *Lazamon's Brut*" (103-20) is the appendix that neatly lists all sixteen of the glosses concerned. Of those, fifteen are medieval and most of these are annalistic in nature. Weinberg describes each gloss, its placement in the manuscript, and links it to possible sources, including Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* (in passages drawn from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*), Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*, Marianus Scotus' *Chronicon*, and the *Worcester Chronicle*. Based on these sources, and the fact that no glossing occurs in the Arthurian section of the *Brut*, she also suggests a twelfth century date for the glosses. While most of these glosses emphasize the historicity of the *Brut*, commenting or expanding upon details of church history or kings' reigns, two of the fifteen differ; both are written in red rather than black ink and in a larger hand. One briefly points out the part of the *Brut* that describes the five kingdom division of England; the other, "deo gratias," Weinberg describes as a personal reaction to the account of Vortigern's death.

In "Angles and Saxons in *Lazamon's Brut*: a Reassessment" (161-70), Neil Wright contests Ian Kirby's claim that the Saxons in the text "are characterised as wicked, cruel and treacherous" while the Angles "receive *Lazamon's* sympathy and approval" (161). He begins his argument with an examination of the *Brut's* sources and their treatment of the Angles and Saxons. In Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, the end-section references to the Angles are, argues Wright, attributable to a switch in sources, from the Welsh-Latin *Historia Brittonum* and Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae* to Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*; this shift is then picked up by the *Brut*. The *Brut's* emphasis on historical chronology further leads *Lazamon* to figure Hengest as a Saxon but from a continental place called Angles. The linkage here of Angles and Saxons Wright posits as preparatory explanation for the shift in name from *Britannia* to *Anglia*. Further examples of both Wace's and *Lazamon's* concern with this name change complete Wright's argument that for *Lazamon* Angles and Saxons were not significantly distinct. Though he agrees with Kirby that *Lazamon* does sympathize with the English near the end of the poem, Wright attributes this once again to *Lazamon's* source and the English Christian ascendancy rather than to any coherent scheme of opposition between Angles and Saxons.

Lazamon's amplifications of Wace's *Roman de Brut* in his depiction of Saxon savagery are the subject of James Noble's essay, "*Lazamon's 'Ambivalence' Reconsidered*" (171-82). Noble supports his claim of *Lazamon's* "systematic" darken-

ing of the Saxons by citing examples such as the multiplication of Wace's one reference to Saxon treachery in the Aldolf-Hengest battle to seven and the expansion of Wace's couplet length mention of Rowena's poisoning of King Vortimer to a sixty-six line dramatic narrative. Once Noble establishes the tendency, he addresses the complex issue of Lazamon's motivations. He argues that instead of presenting the Norman conquest as evidence of divine displeasure with the Saxons, as Daniel Donoghue suggests, Lazamon sets up a parallel between the Norman take-over and the earlier Saxon take-over of Britain. The centrality of the Arthur section to the *Brut* can then be explained as offering hope for salvation, in the figure of Arthur, at a time of disintegration in England. The nationalism such a reading implies is defended by Noble as a precursor to the true and more widespread nationalism of later centuries and as a result of Lazamon's distinction between two groups of Saxon settlers in England. Those associated with Hengest and the early invasions of Briton are condemned and compared to the Normans; those associated with Gurmund and the later, invited settlement of Briton are not condemned and are, concludes Noble, Lazamon's own imagined ancestors.

f. Varia

MILDRED BUDNY and Timothy Graham provide ample illustration to support their discussion of the remaining, rearranged pieces of "Les cycles des saints Dunstan et Alphège dans les vitraux romans de la cathédrale de Canterbury" (*CCM* 38: 55-78). The original windows depicting scenes from the lives of the Anglo-Saxon saints Dunstan and Alphège date from around 1180 and may have been intended to occupy windows around the sepulchres of the saints; what remains now, in three triforium windows, was positioned after the 1942 bombardment. Budny and Graham describe the contents of the surviving six scenes from the life of St. Dunstan and three from the life of St. Alphège, then offer careful identifications and interpretations of each, refining and revising previous assessments. These reassessments are drawn substantially from written sources; the Dunstan cycle in particular corresponds in certain details with Eadmer's version of the saint's life. By restoring some of what may have been the contemporary understanding of the scenes' content, Budny and Graham offer a glimpse of the "Anglo-Norman reinterpretation of the Anglo-Saxon heritage" (78).

The answer to the question, "Where Are the Anglo-Saxons in the Gododdin Poem?" (*ASSAH* 8: 95-98) is, Craig Cessford argues, nowhere. The poem survives in a thirteenth century Welsh version, though it deals with sixth and seventh century events in the kingdom of Gododdin in south-east Scotland. Scholars have traditionally identified the enemies described in the poem with the Anglo-Saxons, taking, for instance, the poem's references to the *saesson* as "Saxons." Cessford examines each instance of words that might confirm this connection and argues that none is conclusive. While Saxons and Angles are certainly mentioned in the poem, Cessford suggests that these are the result of Welsh additions

to the original work.

Geoffrey Ashe reviews the problematic attempts to isolate a historical figure that corresponds with the literary Arthur, then prefaces his search for "The Origins of the Arthurian Legend" (*Arthuriana* 5: 1-24) by suggesting that the question of "did Arthur exist" should be replaced by "how did the Arthurian Legend originate; what facts is it rooted in?" (3). Ashe's investigation begins with an attempt to establish that the legend is at least as old as the stories suggest it is. Archaeological evidence at Tintagel, Glastonbury, and Cadbury indicates that, indeed, these were significant sites in the fifth century. The physical concurrence suggests enough of a tradition for Ashe to turn to the individuals who might have inhabited these places. While acknowledging Geoffrey of Monmouth's unreliability as a historian, Ashe argues that Geoffrey for the most part bases his accounts in some thread of fact or supposed fact; in his description of the Saxons' arrival in Britain, Geoffrey had the basics correct, despite his elaborations, and this suggests to Ashe the possibility that Geoffrey really did have some now-lost source. Asserting the unlikelihood that Geoffrey completely manufactured the lengthy Gallic Arthurian episodes, Ashe assesses the dates associated with Arthur, narrows them to the most plausible—the second half of the fifth century—and then discusses the evidence for the existence of a "King of the Britons" who actually did campaign in Gaul in this period. Rather than directly citing the "original texts" that name or title this king "Riothamus," Ashe focuses on how other sources might have linked him to Arthur or support such a connection. Ashe's conclusion is that this Riothamus might account for some of the elements of the legendary Arthur; though he takes pains to offer alternatives, Ashe does seem to think that Riothamus can indeed be associated with a real historical figure named Arthur.

R. W. Hanning's response to Ashe's arguments ("*Inventio Arthuri: A Comment on the Essays of Geoffrey Ashe and D. R. Howlett*," 96-100) both praises Ashe's enthusiasm for his hunt and questions some of his evidence. Notably, Hanning points to a disjunction between the papal dates cited and the dates Ashe gives to Arthur; Ashe's arguments, however persuasively presented, are, says Hanning, "often held together by somewhat flimsy connectives" (98).

Helen Damico and George Brown together provide an account of work on the *Bede's World* reconstruction between 1993 and 1995 ("*Rebuilding Bede's World*," *OEN* 29.1: 28-31, ill.). Damico describes primarily the recovery of a landscape that had gone from sustaining Bede and his contemporaries to a modern industrial wasteland. Trees, wild plants, and crops typical of Anglo-Saxon England had been substantially replanted at the time of Damico's visit. The farm, known as Gywe Farm and built using Anglo-Saxon techniques, likewise included varieties of cattle, sheep, and goats that mimic the contemporary holdings. And if the physical beauty of the place is not enticing enough, Damico notes an improvement in the guides to interpreting the monastic site and to this George Brown adds a description of the *Bede's*

World museum. At the time of Brown's visit only the first of seven planned building phases was completed, the courtyard garden and the current exhibit depicting the history of the place, using Bede's writings, up to the building of the Monastery of St. Paul in 681; these alone suggest the worth of continued funding for the project.

D.G. Scragg ("The Bible in *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*," *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77.3: 199–203) suggests that by the year 2000, we will have available a register of all surviving quotations from or paraphrases of the Bible in Old English and Anglo-Latin literature, with distinctions made between the Vulgate and other versions of the Bible as well as among Psalter versions. Already becoming available are indices from the *Fontes* database; these Scragg demonstrates, by reference to a quotation from Vercelli homily V in three varying manuscripts, as useful in assessing the familiarity of a variety of biblical traditions in Anglo-Saxon England.

The second edition of C.P. Biggam's *Anglo-Saxon Studies: A Select Bibliography* (Worthing, W. Sussex: þa Englisca Gesiðas) expands on and improves the organization of the first and provides in printed form some of the updatings that continue in the online version (<http://catriona.lib.strath.ac.uk:80/BUBL/SUBJECTS/anglosax/bibsrc.html>). Designed as an initial rather than a comprehensive reference work, the bibliography is devoted primarily to books exclusively concerned with the Anglo-Saxons; Biggam leaves out, for instance, journal articles and essays in collections. The bibliography has eleven sections with subdivisions, ranging from traditional scholarly areas such as Old English language, palaeography, and numismatics to fiction and children's books.

Ann Hagen's *A Second Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Food and Drink: Production and Distribution* (Hockwold cum Wilton, Norf: Anglo-Saxon Books) is a substantial collection of information on the history of food supply in England from c. 400–c. 1100. Hagen draws material from both primary—documentary and archaeological—sources as well as secondary ones, and each heading in this compendium includes extensive footnotes; she provides as well a useful introduction, conclusion, bibliography, and index. The book makes no attempt to present new scholarship, but focuses instead on collating material for reference and overview. Hagen presents fifteen sections on food production, ranging from cereal crops to domesticated and wild animals, imported to tabooed foods, the water supply to fermented drinks; on food distribution are

seven sections, with topics such as measures, theft, monastic food supply, and hospitality and charity. The book's companion volume is *A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Food: Processing and Consumption* (1992).

Piergiuseppe Scardigli, in "Johannes Hoops als Philologe und Begründer des *Reallexikons der germanischen Altertumskunde*" (*General Ling.* 34 (1994): 203–08), both outlines Johannes Hoops's life (1865–1949) and traces the production history of his major work, the *Encyclopedia of Germanic Archaeology*. Though Hoops also published a substantial account of the trees and plants in Germanic antiquity, it was the *Reallexikon* and the information that it brought together that earned him—and, argues Scardigli, should continue to earn him—appreciation.

As wide-ranging as its title suggests, Tony Linsell's *Anglo-Saxon Mythology, Migration & Magic* (Pinner, Mddx: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1994) fabricates an overview of English history from creation to the sixth century, followed by a discussion of runes, the core of which is an illustrated translation and expansion of the OE "Rune Poem." The account of English prehistory is adapted from Snorri's Edda, which is then blended into an account of early English history adapted from Tacitus—sources are not, however, cited within the text. Linsell then moves to discussion of aspects of paganism, focusing on the role of witches, wizards, and rituals associated with them, citing translated examples from OE literature, often charms. He concludes with a brief discussion of the relationship of Christianity and runes.

Parke Godwin's novelization of *Beowulf*, *The Tower of Beowulf* (New York: Morrow), begins by positioning events in relation to a mythic past. Grendel's mother, the offspring of Loki and a giantess, falls in love with "Shild Scefing" and by him produces Grendel. The subsequent narrative follows *Beowulf* more closely, though it does so within the limits of a modern novel, stressing psychological motivation. While Godwin incorporates a surprising number of details from the Old English text, some of the digressions are inevitably left out. The novel is a respectful elaboration on the narrative that may appeal to a wider audience than the Old English reaches; Godwin in his afterword cites a "recent newspaper article" that refers to *Beowulf* as "a book no one has read," and he hopes his novel will "send interested readers to the original work" (245).

Memorials for Rupert Bruce-Mitford and Jackson J. Campbell also were published this year.

J.S.E.

2. Language

a. Lexicon, Glosses

L. Ayoub's "Old English *weta* and the Medical Theory of the Humours" (*JEGP* 94, 332–46) proposes that OE *weta* denotes the doctrine of humours. When *weta* occurred and was associated with illness, it usually occurred with *yfel* or some other pejorative adjective. In addition, OE has many terms for pus and mucus. Old English sources which support this and

explain the OE understanding of humoral theory are cited. Most of these OE texts are translations of or derived from Latin works. Ayoub believes the many different meanings of *weta* might have made it difficult for scholars to study the humoral theory in OE. S. Rubin's "Æthelberht 36. A Medico-Linguistical Discussion on the Word *bion*" (*Nottingham Med. Stud.* 39, 19–25) argues against Lieber-

mann's interpretation of *bion* as meaning "dura mater". He bases his argument on the confusion surrounding linguistic evidence and the general lack of medical/clinical knowledge. Perhaps *bion* refers to skin over skull and the skull rather than the membranes around the brain.

C.P. Biggam in "Sociolinguistic aspects of Old English colour lexemes" (*ASE* 24, 51–65) discusses Old English colour terms with reference to Berlin and Kay's seminal work. Biggam focuses on the OE words denoting the blue and gray ranges, *hæwen* and *har*. *Hæwen* appears to be a macrocolor term originally associated with MOULDY and DOWNY in Germanic cognates, extended to PALE GREY, PALE BLUE and PALE GREEN. It evolved among those OE speakers educated in Latin into a specific color term for BLUE. Biggam discusses the sociolinguistic aspects of color terms in learned vocabulary language, poetic vocabulary, specialized vocabulary, and popular vocabulary. He concludes that *hæwen* did not become a basic color term in OE because it was used only by those using a learned vocabulary. This non-basic term status and use only by those with learned vocabulary helps to explain why *hæwen* did not survive into ME.

E. Buhofer's Universität Zürich dissertation, "Stabende Kompositain Rechtstexten und poetischen Denkmälern der altgermanischen Sprachen" (viii, 329 pp.) is much in the tradition of Sievers (1893), but with a more marked appreciation for what is called semantic classification. Alliterative compounds are of relatively high frequency because Gmc verse encouraged them and traditional legal language entailed them. An obligatory engagement of distinguishing compounds from other phenomena is intelligent but no more successful than many others. The metrics are basically Sievers with a fair acknowledgment of Cable's (1974) suggestions; Pope (1942) and Bliss (1958) are admired but not particularly central to the discussion. The twenty-one semantic types are really syntactic in structure, describing the functional relationship of one member of the compound to the other. The bulk of the work resides in a "critical catalog" of entries that contains citation, metric, "semantic," and formal information. The work finally speaks to the associative and defining characteristics of the Gmc compounds as the possible reason for their persistence where one might not have expected them.

M.S. Grant and D. Moffat's "Lazamon's Archaistic Use of the Verbal Prefix *To-*" (*The Text and Tradition of Lazamon's Brut*, pp. 15–28) focuses on Lazamon's use of the *to-*(2) prefix and whether Lazamon used it in a deliberate, archaistic manner since all instances of it were not eliminated by the Otho revisor. The *Brut* does contain OE *to-*(2) words, but also contains *to-*(2) words not found elsewhere in either OE or ME. Lazamon prefixed *to-*(2) to ME words which normally did not take the prefix as well as using OE words that contained *to-*(2). Grant and Moffat conclude that Lazamon was at times imitating the verse style of OE. Lazamon's use of these forms then is not simply archaic, it is archaistic.

J.A. Harðarson, in "Nord. *metta*, altengl. *mettian*, altind. *mādāyate* und der Ansatz einer uridg. Wurzel **med-* 'satt/voll werden'" (*Historische Sprachforschung* 108, 207–35), gathers

the materials of the title into a relatively coherent history. The root **med-* 'become sated/full' exists next to a homonym meaning 'measure'. The traces left in various languages are as follows: Vedic *māda-*^{ti} 'get drunk/full', *mādaite* 'become drunk', causative *mādāya-*^{te} 'sate oneself'; ON *mettr* 'full' < Gmc **matīða-* 'satiated' represents the past participle of a causative **matja-* 'sated', which is later lost in Gmc, but which is the active counterpart to Vedic *mādāya-*^{te} (The denominative N *metta* and OE *mettian* 'sated' are based on that same past participle.); Latin *madēre* 'be full/drunken' < **m_hd-eh_h* 'be in the condition of being full'; Greek *μειστός* 'full' < **m_hd-tó-* 'sated'; on the other hand, Latin has a homonym meaning "wet, moist" and Greek *μαδάω* "moist". J. Holland's "Dictionary of Old English: 1995 Progress Report" (*OEN* 29.1, 9–10) tells us that work on the project continues. The E fascicle was to be published in 1996 and F fascicle was about half completed. The Electronic Corpus was placed on the Web for the University of Toronto and with luck will be available for the rest of us soon. Funding remains a problem, but a challenge grant was met and another given.

G. Kjellmer's "A 'New' Old English Word" (Stockholm Stud. in Eng., 85, 7–16) [*geat*] suggests OE **geat* as a new word. It is related to but not the same as OE *geat*. Proposing OE **geat* helps to explain more place names than OE *geat*, and cognates exist in other Gmc languages.

P. Lendinara's "Aldhelm, *occa* and Its Old English Glosses" (*Mediaevistik* 7 [1994], 143–53) discusses Aldhelm's use of *occa* in *Carmina ecclesiastica*, *Carmen de virginitate*, and in *De virginitate*. Lendinara argues that *occa* is correctly paired with OE *fealh* "ploughed land". It has the same meaning when used by Aldhelm. C. Morini's "*Xenodochium* nelle glosse anglosassoni ai *Bella Parisiacae Urbis* di Abbone di St Germain-des-Prés." (*Aevum* 69, 347–55) provides evidence that *þearfana bus* is a correct interpretation of *Xenodochium* in the *Bella Parisiacae Urbis*. I. McDougall's "Some Remarks on Dorothy Bethurum's Treatment of Glosses in MS. Bodleian Hatton 113" (*ANQ* 8.4, 3–4) notes some difficulties with Bethurum's transcriptions of glosses in the Bodleian Hatton 113. Bethurum mistook the *o* at the end of 153, really a large period, for an "o". McDougall laments this mistake and others in the same edition of the manuscript because of the renewed interest in glossing and the works of Wulfstan of York. The problems McDougall mentions all involve misreadings or failure to offer a reading for unclear glosses. D.W. Porter's "Old English *fætfellere* and Its Latin Equivalent" (*N&Q* 42, 265–67) contends that equating OE *fætfellere* to Lat *abatis* has obscured the range of interpretation. *Fætfellere* must specifically refer to a royal 'cupfiller' rather than just any cupfiller if it is equivalent to Lat *abatis*.

The abstract of P.R. McKinney's dissertation "*To munde us sylfum: a Semantic Study of the Old English Legal Terms for Protection*" (*DAI* 55A, 3839) notes that the study concerns itself with the legal and extralegal uses of *mund*, *frīð*, *grīð*, and *borg*, all of which refer to "legal protection". The use of these words is context sensitive and OE writers distinguish the meanings of the four words and words appearing to be

synonyms. J.R. Schwyter's "Old English Legal Language: the Example of Theft in the Law-Codes and Documents Containing Lawsuits" (*Index to Theses* 44, 510) is another entry into the field of legal language. Schwyter discusses the lexical-semantic field of THEFT as found in OE law codes and charters. THEFT covers words referring to theft and related crimes.

D. Moffat's "Umbiden and umbreiden: An Unnoticed Middle English Prefix" (*Leeds Stud. in Eng.* 26, 29–34) argues that ME *um-* is a distinct prefix from the common *um-*. It has none of the meanings of "encircle". In *umbiden* and *umbreiden* the *um-* is more closely related to *up-*. This prefix developed after the more common one but is clearly unrelated to it.

H.F. Nielsen's "The Emergence of the *os* and *ac* Runes in the Runic Inscriptions of England and Frisia: a Linguistic Assessment" (*Friesische Studien II*, 19–34) is less concerned with the development of graphic representation of runes than the development of new runes themselves. Nielsen concludes that *os* developed before *ac*; that graphically, *os* was probably invented both in England and on the continent; and that *ac* could have originated in either Frisia or England.

Several works this year were general ones on the history of English or brief explanations of Old English and/or Middle English. F.C. Robinson's "Old English" (*The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* [1994], pp. 2868–71) covers concisely and appropriately the major aspects of OE. Sections include "germanic connections, origin of OE, Dialects, Written Records, Grammar and Sound System, and Foreign Influences". S. Hussey's *The English Language: Structure and Development* (xiv, 188 pp) is a short, general history of English most suitable for the beginning student. The six main chapters concentrate on the word and phrase levels and covers each period of English. A. van Kemenade's "Old and Middle English" (*The Germanic Languages* [1994], pp. 110–41) describes the transition between OE and ME in traditional areas of phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. van Kemenade mentions that the Vikings may have had as much or more influence in the shift from OE to ME as the French, but that this can't be verified.

N.H. Renton's "A Cognitive Analysis of OE *swa*" (DAI 55A, 3496) attempts to deliver the item from its multifarious classification as conjunction, adjective, adverb, and pronoun to the conceptual haven of cognitive grammar. The dissertationally obligatory review of other grammatical methods and the success of cognitive grammar as a delineator of the polysemy of *swa* is not surprising. (Con) "junctive, deixis, and polysemy" are the concepts applied to the mostly narrative analysis that describes the metaphoric and anaphoric functions of *swa*-marked units. The OE *swa* is derived from a "fuzzy package of demonstrative, adjectival, and junctive meanings, with an attendant element of instrumentality" that surrounds IE **so*, later including IE **to-so*.

J. Roberts and C. Kay, with L. Grundy, *A Thesaurus of Old English* (2 vols., xxxv, 1555 pp.) is a long awaited offshoot of Samuels' *Historical Thesaurus of English*. The first volume is organized into categories that are summarized in the table of

contents. The second volume is an alphabetized index of all the words and phrases in the first volume. The original twenty-six major categories of the *Historical Thesaurus* have been reduced to eighteen by the OE world-view and vocabulary. Generations of students and scholars will be pleased by the organization and compilation despite the disclaimer that "any thesaurus is somewhat a of a blunt instrument, sacrificing semantic or grammatical specificity to breadth of conceptual coverage." Of course, it will ultimately be on the shelf next to the *Dictionary of Old English*.

C. Tkacz's "Unlocking the Word Hoard: Conducting Word Studies Using MCOE" (*OEN* 29.1, 32–39) discusses strategies for finding all occurrences of an OE word using the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English* in order to conduct a thorough word study. Seven steps are set out: a bibliographic search, designing the MCOE search for variants, conducting the search, eliminating homographs, counting the forms, considering the Lat. evidence, and reporting the results.

T. Weijnen's "Anglo-Netherlandic Isoloxes" (*Lingua Theodisca: Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft. Jan Goossens zum 65. Geburtstag*, I, pp. 443–54) searches for Netherlandic influences in the Pembrokeshire dialect and attempts to explain them. After listing many possible examples, Weijnen concludes that contact between Netherlandic immigrants to Britain and native peoples was responsible in most cases. A. Wollmann's "Early Christian Loan-Words in Old English" (*Pagans and Christians*, pp. 175–210) resurrects the idea of "learned loan word" to try to decide the date of early Latin loans. Wollmann uses the adoption of "popular" sound changes to determine learnedness. OE *ele* is used an example. It is clearly a Christian word and usually regarded as a later loan. The evidence adduced indicates that it probably was borrowed early and narrowed in its semantic range. OE *prafost*, *butere*, and *segn* may also fall into this category.

a. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

C. ALLEN's *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English* (Oxford: Clarendon, xvii, 509pp) examines the relationship between morphological and syntactic changes in the time period of the title. Specifically, Allen considers whether or not the loss of the impersonal constructions, the reassignment of grammatical relations with 'personal' verbs, the appearance of 'direct' passives, and the appearance of recipient passives could have been caused by the loss of case markings. She concludes that the loss of the accusative/dative distinction and the loss of the nominal dative suffix were both completed by about 1230. Only the introduction of direct passives can be easily related to the loss of case distinctions. The introduction of the recipient passives was not completed until 1375; thus it is more difficult to consider them a result of the loss of case distinctions. Similarly, the loss of productive impersonal constructions was not completed until c1500. This change is more related to the introduction of nominative Experiencers.

M. Atherton's "Grasping Sentences as Wholes: Henry Sweet's Idea of Language Study in the Early Middle Ages"

(*NM* 96, 177–85) outlines the history of Sweet's ideas that language is best learned through using entire sentences and practicing pronunciation before beginning to study grammar at the level of the word. This practice, says Sweet, goes back to medieval times. Sweet mentions Alfred in some of his comments, but that is the extent of material on OE.

A. Bammesberger's "The Paradigm of Germanic **aiblaig-u-* and Notes on Some Preterite-Present Verbs" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 26, 57–66) attempts to explain those Gmc. preterite-presents which are not clearly continuing inherited perfect paradigms. Although **aiblaig-u-* is the focus of the article, **mag/mag-u-*; **wait/wit-u-*; **man/mun-u-*; **kan/kunn-u-*; and **ann/unn-u-* are also discussed. The lack of reduplication in the preterite-presents probably began with **wait/wit-u-* which came from a perfect paradigm without it.

In "The Germanic Fourth Class of Weak Verbs" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 25, 137–39), F. Kortlandt uses primarily Gothic examples to ascertain the probable origin and chronology of the Germanic fourth class of weak verbs. Considering Go. *afifnan* 'be left', *dis-skritnan*, 'become torn', *us-gutnan*, 'to be poured out'; *fra-lusnan*, 'be lost' *galuknan*, 'be shut up'; and *and-bundnan*, 'become unbound' and other fourth class weak, nondenominative verbs, Kortlandt concludes that the class "represents a nasal present derived from a middle root aorist with zero grade vocalism." K. Shields, Jr., "The Indo-European Sources of the West Germanic Second Person Singular Preterite" (*NM* 96, 1–7) concludes that Germanic is an archaic branch of Indo-European. He bases this on his demonstration that the second person singular preterite of strong verbs in West Germanic could be a reflex of IE second person *-t. North and East Germanic reflect IE *-t(h)a. Hittite also reflects such an alternation. Since Hittite is an archaic branch, Germanic may also be ancient.

H. Bergner's "The Openness of Medieval Texts" (*Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 37–54) asserts that medieval texts are "open" by virtue of their lack of clarity to modern minds, by the apparent lack of linguistic standards, and by the various dialects. In this sense they are more intrinsically open than modern day texts. Bergner discusses primarily the lack of linguistic standards within and among the texts. He does discuss "openness" in the structure of manuscripts.

E. Bernárdez and Paloma Tejada's "Pragmatic Constraints to Word Order, and Word-Order Change in English" (*Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 217–41) attempt to explain English word order changes in terms of pragmatic constraints rather than syntactic ones. They view the decrease in word order variability between OE and ME as a decrease in speaker-oriented order (VS) and increase in listener oriented order (SV). Bernárdez and Tejada also tie this shift to types of texts.

F. Beukema and O. Tomic's "Negation in English: a Diachronic View" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 16, 123–35) reviews the development of sentential negation patterns in English in a government and binding framework. Beukema and Tomic conclude that the development of negation in

English adheres to the NEG-criterion during all periods, but tends toward confusion during the Elizabethan period.

J. Bonneau and P. Pica, in "On the Development of the Complementation System in English and Its Relation to Switch-Reference" (*Proc. of the North East Ling. Soc.* 25.2, 135–50) contend that some changes in the Eng. complementation system result from a change in the determiner system in OE. Specifically, in OE seeming complement clauses, relative clauses, and DPs are actually as adverbials. True complementation develops only when the determiner system acquires certain morphological features which determine the projection level. These changes account for not only the rise of the complementation system, but also meaning changes in the prepositions and the emergence of genitive constructions. Basically, they propose that relative and complement clauses share a basic structure with DP's "in which a D^o determiner licenses a CP complement" (136)

P. Boucher in "NP Adverbials of Time and Place in English: Past and Present" (*Travaux linguistiques du CERLICO* 4 [1991], 85–103) contends that Internal Case Assignment theory can be supported by OE temporal NP's, but does not fully explain the difference in form between place NP's and time NP's. Boucher proposes that time NP's are formed by an internal process originating with the verb while place NP's are formed by head to head movement. This explanation covers NP adverbials in all periods of English, something the other two current explanations can't do.

K. Carey's "Subjectification and the Development of the English Perfect" (*Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, pp. 83–102) considers the status of subjectification and the perfect in four periods of English manuscripts: the Alfred period, the Ælfric period, the *Brut* period, and the *Gawain* period. Carey examines Traugott's and Langacker's definitions of subjectification and their relationship to the depiction of the shift from resultativity to perfect as a widening of the notion of result. She concludes that the OE construction 'have' + participle was a resultative rather than a perfect where the subject bears a final resultant state. The increase in stative verbs from the late OE of 0% to the eME of 4.3 and the lME of 10.6 supports the notion that the have + participle construction has become perfect rather than resultative. This shift was a gradual one and constitutes an instance of subjectification. While Traugott's and Langacker's definitions of subjectification differ on their surfaces, each highlights "the fact that conversational implicature plays a crucial role in instigating semantic change." (101)

J. de la Cruz's "Psych-verbs in Old English: from Their Origin in the Lexicon to Final Syntactic Structure" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 28 [1994], 37–48) divides OE verbs of experience into four classes: A class verbs take two objects and have no overt subject (+experiencer, +theme); B class verbs have one object and the subject is the cause of the experience (+experiencer, -theme); C class verbs have one object, but not clearly a direct one, and the subject is the receiver of the experience (-experiencer, +theme); D class verbs have one object, but clearly a direct one and the cause of the experience

(-experiencer, -theme). de la Cruz cites examples of *lystan*, *tweogan*, *spewoan*, *wlatian*, *lician*, *lustfullian*, etc. de la Cruz then relates the psych verbs and their appearance to SOV word order and the V/2 phenomenon.

F. Drobnak's "The Old English Preverbal *ge-* in the Light of the Theory of Language Change as Strengthening or Weakening" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 28 [1994], 123–41) is a statistical study of the strengthening or weakening of verbs with *ge-*. Drobnak takes a control sample of simplex verbs and a basic sample of *ge-* verbs from examples from *Historiarum Adversum Paganos*, and the Gospel according St. Mark. Another control sample was taken from the Gospel according to St. John. Drobnak concludes that OE preverbal *ge-* strongly correlates with markedness and complexity. Five parameters of verbs—propositional modality, tense, mood, transitivity, number—are more likely to assume marked values and once assumed the verbs are more likely to possess the preverbal *ge-*.

M. Fludernik's "Middle English *þo* and Other Narrative Discourse Markers" (*Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 359–92) discusses OE *þa*, its development into ME *þa/þo*, and their replacement by other discourse markers. Using copious examples, Fludernik finds that ME *þo* has three functions: equivalent of OE *þa* in its occurrence in the initial position at the beginning of foreground episodes, as a conjunction, meaning 'then' and occurs following the VP. The transition period for the loss of *þo* seems to be in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries when it begins to be replaced by 'than'. After the 12th century, *þo* seems to no longer occur in its OE function in discourse. B. Wårvik's "The Ambiguous Adverbial/Conjunctions *þa* and *þonne* in Middle English: a Discourse-Pragmatic Study of *then* and *when* in Early English Saints' Lives" (*Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 345–57) contains a short section on OE to give background for the major part of the work which focuses on ME. In OE *þa* is a foreground marker and may be used either adverbially or as a conjunction. This multifunctionality, together with a similar one for *þonne*, changes in Middle English. The frequency decrease in the use of *þa* can be tied to the loss of its use as a foregrounder. Likewise, the distinction in usage between *þonne* and *þa* disappears. *þa* as a conjunction is replaced by *when* by the late 13th century. *When* takes over the discourse roles of the conjunction *þonne* before it does those roles of *þa*. Wårvik attributes this to the fact that *þa* is used in narrative contexts while *þonne* is used primarily in non-narrative contexts. The opposite occurs with respect to the uses of *þa* and *þonne* as adverbials. *þonne* persists longer and becomes unambiguous first.

M. Görlach's "Morphological Standardization: the Strong Verb in Scots" (*New Studies in the History of English*, pp. 51–81) considers the question of morphological leveling in modern languages, specifically Scots in this case. He uses the seeming lack of leveling in the strong verb system for his study and considers 273 specific verbs. He lists these verbs and whether they occur in OE, ME, PDE, Scots, OHG, and NHG. English lost 34.3% of its original strong verbs. There is a short section on Gmc and OE, consisting mostly of the

long table of comparison, but most of the article focuses on ME and Scots. The simple distinction between strong and weak or irregular and regular are not really adequate for English or Scots; Görlach notes that at least seven categories are distinguishable in the "irregular" verbs. Scots did not undergo a standardizing phase. Speakers do not accept either Lorimer's or Smith's translation of the *New Testament* as a standard. Görlach contends, however, that when the two editions/translations are compatible, the language approaches a standard.

E. Haerberli and L. Haegeman's "Clause Structure in Old English: Evidence from Negative Concord" (*Jnl of Ling.* 31, 81–108) argues against van Kemenade (1987) and others who claim that VPR accounts for V2 orders in subordinate clauses. Haerberli and Haegeman contend that OE had a head-initial functional projection. This projection permits a landing site for verb movement in subordinate clauses. They expand on Pintzuk (1991) and adduce evidence from negative concord effects in OE and from West Flemish to support their head-initial claim. S. Pintzuk's "Variation and Change in Old English Clause Structure" (*Lang. Variation and Change* 7, 229–60) also discusses the position of the finite verb in main and subordinate clauses. Her conclusions are counter to those of van Kemenade. There are significant differences between OE syntax and that of NHG and Dut. She contends that the structure and syntax of main and subordinate clauses are the same in OE. The synchronic variation in underlying structures INFL-medial versus INFL-final is reflected in the surface position of the finite verb. A corpus of 5,677 main clauses and 3,341 subordinate clauses from 15 OE texts comprise the data for her analysis. Her conclusions that infl-medial structures increase at the same rate as in main and subordinate clauses lends support to the Constant Rate Hypothesis. "Verb-Seconding in Old English" (*Historical Linguistics* 1993, pp. 387–99) by S. Pintzuk once again takes up the scope of V2 in Old English. After considering V2 in the Germanic languages, Pintzuk demonstrates the feasibility of two landing sites for finite verbs in OE main clauses, one in Comp and one in Infl. This allows for V2 to be lost in ME and still explain verb movement to Comp in PE. Pintzuk also supports the more general conclusion that V2 in OE consists primarily of movement of the verb to Infl.

A. Tomaselli's "Cases of Verb Third in Old High German" (*Clause Structure and Language Change*, pp. 345–69) considers exceptional cases where the finite verb is between the second and final position of the sentence, but particularly verb third and its relation to the problem of "degree of realization" of the V2 constraint. Tomaselli eliminates those examples of verb third in OHG which are clearly due to Lat. influence, even though a syntactic explanation outside of those influences may be possible and concentrates instead on instances where the verb second constraint is violated a subject pronoun occurring between the fronted constituent and the finite verb. Examples are taken from Isidorus Hispalensis's translation of *De fide catholica contra Judaeos*. Referring to van Kemenade (1987) for examples, Tomaselli notes that the

construction is more general and better attested in OE. Moreover, OE and OHG share two important and related characteristics: the relative order pronoun-V_{fin}t and the same range of positions of the finite verb in the subordinate clause. Tomaselli reviews Lerner's (1985) analysis for OHG and van Kemenade's analysis (1987) for OE and finds both lacking the ability to account clearly and consistently for the constructions in both languages. Tomaselli then provides a substantial revision of van Kemenade's analysis which assumes an independent Infl Projection.

W.F. Koopman's "Verb-Final Main Clauses in Old English Prose" (*SN* 67, 129–44) questions van Kemenade's analysis of verb-final main clauses as the result of the V2 rule and notes that Pintzuk's analysis of the verb final phenomena does not account for the low percentage of their occurrences in main clauses. Koopman focuses on those main clauses of the (X)S-v-X type which do not show movement of the finite verb but are potentially verb-final. After examining the frequency of verb-final clauses in *Orosius* and *ÆCHom* ii and estimating their frequency in Bede, CP, Bo, and *ÆCHom* i, and considering the possibility of Lat. influence, Koopman concludes that the potential for verb-final main clauses is probably one of stylistic option. He finds no evidence for a diachronic change within the Old English period.

M. Hare and J.L. Elman's "Learning and Morphological Change" (*Cognition* 56, 61–98) offers evidence that a connectionist, network approach to language change offers a more parsimonious explanation of change than a dual-mechanism account. Hare and Elman use changes in the English verb inflectional system for their data. A network is taught the verb system and basic changes which should occur. This network then simulates the changes in the verb system and teaches the output of the simulation, errors and all, to another generation of the simulation. The multi-generation changes show that the minor verb class changes fail to "take" while the major changes tend to remain. The verbs involved in the minor changes tend to adopt major changes in succeeding generations. The article supports the ideas of regularization as a major process in learning and change, but data and tests were very so carefully limited that accepting generalizations from the conclusions is difficult.

J. Hines' "Focus and Boundary in Linguistic Varieties in the North-West Germanic Continuum" (*Friesische Studien* II, pp. 35–62) offers a modified wave model of phonological dialect variation in northwest Germanic and OE which allows for concurrent dialect separation and provides a cultural function for sound change. N-L. Johannesson in "Old English versus Old Norse Vocabulary in the *Ormulum*: the Choice of Third Person Plural Personal Pronouns" (*Stockholm Stud. in Eng.*, 85, 171–80) investigates the use of the two sets of personal pronouns occurring in this early ME text. He suggests that the ON set dominates the OE set because of its intended audience which consisted mainly of serfs and bondmen. Johannesson concludes that *Ormulum* was written in a more basilectal form than literary texts of the same period and area of origin. P. Kitson's "The Nature of Old English Dialect

Distributions, Mainly as Exhibited in Charter Boundaries" (*Medieval Dialectology*, pp. 43–135) provides an example of a data based OE dialect study with using map and isoglosses. He draws these isoglosses using land features named in the boundary clauses of land charters. Kitson clearly refutes the idea that such a study is impossible for OE while at the same time recognizing the limitations of such studies. P.V. Stiles' "Remarks on the 'Anglo-Frisian' Thesis" (*Friesische Studien* II, pp. 177–220) concludes that it is not feasible to propose "Anglo-Frisian" as a sub-prototype language since an exclusive common chronology cannot be reconstructed. The exclusively shared isoglosses of English and Frisian result from the two languages being adjacent groupings in Ingvæonic.

H. Kim's "Divergence of Syntactic Frames and Diachronic Change" (*Studies in Synchronic and Diachronic Variation*, pp. 38–62) examines the syntactic frames of the OE and ME impersonal verbs and impersonal constructions. The OE verbs considered include *hrewan*, *sceamian*, *eglian*, *lician*, *langian*, and *lystan*. Kim criticizes Fischer and van der Leek (1983) for claiming that the three syntactic types occurred with all of the impersonal verbs and presenting overgeneralized lexical entries for them. The divergence of the synchronic syntactic frames has diachronic consequences.

In "Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax" (*Clause Structure and Language Change*, pp. 140–69) P. Kiparsky demonstrates that OE preserves many traits of early Gmc syntax while arguing that the rise of V to C° is a reflex of the introduction of complementizers and the last major Gmc syntactic innovation. V to C° movement begins to spread in the historic period and is absent from Goth. Using support from topicalization in interrogative and negative clauses, V to C° movement in OE, and the distribution of clitic pronouns in OE, Kiparsky contends that a distinction between Topic and wh landing sites is an early Gmc trait. "The inherited distinction between Topic and wh landing sites is not only preserved in Old English but ultimately lies behind the Modern English "residual verb second" system as well." (162).

G. Kjellmer's "Unstable Fricatives: on Gothic *þliuban* and Old English *fleon*"* (*Word* 46, 207–23) addresses the question of whether *þ* or *f* came first. Kjellmer examines the direction of the /θ/ /f/ changes and incidence of the present of each in various . The /θ/ > /f/ direction is more likely and /f/ is more common in the UCLA Phonological Segment Inventory Database. No specific conclusion is reached, but Kjellmer supports the traditional etymology of Pgm̄c *þl-* (which remains in Goth.) > WGmc and Ngmc *f-*.

R. Millar's "Ambiguity in Ending and Form: 'Reinterpretation' in the Demonstrative Systems of Lazamon's *Brut*" (*NM* 96, 145–68) discusses a stage in the development of the demonstrative system using two manuscripts of Lazamon's *Brut*. Millar divides the demonstratives into closed groupings and open groupings based on their retention of historical forms or ability to become extendable. The efficiency of OE case inflections have become blurred by the time of the texts of Lazamon. Similarly ambiguity in form has become apparent by the time of the texts. The complete development of the

demonstrative hasn't occurred by the time of the *Brut* texts, but the time difference between the "poem's composition and its surviving manuscripts has rendered a great deal of the inherited linguistic material liable to misinterpretation."

M. Moosally's "Rule Ordering: i-Umlaut and Back Umlaut in Mercian Old English" (*Texas Ling. Forum* 35, 173–202) rejects Drescher's phonological, synchronic representation of i- and back-umlaut in the Mercian of the *Vespasian Psalter* in favor a diachronic, morphologically based one. Drescher's objections to the analogical explanation for ordering i-umlaut and back umlaut and reexamines the motivations for analogical extension. Data for the study comes primarily from the *Vespasian Psalter*. Moosally's theory relies on analogical change which is motivated by morphological considerations. Morphological changes have related items in other languages, and analogy helps to account for diachronic evidence. Thus, the traditional view that i-umlaut applied before back-umlaut is upheld. R. W. Murray's "Phonologically Based Morphological Change: High-Vowel Deletion and Paradigmatic Implications in Old English" (*Historical Linguistics* 1993, pp. 323–36) focuses on dialectal differences in patterns of high vowel deletion in Mercian, especially the *Vespasian Psalter*. He tries to distinguish those phonological changes from morphological changes and how the two types interact. In order to fully account for the Mercian forms, investigators must consider a generalized change from high vowel deletion to light trisyllabics and the morphological changes of leveling and paradigm collapse due to analogy. Syllable weight and count play a role in both of these aspects of morphological change.

B.M. Naya's "Hit and *ðæt* anticipating subject clauses in OE: True Syntactic Equivalents?" (*NM* 96, 23–37) argues that in certain situations anticipating subject clauses *ðæt* was more likely to be used than *hit*, even though *hit* was more common. Naya concludes that *hit* and *ðæt* are nearly equivalent in non-appositive structures. As anticipators they are not interchangeable. *ðæt* was used in appositive like constructions. When the two forms are used in similar contexts, *ðæt* is more clearly marked than *hit*. *Hit* was more referential than the anticipatory *it* of modern English.

M. Ogura's "The Interchangeability of Old English Verbal Prefixes" (*ASE* 24, 67–93) considers an enormous amount of evidence and provides several frequency to support the conclusion that, within certain individual lexical limits, OE verbal prefixes were separable and interchangeable. In addition these prefix-verb forms show few signs of being replaced by the verb-adverb or verb-particle construction until early ME.

C. Peeters in "Proto-Germanic Intervocalic *X in Old English" (*IF* 100, 213) argues that the result of the sound change from PGmc *X into OE is not predictable as it is currently formulated. Peeters rewrites the rule PGmc. *X. OE $\phi/V-V$ to read PGmc *vXv(z) > OE, vh[X]#.

H. Penzel's "Runengermanisch. Zur Geschichte einer Trümmersprache" (*BGDSL* 117, 369–80) argues that what he calls Old Runic Germanic, constructed from seven 200–450 AD runic transcriptions (including a corrected Gallehus

transliteration), represents a Nordic-West Germanic that speaks directly to the evolving Norse, OE, OS, and OHG reflexes. He touts the value of a "natural" representation of a substantial phonology, a suggestive morphology, and basic word order syntax rather than the traditionally misperceived reconstructions of past scholars.

S. Schwenter and E.C. Traugott's "The Semantic and Pragmatic Development of Substitutive Complex Prepositions in English" (*Historical Pragmatics*, pp. 243–73) concerns itself with all periods of English, the development of 'instead of', 'in place of', 'in lieu of, and the implications of that development for historical pragmatics. These three complex preposition express the concepts 'X in place of Y' or 'X rather than Y'. Schwenter and Traugott propose a five stage development for 'instead of' and a four stage one for 'in place of'. Only the development of 'instead of' involves OE. In the 0 or preOE stage, it was a locative, in the stage I, during the OE period, a role, in IOE (stage II) it fits into slot Y where it is a "person/being in a abstract social or spiritual position. The development of 'in place of' does not involve OE, but the 0 stage and stage I both occur in ME and match the 0 and II stages of 'instead of.' No clear progression of changes in 'in lieu of' exists.

E. Sielanko's "Split Coordinated Structures in Late Old English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 29, 57–72) places the titular structures within a Government and binding framework where possible but notes that certain of the solutions are outside of this model. Sielanko concludes that deriving the split coordinated structures in OE by means of deletion under identity from underlying coordinated is the best method. "All coordination and apposition patterns in OE will be derived from underlying sentences conjoined by coordinate conjunctions or appositive markers."

H. Smith's "Dative Sickness' in Germanic" (*Natural Lang. & Ling. Theory* 12 [1994], 675–736) discusses the similarities and differences between dative substitution and nominative substitution in the Germanic languages and attempts to provide a uniform treatment of case. For this uniform treatment of case, Smith proposes three constraints on cases and linking: an applicability constraint, a restrictiveness constraint, and a dissimilation constraint on linkers. These constraints allow some changes to be viewed as rule-based analogies rather than reanalyses.

E.G. Stanley in "Lazamon's Un-Anglo-Saxon Syntax" (*The Text and Tradition of Lazamon's 'Brut'*, pp. 47–56) contends that the syntax of Lazamon's *Brut* is very ME. He discusses distinctions he perceives between Lazamon's syntax and that of OE poetry and specifically mentions VS inversion and unconnected clauses and sentences. More detailed studies remain to be done, according to Stanley, but the beginnings are here.

S. Suzuki's "Breaking, Ambisyllabicity, and the Sonority Hierarchy in Old English" (*Diachronica* 11 [1994i, 65–93) relates the process and properties of OE (West Saxon) breaking to the interaction between segmental properties, the sonority hierarchy and syllable internal structure. When /l/

and /r/ are in a terminal position, breaking does not operate, the terminal position being less sonorous than a nonfinal position. On the other hand, /w/ and /h/ are involved in breaking, even when they occupy strong, final positions. Suzuki concludes that OE breaking should be considered part of lenition. S. demonstrates that limited breaking contexts are the result of greater sonority values. The fact that environments with /h/ and /w/ show more breaking than those with /l/ and /r/ is due to /h/ and /w/ being more less sonorous than /l/ and /r/.

W. Viereck's "Realizations of the Definite Article in Dialectal English and How and When They Originated" (*Medieval Dialectology*, pp. 295–307) concerns itself with a discussion of when the /θ/ became voiced in the definite article. He uses modern dialect data to reconstruct a probable pattern. The voicing of initial /θ/ in OE definite articles probably occurred before voicing of /θ/ in other words.

B. Wärvik, in "In Search of Orality in the History of English: A study in signals of textual organization" (*Writing as Speaking Language, Text, Discos, Communication* [1994], pp. 383–88), discusses identifying clues that a text was originally oral. The focus is at the clause level. Parataxis and hypotaxis are not clearly indicative of oral or literate texts. Parataxis is more common in narrative texts and in those probably meant to be heard; but an historical difference cannot be clearly distinguished.

M.M.
K.D.T.

Works not seen:

Brinton, Laurel J. "Pragmatic Markers in a Diachronic Perspective." *Berkeley Ling. Soc., Annual Meeting, Proc.* 21 (1995), 377–88.

Enkvist, Nils Erik. "Problems Raised by Old English *þa*." *Writing vs Speaking: Language, Text, Discourse, Communication*. Ed. Sv tla mejrková et al. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 392. Tübingen, 1994. pp. 55–62.

Haudry, Jean. "Der Ursprung des gemeingermanischen Infinitivs und des westgermanischen Gerundiums." *Philologische Forschungen: Festschrift für Philippe Marq.* Ed. Yvon Desportes. Heidelberg, 1994. pp. 1–17.

Koopman, Willem F. "Coding the Old English Part of the Helsinki Corpus: the Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English." *MESN* 32 (1995), 7–9.

Krygier, Marcin. "The Strong Verb System in the *Peterborough Chronicle*." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 28 (1994), 49–69.

Laing, Margaret. "A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English." *MESN* 33 (1995), 1–8.

Lamberterie, Charles de. "L'Adjectif vieil-anglais *wlacu*." *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris* 88 (1993), 185–208.

Lema, Fanego *Papers from the IVth International...*

Ramat, Paolo. "Le lingue germaniche." *Le lingue indoeuropee*. Ed. Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paolo Ramat. Bologna, 1993. pp. 409–40.

Rot, Sándor. *Old English*. 3rd ed. Budapest: Magyar Macmillan-Tankönyvkiadó, 1992. 600, viii pp.

Smirnitkii, A. I. "Leksika drevnegermanskikhazykov." *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta*, ser. 9, filologiya, 1995, no. 2, pp. 155–78; no. 3, pp. 191–203; no. 4, pp. 158–65. [early Germanic vocabulary].

Suzuki, Seiichi. "The Decline of the Foot as a Super syllabic Mora-Counting Unit in Early Germanic." *Trans. of the Philol. Soc.* 93 (1995), 227–72.

Takeuchi, Shin'ichi. "Semantic Focus in Old English Verbs of Saying and the Choice of Mood in the Dependent Statement." *Actes du XVe Congrès international des linguistes*. Ed. André Crocheteur et al. Sainte-Foy, Québec, 1993. IV, 39–42.

van der Rhee, Florus. "Entstehung und Verfall des grammatischen Wechsels." *North-Western European Lang. Evolution*. 26 (1995), 43–55.

3. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous

Textbooks and Reprints

WILLIAM VANTUONO'S *Old and Middle English Texts with Accompanying Textual and Linguistic Apparatus*, Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 12 (New York: Lang, 1994), offers a selection of primary texts for use in a course on the history of the English language. It includes brief sections on Old English phonology and morphology, and each text is given a short critical introduction and a glossary. The Old English texts (all from extant editions) are *Cædmon's Hymn* and very brief selections from *The Wanderer*, Ælfric's homily on Gregory the Great, Alfred's Boethius, and *Beowulf*.

Some of Larry D. Benson's papers on Old and Middle English literature are collected and reprinted in *Contradic-*

tions: From Beowulf to Chaucer, ed. Theodore M. Andersson and Stephen A. Barney (Aldershot, Hants/Brookfield, VT: Scolar). The three on Old English have proved to be of eminently durable worth: they are "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry" (1966), "The Pagan Coloring of *Beowulf*" (1967), and "The Originality of *Beowulf*" (1970).

Language and Poetic Form

It is gratifying to see what a large proportion of the work done in 1995 in the "general" category pertains to language and meter. There are several papers dealing with Old and Middle English poetic language and meter in *Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of C.B. Hieatt*, ed. M.J.

Toswell (Univ of Toronto Press), a collection derived from a 1993 conference. In the Introduction (pp. 3–12) Toswell characterizes the collection as unified by a preoccupation with the style of Old English verse, a topic she finds poorly represented in current critical discourse on Old English. She surveys definitions and non-definitions of style and concludes that study of the subject combines issues of “linguistic interaction: sounds, syntax, vocabulary, context, and register” (p. 8). Her approach to style is conservative, for example in maintaining the intrinsic worth of texts as literary objects and in distinguishing some surviving verse as non-literary in nature. In “The Case against a ‘General Old English Poetic Dialect’” (pp. 117–32), David Megginson expresses his conviction that Anglo-Saxonists are deluded in crediting the idea of a poetic *koine* in Old English, at least in regard to spelling practices. He surveys the introductions to editions published since Kenneth Sisam’s influential 1953 essay “Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse” to demonstrate the power of Sisam’s influence, and then he argues that all these editors are mistaken in presuming “that the poetic dialect theory applies to phonology or orthography rather than to vocabulary or morphology” (123). He seems to mean that Sisam’s ‘general Old English poetic dialect’ is defined only by structural features (i.e. those that can be confirmed by the meter), and thus has nothing to do with orthography. This is not how I understand Sisam’s argument, which is that (1) structural features at least initially seem more reliable than orthographic ones for the purpose of identifying a poet’s *native* dialect (not the common poetic dialect), and (2) in actuality even structural features may be deficient in this regard, so that they, too (like orthographic features), could represent common poetic usage rather than evidence of regional dialect origins. Megginson, critiquing Angelika Lutz’s analysis of the spelling of reflexes of WGmc. *-ald-, feels that because the scribes are in disagreement over such spellings, there must not have been a poetic dialect dictating orthographic practices—a conclusion with which I cannot concur. Douglas Moffat introduces us to the Hat Pattern in “The Intonational Basis of Lazamon’s Verse” (pp. 133–46). This is the commonest intonational contour (of independent clauses, it should be specified) in most European languages, and is the contour heard in the sentence “I’m surprised to hear about it.” He contrasts this *clausal* pattern with the stress patterns of Old English *verses* and suggests that the commonest rhythms of the *lines* (i.e. verse pairs) of the *Brut* and of Old English rhythmical prose approximate the structure of the Hat Pattern. The heightened intonation in the coda of this pattern, he reasons, explains why the alliteration is so often of the type $x a : x a$ (where *a* stands for an alliterating syllable) in Ælfric and in Lazamon, and why rhyme is so common in the latter. Very interesting, particularly for the light it sheds on syntax as an important component of scansion (cf. B.R. Hutcheson’s book, summarized below) is O.D. Macrae-Gibson and J.R. Lishman’s “Computer Assistance in the Analysis of Old English Metre: Methods and Results—A Provisional Re-

port” (pp. 102–116). The authors describe some of the difficulties that face the construction of a computer analysis of verse, such as what to do with erroneous analyses (roughly ten percent of the output) and the problem of distinguishing compounds and noncompounds. They give an account of how their program proceeds as it multiply analyzes words in the text and generates metrical analyses of them with competing values, then assigns a type designation. The types are subjected to statistical tests in an attempt to detect abnormal distributions. By these methods the authors find that although *Juliana* and *Elene* show the expected metrical consistency, *Christ II* differs in that verses in it resembling *heofonrices weard* (*Juliana* 212b) appear most commonly in the on-verse with double alliteration, while in the other poems it appears mostly in the off-verse. The two halves of *Beowulf* show a similar distributional difference in regard to verses like *lāðan liges* (83a), but more significant differences distinguish it from poems like *Andreas* and *Exodus*. Thomas Cable argues in “Grammar, Spelling, and the Rhythm of the Alliterative Long Line” (pp. 13–22) that the representation of final *-e* in the manuscripts of late medieval alliterative verse does not conform well to the metrical requirements of the verse. Old English verse is mentioned only in passing.

James Keddie’s critique of Daniel Donoghue’s *Style in Old English Poetry: The Test of the Auxiliary* was summarized in *YWOES* 1993 (pp. 21–22); Donoghue responds in “Passing the Test with *Style*: A Response,” *SP* 92 (1995), 164–80. The two agree on a number of distributional features of verses comprising a verbal and an auxiliary, for example that they usually appear in the off-verse and that they are rarely clause-initial. The central issue in dispute, then, is whether such features, especially in *Beowulf*, are conditioned on a metrical basis (Keddie’s position) or by a combination of metrical and syntactic considerations (Donoghue’s). Donoghue illustrates why the distributional facts demand a balance of the two types of conditioning: “Verbal-auxiliary half-lines are found in the b-verse far more often than in the a-verse (metrical); they are not clause initial because verbals are excluded from that position (syntactic). Light verses are found far more often in the a-verse (metrical); they are usually clause-initial (syntactic)” (169–70). He counters Keddie’s arguments about how the uniqueness of *Beowulf* casts doubt on the conclusions of Donoghue’s book with the observation that if syntax were subordinated to meter we should expect verbal-auxiliary verses to be distributed in comparable proportions between principal and dependent clauses, which they are not. Donoghue cites basic errors in Keddie’s scansions to call into question his authority as a metrist, concluding that “his facility with meter seems to be only as extensive as his familiarity with the index to Bliss’s *Metre*” (pp. 173–74). The article concludes with an appendix designed to furnish the data Keddie had criticized Donoghue for not including in his book, along with corrections to Keddie’s own data on *Beowulf*.

In “Paradise Lost of the Old English Dual,” in *The Endless Knot: Essays on Old and Middle English in Honor of*

Marie Boroff, ed. M. Teresa Tavormina and R.F. Yeager (Cambridge: Brewer), 1–27, E.G. Stanley collects examples of dual pronouns in context, first from his undergraduate reader, then from more far-flung texts in verse and prose in Old English, Old Saxon, and Middle English. He laments the passing of the defunct pronouns, since he believes they performed a valuable service, indicating “a special relationship . . . that may involve strong emotions” (14). He seems unaware of Lois Bragg’s 1992 article, which reaches a similar conclusion (*YWOES* 1993, 21). The title of Stanley’s “Dialect Origins of Late Old English Verse” would appear to indicate a desire that we pair it with Kenneth Sisam’s “Dialect Origins of the Earlier Old English Verse” mentioned above, though actually the article has little to do with late verse. The first half is devoted to a study of the dialect spellings of *Christ and Satan*, a poem Stanley does not consider late. Although the first scribe’s dialect is Anglian, “the phonological details of neither scribe nor corrector reveal anything safe about the date or provenance of the original” (12), since none of this evidence is structural. Stanley does not examine any of the morphological or syntactic criteria of this sort. The second half surveys the uses of the word *þræt* in verse, in extended response to Franz Wenisch’s inclusion of the word in his collection of lexical dialect indicators. Stanley turns fully to late verse only in the final paragraph, where he lists the late poems he believes are Southern in origin. Since he does not offer reasons, his list, as might be expected, is fairly orthodox.

In “Artful Alliteration in Anglo-Saxon Song and Story,” *Anglia* 113 (1995), 429–63, Andy Orchard argues for the significance of nonstructural alliteration in verse—that is, of kinds other than the sort that binds two verses to form a line—and he collects passages demonstrating various sorts of pluriliteral alliterative patterns. These, he finds, are used to rhetorical effect, providing emphasis and furnishing aural punctuation. Such devices are rare in other early Germanic languages, though he finds some examples in verses in *Grettis saga*. He illustrates the structural use of such patterns in early Irish verse and compares the uses of alliteration in the poetic works of Aldhelm and his student Æthelwald, prompting him to wonder whether the English techniques he perceives are purely a Germanic inheritance or whether they show the influence of Latin and Irish models. Finally he turns to prose, analyzing a passage each from Aldhelm’s *Epistola ad Acircium* and the homily *Be ane munuccilde*, of uncertain authorship, showing that they display many of the same alliterative devices.

B.R. Hutcheson’s *Old English Poetic Metre* (Cambridge: Brewer), a revision of his 1991 doctoral dissertation, is a work of considerable importance, and one that has already had a significant effect on the way metrists conduct business. It offers an analytic system comparable in detail to those currently in use. Some of Hutcheson’s innovations are technological: unlike Bliss’s and Pope’s, his system is not derived solely from analysis of *Beowulf*, but is based on an impressive electronic database analyzing roughly half the OE poetic corpus for a wide range of variables. This technological

innovation is the basis for many of the non-technological ones, which derive from statistical analysis of the database. Indeed, the fundamental methodological assumption of the book is that statistically significant differences in the distribution of metrical variables demand recognition in any taxonomy of verse types—an assumption that leads to the construction of a system entailing a greater number of verse types than any prior one. In the Introduction Hutcheson sketches the outlines of research on OE metrics since Sievers and characterizes what is different about his approach. He rejects the notion of the foot (as well as Bliss’s idea of ornamental alliteration) and argues instead that meter is in large part governed by formalism, and particularly the syntactic aspects of formalism. Here he also explains his practice in regard to textual emendation (which is broadly pragmatic in character) and his assumptions about stress and quantity, and he outlines the contents of his database. The remainder of Part I is devoted to the analysis of variables, both diachronic (parasiting, contraction, etc.) and synchronic (resolution, anacrusis), that produce potential ambiguities of classification. Some of the more significant of his conclusions about such matters are these: nonparasiting is far commoner in the first elements of compounds than anywhere else, and this may be explained by the assumption of the later syncope of composition vowels than of thematic vowels; the same chronology may explain odd verses like *ēpelstōl hēold* in *Genesis A*; verses of type D* are not unmetrical in the off-verse; in most verse types, resolution is commoner in the on-verse than in the off-verse, and so types with long lifts and those with resolved ones ought to be classified differently; Kaluza’s law does apply to verses like *eorðweard ðone* and is conditioned formulaically rather than phonologically in *Beowulf*; and double alliteration is not actually compulsory with anacrusis in the on-verse. Part II explains his system of classification in detail, surveying the different types. Though he explicitly rejects Sievers’ five types and “any more abstract theoretical construct” (136) in favor of lexico-syntactic patterning, his system does still classify verses into types A through E corresponding to Sievers’ types. But he adds a separate classification (“type 3”) for verses bearing three primary stresses (e.g. *fēþa eal gesæt*), which prior systems have fitted into the other categories by subordinating one stress. Here he also provides detailed arguments to show that Bliss’s concept of the caesura is insignificant, while syntax is of considerable importance: for example, the distribution of verses of type B with the caesura in different places is roughly the same, while the distribution of those with a verse-final finite verb is significantly different from that of verses that end in a noun (126). Part III catalogues the types, giving templates, examples, data on frequency, and commentary for each type. The volume is rounded out by a set of detailed appendices giving rates of double alliteration, alterations to Bliss’s scansion of *Beowulf*, a list of types, statistics on variation between types and the combination of verses into lines, frequent formulaic types, hypermetric verses, and information on the use of the database. There is also a bibliography and two indices (subjects

and verses cited). I have reviewed and evaluated the book in *Language* 73 (1997), 866–69.

In "Syllable Weight in Old English Meter: Grids, Morae, and Kaluza's Law," *Diachronica* 11 (1994), 1–11, Thomas Cable begins by explaining the operation of Kaluza's law, which governs the etymological weight of final syllables in resolution under secondary stress, such that, for example, the verse *frēowine folca*, with resolution, has an etymologically short third syllable, while *wis wordcwida*, without resolution, has an etymologically long final syllable. He devises a grid-moraic analysis to account for this, and states the rule as follows: "(i) A short syllable with a peak of two or more x's always resolves with the following syllable (i.e., the following syllable can have any count of morae). (ii) A short syllable with a peak of fewer than two x's resolves iff the following syllable has only one mora" (p. 5). He explains that the height of a peak is determined in relation to the preceding metrical position, and so a verse like *gūðrinc monig*, with 3, 2, 3, and 1 x's in its four positions, must be subject to his rules, which block resolution because the third position has a peak of just one x. He sees the interaction of such principles as a psychologically more realistic representation of a scop's competence than any list of metrical types.

Textual Criticism

The publication of J.R. Hall's "Old English Literature" in *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research*, ed. D.C. Greetham (New York, MLA), pp. 149–83, was unconscionably delayed over a period of several years, and yet the work shows no significant sign of datedness. After a brief introduction to the nature of the Old English remains, Hall offers an informative history of Old English editing from Parker and Joscelyn's *Testimonie of Antiquite* (1566) to De Vriend's edition of medical texts (1984), illustrating the wide range of philosophies, analytic components, and textual varieties that have structured and continue to structure our editions. But the most useful part of the article is a concise introduction to the resources available to editors—virtually a brief bibliographical guide to Old English studies. In discussing the treatment of the text itself, Hall admirably foregrounds the really central issue in editing that so few in Old English studies have acknowledged—that of suiting the edition to its intended uses. His recommendations are sensible and generally even-handed, even though his allegiance is clearly to textual conservatism. Ultimately he recommends, as models for conservative editions of different sorts, Rypin's prose texts from the Nowell Codex, Yerkes' *Life of Machutus*, Godden's *Catholic Homilies of Ælfric*, and Gollancz's *Exeter Book*, also praising the idea of such facing-page editions as Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe has recently advocated (see this section in *YWOES* 1994).

Source/Influence Scholarship and Dating

In "Il *Liber Monstrorum* e i glossari anglosassoni," in *L'immaginario nelle Letterature Germaniche del Medioevo*, ed. Adele Cipolla (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 1995), pp. 203–25,

Patrizia Lendinara collects internal evidence for dating the *Liber monstrorum* to the period ca. 650–750 and ascribing it to Aldhelm or to someone familiar with his works. She traces the uses of Virgil in the *Liber* and in Aldhelm and points out how the descriptions of monsters in the one bear resemblances to the riddles of Aldhelm and Eusebius. But the central interest here is in analogous formulations and similar motifs in the *Liber* and the Epinal and Erfurt glossaries (which may have been compiled in the school of Aldhelm at Malmesbury), for example in regard to the *homo utriusque sexus* who begins the *Liber* and the hermaphrodites mentioned in the early glossaries. The early date that this argument demands for the *Liber*, she points out, permits the assumption of its influence on a wide variety of other texts, including *Beowulf*.

The title of Hildegard L.C. Tristram's *Early Insular Preaching: Verbal Artistry and Method of Composition*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 623 (Vienna, 1995) suggests a series of close readings. In actuality, this slim but bibliographically rich volume is a study of origins. In the process of laying out a general outline of OE homiletic scholarship, Tristram identifies two features as the hallmarks of OE homiletic practice: compositional eclecticism (that is, plagiarism without the opprobrium that attaches to that word) and rhythmical prose. Patristic attitudes toward the use of rhetoric in preaching is traced from the fourth century (particularly in Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*) into Irish and English homiletic practice. The central argument, though, is that the rhythmical prose of Wulfstan and Ælfric has its origins in Irish texts. The influence is only indirect: in the tenth and eleventh centuries, preaching styles in Ireland and England were influenced independently by Continental sources, mainly later Carolingian homiliaries that incorporated earlier Hiberno-Latin features. The English achievement is primarily its nativization of preaching characteristics that are ultimately Irish.

In "The Three Hosts of Doomsday in Celtic and Old English," *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* (Zaragoza) 15 (1994), 71–79, Andrew Breeze takes issue with the Malcolm Godden's characterization of the confessor's maxim "Betere is þe þæt ðe scamige nu beforan me anum, þonne eft on domes dæge beforan gode, and beforan eallum heofenwaran and eorðwaran and eac helwaran" as peculiarly Anglo-Saxon. In support of Charles Wright's view that the mention of three hosts at Doomsday is Irish in origin, Breeze cites parallels in the eighth-century Hiberno-Latin *Liber de numeris* and a ninth-century homily wrongly attributed to Boniface.

Orality, Literacy, and Formulaic Theory

In *The Singer of Tales in Performance* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press), John Miles Foley's overriding concern is to wed the insights of oral-formulaic theory and the "ethnography of speaking" as the latter is represented in the work of Richard Baumann, Dell Hymes, and Dennis Tedlock. What the two have in common is their attention to "oral" or "paralinguistic"

features that are too often obscured when performances are reduced to texts, which tend to compel all literary productions to conform to a Western literary model. For oral and oral-derived works it is essential to take into account methods of "keying performance," such as "special codes, figurative language, parallelism, special paralinguistic features, special formulae, appeal to tradition, and disclaimer of performance" (11). Foley is concerned primarily with Serbian and Homeric traditions, but one chapter is devoted to an analysis of such passages in *Andreas* as have no counterpart in the Πράξεις Ἀνδρέου and at the same time demonstrate traditional features. For example, when God calls Andrew a *wigendra hlēo* (1672b), the formula is "indexed" in the sense that it applies to the hero the constellation of qualities the phrase bears in other heroic contexts. Thus Andrew's saintly achievements are as heroic as Beowulf's secular ones. One of the features of this "indexed translation" that Foley examines is poetic variation, which is not inessential filler but a means of invoking "the full implications of the Anglo-Saxon traditional register" (196). But Foley's primary concern in this chapter is to explain the poet's self-interruption in lines 1478–91, where he questions his own ability to complete the task before him. Foley accounts for this instance of performance anxiety as a confession not simply of either limited book-learning or poetic incompetence but of uncertainty about his ability to adapt his source to the poetic register. It is also a particularly clear example of how a "presumably literate poet can work pen in hand but still very much within the traditional register or idiom" (213).

In *Heldensage und Epos: Zur Konstituierung einer mittelalterlichen volkssprachlichen Gattung im Spannungsfeld von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit*, ScriptOralia 68 (Tübingen: Narr), Alois Wolf traces the rise of vernacular epic in the medieval West. Because theirs were oral cultures, the native peoples of the area had no epic form, and so the development of native epic was under Latin influence, the result being first scriptural and then secular creations. Saints' lives, in addition to *Biblepos*, may also have exerted significant influence on the development of epic out of native legends and lays. The book is primarily about the *Nibelungenlied*, but three Old English poems are given extensive consideration, and in each case Wolf's method is to proceed through the poem passage by passage, analyzing the relationship of individual elements to his metanarrative of the development of the genre. Like the Chronicle poems about Edgar, *Brunanburh* is not derived from a larger folk-epic about the king but was composed specifically for the Chronicle context, since it begins with *hēr*, names the place of battle (unlike truly early products of Germanic heroic tradition and Scandinavian praise-poems) and provides other kinds of historical information that characterize the poem as the work of a chronicler. It thus shows generic development beyond the stage of the early lay. Nor does Bede's account of Cædmon provide unambiguous evidence of the existence of epic in England in the Anglo-Saxon period. Cædmon's renderings of scripture need not have been

in epic form, but may have comprised shorter lays. *Biblepos*, then, is more safely assumed to have developed on the Continent; hence the Old English *Genesis* and *Exodus* are passed over, the attention instead being awarded to Otrif and the *Heliand*. *Beowulf*, too, is neither true epic nor archaic in nature. It cannot have been in existence during Bede's lifetime, or he would surely have mentioned it in his *History*. In reliance on arguments offered in Colin Chase's *Dating of 'Beowulf'* Wolf dates the poem to the Viking age and sees it as an attempt to build a bridge to the Scandinavian community in Britain, an attempt perhaps inspired by the policy of the early English church that native culture was not to be unnecessarily deprecated. *Beowulf* is not a typical heroic poem, though it contains some typical elements. The poet does not simply reproduce traditional material but chooses (or creates) a hero obscure to legend, along with two atypical monsters, and organizes his material in unprecedented ways. His interest, also, is in representing not simply heroic but exemplary lordship, not focusing on the tragedy of heroic individuals but assuming a universalizing perspective. In these ways the poem is not like an oral creation, but shows extensive planning. Wolf sees *Maldon* as the missing link between heroic lays or legends and the *chansons de geste* in the development of vernacular heroic epic, and as a result it partakes of the characteristics of both earlier and later compositions. The geographical and historical information in the poem is precise, yet it does not serve an affective purpose, as in the later *Chanson de Roland*, but an annalistic one. Still, some poeticizing of the facts of the battle has taken place, for example in the omission of Óláfr Tryggvason's name, since leaving one's opponents unnamed demonizes them. The theme of dying by one's lord is not archaic and Tacitean but may be related to the ideology seen in *Roland* and the *Wilhelmsdichtungen*. The liminal status of *Maldon* is also revealed by its combination of traditional meter and newer stylistic features (rhyme, double alliteration) and by its combination of features from both lay and epic. The book is sparsely footnoted and is not user-friendly in that it lacks both a summary and an index.

Carol Braun Pasternack, in *The Textuality of Old English Poetry* (Cambridge Univ. Press), identifies Old English texts as "inscribed" (i.e. oral-derived), taking into account "the format of the verse as it exists in the manuscripts, the formulaic quality of the diction and the structure that the words convey aurally" (p. 2). Poetry partakes of both oral and literate cultures, since "the readers decipher letters on pages, and on the other hand, they need to listen to the rhythms, syntax and meaning of the words to perceive the verse's structure." The texts themselves "indicate how they operate, through the predominance of aural over visual clues, the absence of the author, the presence of implied tradition and the use of language common to many texts" (p. 4). Chap. 1 deprecates the idea of Old English poetic authorship, since for the most part authors are unidentified in the manuscripts, and the extent of scribal alteration suggests that texts were perceived instead as products of poetic tradition. Moreover,

poetic texts are presented in their manuscript contexts in such a way as to invite the reader to participate in the production of their meaning. Based on a 1991 article that appeared in *ASE*, Chap. 2 examines *The Wanderer* in detail, identifying the various perspectives of the poem, which are arranged in "movements" and offered by discrete speakers who are not presented as characters but only as conduits for varying points of view. The text also contains "echoes that facilitate intertextual associations"—for example, *āre* (2) is echoed at the end in line 114—and such echoes create structure and invoke relationships to other texts. In Chap. 3 Pasternack examines how poets use aural effects to promote the oral aim of rhetorical memorableness. For example, in the Geats' approach to Heorot in *Beowulf* she finds a preponderance of verses of type A and identifies the effect as a galloping rhythm. Similarly, in *The Ascension* 744–55 the alliterative pattern provides structure and links concepts in significant ways. This chapter also examines, among other rhetorical schemes, the *ne . . . ac* construction as an intertext that similarly provides structure but also "calls attention to ornament as ornament" (83). She argues in Chap. 4, *contra* Daniel Donoghue (as above), that syntactic style is not a reliable indicator of authorship, since her assumption is that authorship is a modern construct. *Christ and Satan*, she finds, is not a "poem" but a "series of poetic accretions," a set of contrasting narrative lamentations and homiletic exhortations. The devil's efforts in his speech in *Elene* 902–33 are undermined by "murky syntactic relationships" that defeat logical continuity, while Judas' response is syntactically coherent. The contrast in style is rhetorical rather than authorial. Shifts in style, examined in the next chapter, also serve a structural purpose, marking borders and transitions and breaking chronology, as when normal verses give way to hypermetric, and when anaphoric series of expressions demarcate "movements," as in *The Seafarer*. As argued in the concluding chapter, since poems are not always demarcated as unities in the manuscripts (lacking incipits), beginnings and endings are marked in other ways. The transition between *Andreas* and *The Fates of the Apostles* demonstrates how ambiguity is part and parcel of the manuscript context of verse. Pasternack examines the opening and closing sequences of *Beowulf* and *Juliana* to illustrate how "echoic repetitions" (Eugene Kintgen's term) signal unifying themes, indicating the coherence of disparate movements. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to an examination of the structure of the Junius Manuscript and an articulation of the ways in which Old English manuscripts differ from modern books.

Intertextuality and Culture Studies

Another book in the same Cambridge series, the late Peter Clemoes' *Interactions of Thought and Language in OE Poetry*, is divided into two parts, the first concerning the tradition out of which Old English poetic practice grew, that of an aristocratic warrior society. Chap. 1 then deals with the date of *Beowulf*, since this poem is essential to a determination of what the system of thought of such a society might have been.

Clemoes examines the kind of monarchy portrayed in the poem, which is essentially tribal in nature, and compares it with what is known of OE kingship, which already by Alfred's day had incorporated a variety of large-scale administrative duties and prerogatives determined in part by ecclesiastical institutions. The poem's preoccupation with monsters and combat is paralleled also by images on the seventh- and early eighth-century so-called Saxon "sceattas" and in Felix's *Life of St. Guthlac* and Aldhelm's *De virginitate*. Literary elements from Latin sources (the description of the mere, *gigantas*) do not compromise *Beowulf*'s location in native tradition. Since the text shows minimal compositional impurity or scribal confusion involving *þ/ð*, *w*, and open-topped *a*, no more than one intervening copy should be posited between the eighth-century original these features suggest and the extant manuscript. Clemoes also traces how the chief qualities of kingship in the poem—"folk' imagination, threats from Cain-descended monstrosity and Christian responsibility to God"—are expressed in pre-ninth-century texts and cultural artifacts, and he favors a Mercian setting for composition before the reign of Offa, in the second quarter of the eighth century. With Chap. 2 Clemoes turns to the real matter of the book, attempting to define the major features of an early English epistemology concretized in verse. To the Anglo-Saxon mind, in all things there are by nature inherited potentials for action that form the basis for identity: *Forst sceal frēosan, fyr wudu meltan*, and so forth. Actors and their actions then may serve as sources of analogy, as when the teats of a mother ox are metaphorized as welling springs in *Riddle 38*. When the potential of one actor is transferred to another (as when a glass beaker speaks in *Riddle 63*), this may be distinguished from metaphor and termed 'hybridization'. Such analogy results naturally from the dominance of time (rather than space) within "narrative living": actions are thus naturally inclined to such analogizing processes. In the following chapters Clemoes applies this hypothesis to the analysis of poetic language. Examining conventional expressions involving nouns (compounds, genitive combinations, adjective combinations), he argues that they signal interactions of such potentials as described above. For instance, *bēahgifu* denotes all acts of bestowal by a ruler, not just the giving of rings, thus representing "potential untrammelled by circumstances" (124). The term lends conventional form, suitable for verse, to conventional wisdom, and serves as a symbol, transmitting experience across generations. Such formulaic structures therefore are not merely a feature of style but a mode of conveyance for cultural truths; they do not derive simply from poetic tradition but from all varieties of oral tradition. Here Clemoes also distinguishes varieties of narrative, the most fundamental distinction being between "narrative," to which the narrator serves as primary witness, and "story," which, being derived from tradition, must "incorporate authenticating processes of witness as part and parcel of its own narrative" (189). For example, *Riddle 59* invokes the presence of men drinking in witness of the object described as borne into the hall. In Part

II Clemoes turns to the changes wrought upon the tradition he has described by the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity. The social concerns enshrined in traditional diction became wrapped in a metanarrative of divine proportions that gave a new purpose to all of it. The result was increased complexity. "Christian intellect overtook Germanic instinct. Implicit symbols surrendered to explicit images. . . . Latin 'style' replaced Germanic 'expression'" (230). Narrative itself acquired a new role, not simply as the repository of the society's active principles but also as an evangelizing activity. Among other things, the individual chapters of Part II deal with the roles of poet and preacher, the fashioning of symbolic language in the service of God, moral evolution in narrative, changes in the role of the social hero, and the problem of individual loyalty. An index of word pairs makes it easier to relate Clemoes' analysis of traditional diction to more conventional ideas about the formula in verse.

Gunhild Zimmermann's argument, in *The Four Old English Poetic Manuscripts* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1995), is that the contents of the poetic codices comment on the political issues of the age of the Benedictine Reform, when they were made, and that these collections were assembled precisely for the purpose of such commentary. She identifies the most pressing political issues of the day, which included the sanctity of kingship, the king's obligation to support the Church and render justice to his subjects, the rule of law, the king's obligations in war, and the basis of society in bonds of loyalty. The Junius Manuscript, then, deals with the issues of community and rebellion: the two parts of *Genesis* treat of the effects of loyalty and disloyalty to God, while *Exodus* and *Daniel* illustrate the basis of community in God's law, and *Christ and Satan* narrates the fulfillment of the promise of the Old Testament epics. The Exeter Book is concerned with the socialization of the individual. It emphasizes the constant threat of loneliness and meaninglessness in life (primarily in the elegies) and points to God as the source of all stability: it is through God that the social order is maintained, and poems such as *Juliana* and *The Order of the World* thus deal with the need for the individual's participation in both human and divine community. The poems of the Vercelli Book offer a history of the Church, developing from a persecuted body (*Fates*, *Andreas*) to an established one (*Elene*) to a perfected one (*Dream of the Rood*, which she sees as a call for monastic discipline). They also illustrate different modes of life available to the individual within a Christian society. *Beowulf* and *Judith* deal with the societal obligations of the warrior class. Wiglaf emerges as the representative of a new social code demanding political rather than personal loyalty. That is, the good of the nation should be one's paramount concern, as it is for Wiglaf, who serves what Zimmerman takes to be a failed king. Because the theme is one of loyalty, the focus in both poems is on the retainers' point of view. Three appendices discuss royal encouragement of the Benedictine Reform, Cnut's consolidation of power upon coming to the throne, and the date of *Beowulf's* composition (she favors the late ninth century).

Giangabriella Buti's *Mantica e mito nell'antica poesia germanica*, Biblioteca del Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere Moderne dell'Università degli Studi di Bologna 10 (Bologna: Pàtron, 1993) hypothesizes that the purpose of early Germanic verse was to "point out the educative substance of reality" (p. 8), a practice that is mantic in origin and is frequently still so at base. This "educative substance" takes the form of myth, a concept to which she apparently gives the broad sense of what is concrete by way of example. Hence the first chapter is devoted to "concrete knowledge": it sets out "to define the connection between content and form in the full function that it originally had, and aims to demonstrate that in it was identified the very inspiration of poetry, since the role of the singer was to establish in myth the truth of the present by rendering it accessible in a mantic form" (p. 9). More concretely, this chapter examines first-person narrative formulas ("I have heard" and "I can say") in order to delineate the "cultural identity" of the Germanic poet. Such formulas are not actually an Indo-European heritage, since they differ in several respects from cognate formulas (the examples cited are Vedic), such as in their logical structure and in respect to the contexts in which they are found. Far from being associated solely with the epic, such formulas in early Germanic must have had a mythic significance, introducing an emotional state requiring resolution through the mythic example. Hence the formulas' use in elegy. On the other hand the use of such formulas in *Beowulf* is stereotyped, betraying departures from their original function. Other Old English works exemplify innovations in terms of form (*Widsith*) and content (*Elene*). In the succeeding chapters, verse is divided into two types, the catechetical and the heroic, which are then examined under the rubrics "spiritual knowledge" and "abstract knowledge," respectively. The Old English poems studied in the former category are *The Seafarer*, *The Wanderer*, and *The Dream of the Rood*, and for each Buti discusses the structure, the purpose of the mythic elements (for example to teach intellectual transcendence in *The Wanderer*), formal means of expression of the mythic *exemplum* (such as first-person formulas), and the Christian didactic elements. "Abstract," heroic verse is subdivided into the categories "instructive" (or "endocentric," including *Widsith*), "didactic" (or "exocentric" or "oracular," including *Hávamál*) and "commemorative" (*Maldon*), and each is treated to a consideration of structure and organization of the material. Roughly the final third of the volume comprises texts (based on extant editions) with Italian translations of all the lyric poems discussed under the rubrics "catechetical" and "heroic."

Patrizia Lendinara offers non-specialists a non-Tacitean view of the warrior in Anglo-Saxon society in "Rappresentazioni della guerra nella letteratura anglosassone," in *Raccontare la guerra*, ed. Antonino di Spanti and Mario Giacomarra (Palermo: L'epos società editrice, 1995), pp. 111-24. She cites passages from Bede's *History* and Felix's life of Guthlac to illustrate the cult of the heroic in Germanic civilization, yet also finds in them evidence of skepticism about the heroic code, in the unheroic stance of the warrior Imma and in Guthlac's rejec-

tion of warfare. The cult of the heroic is also illustrated by its political use in the West-Saxon genealogical regnal list and by the very survival of heroic verse (which *Finnsburg* is used to illustrate). Connections are also drawn to contemporary attitudes, since the volume was conceived as a reaction to the Gulf War. Also for non-specialists is André Crépin's "Poétique latine et poétique vieil-anglaise: poèmes mêlant les deux langues," *Médiévales* 25 (1993), 33–44, which begins with a brief history of Anglo-Saxon ideas about the relative importance of English and Latin in composition. This is followed by a consideration of what was known of Latin verse and then a survey of macaronic verse, the Latin and Greek elements of which must be derived from poems in Latin, hymns, prayers, and glossaries. Summing up, Crépin says that there are certain metrical and quantitative affinities (though not very regular ones) between the Latin and English verses, and that the incidence of macaronic verse is small—some 60 verses in 61,000.

In *Psychiatry Around the Globe* (1988) J.P. Leff argued that, historically, there is no original distinction between somatic and psychic expressions of emotional distress, and he held up Anglo-Saxon England as an example of an early culture in which the two are undifferentiated. In "The Expression of Emotional Distress in Old English Prose and Verse," *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 19 (1995), 327–38, Simon Nicholson counters Leff's argument by examining ten elegies and Alfred's translation of Boethius, in which he finds 37 abstract nouns signifying adverse mood states, most of which have no somatic reference. Moreover, these nouns can be classified under three headings according to whether they refer to terror, anger, or disturbance, and thus Leff is mistaken to claim that different kinds of emotional distress were undifferentiated before the seventeenth century. Nicholson thus rejects the evolutionary theory of emotional expression and supports the view of M.R. Godden ("Anglo Saxons on the Mind": see *YWOES* 1985, p. 61) that native and classical conceptions of the mind coexisted in Anglo-Saxon England.

In "Treatments of Treachery and Betrayal in Anglo-Saxon Texts," *ES* 76 (1995), 1–19, Hugh Magennis surveys the literature for relevance to treachery, with particular attention to the later period, in which interest in the subject seems to have been particularly intense, especially in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Though the hero of *Beowulf* is continually praised for his trustworthiness, the poem is shot through with betrayal, which is the rule in the world of the poem rather than the exception. This preoccupation reveals nothing about the poem's date of composition, but it does suggest that the poem would have been received appreciatively by a late audience.

Barbara C. Raw's ultimate concern in "Verbal Icons in Late Old English," *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77 (1995), 121–39, is to account for the frequency of Ælfric's use of Old Testament figures as types of Christ. She illustrates the uses of typology in the debate with Arians and Jews over the status of the old law and the messianic nature of Christ. Typology, she finds, is used in Ælfric as a mnemonic device: the stories of Old Testament figures recall

the theological significance of New Testament events, and are more easily remembered than theology itself. Indeed, because they are arranged chronologically they structure the theology of the new law, in much the same way that metaphorical devices like honeycombs, pigeon-holes and treasure chests were used to structure memories systematically in other contexts. Yet typology of this sort is more than a trick of memory, since it demonstrates that "Christian revelation was not something new, but that it was already present in the Jewish scriptures" (138), and it thus asserts, against Jewish and Arian counterarguments, that Christ had always existed, leaving imprints of himself in the prophets.

Anita R. Riedinger's "'Home' in Old English Poetry," *NM* 96 (1995), 51–58, is a brief lexicosemantic study. She finds fourteen synonyms for the concept in verse, used in 116 different compounds, connoting variously a geographical location, an edifice, or a family setting. She examines several examples in context to demonstrate that "home" has many of the sentimental associations in Old English verse that it has in modern usage, being associated with moments of crisis and contentment.

In "Word, Breath, and Vomit: Oral Competition in Old English and Old Norse Literature," *Oral Tradition* 10 (1995), 359–86, Robin Waugh's concern is with the physicality of communication in an oral culture. Speech is conceived as lodged in the body. Thus in heroic texts verbal sparring is equated with battle, and Waugh locates instances in which the speech organs (including the breast) come under attack, since these concretize the nature of debate. Vomiting (mercifully restricted here to a single instance in *Grettis saga*), too, is associated with words, and particularly with dispensing poetry. The advent of Christianity alters matters not only because it introduces literacy, but also because God is associated with quietness and the physical word-hord in one's interior is replaced by a more abstract soul. The Old English texts dealt with are *Vainglory*, *Beowulf*, and *Solomon and Saturn*, with briefer reference to a variety of others.

María José Mora has given us two articles dealing with questions of genre. He dismisses the concept of the OE elegy, along with the elegiac canon, as a nineteenth-century fabrication with its origins in Romanticism in "The Invention of the Old English Elegy," *ES* 76 (1995), 129–39. These poems were held to represent the first utterances of the true Teutonic soul, embodying such typically Romantic themes as solitude, the search for identity, and sympathy with nature. Thus they provided evidence of a transcendent, timeless constant in Germanic literature and character. The Romantics projected their own attitudes onto these poems and then, naturally, saw themselves reflected in them. Much of the article is devoted to demonstrating these attitudes in Conybeare's *Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (1826). In "Modulation and Hybridization in the Old English Elegies," in *Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Teresa Fanego Lema (Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1993), pp. 203–11, Mora considers alternative modes of defining

"elegy," either as a universal genre or one constructed particularly on the basis of features located in Old English examples, and he explores the problems facing both approaches. Because the Old English elegiac genre is a Romantic creation, perhaps a nineteenth-century definition is best, and he suggests "a kind of personal poetry that combines feeling and meditation" (207). More useful than any such definition, though, are Alastair Fowler's concepts of "generic modulation" and "hybridization," whereby works are conceived of not as belonging to discrete and ideal generic entities but as amalgams of mixed generic properties.

In "Direct Speech in Six Old English Religious Narrative Poems: Forms, Uses and Consequences," 1994 diss. Univ. of Maryland College Park, *DAI* 55A (1995), 3198, Catherine Peterson Haar examines *Elene*, *Andreas*, *Juliana*, *Daniel*, *Exodus*, and *Judith* and finds differences among them in patterns of direct speech. The first two present lengthy educational dialogues; the next two foreground God's participation in human history; and the last two focus on the protagonists as representatives of divine power. Linda Margaret Simpkins argues that the Germanic genre of flyting influenced the Christian trope of the war of words to produce a new and sacred subgenre. In "From Secular to Sacred Flyting: The Anglo-Saxon Reanalysis of the Christian War of Words in Old English Religious prose and Verse," 1994 diss. Univ. of British Columbia, *DAI* 55A (1995), 2409–10, she culls examples of adversarial dialogue from a wide selection of religious prose and poetry. Adelheid L.J. Thieme applies Marcel Mauss's theory of the gift to the analysis of Old English literature in "Gift Exchange and the Heroic Ethos in Old English Poetry," 1994 diss. Arizona State Univ., *DAI* 55A (1995), 3855–56. She finds that, in addition to binding together the *comitatus* in heroic verse, gift exchange underlies the implicit compact between God and humankind in religious poetry. In "Chronotopes: The Sense of Time in Old English and Old French Poetry," 1994 diss. Univ. of Iowa, *DAI* 55A (1995), 2381, Mircea Mihai Tomus distinguishes a "heroic" type of perception of time from the more modern one imposed by Christianity. Heroic verse is characterized by a perception of time that is not objective and linear, and this contrasts with the treatment of time in elegiac verse as well as in the *chansons de geste*.

Sex and gender

Some good sex this year. M.R. Godden offers a survey and very perceptive analysis of OE literary references to Sodom and its inhabitants in "The Trouble with Sodom: Literary Responses to Biblical Sexuality," *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77 (1995), 97–119, demonstrating how Alcuin and Ælfric strive to heighten the contrast between homosexual and heterosexual sin, fiercely condemning the former by comparison. In contrast, there is a concerted program to explain and ameliorate the incestuous relations of Lot and his daughters. Like later commentators, Alcuin and Ælfric see its homosexual nature as the defining characteristic of the Sodomites' sin, yet this is not so for the *Genesis A* poet

(or for the authors themselves of other books of the Bible, for that matter), for whom the Sodomites' "urban excess," especially drunkenness, seems a more pressing ill. The polarizing tendency of Alcuin and Ælfric is continued and enhanced in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and the Middle English *Cleanness*, though the poets strain logic in attempting to justify the acceptableness of heterosexual sins and the general disinterest in women's sexual agency in these works.

In translations from Latin, references to women's beauty and fine dress tend to be omitted, Hugh Magennis argues in "No Sex Please, We're Anglo-Saxons? Attitudes to Sexuality in Old English Prose and Poetry," *Leeds Stud. in Eng.* 26 (1995), 1–27. This is true particularly in saints' lives, but also in *Apollonius of Tyre* and in translations and adaptations of biblical material. Among the biblical narratives only *Genesis A* does not avoid sexual themes. When OE literature does not ignore sexuality it takes a "pessimistic" view of it inherited from patristic teaching. The riddles, however, are a remarkable exception, treating sex playfully and pleasurably, without a moral dimension, while *The Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* present passionate love as dangerous and threatening to the social (as opposed to the moral) order. They are unique in treating themes generally ignored in the heroic and literate traditions.

Roberta Frank discusses the relative invisibility of women in heroic texts (mostly Old English and Old Icelandic) in "Quid Hinieldus cum feminis: The Hero and Women at the End of the First Millennium," in *La funzione dell'eroe germanico: storicità, metafora, paradigma*, ed. Teresa Pàroli (Rome: Il Calamo), pp. 7–25. Their marginalization stems from their association with the ordinary, which is what heroes must escape. When women actually do appear, they resemble either Helen of Troy, as sources of trouble for men, or Andromache, as lamenters and victims. Primary attention is devoted to *Beowulf* and the Bayeux Tapestry.

Marjorie Anne Brown's "Juliana, Elene, and Judith: Holy Women and Christian Doctrine in Old English Poetry," 1995 diss. SUNY-Binghamton, *DAI* 56A (1995), 2245, is a historical study positing that women were treated along with men as *milites Christi* in the seventh and eighth centuries, but after the Benedictine reform they were marginalized. She finds evidence in Aldhelm, Bede, and Ælfric, in addition to the poems mentioned in the title.

Non-Old English Texts

Mark C. Amodio's Introduction to his edited volume *Oral Poetics in Middle English Poetry*, Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition 13 (New York: Garland, 1994), 1–28, deals only tangentially with Old English, but it may interest Anglo-Saxonists in that it offers a brief consideration of the history and current state of the study of oral poetics. It includes an extended discussion of Lazamon's *Brut*, attempting to locate the poet on an oral-literate continuum and finding him so limited in "oral traditional competence" that he is situated "at (if not beyond) the absolute limits of an active oral poetics" (20). As if in response to Amodio's complaint that too few are

aware of the *Brut*'s manuscript encoding, Erik Kooper argues, in "Lazamon and the Development of Early Middle English Alliterative Poetry," in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry & Prose*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1994), pp. 113–29, that the pointing in the manuscripts participates in a historical trend of increasingly systematic punctuation (he seems unaware of Malcolm Parkes's 1993 history of Western punctuation, *Pause and Effect*), a trend of a compensatory nature related to the decline of the Old English poetic tradition. He asserts both that rhyme and assonance were mere ornamentation before poems were lineated in manuscript and that "there was no clear-cut distinction between prose and poetry" in the tenth and eleventh centuries (119). He provides statistics to demonstrate that the use of assonance and rhyme increases over the course of the *Brut*, as does that of mid-line enjambement.

Also in *Loyal Letters*, Tette Hofstra's "Note on the 'Darkness of the Night' Motif in Alliterative Poetry, and the Search for the Poet of the Old Saxon *Heliand*," pp. 93–104, first reviews some of the arguments proposed for locating the home of the *Heliand* poet (though the Straubing fragments and their relevance to this question are left out of consideration). One of these pertains to the meaning of *uuanomnabton*, apparently 'dark nights', and this suggests the subject of the second half of the paper, which is not explicitly connected to the question of the location of the *Heliand* poet's home: the meaning of *narouua naht*. Hofstra adduces the testimony of cognate expressions in other Ingvaeonic languages (particularly Old English) and concludes that it means 'dark night'.

R.D.F.

Works Not Seen:

Hill, Joyce, ed. *Old English Minor Heroic Poems*. Rev. ed. Durham Med. Texts, 4. Durham: Dept. of Eng. Stud., Univ. of Durham, 1994.

Paroli, Teresa. "Eroi e santi nella letteratura inglese antica." *Rendiconti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, ser. 9, 6 (1995), 327–55.

b. Individual Poems

Cædmon's Hymn

In "New Formulas for Old: *Cædmon's Hymn*" (*Pagans and Christians: The Interplay between Christian Latin and Traditional Germanic Cultures in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. T. Hofstra, L. A. J. R. Houwen, and A. A. MacDonald, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, 16 [Groningen: Forsten], 131–148), E. G. Stanley ranges far, commingling remarks on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, history, learning, poetry, and piety, with pleasing quotations from Oliver Goldsmith and Samuel Johnson. Stanley's central focus is on certain formulas in *Cædmon's Hymn*: *eci drybtin*, which he compares with and

contrasts to words for "lord" in *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*; *hefenricas uard*, which he believes must have been "an exciting new kenning" based on "some secular poetic circumlocution for a prince" (143–44); and *frea allmihtig*, which he thinks was much used by later OE poets partly because it was reinforced by Latin *dominus omnipotens*. *Cædmon* "shaped the poetic language of England for four hundred years, away from paganism, away from secularity, and he gave to the vernacular a sacred authority for verse on many themes of divine praise and biblical and sacred story, such as no other vernacular possessed so early, except a little through his indirect influence" (148).

In "Structure and Idea in *Cædmon's Hymn*" (*NM* 96, 39–50), Charles Abbott Conway first argues that *middungeard*, 7a, is not a direct object of *tiadae*, 8b, but the second direct object of *scop*, 5a, the first direct object being *heben*, 6a; that *firim*, 9a, is not a dative but an instrumental—God adorned the earth "with people" rather than "for people" (41); and that creation is described in three stages in accord with the adverbs *aerist*, *tha*, and *aefter*, 5–8. A plausible reading. (As Conway perhaps acknowledges implicitly, A. H. Smith, ed., *Three Northumbrian Poems* [London, 1933], 40–41, earlier maintained that *middungeard* is the second direct object of *scop* and that *aerist* and *tha* are correlative.) Conway next contends that *maecti*, *modgidanc*, and *uerc*, 2–3a, form a "triad of power, thought, and accomplishment . . . stemming from Aristotle, and found in Marius Victorinus, and Boethius" (41), a triad also reflected in the story of *Cædmon*, who, given power and counsel in his dream, was able to compose the hymn. Complementing the hymn's philosophical sophistication is its numeric structure. The first sentence consists of four lines, the second of three, the third of two. Further, a syllable and word count reveals intricate proportions: "For in the first segment there are 20 words and 40 syllables; in the second there are 14 words and 25 syllables; in the third there are 8 words and 16 syllables. The number of words in the second segment of *Cædmon's Hymn* represents the arithmetical mean between the first and the third. The number of syllables in the second segment is within a fraction of the geometric mean. Both sets of relations suggest that the segments of the poem are elements in a proportional system" (43). Things grow still more complex when Conway contends that the word count echoes (as it were) various musical intervals. To the objection that a herdsman would not have understood such intricate numeric relations, Conway responds, "we must remember that according to the story it is not *Cædmon* himself, but a dream visitant, who first pronounces the *Hymn*" (44). If by "pronounces" Conway means "recites," his text of the story differs from mine; if by "pronounces" he does not mean "recites," it is hard to see how his response answers the objection. It is in any case surprising that he shows no acquaintance with two studies in which the number of syllables in the hymn was earlier noted: P. L. Henry's *The Early English and Celtic Lyric* (London, 1966), p. 211; and Ute Schwab's "The Miracles of Caedmon," *ES* 64 (1983), 10–11.

Genesis B

"In this paper," says Pétur Knútsson in "Translation or Dialectal Adjustment?" (*North-Western European Language Evolution* 25, 107–26), "I shall be examining examples of textual transmission entailing language shifts of varying degrees, ranging from relatively minor dialectal shifts to movements between distinct although closely related national languages. In spite of their differences, I shall argue that it is unrealistic to subclassify them, and that it makes more sense to regard these activities as continuous within a spectrum" (107–08). Knútsson discusses three sets of texts: first, *Genesis B* 805–09 and the corresponding OS lines; second, a (delightful) little Icelandic poem by the modern writer Snorri Hjartarson translated into Faroese by Martin Næs; third, *Cædmon's Hymn* in Northumbrian and West Saxon dialects. Knútsson shows that the manner of translating OS into OE is comparable to that of translating modern Icelandic into Faroese and maintains that the manner is not so very different from the conversion of a Northumbrian text into West Saxon. Knútsson overstates the case but makes his point. Today's language standardization inclines us to apply the term "translation" to the conversion of a text between cognate tongues that medieval scribes or editors might rather have conceived as dialectal adjustment.

"*Genesis: Old Saxon and Old English*" (*ES* 76, 409–23), by R. Derolez, is a review essay. After succinctly giving background on the OS fragments and *Genesis B*—a valuable service—Derolez embarks on a précis of Ute Schwab's *Einige Beziehungen zwischen altsächsischer und angelsächsischer Dichtung* (Spoleto, 1988), recapitulating her historical, cultural, literary, and codicological findings and arguments. He then does the same for Schwab's *Die Bruchstücke der altsächsischen Genesis und ihrer altenglischen Übertragung* (Göppingen, 1991), which "presents the essentials [of *Einige Beziehungen*] in 50 pages" (417). Derolez now takes up A. N. Doane's *The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon 'Genesis B' and the Old Saxon Vatican 'Genesis'* (Madison and London, 1991). Although calling it "an impressive piece of work that has all the ingredients of a 'classical' edition" (419), Derolez is more willing to fault Doane's *Saxon Genesis* than Schwab's scholarship: for example, Doane's "discussion of the punctuation, accents, and spacing of letters (p. 24ff.) is not informed by a unified vision of the 'function' of the Old Saxon *Genesis* (which as we saw was Schwab's concern)" (420); his treatment of language, composition, and date tries to do too much in too little space; his "two dozen pages devoted to 'Meter' (pp. 65–88) supplemented by the last three appendices (pp. 437–464) are in stark contrast with only four devoted to 'style' (pp. 89–92)" (420–21); and his quotations from German or citations of German titles are sometimes inaccurate. Yet "Doane's *The Saxon Genesis* is a courageous attempt to bridge the gap between two texts and two philologies. It does not supersede Schwab's numerous contributions to the subject, which will remain a source of information and inspiration" (423). No one—including Doane—is likely to challenge Derolez's last

point, but I would like to answer his charge that Schwab's work on the OS *Genesis* and *Genesis B* has been largely ignored. During the last twenty years I have reviewed in these pages most of the scholarship by Schwab which Derolez cites in his essay, including *Die Bruchstücke* (*OEN* 27.2 [1994], 34). The sole major exception is her *Einige Beziehungen*, which fell under another section of YWOES and which the reviewer lists among *works not seen* (*OEN* 23.1 [1989], 56). Little wonder. Until recently it has been difficult for those of us outside Europe to secure scholarship published in Italy. (When I finally persuaded my impecunious university library to subscribe to *AION*, the publisher repeatedly sent the wrong issues.) As for Doane's purported neglect of Schwab's work, my files contain a letter from him dated September 13, 1989, asking for help on two articles by Schwab which, Doane says, "I have been trying to track . . . down for years, without success." Derolez faults Doane for not using Schwab's *Einige Beziehungen*—"which had come out three years before *The Saxon Genesis*" (419)—but Doane's study went to press in late 1989, and the *OEN* bibliography listing *Einige Beziehungen* appeared only a few months earlier.

"The Old English Epic of the Fall" is chapter 4 in Eric Jager's *The Tempter's Voice: Language and the Fall in Medieval Literature* (Ithaca and London: Cornell, 1993), 145–89. (The book is much enlarged from his dissertation, "The Tempter's Voice: Language and the Fall in *Genesis B*, *Ancrene Wisse*, and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," University of Michigan, 1987.) Drawing on some of his earlier published work, Jager proceeds through the poem, contending that *Genesis B* makes a "virtual equation of the Fall with corruptible oral tradition" (151). Jager's bold thesis is best epitomized in section 7, under the heading "Conclusion":

. . . *Genesis B* turns the Fall into a tragedy of oral tradition. Monastic poets using native meters inevitably wrote literate attitudes into their religious poems. As a product of monastic culture, *Genesis B* adapts the native heroic ethos to its biblical plot and censures the old pagan culture whose exclusive reliance on memory and speech makes it vulnerable to errors and contingencies that a script-based culture could ward off, at least to some extent. According to the poem, the tempter's voice is heard not only in the Devil's allurements, in womanly wiles, and in heresy at large but in the old oral tradition—now on the retreat but still a powerful memory, possibly even in the monasteries. In the poem's typology of fallen and redemptive language, oral tradition is seductive, fallible, "bodily," whereas script is corrective, authoritative, "spiritual." (188)

That dog (as we say in the South) won't hunt. The poet does not so much as refer to books or writing, much less elaborate a contrast between written and oral traditions. By which license of language is Jager entitled to call speech acts in the poem "oral tradition"? The tempter uses the spoken word to beguile Adam and Eve; earlier God uses the spoken word to forewarn them. If the characters had communicated by pen and parchment, would anyone equate the fall of Adam and Eve with the fall of the "written tradition"? The fall of Adam and Eve points to the corruptibility of the human heart, not to the corruptibility of "oral tradition" or to the superiority of script. The medium is not the message. The message is the message.

Exodus

In "*Exodus* 362–446 and the Book of Wisdom" (*N&Q* 42, 4–7), Hugh Fogarty claims that he has discovered the source of what is elsewhere called the "patriarchal digression." After citing Wis. 9:7–8, in which Solomon says that God chose him king of Israel and ordered him to build the temple, Wis. 10:4–5, in which Noah's flood and Abraham are mentioned, and Wis. 10:17–21, in which the crossing of the Red Sea is recounted, Fogarty asserts:

Not only does this passage unite all the figures referred to by Earl, but it specifically selects the episodes chosen by the *Exodus*-poet in his 'digression'—Solomon's building of the temple; Noah's steering over the waters of the Deluge; Abraham's offering of Isaac. And, of course, the Wisdom passage incorporates the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of the Egyptians, thus effectively providing a link between the episodes of the Noah/Abraham passage and the events which are in *Exodus*, described directly before and after the 'digression'. The book of Wisdom, seen earlier to be an important source for the *Exodus*-poet, provides the 'single coherent tradition' desired and despaired of by Earl. (6)

"This passage" from Wisdom, as Fogarty calls it, contains much more than he acknowledges. After Solomon's reference to himself as the builder of the temple in Wis. 9:8, the rest of the chapter continues with a ten-verse meditation on the role of wisdom in human affairs. Chapter 10 follows with verses on Adam, Cain and Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Lot's wife, Sodom, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and the crossing of the Red Sea. In short, Wisdom chapter 10 hardly "selects the episodes chosen by the *Exodus*-poet" but simply lists significant Old Testament persons or events, some of which also occur in *Exodus*. (For a similar list—including reference to Abraham, Isaac, Moses, the crossing of the Red Sea, and Solomon's building of the temple—see Acts 7.) Fogarty's citation of Wisdom chapters 9 and 10 is at best a loose analogue for the digression in *Exodus*. His argument that the eschatological implications of the Book of Wisdom explain the poet's reading of the Red Sea episode as a figure for the Last Judgment fares no better. The poet does suggest that the episode is such a figure, but the biblical book does little to illuminate the poet's purpose.

In "The Dual Function of Repetitions in *Exodus* 447–515" (*Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry & Prose*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, 15 [Groningen: Forsten, 1994], 55–70), Karin E. Olsen contends that repetitions in the account of the Egyptians' death by water "both reinforce the graphic nature of the imagery of the passage and convey the shift from a worldly to a heavenly perspective which is implicit in the poem's biblical subject matter" (56). Olsen finds "four self-contained episodes" (56) in lines 447–76, each giving a different slant on the same incident. In the first, lines 447–59, the poet personifies the sea as a lethal opponent and outlines the action; in the second, lines 460–63, he concentrates on the Egyptians' outcry and terror; in the third and fourth, lines 464–67a and 467b–76, he stresses treachery and the (ironic) use of weapons. In the rest of the passage, lines 477–515, the poet gradually shifts from the sea to God as the Egyptians'

opponent, as God acts to protect the Israelites from the sea and unleash it against Pharaoh and his followers. Although Olsen's analysis of the overall scene tends to be schematic, it is most welcome. (The only other attempt I know of to explore the poet's astonishing achronological narrative mélange in lines 447–500a appears in Peter Reinhold Schroeder's 1967 Harvard dissertation, "The Narrative Style of Old English Biblical Poetry," pp. 87–96.) In treating the passage, Olsen must confront a host of textual cruxes. To some of them she brings a fresh new approach, as in her attempt to understand *ypþinge* at line 499b. But others she handles a bit hastily. At line 479a, for example, she takes *sið* as an accusative of *hweop*, whereas elsewhere the evidence seems to show that the verb takes a dative object. (See "Old English *Exodus* and the Sea of Contradiction," *Mediaevalia* 9 [1986 for 1983], 43, n. 31.) And at 494b she emends MS *flodwearde* to *flodward*, producing an unmetrical, trisyllabic half verse, *flodward sloh*, whereas the manuscript reading makes good sense and meter as it stands. (See "*Exodus* 488b, *hælpendra pæð*," *ANQ* ns 5 [1992], 6, n. 11.) Yet no one who attempts the passage will please anyone on everything, and Olsen's effort is enlightening overall.

In "The Death of the Messenger: The 'spelboda' in the Old English *Exodus*" (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77.3, 141–64), Richard Marsden takes note of the poet's stressing in lines 506b–14a that no Egyptian survived the sea's onslaught—not even a messenger to bear news of the disaster back home. Marsden observes that the detail of the messenger, not found in the Book of Exodus, occurs in the Book of Judith at 5:13, in which the sacred author has Achior say that no one remained from the Red Sea debacle to announce it to posterity. (At the end of the essay Marsden thanks "Joy Anderson (who pointed me to Judith)" [164], so it may be she who first noted the parallel.) Marsden believes that the reference in Judith is the probable source of the detail in *Exodus*. However, he also acknowledges, first, that in Judith the messenger's role is to declare the news to posterity whereas in *Exodus* his role is simply to bring it to Egypt, and, second, that the messenger motif also appears in the *Paris Psalter* 105:10. The matter is somewhat more complex than Marsden suggests. In "The Old English *Exodus* and the *Antiquitates Judaicae*: More Parallels," *ASNSL* 216 [1979], 343–44, the present writer noted the *Paris Psalter* parallel, together with parallels from Josephus and Philo, both of whom employ the detail in reference to the Red Sea episode; in "Hermeneutic Sensibility and the Old English *Exodus*," Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Toronto, 1990, Nancy Speirs noted that the detail is also found in reference to the episode in the so-called Irish Augustine's *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae* (200–01). In the second part of his essay Marsden richly meditates on "the explicit and implicit functions of the 'tale-teller' in Old English poetry" (149). His survey of OE verse includes *Beowulf*, the *Battle of Maldon*, the *Battle of Brunanburh*, *Widsith*, *Deor*, and *Daniel*. He does not limit himself to OE, however, but refers to Old Testament narratives, Welsh

poetry, and even an ancient Egyptian inscription. "The storyteller," Marsden remarks, ". . . bears the burden of his nation's history" (159).

Daniel

In "A Daniel Come to Judgement? Belshazzar's Feast in Old and Middle English" (*Loyal Letters*, as above, 71–91), Peter J. Lucas compares and contrasts the episode as related in *Daniel* 675–764 and in *Cleanness* 133–1804. One major difference between the two accounts is that the ME poet's narrative voice is supreme and magisterial, whereas the OE poet's is more confiding and exploratory. A second major difference is that the poets depart from the scriptural source in distinct ways, "one (*Cleanness*) amplifying and elaborating, trying to make human and even divine behaviour psychologically plausible, one (*Daniel*) condensing and focusing on the moral issue" (91). Lucas concludes by noting "how diverse mediaeval English literature can be" and by bidding us to beware of "generalisations that seek to typify it as showing one 'normal tendency' or another" (91).

In "Repentance and Retribution: The Use of the Book of Daniel in Old and Middle English Texts" (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77.3, 177–92), J.-A. George also focuses on OE *Daniel* and a fourteenth-century ME alliterative poem, in this case *Susannah*: "both texts attempt at least in part to explore the relationship between sin and repentance (or lack thereof)" (178). In discussing *Daniel*, George concentrates on Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its aftermath: "the Babylonian king experiences all of the identifiable stages in the penitential cycle: temptation, sin, repentance, confession, punishment, forgiveness, and then a rebirth" (180). George next compares the episode with episodes in other OE biblical or hagiographic poems. Her most apposite comparison is between Nebuchadnezzar in *Daniel* and Constantine in *Elene*; in each case a national leader undergoes conversion partly through a dream, and the conversion claims political significance. In analyzing *Susannah*, George notes that the story as told in ME exhibits features of a saint's life but that later, Renaissance writers adapted the story to secular ends. In *The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna* (ca. 1578), for example, Daniel "emerges as shrewd solicitor exercising his constitutional authority" (191). Is not this an appalling devolution? From Daniel come to judgment to Daniel come to court. From Daniel the prophet to Daniel the lawyer.

Judith

In "La dimensione eroica nella *Giuditta* anglosassone" (*La funzione dell'eroe germanico: storicità, metafora, paradigma*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studio, Roma, 6–8 maggio 1993, ed. Teresa Pàroli, *Philologia*, 2 [Rome: Il Calamo], 75–91), Paola Orlandi points out that the poet christianizes and germanicizes the biblical narrative. On the one hand, he departs from the scriptural source by seeking to eliminate any suggestion that Judith is a seductress; on the other, he gives her some attributes of a Germanic heroine and relates the tale

in terms of the comitatus ethic. Holofernes is portrayed as an antihero, who fails to live up to the Germanic heroic ideal, in contrast to Judith, who exemplifies both *sapientia* and *fortitudo*. Judith's wisdom, however, is not worldly wisdom but knowledge of God, and her strength is not martial strength but the power of faith. In the poet's hands the comitatus ethic becomes a vehicle for Christian values.

Guthlac A

After noting that Guthlac is described in ways that bring Beowulf to mind, George E. Nicholas, in "Monasticism and the Social Temptation in the Old English *Guthlac A*" (*Amer. Benedictine Rev.* 46, 444–58), argues that

the equation between spiritual and martial heroism is more than skin deep. There is a substantive concern in the portrayal of Guthlac that connects him to a social world, suggesting that conventional ideas of heroism do indeed extend to the thematic level. Though he is alone, Guthlac represents a true, faithful, and well-ordered society, while the demons who assail him remain isolated and confused. Furthermore, failure to perceive Guthlac's "connectedness" to a true society is portrayed in the poem as an important index of spiritual blindness. (445)

Nicholas takes the opening 29 lines, which describe an angel's welcoming a saved soul into heaven, as the poet's way of indicating the spiritual community to which Guthlac belongs. (Nicholas is evidently unaware of Roy M. Liuzza's argument in *RES* 41 [1990], 1–11, that a scribe or editor composed the lines to link the beginning of *Guthlac A* to the end of *Christ III*.) Nicholas then applies the theme to Guthlac's three temptations. To the devils' claim that Guthlac is isolated from his kinsmen, the saint replies that he has spiritual company and support. To the devils' claim that he and his spiritual kinsmen, monks, are hypocrites, Guthlac replies that the worldly monks in question are young yet and may yet attain full membership in the kingdom of God. To the devils' claim that Guthlac—whom they carry to hell's mouth—is destined to be damned, he responds that he has faith in Christ and that it is the devils themselves who must despair. At the poem's end Guthlac dies, and celestial society receives his soul.

That Guthlac's anchorite life has communal implications is an argument also pursued by Christopher A. Jones in a meticulous, measured, and persuasive essay, "Envisioning the *cenobium* in the Old English *Guthlac A*" (*MS* 57, 259–91). Jones contends that "*Guthlac A* evidences a deliberate, sustained effort to dissolve the tension between two very different understandings of sanctity, and to claim the glory of the desert for a more conventional, accessible form of the monastic life: the *vita communis*, or *cenobium*" (260). Jones maintains that Guthlac's dwelling place and dwelling are described in terms suggesting a monastery, that his unalterable resolution to remain in the place hints at the Benedictine vow of *stabilitas*, that the poet's omitting the historical fact that Guthlac began religious life as a monk before becoming an anchorite is explainable as the poet's decision to avoid any hint of instability in Guthlac, and that, after Guthlac has vanquished the devils, the transformation of his *beorg* into an earthly paradise in which he will live out the rest of his life is meant to intimate

the spiritual paradise a monastery should be for monks. "Guthlac's heroic battles and glorious victories are all, in a manner of speaking, the monastic audience's own, since in theory the anchorite's life is rooted in the *cenobium*. At the same time, the poem allows its audience, by an exercise of pious imagination, to see in Guthlac a good Benedictine like themselves, and so, perhaps to a much greater degree than has been acknowledged, anticipates the later iconographic development of the saint's cult after the refoundation of Croyland (ca. 971)" (291).

Juliana

Juliana 718b–21a (ASPR III):

Bidde ic monna gehwone
gumena cynnes, þe þis gied wræce,
þæt he mec needful bi noman minum
gemyne modig . . .

Peter Orton, in "*Juliana*, 719: *þe þis gied wræce*" (*N&Q* 42, 421–23), points out that *wræce* is in form a preterit but that the preterit makes little sense in the context. Half of the difficulty disappears, however, if *wræce* be taken as a variant spelling of or a scribal error for *wrece*. And that is how all recent editors and translators take it, interpreting *þe þis gied wræce* as an adjective clause modifying *gehwone*: "I pray each one of the race of men that may utter this story, that he . . ." (422). "However," says Orton, "it is questionable if the meaning of the Old English verb *wreccan* was broad enough to cover the recitation by one person of another's original poem . . ." (422). If *wreccan* is limited to such a meaning as "to relate what one has composed," we need not despair of making sense of the passage. Orton observes that *þe þis gied wræce* may modify *ic* of line 718b, in which case the first part of the passage may be rendered as "I, who am uttering this story, pray . . ." (423). I like the things Orton worries about.

Andreas

John Miles Foley addresses "The Poet's Self-Interruption in *Andreas*" (*Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of C. B. Heatt*, ed. M. J. Toswell [Toronto, Buffalo, and London: Univ. of Toronto Press], 42–59). The "self-interruption" occurs in lines 1478–91, in which the poet seems to say that, although he has told much of the *Andreas* story, telling the whole thing would require a man more learned than he. (I am not at all certain that the poet says this. The passage is difficult, and different translators differently construe it. Foley tenders only a loose paraphrase.) Foley begins by explaining how complex it is to judge the interaction of oral and written traditions but believes that the concept of "poetic register," by which he means "that specialized variety of language tied to situation and social function" (45), will prove helpful. He then takes up various passages in *Andreas* to show how the poet departs from his source "to harness the metonymic power of the register in service of his 'indexed translation,' in which the story told in the *Praxeis* or a close relative becomes a work of identifiably and authentically

Anglo-Saxon verbal art" (54). Turning, finally, to the poet's self-interruption, Foley notes that the passage is not based on the source and that, although the passage is an "unknown genre" (56), the poet is able to deliver it in the traditional poetic idiom. Given his mastery of the idiom, why does the poet assert that an *aglewra mann* could do better than he with the rest of the narrative? "[A] person 'wiser in the law' would be a poet who could more easily adapt his fluency to this particular compositional task, who could match register and source text with more success or authority. Further, I would suspend judgment on whether the poet 'truly' feels inadequate or whether this is another Anglo-Saxon avatar of the modesty topos, but in either case I believe that he longs for a syncretic poetics" (56–57).

In the same volume (164–79) Brian Shaw aims to show in "Translation and Transformation in *Andreas*" that the poet "has carefully shifted the nuances of the Latin text so that the less-than-significant original references to concepts associated with speech echo throughout the recension to create what is essentially a newly focused version of the story. Thus the *Andreas* poet redefines the subtext of Andrew's story to make it the model of the ability of the word to rival the power of the letter" (165). Analyzing the poem's introduction, the Mermedonians' treatment of Matthew, Christ's and Andrew's dialogues, and Andrew's encouragement of his followers, Shaw stresses the function and force of the spoken word and concludes that "The poet has not just translated: he has transformed so that an oral-poetic version coexists with a bookish version" (176).

Elene

In "La Légende de sainte Hélène de Cynewulf à Evelyn Waugh" (*EA* 48, 306–18), Marie-Françoise Alamichel first surveys some writers who have written on Helen or Constantine over the centuries—Bede, Nennius, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Layamon, Drayton—then contrasts Cynewulf's *Elene* to Waugh's *Helena* (1950). Cynewulf considers his story historically true; Waugh stresses that his is not. Cynewulf celebrates Constantine's victory, depicting the man as sincere and saint-like; Waugh downplays the victory, portraying Constantine as corrupt and cynical. Cynewulf devotes most of his narrative to Elene's finding the true cross; Waugh gives the theme comparatively little attention. Cynewulf relates the conversion of Constantine; Waugh relates the conversion of Helen. Cynewulf's Elene is anti-Semitic and authoritarian; Waugh's Helen is generally benevolent and reasonably humble. Cynewulf decisively adheres to the genre of a saint's life, relating it in epic terms and extolling God's grace and power; Waugh's work wavers between historical romance, saint's life, and satire. Cynewulf celebrates the cross as a luminous token of victory; Waugh emphasizes its materiality. "Et c'est précisément cet objet transfiguré, cette glorification au travers de la poésie et ce message spirituel et universal qui font d'*Elene* une œuvre beaucoup plus captivante et stimulante qu'*Helena* d'Evelyn Waugh" (318)—a daring, pleasing conclusion.

The Partridge and A Prayer

Gwendolyn Morgan and Brian McAllister's "'The Dove' and 'A Prayer': Two Anglo-Saxon Poems" (*Lit. and Belief*, 14 [1994], 57–65) consists of a one-page introduction, the OE poetic texts, and facing translations. In the introduction they note that what they dub "The Dove" is otherwise known as *The Partridge* but do not say why they prefer their new title. Since they say, however, that the poem "adapts the classical bestiary parable as a vehicle for depicting the Holy Trinity and God's grace," perhaps they associate their "Dove" with the Holy Ghost. They do not say from which source they take the OE texts, but the punctuation agrees with that in ASPR. Although they claim that *A Prayer* "has never before appeared in English translation," ASPR VI:clxix lists an English translation by E. Thomson (1849), and Thomas Lawrence Noronha provides another in his 1971 Stanford dissertation. "As with our previous work," remark Morgan and McAllister, "we have preserved in the translations both the literal meaning of the lines and the peculiar poetic qualities of the original. We hope also to have preserved the spirit in which they were created." Morgan and McAllister do better with the spirit than with the letter. For example, their rendering of *The Partridge* 12–13,

Uton we þy geornor gode oliccan
firene feogan, friþes carnian,

as

Come! Because we wish to welcome God—
disowning error, earning peace—

captures the poem's piety but cannot confidently be called a literal translation.

In the same journal, following hard upon Morgan and McAllister, is Paul Thomas's "Modern Renderings of 'The Dove' and 'A Prayer'" (67–72). In a three-page introduction, Thomas discusses the manuscript sources of the poems and his aim in rendering them. Of the first poem, he says that he imagines, "The narrator is Cynewulf, who is working from some Latin *Physiologus*" (67), and that the poem is "a sort of riddle. Just what bird is singing this poem? What does the bird say on the missing two-page folio? This rendition is one answer to that riddle" (68). Given Thomas's "two imaginative stances" (67), one need not be too imaginative to imagine that his rendition will be rather distant from the fragmentary poem in the Exeter Book. And so it proves. Thomas's treatment of *A Prayer* is an "alliterative imitation of Old English poetry" (68) and more imaginative still. Not a rendering of the poem but a poem about the poem. It begins (paragraph sign in original):

¶ From the fierce fire he fetched a fine prayer,
From the ashes of books at Ashburnham house.
On three parchment pages parched and shrunken by the flames,
Was the multi-parted prayer of the priestly scop.

Meters of Boethius

To call Boethius: *The Poems from 'On the Consolation of Philosophy' Translated out of the Original Latin into Diverse*

Historical Englishes Diligently Collaged by Peter Glassgold (Los Angeles: Sun & Moon, 1994) an odd exercise is to commit meiosis on a grand scale. Glassgold construes the Boethian *meters* by drawing on the translations of King Alfred, Chaucer, Queen Elizabeth, and others, often fusing different forms of English in strange ways. Or, as he puts it, ". . . by putting new demands on the resources of early English, I have wrung something fresh—and I think beautiful—from the supposedly 'dead' ancestral strains of our language. I have called these translations sound-collages, indicating that they fall outside the bounds of conventional grammar; but like any macaronic composition, they have an essential logic: in this case, historical English" (21). The book has a forward (11–15), in which Glassgold outlines the historical context of Boethius; "A Note on Texts, Method, and Pronunciation" (19–23), in which he discusses his sources and approach; the Latin text and facing translation (if that is what it is) of the *meters* (25–171); and a glossary (175–235). Glassgold renders the first six lines of the first *meter*:

Hwæt, ic hwilum gedýde songez in florysching studie,
sorgleop la! I wepyng am cumpeld to begin.
Me the muses rent dictate I must write,
and elegies wif verray teers my face bedew.
No terror at þe leest þo muses mihte ofercuman
that they ne beon fellow travelers following my way. (27)

"And elegies wif verray teers my face bedew" (translating "Et veris elegi fletibus ora rigant") is worthy of Edmund Spenser. Glassgold's other lines also remind me of Spenser—or, rather, of Ben Jonson's remark that Spenser "writ no language."

J.R.H.

Battle of Brunanburh

In "Words of Technological Virtue: 'The Battle of Brunanburh' and Anglo-Saxon Sword Manufacture" (*Technology and Culture* 36, 987–99), Steven Walton focuses on the *hapax mylenscearpum* (*Brunanburh* 24a) as an indicator both of the technology of the Anglo-Saxons and of their attitudes toward technical innovation. At issue are two different methods of sword-finishing: filing and grinding. Both methods are illustrated in the Utrecht Psalter, where the virtuous employ the rotary grindstone rather than the sinners' simple whetstone. Advanced technology is good. Walton follows Campbell in reading *mylen-* 'mill' as 'grindstone', the most essential part of that industrial plant, but rejects on technological grounds the possibility that swords could be sharpened on horizontal, agricultural millstones. Thus, "The immediate meaning of *mylenscearpum* is that the sword is ground sharp on a [vertical] rotary grindstone" (995). On the other hand, "Whetstones are much more common in Anglo-Saxon England than rotary grindstones" (993), so the use of *mylenscearp* swords by Æthelstan and his men may indicate not only their reliance on cutting-edge technology, but perhaps the possession of imported weapons, a sign of prestige. Walton waffles on this issue, suggesting both that the Anglo-Saxons used better grindstones than the Danes (997) and that the Danes held technologically superior weapons (998–99). Nevertheless, he

does argue convincingly that the advanced technology of the *mecum mylenscearpum* is marked in the text and can be interpreted as contributing to the moral virtue poetically enabling the Anglo-Saxon victory at Brunanburh.

Battle of Maldon

In a brief paper, Antonio Bravo compares some stylistic features of *Maldon* and the *Cantar of Mio Cid* ("The Battle of Maldon and the Poem of the Mio Cid; Some Analogies in Style," *Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Teresa Fanego Lema, *Cursos e congresos*, 74 [Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santo de Compostela, 1993], pp. 35–41). The essay enumerates the two poems' "oral epic devices" (36): formulas, parataxis, anaphora, and apposition. Bravo offers no real point to the comparison, unless it is to show oral characteristics in both works; nevertheless, he favors literate monks as the final redactors of both poems.

In a useful article, "Interpretation of *The Battle of Maldon*, Lines 84–90: A Review and Reassessment," *SN* 67, 149–64, Paul Cavill evenhandedly reviews the arguments made about three important phrases in the poem, then offers his reasoned opinion regarding each crux. The words in question are those which have seemed most ambiguous in describing the character and actions of Byrhtnoð: *ongunnon lytegian*, *ofermod*, and *landes to fela*. In his attempt to find a "via media" between "the polarized positions of critical opinion" (158), Cavill presents little new evidence, but carefully weighs the old. Generally, he settles upon a positive, though not necessarily hagiographic, characterization of the English *ealdormann*. The blame implicit in the phrase *ongunnon lytegian* lies squarely with the Vikings, as "Byrhtnoð was practised upon, not deceived" (149). *Landes to fela* is interpreted not as meiosis or hyperbole, but literally as indicating a tactical error: "Byrhtnoð allowed the Vikings the space they asked for, and . . . gave them too much land, too much room to manoeuvre" (152). Not surprisingly, *ofermod* enjoys the lengthiest analysis. Cavill reviews the evidence for hagiographic influence, as well as Helmut Gneuss's philological argument for a pejorative meaning (*SP* 73 [1976], 117–37). He concludes, based on semantic and biographical data, that Byrhtnoð is consistently portrayed as a forceful, even belligerent, figure, so that "his problem, if such it is, is excess in courage or confidence or belligerence . . . , not his Christianity or lack of it, or the state of his soul" (157). One may not agree with all of Cavill's conclusions, but it would be difficult to find these issues and arguments laid out more thoroughly or fairly.

Robert Payson Creed continues his study of Old English prosody by applying the system he derived from *Beowulf*—a poem he dates early—to *Maldon*—a poem that is indisputably late ("The Battle of Maldon and Beowulfian Prosody," in *Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of C. B. Heatt*, ed. M. J. Toswell [Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press], 23–41). Creed finds that the verses of *Maldon* conform to his definitions of the line and halfline, with only eleven

exceptions. One of these aberrations is the first, fragmentary line, which Creed determines was not "a complete halfline but . . . was probably the second measure of the second halfline" (25). Lines 172 and 183 are also incomplete, but can be scanned into measures. Four verse lines (29, 32, 240, 271) "cannot be acceptably divided into two halfines on the basis of sound-patterning [i.e., alliteration]" (28); four others (45, 80, 224, 288) are unusual, but acceptable. Creed adds up the poem's lines, halfines, and measures to total 323.75 verse lines, then concludes, despite the anomalous lines listed above, that 322 of these represent "acceptable verse lines" (28). Creed's desire to avoid the conclusion that *Maldon*'s prosody differs substantially from *Beowulf*'s pervades the rest of the article, in which he defines types of measures and scans problematic lines. For example, he explains the "multi-measure" (i.e., hypermetric) lines 72 and 11 by suggesting that they "may have been 'improved' by an Anglo-Saxon editor. It is possible that the editor provided the pronouns, the demonstratives, and the Tironian *et*-signs as semantic cues for a reader, knowing that anyone who spoke the lines aloud would not speak these words" (34). Elsewhere, Creed explains away violations of his "Rule of Three" (syllables in a Part) by noting that "The *Maldon*-poet is much fonder of these 'little words' and unstressed syllables than is the *Beowulf* poet" and that leaving out such things as possessive pronouns and unstressed adverbs "would bring eleven of these verse lines into conformity with the rule" (35). Qualitative differences between the prosody of *Maldon* and that of *Beowulf* and *Cædmon's Hymn* may derive from the later poet's attempt "to express ideas that either had not been expressed before by traditional poets or had only been expressed in more traditional ways" (39) or perhaps by his trying "to recreate Byrhtnoð's actual words" (39). There are too many exceptions to Creed's rules for me to accept that "The prosody of *The Battle of Maldon* can be said . . . to be essentially the same as the prosody of *Beowulf* and *Cædmon's Hymn*" (38), but it is useful to know that the significant differences lie in "the *Maldon* poet's use of more multi-measure verse lines and his willingness to crowd many more Parts with four or even five syllables" (38).

In the same volume, M. S. Griffith addresses "Alliterative Licence and the Rhetorical Use of Proper Names in *The Battle of Maldon*" (60–79). Like Creed, Griffith is concerned with anomalies in the poem, but takes a broader approach to a more limited set of examples. Griffith categorizes the alliterative anomalies as "Lines without alliteration on the main stresses" (61), "Lines containing postponed alliteration" (62), and "a-verses which . . . ought to contain double alliteration . . . but which fail to do so" (63). Proper names occur with significant frequency in all three categories, leading Griffith to consider "the possibility that some or all of these oddities might be explained as the products of metrical licence" (64). Such metrical license in the presence of proper names occurs elsewhere in the poetic corpus, so its frequency in *Maldon* "suggests that this is rhetoric and not incompetence" (65).

Griffith goes on to examine other stylistic features, such as the use of repetitive phrasing and parallel syntax to emphasize "a larger pattern in the poem which shows warriors acting in groups of three" (66). Attitudes towards etymology are examined, and repetitions discovered to link a warrior's actions to his name. The article concludes with a most interesting analysis of lexical and stylistic repetition by which Byrhtnoð and Byrhtwold are represented as "fundamentally similar in nature and role" (75); Griffith wisely remains agnostic as to whether Byrhtwold's (?historical) name or his invented characterization initiated the parallel.

Margaret A. L. Locherbie-Cameron examines "Some Things the *Maldon* Poet Did Not Say" (*Parergon* 13.1, 69–80) in an exercise not quite as quixotic as it might seem. Because the battle of Maldon was an actual event, some circumstances did historically occur, not all of which are mentioned in the poem. Locherbie-Cameron gives the example of Byrhtnoð's probable decapitation, a humiliating blow unsuitable for mention in a heroic eulogy. Of course, we cannot be certain that the poet possessed the same information we do, a point that Locherbie-Cameron gives insufficient attention. It may be "likely" (74) that the poet knew Wulfmær to be Byrhtnoð's immediate male heir, but it is not indisputable, so it is dangerous to infer that Byrhtnoð's failure to avenge his nephew himself shows him "undistracted from his duty" (74). Locherbie-Cameron arranges her examples of strategic silence around three types of conflict: "heroic loyalty versus family loyalty, heroic loyalty versus ethnic loyalty, and . . . heroic loyalty versus personal weakness" (72–73). Heroic loyalty is made the ideal which can be lived up to or fallen short of relative to familial or ethnic pressures, while the final pairing is portrayed as a parallel in which desire to show loyalty transcends personal limitations. Offa and Byrhtwold may be old, but they do not use any infirmity as an excuse to avoid their heroic duty; "For the remainder of the warriors our knowledge of other close ties of family or neighbourhood association underlines the tragic reality behind the heroic convention" (80).

Zacharias P. Thundy sees a parallel, even a source, for the *Battle of Maldon* in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* II.x ("Livy and the *Battle of Maldon*," In *Geardagum* 13 [1992], 51–65), "where the historian graphically describes the attacks of Porsinna and the Etruscans on the city of Rome from their position on Janiculum Hill across the Tiber" (54). Thundy counts nineteen parallels between the history and the poem, some of which compel interest, some of which seem forced, and some of which are merely redundant. Examples in the first category are numbers 1—"The enemy is already within the territory of the host nation, and the publically professed purpose of their presence is not battle but peace/truce" (55)—and 3—"The first phase of the battle takes place on a bridge over the river" (56). Parallel number 14—"the hosts yield too much land to the invaders" (58)—lacks explicit testimony in Livy's account. Redundancy appears in numbers 5 and 10, both of which describe the panicked flight of defending troops. Thundy acknowledges the differences between the two battle narra-

tives, and also the possibility that both derive from the use of oral themes, but concludes that "the poet was directly influenced by Livy" (63).

Deor

The genitive is arguably the most flexible and complicated case in Old English grammar, and the genitives in the refrain of *Deor* ("þæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg") represent its most famously baffling use. In a dense but straightforward article ("On the Genitive of [the] Anglo-Saxon Poem *Deor*," *NM* 96, 351–59), Hyeree Kim addresses the *Deor* genitives from the standpoint of contemporary linguistics, but falls short of traditional philological standards of evidence. The argument of the paper is clearly made: the *Deor* genitives should be parsed as objects of the verb *ofergan*, which can govern a genitive object because preverbs (prefixes) can affect the case government of compounds; the preverb/preposition *ofer-* does not normally govern the genitive case in Old English, but it did so in Proto-Germanic, a conclusion based on evidence from Gothic. The argument is an intriguing one, but it too often relies on insufficient or misinterpreted evidence. For example, Kim easily demonstrates that the addition of a preverb can change an intransitive verb to transitive—e.g., *feran* (Vi) versus *geondferan* (V+ACC)—but fails to prove that a preverb alters the governed case of an already transitive verb. The only possible instances offered are *bregdan* (+ACC or DAT) and *standan* (+0 or DAT), which, according to Kim, can gain a genitive object by compounding with *wip-*. Kim's analysis shows, however, that the addition of *wip-* allows only for a genitive indirect object: "*wip-bregdan* 'to restrain [DAT] from [GEN]' . . . *wip-standan* 'to hinder [DAT] against [GEN]'" (356). Any application to *ofergan* is slight. The only example of an Old English verb compounded with *ofer-* and governing the genitive is also problematic. Kim offers "*wuldorfæst ys [ond] micel cristenra manna god þæs walderge worces nane mennisce searwa ofercuman ne magon*" (354), but fails to acknowledge that the emphasized noun phrase is genitive because it is relativized, not because of the case government of *ofercuman*. I will mention only one other problem with this article, and that is its lexicographical imprecision. Kim provides three different (transitive and intransitive) glosses for *ofergan*, based on the syntactic feature being illustrated. Thus, "*ansien ofergæð*" becomes "the sight . . . goes away" (352), "*þæs ofereode*" is glossed "He/She/I . . . overcame that" (355), and we learn that "Although the [Gothic] verb *usleiþan* 'to pass by' is not an exact cognate of OE *ofergan*, they are synonymous with each other" (358). If this last were true, Kim's translation of *Deor*'s refrain would have to read "He/She/I passed by that, and may he/she/I pass by this also." It may in fact be that *ofergan* can govern the genitive case, but that has not been proven here.

Maxims I

In response to a request from the editors of the *Dictionary of Old English*, the late John C. Pope reexamined the meaning of the *hapax* "*apolwarum*" (*MaxI* 198b) with thoroughly satisfy-

ing results ("A Supposed Crux: Old English *apolwarum* in *Maxims I*," *MP* 93, 204–13). Using the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English*, a tool he modestly points out as being unavailable to earlier scholars, Pope locates the first element of the compound in the *Old English Bede*: it appears in three manuscripts as a spelling variant of *adl* 'sickness' (208). Thus *apolwarum* is to be glossed "pestilence-dwellers," and the sentence in which the word appears is to be translated "it was widely known afterwards, that everlasting violence did injury to men, as to dwellers in a pestilence" (209). Pope is due thanks not only from the editors of the DOE, but also from all readers of Old English poetry, for calling to our attention this rare and striking simile between the universal violence attendant on Abel's murder and "the epidemic diseases that have continued to appear without warning to decimate the nations" (211).

Order of the World

Ruth Wehlau interprets *The Order of the World* as "a kind of Old English poetic manual in brief" (65) within which a "model of good poetry" (65) is presented in the *berespel* making up the central part of the poem ("Rumination and Re-Creation: Poetic Instruction in *The Order of the World*," *Florilegium* 13 [1994], 65–77). The *berespel* is based on Psalm 18, but loosely: the poet creates "a whole new poem, not a translation, but a transformation, a reworking of the fundamental images found in the Latin psalm" (72). These images of the Creation include the cosmos praising God and the movement of the sun. The Old English poet presumably amplifies these images and rephrases them in formulaic ways, even departing from the Latin to describe God as the Helmsman of nature. This manipulation of images reminds Wehlau of the monastic practice of rumination, which she finds described in the poem: the aspiring poet is instructed to contemplate Creation in order to reproduce the creative process, or "to digest this book and to re-create it through the medium of poetry" (74).

Resignation

The dialectic regarding the unity of *Resignation*, or its lack thereof, reaches something of a synthesis in Phillip Pulsiano's "Spiritual Despair in *Resignation B*" (*Neoph.* 79, 155–62). As his title indicates, Pulsiano divides the text into two poems, but he also links these thematically through their common use of the psalms and their contrasting portrayals of penitent figures. He perceives allusions to Psalm 142 in *Resignation B*'s reference to a *mod morgenseoc* and in the tree passage ("Wudu mot him weaxan . . ."); in the poetic speaker's famous complaint about lacking the funds to hire a ship, Pulsiano hears a resonance from Psalm 141.5: "Periit fuga a me, Et non est qui requirat animam meam" (160). Following Bestul (*NM* 78 [1977], 18–23), Pulsiano places both parts of *Resignation* in a monastic milieu, where allusions to the psalms "would have been familiar to poet and audience alike" (160). He concludes that *Resignation A* is a conventionally confessional and penitential poem, while *Resignation B* is "a unique, even audacious

work" that "responds to the first with a narrative from the anti-type of the penitent, one who is in unwitting exile from spiritual understanding and who is thus imprisoned by self-pity and by a literalist response to the outward forms of penitence" (161).

Rune Poem

The *Rune Poem* garners due notice in Nyr Indictor's whirlwind "Alphabet Poems: A Brief History" (*Word Ways* 28.3, 131–35), in which it is described as "Quaint and curious in nature" (133) and briefly compared to "Rune poems . . . found in Old Icelandic (earliest manuscript VIIth [!] century)" (133–34).

Seafarer

John F. Vickrey addresses certain passages near the end of the *Seafarer* in order to clarify their meaning, to show their unity and correspondence, and to explore wider themes like paganism versus Christianity and the salvation of the soul ("The *Seafarer* 97–102: *Dives* and the Burial of Treasure," *JEGP* 94, 19–30). He begins with a painstaking syntactical analysis of lines 97–102, in which a hypothetical brother strews with gold the grave of his *geboren*; the difficult lines 98a–99 are finally construed as "bury beside the dead (one) as (i.e., in the form of) various gifts that which (he) wishes (to go) with him" (25). Along the way, Vickrey argues that the *gold* of line 101 can be sufficiently personified to provide *geoc*, or even considered animate if the poet is portraying the (pagan) point of view of the *broþor* and his kinsman (23). Additionally, he establishes that both pagan and Christian attitudes towards treasure require that the gold and gifts in question belong to the deceased *geboren*, not his survivor. Vickrey expands on his earlier work on the figure of *dives* in the *Seafarer* (*PLL* 28 [1992], 227–41), linking lines 97–102 with 113–15 in that "Both passages intimate that this expectation of advantage from his wealth is fatal to *dives*: it brought him where he was and it cannot save him when he is there" (28). Both passages use concessive clauses, immediately precede references to Judgment, hint at a better alternative to *dives*'s course, and personify his treasure. This personification contributes to the poem's Christian refutation of pagan belief in the efficacy of treasure: "In lines 97–99 treasure is the animate henchman of the *geboren*; in line 115 the personification *wine* is the master which kept the *geboren* from salvation and cannot help him now" (30).

Solomon and Saturn II

In admirably thorough fashion, Paul Schaffner proposes an elegant solution to one of the many vexing cruxes of *Solomon and Saturn II* ("The Errant Morsel in *Solomon and Saturn II*: Liturgy, Lore, and Lexicon," *MS* 57, 223–57). The difficulty in question is the verb *gesyfleð* (395), which in this context has been read to mean that when a man drops a morsel of food, he should pick it up, sign (i.e., bless) it, *put relish on it*, and eat it. The need for relish under these circumstances being not immediately clear, Schaffner improves the passage by inter-

preting *gesyfleð* “not as a form of the verb (*ge*)*syflan* . . . but as a nonce loan of Latin *sufflare*, ‘to blow, breathe’” (229). Schaffner admits some small problems with the philology of this alternative, but ultimately proves its likelihood through extensive recourse to the liturgical and hagiographic traditions of (*ex*)*sufflatio*, the folkloric belief that dropped food belongs to the devil, and the unity of the passage itself, which treats of baptism, consecration, and perhaps the Easter liturgy. Schaffner establishes the morsel in question as a consecrated host and surveys the penalties and remedies for its mishandling. These do not include blowing on it, but the use of that expedient is shown to be “superstitiously, rather than theologically, based” (235). Sufflation is connected with baptism and exorcism, and with signing, as in *Solomon and Saturn II*. Schaffner goes on to document the “frequent association [of exsufflation] with imagery of fire and of darkness and light” (243) and of these with the liturgical symbolism of Easter. He brings all of these images and traditions together in the poem, providing it not only with a new lexeme, but with “as coherent and natural a sense as *Solomon and Saturn II* ever yields” (223).

Wanderer

To Richard North, the *Wanderer* is composed as a riddle that contrasts two main characters—one pagan, one Christian—while veiling, but hinting at, their identities (“Boethius and the Mercenary in *The Wanderer*,” in *Pagans and Christians: The Interplay between Christian Latin and Traditional Germanic Cultures in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. T. Hofstra, L.A.J.R. Houwen, and A.A. MacDonald, Mediaevalia Groningana, 16 [Groningen: Forsten], 71–98). North’s route to this ambitious reinterpretation is complicated, but clearly mapped. First, he argues that the switch from first person to third at line 29b marks the end of the *Wanderer*’s speech and that the Wise Man who speaks in lines 92–110 represents an entirely different character. For the identity of the first speaker, or *anbaga*, North offers Starkaðr, the morally ambiguous figure known primarily from Scandinavian sources. Using *Gautreks saga* and Saxo’s *Gesta Danorum* and relying on a close reading of the *Wanderer*’s speech, North concludes that “it is likely that the *Wanderer* is identical with Starkaðr” (83): “the *Wanderer* seems to row about at sea, though apparently peacefully; to be a mercenary employed in royal retinues in whose company he must keep silent; to be downcast or sad in the hall he is in; to be unnaturally old; to have buried his lord in disgrace” (83–84). On the Christian side of the coin, North offers the less controversial figure of Boethius, whose influence on the *Wanderer* has been explored for almost fifty years. He adds to the discussion a focus on Boethius as the model specifically for the Wise Man in the poem. So far North’s thoroughfares have been fairly straight and broad, but henceforth he introduces sufficient lanes and byways to create a teeming metropolis of integrated Latin and Germanic influences. The *Wanderer*’s *gífstol* dream is linked to both Útsteinn (of *Hálfs saga ok Hálfsrekka*) and to Ulysses, and the vision of the sea-birds is compared to both Germanic

augury and the Sirens as portrayed in Boethius. The Sirens again recall Ulysses, “on whose tearful road Boethius might have been forever lost, had he heeded the Sirens of (poetic) seduction rather than Philosophy” (92). Starkaðr/the *Wanderer* provides another negative example for Boethius/the Wise Man. North details other, smaller allusions to Starkaðr, Óðinn, Boethius, Ulysses, and Mercury, finally schematizing the “native” elements of Starkaðr and augury as “answers” to the Latinate Ulysses, Sirens, and Mercurian magic (96). North’s connections are interesting and thoughtful, but if such a juxtapositioning of allusions indeed formed part of the poet’s intention, it is no wonder that “the riddler’s aim of sending everyone off the track for a while has worked a little longer than expected” (98).

Wife’s Lament

The Old English elegies are often compared to their Celtic counterparts, although the exact historical relation has never been made clear. In “A Woman’s Loss and Lamentation: Heledd’s Song and *The Wife’s Lament*” (*Neophilologus* 79, 147–54), Dorothy Ann Bray prudently presents “not an attempt to produce cross-cultural influences, but rather to look at two women’s situations in the context of two similar heroic cultures, and the expression of women’s lamentation in those societies which both valorized heroic ideals” (147). The Welsh Heledd cycle comprises the laments of Heledd for her slain brother Cynddylan; she has suffered and will suffer personal calamity, but the disaster extends to her entire people. Bray concludes that “The voice of Heledd is, then, much like the poet who has lost his patron in battle: the hero is dead, and therefore the land and its people will suffer” (149). Bray perceives “the larger backdrop of a political conflict” (149) behind the *Wife’s Lament* also, as well as the gender ambiguity that can turn dependent wife or sister into dependent poet or retainer (or *vice versa*). Adducing the female role of public, ritual mourner, Bray opposes these feminine elegies to masculine panegyrics. The laments form part of the heroic tradition by expressing the inevitable losses that ensue on heroic conflict; thus, “both Heledd and the wife may have become poetic personae for an elegiac expression in which the court poets used the traditional female role of mourning to voice both a lament for, and a critique of, heroic society” (150).

Unlike Bray, who rejects the connection, Anne L. Klinck contextualizes the *Wife’s Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* among the erotic *Frauenlieder* (“Lyric Voice and the Feminine in Some Ancient and Mediaeval *Frauenlieder*,” *Florilegium* 13 [1994], 13–36). Both scholars refer to cultural factors, as Klinck compares medieval and ancient poems not in order to discern direct influence, but “as two manifestations of a probably universal phenomenon, coloured and distinguished by their separate social contexts” (15). The Greek corpus consists of the monody of Sappho and the parthenia of Alcman and Pindar—“choral lyrics sung and danced by young girls at religious festivals” (15). Unlike the medieval poems, the Greek songs are homoerotic, occasional, and designed for

performance among young women. The two corpora do share “feminine voices which present themselves as frank, unpretentious, and spontaneous” (19), features that Klinck finds in a number of English, Spanish, Latin, Provençal, French, German, and Portuguese poems. Klinck addresses the *Wife’s Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* only very briefly, noting that the former uses “Very small differences in the formulaic and conventional language applied to male, heroic subjects” (21) and that both poems express longing combined with “ambivalent sexual feelings” (22). After a survey of other medieval lyrics and letters, Klinck compares the circumstances of their creation to those of the Greek. She notes that “Both [corpora] arise from a male-dominated society” (26) but that female rituals held greater political importance in early Greek than in medieval culture. The higher status of the Greek women’s groups produced poetry that was more homoerotic and “woman-centred” (27) than the medieval, and more likely to treat gratified rather than frustrated love. On the other hand, “In the medieval poems, the restrictions on women’s activity intensify the feelings expressed” because “denied formal authority, [the speaker] is richly endowed with eloquence” (27).

Wulf and Eadwacer

Both of the current entries on *Wulf and Eadwacer* support an identification of the poem’s speaker with the fierce but unhappy figure of Signy from the Völsung cycle. Carole A. Hough focuses on the refrain-like line “Ungelic(e) is us,” using examples from *Beowulf*, the *Dream of the Rood*, and some homilies to argue that the prefix *un-* can, and in this case does, perform an intensifying rather than negating function (“*Wulf and Eadwacer: A Note on Ungelic*,” *ANQ* 8.3, 3–6). She thus translates the line “We [Wulf and I] are too much the same” and concludes that “The speaker’s dilemma is not that she and her lover are different from each other, but that as brother and sister they are too much alike” (5).

Richard North’s study is much more complicated (“Metre and Meaning in *Wulf and Eadwacer*: Signy Reconsidered,” in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry & Prose*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald, Mediaevalia Groningana, 15 [Groningen: Forsten, 1994], 29–54), in part because he perceives *Wulf and Eadwacer* as a riddle, much as he does the *Wanderer* (see above). North begins by finding several Old Norse meters in *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and Norse semantics in its use of *giedd* and *dogode* (‘passion’ and ‘availed’ in his translation). On this evidence he concludes that “*Wulf and Eadwacer* would seem to be the work of a poet from the Danelaw” (38). A Scandinavian poet would suggest a Scandinavian background narrative, and North returns to the Signy story first offered by William Henry Schofield in 1902 (*PMLA* 17, 262–95); later, he rejects any connection between *Wulf and Eadwacer* and the Odoacer legend, but without apparent knowledge of the argument made by Joseph Harris (“Hadubrand’s Lament: On the Origin and Age of Elegy in Germanic,” in *Heldensage und Heldendichtung im Germanischen*, ed. Heinrich Beck [Berlin and NY: de Gruyter, 1988], 81–

114). North builds his case more with small touches than broad sweeps. The former include the presence in *Wulf and Eadwacer* of kennings and collocations that he characterizes as markedly Norse (and Völsung), but he sometimes presses too hard in his attempt to account for every detail of the Old English poem. One example will suffice:

‘nales meteliste’ only makes specific sense if it alludes to the murder of Signy’s previous sons, after in each case they had failed to bake Sigmundr a loaf of bread. Going thus without food on two occasions, Sigmundr kills the boys at the bidding of Signy . . . In this cold way it is not the murder of her first children that makes ‘Signy’ sick in *Wulf and Eadwacer*, but grieving for her father Wæls and expecting a stronger child by Sigemund in order to avenge him (48–49).

This is quite a load to lay on a single half-line. Tendentiousness aside, North’s article presents a serious challenge to those who have given up trying to relate *Wulf and Eadwacer* to the broader Germanic heroic tradition.

S.E.D.

Charms

Mariann Larsen and Paloma Tejada Caller consider Anglo-Saxon spells and charms as “texts of the purest oral tradition” in a study intended as a “contribution to the idea that speech and writing are not solid linguistic categories in themselves” (“Oral-Literate Continuum: an Initial Approach,” *Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Fanego Lema, *Cursos e congresos*, 74. [Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1993], 165–74; 165). Following a survey of the problems inherent in the study of Old English texts from the oral/written perspective, the authors posit a typology of features “traditionally assigned to written discourse that can be found in . . . oral texts” (168). The spells, charms, and other ritualized, verbal productions are, they theorize, purpose-specific and content-focused, formalized (a feature that promotes permanence) and they belong to the public domain. “The resulting formalized text is by definition autonomous, and decontextualized, i.e. detached from a particular time, place, and person” (168). They then briefly illustrate these features using the Old English charms.

L.M.C. Weston explores the limits of the discernible in “Women’s Medicine, Women’s Magic: the Old English Metrical Childbirth Charms” (*MP* 92, 279–93). She begins with a brief summary of traditions underlying Anglo-Saxon magico-medical lore as preserved in Bald’s *Leechbook* and the Harleian *Lacnunga*. She identifies contrasting influences, including the Greco-Roman and Germanic, literature and oral, Christian and pagan, in the “palimpsest” that is Anglo-Saxon medicine. To this list she would add gender (280). At the very outset she suggests “the existence of an identifiable female medical tradition, one which came to be partially appropriated by male authorities even as it was viewed with suspicion” (281). Weston devotes the next five pages to the complex issue of medieval gender relations, with special reference to Anglo-Saxon England (283–88). “[B]y looking through female-defined rituals, by looking with women at images of female

ambiguity and power, we can best interpret the women's metrical charms which appear in Lacnunga amid other, more male-identified, incantations and remedies" (288). Weston ultimately turns her attention to Metrical Charm 6: *For Delayed Birth*, which she takes in fact to be three separate charms. Dobbie, Grendon, Storms, and Grattan edit these as one, yet Weston believes that "the evidence would suggest that the scribe has in fact gathered together three separate but related remedies" (282). The shared rubric (*Se wifman, se hire cild afedan ne maeg, Se wifmon, se hyre bearn afedan ne maeg, and Se wifman, se ne maege bearn afedan*, lines 1, 16, and 21, respectively)—may be translated in at least three ways, the variable elements to be rendered "nourish her child in her womb," "bring her child to term," and "nourish her child" after its birth, respectively—and Weston argues that all three should be employed here, that the rubric "subsumes all of childbearing from conception to weaning, the entire period during which the child depends upon the nurturance and potency of its mother's body" (282). The article concludes with a close reading of these charms, as Weston defines and delineates them. This is a reading in which she discerns a common voice, a voice that speaks for female agency and empowerment.

Individually, each of these charms empowers the childbearing woman, and indeed, the female community to which she belongs. She takes responsibility for her own healing; she speaks words no one else can speak for her. But these charms are exceptions in the magico-medical manuscript tradition. Their oral and female healing practices have been appropriated and segregated within male writing and male classification of knowledge in hierarchical systems (291).

Dream of the Rood

Crux-busting can be a fun and profitable enterprise, even if one sometimes has to squint a bit to see the crux to begin with. In "Deorc 'bloody' in the *Dream of the Rood*: Old Irish *derg* 'red, bloody'" (*Éigse* 28 [1994], 165–68) Andrew Breeze makes the case for the adjective 'deorcan' in line 46 of *The Dream of the Rood*: *þurbdrifan hi mid deorcan næglum*. While most editors and translators render this 'dark,' 'sinister,' or 'viscious,' Alistair Campbell alone suggests 'bloody' (*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: enlarged addenda and corrigenda* [Oxford, 1972] 18). Breeze picks up on this and produces numerous citations from Irish sources as support. Many of these are taken from contexts that deal with the Crucifixion and illustrate the frequent use of OE *derg* with reference to Christ's wounds and the nails. Breeze answers the most obvious objection to this theory—can we really use relatively late Irish sources to illuminate Old English poetry?—by noting the extreme conservative nature of Old Irish poetry. He argues, then, for a primary translation here of "red, bloody," and sees the appearance of this word in the Old English poem as a further "Irish symptom in Northumbrian poetry and devotion," as well as "... Irish influence on Northumbrian English" (167). Breeze's case is further strengthened by the absence in any of the other older Germanic dialects of an adjective cognate with 'deorc,' though there is the OHG verb *tarnjan* 'conceal.' Breeze posits

in the end that 'deorc' may in fact be a loan from Old Irish, and as such belongs with others like *ancor* 'hermit,' *bratt*, 'cloak, and *cluceg*, 'bell', to name just a few. What starts out as an apparent non-problem soon solidifies into a crux and seems nicely busted by the end of this note.

J. Stephen Fountain juxtaposes commentary on Julia Kristeva, Thomas J. J. Altizer, and A. S. Byatt to some musings on *The Dream of the Rood* in "Ashes to Ashes: Kristeva's *Jouissance*, Altizer's Apocalypse, Byatt's Possession and 'The Dream of the Rood'" (*Lit. and Theol.* 8 [1994], 193–208). The first six pages of this "non-article" will make more sense to devoted students of Taylor and Altizer than they do to this reader: "Despite his perceptive reading of Kristeva, Mark C. Taylor, in another recent non-book, criticizes the work of Thomas Altizer by saying that in Altizer's writing 'there is no place for the postmodern', and that Altizer does not understand the difference between Hegel and postmodern thinkers" (195). This is, with the exception of the reference to the 'non-book', straightforward enough. But must it be assumed that only connoisseurs of Kristeva's *oeuvre* will be able to make sense of passages like the following?

An understanding of the subject in which the semiotic *chora* functions as the endless displacement of the symbolic offers, in opposition to the alternatives of the perpetual frustration of the symbolic drive toward mastery through the eradication of the semiotic or the desperation of an absolute loss of meaning, another mode of existence. Fully related to the semiotic and the symbolic, between errancy and propriety, between drive and reason, between the irrecoverable freedom of the maternal origin and the unfulfillable law of the paternal rule, the subject in process is open to what Kristeva calls *jouissance* (194).

Four pages later Fountain brings *The Dream of the Rood* into this non-discussion, in a section entitled "*The Suspended Subject: 'The Dream of the Rood'*" (198). This entire section is less than transparent. It seems primarily to serve as a segue to the next section, in which Fountain takes up the work of the nineteenth-century poet Randolph Henry Ash. Fountain effects the transition in a profoundly precious manner: "The marking of the body with the sign of the cross takes place most notably on Ash Wednesday, when the leaves of the triumphal expectations of Palm Sunday give way to the ashes of Lenten mourning. The crossing of the self takes place with the bearing of the ash. Ash, however, 'black with burnt up meaning', can make for fertile soil" (202). Six pages further on Fountain quotes Ash: "[W]e are driven by endings as by hunger. We must know how it comes out . . ." (207).

It is in answering that call, in the reading, in the enactment, the re-writing of the text, that we provide and are provided with an ending, an ending which is truly ending, actual only in its perishing. Reading from such a precarious position is necessarily writing, turning from the nostalgic impossibility of the blank page of the eternal same toward the ashes of the apocalypse. Reading in the wake of the death of God, following deconstruction, calls for a kind of poetics of *jouissance*, a kenotic reading and writing which accepts the end of endings and takes apocalypse seriously, as genesis. Perhaps then we may begin, following the fragmentary trace of the death of God, to read, and write, "It is finished" (207).

"Finished"? One questions the point of such writing in the first place.

Emma Hawkins explores Anglo-Saxon perceptions of gender in "Gender, Language, and Power in 'The Dream of the Rood'" (*Women and Language* 18.2 (1995):33–36). Characterizing previous work on the subject as 'timid' and 'brief' (33), she observes that more recent appraisals of the Anglo-Saxon perception of gender show that it closely resembles the definition of sociologists Judith Gerson and Kathy Peiss: "Gender is not a rigid or reified analytic category imposed on human experience, but a fluid one whose meaning emerges in specific social contexts as it is created and recreated through human actions." (33). Hawkins further develops the "free-floating" system of gender perception as proposed separately by Allen Frantzen and Carol Clover, applying it in this instance to Anglo-Saxon poetry. The poet, she says, "depended upon gender-coded language to trace the ebb and flow of power among poetical figures." The "malleability" of the Anglo-Saxon gender system is reflected in the application of masculine-coded and feminine-coded language to persons or objects regardless of sex. For example, the cross is masculine-coded, in that it is the "typological emblem of the greatest of all victories" (33). But to this image of masculine power the poet allies a feminine-coded one: "Christ submissively allows himself to be physically defeated on the cross and to be mastered, an indication of powerlessness and weakness in the Anglo-Saxon audience" (34). Thus, Hawkins concludes, such gender-coded language serves to signal the movement from power to powerlessness and back again. The rest of the article identifies further instances of such language and the power relationships they illustrate. The perils of applying a 20th-century theory of gender relationships and definition to an Anglo-Saxon poem and its audience with too much rigor are illustrated by Hawkins's analysis of the actual crucifixion. According to the heroic standard the cross should not complain, cry, or exhibit emotion, but its very account in the vision must have seemed "unmanly" behavior to the poem's audience. Hawkins pursues this line of thought further:

Furthermore, although the cross is obeying his lord's orders not to offer resistance, the warrior-based audience probably would have interpreted his action as cowardly. His behavior is no more virtuous than that of the cowardly retainers who failed to protect Beowulf during his battle with the dragon. (34)

All of this is to show that the cross has now slipped into the feminine-coded role of "the weak, the ineffectual, the cowardly, the disempowered." I suspect an Anglo-Saxon audience would have seen what Hawkins does not: that Beowulf's retainers were not ordered by Beowulf to desert him. Her final conclusion: "[C]ircumstances could cause a male-figure to lose a masculine-coded position and assume a feminine-coded one. Through such gender-coded language, the changing status of the cross and Christ can clearly be traced in 'The Dream of the Rood'" (35).

Robert Murray introduces a new translation (by Kevin Crossley-Holland) of the *The Dream of the Rood* in "Tradition and Originality in the *Dream of the Cross*" (*The Month* 255 (May 1994), 177–81). Murray places the poem in the context of other early medieval works devoted to the celebra-

tion of the cross. He compares portions of it to passages in Cynewulf's *Juliana*, the *crux gemmata* in the apse of Sant' Apollinaire in Classe in Ravenna, and the poem's "nearest antecedents . . . the hymns of Venantius Fortunatus in honour of the Cross" (179). He finds parallels in the vision of Blathmac, Cynewulf's *Christ III*, and *The Heliand* for the poem's incorporation of "the theme of cosmic and creaturely compassion" (179). "In the whole visionary part of the poem it is the Tree itself—brutally cut from its native home and forced to become an instrument of torture for humans, and finally for the young Hero—which is the central 'character'; we are invited to feel with it, both for its own sufferings and even for Christ. This is an extraordinary stroke of imagination" (180). Murray concludes his discussion with a comment on the second part of the poem where the Cross urges the Dreamer to reveal the vision to others, to which the poet responds with a confession of faith and hope (lines 95–156; 89–128 in Crossley-Holland's translation). He notes that many have labelled this part of the poem inferior and some have omitted it altogether ("The present version abbreviates it and omits the last few lines," 180). "Yet there is both grandeur and personal pathos here, and after Christ's harrowing of hell and return to heaven 'with many' (an echo of an archaic Syriac formula), the movement and final quiescence of the last lines, in which the Lord comes home to his own land, are exquisite" (181).

Louis J. Rodrigues offers a rather eloquent if necessarily abbreviated and preliminary plea for reappraising the extent of Cynewulf's canon in "*The Dream of the Rood* and Cy(e)wulf" (*Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Fanego Lema, *Cursos e congresos*, 74. [Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1993], 257–63). Citing S.E. Butler's 1982 study ("The Cynewulf Question Revived," *NM* 83 (1982), 15–23), Rodrigues establishes the unreliability of S.K. Das's and C. Schaar's conclusions regarding Cynewulf's metrics and style, and thus of the idea that only the poems that bear his runic signature can be attributed to him (257–59). What ensues is an analysis of the structure of Cynewulf's *Elene*, *Fates of the Apostles*, and *The Dream of the Rood* that relies heavily on David Howlett's structural analysis of the "Golden Section" of the latter poem. Rodrigues's conclusions are cautiously and wisely tentative, and he recognizes in the work of 19th and early 20th-century scholars who addressed the problem "a remarkable tendency towards fanciful speculation," which he strives to avoid. His analysis of structural, metrical, and thematic similarities between *The Dream of the Rood* and the poems of Cynewulf's established canon help him achieve this paper's primary goal: to establish that "the time is ripe indeed to revive the question of [Cynewulf's] authorship of the group of poems hitherto attributed to him" (263).

In "Rituels de l'image et récits de vision" (*Testo e ommagine nell'alto medioevo. Settimane di studi del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo*, 41 [Spoleto, 1994], 419–62), Jean-

Claude Schmitt examines the connection and interaction between dream and vision narratives on the one hand, and the physical representations of such narratives on the other. Schmitt identifies three major transformations in the history of the Cross in western Christianity: the transition from sign to image (that is, from *signum crucis* to *imago crucifixi*), the transition from two-dimensional to three-dimensional images, and finally, the promotion of the image of the Virgin and other saints to the same level as the image of Christ. Although Schmitt announces his intention at the outset to limit the scope of his study to the late Middle Ages ("A travers l'ensemble des traditions médiévales, mais en me limitant ici à la période du Haut Moyen Age" 419), he illustrates the first transition with Eusebius's *Vita Constantini*, followed by an example from Gregory of Tours, who, he argues, represents the first step in the development of the cult of Christian images (423–24). Schmitt next devotes seven pages to an analysis of *The Dream of the Rood* in which he deals not with philological issues or even the iconographical or religious program of the cross, but rather focuses on the relationship between the dream poem and the Ruthwell Cross (425). In *The Dream of the Rood* we encounter a narrative that has developed in relation to an object of devotion, he argues, but unlike in Gregory of Tours, it is not the *image* of the crucifix that stands central, but the glorious *sign* of the cross. The poem's insistence upon the *sign* of the cross conforms to the Insular tradition and especially to the Northumbrian liturgy of the Exaltation of the Cross (426). St. Augustine wields the cross in a way reminiscent of the Constantinian *sign*, as does Oswald, both examples which Schmitt draws from Bede. He considers briefly the parallels between *The Dream of the Rood* and the apocryphal story of the crucifixion of St. Andrew, following which he turns to the verses inscribed in runes on the Ruthwell cross (427–30). The Ruthwell Cross, he concludes, represents the manifestation of a new ecclesiastical politics in that it reflects a strong Anglo-Saxon influence (the runic inscription) combined with a Celtic iconographical program that celebrates the union of the cross and the body of Christ. Finally, Schmitt sees the prosopopoeia in *The Dream of the Rood* as an expression of the poet's own dual desire to unite with the Cross and with the Son of God (431).

Ricardo J. Sola Buil revisits the evolutionary theory of art in "The Dream Vision as a Literary Convention: a Tradition" (*Papers from the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Fanego Lema, *Cursos e congresos*, 74. [Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1993], 273–83). Sola Buil sees evolution as adaptation rather than a movement from simple to complex. Generic forms evolve as they are introduced to new audiences and in as much as these audiences are able to receive them. His introductory remarks can, he claims, "be summarized in only one simple sentence: code influences the evolution and the function of forms" (274). The rest of the paper is devoted to an attempt at tracing the development of the dream-vision in medieval literature.

Sola Buil cites several examples from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the Old English *Daniel*, *The Dream of the Rood*, *La Roman de la Rose*, and *Pearl*. Along the way he notes details of these visions that illustrate general principles of the convention: perspective, setting, narrative voice, and "the need for interpretation" (277).

Phoenix

In "Biblical Realignment of a Maxim in the Old English *Phoenix*, Lines 355b–60" (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 77.3, 193–98), Paul Cavill notes the difficulty of identifying clear biblical sources for Old English maxims, and then focusses on "four aspects of the poet's use of the maxim form" in lines 355b–60 of *The Phoenix* (195). His analysis of these lines suggests to him that the poet consciously used the maxim form, that he did so to evoke a sense of wonder at the bird itself, and that this serves to highlight the bird's rebirth through death. Moreover, the maxim in these lines "builds an association between the bird and Christ and the Christian" (196). The maxim, he argues, ties together scripture and tradition, bringing its "traditional associations of birth and death into play, and through allusion to eschatological texts it anticipates the extended allegorical exposition of the second part of the poem. Thus the maxim enhances the spiritual message and effectiveness of the poem" (198).

Mark Griffith argues for a new interpretation of the unique form *bræd* (*Phoenix* 240b) in "Old English *bræd*, 'flesh': a Ghost Form?" (*NeQ* 42, 7–8). Noting that the word is traditionally regarded as a variant form of *bræde* (glossed as "roasted or grilled meat," "referring to the flesh of the phoenix, refined by fire," and "beaten flesh") Griffith argues that there may be a more sensible explanation for this word, and one that would better fit the situation of its unique occurrence in *The Phoenix*. He shows that it may very well be an unprefixated, syncopated past participle of the class one weak verb *brædan*, 'to make bread,' or 'to develop, to grow' (8). ". . . *Phoenix* 240b *bræd* may be the past participle of *brædan*, here dependent on *weorped* and in parallel with *acenned* and *asundrad*, with the subject of the clause, the new-born phoenix, understood (as it is just before this in lines 234b and 236b–7a). We may then translate: 'Then he is grown all anew, born again, set apart from sins.' Finally, "Though the details of the metamorphosis of the phoenix are different in the sources, both pseudo-Lactantius and Ambrose make explicit mention of the process of enlargement which the bird experiences" (8).

Riddles

Andrew Breeze argues for another Anglo-Saxon loan from Old Irish in "Old English *gop* 'servant' in Riddle 49: Old English *gop* 'snout.'" (*Neophilologus* 79, 671–73.) The riddle in question describes an object standing "fixed to the ground, deaf, dumb, who by day often swills gifts greedily *from servant's hand*" (John Porter's translation (64); see below). The meaning of *gopes* (*þurh gopes hand*) has always been deduced from

the context, the form *gop*, from which it must be derived, being a *hapax legomenon*. Breeze posits a connection with Old Irish *gop* 'beak, snout, muzzle,' also used of persons, and he adduces contexts in early Irish satire where it meant 'beak- or snout-faced menial'" (672). If the word is indeed a loan from Irish, it may be added to the list of a dozen or so such terms Breeze calls to our attention, and it may "also be evidence that riddle 49 was composed in Northumbria" (672).

Caroline Dennis proposes a new solution to one of the most notoriously difficult riddles in the Exeter Book, in "Exeter Book Riddle 39: Creature Faith." (*Medieval Perspectives* 10, 77–85). Noting inconsistencies in previous solutions—"Moon," "Cloud," "Time," and "Day"—all fail to match completely the 'creature' described in this riddle, she acknowledges that there may indeed be more than one solution and endeavors to locate hers within the "context of the abstract and the spiritual": the "hypostatized virtue 'Creature Faith' . . . conforms in some ways to the sense of time presented in the riddle, as well as being in accord with the cultural consciousness that we see evidenced in the poem's context, the Exeter Book" (77). Important to her exposition are the themes of exile and journey in the poem, both means of demonstrating faith and spreading it. The Anglo-Saxons were more than just passingly familiar with these concepts, a position that Dennis supports by citing the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Gospels, *Andreas*, and by discussing the Anglo-Saxon missions in Germany. Her conclusion "that the theme of the wandering traveller, whether to exhibit faith or to carry it, would seem to be a well-established concept in the mind of the anonymous riddler" makes good sense. Many of the features offered by the poet as either positive or negative characteristics of the subject fit the solution nicely. "Faith" can in some sense be seen (Riddle 39, line 3), it moves about and brings comfort to the children of God (line 19). It has of course no soul, no life, no limbs, blood or bone (line 16–18), but these are the riddler's habitual method of throwing sand in the eyes of the reader/listener, by describing the subject as if it were a living creature, yet stating categorically that it lacks common features of the living. Dennis explains, however, that the poet may be going further here. The poet tells us that the subject "has no foot or hand, she never touches earth" (line 10) and "no eye, neither of the two" (line 11). Dennis sees in these lines reminders of Paul's words in Corinthians 5:7, *Per fidem enim ambulamus, et non per speciem*, or Hebrews 11:1, *Est autem fides sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium* (81). Particularly interesting is her explication of lines 5–9: "She wishes to seek each lifebearer / separately, leaves afterwards to go the way. / She never spends a second night / but, homeless, must always wander the path of the / exile—she is not the more lowly because of this (Dennis's translation, 80). The riddler tells us, she says, "that God wishes faith to visit all . . . , but that he does not force her on us" (82). This latter point is reinforced by a citation of Matthew 10:13–14, which illustrates that like the gospels, "Creature Faith is the traveller who brings the message but

does not stay" (82). A persistent problem with all solutions suggested thus far remains in lines 13–15, which describe the subject as the humblest or poorest of all creatures:

ac gewritu secgað
þæt seo sy earmost calra wihta
þara þe æfter gecyndum cenned wære.

Even Williamson's otherwise plausible and cogently argued solution, "word, language," falters a bit in this regard. Bearing in mind that this is something *gewritu secgað*, Dennis remarks: "According to the Gospels, the smallest, most insignificant thing is the mustard seed. Again, Matthew (17.19) and Luke (17.6) are the disciples who record Christ's promise: faith, even when it is as small as a mustard seed, can perform miracles" (82). Other details fall into place: Faith never touches heaven (v.10), for, as Ælfric tells us, once there men have no need of it. Nor does Faith ever enter hell, for that is the dwellingplace of those who have rejected it (82). While the Exeter Book contains its share of didactic pieces, the riddles, on the whole, are not overtly didactic. Still, if Dennis is right about the solution to this one, some of them may "provide opportunity for a Christian audience to name creatures in ways that reinforce their Christian beliefs and experiences, this, in itself, is a type of teaching" (84). Finally, she does not claim that solutions like "Time" or "Death" are necessarily wrong (though how either can be construed as "poor" or humble" remains problematic), but that Faith "encompasses more and penetrates further into the mystery of the riddle and is thus an acceptable solution to the enigma" (84).

Roberta Dewa considers the riddles containing runes and the problems they pose for interpretation in "The Runic Riddles of the Exeter Book: Language Games and Anglo-Saxon Scholarship" (*Nottingham Med. Stud.* 39, 26–36). Citing Patrizia Lendinar's situating of the Latin riddles in the didactic sphere, she posits that the same kind of mental agility is fostered by the study of the Old English riddles, and that the addition of the runic alphabet adds a further dimension: "it becomes necessary for that mental agility to embrace concerns of language and orthography" (26). In the ensuing discussion Dewa scrutinizes "orthography, language, meaning, and the relationship between them" with regard to riddles 19, 24, 42, 64, and 75 (26). In all cases, the incorporation of runes in the text of each riddle "creates linguistic dislocation which is both syntactic and semantic," and it is especially this latter that is produced "through their semiotic properties" (28). Dewa considers a range of cryptographic codes employed by the runic riddlers, though she does not provide new or definitive solutions to the riddles. Her conclusion:

The runes of the Exeter Book Riddles are employed in various forms of creative linguistic dislocation: understood as a separate text, they provide alternative semantic approaches to the riddle; understood as ciphers, they function to complement and illuminate poetic description; but always, their reading requires a variety of problem-solving approaches from the reader (36).

Gwendolyn Morgan and Brian McAllister tackle the problem of two Exeter Book riddles that occur within about

a dozen pages of one another and exhibit only marginal differences. ("Reading *Riddles 30A* and *30B* as Two Poems," *In Geardagum* 14 [1993], 67–77). The two poems have traditionally been regarded as either the result of scribal error (the same scribe copied the same text twice and made mistakes the second time around) or as variants of the same poem. Morgan and McAllister argue convincingly that such repetition is unlikely to have occurred "unless the differences were thematically important, that is, affecting their solution" (67). What we are dealing with here, they maintain, are two poems that are similar yet sufficiently different so as to produce two equally similar yet distinct solutions. Following a detailed analysis of both poems and the range of images (and thus possible solutions) they evoke (68–74), what emerges is the puzzling combination, for both poems, of "constellation" and some wooden object. Both may be solved at one level as "constellation," while the wooden object described in *30A* seems to be a "harp," that in *30B* a "cross." Morgan and McAllister resolve this ingenious confusion by proposing solutions of *Lyra* and *Cygnus*, both constellations known and visible to the Anglo-Saxons. *Lyra* was viewed since classical times as a lyre or harp, whereas *Cygnus*, despite its more usual designation as a bird, is made up of five central stars that form a perfect cross. By the time of the Renaissance, "this group was often identified as the Christian cross and became popularly known as the "Northern Cross" (75).

To read *Riddles 30A* and *30B* as individual poems, each worthy of consideration in its own right—especially when the readings are informed by consideration of the constellation images and of the various possible translations of the more complex images—eliminates much of the confusion surrounding their solution. Solving them specifically as the Harp and the Cross recalls two different and equally important aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture: its heroic past symbolized by the scop's harp, its Christian 'present' by the Rood. It may be that *30B* represents an adaptation of an earlier *30A*, but whether or not this is so is unimportant. The two did coexist in the tenth century and, therefore, can be taken as a poetic pair (75).

Furthermore, "they are truly 'joined,' just as the stars join in a constellation, just as the constellations *Lyra* and *Cygnus* are contiguous—"joined in the sky,"—and just as the poetic paintings of these constellations are joined as they occupy different sides of the same leaf in Cotton Tiberius B.V.i" (76).

Whereas Morgan and McAllister read riddles *30A* and *B* as separate poems, Edith Whitehurst Williams analyzes riddle *30A* [K-D Riddle 30] in isolation in "Sacred and Profane: a Metaphysical Conceit upon a Cup" (*In Geardagum* 13 [1992], 19–30). Following an introduction in which she deals with T.S. Eliot's theory of tradition in English poetry and "the Whorfian concept of the relationship of language to world view" (19–20), she compares the Old English riddling tradition to a later poetic tradition: "There is a closer rapprochement between the Old English riddle and the seventeenth century conceit than between either and any of the lyric forms which lie in between them" (21). Their similar use of metaphor and "metaphysical statement" is something she sets out to illustrate by comparing Donne's "Valediction: of Weeping" to Exeter Book riddle 28a" (Williamson's numbering). We

stand to learn much, she says, "about how not to read a riddle by approaching Donne's "Valediction: of Weeping" as if we knew very little about his language or his times and were attempting to designate a single object about which he is writing" (22). Having done this (22–24), she introduces the concept of interlace into her discussion and gets down to the business of defending her solution to the riddle: the object described is a cup, or more precisely, two cups, the one a wooden drinking cup, the other a chalice fashioned from metal ore. The poem alternates between references describing aspects of a wooden object and words and phrases that evoke some use of fire (perhaps as a purifying agent, e.g. it is *legbysig*, "busied" or "harassed by fire" (26). Williams's explication draws out this perceived interlace structure quite nicely, though her explanation of lines 2b and 3a seems strained and a weak link in her argument: "Lines 2b and 3a, read consecutively, speak for the wood: 'I am heaped up by the storm ready for journey.' It is true that the phrase *fus forðweges* often refers to the journey into the afterlife, as in *The Seafarer*, but it is not constrained to do so. Here, it is probably a statement, 'I am gathered by the storm ready for journey.' One envisages something like a log jam, the collected lumber ready to be swept downstream by a swift enough current" (26). While Donne used concentric circles as an organizing principle in his poem, the riddle poet, on the other hand, begins with oppositions and develops his pattern on the basis of an intertwining comparable to an interlace motif. His fundamental contrary and its correspondences are based on the secular-sacred opposition which is paralleled by the earth-heaven, corruptible-incorruptible, temporal-spiritual dichotomies. The corruptible wooden cup, representative of earthly existence passes through a series of temporal experiences, both good and bad, all analogous to aspects of man's secular life. The incorruptible chalice, symbol of salvation, is presented by means of the purification theme which moves over and under its opposite until it firmly moves to the fore in the conclusion to represent the triumph of the spiritual over the temporal (28–29).

John Porter has translated nearly all of the Exeter Book riddles in his *Anglo-Saxon Riddles* (Hockwold cum Wilton, Norf: Anglo-Saxon Books). The book opens with a two-page introduction. The translations that follow are apparently based on the Krapp and Dobbie edition (they do not reflect Williamson's renumbering), though Porter does not make this explicit. He does clarify, however, his editorial principle concerning partially legible words and letters: only fully legible words are translated (8). I say "nearly all" above because he does not include the so-called riddle 30b, nor does he note the omission. The translations are faithful renderings without being slavishly literal, and they read quite well. The volume is rounded off by an index of solutions which, Porter claims, "represent both consensus and continuing debate" (8).

In "Heroic Aspects of the Exeter Book Riddles" (*Prosody and poetics in the early Middle Ages: essays in honour of C.B. Heatt*, ed. M.J. Toswell [Toronto: University of Toronto

Press], 197–218), Eric Stanley scrutinizes, sometimes in great detail, the putative uses of heroic language or references to the heroic life in the Anglo-Saxon riddles. Stanley sets the tone of his discussion early on, and strikes a familiar chord: “I do not mean to puzzle anyone by using in the title the word *aspect*, but it may be wondered if its sense here goes beyond a specious seeming, that is, beyond an assumed heroic manner, to reveal what lies deep within: an heroic world of thought and feeling, the conception of heroes expressed in the only language fit for heroes” (198). The assumptions of other critics, especially where they concern the pagan, Germanic past of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, are again held up here for scrutiny by Stanley, together with his characteristically incisive analyses of the Old English lexicon. He examines some fifteen of the Exeter Book riddles for “heroic” imagery (nos. 90, 95, 17, 15, 5, 80, 93, 20, 23, 55, 71, 73, and 80, in that order), beginning with the only Latin riddle in the collection, no. 90. Of this short poem, with its mention of three wolves, a lamb, four feet, and seven eyes, he concludes: “I mention the Latin riddle only because the heroic reader of Anglo-Saxon verse might feel that when he or she comes to the wolf a good Wodenism is in sight: that feeling cannot last long for a riddle the solution of which I believe to be, probably on insufficient grounds, ‘The Trinity’” (199). The rest of Stanley’s discussion is too rich in detail to summarize here, so it is perhaps sufficient to say that he has done a thorough job of combing through the riddles for real and imagined heroic allusions and language. His conclusion:

Where does this listing of heroic aspects lead us? Some riddles clearly body forth moments set in the world of heroes. *Riddle 80* does so perhaps most fully, showing the varied uses of the horn in an heroic and courtly society. Many other riddles make use of locutions reminiscent of Old English heroic poetry, but their heroic sense goes no deeper than words: aspects are, by definition, superficial. In others of the riddles the heroic element is slight, for the most part read into the poems by Anglo-Saxonists so much in love with Germanic heroic literature that they find it as gallantly as Don Quixote found occasions for his sort of display of chivalry. As far as I am concerned, I enjoy the bookishness of riddles. If academics do not like bookishness, who will? (211)

Colette Stévanovitch (“Exeter Book Riddle 70a: Nose?” *N&Q* 42, 8–10) attempts to solve the fragmentary riddle divorced by John Pope (citing irreconcilable differences) from what is now known as “Riddle 70b.” Stévanovitch regards previous solutions—among them “lyre,” “rye-flute,” “harp,” and “hurdygurdy”—as “too easy” (9), subjects the four-line poem to a close analysis, and concludes that this creature, with its crooked neck, sharp shoulders on shoulder-blades and ability to sing through its sides, is none other than the human nose. “The selection of physical details shows some ingenuity on the part of the poet bent on confusing his reader. . . . The image is strained, and this is part of the game, but the various items are in the right relative position and have the right general shape” (10).

Keith P. Taylor offers a new solution to riddle 55 in “Mazers, Mead, and the Wolf’s-head Tree: a Reconsideration of Old English *Riddle 55*” (*JEGP* 94, 497–512). Building on Williamson’s observation that none of the previously

suggested solutions for this riddle is really appropriate—the best among them including “scabbard,” “sword rack,” and “cross”—Taylor sets out “to propose a solution to *Riddle 55* that not only answers all the conditions of the question posed in the riddle but does so in a logical fashion” (498). In a closely argued analysis of the text he first identifies two critical precepts concerning this riddle and its solution: that it must be a single object made of four woods (the maple, oak, yew, and holly mentioned in lines 9 and 10), and that this object is adorned with silver and gold (499). Taylor attacks these assumptions and finds the reason for their perpetuation in the poet’s own “introduction into his text of superfluous detail concerning the *rode tacn* that first appears at line 7a of *Riddle 55*” (499). The riddler, true to his craft, seeks to mislead his reader: “[B]y first mentioning in his poem wood, gold, and silver—three materials from which most Anglo-Saxon representations of the Cross would have been constructed—and then providing his reader with extraneous information concerning the Cross, the author of *Riddle 55* causes his reader to disregard his previous suggestion that the objects brought onto the floor of the hall in lines 1–5b of the poem are apparently *fewer cynna*, ‘four individual items,’ and not, as is generally assumed and as the author’s allusion to the cross might suggest, ‘a thing of four types,’ that is, a *single object* that is simultaneously wooden, golden, silver, and a sign of the Cross” (500). Despite the poet’s use of nominative and genitive singular terms (*wudutreow*, *wudu*, *beames*), and his invitation at the end of the riddle to say “*hu se wudu hatte*” (l.15b) Taylor argues that the solution is to be sought not in one object made of the four kinds of wood, but rather “to the *anne naman*, the ‘singular name’—*wulfheafedtreo*—given to these woods when they are *nyt ætgædre*, ‘used together,’ by lords. It follows that the *wulfheafedtreo* of *Riddle 55* could actually be comprised of several objects, provided, of course, that these objects could be employed logically as some sort of unit and that oak, yew, maple, and holly were all involved in their production” (502). Turning to the context of the objects and events mentioned in the poem, Taylor compares the riddle to the *Beowulf*’s post-victory celebration at Heorot (*Beowulf* 1008–1233) and finds many notable similarities, but one significant absence: *Riddle 55* contains no explicit mention of “mead, ceremonial mead-drinking, or the vessels required to partake thereof” (504). Taylor proceeds to demonstrate that the poet has after all incorporated many allusions to mead and mead-drinking into the text, so many that his proposal is to solve the riddle as “mead-barrel and drinking bowl.” The oak and yew, he argues, refer to the mead-barrel, and cites archaeological evidence to support the theory that Anglo-Saxon coopers made their staves of yew, and barrel heads of oak (504). Maple refers here to the Anglo-Saxon mead-drinking bowl, or “mazer,” typically made of maple and adorned with silver (505). The reference to holly (*fealwa holen*, l.10a) proves more difficult to nail down with the available literary or archaeological evidence, yet Taylor rallies nicely with some interesting circumstantial evidence: “Perhaps by

referring to 'yellow holly' in his poem, the author of *Riddle 55* had hoped to recall to his reader's mind the image of the holly tree laden with honeybees as a reminder of the honey from which mead is made (507). As Taylor claims, "the mention of these four woods might bring to mind a definable group of objects that would be both portable and quite at home in a 'hall where men drank'" (507). The real crux of the poem appears in lines 11b–14a, where we are told that the four woods, when used together, "have one name, *wulfheafodtreo*, that often *abæd* weapons from his lord, treasure in the hall, the gold-hilted sword" (507). Taylor points out the difficulty in establishing the literal meaning of *wulfheafodtreo* when it appears only in a medium that draws on metaphor and ambiguous language, and here, too, he rejects the most common interpretation of the object described here as a "gallows." He concludes instead that it is "appropriate here to consider the term *wulfheafodtreo* not as a literal "gallows" but as a metaphor denoting something that perpetuates the creation of outlaws, something that outlaws "grow up out of," so to speak." He suggests, in short, "that *wulfheafodtreo* constitutes a metaphorical reference to the mead-barrel and drinking bowl when they are used together by a lord to dispense mead—a drink that is notorious throughout Old English literature for turning law-abiding citizens into criminals of the worst sort" (508).

D.F.J.

Not seen:

Garcés Conejos, Pilar, and Julia Fernández Cuesta. "The Battle of Maldon y St. Edmund: una aproximación pragmática desde la teoría de la cortesía lingüística." *Miscelánea* (Zaragoza) 15 (1994), 235–62.

c. *Beowulf*

Text

SCHOLARS HAVE OFTEN argued over the amount of time the hero has to hold his breath during his descent into Grendel's Mere, mostly in response to Fred Robinson's 1974 essay "Elements of the Marvellous in the Characterization of Beowulf." The crux seems to reside in the meaning of the phrase *hwil dæges* (1495). Alfred Bammesberger's "Beowulf's Descent into Grendel's Mere" (*NM* 96, 225–7) agrees with Robinson that the expression means 'daytime' rather than 'the space of a day', and suggests that it is a parenthetical expression inserted between two clauses. He translates the passage "the surging water received the warrior—then it was daytime—before he could make out the bottom of the mere" (226). In another careful reading of a detail in the poem, "A Textual Note on *Beowulf* 431–32" (*ES* 76, 297–301), Bammesberger suggests that the phrases 'minra earla gedryht and þes hearda heap' are vocative; this removes an apparent contradiction, since Beowulf has just said that he alone ('ana') might cleanse Heorot. Bammesberger translates "I will entreat of you one favor . . . that I may alone, o company of my earls and you, this strong gathering, purify Heorot" (301). These are minor

improvements, perhaps, but they are deeply satisfying; by concentrating on the smallest textual elements our sense of the poem's larger coherence and artistry grows more refined.

In "A Musing on *Beowulf* 70" (*MESN* 32, 3–6), Shigeru Ono examines the quirky grammar of that line, *þone ylde bearn æfre gefrunon*. Ono questions the reading of Fred Robinson, who retains the MS *þone* and translates *gefrunon* as optative for, presumably, *gefrunen*: "which the sons of men should hear of forever." Ono hesitates to take *gefrunon* as optative and notes that this construction is found elsewhere only with a negative; he suggests, not altogether seriously, that perhaps the original reading was *ær ne gefrunon*, and translates 'had never heard of before'. Ono concludes with a heartfelt admission: "Despite Robinson's argument *Beowulf* 70 still remains a crux to me, and . . . if the scribe or the poet had written or composed otherwise, the meaning of the passage would have been clearer" (5). In a sort of postscript to this essay, Raymond Tripp adds his thoughts on the line ("More Musings on *Beowulf* 67b–70: a Literary Reverie," *MESN* 32, 8–10). Tripp suggests that a 'literary' rather than a 'linguistic' approach to the line will yield better results: quoting his own 1977 article on "The Exemplary Role of Hrothgar and Heorot," he notes that the line "admits of a declarative reading: 'which men have heard about forever,' that is, 'still hear about.'" It is, he argues, a praise of Hrothgar. Tripp prefers a reading in which, on literary as well as on linguistic grounds, "the comparative on which an inference of competition and thus of pride is based is eliminated" (8).

Meter

In the world of OE metrical studies there are few things you can count on. One of them is Alan Bliss's system of scansion, which has held up remarkably well in this rough-and-tumble field. Peter Lucas has done teachers of Old English poetry a great service in bringing to print Alan Bliss's *The Scansion of 'Beowulf'* (OEN Subsidia 22. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan U. 51 pp.). This work, which Bliss produced shortly before his death in 1985 and originally intended as a handout for his students, gives examples (and in many cases complete listings) of all metrical types found in the poem. The analysis is based on *The Metre of Beowulf*; it expands the schematics of that work's Appendix C into a useful and illuminating collection of examples. Lucas's editorial work should find a place alongside Bliss's *Introduction to Old English Metre* (OEN Subsidia 20) and Jeffrey Vickman's *Metrical Concordance to Beowulf* (OEN Subsidia 16) as an indispensable (and inexpensive) tool for both scholars and teachers.

Resolution (the principle that two short syllables may take the place of one long one in a metrical foot) is a problematic concept in OE meter, and no less than three articles this year have taken a crack at it. Geoffrey Russom's "Constraints on Resolution in *Beowulf*" (in M.J. Toswell, ed., *Prosody and Poetics in the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of C.B. Heatt*; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 147–63)

notes that while there is some agreement on when resolution is necessary, "there has been less agreement about the conditions under which a resolvable sequence must stand unresolved, occupying two metrical positions" (148). He proceeds to explain these conditions, in terms too complex to be summarized here. Much of the problem, admittedly, stems from Sievers's failure to articulate the conditions under which resolution did—and more importantly did not—occur; it's a convenient but not particularly well-grounded principle of OE meter. In "Simplifying Resolution in *Beowulf*" (in Toswell, ed., *Prosody and Poetics*, pp. 80–101), James Keddie argues that Sievers had "an untenable view of resolution" (80). Keddie proposes a simpler alternative: he accepts the use of two short syllables in place of one long stressed one—the classic 'resolution' situation—but denies that resolution occurs in drops or half-stresses (whose existence he also denies). "[Y]ou cannot resolve unstressed syllables in the same sense in which you can resolve stressable syllables," he argues (80–1). Keddie's arguments are "part of a larger metrical theory" (93) which, while largely traditional, hopes to offer a somewhat simpler and more logical approach than Sievers. This larger theory proposes that the OE metrical template consisted of all six possible combinations of Lifts and Drops, all but one of which correspond to one of Sievers's Five Types. A different approach to resolution and half-stress makes this theory a small but important departure from Sievers and his many followers; Keddie makes an attractive case for a simpler and more 'human' attitude towards OE meter. Seiichi Suzuki rises "In Defense of Resolution as a Metrical Principle in the Meter of *Beowulf*" (*ES* 76, 20–33). After lengthy debate with Hoover's 1985 anti-resolutionist *New Theory of Old English Meter* and Wolfgang Obst's 1987 absolute-resolutionist *Der Rhythmus des Beowulf*, Suzuki re-asserts the traditional view: resolution is a metrically-significant principle, and it is applied or not applied depending on context. Which is pretty much back where we started.

Mary Blockley and Thomas Cable, in "Kuhn's Laws, Old English Poetry, and the New Philology" (in Baker, ed., *Beowulf: Basic Readings*, 261–79) strongly, systematically, and, I think, effectively dismantle the complex but creaky mechanism known to metrists as Kuhn's Laws (which deal with the placement and stressing of sentence 'particles'—among them pronouns, adverbs, finite verbs, conjunctions). They point out that Kuhn's laws do not account for things they ought to account for, and the things they *do* account for are epiphenomena of other, more important laws. "Our basic argument," they say, "is that the levels of syntactic representation and of metrical representation must be kept distinct" (263); things which can be explained by syntax (e.g., the placement of conjunctions at the beginning of a clause, the relation of an infinitive verb to an auxiliary) need not be explained by a special metrical 'law'. Blockley and Cable argue that "the syntax of Old English poetry is not as simple, nor the meter as complex, as Kuhn's Laws would make them appear. There are various independent but interacting syntactic constraints that

can be understood only after the metrical constraints have been factored out" (272–3). They suggest that OE meter may be better thought of as "alliterative-syllabic" (273), but their rejection of Kuhn's Laws does not hinge on acceptance of this proposition; their insistence on syntax as a fundamental term of OE meter is, however, most apposite. They end by reminding the reader that "there is a certain bedrock stability to the interaction of sound and syntax in Old English poetry, a stability which generations of readers have intuited. The task of the philologist is to find the descriptions that make those intuitions explicit" (278). Their serious scrutiny of Kuhn's 'laws' is a long stride in the right direction.

In its manuscript, of course, *Beowulf* does not look like verse at all, and the first task of the metrist is to determine where the half-lines begin and end. This work, though it depends upon a whole *ars metrica* for its operation, is often automatic and unexamined, or accepted as already done by earlier editors. Mary Blockley's "Klaeber's Relineations of *Beowulf* and Verses Ending in Words without Categorical Stress" (*RES* 46, 321–32) pauses over this process and proposes several refinements to the metrical rules governing the construction of verse-boundaries. In the case of determining whether the first half of a line like 290, 'Ic þæt gehyre þæt þis is hold weorod' contains a B verse (ending on the second 'þæt') or an A3 (ending with 'gehyre'), Blockley proposes the following rule: "When the first three syllables of an on-verse are not categorically stressed, and when the stressed syllables of a finite verb falls on the fourth or subsequent syllable, that verse will be an A3 and will end with that verb" (324). After a number of weak syllables, she suggests, stress on the verb becomes inevitable, for reasons which "may well have to do with the requirement that every verse have four syllables" (325). As a corollary, Blockley notes that "On-verse Bs in which the second stress is non-categorical and non-alliterating are allowed only when the subsequent off-verse begins with a stressed word; preferably a word with categorical stress" (329); an example is 909, 'se þe him bealwa to bote gelyfde'. Blockley admits, quite rightly, that there are good grammatical reasons for most of these determinations of verse boundaries—the rule that a half-line must be in some sense grammatically self-contained would account for the division of the verse after 'to' rather than before it—but a case like 2481, 'þeah ðe oðer his ealdre gebohte', which is usually divided after 'his' rather than before it, "suggests that the grammatical motivation answered to a metrical imperative" (330). Blockley notes that Klaeber, between his first and second edition, changed the lineations of a number of such lines, including 2481 just quoted; she suggests that several other lines (632, 1175, and most controversially 2048) "might benefit from carrying out Klaeber's programme of relineating according to metre so that the A3 becomes a B ending in a categorically unstressed word" (331).

In "Anacrusis in the Meter of *Beowulf*" (*SP* 92, 141–63), Seiichi Suzuki defends the idea of anacrusis, unstressed monosyllables or disyllables occurring before the first lift of a verse,

against those theorists, notable Hoover and Kendall, who deny its existence or importance. Suzuki accepts and refines the traditional concept that anacrusis is a kind of increased metrical strength: "anacrusis most typically appears at the beginning of metrical configurations that are almost exclusively used as a-verses with double alliteration, and anacrusis is realized by a verbal prefix or a negative particle *ne*" (148); exceptions to these generalization (about 20 half-lines) usually violate several of its provisions at once, suggesting that the verses are truly anomalous. Suzuki further argues against the view of Donoghue (and others) that lines such as 93b 'swa wæter bebugeð' represent a type C with anacrusis before the second lift.

One suspects that almost every student of OE meter, at one time or another, has been tempted to take Occam's razor and slash the whole crazy thing to tatters, replacing the many elaborate descriptive schemes with a simple generative principle or two, a few gut-feeling intuitions and a couple of rough rules of thumb that might then account for all surviving OE verses. David Gould's "A New Approach to Old English Meter Based upon an Analysis of Formulaic Language" (*Neophil* 79, 653–69) attempts to do just that. Clearing the deck of previous work (he cites only Creed and Russom, with a passing tip of the hat to Pope and Sievers), he offers instead an attractively simple hypothesis: "I assume that the Old English meter is essentially accentual rather than temporal or accentual-syllabic. Only accented syllables are metrically significant, and each half-line contains two accented syllables" (653). This is a common enough 'intuitive' approach to the OE poetic line, and in its simplicity it certainly does (a) account for all (or nearly all) the surviving lines of OE verse, but it fails to do two other things which a serious theory of OE meter must do: (b) explain which syllables are stressed and which are not when a choice of stress is present, and (c) explain why certain patterns of stress common enough in prose are never found in verse. For the second of these duties Gould relies on alliteration ("all syllables which alliterate are stressed," he suggests, p. 658) and 'formulas', "designed to meet the metrical and alliterative needs of the half-line" (664). Non-formulaic unstressed syllables have the effect of "syncopation" on the poetic line. Regarding the third of these theoretical requirements the theory is silent. Gould's work certainly wins points in the simplicity department, but it fails to address how a formula gets to be a formula—that is, how certain metrical/alliterative patterns, rather than others, become standardized and subject to formulaic variation. Clearly this work awaits further refinement, which will perhaps add subtlety and some depth of context to its admirably forthright application of the principle of parsimony.

Origins and Analogues

The pioneering insight of Milman Parry and Albert Lord—that traditional poetry is assembled from a stock of formulas—has been subjected to more than half a century of scrutiny and development. The great strength and weakness of the theory

of oral-formulaic composition is its elasticity—a 'formula' or 'type-scene' or 'theme' may be defined and redefined in many different ways, and when a definition has been made broad enough to embrace widely different literary forms and vast cross-cultural comparisons it is often attenuated past the point of usefulness. Francelia Mason Clark's *Theme in Oral Epic and in 'Beowulf'* (New York and London: Garland, pp. xxxvi, 252) begins with a careful consideration of the development of Lord's definition of 'theme' in oral poetry. Of course there are 'themes' in all literary works, and the *topos* is an ancient term of rhetoric; for the term to have any particular usefulness as part of the oral theory it must mean something more. In an introductory chapter (xv–xxxvi) Clark traces this changing definition through Lord's long career; the most common meaning is that 'theme' refers to a traditional grouping of ideas, while 'formula' refers to a traditional grouping of words—Clark distinguishes the two by noting that "formula and theme are different focuses of critical thinking, instead of mutually complementary parts of the epic" (xxviii). The crux of the definition, for most proponents of the oral-formulaic theory, is whether or not a 'theme' needed to have the same ideas expressed in the same language—whether verbal repetition is essential to its existence as a theme, or whether a collocation of ideas is enough. In his later work Lord added 'repeated verbal elements' to his definition of theme, a refinement which both clarifies and complicates the meaning of the term.

Clark takes Lord's developing definition and applies it to a comparison of the south Slavic epic (specifically Salih Ugljanin's *Song of Baghdad*) and to *Beowulf*. The two works are comparable, Clark argues, because in addition to their genre and subject matter they share a compositional technique that relies on the half-line as the unit of thought and a style that is based on repetition and variation. In the *Song of Baghdad*, however, repetition of whole clauses is not uncommon, while in *Beowulf* it is exceptionally rare, and when it does occur (e.g. 'þæt wæs god cyning') it is never in similar scenes and situations. Verbal repetition in *Beowulf* works in a fundamentally different way; it does not serve the needs of thematic repetition. Scenes in the *Song of Baghdad* are clear, discrete, and uniform, characterized by the 'thrift' of oral composition; scenes in *Beowulf* are diffuse, chronologically complex, characterized by variation and indirection. "While the halfline as unit of composition and the observable minimal theme and its boundaries like centripetal forces bring the two epics together for comparison, characteristic styles and their implications for meaning, like centrifugal forces, resist" (27). Recurring themes and scenes in *Beowulf* such as Hygelac's ill-fated raid on Frisia generally contain new information and new emphasis with each re-telling; the amount of direct verbal repetition is dramatically small. Even *Beowulf*'s re-telling of his own adventures offers a number of striking new perspectives on the story we have just heard; even speeches which are to some extent parallel in organization and *topoi*—such as *Beowulf*'s three introductory boasts in Denmark—are char-

acterized by elaborate variation and differences in specific ideas. Recurring traditional scenes such as sea-voyages and funeral pyres are not interchangeable. All this is quite different from the *Song of Baghdad*, in which similar scenes and situations tend to be told in similar language, in keeping with the compositional 'thrill' that is, after all, the central principle of the theory of oral composition.

Throughout the book Clark is repeatedly led to conclude that the similarities between these two works exist only in the midst of great differences. Comparing common themes—traveling, arming, boasting—Clark shows quite convincingly that while verbal repetition is a common feature of the Balkan epic, *Beowulf* is characterized by variation with a very small percentage of repeated phrases and half-lines. If Lord's definitions are accepted, Clark notes, his "characteristic model of the theme does not appear in *Beowulf*" (124). Yet Clark suggests that if you examine the Balkan poetry closely enough, you can find signs of innovation and originality; if you consider *Beowulf* abstractly enough you can find pattern and tradition. Clark suggests that the closest thing to 'theme' in *Beowulf* is the use of the language of elegy: "it recurs as rhetorical pattern carrying emotional and individualized meaning. It shows artistry and also pattern. Is this as themelike as sea voyage, funeral pyre, boast, the failing sword? To us, no, this is uniquely a genre. But to poet and audience the boast itself was a genre. Following internal principles . . . elegy is that patterned subject nearest equivalent to Lord's theme" (163f).

Clark concludes with a discussion of the element of creativity and authorial control in traditional poetry, and cautious speculation on the implications of her study for arguments for the origin of *Beowulf*. "Nothing we have seen in *Beowulf*'s kinds of complexities rules out the possibility that it could be oral-traditional epic. Nothing proves the *Beowulf* poet used writing Conversely, nothing we have seen prevents the *Beowulf* poet from having used writing to record his epic" (222–3). What is most abundantly clear from any comparative study is that the Balkan epics, full of verbatim repetitions and thoroughly formulaic characters and scenes, are far more like Middle English romances than like *Beowulf*, and the two literary forms are only comparable if the terms of definition are made so broad and pliant as to be nearly tautological. Lord's concept of 'theme' is useful in its very broadness, Clark suggests, and in its failure to explain works like *Beowulf* which is purports to describe: "When extrapolated, theme is a way to approach purported 'universals' of epic through both internal and cross-cultural contexts Lord's earlier and last definitions and his later interpretations suggest the latitude to look for what *does* recur in epics at narrative level and, within that, what changes" (224; emphasis in the original). Clark's book is a generally well-balanced study, refreshingly skeptical but open-minded, critically self-conscious and sensitive to the demands of both proponents and opponents of Lord's theories. It generously manages to confirm the value of Lord's work while challenging both its

applications and underlying assumptions.

Jacques Chocheyras's "Les légendes épiques du Danemark (VIII^e – X^e siècles) et les origines de la chanson de geste" (*Olifant* 18 (1993–4), 289–302) concentrates on parallels between the *Bjarkamal* and the *Chanson de Roland*, but mentions *Beowulf* in its first few pages. Chocheyras is interested in the analogies between the political structures which can be detected underneath the profound differences in tone and context of the poem: an old king and a young hero, a treacherous advisor (Unferth, Ganelon), and so on. Did these Danish stories, imported by the Normans, have their influence on the Frankish material that became *Roland*? Chocheyras very cautiously concludes: "contentons-nous de constater qu'il existait côte à côte en Normandie des traditions épiques danoises et une légende franque—sans préjudice d'autres traditions. Il est tentant de penser que des motifs épiques empruntés à la tradition nordique on pu venir se greffer sur un schéma dramatique d'origine franque" (298).

In the typical American 'sophomore survey' of English Literature, students lurch with some suddenness from the gloomy death-scene of *Beowulf* to the merry springtime cavalcade of Chaucer's 'Prologue' to the *Canterbury Tales*. The contrast is shocking and, more often than not, put to good pedagogical use; less often do students notice the parallels between these two quite different literary styles. In "Heroic Worlds: 'The Knight's Tale' and 'Beowulf'" (in R.G. Newhauser and John A. Alford, eds., *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages: Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel* (MRTS 118. Binghamton, NY, pp. 43–59), Edward B. Irving brings his considerable knowledge of Old English heroic poetry to a consideration of the most complex of Chaucer's tales. Despite the obvious differences between these two works, Irving points out, "the two poems are similar in both being composed by Christian poets examining, seriously and sympathetically, a pre-Christian heroic world" (44). Both poems are haunted by the grisly image of piled-up corpses, the awful spoils of war; both posit heroic life as a desperate struggle of order against chaos, both within and without the walls of society (and both rely on building-imagery to convey these points); both accept the tragic necessity of death and the inexorability of fate. "I know I have been ignoring very large areas of the *Knight's Tale*," Irving admits (57), but the similarities he points out are more than enough to demonstrate that the tone of heroic tragedy, so starkly in the foreground of *Beowulf*, lingers darkening the background of Chaucer's romance. "The merry wedding that Theseus and the Knight so enthusiastically support is not a sentimental ending What the characters have they have earned, within the harsh limits of this iron world" (59).

Societies built upon violence, loyalty, honor and fame exhibit certain parallels throughout history; it was, after all, no great stretch to turn *The Seven Samurai* into *The Magnificent Seven*. Yet far-ranging cultural comparisons, however fascinating, have their limitations. Akiyuki Jimura places *Beowulf* alongside the 8th-century Japanese *Kojiki* in "A

Comparative Study of Beowulf and Yamato Takeru" (*In Geardagum* 14 (1993) 79–87), singling out one hero in the Japanese collection, Yamato Takeru, for particular comparison. Since the Japanese hero is given his name by a dying warrior named Kumaso Takeru, and 'Kumaso' means 'bear' (and perhaps 'Beowulf' means 'bear' too, for all anyone knows), one might hope to find promising common ground. Furthermore, both lives have a trajectory that is "both triumphant and tragic" (80), and both lives fall roughly into two parts. But the more Jimuru compares, the more striking the contrasts. Takeru leads armies and conquers kingdoms; Beowulf fights alone against monsters. Takeru disguises himself as a woman; Beowulf proudly announces his name and mission. Takeru kills his own brother; Takeru has a lady friend and a wise old aunt who gives him a magical 'bag' which protects him; Takeru's sword never fails him, though he leaves it behind at a woman's bedside—something Beowulf can hardly be imagined doing. The point that emerges from Jimuru's essay is that there are, after all, various kinds of heroes and various kinds of stories in the world; the idea of archetypes can only be taken so far.

From a great height—up in a plane, say—the world looks neat and pretty: little square fields, straight clean highways, soft mottled forests and shining rivers. On the ground, it's a different and considerably messier story. Similarly, from the stratosphere of cross-cultural comparison, the world of *Beowulf* is reduced to its outlines: useful for large-scale cartography, perhaps, but hardly a substitute for tramping across the territory. Italo Signorini's "Monsters, the Gaze, Death, and the Hero: an Outsider's Rambling Thoughts on Beowulf, Grettis Saga, and the Myth of Medusa" (in Teresa Pàroli, ed., *La funzione dell'eroe germanico: storicità, metafora, paradigma*, pp. 27–39) take this long view; Signorini examines from an anthropological perspective the elements which make up "the constellation of the hero in the northern world and their connection with the broadest possible Indo-European horizon in which the northern world shares" (28). Specifically he discusses connections between Beowulf (and Grettir) and Perseus, the Grendels and Medusa. He singles out "the power of enchantment in the monster's gaze, the hero's maleness, and their lunar and chthonic connections" (28) as the primary similarities. Some of these, of course, are so general as to be trivial—the monsters are monstrous and terrifying, the heroes are heroic and exceptional and, almost inevitably, men. Other connections are, strictly speaking, irrelevant to *Beowulf*—the fact that Glámr gazes on the moon and dazzles Grettir has little to do with Beowulf's fight with Grendel's mother, except in the critic's imagination. Others are probably coincidental—the sickle-shaped knife used to decapitate Medusa is related to the magical sword used to dispatch Grendel's mother only in that both are super-human weapons taken up against super-human opponents. In other words, similarities in the story of a Greek hero and a Germanic one are, perhaps, more due to the universals of the unconscious or the logical requisites of heroic experience than to their common Indo-European roots.

[The following abstract has been generously submitted by Claudia di Sciacca of the University of Palermo: In "L'eroe germanico contro avversari mostruosi: tra testo e iconografia" (in *La funzione dell'eroe germanico: storicità, metafora, paradigma*, ed. T. Pàroli, pp. 201–257), M. E. Ruggerini attempts a comprehensive analysis of the fight of a hero against monsters as it is portrayed in Germanic literature, resting her arguments both on literary and iconographic evidence. Bearing in mind the features of the classical antecedents of the Germanic hero, she examines the key role the fight against monstrous adversaries plays in the discovery and fulfilment of the hero's vocation (1). In Ruggerini's words, fighting against a monster was a sort of initiation rite, the eventual victory over the adversary implying a victory over the hero's inner and unconfessed fears (2.1). The article concentrates on Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian literature and iconography, pointing out their mutual influences, as they emerge, in particular, from *Beowulf*, where Ruggerini finds what she calls a hypertrophic presence of monstrous elements (5). Beowulf faces three monsters in his lifespan, so the poem provides a rich share of elements pertaining to the hero-monster conflict, allowing Ruggerini to detect some features which she considers to be archetypal: the monster as warden of the underworld (2.1) and as a menace for social and moral order (2.2); the hero as a solitary and weaponless fighter (2.3 and 3.1). However, the poem's treatment of the subject is also somewhat innovative; the monsters are assigned not only a symbolic value, but also a more complex nature with a few human features (5). According to Ruggerini, the presentation of the three major monsters is different because the poem, as it now stands in the manuscript, contains both reshaped old stories and more recent ones (such as the dragon-fight). English Christian iconography made frequent use of the motif of the fight between heroes, such as St Michael or St George, who—unlike Beowulf—were God's champions. Their fight against monstrous adversaries, in particular dragons, was seen as a symbolic representation of the eternal conflict between Good and Evil. Moreover, in Scandinavian literature the fight against the dragon is handled in an original way and often does not have so much an epic dimension as a sapiential one, as in the *Fáfnismál* (7). With the passing of the centuries the conflict of the hero against the monster was to lose its peculiar status and its relevant meaning in the career of a hero, becoming a mere cliché, as it is evident in the Middle German narrative of Theodoric the Great and in its Norwegian counterpart, the *Þiðreks saga* (8). Monsters themselves gradually became more and more familiar to the audience, losing part of their threatening power. In contrast, in Romanesque art they retained their symbolic significance, though they were also used as fabulous decorative devices (9).]

[The following abstract has been submitted by Danielle Maion of the University of Udine: Teresa Pàroli in her article "Profilo dell'Antieroe" (in *La funzione dell'eroe germanico, storicità, metafora, paradigma*, ed. Teresa Pàroli, pp. 273–321) aims to define the traits of the anti-hero in Germanic literature. After defining the characteristic of the hero—his con-

nection to kingship, his inborn qualities and moral value, his 'faithful friends' (that is, his sword and horse), and the feast and fame which he may enjoy—she emphasizes that the figure of the anti-hero may be considered not only the antagonist of the hero, but anyone who does not behave according to the heroic ethic (280). She argues that even the hero can play the role of anti-hero when he overestimates his own heroic condition, isolating himself and becoming guilty of *oferhygd*. Each heroic value has an opposite, such as cowardice and courage, as illustrated by the episode in which Beowulf fights with the dragon and is abandoned by all his companions except Wiglaf. In this context, Paroli suggests that the best representative of the anti-hero in the heroic poetry is Hagen of the *Nibelungenlied* (288). She then points out that when Christianity influenced the heroic code, the parameters of evaluation were inverted (301). In the Christian epic, however, God and the saints were never identified with the hero, although Satan and his followers have a role similar to that of the anti-hero of the Germanic epic. Paroli concludes her work by examining the different opinions of the role of Unferð in *Beowulf*.]

Criticism

Beowulf studies, like the poem itself, is a kind of wilderness with widely scattered landmarks, a confusing and sometimes treacherous terrain with only a few prominent points in relation to which we may orient ourselves; perhaps each reader of the criticism, like each reader of the poem, will have his or her own sense of what those landmarks are. The editor of an anthology offers a selection of such critical landmarks for the use of teachers and students, and the success of the anthology depends on a balance between the familiar and widely-recognized landmarks and the pleasantly surprising new discoveries. A good anthology, then, will be a sort of map of the current critical consensus, with (usually) a few provocative articles included for piquancy and the prospect of new bearings in new directions. Peter S. Baker's *Beowulf: Basic Readings* (Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England I. New York and London: Garland; pp. xx, 306) is by this definition a good anthology, though it must be understood on its own terms. It is not a new map of *Beowulf* studies but a map of new *Beowulf* studies: it limits its survey to work done since the 1960s, and is "concerned less with older orthodoxies than with the movement away from them and the development and testing of new ways to think about the poem" (xi). Its selections are judicious and, most readers will agree, necessary for serious critical reflection on the poem: Eric Stanley's chapter from *Continuations and Beginnings*, Larry Benson's "The Pagan Coloring of *Beowulf*," Eric John's "*Beowulf* and the Margin of Literacy," Stanley Greenfield's "The Authenticating Voice in *Beowulf*," Marijane Osborn's "The Great Feud: Scriptural History and Strife in *Beowulf*," Roberta Frank's "Skaldic Verse and the Date of *Beowulf*," Colin Chase's "*Beowulf*, Bede, and St Oswald: The Hero's Pride in Old English Hagiography." Several articles are updated with new notes and revisions: Fred Robinson's "Elements of the Marvellous in the Characterization of *Beowulf*:"

A Reconsideration of the Textual Evidence" is a fine introduction to the discipline of reading what the text says rather than what we expect it to say; Kevin Kiernan's "The Legacy of Wiglaf: Saving a Wounded *Beowulf*" is an epitome of his larger hypothesis about the date and composition of the poem; Gillian Overing's "The Women of *Beowulf*: A Context for Interpretation" is a self-contained recasting of her Chapter "Gender and Interpretation in *Beowulf*" in *Language, Sign, and Gender in Beowulf*. Two new articles, by Blockley/Cable and Liuzza, are reviewed elsewhere. All the articles in Baker's volume take strong positions on matters of some controversy in *Beowulf* studies, and all are forthrightly (and often eloquently) self-conscious of the interdependence of method and matter; any of these should, carefully approached, spark a useful classroom debate that includes not only the 'facts' about the poem but the critical processes by which we arrive at these 'facts'. The book is also, it should be noted, well-designed and printed, and complemented with an Index of "Passages Cited" and "Words and Phrases." As a resource to supplement a 'classic' critical anthology, this book should find a welcome place in many a classroom.

A succinct description of the religious atmosphere of *Beowulf* has so far eluded critics. What word could capture the poet's ambiguous attitude towards his pagan characters? C. Tidmarsh Major proposes (or rather borrows from others, notably John Niles) the word 'syncretism' ("A Christian *wyrd*: Syncretism in *Beowulf*," *ELN* 32.3, 1–10). Major asserts "I would argue that the poet—most likely a cleric himself—has both accepted the Christian teachings of the monastery and retained certain amenable native Germanic traditions as well" (7). This is surely an argument that few would bother to challenge; the question is whether and to what extent these 'traditions' carried with them religious implications. Suggesting that most critics are unable to rise above their own modern notions of Christianity as an either/or sort of belief system, Major notes that the religion of the Anglo-Saxons tolerated some gradual accommodation of pagan practices to Christian purposes, and "allowed for the survival of pre-Christian attitudes, morals, and stories as well" (5). This quiet but catastrophic elision of the crucial distinction between 'pagan' and 'secular', it should be said, is precisely the reason why so many critics have had so much trouble characterizing the religious atmosphere of *Beowulf*. In another essay bent on exposing the pagan roots of the poem, Emma B. Hawkins suggests that the words 'hild' and 'guð' have powerful resonance in *Beowulf* because of their associations with pre-Christian valkyrie figures ("Hild and Gup: the War Maidens of *Beowulf*," *In Geardagum* 15 (1994), 55–75). The words connoted "superhuman strength and martial ferocity" (55), she suggests; in passages where 'hild' or 'guð' is the subject of the sentence, their quasi-personification arouses semi-conscious echoes of their pagan analogues. Christine Fell offers a trenchant and convincing rebuttal to such notions as 'syncretism' and covert paganism, in "Paganism in *Beowulf*: a Semantic Fairy-Tale" (in T. Hofstra et al., eds., *Pagans and Christians: the Interplay Between Christian Latin and Traditional Germanic Cultures in*

Early Medieval Europe. Mediaevalia Groningana, 16. Groningen: Forsten, pp. 9–34). “Rome had been officially Christian only a couple of centuries before Pope Gregory sent his missionaries to the Anglo-Saxons yet we accept that these missionaries came with a full understanding of Christian teaching,” she pointedly observes; “[w]e are curiously reluctant however to accept that within another couple of hundred years the Anglo-Saxon educated mind was equal in understanding and commitment” (14). Fell argues that the biases of the nineteenth-century philologists—not only their desire to find evidence of pre-medieval Germanic paganism but their preference for etymologies and cognates as determinants of a word’s meaning—have led readers of *Beowulf* to imagine that the poem’s depiction of paganism is far more focused and vivid than it actually is. Our modern failure to distinguish between ‘pagan’ and ‘secular’ blurs our vision of the Anglo-Saxons; nor do we always remember to make the elementary distinction between an author’s characters or sources and an author’s beliefs: “One could excavate as much ‘paganism’ from a study of the nineteenth-century novel” (14), she retorts. Fell argues that boar-helmets, *eotens*, and treasure-laden pyres are more likely to be antiquarian touches, rather vaguely applied, than genuine survivals or depictions of pre-Christian practice. Further, our tendency to define words etymologically gets in the way of our perception of their use by the Anglo-Saxons themselves; the depictions of pagan practices in *Beowulf* are far sketchier than most editors, glossators, or translators have been willing to admit (Fell suggests, for example, that the phrase ‘hæl sceawedon’ 204, usually translated ‘they consulted the omens’, means rather ‘they wished him luck’—her argument that ‘hæl’ has nothing particularly pagan about it is convincing, but she does not explain how ‘sceawian’ can bear an unusual sense here). Fell’s polemical but precise essay demonstrates again—and apparently continued demonstration is needed—that the evidence for paganism in *Beowulf*, even the evidence that the poet really knew much about paganism, is remarkably thin.

Johann Köberl’s “Referential Ambiguity as a Structuring Principle in *Beowulf*” (*Neophil* 79, 481–95) calls attention to the surprising number of places where the referent of a pronoun or the subject of a verb is not immediately clear, e.g. ‘him’ in line 114, which could refer to either the giants (pl.) or Grendel (sg.); ‘he’ 404, which could refer either to Wulfgar or Beowulf; or the many moments in the Finnsburh episode where modern readers are, frankly, baffled as to who is doing what to whom. Usually such ambiguities are chalked up as an unintended effect of our distance from the text; in the original, we assume, the sense must have been clearly conveyed by some non-lexical element such as meter or intonation. Köberl prefers to let these moments retain their confusing resonance; he notes that such ambiguities “tend to occur in places where new plot elements are being introduced” (482) and suggests that they may be a conscious part of the poet’s art. Their effect, he argues, is to “highlight existing links between its potential referents, links in the form of bonds existing in a

heroic society or—even more strongly—in the form of an essential identity between two referents, of a view of two referents as two sides of the same coin” (491). While surely not every instance of such referential ambiguity is deliberate (and the essay offers no way of telling which ones are not), Köberl makes a provocative claim for the value and validity of those moments of indecision and hesitation which most readers are too eager to explain away.

It is a dangerous business to mingle two fields as different as reader-response criticism and oral-formulaic theory; the recent work of John Miles Foley has shown, however, that the two are, at least in their further developments, not only compatible but harmonious. Mark Amodio navigates the same treacherous straits in “Affective Criticism, Oral Poetics, and *Beowulf*’s Fight with the Dragon” (*Oral Tradition* 10, 54–90), and with some of the same success. “Contemporary reader-based theory has yet to embrace medieval literature,” he notes (58); this is unfortunate because oral-derived poetry might prove fertile ground for affective criticism. Oral poems, like the affective critic’s notion of a literary work, are resistant to textualization and reification, existing only in their performance and in the reception of an audience. On the other hand, oral poetics, to the extent that it is understood at all, is understood as traditional—individual instances of formulae and type-scenes hardly exist apart from the complex of meanings in which they are embedded; verses and whole stories are assembled from an inherited stock of epithets, ideas, descriptions, and plots whose meanings, like their diction, are given, not invented. And it is, needless to say, difficult to guess at what an audience might have known or felt a thousand years ago. Armed with this paradox Amodio examines the dragon-fight in *Beowulf*. The inherited tradition, he argues, encodes the audience’s expectations, and by studying a given instance of a story against its traditional elements we might begin to calculate the audience’s response. Though structurally similar to the other two fights in *Beowulf*, Amodio notes, the dragon-fight is more disturbing, unfamiliar, unusual; the audience’s anxiety may have been heightened by their uncertainty over the narrative path, but “the episode’s oral poetics provides clear signals, or codes . . . that shape the narrative and direct the audience’s response to it” (66). The dragon is vaguely described—which signals its fatal power; Beowulf resolves to face the dragon alone—which, considering his age, signals his doomed courage; his sword *Nægling* fails twice—which, Amodio argues, “forms the emotional, if not narrative, climax of both the dragon episode and of the entire poem” (74). All these features are part of the traditional complex of ideas in the monster-fight motif, and all are deployed here for audience effect. Amodio compares the scene to a moment in the *eME Brut* with a somewhat similar monster-fight; there, as in *Beowulf*, the moment when the hero’s weapons fail marks the climax of a patterned expectation of terror.

Beowulf is often read as a Christian poet’s bittersweet elegy for the doomed heroic economy, the futility of forging peace by the works of war, the instability of the bonds formed by

gifts and exchange and inter-tribal marriage, and the impossibility of permanence in the tragically limited pagan world: indeed, this post-Tolkein consensus has become almost a given in our understanding of the poem, an invisible (because self-evident) point of entry into the poet's work. John M. Hill's *The Cultural World in 'Beowulf'* (Anthropological Horizons, 6. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: U of Toronto Press. pp. x, 224) offers a comparative-ethnological perspective on the world of feuds, kinship, violence, and gift-giving in the poem, a view that seriously challenges these assumptions. "The burden of this book," he declares in its conclusion (p. 145) "has been to reanimate that world and its values, to see it as Beowulf, Hrothgar, and others do and to reposition the poet in relation to the heroic past he labours into being." Hill forcefully and repeatedly reminds us that the poet regards these values as positive things, capable of creating stable social bonds even though they often do not.

He notes, quite rightly, the subtle politics of the society depicted in *Beowulf*, and argues that modern readers import modern biases—a distaste for violence and feud, a distrust of wealth and display, a disdain for boasting and heavy drinking—into their reading of the poem, which prevents us from seeing that these are the very terms in which the political life is played out. Hill's ethnological reading of the poem brings to the foreground all the social structures often regarded as 'background', and gives a positive value to elements of the poem's society which are often seen as negative. Hill emphasizes the complex political nuances of gift-giving and the positive jural force of violence and revenge. In this reading of the poem Beowulf emerges as a lawgiver, a bringer of justice and peace, rather than a burly adventurer searching for personal glory. Gifts are subtle political statements and debts to be repaid, not barbaric displays of wealth and heroic generosity; kinship is at least partially a shifting construct, not a primal tie of loyalty in conflict or consonance with one's duties to one's lord. Feasting and boasting are moments of political negotiation and diplomatic maneuvering, not glittering scenes of heroic excess. "Beowulf's world is one in which gift exchange and feud are central; law (or what is right) is reasserted through combat; and revenge or requital are unquestioned by all the noble characters." (85f). Chapters on "The Jural World" (63–84) and "The Economy of Honour" (85–107) argue forcefully and convincingly that feuds, violence, and gift-giving are the foundation on which the poem's heroic society rests, and that this foundation, far from being fatally flawed, is more or less stable: "it is not mutability or revenge violence or sudden change that the poet eventually laments: he laments the end of exchange, stability, order, and joy among peoples" (91). The poet's sadness, in other words, is only local, not global; he mourns the tragic failures of the heroic code, not the tragic futility of the code itself.

Hill's work proceeds by taking the poem's complex fictional world at face value, examining its operation as if it were a real social structure, and drawing analogies to other cultures with similar structures; there is relatively little consideration

for the complexities of authorship or audience, context or creation. He assumes that the world depicted in the poem is broadly similar to the world of its creator; though Hill hesitates to put forth arguments for the poem's provenance, he asserts that "the poet's occasional sense of difference is moral or spiritual, rather than social or temporal" (18). In a chapter on "The Temporal World in *Beowulf*" (38–62) he argues that modern critical readings, notably Fred Robinson's *'Beowulf' and the Appositive Style*, have overemphasized the poet's sense of separation between his world and the world of his characters; instead, he argues, the poet regards the past of the story as mythic, and assumes a fundamental continuity with that past. "The poet emphasizes great sameness with only some differences, rather than great difference finally with some sameness" (147). The values of *Beowulf*, Hill argues, are the values of *Beowulf*; why, he asks (p. 50) should a poet work so hard to create so vividly a culture he consigns to damnation? He argues that the poet's sense of distance from his characters is minimal, and "within that difference he marks out a great sameness of values, of events to rejoice in, of hopes to entertain, through which the heroic past becomes an arena for noble depictions and for man's relationship to God" (62). In this chapter the gap between the Hill's anthropological assumptions and evidence and those of the literary critic is most evident and most frustrating, but in any case assumptions about the poem's context and audience are not really Hill's business here (the book is, after all, called *The Cultural World IN 'Beowulf'*, not *The Cultural World OF 'Beowulf'*); he is nevertheless certainly right to emphasize the poet's sense of connection with the world he creates.

But, one inevitably asks, if the poet endorses the values of his characters' world, then why does everything turn so dark and doom-laden at the end? A fifth chapter on "The Psychological World in *Beowulf*" (108–140) moves beyond ethnology to a (rather conventional) Freudian psychoanalytical approach; having accepted the value of cross-cultural analogy it is, in any case, only a small step to accepting a universal psychological model of the individual. He admits that Freudianism is "somewhat out of favor" (108) in anthropology (not to mention literary theory, and don't even *ask* about psychology), but he deploys it anyway, and to good effect, by connecting both "the poem's foreground of monster fights and its background of feud relations between neighbouring peoples" (113) to the psychology of exchange. The hero's three monstrous opponents draw "successively upon elementally deeper and older levels in the psyche" (137); the poet's melancholy arises from the realization that "super-ego mastery is rare, impermanent, and (even in its exemplars) necessarily rests upon, and draws from, ghostly susceptibilities to impulses otherwise fully suppressed or else repressed in the service of super-ego mastery" (139).

The value of Hill's thoroughly-argued work (there are nearly 50 pages of notes for 150 pages of text) is undoubtedly its emphasis on the positive aspects of the social bonds of the poem's heroic society; their flaws and failures are too often

viewed by modern readers as self-evident. It is, however, one thing to say that the characters in *Beowulf* clearly believe in the values of feuding, violent self-assertion, gift-giving, thaneship and peace-weaving; they believe in them because their world, at least as the poem constructs it, offers no other choice. It is another thing to say that the poet endorses these values wholeheartedly, or that the poem functions simply and univocally, like an ethnographer's case-study rather than a work of literature. Hill's work is an articulate balance to modern post-Tolkien assumptions about the moral and message of *Beowulf*, but its value is perhaps more as a polemical corrective to other views than as an independent reading of the poem.

[Roy Michael Liuzza's "On the Dating of *Beowulf*," in Baker, ed., *Beowulf: Basic Readings*, 281–302), is one of two essays written especially for the Baker volume. He begins with a detailed, balanced survey of the wide variety of opinions on the subject, concluding that part of his essay with the observation that "the most historically-minded branch of English literary studies [Old English] cannot place its most important poetic text more securely than in a range of three centuries" (283). Liuzza then turns to what he sees as the two most important methods used to determine the poet's date: he suggests calling them "the beauty of inflections" and "the beauty of innuendoes" and notes that "the first regards the internal evidence of meter and language, the second the external evidence of historical context" (284). In the course of a rigorous review, he comes to some rather pessimistic but I think valid conclusions: "if we accept that the manuscript text is a unique occasion, only one manifestation of a changing complex of variant versions, then we must accept that the only meaningful date for the 'effective composition' of *Beowulf* is that of the manuscript" (294); and that "reading this undated text reminds us of the fragility of our knowledge of Old English literary culture and the pervasiveness of interpretive activity in even the simplest matters of dating and context" (295). Finally, for Liuzza, "the dating of *Beowulf* is itself an act of interpretation" (295); and this fine essay deserves a place among the more thought provoking recent pieces of interpretive criticism. For a useful integration of the major points in Liuzza's essay into some earlier studies reprinted in the volume, see Baker's Introduction, pp. xvi ff.—J.B.T.]

Robin Waugh's "Competitive Narrators in the Homecoming Scene of *Beowulf*" (*Journal of Narrative Technique* 25, 202–22) proposes that in his long storytelling at Hygelac's court, the hero "tries to usurp the poet's role" (202) and offer a counter-narrative to the poet's own version of the tale. This creates a paradoxical situation for the narrator: the hero must be as skilled in wordplay as he is at swordplay, so his story must be superbly told, but if he is *too* good, he will somehow make the poet look bad. And so the two narrators face off in a kind of *agon* that is, Waugh notes, typical of oral poetry: "The poet competes with *Beowulf* because he comes from a fighting tradition where everyone strives to increase one's reputation, where every action (including a poetic performance) competes

with other people's actions in one way or another" (205) (Waugh refers to the work of Harold Bloom and Michel Foucault as well as Jeff Opland and Walter Ong to make these points, a good example of the applicability of contemporary theory to medieval studies). The hero, who has a kind of exemplary historical reality the poet can only hope to achieve, is at least potentially a threat to the poet because he is greater and more real than his narrator; when *Beowulf* begins to tell his own story, he breaks the poetic truce that exists between the poet and his hero whereby the poetic fame of each is enhanced. The contest between *Beowulf* and his narrator is, as you might expect, rigged from the start (one is reminded of those weird meta-cartoons in which the artist's pencil enters the frame and starts erasing Bugs Bunny's legs or Daffy Duck's bill); in the end the poet will always have the last word. This is a fascinating notion, casting a bright light on the psychology of a narrator who normally does his work in the shadows. The arguments by which this provocative thesis are advanced are not always persuasive—Waugh proposes, for example, that *Beowulf* is made out to be a deliberately "slipshod" narrator with "fractured chronology," a tactic by which "the poet subtly reasserts his own story-telling authority" (211); many readers of the poem (most recently Seth Lerer in "Grendel's Glove," *ELH* 61 (1994), reviewed in these pages last year) have felt the hero's story to be not only well-crafted but rhetorically sophisticated. And it may be pushing the limits of a theory to suggest, as Waugh does, that the poet mentions *Beowulf*'s inglorious youth (lines 2183–88) to "indicate [] what he could do with a career if he wished" (212). But it is certainly right to insist that narrative is a kind of contest and poetic reputation is on the line along with heroic fame; Waugh notes that *Beowulf*'s deeds, like his story, implicitly contest the authority of Hygelac, and shows the power of a well-turned narrative by suggesting that the young hero's fame may have incited his uncle to the ill-fated Frisian raid which costs him his life: "the comparison with the heroic past and the accidents of history make Hygelac strive for fame in a field of little opportunity. He does not fight against *Beowulf*. Hygelac fights for the heroic ideal. But *Beowulf* represents this ideal, especially when he returns home at the height of his career" (216). Ultimately, Waugh insists, it is the narrator whose fame will last forever. This interestingly speculative essay brings to *Beowulf* an almost Flaubertian sense of the narrator as the true hero of the literary work, a modern idea which insinuates itself with surprising ease into the agonistic world of the poem.

Manuel Aguirre's "Ring-Giver, Hoard-Guardian: Two World Views in *Beowulf*" (in Teresa Fanego Lema, ed., *Papers From the IVth International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*. *Cursos e congresos*, 74. Santiago de Compostela, 1993. pp. 9–17) begins interestingly enough: "whatever else *Beowulf* tells . . . it is a horror story about a haunted house. . . . Whatever rules apply in the field of haunted-house fiction, they should have relevance to the study of *Beowulf*" (10–11). This promising

train of thought is quickly derailed, however, as the author dons the blurry goggles of mythological criticism and trains his gaze on the hero's combats. In the resulting swirl of cross-cultural archetypes he finds that *Beowulf* is a grim and failed attempt to impose a solar, patriarchal order on an older telluric matriarchal structure. "Whether they face Grendel, his mother, or the creatures of the ocean deep, Beowulf and the Geats are involved in a battle against telluric powers and earth symbols which they cannot truly defeat, for the earth-principle remains a part of their own mythological heritage" (15).

Of all the contexts in which scholars have tried to place *Beowulf*, one of the strangest and most fascinating is that of its manuscript. Cotton Vitellius A.xv is, by modern standards, a weird salmagundi of sacred and secular, prose and poetry, christian and classical and germanic influences; its selections are united, if at all, apparently only by a common interest in the huge and/or monstrous. How else to explain the bizarre (to modern sensibility) juxtaposition of the homiletic-hagiographical horror story of *St Christopher*, the psycho-geographical catalogues of the *Wonders of the East* and *Alexander's Letter to Aristotle*, our own dear *Beowulf*, and the harsh germano-hebraic piety of *Judith*? The theme of "monsters" seems a slender and, arguably, a trivial thread to stitch together so much diverse material. Modern readers, who are anyway accustomed to encountering *Beowulf* in its own separate edition, seldom turn to its companions for insight into the meaning of the poem, yet the manuscript context of a poem is, as we are often reminded these days, the only context for which we have any concrete evidence; all else is conjecture. Now readers in search of a method to this monstrous manuscript can rely on a fine work by Andy Orchard, *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the 'Beowulf'-Manuscript* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer; pp. viii, 352). Orchard insists upon the connections between these works; he argues that *Beowulf*, like the manuscript in which it survives, combines biblical, patristic, secular Latin, and popular germanic material to create a new view of the psychology of heroism. Orchard further brings into his discussion two works often associated with *Beowulf*, the *Liber Monstrorum* and *Grettis saga*; all these works, he insists, are connected by many similarities of diction, structure, and ultimately theme: they share "a twin interest in the dangers of human pride and in battles against outlandish monsters; all are concerned with the relationship between pagan past and Christian present, and with the tension between an age which extolled heroic glory and an age in which vainglory was condemned" (169).

Orchard begins by making a convincing plea for the artfulness of both *Judith* and *St Christopher*, and by noting the similarity of their themes: "the basic polarity between believers and non-believers, and between oppressors and oppressed is examined; once more the proud are humbled" (18). *St Christopher*, moreover, is concerned with the antagonism of men and monsters; the *Wonders of the East* is also full of this theme, stressing the "mutual mistrust and even open hostility which exist between the twin worlds of monsters and men"

(27). What most clearly unites the texts in this manuscript, however, is their "twin interest in the outlandish and in the activities of overweening pagan warriors from a distant and heroic past: pride and prodigies" (27). While Orchard's discussion of *Beowulf* is not startlingly novel, it is subtle, precise, and revealing. He notes similarities in the structural development and diction of the monster-killing episodes in the several stories in the MS as well as in the occasional 'humanization' of the monstrous opponents. The land of monsters is always a bit hellish; even in *Beowulf* the lair of Grendel's mother manages to evoke the conventional signs of Hell and apocalypse: "the image of apocalyptic cleansing flood and flame in the context of Grendel and his mother is particularly appropriate; they were, after all, of the doomed kin of Cain, whom God had purged in the Flood" (44). But such images, Orchard notes, are as much a part of the pagan poetic tradition, surviving in *Alexander's Letter to Aristotle*, as of the apocryphal biblical tradition of the *Visio Pauli*; he suggests that "Hrothgar's description of the monster-merc . . . may represent a significant blend of imported Latin and native germanic elements, the whole strongly influenced by the Christian homiletic tradition" (47). This mingling of traditions, Christian and classical, Latin and vernacular, heroic and homiletic, is, Orchard suggests, the keynote of *Beowulf*. He explores these cross-cultural links in a chapter on the kin of Cain (pp. 58–85), finding that many patristic and insular sources connected "biblical giants, human tyrants, and classical monsters" (79) in such a way that the monstrous becomes part of history, and both are subsumed under an over-arching moral and Biblical vision of creation.

The *Liber Monstrorum* has long been associated with *Beowulf* because of its celebrated reference to the bones of Hygelac. Orchard notes further connections between the two works (pp. 109–113); he examines its influence on the *Wonders* and the *Letter of Alexander*, and argues that "far from being a casual compendium of the bizarre and outlandish, [the *Liber Monstrorum*] is in fact the rather subtle and sophisticated work of a learned author who drew on and cunningly manipulated a number of disparate texts to offer a cogent (if uncomfortable) view of the monstrous in nature" (87). His case for the under-appreciated complexity of this work is strong; most important is its implication that human beings, great heroes of the past like Hygelac or Hercules, are themselves 'monstrous' in their pride, fury, and lust for fame. Similarly, the medieval legends of Alexander are ambivalent in their portrayal of a hero who was both a brave monster-slaying explorer and an insatiable megalomaniac; Orchard focuses on how the OE *Letter* deviates from its sources to emphasize Alexander's reckless pride: "at every point, Alexander is depicted in the vernacular translation as much more blood-thirsty and unreasonable than in the Latin original" (122). The Latin wonder-tales of Alexander are turned by the translator into an Orosian *exemplum* of the danger of pride, the story of "a mighty hero, the mightiest indeed of mortal men, who travelled to distant lands in his youth in quest of

glory, a monster-slayer and a treasure-laden king who was to die before his time and leave monuments and memories to his people, whose own fate would decline" (139); in this it is, obviously, strikingly similar to *Beowulf*. A similar literary treatment of "pride and prodigies", and of the gradual development of the monster-slaying hero into a monster himself, is found in *Grettis saga*, to which Orchard devotes his Chapter VI (pp. 140–168). He notes the many parallels between events and motifs in the saga and in *Beowulf*, which he ascribes to their development from a common oral source. This similarity of structure suggests a similarity of meaning: "Beowulf himself . . . begins very much as a member of the courtly world of men, but as the moral imperative diminishes in his three chief battles with monsters, with a corresponding increase in the amount of weaponry he brings to bear, he gradually becomes identified with the figures he fights, described, like them, as an *aglæca*, . . . and ends up buried with the cursed treasure of a dragon in a barrow by the sea" (168).

Orchard's book, like the *Beowulf* MS, appears to be a hodge-podge but is marked by a subtle continuity of theme and the persistence of several threads of argument. He includes, in a group of lengthy appendices, texts and translations of the *Wonders*, the *Letter*, and the *Liber Monstrorum*, and a brief source-study of the latter; though the textual apparatus in the OE portions is a bit ungainly, these new editions in themselves are long-overdue contributions to Anglo-Saxon studies and will, it is hoped, spark new interest in these odd and undervalued works. Drawing together a vast amount of earlier research, from a broad range of fields, this work will clearly be cited and studied for many years to come. It is, in some respects, a culturally-conscious updating of Tolkien's "The Monsters and the Critics": like Tolkien, Orchard insists upon the centrality of the monstrous to the poem's theme, but unlike Tolkien, he does not isolate the poem in the lonely brilliance of its literary excellence: by diligently examining *Beowulf* in its manuscript context, exploring the sources and meanings of the works which were apparently thought to be related in some way to *Beowulf*, he not only shows the complex resonances of the idea of 'the monstrous' in a culture which blended Germanic, classical, and Christian influences, but offers a moral and historical framework for understanding the monsters and the meaning of *Beowulf*.

The first of the so-called 'digressions' in *Beowulf*, the story of Sigemund, is thought by most critics to be relatively unproblematic—at a moment of triumph, when the jubilant Danes are rejoicing over the death of Grendel, someone sings a song in celebration of Beowulf's might, and the song happens to be about another brave monster-killer, Sigemund. For most readers this sort of indirect praise-by-comparison is, if not entirely expected, at least thoroughly understandable—indeed a 'spel gerade' (873) which elevates Beowulf, by implication, to the ranks of legendary heroes. Of course the Sigemund of legend, patched together from Scandinavian sources, is a more complex and ambiguous figure; M.S. Griffith's "Some difficulties in *Beowulf*, lines 874–902:

Sigemund reconsidered" (*ASE* 24, 11–41) suggests that the Sigemund in *Beowulf* is equally complex, and his appearance here not at all unproblematic. Griffith notes the relatively common assumption that since Beowulf is characterized by many of the same epithets used of Sigemund "the Danish scop and the poet of *Beowulf* speak with one voice of the heroic ethic" (14), but argues that this is not, upon examination, the case. Griffith proceeds by examining with minute precision virtually every epithet applied to Sigemund and his actions—'ellendædum', 'uncupes fela', 'fæhðe ond fyrena', and the notorious 'aglæca'—and finds that most of them can bear, either outright or implicitly, a negative connotation, though they are only rarely translated that way. "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the translators (and therefore, perhaps, readers?) are favourably predisposed to Sigemund" (21). Griffith insists upon the difference between the two heroes, concluding finally that "Beowulf's deeds are socially purposeful, whilst Sigemund's seem to take place apart from society" (40). There are heroes, in other words, and then there are heroes—and this is, perhaps, the point of the 'Lay of Sigemund'. Griffith concludes that the poet, caught between his Christian values and his pagan material, "gives us blurred and contradictory impressions of this past figure" (40), but perhaps there is more art to the episode than that. Like the later Finnsburh episode, the story of Sigemund draws attention to the difference between the values of the audiences in the story and the audience of the story—Sigemund, like Hengist, is a hero to the Danes, but to the audience of *Beowulf* he cuts a darker and more tragic figure; the ambivalence of the language used to describe him is part of the poem's pervasive dramatic irony. "We hear both more and less than the Danish audience," Griffith notes (40); this complexity of reference is part of the beauty of the poem. The interpretation of the Sigemund episode is an epitome of the interpretation of the whole poem; Griffith's attention to the connotations and contexts of the stock formulae of heroic praise shows how rewarding a close reading of *Beowulf* can still be.

Robert Lawrence Schichler's "As Whiteness Fades to Fallow: Riding into Time in *Beowulf*," (*In Geardagum* 14 (1993), 13–25)—certainly the most wistfully lovely title of the year—argues that the poet has woven a subtly symbolic detail into the carefully-framed scene of triumph following the defeat of Grendel. As the exuberant riders return from the mere, their horses are described first as *blancum* (856) and then as *fealwe* (865). Schichler notes first that quite apart from alliterative requirements, this is a realistic detail, suggesting the various effects both of the sun's sloping rays and the horse's increasingly lathered coats. He then explores the symbolic resonances of the two words: *blanc* or 'shining' is "a bright sign of heaven-associated glory" (22) and *fealu* or 'dun', the color of autumnal leaves and fading flowers, conveys "the suggestion of temporal change with all of its ramifications, including decline, death, and ultimate reversal or *edwendan*" (24). The shift from one to another, he maintains, is another instance of the poem's pervasive topos of mutability; the

color-words invite the audience "to perceive a mellowing of mood, an advance in time, and to look for or expect a change" (24).

Shunichi Noguchi's "'Seeking' in *Beowulf* and the State of the Hero's Soul" (*In Geardagum* 14 (1993), 1–12) takes another stab at the meaning of the vexed lines 3074–75, in which the hero's soul departs to seek *soðfastra dom*, 'the judgment of the righteous', whatever that means. Noguchi considers separately the verb *secan*, the noun *dom*, and the genitive plural *soðfastra*; no new conclusions are reached, and no solution is offered to the problem of whether *soðfastra* is a subjective or an objective genitive, though Noguchi favors the former. Noguchi proposes that Beowulf seeks a judgment from the 'truth-fast' against his faithless retainers and on the purposefulness of his fatal fight.

Beowulf's triumph in Hrothgar's hall is a moment of supreme celebration and sublime tension; in the scenes after the death of Grendel, the potential conflict between heroism and statecraft is at its most anxiously visible. The hero's glory is an unspoken reproach to the honor of the Danes; his triumph in the face of their helplessness seems to stir as well the hidden currents of envy that will eventually destroy Heorot. In a brief article entitled "Wealhtheow's Threat: *Beowulf* 1228–1231" (*In Geardagum* 14 (1993), 39–44), Leslie Stratyner suggests that the queen's stately and hopeful address to Beowulf—"Here each nobleman is true to the other, loving in thought and loyal to their lord, the thanes are united, the nation prepared: these men, having drunk at my table, will do as I ask"—contains a veiled threat: "she is stating, very subtly, that if Beowulf doesn't choose to honor her request to behave graciously, she will have the obedience of Hrothgar's thanes behind her in her defense of them" (43). Not so much a peace-weaver as a protector of her children's interests, her "true motives" (42) are to warn Beowulf away from any ideas he might have about using his glory to usurp the throne.

Naoko Shirai re-examines the possibility of the hero's greed in "Treasure and Sword in *Beowulf*" (*In Geardagum* 14 (1993), 27–36) and argues against those critics who would see Beowulf's downfall as somehow linked to his lust for treasure. Shirai points out that Beowulf, who receives rich rewards for his early battles, generously gives them away, thus converting implements of battle into tools of peace; "the giving and receiving of treasure emerges as the traditional proof of a warrior's loyalty and merit" (35).

Martin Puhvel's "The Concept of Heroism in the Anglo-Saxon Epic" (in Pàroli, ed., *La funzione dell'eroe germanico*, pp. 57–73) begins by asserting that *Beowulf*, "far from being the dated product of one person's mind," is a kind of accretion of the collective wisdom of centuries, and that it is relatively easy to separate "the so-called *Beowulf* poet's obviously Christian-oriented ideas" (57) from the pagan and mythical parts of the poem. Having thus disavowed any interest in the poem as it exists in favor of some imaginary autochthonous ur-*Beowulf*, Puhvel goes on to discuss the "intense and pervasive" (58) craving for 'glory' (OE *dom*, usually translated 'fame') that is

characteristic of the poem. He argues that this must reflect a pagan belief in some posthumous heroic reward. Much of the rest of the article is devoted to describing the Scandinavian notion of Valhalla, "the aspiration of Germanic heroes to qualify for admission to a warrior paradise" (64) though a kind of suicidal bravery. Relatively less space is given to establishing its relevance to *Beowulf*. Puhvel admits but is undaunted by the chronological difficulty of the fact that the cult of Valhalla is a relatively late product of the Scandinavian pagan imagination—later, apparently, than the conversion of the English. He insists that the desire for status in some pagan afterlife, not merely "cherished posthumous memory in heroic song and story" (65), lies behind Beowulf's quest for *dom*; this separates the hero's deeds from "rather crude vanity" (67) or foolhardy recklessness. Even the hero's qualities of endurance are ascribed to the cult of Odin rather than the Christian virtue of fortitude, or the universal heroic need to persevere. Puhvel does, however, admit that Beowulf's mortal interest in his moral state (rather than his heroic merits) is probably a mark of the meddling Christian redactor, and he acknowledges that praise for the same virtues is expressed in *The Battle of Maldon*, a poem whose Christian origins he does not seriously question.

Fidel Fajardo-Acosta's "The Riddle of *Beowulf*" (*In Geardagum* 15 (1994), 1–27) turns out to be a quirky but provocative quest to identify the elusive author of the poem. After remarking that the whole poem is in some ways a riddle in that "the most powerful forces, those invisibly guiding the unfolding of the narrative, remain concealed and in need of elucidation" (3), Fajardo-Acosta notes the particular similarity of lines 1345–79 (in which Hrothgar describes to Beowulf the mysterious lair of Grendel's mother) to the riddles of the Exeter Book, from its descriptive language to its challenging ending 'sec gif þu dyrrre' (1379). The similarity is thought-provoking; Fajardo-Acosta notes: "what riddles . . . add to the understanding of the epic is the sense that the challenges have a dual character as literal and as symbolic tasks" (12). The thickening of allusiveness at this point in the poem makes it, he argues, "an elaborate *mise-en-abyme* where the poet concentrates a number of suggestive comments concerning the problems of identity, self-consciousness, responsibility, guilt, and, ultimately, authorship" (4). These suggestive comments include, according to Fajardo-Acosta, a hint of the author's ambivalence towards the heroism of Beowulf, ambivalence towards the whole poetic project, and "a cryptic revelation of the name of the poem's author" (17). He unravels this latter cryptogram by looking at key words in the poem and recombining their elements: from 'Beowulf' to 'Beornwulf' to 'Werwulf' or, perhaps, 'Cynewulf'. He concludes, "I believe the author of the poem might have been a Mercian scholar by that name who worked in the service of King Alfred the Great" (23). Fajardo-Acosta makes a number of ingenious observations, full of free play and *jouissance*, about the poem's depths of enigmatic allusiveness, but finally does not offer more than assertions for these historical and contextual

in a classroom they would make an interesting presentation on the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to translation. And they could remind us critics that sometimes the only appropriate response to a poem is another poem.

*Loren Gruber fulminates against Burton Raffel's translation of the poem in "Teaching *Beowulf* to Undergraduates: The Role of Translation" (*Publications of the Missouri Philological Association* 20 (1995), 1-8). While bemoaning the pedestrian qualities of Donaldson's prose translation in the *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Gruber points out errors and misleading paraphrases in Raffel's lively verse rendering in the *Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*. He admits, however, that his students prefer it to Donaldson. With a kind of millennial urgency, Gruber observes that "since fewer graduate programs in English require the successful completion of a course in either Old English or *Beowulf*, fewer high school teachers, college instructors, and university professors will consequently know whether or not they teach from an accurate modern English version" (1). He notes that "we are therefore as much at the mercy of publishers as we are at that of the fire and worms which destroyed the *Beowulf* manuscript" (5). These are all-too-familiar complaints, I expect, for most teachers of the poem. Most interesting, perhaps, is the fact that on p. 3 Gruber slips in, without comment, his own reconsideration of the grammar of lines 1-3, which entails a radical re-vision of the poem's origins and original audience; he translates "Behold! *Learn how we Spear-Danes* in days of yore, how kings of the people [achieved] might, how the heroes performed deeds of valor" (emphasis added).

Kevin Kiernan gives an update on an ongoing project to compile "The Electronic *Beowulf*" (*Computers in Libraries* 15.2, 14-15). Kiernan is assembling an electronic archive, "an encyclopedic resource" which will include digitized versions of the MS itself (photographed under some kind of "fiber-optic backlighting" which brings out the letters obscured by the page mounts), the two Thorkelin transcripts, the early collations of Conybeare (1817) and Madden (1824), and, one assumes, some software to make sense of it all. "A reader studying a given folio of *Beowulf* will now be able to superimpose enhanced, back-lit, or ultraviolet images over covered or erased readings; bring in for comparison the corresponding pages from a transcript, a collation, an edition, a translation, or other popular portrayals; access an Old English glossary or a related archaeological find; or initiate a bibliographical search and retrieval of a related article." Whew. The British Library, Kiernan reports, is using this as a test project for more texts and MSS; it's good to see *Beowulf* getting this sort of state-of-the-art attention. When the project is all wired together, the development team (called GRENDL, the "Group for Research in Electronically Networked Digital Libraries," but one hopes more kindly disposed toward the hero and his poem) will figure out how to make it appear on our own poor little home PCs. Kiernan gives internet addresses for test images from the project; more information (including the

article itself) can be found at <http://www.uky.edu/~kiernan/welcome.html>.

R.M.L.

Works not seen:

North, Richard. "Saxo and the Swedish Wars in *Beowulf*" (in *Saxo Grammaticus tra storiografia e letteratura*, ed. Carlo Santini. Rome, 1992. pp. 175-88).

d. Prose

THE MAGISTERIAL EDITION of Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* (Early English Text Society, s.s. 15; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995; cxxxiii, 480 pp. Ill.) marks the single most important contribution to Old English prose studies for 1995. Peter Baker and Michael Lapidge embarked on editing this difficult and arcane text twenty years ago, and this superb edition admirably reflects years of careful study, meticulous scholarship, and attentive erudition on ecclesiastical computus, arithmology (the study of the mystical properties of numbers), astronomy, and a host of related topics, texts, and terms: the calculation of the *annus Domini*, epacts, the celestial equator, the lunar year, the synodical lunar year, the ecliptic, the zodiac, the Julian calendar, the decennovenal cycle (a cycle for predicting the moon's age on any day of any solar year), Pythagoreanism, the tetractys, the decad, Plato's cosmology, the *Theologumena Arithmeticae* by Nicomachus, the *Commentarius in Somnium Scipionis* by Macrobius, Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, Isidore of Seville's *Liber Numerorum*—and the list goes on.

Baker and Lapidge move lucidly, learnedly, and succinctly through this universe of cosmological concepts and man's attempt to chart time through the motion of the sun, moon, and stars. In their introduction, for example, they explain the lunar year in the following way:

If a 'year' is understood to be the time it takes one heavenly body to orbit another, then the lunar year is, as Bede wrote, about 27 days, 8 hours. In that time the moon completes its circuit through the zodiac. But a more obvious measure of lunar time than this periodic year is the synodical lunar year (or, as is more convenient to call it, the synodical lunar month), the time from one new moon to the next. If one drew a line from the centre of the sun through the centre of the earth, the moon would be new (and invisible) when it was directly above or below the line between the sun and the earth, and full when it was above or below the line on the far side of the earth.

This type of explanation—brief, clear, and to the point—eases the task of following the concepts presented in Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*. The editors reveal, through the course of surveying varied background material, how Byrhtferth draws on a long tradition of Pythagorean and Platonic arithmology, as well as on Christian arithmological exegesis. Baker and Lapidge also provide a good account of Byrhtferth's life, although lamentably little can be gleaned from the few personal asides in his writings and much must be deduced from his surviving oeuvre. Byrhtferth spent much of his life at Ramsey Abbey, one of the principal English Benedictine abbeys, and it was there that he studied the arcana of the arithmological tradition and all matters computistical under the tutelage of Abbo

of Fleury, who sojourned at the abbey during the years 985–87. His influential teachings shaped much of Byrhtferth's writing, which includes his *Computus*, the *Enchiridion*, the *Vita S. Oswaldi*, the *Vita S. Egwini*, the early sections of the *Historia Regum*, and various items of Latin verse.

Baker and Lapidge present the lengthy text of the *Enchiridion* with impeccable care. The facing translation will serve to widen the scope of the text's audience, and excellent commentary coupled with a superb glossary round out this truly remarkable addition to Anglo-Saxon studies, a fitting edifice indeed for Byrhtferth's important intellectual contributions to Anglo-Saxon England.

Another edition, on a far more modest scale, comes from Regina Cornelius. Her text, *Die altenglische Interlinearversion zu 'De vitiiis [sic] et peccatis' in der Hs. British Library Royal 7. C. iv* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, ser. 14; Angelsächsische Sprache und Literatur, 296; Frankfurt am Main and New York: Lang, 1995; 238 pp.), presents the interlinear gloss to a series of Latin extracts taken from chapters 25–26 of *Ecclesiasticus* and from a section of Isidore's *Sententiae* (II, vi. 17–21). The brief extracts that constitute *De Vitiiis et Peccatis*, found on six folios (folios 100–106) of the Royal manuscript, appear in eight chapters under headings such as "Apostrapha [sic] de Muliere Nequam," "Item de Muliere Bona et Mala," and "De Predestinatione Electorum et Reproborum." These texts follow Defensor's *Liber Scintillarum*, which occupies the first one hundred folios of the Royal manuscript—and this close manuscript association between the *Liber Scintillarum* and the appended text of *De Vitiiis* repeats itself in several other manuscripts, including Royal 6 D. v, Royal 8 A. xxi, and Bodleian, Rawlinson C. 23.

The *Liber Scintillarum* may not hold the same scintillating appeal today as it did when it was first penned at the beginning of the eighth century by Defensor, a pupil of Ursin (later bishop of Autun), who gathered together various patristic and scriptural *bons mots* under headings such as "patience," "humility," "avarice," "folly," and "forsaking the world." And if these headings seem somewhat less fulgent today, they nevertheless reflect the fact that the *Liber Scintillarum* and *De Vitiiis et Peccatis* cover very similar ground.

Cornelius corrects the inaccuracies in the Latin and Old English found in the EETS edition of 1889 by Rhodes, whose *Defensor's Liber Scintillarum* includes a text of *De Vitiiis* beginning on page 223. She provides ample material on the history of the manuscript and on the phonology and morphology of the Old English translation. An analysis of the Latin text, a full glossary, a good critical apparatus, and indices of the Latin and Old English augment this fine edition.

Robert DiNapoli's reference book, *An Index of Theme and Image to the Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (Hockwold cum Wilton, Norfolk, England: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1995; 122 pp.), notes the loosely associative manner in which Anglo-Saxon homilists move through their material. The seventeenth item in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, for example, contains references to the Law and the Spirit, the torments of

hell, various lists of sinners and their sins, idolatry, augury, sortilege, travel charms (making use of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed), Simon Magus, animism, infanticide, medicine, love potions, exorcism, fate and free will, divine foreknowledge, animal psychology—among other matters. DiNapoli hopes his work, admittedly neither comprehensive nor exhaustive, will nevertheless aid the student of Old English literature by allowing a search of theme and image that might prove somewhat more efficient than key-word searches through the microfiche concordance published by the University of Toronto—and certainly far easier than simply reading through a mass of homiletic material.

The words "theme" and "image" from the title of this work tend to be ideas, objects, doctrines, symbols or, in the words of the author, "anything else that held enough significance for a homilist to engage his attention for more than a passing mention." DiNapoli restricts his index to the homilies of Ælfric (those available in the editions of Godden, Pope, Skeat, and Thorpe—but excluding any others, such as those found in Assmann), Wulfstan, the Blickling collection, and the Vercelli collection. The index is arranged alphabetically, and randomly opening to a page of listings under the letter *S* reveals just one reference to *seals* (Ælfric reports that seals ministered to St. Cuthbert), about ten references to *serpents* (the bronze serpents of Simon Magus appear in Blickling XV and in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*), two references, both in Ælfric, to the *Seven Sleepers of Ephesus*, and some twenty-five references to *sexuality*, covering such matters as Christ's chastity, sex on Ash Wednesday, homosexuality, and the alleged fact that bees reproduce without sex.

The fact that DiNapoli works with a restricted range of editions limits the usefulness of the index. For example, he lists just one reference for the word *elephant* (in *Lives of Saints* XV), but another reference to an elephant, found in Ælfric's Second Homily for the Feast of a Confessor (published as Assmann IV) uses the unlikely exempla of the elephant's fear of the mouse (the exempla apparently derives from Ambrose's *Hexaemeron*) for veiled yet powerful political purposes. Despite such omissions, this index will prove a useful tool for thematic study and literary analysis. The book concludes with three especially helpful appendices: one on major names (beginning with Aaron, St. Abdon, Abel, and Abigail), a second on major place names (headed by Mt. Aetna, Alexandria, Athens, and Babel), and a third on primary topics and occasions: this appendix treats each collection of homilies sequentially and begins with the Blickling collection by noting "B 1: The Annunciation," "B 2: Spiritual blindness," "B 3: The Temptation of Christ," and so forth. In short, this index should prove a helpful guide to the welter of material contained in the homiletic texts from the Anglo-Saxon period.

A fourth book on Old English prose, Ulrike Borgmann's *Von Lindisfarne bis Hastings: Kampf und Kriegskunst in der angelsächsischen Chronik* (Literatur, Imagination, Realität, 8; Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 1993; pp. 160),

analyzes the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle with respect to its presentation of the arts of fighting and warfare. She perceives different lines of development through the evolution of the Chronicle, but finds these developments neither progressive nor linear. She notes that the Alfredian sections of the Chronicle focus on the action of fighting; tactics can be read between the lines, but the actual steps taken in the planning of warfare do not figure in the text:

Die alfredische Chronik verbleibt hier auf einer rein handlungsorientierten Ebene, indem sie solche Aspekte zwar gelegentlich aus dem Inhalt der Schilderungen erschliessen lässt, aber die zugrundeliegenden Planungsvorgänge nicht einbringt.

In later sections of the Chronicle, particularly those pertaining to the reign of Æthelred, Borgmann finds that the descriptions do in fact give a better picture of the planning and strategy involved in warfare.

Ælfric remains a major focus of interest again this year, and nearly a dozen articles examine his writings from a variety of viewpoints. Several articles deal with Ælfric's sources. In "Ælfric's Treatment of Source Material in His Homily on the Books of the Maccabees" (*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 77.3 [1995] 165–76), Stuart Lee analyzes Ælfric's use of Vulgate materials and other possible sources for his homily on the books of the Maccabees. Lee begins by briefly investigating the so-called "Cotton-Corpus Legendary," a compilation that Patrick Zettel posits as the major influence upon Ælfric's hagiographical writings. This compilation contains no source for Ælfric's treatment of the Maccabees, though Zettel himself excludes Maccabees and other biblically-based homilies from his study. Lee, for his part, broadens the notion of hagiographical writing to include the Maccabees, and claims that none of the medieval hagiographical writings serves as Ælfric's source—though such blanket assertions deserve qualification since not all hagiographical writings have been catalogued or printed. Lee himself admits in a footnote that some source, now lost, may once have existed—and of course something may yet turn up that has not been noticed before by scholars. In vain, too, does Lee try to identify a source for the material appended to the end of Ælfric's sermon ("Item Alia") on the three orders of society: the oratores, the laboratores, and the bellatores. Here again precedents can be found (in Alfred's version of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, for example), but no clearly identifiable source. Lee accepts the findings of Skeat (who edited the Ælfric's homily as item XXV in the *Lives of Saints*) and Loomis, who both identified the Old Testament books of Maccabees I and II as Ælfric's chief sources, though augmented by explanatory material taken from Leviticus, Isidore's *Etymologiarum*, and other sources that remain to be uncovered. Finally, Lee attempts to characterize the homily not as a straightforward biblical translation but rather as a "highly personalized and complexly structured paraphrase," one designed to bring clarity to the Old Testament tale.

In "Ælfric's Pastoral Letters and the Episcopal *Capitula* of Radulf of Bourges" (*N&Q* 42 [1995] 149–55), Christopher

Jones notes that Fehr proposed a passage from the Penitential of Egbert as a source for the list of liturgical books that Ælfric suggests every priest ought to own. Jones observes two problems with Fehr's hypothesis—the list in Ælfric's Old English pastoral letter to Wulfsige does not agree in all points with Fehr's proposed source and, more importantly, the Old English list does not even agree in its particulars with Ælfric's own list in his Latin letter to Archbishop Wulfstan. Jones quite plausibly posits a supplementary source, a sequence of excerpts from the *Capitula* of Radulf, who served as bishop of Bourges from 840 until his death in 866. These excerpts appear in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265, one of the three extant manuscripts that contain both of Ælfric's Latin pastoral letters for Archbishop Wulfstan. Jones aligns Radulf with the church reforms of the later Carolingian empire, and in this sense Radulf joins the list of *auctores* (Alcuin, Paul the Deacon, Haymo of Auxerre, and Smaragdus among others) who helped to transplant Carolingian ideals of ecclesiastical reform to late Anglo-Saxon England.

In another note, "Ælfric's *truð* 'buffoon': Old Irish *drúth* 'buffoon'" (*N&Q* 42 [1995] 155–57), Andrew Breeze argues that the rare Old English word *truð*, found in Ælfric's homily for Ash Wednesday, derives as a loan from the Irish *drúth*, which appears to be related to medieval Latin *indruticare*, 'to flaunt, behave wantonly' (used by Aldhelm) and also to the Middle English *love-drury* 'love token; courtship.' Breeze suggests that Irish *drúth* entered the English language simultaneously with the actual arrival of the strolling entertainers denoted by the word. These entertainers presumably sailed to the seaports of Britain in order to seek out a living, and Ælfric's story of a *truð* who received an unwelcome premonition of death when he sought to entertain in a bishop's household may provide evidence for Celtic entertainers active in England about the year 1000.

Michael Benskin's article on "The Literary Structure of Ælfric's *Life of King Edmund*" (*Loyal Letters*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 1–27) takes a numerological approach. Benskin first suggests that Ælfric divided his homily on Edmund into four sections: the prologue, the passion, the miracles, and an epilogue. He then observes that the two central sections are of equal length and that the brief prologue answers to an epilogue of twice the length, which, he notes, forms a diapason. Whether this was something meaningful to Ælfric seems unclear, and Benskin doesn't press the point too far. In fact, Benskin issues caveats against overly narrow numerological approaches, and he distances himself from claims such as those made in D. K. Howlett's 1978 study of *The Dream of the Rood* where, for the sake of numerological theory, "lines can be added or condensed at need, and the only control (as it appears) is a circular appeal to the proclaimed excellence of the poet." Although he does not claim that counting lines was necessarily an activity practiced by Ælfric, Benskin does maintain that Ælfric used a compositional technique that is numerical but only trivially so: the symmetries and juxtapositions in Ælfric's work, he concludes, do not seem to depend

on arithmetical calculation. And Benskin notes, rightly and perhaps more importantly, that Ælfric introduces antitheses and inversions not found in Abbo's account of Edmund, which seems a meaningful and significant observation about Ælfric's memorable and moving account of Edmund's cruel martyrdom.

Ælfric's *Life of King Edmund* also figures importantly in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne's "The Hero in Christian Reception: Ælfric and Heroic Poetry" (*La funzione dell'eroe germanico: storicità, metafora, paradigma*, ed. Teresa Pàroli; pp. 323–46). She argues that the bulk and influence of Ælfric's writings make him a pivotal figure for pursuing an investigation of the Germanic heroic paradigm. She maintains that heroic culture "is now more credibly seen as proceeding from within Christian culture and as having its own history of changing assimilations there." She compares Ælfric's account of the *Life of King Edmund* with *Maldon* and finds that the social relations and values of the Germanic heroic ethos (vengeance, treasure-giving, and loyalty) "are not present" in Ælfric's account of *Edmund*, where the leader chooses to die rather than to fight, and the concept of vengeance is replaced by that of sacrifice. The essay also takes up Ælfric's lives of Martin, the soldier-saint who renounced fighting and turned toward service to Christ. Wogan-Browne attempts to analyze the lives of Martin and notes, misleadingly, that Ælfric's Second Series of *Catholic Homilies* "was written for a monastic audience" whereas the *Lives of Saints* was written "primarily for a lay audience." Although Godden has written that the Second Series seems "addressed less to the congregation and more to the clergy," a lay audience is still in evidence: as Wogan-Browne herself notes in a footnote, Ælfric wrote the "life of Martin in his *Catholic Homilies* II (CH XXXIX) for Æthelweard." Æthelweard, Ælfric's noble patron, constitutes part of a non-monastic audience, and it would be unwise to characterize the *Catholic Homilies*, even the second series, as being written solely for a monastic audience. It should also be noted that Godden designates the life of Martin as item XXXIV (not XXXIX), of the second series of the *Catholic Homilies*—the number XXXIX derives from Thorpe's earlier edition. Wogan-Browne speculates about how Ælfric or Æthelweard might have responded to a text such as *The Battle of Maldon*, and she concludes her essay by considering other aspects concerning the nature of heroic thought in the later years of Anglo-Saxon England.

One of Ælfric's lesser-known works forms the focus of attention in "Euhemerisation versus Demonisation: the Pagan Gods and Ælfric's *De Falsis Diis*" (*Pagans and Christians*, ed. Hofstra et al., pp. 35–69); in the article, David Johnson uses Jean Seznec's *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* as a point of departure in analyzing the euhemeristic traditions of medieval writers. Tertullian, Lactantius, Augustine, Isidore and other patristic writers embraced the idea that pagan gods had actually been mere mortals, and Seznec attached special importance to the process whereby medieval authors situated pagan gods in world history, "secundum ordinem temporum."

Johnson takes up a related process, the demonization of the gods, a process that he attributes in part to writers such as Augustine, whose Christian war-cries on the subject find their basis in Psalm 96:5, "Omnes dii gentium demonia. Dominus autem caelos fecit" ("As for all the gods of the heathen, they are but devils, but it is the Lord who made the heavens"). Johnson charts a pattern whereby euhemerization leads to demonization. The first step among many Christian apologists, Johnson contends, was to establish that gods had been men, long dead, born of human parents. The second step was "to blame the devil for urging men to worship these dead men, and to identify them with the resulting gods."

Johnson posits a scale with euhemerization at one end and demonization at the other: he claims that Snorri Sturluson's work represents the euhemeristic end of the scale. Snorri writes of the Æsir, for example, that through whatever lands they went "such glorious exploits were related of them that they were looked on as gods rather than men." Johnson places the writings of Martin of Braga, the sixth-century bishop of Galicia, at the other end of the scale. In his *De Correctione Rusticorum*, various classical gods are portrayed as men or women remembered for their crimes (Jupiter, for example, was an adulterous soothsayer), whose identity is subject to appropriation by demons ("another demon called himself Mercury, who had been the crafty inventor of all theft and deceit"). Johnson accurately characterizes Martin of Braga's "demonisation of the origin of the pagan gods" as virtually absolute.

Turning to Ælfric's *De Falsis Diis*, Johnson attempts to see where it fits on his scale: an exercise that some may find of limited value, but one which nevertheless reveals the interesting fact that Ælfric's account, largely derived from Martin of Braga, deletes many references to demons and generally tones down Martin's condemnation of those pagans who name the days of the week after demons. Much of Johnson's article seems a preamble to this last point: determining Ælfric's own attitude toward the English names used for the days of the week. Pope has written on this same topic that Ælfric "had no wish, as did some churchmen, to abandon the names, and to remind the English of their ancient heathenism would have introduced an unnecessary complication at best; yet his silence attracts attention." Johnson suggests a slightly different motive for Ælfric's attitude toward naming the days of the week: by avoiding any mention of Wodnes-dæg and other days that evoked the Anglo-Saxon pagan past, Ælfric may have been bowing to his political patrons, Æthelweard and Æthelmær, who belonged to the royal line that claimed Woden as an ancestor in their genealogies. In the Latin *Chronicon Æthelweardi*, Æthelweard portrays Woden in an entirely euhemeristic context, calling him a king of the barbarians, the great-great-grandfather of Hengest and Horsa. Æthelweard writes further of Woden that

The heathen northern peoples are overwhelmed in so great a seduction that they worship him as a god to the present day, that is to say the Danes, Norwegians and also the Suebi.

Since Woden occupies an important and dignified position in the genealogy of Æthelweard's ancestry, Ælfric's strategy seems to be one of evasion: by avoiding any reference to the pagan names for the days of the week, Ælfric avoids offending his patron. In some ways this strategy echoes Malcolm Godden's eloquent explanation of the pains Ælfric took to mitigate the severe biblical criticism of the wealthy by, among other things, developing a vocabulary that distinguishes between the merely rich and the "proud" rich. Godden observes that

Ælfric's interest in defending the moral position of the rich is to be related to his involvement with the wealthy landowning class and his awareness of their creditable part in the revival and maintenance of the monasteries.

A similar sentiment may well lie behind Ælfric's treatment of the pagan pantheon in *De Falsis Diis*: Ælfric may have been motivated by concern for his patrons.

In another essay on Ælfric, Hugh Magennis briefly compares Ælfric's prose homily on Judith with the late Old English poem *Judith*, which is found in the Beowulf manuscript. His article, "Contrasting Narrative Emphases in the Old English Poem *Judith* and Ælfric's Paraphrase of the Book of Judith" (*NM* [1995] 61–66), begins by arguing that *Judith* emphasizes the themes of opposition and resolution, whereas Ælfric's narrative highlights the relationship of God to his people—although Ælfric's exegetical passage at the end of his paraphrase adds an additional focus on chastity. Ælfric's homily, while closer to the Old Testament original than the poem, nevertheless seems to veer from the standard of straightforward translation—of merely supplying the bare narrative—as outlined by Ælfric in his *Preface to Genesis*. And in another work touching on Judith, the *Letter to Sigeward*, Ælfric emphasizes the exemplary message of Judith for the English people when faced by invasion; yet his homily avoids polemic and portrays Judith as a figure of the church and as a figure of chastity. Magennis concludes that Anglo-Saxon writers derive a variety of themes from the Book of Judith and that its significance to Anglo-Saxon readers was "far from monolithic."

In "The Labor Structure of Ælfric's *Colloquy*" (*The Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery and Labor in Medieval England*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen and Douglas Moffat; Glasgow, 1994; pp. 55–70), John Ruffing begins by stating "I would argue that social structure, and in particular the structure of its labor, to be no less formal and no less communicated than the grammar taught through the text." This apparently means that the *Colloquy* deals with social structure, a point perhaps more felicitously phrased by Mitchell and Robinson who note, in *A Guide to Old English*, that the *Colloquy* "offers an informal glimpse of Anglo-Saxon social structure." Ruffing's essay essentially offers an analysis of the different occupations in the Latin text of the *Colloquy*, with a survey of some recent scholarship, some of it on sources. He notes, for example, that

Most recent criticism has focused on the dialogue's linguistic anomalies, with less frequent interpretation looking to Ælfric's Latin sources. Colledge argues for Augustine's treatment of the merchant, while Anderson finds influences of many authors and reads the whole "as an expression of the Benedictine

monastic ideal, derived from the Rule, of an orderly and well-regulated life within the confines of an economically self-sufficient community devoted to the service of God."

Ruffing argues that the *Colloquy* teaches novices "to speak the language of work, how to constitute and manipulate it"—though one might wonder what opportunities such monks would have to speak such a language given the fact that their primary work seems to have been prayer (as Ruffing himself observes when he suggests the motto "orare est laborare" might well displace "ora et labora").

Ruffing finds definite groupings in the *Colloquy*, though at times these groupings seem largely unremarkable; he writes, for example, that the "merchant and shoemaker are also unique as the only non-trio in the first section and the only ones who have nothing to do with food." This leads nowhere; it would have been more interesting, perhaps, to explore the merchant's controversial role vis-à-vis work and profit. But aside from a brief reference to a note by Eric Colledge (inadvertently cited as "College" in the footnotes) on the topic, Ruffing passes over this controversy and largely concentrates on the various occupations and how they are grouped. Ruffing concludes: "I hope it is clear from this analysis that there are definite groupings and structures in the *Colloquy*'s depiction of labor, and that those structures have a clear relation to the societal position of the workers."

In "Rhythmical Alliteration: Ælfric's Prose and the Origins of Lazamon's Metre" (*The Text and Tradition of Lazamon's 'Brut'*; ed. Le Saux, pp. 65–87), S. K. Brehe essentially underlines the importance of N. F. Blake's earlier and similarly titled work on the same topic: "Rhythmical Alliteration" (*Modern Philology* 67 [1969] 118–24). Blake's article marshals arguments against the theory that so-called Old English "popular" verse forms the source for the loose meter of Lazamon's *Brut* and for several other Middle English poems such as the *Proverbs of Alfred*, the *Soul's Address to the Body*, the *First Worcester Fragment*, the *Grave*, and portions of the Middle English *Bestiary*. This popular verse form has been taken to have existed before the development of classical Old English meter and to have coexisted with it; Derek Pearsall, for example, finds traces of an ancient, "popular" verse form in certain features of *Finnsburgh*, *Widsith*, *Deor*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer*. And Pearsall and others have claimed that this hypothetical popular verse forms the source for the loose meter of Lazamon's *Brut* and of similar meters in Middle English. Other literary historians, however, have traced the roots of loose meter to classical Old English meter, the meter of Caedmon and *Beowulf*. N. F. Blake argues that loose meter develops neither from classical Old English meter nor from some hypothetical Old English "popular" verse but rather from Old English alliterative prose. Blake maintains that although the tradition of Old English classical verse declined and perished with the Conquest, prose traditions (represented by Ælfric and Wulfstan) survived because "the need for alliterative prose to preach the church's word in the vernacular remained as pressing as ever." Brehe accepts this

point of view and questions why recent reference works and literary histories (by Derek Brewer, J. A. W. Bennett, Stanley Greenfield, and others) fail to adopt Blake's stance. In Brehe's opinion, "Blake's point, then, needs to be made again." And Brehe supplements Blake's arguments with additional details in an attempt to persuade us of the important connections between Ælfric's rhythmical style and the style of *Lazamon's Brut*.

The importance of Ælfric and Wulfstan to later writers of the Middle Ages also forms the theme of Stephen Morrison's "A Reminiscence of Wulfstan in the Twelfth Century" (*NM* 96 [1995] 229–34). Morrison finds similarities between the *Ormulum's* twelfth-century paraphrase of Luke 3:1–14 and a passage in Wulfstan's *Secundum Marcum*. In his description of the terrible chaos accompanying the appearance of Antichrist on earth, Wulfstan writes "Eac sceal aspringan wide ȝ side sacu ȝ clacu, hol ȝ hete ȝ rypera reafac, here ȝ hunger, bryne ȝ blodgyte ȝ sturnlice styrunga, stric ȝ steorfa ȝ fela ungelimpu." Morrison finds an echo in various phrases in lines 9307–24 of the *Ormulum*, where Orm writes of "clake annd sake," "holeþþ," "rippeþþ," and "ræfeþþ." Morrison concludes that the resemblance can best be interpreted not as a direct borrowing but rather as an imperfect recollection of "a memorable passage" taken from Wulfstan's earlier, vernacular homily.

Wulfstan is also the subject of a note titled "Napier XLII and Wulfstan's Homily V" (*N&Q* 42 [1995] 423–26). In that note, Stephanie Hollis critiques the claim made by Wilcox that Napier XLII, a loose translation and augmentation of Adso's *De Antichristo*, was translated and compiled at Winchester. Hollis observes that the extant copies of Napier XLII and the earliest surviving English copies of Adso's *De Antichristo* are preserved in manuscripts associated with Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York. And although Bethurum showed that lines 72–5 of Wulfstan V bore no relation to the translation of Adso in Napier XLII, Hollis finds an apparent borrowing from Napier XLII in lines 88–96 of Wulfstan V—a passage that Bethurum had failed to consider. Hollis concludes that Bethurum was correct in assuming that even though Wulfstan himself was not responsible for the translation of Adso in Napier XLII, the translation may well have been commissioned by him. Moreover, Hollis argues that these close associations between Napier XLII and Wulfstan V make it less likely that the translation of Adso was made at Winchester.

Only one item this year deals with Alfredian prose. In his article "The Prologue to Alfred's Law Code: Instruction in the Spirit of Mercy" (*Florilegium* 13 [1994] 79–110), Michael Treschow surveys previous comments on Alfred's law code, from Liebermann's view that the code's conservative alignment with previous codes stems from the very conservative nature of the king's counselors, to Wormald's view that early medieval law codes were little more than exercises in image-making. Treschow, however, draws attention to the rather distinctive prologue that precedes the actual preface to Alfred's

law code. This prologue falls into four sections: an Old English translation of Exodus 20–23, an excerpt from the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:17), a translation of Acts 15, and a concluding section, taken from Christian synods, on monetary compensations that might be accepted in lieu of various corporal or capital punishments. M.B. Parkes contends that the Parker manuscript, with its chronicles of Alfred, laws of Alfred, and genealogies of the family of Alfred, demonstrates the influence of a Frankish historiographical and dynastic tradition imported to Winchester by Grimbold. But in Treschow's opinion the overtly Christian prologue takes Alfred's law code out of the sphere of Frankish influence and places it more closely within the sphere of Celtic cultural influences. The Irish compendium of Mosaic law called the *Liber ex Lege Moysi*, for example, also opens with the same quotation from the book of Exodus found in Alfred's text. Treschow concludes by stressing the importance of these Christian influences in Alfred's law code, principles that seem to call its readers to "live in charity with their neighbour—especially in the practice of public life."

Rounding out this year's work on prose are miscellaneous articles on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, herbals, and the West Saxon Gospels. A passing reference is made to the travels of Ohthere in an article titled "Viking Expansion Northwards: Mediaeval Sources" (*Arctic* 48 [1995] 235–47). The authors, Tette Hofstra and Kees Samplonius, add nothing new to the field of Old English studies; they merely summarize the findings of Bately (and of several other recent translators and editors) in order to show that the first report of a trip across the White Sea by Scandinavians also appears to be one of the fullest and apparently one of the most accurate accounts. The authors briefly summarize the story of Ohthere: they report that he lived at the northern edge of Halogaland, that he hunted walrus for their tusks, that, after traveling to the North Cape, he sailed east for four days, turned south, sailed for five more days, and that he then reached the land of the Beormas, the first settled area beyond Halogaland.

In "L'erbario anglosassone, un'ipotesi sulla data della traduzione," (*Romanobarbarica* 13 [1994–95] 325–66), Maria Amalia D'Aronco reviews the scholarship on the dating of the translation of the Old English *Herbarium*. She begins with the opinions voiced by Cockayne in the nineteenth century and, more pertinently, the evidence assembled by Hubert Jan De Vriend in his definitive EETS edition of 1984. Other scholars, including Meaney, Hofstetter, and Cameron, have vacillated on the date of the translation. De Vriend inclines toward an earlier date and suggests that the Old English *Herbarium* came into existence during "the period of Northumbrian cultural ascendancy" (i.e. the eighth century), but he also admits the possibility of a later translation. Meaney expresses similar caution, noting that it is difficult to know "whether we can assume ° that there was a complete Old English version of the 'Apuleius complex' circulating in pre-tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England, or whether it was only certain individual remedies which were translated and circu-

lated." D'Aronco's study considers not only phonology and morphology and other items of internal evidence that have traditionally been used to date this text, but also explores matters of external evidence, such as manuscript format and illustration, in order to reassess the issue of dating the translation. She hypothesizes that the model for the richly illustrated manuscript Cotton Vitellius C. iii, one the most important witnesses to the Old English *Herbarium*, may derive from a Winchester model written during the time of Æthelwold: "Dato che il Vitellius C.iii è una copia, si potrebbe essere tentati a ipotizzare che il suo modello provenisse da Winchester." This hypothesis may have merit, and the translation of the Old English *Herbarium* may possibly date from the rich period of intellectual activity during the early years of the Benedictine reformation in Anglo-Saxon England. Certainly Æthelwold's Old English translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, translated for monks who did not know Latin, also supplies evidence of an educational program intent upon disseminating Latin texts—such as the *Herbarius Apuleii*—to a wider audience.

E. M. Treharne has examined a Latin formula for excommunication as well as its Old English parallel text in a piece titled "A Unique Old English Formula for Excommunication from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303" (*ASE* 24 [1995] 185–211). CCCC 303, a vernacular manuscript from the mid-twelfth-century, contains seventy-three texts arranged according to the *Temporale* and *Sanctorale*. The two excommunication texts occur in a section of twelve texts seemingly linked by their suitability for the Lenten season. And, more specifically, the two texts appear sandwiched, without apparent reason, between two items by Ælfric. Treharne rightly suspects that the "ill-fitting excommunication texts were never intended as an original part of the manuscript's design" and cites the lack of titles and the omission of pen-drawn initials at the beginning of the texts as corroborating evidence. In investigating the texts, Treharne cannot find specific sources but plausibly suggests that these types of excommunication texts probably derive from a variety of liturgical *ordines excommunicationis* with origins in church *concilia* transmitted by continental pontificals. Texts such as Regino of Prüm's *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis et Religione Christiana* (from the tenth century) or the *Decretum* by Burchard of Worms seem likely general models.

The various English excommunication formulas all vary from one another; one formula, found in CCCC 190 and consisting of a mere five lines, links the excommunicate with the infamous sinners Dathan, Abiron, Herod, Pilate, Judas, Caiaphas, Barabbas, Nero, and Simon Magus. Another English formula, found in CCCC 422, runs to some fifty lines. The anomalous nature of the appearance of the formulas in CCCC 303 is further underscored by the fact that such formulas usually occur only in manuscripts that contain legal, liturgical, and penitential writings. Treharne presents both the Latin (twenty-nine lines) and the Old English (twenty-six lines) excommunication formulas from CCCC 303 in an appendix and concludes by suggesting that excommunication may have played a more prominent role in Anglo-Saxon culture than historians have yet recognized.

And in one last item of interest, "An Unexpected Reading in the West-Saxon Gospel Text of Mark 16.11" (*New Testament Studies* 41 [1995] 458–65), Tjitze Baarda contrasts a reading in the Vulgate, "et illi audientes quia uiueret et uisus esset ab ea, non crediderunt" ("And they, hearing that He lived, and was seen by her, did not believe") with a West-Saxon translation that reads in part "hi hine gesawon" ("they saw him"). One would expect, of course, something more along the lines of the Northumbrian interlinear version's "gesene wære from hia" ("was seen by her"), which more precisely renders the Vulgate's account of Mary Magdalene seeing Jesus. The West-Saxon Gospel reading seems to suggest that the translator read the plural form "ab eis" rather than the feminine singular "ab ea" in his source, a reading that does not occur in the Greek manuscripts but one that does in fact crop up in the uncial codex *È* and cursives 209 and 346. Similar readings also occur in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic texts. Latin harmonies (and here Baarda quotes the *Codex Fuldensis*) also suggest plural forms for this particular reading, and Baarda surmises that the Latin, Old High German, and Tuscan harmonies preserve a plural reading that was present in the original Latin Diatessaron text. Baarda concludes that the translator of the West-Saxon Gospels based his version on some contaminated Vulgate or *Vetus Latina* manuscript "into which some Latin Diatessaron readings had crept, or he used a Latin Diatessaron text alongside his separate Latin Gospel of Mark."

T.H.L.

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

a. Early Anglo-Latin (excepting Aldhelm and Bede)

THE SECOND PART of Gildas's *De excidio Britanniae* (? c. 540 × c. 580) has sometimes been characterized as a biblical pastiche, an Old Testament-based harangue whose author emerges as a sort of sub-Roman Jeremiah in his denunciation of contemporary British officials. Rex F. R. Gardner, in a pair of articles issued during 1995, offers a thorough examination of Gildas's often overlooked New Testament sources ("Gildas's New

Testament Models," *Cambrian Med. Celtic Stud.* 30 [Winter 1995], 1–12, and "The New Testament Motivation of Gildas and his Friends," *Trans. of the Honourable Soc. of Cymmrodorion* n.s. 1 [1995], 5–26). Gardner notes that François Kerlouégan identified 139 Gildasian allusions to New Testament passages in his book *Le "De excidio Britanniae" de Gildas: les destinées de la culture latine dans l'Île de Bretagne au VI^e siècle*, *Serie histoire ancienne et médiévale* 4 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne,

1987)—refining the citation at *OEN* 21.2 [1988], 59. Building on this insight, Gardner hazards the unexpected but ultimately impressive suggestion that Gildas based much of the second part of *De excidio* on the text of Acts vii.1–53, where the protomartyr Stephen (whom Gildas mentions three times by name) gives “a long but highly selected and compressed history of Israel as a launching pad for his blast of condemnation of his listeners.” Moreover, Gardner maintains that Gildas, in his chastisement of bishops (*De excidio* LXIX–LXXII), “did not work directly from the Old Testament sources” but rather drew on a number of New Testament verses, most notably Heb. xi.4–32 supplemented by Heb. v.6–9 and vi.20–vii.22, the verses in Heb. vi–vii informing his unusual treatment of Melchizedek. Gardner shows that the tally of parallel passages in Acts and *De excidio* is nearly complete and, moreover, that Gildas reproduces the nuance of the conflation and other compression exhibited by Stephen’s speech. The series of *exempla* in the section on the bishops resembles the roll-call of patriarchs and prophets in Hebrews xi, citing even such minor figures as Jephthah *in loco*, and the whole section actually concludes (at *De excidio* LXXII.4) with a reminiscence of the final verses of the same chapter (Heb. xi.37–8). Although some of these parallels were noted previously by Hugh Williams in his 1899–1901 edition of Gildas’s work, and by Kerlouégan, Gardner deserves full credit for driving home the point of their collective significance. It now remains to assess the impact of these findings on the conventional view, not mentioned by Gardner, which would regard Gildas’s Latin as a firsthand witness to certain ante-Hieronymian texts of the Old Testament.

Gardner offers provocative comments on some “semi-Pelagian” (but not wholly anti-Pauline) views held by Gildas, and he addresses some Anglo-Saxon topics involving the Hwicce, Magonsætan, King Oswald (see below), and Bede. For the last, Gardner cites Steven Bassett’s recent assertion that “what Bede does *not* tell us about British churchmen participating in the mundane affairs of the infant Anglo-Saxon church could fill a whole book” of his *Historia ecclesiastica* [hereafter *HE*]. Gardner also cites an appealingly illustrated paper of his own (originally delivered as a presidential address to a medical society), “Miracles of Healing in Anglo-Celtic Northumbria as Recorded by the Venerable Bede and his Contemporaries: a Reappraisal in the Light of Twentieth Century [*sic*] Experience,” *Brit. Medical Jnl* 287 (1983), 1927–33, illus.—new to *OEN*.

A recent, comprehensive reference work in the field of Anglo-Latin studies may be noted briefly here, even if it appeared in the publication year of this issue of *OEN* (1997) rather than the year under review (1995): Richard Sharpe’s *A Handlist of Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Pub. of the *Jnl of Med. Latin* 1 ([?Turnhout]: Brepols, 1997). Stated plainly, this magisterial work provides a new benchmark which allows the serious scholar of Anglo-Latin to evaluate—within seconds—the merits of any reference to an English literary production known to have been written, or

conjectured reasonably to have been written, by a named author. Sharpe’s *Handlist* also provides the same capability to a student of any other insular Latin literature, whether early British, Irish, Welsh, Scottish, or Cornish. (Breton Latin authors, however, have been excluded from the insular literary culture of western Europe, as it is defined here.) The chronological sweep of the work continues down through the central and later Middle Ages and into the early modern period. It is worth stressing at the outset that the *Handlist* exceeds every previous effort in this area by an order of magnitude, and that Sharpe’s entries achieve a high degree of precision throughout the work. The dictates of the present column require the reviewer to carry out a substantial amount of verification of authors’ names, titles of works, dates, and so on. It is thus already possible to state confidently that Sharpe’s work holds up very well in this regard. Moreover, some omissions (as of *liturgica* or continental works by authors with tenuous English associations) appear to be deliberate. Indications in the present column of items which are *not* listed by Sharpe should not be construed as negative criticisms of the work, either in detail or as a whole.

One innovative feature of Sharpe’s *Handlist* resides in the effort that is made in certain entries to distinguish among *signed*, *ascribed*, and *attributed* works. As Sharpe explains in his introduction: “An authorial signature is an indication of authorship contained within the text. . . . By an ascription, I mean an indication of authorship accompanying the text in one or more manuscripts. . . . An attribution, on the other hand, is supplied not from the manuscripts but by scholarship, supposition, or guesswork.” If Sharpe had supplied information of this nature exhaustively in his entries, this 951-page volume surely would have expanded to a two-volume set. But it is to be hoped that the approach will be taken farther in any future revision of the *Handlist*, as it is immensely useful to know at a glance on what sort of evidence a particular assignment of authorship may rest. Moreover, it is clear that the indications of authority have not been meted out with absolute consistency here (without doubt, of necessity), and some refinements may be in order. I will briefly address three examples, the last of which will also be the next main subject of this review.

First, Sharpe follows Michael Lapidge in assigning some relatively brief *caritas*-Lieder, or drinking poems (entitled *Carmina potatoria* by Sharpe), to a Frankish author identified as Fredegand of Brioude (*Handlist*, p. 117 [no. 301]). Although Lapidge’s wholly original and, in many respects, quite brilliant argumentation has led to a conclusion that, in my view, very well may be correct (see *OEN* 23.1 [1989], 75–7, in two notices), strictly considered, there is only a limited amount of external historical evidence to support this attribution. Fredegand’s authorship has been inferred from the following: the improbability that a native English author around the middle of the tenth century (948 × 958) might produce Latin verse such as we find in a long hexameter poem on Wilfrid of York, the *Breviloquium vitae beati Wilfredi*;

William of Malmesbury's attribution (in the twelfth century) of this long poem to an attested tenth-century Canterbury-area figure, Frithegod (mentioned in an extant will issued before 958); the Frankish nationality of the long poem's patron, Oda, archbishop of Canterbury; the continental phonology that would account for a form *Fredegaud* underlying the Old English onomastic form *Frēðegod* (unattested in pre-Conquest sources outside of the cited legal text); stylistic, codicological, and transmissional links connecting the long poem (and its preface in prose) with the *Carmina potatoria*; similar links with some other short poems assigned to *Fridegodus* (or *Frēðegodus*) by early modern bibliographers, presumably on the basis of reliable ascriptions in lost manuscripts; and, finally, transmissional links and other connections with centers in the Auvergne, including Clermont-Ferrand and, most conspicuously, the canonry of Brioude. But the fact remains that the name *Fredegaud* (or *Frithegod*) is not associated with the *Carmina potatoria* in any manuscript identified so far, and there is not so much as a confraternity-list entry to document the existence of a *Fredegaud* of Brioude. Lapidge himself, in the cited study, stressed "how much of this reconstructed career is based on hypothesis," even if subsequent discoveries have tended to corroborate his prescient conjectures.

The important point for the present discussion, however, is that there is nothing in Sharpe's *Handlist* to indicate that these *Carmina potatoria* are anything other than signed works of an historical *Fredegaud* of Brioude. At the opposite extreme, the anonymous *Libri Carolini* (see *Handlist*, pp. 36–46 [no. 87], at p. 45), whose attribution to Alcuin was accepted by their MGH editor Bastgen and championed tirelessly by Luitpold Wallach, are grouped by Sharpe with works such as the miscellaneous *liturgica* of the *Officia per ferias*. These appear under a special heading within the treatment of Alcuin's canon—"spurious"—and, even beneath this heading, the *Libri Carolini* alone are preceded by an additional tag: "(attrib.)." Occurring within the middle range of Sharpe's system is an item in the section of works attributed to Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 690), known as the *Laterculus Malalianus* (*Handlist*, pp. 637–8 [no. 1686], at p. 638), which recently appeared, as Sharpe notes, in a new edition that is included as part of a monographic study by Jane Barbara Stevenson (*The "Laterculus Malalianus" and the School of Archbishop Theodore*, Cambridge Stud. in A-S England 14 [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995]). As this installment of *YWOES* will bear out, 1995 represents the second year in a row over which our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon affairs in the time of Theodore's archiepiscopate has increased exponentially (see further *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 72–6). If arguments set out by Stevenson championing a Canterbury milieu for the *Laterculus* find acceptance, the appearance of her monograph will define the high-water mark of the 1995 publications treating Theodore's seventh-century school. Regarding the authorship of the work, Sharpe states: "The attribution [to Theodore] is inferred from Greek syntax used in the Latin, and knowledge of the Syriac chronicler John

Malalas." It is true that the determinedly literal mode of translation observed in the *Laterculus* might tend to link it to a stylistically similar *Vita S. Anastasii*, which now has been associated reliably with Theodore's peregrinations (see the notice of Franklin, below). The writings of John Malalas, moreover, are adduced many times as offering parallels to opinions offered by Theodore at Canterbury, as attested in the recent *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge (1994; hereafter *Biblical Commentaries*; see *OEN*, as just cited). It strikes the present reviewer that the case for Theodore's authorship of the *Laterculus*—or, at any rate, for the association of that text with Theodore's school at Canterbury—is somewhat stronger than Sharpe's comment might suggest, although the relevant pieces of evidence are fairly widely separated in Stevenson's monograph and the full argument is presented most concisely in a separate 1995 essay (Stevenson, "Theodore and the *Laterculus Malalianus*," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on His Life and Influence* [hereafter *Archbishop Theodore*], ed. Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Stud. in A-S England 11 [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995], pp. 204–21).

In simple terms, any substantial Anglo-Latin prose work produced before the florescence of Bede, exhibiting firsthand familiarity with the Greek language and with Greek texts, almost certainly will have originated at—or passed through—the Canterbury school. Questions of dating and localization are thus crucial to Stevenson's arguments. (The latter concern, localization, is especially problematic insofar as the *Laterculus*, beyond its Syriac and Greek literary affinities, has transmissional links to Italy, Germany, and Ireland.) Speculation about the residence of Mediterranean associates of Theodore and Hadrian in England notwithstanding (see notice of Hohler, below), the archbishop remains the only figure at Canterbury known to have possessed firsthand knowledge of Greek and to have produced original written works in Latin. Even if the orally promulgated Canterbury biblical commentaries and penitential and canonical *Iudicia* (see notice of Charles-Edwards, below) are ruled out of the question, the epistolography quoted and ascribed to Theodore by name in Stephen of Ripon's *Vita S. Wilfridi* (at ch. XLIII), as well as Theodore's signed poem "Te nunc, sancte speculator" (see notice of Lapidge's essay in *Archbishop Theodore*, below), prove beyond dispute that the Cilician émigré, at least on occasion, emerged in a Latin idiom as a man of the pen.

Stevenson's discussion plainly reveals that the *Laterculus Malalianus* has been titled poorly by modern scholars. The Greek writings of the Antiochene author John Malalas (a native speaker of Syriac who wrote mainly in Greek [c. 491–578]), it is true, provide much of the work's inspiration and (in translation) no small amount of its actual text. The "bipartite" arrangement of the work's "two parallel structures of historical fact and spiritual significance" finds a counterpart in eastern exegetical tradition, where "the most specific model for the plan of the work as a whole appears to be Theodore of

Mopsuestia's commentary on the minor epistles of St Paul," with another possible model occurring in the famous Byzantine hymn known as the "Akathistos," a two-part historical treatment and spiritual celebration of the life of the Virgin Mary. But the unusual synthesis of historiography and Antiochene biblical exegesis in the work edited by Stevenson in no way resembles the sort of computistical list known as a *laterculus* (literally, "brick" or "tile," and figuratively "plot of land," or even "pastry"). Moreover, a better form of the standard title's eponymic adjective would be *Malalianus* (*sic*) and, even here, the work's opening translations from John Malalas (by turns, painstakingly literal and rather freely augmented) are in some respects overshadowed by the typological meandering of its second part. Unfortunately, the most widely distributed alternative title for the work, *Chronicon* (or *Chronicon Palatinum*, reflecting the current home of the main manuscript witness, to be discussed below), is not much better, as the work cannot properly be regarded as a chronicle. Stevenson has thus seen fit to retain the distinctive (if imprecise) title *Laterculus Malalianus*.

The pre-Carolingian date assigned by Stevenson to the composition of the *Laterculus*, following earlier authorities, is beyond question. The major witness to the text occurs in the present Rome (Vatican City), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [hereafter BAV], Pal. lat. 277, pt. 1 (i.e., fols. 1–93) (Italian center [i.e., in Rome or ? northern Italy], s. viii in. or s. viii 1; provenance in Germany [i.e., ?Lorsch] by s. ix). The only other known witness occurs in a manuscript written c. 800, now at Leiden, which Stevenson sees as wholly dependent on the Vatican text and thus as possessing little or no independent value for an editor of the *Laterculus*. E. A. Lowe dated the production of Pal. lat. 277 to s. viii med. in his *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols. with suppl.; 2nd ed. of vol. 2 only (1934–72) [hereafter *CLA*], at I, 27 [no. 91], with I, 42, and suppl., 44. The account of the quiring and ruling of Pal. lat. 277 provided here, drawing on codicological research by Michael Lapidge (which reveals that the second part of the manuscript, written in a distinctive minuscule hand, has its own physically discrete identity), taken together with Stevenson's own analysis of the contents of the volume, might well qualify the second part of the Vatican monument (fols. 94–115) for a new entry in any future addenda to *CLA* (no. 91b?). Be that as it may, Stevenson's detailed palaeographical analysis and lengthy, learned treatment of the volume's decoration, offering specific comparisons with other Italian manuscripts preserving copies of texts in uncial scripts—some dated by Lowe himself to s. viii in.—surely suggest that the date given in *CLA* is in need of revision. This discussion points to a date in the first half of the eighth century, most plausibly in its early decades (Stevenson even credits the possibility of a dating to s. vii/viii). In other words, if an Anglo-Saxon origin for a Greek-influenced text preserved in Pal. lat. 277 could be established reliably, that text would almost certainly have to be viewed as a product of the Canterbury school.

In the case of the copy of the *Laterculus* in BAV Pal. lat.

277, there is strong evidence to indicate that the manuscript's collective contents reflect an insular Latin literary tradition. This is seen most clearly in the volume's preservation of two items presently included in the canon of Hiberno-Latin literature: (1) a copy of the so-called *Acta suppositi concilii Caesareae* (B recension), a forged conciliar text that is probably of Irish origin and possibly was confected as early as the middle of the sixth century; and (2) *De vetere et novo testamento quaestiones*, an exegetical treatise circulating under the name of Isidore of Seville, most plausibly produced by an Irish peregrinus. (See M. Lapidge and R. Sharpe, *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature* [1985; hereafter *Bibliography*], pp. 90 and 209 [nos. 318 and 779].) The volume also includes an authentic work of Pope Leo I (440–61), raising the possibility, which cannot be removed, that the collection was put together on the Continent. But Stevenson demonstrates that other works in the volume (including several authentic works by Isidore) circulated widely among insular literary centers.

Stevenson adduces palaeographical evidence to indicate that an exemplar in an insular script stands behind the copy of the *Laterculus* in BAV Pal. lat. 277, which quite possibly was the exemplar of the whole collection. Somewhat unfortunately, the main item of palaeographical evidence bearing on this point is introduced in the course of Stevenson's analysis of abbreviations (after her long discussion of decoration), rather than in the earlier section treating scripts proper. Stevenson notes the erroneous inscription of *suminantur* for *ruminantur* in the copy of ch. iv of the *Laterculus*, representing a slip which is "impossible in uncial hands, but all too easy with Insular minuscules." On first consideration, the weight of this single, isolated error may not seem great, but the reading it has produced is wholly nonsensical in context and, assuming even a modest knowledge of Latin on the part of the Italian scribe, it is unlikely that it survives from an anterior stage of transmission. (The German scribe of the later copy now at Leiden, however, does reproduce this error.) The most economical explanation would probably involve a *trompe l'œil* on the part of a scribe who was otherwise successfully negotiating the ambiguity of insular r and insular tall s and simply slipped under the pressure of the moment. As the insular tall s possesses the more alien appearance (*vis-à-vis* insular r) with respect to continental usage, the error amounts to a palaeographical sort of hypercorrection—albeit a mindless one, and it is all the more telling for that. But it points to the production of the immediate exemplar of the Vatican copy of the *Laterculus*, and plausibly the exemplar of the whole collection, at an insular center, though the evidence adduced so far cannot suffice to determine whether this was an Irish or an English center. And, of course, it is still possible that the *Laterculus* was produced at some non-insular, continental European center, perhaps assembled with some or all of its accompanying texts there, then transmitted to an insular center (possibly there accruing more satellite texts), and then transmitted to an Italian center—all by c. 710.

The presence of xenophobic remarks denigrating the

scholarship of the Irish renders extremely unlikely the possibility that the insular milieu which saw the composition (or, perhaps, transmission) of the *Laterculus* was in Ireland—or, if situated away from Ireland, was at a center populated mainly by Irish *peregrini*. These anti-Irish remarks include an apparent grecoizing pun warning readers to beware of Irish dogs, “lest they deceive us with their verbiage” (“... ne nos fallant multoloquio”), and criticism of the Irish manner of reckoning of the ages of the world, in connection with which Stevenson notes “the jeering tone of this remark about Irish chronographers.” To sum up, Stevenson documents the following: the production of a Greek-based work of Latin prose with Syriac connections; the work’s internal textual witness to a center where Irish intellectual trends were known, but which was concerned to promote most vigorously a specifically non-Celtic scholarly tradition; the transmission of this work in an exemplar executed in an insular script; and the juxtaposition of this work with other insular texts—all by c. 710. Indeed, as Stevenson argues, the role of the Canterbury school in the transmission of this text rightly may be regarded as almost certain. This will be so even if we retain Lowe’s dating to c. 725 × c. 775. The precise date is inessential to this argument insofar as the resources in place at the seventh-century Canterbury school were never to reappear.

The bulk of Stevenson’s remaining argumentation is intended to corroborate her conclusion that the *Laterculus* was actually composed at Canterbury, most plausibly by Theodore himself, and not within, say, a community of Greek-speaking monks resident in Rome who were in contact with Theodore’s new community in England. Within Stevenson’s seven-part literary (and literary-historical) analysis, and in her edition’s full set of notes, specific items of evidence include the following: substantial points of agreement between the *Laterculus* and the Canterbury biblical commentaries in matters of doctrinal judgment; those texts’ common use of a very wide range of sources; points of comparison with other productions known to have connections with Canterbury, including Theodore’s canonical and penitential judgments, Aldhelm’s writings, some Greek-derived Sybilline poems, other relatively brief compositions in verse, and even some “Byzantine-Italian” traits observed in the stone sculpture of southeastern England. Stevenson notes that the eighth-century German provenance of BAV Pal. lat. 277, first situated at Lorsch by Traube, is indicated by the script used for some corrections and is corroborated by later library-historical data. She also cites attestations to a range of Anglo-Latin works (including a *symbolum* ascribed to Theodore by name and works by Aldhelm and Bede) owned at Lorsch. Further corroborating evidence includes linguistic criteria, including a translation technique similar to that observed in the cited *vita* of Anastasius; apparent knowledge of other rare insular sources, such as the writings of Gildas; the lack of evidence for the presence of Irish *peregrini* on the Continent in the later seventh century, or for concerns about Irish issues outside of England such as occur in the xenopho-

bic remarks noted above; and the handling of certain biblical texts and *topoi*, such as the “ordinals of Christ” commonplace.

It is to be hoped that the appearance of Stevenson’s study and edition will encourage further work on the fascinating chapters of the *Laterculus Malalianus*. Stevenson’s English translation may encourage this, along with the recent appearance of an English translation of the major source for the *Laterculus* (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. Elizabeth Jeffreys, et al. [1986]). There are also signs that interest in the work is in increasing with recent notices in the third edition of the Dekkers-Gaar *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (1995) [hereafter *CPL*], at p. 725 (no. 2272), and by Hermann Josef Frede, in the fourth edition of the *Vetus Latina* companion volume *Kirchenschriftsteller*, inaugurated by Bonifatius Fischer (1995; [hereafter *Frede*]), in this case at pp. 150 (item AN Mal) and 982 (no. 7511).

Bede tells us that Theodore was born in Tarsus in 602 (*HEV.viii*) and that he was living as a monk in Rome when he was approached by Pope Vitalian about his possible service as archbishop of Canterbury (c. 667; *HE IV.i: ipso tempore Romae monachus*). Scholars have long sought to flesh out these meager details by identifying the monastic community in Rome at which Theodore presumably was resident when he received his archiepiscopal calling. Recent work by Michael Lapidge has greatly advanced the state of the question (see *Biblical Commentaries*, pp. 65–81). But a recent study of the Anglo-Saxon cult of Anastasius by Carmela Vircillo Franklin would now seem to have resolved the issue conclusively (“Theodore and the *Passio S. Anastasii*,” in *Archbishop Theodore*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 175–203). (The following remarks wholly supersede some compressed and potentially misleading comments at *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 75.) Around the middle of the seventh century, four monastic communities in Rome are known in which a displaced Cilician such as Theodore might have taken up residence in the company of other Greek-speaking monks. Three such houses are “attested in the minutes of the second session of the Lateran Council of October 649,” two of which receive close consideration by Franklin. One of these is the early medieval predecessor of the house now known as the Tre Fontane, a Cistercian establishment since c. 1140, which was built on the location of the supposed beheading of St. Paul—“on the ancient road which went from the via Ostiensis to the via Ardeatina or . . . via Laurentina.” Although none of the original fabric of this monastery has been identified, its historical prominence as a prosperous Greek community and as a popular stop for pilgrims continued for centuries. The cited *acta* of the Lateran Council are also witnessed by a representative of some Greek-speaking monks from Armenia. The precise location of their community (possibly on the Esquiline), known only as the *monasterium Renati*, is uncertain. Yet another representative of the Greek-speaking communities, an abbot named John from the *laura* of St. Saba on the Aventine, is also mentioned in the Lateran minutes. Receiving only brief mention in Franklin’s study, John’s establishment, probably founded be-

tween 647 and 653, housed a community of Greek-speaking monks from Palestine (and, perhaps, from Syria), who might well have opened their doors to refugees from Cilicia such as Theodore. Finally, a fourth location mentioned by Lapidge but not treated by Franklin, "a monastery of (Syriac-speaking) Nestorian monks, called *Boetia* (location unknown)," which apparently was dispersed c. 676/8, may also deserve consideration in this regard.

A convergence of evidence, however, points to the first-mentioned establishment, the antecedent of the modern Tre Fontane, as the site of Theodore's residence in Rome. The community, known as *S. Anastasius ad aquas Salvias* (at least by the late eighth century), had been founded by a group of monks from Theodore's homeland (*de Cilicia*, according to the Lateran *acta*). The claim of that house to own the head of the Persian saint Anastasius (*né* Magundat), as Franklin goes on to show, accords well with the extraordinary popularity which the cult of that Christian convert (a former Zoroastrian soldier) attained in Anglo-Saxon England within fifty years or so of his death by strangulation in the vicinity of the modern Kirkuk in Iraq. Martyrological commemorations of Anastasius in Bede's writings and in other early monuments, including the *Kalendarium S. Willibrordi* (see below), bear early testimony to the rapid spread of this cult. Moreover, an entry by Bede in the *Chronica maiora* section of his *De temporum ratione* (chs. LXVI-LXXI)—including a treatment of the life and martyrdom of Anastasius and a reference to a *monasterium beati Pauli apostoli* ("... quod dicitur ad aquas Salvias") *sub anno* 4591 (in Bede's Sixth-Age chronology)—shows that the Pauline associations of the Cilician center of the cult were known early on in Anglo-Saxon England.

The legend of Anastasius did not provide Aldhelm, sometime scholar of Canterbury, with a figure he deemed suitable to join the exemplary virgins of his prose treatise *De virginitate* or his metrical *Carmen de virginitate*. But Franklin adduces strong evidence to show that writings on the Persian saint would have been available to the English author during his composition of those works. The key to the riddle is an almost mechanically literal Latin translation (*Biblioteca hagiographica Latina* [1898-9; hereafter *BHL*], suppl. [1911/1986], no. 410b) of a Greek life of Anastasius—exhibiting a servile dependence on the Greek original in matters of grammar, syntax, and word-choice—preserved in Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, F. III. 16, fols. 14-23 (s. x; provenance Bobbio). The translation technique, Franklin notes, closely resembles that of the *Laterculus Malalianus* (see above). (The precise relationship of this Greek-based version to extant Greek hagiography of Anastasius—some of which has been associated with the name of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (see below)—requires further investigation; cf. *Biblioteca hagiographica Graeca*, 3rd ed. [1957], pp. 27-8 [nos. 84-90].) The Turin dossier also preserves three distinct hagiographical compositions which collectively treat a total of seven figures whose meritorious chastity is celebrated by Aldhelm: the virginal couple Chrysanthus and Daria; the sisters Chionia,

Irene, and Agape; and the martyrs Victoria and Anatholia. Franklin has identified a distinctive text, preserved in Turin F. III. 16 and at least four other witnesses, in which the "passio of Victoria is conjoined to that of Anatholia" (*BHL*, suppl. [1911/1986], nos. 8591a-d; cf. nos. 418a-c). Some exemplar of this version almost certainly informs the joint celebration of the two virgins in Aldhelm's prose and verse, and preliminary collations suggest that, of the known witnesses, the Turin text may be especially closely related to the one consulted by Aldhelm. (This conjoint text is not included in *CPL*³, but it is treated in Frede⁴ at p. 89 [item A-ss Victoria], citing a 1964 edition by M. Grazia Mara that is criticized here on several counts by Franklin.) Moreover, the Turin collection includes texts celebrating a cluster of saints of eastern origin, several of whose legends appear to have exerted an influence on the early Anglo-Saxon cult of saints (appearing in Bede's *Martyrologium*, in the *Old English Martyrology*, and elsewhere—see further the notice of Hohler, below). Finally, as Franklin and Paul Meyvaert have shown previously (see *OEN* 17.1 [1983], 105), the literalistic translation in the Latin *vita* of Anastasius that was most plausibly imported to Anglo-Saxon England by Theodore himself and consulted by Aldhelm (now represented by *BHL* 410b) also may have formed the basis of Bede's own reworking of that saint's hagiography, which he mentions at *HE* V.xxiv ("... librum vitae et passionis sancti Anastasii, male de Greco translatum . . . , prout potui ad sensum correxi"). Several apparent exemplars of a text of this *vita* that may embody Bede's revisions (printed in *Acta Sanctorum*, January, vol. 2 [1643], pp. 426-31 = vol. 3 [1866], pp. 39-45; *BHL* p. 68 [no. 408]) have recently been identified by Franklin and Meyvaert (as cited) and by Richard Sharpe (*Handlist*, pp. 70-6 [no. 152], at p. 74).

Franklin has succeeded in forming a coherent argument out of some fairly disparate items of evidence: Aldhelm's study at Canterbury; his knowledge of the conjoint life of Victoria and Anatholia; the Greek-dependent translation technique observed in the *vita* of Anastasius and other hagiography preserved in Turin F. III. 16 (which includes a copy of the conjoint life); the records of the celebration of Anastasius and other eastern saints in early English martyrological sources; and Bede's knowledge of other details of the saint's cult and his declared revision of a faulty, Greek-based life of Anastasius. Taken together, the facts set out here leave little room to doubt that Theodore personally introduced the cult of Anastasius to Anglo-Saxon England, a cult in whose devotions he had been a regular participant during the time of his previous residence at the Cilician monastery of St. Anastasius, near the Salvian Springs in Rome.

In addressing the possible contributions of the Tarsus native Theodore to seventh-century Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice, Christopher Hohler acknowledges that the primary sources for such an inquiry mainly have perished ("Theodore and the Liturgy," in *Archbishop Theodore*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 222-35). Hohler thus searches through a range of eighth-century and later monuments for English reflexes of Mediter-

anean liturgical customs that might be attributed plausibly to Theodore's mediation: Bede's *Martyrologium* (citing editions by Quentin [1908] and the Bollandists [1931], as well as the "practical edition" of Dubois and Renaud [1976], but not the chronologically informed reconstruction of Jones [CCSL 123C, 563–78]); the unique window on early Anglo-Saxon cults of saints opened by the vernacular *Old English Martyrology* (possibly composed c. 800 or slightly later, even if attestations in manuscripts do not begin until the late ninth century [hereafter *OEM*]); continental witnesses to the "old Gelasian" sacramentary, on the assumption that "Gelasians were used in earlier seventh-century England, and that reflexes of these are preserved in the later Gelasians from eighth-century Bavaria"; and, finally, several calendars of continental provenance whose information may reflect the customs of early English missionaries to Germania, notably Willibrord (archbishop of Utrecht from 695 until 739) and Boniface (archbishop of Mainz, *ob.* 755). Supplementing in some respects the information provided by Hohler, these monuments may be summarized concisely:

(1) The so-called "Calendar of St. Willibrord" (or *Kalendarium S. Willibrordi*, following *CPL*³, p. 665 [no. 2037]), a very early Anglo-Saxon martyrological witness, contains a celebrated instance of Willibrord's own handwriting, which has now been retraced. The calendar is preserved in the present Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale [hereafter BN], lat. 10837, pt. II (i.e., fols. 34–41 and 44) (English center(s) in ?Northumbria and/or eastern Francia [i.e., ?Echternach], s. viii 1 [i.e., ? c. 701 × 728]; additions of s. viii–ix; provenance at Echternach by s. viii med.), with the martyrological entries on 34v–40r. See *CLA* V, 26 (no. 606a), with V, 58, and suppl., 58; Klaus Gamber, *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores*, 2nd ed. [1968; hereafter *CLLA*²], pp. 234–5 (no. 414); and Gneuss, "Preliminary List" (in *ASE* 9 [1981], 1–60 [hereafter "Preliminary List"]), p. 57 (no. 897). Willibrord receives no entry in Sharpe, *Handlist*; see further the notice of Meens, below.

(2) The "Walderdorff Calendar Fragment" (or *Kalendarium Ratisbonense*, following *CPL*³, p. 666 [no. 2038]; cf. p. 634 [no. 1918gg]) "was used in Regensburg but is drawn from earlier Anglo-Saxon materials," once forming part of a sacramentary connected with the circle of Boniface. With the discovery of a third fragment at Regensburg, the known *membra disiecta* of the sacramentary containing the calendar now comprise Berlin, Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 877 + Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek CIM 1 + Schloss Hauzenstein near Regensburg, Gräflisch Walderdorffsche Bibliothek, *s.n.* (English center in ?Northumbria, s. viii med. [Gneuss] or s. viii 2 [Lapidge]; provenance at Bavarian center [i.e., ?Regensburg] from s. viii med. or s. viii 2). The fragmentary calendar appears in the Schloss Hauzenstein fragment. See *CLA* VIII, 9 (no. 1052), with VIII, 61, and suppl., 60; B. Bischoff and V. Brown, "Addenda . . . [to *CLA*, I]," *Med. Stud.* 47 (1985), 317–66, at 357 (item **VIII.1052) and 363; *CLLA*², pp. 125–6 (no. 96) with pp. 233–4 (no. 412); and Gneuss, "Preliminary

List," pp. 49 and 53 (no. 791 [for 887 read 877]).

(3) A neglected and, unfortunately, now missing martyrological fragment (incorporating some intriguing death-dates of Anglo-Saxon figures) was catalogued as Munich, Hauptstaatsarchiv, Raritaten-Selekt 108 (English center in ?Northumbria [Lowe] or continental Europe, s. viii; provenance in southern Bavaria [i.e., ?Tegernsee] by s. ix; *CLA* IX, 3 [no. 1236], with IX, 61; suppl., 63; and "Addenda . . . [I]," 364). The fragment was not included by Gneuss in his "Preliminary List." The May–June chronology which it preserves was studied and edited by Paul Grosjean, "Un fragment d'obituaire Anglo-Saxon du VIII^e siècle . . .," *AB* 79 (1961), 320–45, before the item dropped out of sight.

(4) Finally, a calendar fragment with possible English associations, treated by Lowe when it was preserved in the sacristy of the church of Sankt Emmeram at Regensburg (*s.n.*), is now Regensburg, Bischöfliches Zentralarchiv, Pfarrarchiv Sankt Emmeram, Fragment Nr. 8 (southeastern Germany [?Regensburg region], s. viii ex.; *CLA*, suppl., 38 [no. 1805], with "Addenda . . . [to *CLA*, II]," *Med. Stud.* 54 (1992), 286–307, at 307; no bibliographical references are given in *CLA*).

Hohler notes that Bede's *Martyrologium* (which, Sharpe reminds us, "does not survive in any copies of English provenance": *Handlist*, pp. 70–6 [no. 152], at p. 73) records the martyrdom of the Tarsus saints Ciryus and Julitta under 15 July, agreeing with the dating found in Greek sources, as against the date of 16 June found in major Latin martyrologies down to the sixteenth century. Here and in the case of Bede's entry for Mary Magdalene (her earliest known commemoration in the Latin West, also occurring in a notice set against a date—22 July—found in Byzantine sources), the atypical brevity of Bede's information leads Hohler to suspect that its source was "some sort of calendar (rather than . . . an extensive *passio*)," which may have been imported during Theodore's archiepiscopacy. Hohler isolates no fewer than eighteen entries in Bede's *Martyrologium* commemorating saints (including figures resident in Tarsus, Antioch, Constantinople, and Syria) and occasions (such as the Invention of John the Baptist's Head) that correspond to entries in the ninth-century Synaxarion of Constantinople, leading Hohler to speculate about some lost antecedent in an eastern tradition that may have been known to Theodore.

One indication that such a source may have descended from Syriac custom, and not from a Greek tradition such as that exemplified by the cited synaxarion, might appear in the date of 9 July recorded by Bede for the feast of St. Ephrem the Syrian, which apparently now occurs elsewhere only in a Syrian calendar promulgated by the community at Qennesra along the Euphrates. I would note further that Franklin (see above) and Lapidge (*Biblical Commentaries*, p. 184) have recently associated the influence of Theodore's scholarship with references to St. Anastasius—not mentioned by Hohler—in Bede's *Martyrologium* and *De temporum ratione* (within the so-called *Chronica maiora* [chs. LXVI–

LXXI)). Franklin and Lapidge have also noted that Anastasius is celebrated in *OEM*, and, as Hohler notes here, that vernacular compendium also commemorates the previously mentioned SS. Cirycus and Julitta against the date favored by Greek sources and, moreover, records that their martyrdom occurred at Tarsus—not mentioned by Bede in this context. The *OEM* also offers a vernacular *précis* of the exotic (most plausibly Greek-derived) hagiography of Mary Magdalene entitled *Vita eremitica beatae Mariae Magdalenae* by Victor Saxer (*BHL*, pp. 804–11, at 805–6 [nos. 5453–6]), quite possibly the earliest witness to this tradition anywhere in western Europe, following Bede's brief mention of Mary in his *Martyrologium*—the earliest reference to the saint in the Latin tradition. It is thus clear that the cult of Mary Magdalene was known in England by c. 730 and the *Vita eremitica* legend by c. 800, even if the latter tradition remained unknown in Frankish territories until the eleventh century. Hohler speculates quite reasonably that we may have to reckon here with another trace of the devotional life of Theodore and his contemporaries. (Hohler's analysis of the matrices of saints in Bede's *Martyrologium* and *OEM* might well be considered alongside the efforts of Franklin, noted above, to compare the contents of these two sources with those of Turin F. III. 16—a manuscript not mentioned by Hohler.) Most remarkably, Hohler finds that the *OEM* commemorates another Persian saint, Milus of Susa, in an entry exhibiting “the relevant place-names in corrupt Syriac forms, which are strikingly different from those found in Greek.”

The two distinct Syrian traditions of saintly commemoration detected by Hohler in Bede's *Martyrologium* and *OEM* lead him to offer the striking suggestion that their sources possibly “were brought [to England] by different men.” If so, “one of the men must have been [Theodore] . . . , and the second . . . a companion of his.” Hohler notes further that there can be no question that Hadrian brought companions with him from Italy (as attested by Bede, *HE* IV.i, where it is stated that Theodore received the recently arrived Hadrian *cum suis* [“with his followers”—Colgrave]). In line with the early inquiries of Louis Duchesne and H. A. Wilson, and, more recently, Lapidge (*Biblical Commentaries*, pp. 160–7), Hohler is inclined to credit the notion that the cluster of Campanian (often local Capuan) saints in the calendars of Echternach and Regensburg provenance noted above, also seen in *OEM*, might be associated plausibly with the agency of Hadrian or his satellites.

Hohler does not separately consider the presence of a similar grouping of Campanian saints in the text of the so-called Echternach recension (*Epternacense*) of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, also associated with the continental household of the aforementioned Anglo-Saxon missionary Willibrord, which was copied by the scribe Laurentius on the leaves that now form BN lat. 10837, pt. 1 (i.e., fols. 2–33) (Echternach, s. viii in. [Lowe] or s. viii 1; *CLA* V, 25 [no. 605], with V, 58, and suppl., 54; cf. *CPL*³, p. 664 [no. 2031]). This monument is treated in the synoptic edition of martyr-

ologies established in *Acta Sanctorum*, November, vol. 2, pt. 1, sect. 1, at pp. viii–ix, 1–156, and 193. Neglected later reflexes of the Campanian grouping, noted by Lapidge, occur in a calendar in London, British Library [hereafter BL], Cotton Nero A. ii, fols. 3–12 (Cornwall or southwestern England [?St. Germans, Cornwall, or ?Sherborne], s. xi 1 [i.e., 1029 × 1047: Muir]), at 3r–8v, and in the Cambro-Latin *Martyrologium* of Rhygyfarch ap Sulien (Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 41 [no. 123]; not in Sharpe, *Handlist*). See further Lapidge in *Biblical Commentaries*, pp. 162–7, and *idem*, “Some Latin Poems,” pp. 72–4 with 471 (rev. repr., as cited at *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 73–6, at 74 [no. 2]).

In other important comments bearing on Anglo-Saxon involvement in the transmission of pre-Carolingian liturgical texts, Hohler suspects that the exemplar of the unique Chelles witness to the “old Gelasian” sacramentary may have been transmitted to the region of Paris by way of Canterbury after acquiring some non-Roman Italian features. He also elucidates a hitherto unrecognized textual connection between the *Kalendarium S. Willibrordi* and an “eighth-century Gelasian” monument now in Prague, *Metropolitní kapitoly*, O. 83 (Regensburg, s. viii 2 [i.e., before 794 or ?788]; later provenance Prague). Hohler mentions in passing the hypothesis—going back to work by F. J. Badcock in the 1930s, but receiving its most cogent formulation in the recent scholarship of Lapidge (see *OEN* 26.2 [1993], 60–1, with corrected information concerning Israel the Grammarian at *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 65)—that Theodore's arrival occasioned the importation of a booklet containing several eastern texts, most plausibly including a litany of saints and Greek-language texts of the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Trisagion (corresponding to the Latin *Sanctus*).

Finally, this article concludes with some wholly original (if admittedly speculative) comments on a void into which Hohler is uniquely qualified to peer, having spent several decades addressing many of the imponderables of Anglo-Saxon liturgy: the possible influence of Greek liturgical singing (through Theodore's agency) on devotional practices at Canterbury. Although “[n]o music survives from England from earlier than the tenth century” and the traditions of Greek church music from the patriarchate of Constantinople were only set out systematically in 1832, Hohler notes that Bede “interposes a paragraph on [music] . . . between two paragraphs discussing Theodore” (*HE* IV.ii). He suspects that the singing at Canterbury “differed very little if at all from that of the Greek church,” where “the music cannot properly be written on staves because of the chromatic scales and sundry glissandi” and “a singer [knows] . . . to go up two and down one; but in order to know where you have got, you have to rehearse the whole thing (silently even) from the beginning.” Beyond the evidence preserved in the *Epternacense* recension of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and in Turin F. III. 16, the subject matter of Hohler's inquiry might be explored further through consideration of evidence preserved in the recently published Canterbury commentaries; among members of the

Leiden family of glossaries and the Épinal-Erfurt group; in Aldhelm's prose and poetry (including the neglected *Carmina ecclesiastica*); and in sources cited recently by Ó Carragáin (see below).

Three studies published during 1994–5 addressed the disparate body of early medieval penitential and legal writings going back to the official pronouncements of Theodore. The most expansive of these essays, by Thomas Charles-Edwards, makes great progress in illuminating the processes of these texts' composition and transmission and in defining the Theodorian content of two major texts in the tradition: the disparate collection known as the *Iudicia Theodori* and the revised and more carefully structured *Recensio discipuli Umbrensiū paenitentiarum et canonum Theodori* (Charles-Edwards, "The Penitential of Theodore and the *Iudicia Theodori*," in *Archbishop Theodore*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 141–74). The *Iudicia* intersperse a somewhat heterogeneous selection of penitential materials with various judgments bearing on issues in canon law, with the greater emphasis falling evidently on items of the latter, legalistic group. The canonical strictures characteristically lack explicit assignments of penance or other specific penalties for wrongdoing. The *Recensio discipuli*, which would in time prove to be far more influential than the *Iudicia*, possesses by contrast a carefully delineated structure "organized in Roman fashion, by books and titles," wherein penitential texts (many specifying penalties) occupy the first book and canons fill out the second. The organization of the recension in some measure may be attributed to the efforts of the self-described "Disciple of the Umbrians" (*discipulus Umbrensiū*; see below) who acknowledges his involvement near the start of the collection.

The most important point for understanding the origins of these texts involves the recognition that none of the judgments (or "sentences") associated with Theodore's name was actually written out by his hand. Similar to the recently published biblical commentaries from Theodore's school at Canterbury (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 72–6), all of these texts ultimately reflect the note-taking efforts of students or other interlocutors, and in some cases the received texts embody the revisions of redactors. In terms of textual chronology, the *Iudicia Theodori* almost certainly represent the earlier of the two collections under discussion. The fortunes of the *Iudicia*, which passed through Ireland at an early stage of transmission, show that the opinions of Theodore were known abroad within a generation of his death. (The compilation of the *Iudicia* must antedate the dissemination of quotations from the text c. 720 [i.e., c. 716 × c. 725] within the so-called A-recension of the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*, at I.xxii and LIV.xii–xiv, quotations mainly addressing aspects of marriage and divorce.)

Somewhat confusingly, the *Iudicia Theodori* and *Recensio discipuli* in different ways reflect the progress of Irish scholarship in the eighth century, and Charles-Edwards's effort to sort out this issue is perhaps the greatest single virtue of this valuable article. Specifically, Charles-Edwards shows that the

Iudicia appear to represent a text taken home to Ireland early on by one of the Irish pupils stated by Aldhelm (*Epistola* V) to have hemmed Theodore in over the course of close questioning. Charles-Edwards demolishes arguments holding that the *Iudicia* are a continental compilation, noting, as one striking Irish symptom, the characterization of Theodore as *episcopus* and not *archiepiscopus*. In addition to the aforementioned quotations of the *Iudicia* in the A-recension of the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*, a full and continuous text of these sentences accompanies the text of the B-recension of the *Collectio* in BN lat. 12021 (Breton center, s. x in.; provenance Corbie). This most plausibly bears witness to the codification of the received text of the *Iudicia* in Ireland and the text's subsequent importation to Brittany as one of a number of "satellite" items circulating in the company of the Irish *Collectio* (others including canons of the Council of Ancyra and the *Canones Adomnani*).

In the rather different case of the *Recensio discipuli*, two distinct strands of Irish influence may be discerned. These appear to have arisen in turn at the compositional and transmissional stages. First, Irish textual influence is evident in an additional stratum of penitential material (above and beyond that contained in the *Iudicia*) which apparently includes responses to further questions directed at Theodore by an Anglo-Saxon interlocutor, identified hypocoristically as Eoda, regarding the content of a certain Irish tract (*libellus Scottorum*)—evidently the *Paenitentiale* ascribed to Cumman (Cumméne Fota or Cummanus Longus, *ob.* ?662; see Sharpe, *Handlist*, p. 94 [no. 210], and notice of Howlett, below, under "The Tenth and Eleventh Centuries"). Second, the *Recensio discipuli*, with its distinctive treatment of Irish material, somewhat paradoxically became the version of Theodore's sentences that circulated most widely in England, while the textually earlier *Iudicia*, lacking the matter relating directly to the Irish penitential tradition, was preserved for posterity by way of its early importation to Ireland. By the middle of the eighth century, the *Recensio discipuli* had emerged as the most important representation of Theodore's penitential pronouncements, and this led in turn to a second wave of Theodorian influence on the Irish penitential tradition, in which the *Recensio* (and not the *Iudicia*) became a source for the later eighth-century Hiberno-Latin *Paenitentiale Bigotianum* and the so-called Old Irish Penitential. (For the last item, never cited in full by Charles-Edwards, see the text established by E. J. Gwynn in *Ériu* 7 [1914], 121–95, with corrections at 12 [1938], 245–9, and discussion (with a bowdlerized English translation) by D. A. Binchy, in *The Irish Penitentals*, ed. Ludwig Bieler [1963], pp. 47–51, 258–77, and 365–7.)

Charles-Edwards argues at length that the *discipulus Umbrensiū* was personally responsible for the earliest division of this material into two books and the addition of titles, even if the Disciple's motivation for this effort derived largely from the prior evolution of the collection into a multiply sourced work with the addition of matter relating to Cumman's penitential (or the *libellus Scottorum*)—albeit on Theodore's

own authority, in his provision of responses to Eoda, and not as a result of tampering (say) by an expert on Irish practices. These developments also account in part for the foregrounding of penitential texts (as opposed to canons) in the prologue of the *Recensio discipuli* as well as their placement in the first half of the redaction. Charles-Edwards would also thus reject any hypothesis maintaining that the Disciple personally introduced all of the Irish matter, while leaving open the possibility that he consulted Cumman's text in the course of the revision. The redactor's comments do seem to suggest that he had formed an opinion of the Irish work, perhaps as a result of a chain of oral communications going back to Eoda or another associate of Theodore. Regarding the milieu of the *discipulus* himself, Charles-Edwards disputes Lapidge's association of the ethnographically obscure *Umbrenses* specifically with the Deirans, arguing that the term may refer to any of the Northumbrian peoples. Lapidge, in the light of a passage in the anonymous Anglo-Latin *Vita S. Gregorii*, had admitted a region comprising Whitby, Hartlepool, and York, maintaining that in *HE* "Bede . . . does not use the word (*H*)umbrenses [as a general term for Northumbrians], although the word *Nordanhymbri* is used some 58 times" (see *OEN* 20.2 [1987], 67). (A revised citation will appear in my next column.) But Charles-Edwards notes the occurrence of the phrase *Ecgrido rege Humbronensium* in the treatment of the Synod of Hatfield in *HE* (at IV.xv[xvii]), in reference to Ecgrith, king of all Northumbria. Despite the geographically expansive implications of his semantic analysis, Charles-Edwards accepts Levison's narrower view (not incompatible with Lapidge's conclusion) that this pupil's *magistri* may have been resident at the school of York—his recension thus perhaps witnessing another neglected early transmission of texts from Canterbury to York (see also *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 109–10).

Charles-Edwards's wide-ranging article also contains important comments addressing the following concerns: the so-called *Regula* of Basil (actually comprising Basil's *Epistolae* CLXXXVIII, CXCIX, and CCXVII), notably its influence on public and private penance in insular centers; the possible—or, Charles-Edwards feels, doubtful—use of a Latin version of the canons of the 325 Council of Nicea made from the Greek at Canterbury; and special problems confronted by Theodore as a result of Anglo-Saxon attitudes toward feuding, revenge, weapon-bearing, and sexual activity. Charles-Edwards also cites important discussions of Theodore's sentences in two publications by Raymund Kottje that have not yet been cited in *OEN*, i.e., Kottje's monograph *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus: ihre Überlieferung und ihre Quellen, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters* 8 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980), and a 1984 lexicon entry by Kottje in a standard—and only very recently completed—reference work treating German (and Germanic) legal history: "Paenitentiale Theodori," in *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (*HRG*), ed. Adalbert Erler, Ekkehard Kaufman, and Dieter Werkmüller, 5 vols. (Berlin: Schmidt, 1971–98), III, cols. 1413–16. (The

last of the forty fascicles constituting *HRG* bore a cover date of 1997, but the more recent appearance of an integral edition of the fifth volume, dated 1998, may supply the proper closing date for the work.)

In a study that is a model of cautious textual and library-historical detective work ("A Note on Two Manuscripts of the *Poenitentiale Theodori* from the Library of De Thou," *Sacris Erudiri* 34 [1994], 175–84), Marinus M. Woesthuis begins by countering the impression, common among modern authorities (and no small number of their medieval predecessors), that Theodore issued an integral "penitential book." Even within the best-known redaction of Theodore's pronouncements (the *Recensio discipuli*), there are two main versions: (1) the full text in two parts (*paenitentiae* and *canones*), respectively containing fifteen and fourteen major divisions; and (2) an abridged text, which is in fact the more prevalent version, containing only the bulk of the second part (the *canones* from II.i.4 onwards) with the addition of most of I.xiii.1–4 from the first part. Two manuscripts of the abridged text, formerly in the library of Jacques-Auguste de Thou (and thus cited as *codices Thuani*), dropped out of sight after the appearance of Wasserschleben's 1851 penitential study and edition. Woesthuis has now identified the two missing manuscripts in the present BN lat. 1458, fols. 64–87 (northern France, s. ix 1 [i.e., c. 800 × c. 825]; later provenance Beauvais) and BN lat. 3842a (s. ix med. or s. ix 2; same place of origin and provenance). Woesthuis notes that Henri Omont established in 1916 that these manuscripts *did* once belong to the library of De Thou. Woesthuis cautions, however, that a collation of the texts in the newly identified manuscripts with variants reported in the apparatus of the 1677 edition of Petit (whose readings were reproduced in bulk in the study and edition of Willem Finsterwalder, *Die "Canones Theodori"* [1929], under the sigla l and m) points up some notable discrepancies. But these may call into question some aspects of Petit's editing technique, and not the identification of the manuscripts from the Bibliothèque Nationale with the codices cited by that editor. Moreover, Woesthuis shows that the texts in these neglected ninth-century witnesses stand very close to one preserved in BN lat. 1454 (?Paris region, s. ix or s. x; Finsterwalder's *Maz*).

Additional commentary on the corpus of penitential instructions promulgated by Theodore appeared in a 1995 study of food-related prohibitions by Rob Meens ("Pollution in the Early Middle Ages: the Case of the Food Regulations in Penitentials," *Early Med. Europe* 4 [1995], 3–19). Somewhat ambitiously, Meens seeks to identify the *mentalité* (or "people's experience of their universe") that would encourage them to proscribe the consumption of food that had been touched by the blood of certain animals or by various human bodily fluids. Following Mary Douglas, he concludes that intuitive aversion to boundary-crossing and transgression of categories stands behind many kinds of penitential restrictions. Bestiality, for example, transgresses the natural procreative boundaries distinguishing human beings from other animals. Theodore's

responses to certain food-related queries appear to be somewhat more lenient than those of some other penitential authorities, notably in the penitential ascribed to Cummián (see above). Theodore states that bees which have killed a human being should be put to death swiftly, but he still would find it acceptable to eat honey from the hive of such a homicidal swarm—a stipulation developed further in the *Poenitentiale* (or *Excerptiones*) formerly attributed to (pseudo-)Ecgberht, but now associated with the Cornish Latin author Hucarius (or Hucar; see Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 317 [no. 1183], and Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 105–6 [no. 251], at 106). The archbishop permits his subjects to eat animals that have consumed carrion, but not those that have fed on human corpses within the past year. He allows the use of hides from animals that have been sexually assaulted by humans. And, in certain cases, he allows the consumption of blood or certain forbidden foods without penance: in the case of blood, in one's own saliva; in the case of animal carrion, in times of dire necessity; and, in both cases, in situations involving the unintentional and unknowing consumption of polluted food.

Meens's well-documented study provides useful bibliographical references to secondary studies of food regulations. His citations of primary sources advert to fully five recensions of Theodore's penitential instructions and canons, including the textual tradition of the so-called *canones Basilienses*, a tradition which has only been identified since the appearance of Finsterwalder's 1929 edition (treated in a separately paginated appendix [at pp. 79–89] in F. B. Asbach's 1975 dissertation, also issued as a monograph: *Das "Poenitentiale Remense" und der sogen. "Excarpsus Cummeani": Überlieferung, Quellen und Entwicklung zweier kontinentaler Bussbücher aus der 1. Hälfte des 8. Jahrhunderts* [Regensburg: Universität Regensburg, 1975]; not found in *CPL*³ or other standard sources). Anglo-Latinists may also wish to take special note of the following: Meens's reference to his own recent study of the penitential text known as the *Paenitentiale Oxoniense II* (or *Iudicium Clementis*), probably to be assigned to the first half of the eighth century, which was possibly (if doubtfully) written by Willibrord (R. Meens, "Willibrords boeteboek?," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 106 [1993], 163–78; see *CPL*³, p. 615 [no. 1890] and Frede⁴, p. 659 [item PAE Cle]; not in Sharpe, *Handlist*), and whose text has recently been established by Raymund Kottje (CCSL 156, 179–205); a related article by Meens cited as forthcoming in *Middleleeuwse Studies en bronnen* 41 (1994); and papers assembled in the collection *Willibrord, zijn wereld en zijn werk: Voordrachten gehouden tijdens het Willibrordcongres, Nijmegen, 28–30 September 1989*, ed. Petty Bange and Antonius Gerardus Weiler, *Middleleeuwse Studies* 6 (Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Centrum voor Middleleeuwse Studies, 1990).

At some point in the fifteen-year span marked out by the consecration of Hæddi as bishop of Winchester in 676 and Theodore's death on 19 September 690, the self-described *peregrinus* Theodore solicited the prayers of the West Saxon

bishop in a six-line rhythmical poem which, Michael Lapidge suspects, is possibly "the earliest piece of Latin verse written in Anglo-Saxon England (certainly the earliest which is securely datable)" ("Theodore and Anglo-Latin Octosyllabic Verse," in *Archbishop Theodore*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 260–80, now repr. in Lapidge's *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* [London: Hambledon Press, 1996], pp. 225–45). The poem is preserved uniquely with a witness to Theodore's penitential and legal pronouncements (in the *Recensio discipuli Umbrensiensis*, as treated above in the notice of Charles-Edwards's study), the present Cambridge, Corpus Christi College [hereafter CCCC] 320, pt. II (i.e., fols. 117–70) (St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, s. x 2), fol. 152r (= pt. II, p. 71, in an earlier foliation). (The poem is treated briefly in *CPL*³, at p. 613 [sub no. 1885]; not in Frede⁴; *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*, ed. Dieter Schaller and Ewald Köngsen [1977]—hereafter *ICL*—at p. 713 [no. 16100], correcting *CPL*³; Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 637–8 [no. 1686], at p. 638; for additional references to printed texts and detailed, if obsolescent, comments on the context in the manuscript, see Finsterwalder's edition, as cited above, pp. 96–101 [item u.2].) The combination of the poem's octosyllabic form and its trochaic alternation of strong and weak stresses, engendering regular penultimate (paroxytone) stress and encouraging placement of bisyllabic words at the ends of lines, may serve to distinguish Theodore's verse both from the early Christian Latin hymns of Ambrose and others (notable for their cultivation of the iambic dimeter) and from the derivative insular Latin octosyllables (exhibiting regular antepenultimate—proparoxytone—stress) composed by Theodore's younger contemporaries Aldhelm and Æthilwald, as well as their Celtic precursors (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 79–80 and 84). In the light of these discrepancies, Lapidge sees Theodore's poem as an imitation of the Greek poetic form known as anacreontic verse, characterized by the use of ionic dimeters exhibiting a reversal of scansion (anacalasis) in the fourth and fifth syllables. Lapidge summarizes the pioneering Christian use of this originally pagan form by Gregory of Nazianzus (*ob.* 390) and by the Libyan bishop Synesius (*ob. c.* 412). But he draws his closest connection with some anacreontics (ninety-three percent of whose lines exhibit penultimate stress) attributed to Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, whom Theodore may have met during a sojourn in Constantinople. Lapidge notes further that there are three other Anglo-Latin poems (*ICL*, pp. 109 [no. 2283], 280 [no. 6189], and 651 [no. 14640]), all preserved in the Book of Cerne (Cambridge, University Library [hereafter CUL], Ll. 1. 10 [Mercian center, s. ix in. or s. ix 1; provenance Cerne]), which exhibit all of the following: a rhythmical form identical to Theodore's verse; subject matter recalling some anacreontics by Sophronius; and knowledge of Greek vocabulary and sources (perhaps including a Greek text in the *Physiologus* tradition). Lapidge is thus inclined to support the attribution of all three poems to Theodore. (None of these items appears in *CPL*³, Frede⁴, or Sharpe, *Handlist*.) One of the three poems (*incipit* "Sancte

sator, suffragator") circulated widely in England and continental Europe, and was apparently included in an important devotional handbook (*manualis libellus*) compiled by Alcuin—lost in its original form but attested in several sources, including fully three extant manuscripts which are discussed here by Lapidge (see also *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 92).

Two articles included in the same collection address some of the difficult questions surrounding the biblical texts that were known to Archbishop Theodore (Richard Marsden, "Theodore's Bible: the Pentateuch," in *Archbishop Theodore*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 236–54, and Patrick McGurk, "Theodore's Bible: the Gospels," *ibid.*, pp. 255–9). In the first of these, addressing Old Testament pentateuchal texts, Richard Marsden explores the information about early Vulgate traditions now available in the recently edited glosses of the "PentI" group (in the text established mainly by Bischoff in the Bischoff–Lapidge *Biblical Commentaries*). The most famous pre-Carolingian witness to Vulgate texts of the Pentateuch occurs in the celebrated Codex Amiatinus and the surviving fragments of one of its two sister pandects (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino I; siglum A; *CLA* III, 8 [no. 299], with III, 43, and suppl., 49; and the fragments in BL Additional 45025 + BL Loan 81 ["Bankes Leaf"]; *CLA* II², 17 [no. 177], with II², 48; suppl., 46; and "Addenda . . . [I]," 351–2; all Wearmouth–Jarrow, s. vii/viii [i.e., 690 × 716]). Beyond these English monuments, only two manuscripts are extant which provide any substantial witness to the Vulgate Pentateuch. These are:

(1) The lacunose witness, codicologically augmented in the eighth century, in BN nouv. acq. lat. 2334 (center outside of western Europe [i.e., ?northern Italy], s. vii 1; provenance at Saint-Gatien at Tours by s. ix 1; "Ashburnham Pentateuch"; siglum G; *CLA* V, 49 [no. 693a = original leaves], with V, 63, and suppl., 56), on its 129 surviving original leaves: fols. 1–3, 5–7, 9–36, 39–59, 65–121, 123–8, and 130–40.

(2) A valuable text, which includes some important Old Latin interpolations in Exodus, in BAV Ottobon. lat. 66 (?insular center in northern Italy, s. vii/viii; "Codex Ottobonianus" or "Codex Cervinianus"; siglum O; *CLA* I, 20 [no. 66], with I, 41, and suppl., 44; *Vetus Latina*, ed. Bonifatius Fischer, *et al.* [1949–], I, 17 [no. 102]).

Marsden finds that out of the 474 numbered entries in the Bischoff–Lapidge text of PentI, fully 465 items witness specific readings in verses of the Vulgate Pentateuch (sixteen of these deriving from Jerome's preface to Genesis). Ignoring readings that appear to be universal in the Vulgate tradition, Marsden identifies ninety significant variants spread across eighty-eight *lemmata*. Twenty-four of these ally themselves with distinctive readings in the three cited pre-Carolingian biblical manuscripts, and nineteen correspond to variant readings in later witnesses. But more than half of the significant variants identified by Marsden, forty-seven in all, appear to document previously unknown readings in the early Vulgate tradition. These "may thus be a measure of the independence of the Canterbury textual tradition," even if some of the readings

may reflect no more than contamination emerging out of the classroom origins and the varied transmissional fortunes of the Milan glosses. Most of these independent readings occur in Genesis. Interestingly, the readings for which early parallels exist stand farther from the text in Codex Amiatinus than from other texts. Among the readings paralleled in later monuments, Marsden identifies a very intriguing counterpart to an Italian-derived reading in Numbers hitherto considered wholly anomalous by Vulgate scholars, having been identified previously only in the fragmentary witness to the Pentateuch executed by the scribe and sometime dean Winithar, now in Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 2, pp. 3–294 (Sankt Gallen, s. viii 2 [i.e., c. 761 × c. 775]; siglum S; *CLA* VII, 18 [no. 893a], with VII, 56, and suppl., 59). Marsden also discusses the shreds of evidence for Old Latin influence at Canterbury, suspecting the impact of liturgical intermediaries in the few cases in which ante-Hieronymian readings seem to have impinged on the seemingly reliable (if pre-Amiatinus) Vulgate text known to Theodore and Hadrian.

The exciting preliminary results on display in Marsden's study should encourage more work on early Old Testament texts known at Canterbury. Some limitations of the present study are its exclusive reliance on the Bischoff–Lapidge text of PentI, which, as noted in last year's column (*OEN* 29.2 [1996], 76), was reconstructed by Bischoff from a series of excerpts in the Milan witness. Two fragmentary batches of Milan glosses treating the Pentateuch (among other unprinted Old Testament material) are left out of Marsden's account, and there is no consideration of the printed Old Testament glosses preserved among glossaries of the Leiden family (where Theodore is mentioned by name) or the unprinted Leiden-family glosses on the Pentateuch (and other Old Testament books) in BN lat. 2685 (northeast Francia [Pheifer], i.e., in the area of modern Belgium or Holland [Lapidge], s. ix 2), fols. 47r–56r.

A later essay in *Archbishop Theodore*, by J.D. Pheifer (see notice below under "Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters"), does benefit from its author's control of nearly the full range of glossary materials bearing on the situation at Canterbury. Pheifer's detailed and fairly technical survey has a number of features that may be of interest to Anglo-Latin specialists: a valuable reference to an edited, if unpublished, text of the Leiden-family glossary in BN lat. 2685 just noted (H. Schreiber, "Die Glossen des Codex Parisinus 2685 und ihre Verwandten," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Jena, 1961, with an edition of the glosses at pp. 119–46); extensive citations of unpublished Milan glosses; and useful model references to the so-called First Erfurt Glossary and the Épinial Glossary (Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, Amplonianus F. 42 [?Cologne, s. ix 1], 1ra–14va, and Épinial, Bibliothèque Municipale, 72 (7) [cf. Lowe and Ker], 94ra–107vc [English center, i.e., in ?Northumbria, s. vii ex. (Pheifer) or s. viii 1 (Lowe); later provenance Moyennoutier]; *CLA* VI, 18 [no. 760], with VI, 44, and suppl., 57). Finally, a brief article in the same collection by Patrick McGurk addresses the textual affinities of the

gospel series edited in *Biblical Commentaries* (see citation above). Confirming Richard Marsden's impression that the Canterbury scholars most often had recourse to Vulgate biblical texts, not Old Latin texts, McGurk provides a plausible rationale for the selection of glosses in this series (citing their common emphasis on monetary issues and trade), and he adduces evidence for the possible influence at Canterbury of the "Monarchian" prologues to the Vulgate gospels. On the whole, McGurk finds that the Canterbury *lemmata* "disagree least often" with the readings preserved in two continental manuscripts:

(1) CCCC 286 (Italy, s. vi; provenance in England by s. vii/viii, and at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, by s. xi; "Gospels of St. Augustine" [cf. next item]; siglum X; *CLA* II², 4 [no. 126], with II², 46, and suppl., 45);

(2) Oxford, Bodleian Library [hereafter OB], Auctarium D. 2. 14 (SC 2698) (?Italy [Lowe], s. vi/vii [McGurk] or s. vii [Lowe and Gneuss]; provenance in England before c. 800, and at ?Lichfield or ?Bury St. Edmunds before c. 1100 [Lowe]; "Codex Oxoniensis"; "Gospels of St. Augustine" [cf. preceding item]; siglum O; *CLA* II², 31 [no. 230], with II², 51, and suppl., 48).

Peter Dronke ("Two Versions of an Insular Latin Lyrical Dispute," *Filologia mediolatina* 2 [1995], 109–25) addresses the significance of a recently discovered poetical cognate of the lyric "Ad deum meum convertere volo." The latter embodies an engaging poetic dialogue between husband and wife that is thematically concerned with divorce, a lyric whose characteristically insular rhythmic lines may mark it as a seventh-century composition of Irish or English origin (see *ICL*, p. 8 [no. 165]). The verse just mentioned was scrutinized closely ten years ago by Michael Lapidge (for notices in *OEN*, see Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1985, with *YWOES* = *OEN* 20.1 [1986], 105), whose analysis prompted a quick response by Dronke (" 'Ad deum meum convertere volo' and Early Irish Evidence for Lyrical Dialogues," *CMCS* 12 [Winter 1986], 23–32—new to *OEN*). The text of the recently recognized cognate dialogue ("Audite versum dignum") was first printed in 1989, in a near-diplomatic transcript which Gabriel Silagi and Bernhard Bischoff included with their study "Scheidung auf Galiläisch," in *Tradition und Wertung: Festschrift für Franz Brunhölzl zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Günter Bernt, Fidel Rädle, and Silagi [Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1989], pp. 47–57 with 2 plates (also new to *OEN*). This unstudied composition had been previously listed in the 1977 *ICL* repertory (p. 65 [no. 1362]) on the basis of a prepublication report by Bischoff. Dronke here establishes a punctuated and otherwise lightly edited text of "Audite versum dignum," seconding the proposal of Silagi and Bischoff that the verse at issue should be included in any addition to the sixth volume of *MGH PLAC*—a series that has been left open since the appearance of Karl Strecker's 1951 supplement (as vol. VI.i). Silagi and Bischoff saw this lyric as a corrupt version of a lost, elaborately abecedarian poem that is also imperfectly witnessed by the previously known rhythmical dialogue. Dronke, however, is

adamant in defending the artistic integrity of "Ad deum meum convertere volo," which he characterizes as a secular treatment of the theme of a husband (anonymous in this lyric) leaving his wife to undertake a religious profession. He sees this scenario of divorce as a medieval commonplace that has been cast in a different form in the newly printed dialogue, where an evocation of the sacred history of St. Peter adverts to the tradition that the apostle abandoned his wife in following Christ. Dronke cites a striking parallel to this Petrine tradition in the pseudo-Isidorian *Liber de ortu et obitu patriarcharum et apostolorum*, evidently a later eighth-century work of an Irish *peregrinus* (see Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 209 [no. 780]), but he does not explicitly address the milieu of the cognate lyric or revisit his earlier investigation of the origin of its ostensibly seventh-century congener, whether Celtic or Anglo-Saxon. Dronke takes issue with many aspects of the textual criticism on display in the cited article by Silagi and Bischoff, who grafted verse from "Ad deum meum convertere volo" onto the dialogue between St. Peter and his unnamed wife in an attempt to reconstruct their hypothetical lost, original version of the lyric. Dronke closes this study by expressing his hope that the editors' conflated text "has—like Hamlet's Ghost . . . —made its last appearance on the stage."

A recent study by D. Patricia Wallace addresses the epistolography of the women who corresponded with the Anglo-Saxon émigré Boniface, arguing that these early medieval *litteratae* "manipulated conventions" of letter-writing "in ways that marked their literary relationship to men" ("Feminine Rhetoric and the Epistolary Tradition: the Boniface Correspondence," *Women's Stud.* 24 [1994–5], 229–46). Noting Tangl's thesis that the third stage in the codification of the Boniface correspondence, undertaken by Hrabanus Maurus, was mainly concerned with presenting a collection of formulaary or "model" letters, Wallace provides detailed analyses of the epistolary formulae, *topoi*, and imagery of her subjects' epistolography, offering comparisons with Old English verse (such as the *planctus* of the *Wife's Lament* and the *Wanderer*) throughout her study. Discussing the nature of friendship, especially friendship between women and men in Anglo-Saxon England, Wallace notes that Ecgburg, a princess of the Hwicce, refers explicitly to Boniface's *masculus sexus* and calls herself the least of his male or female pupils (*ultima discipulorum seu discipularum tuarum*). Wallace offers an in-depth analysis of the epistolography of Berhtgyth, whose "mother had been one of the Anglo-Saxon women selected to teach in Thuringia," noting that "because of its repetitiveness, Berhtgyth's self-deprecation seems to exceed" the conventional requirements of modesty-*topoi*. I would note that with the appearance of a greatly expanded revision of the *Université du Québec Clavis Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum*, ed. Rodrigue LaRue, 2nd ed., 10 vols. (Trois-Rivières, Quebec, 1996), and Sharpe's 1997 *Handlist*, all of the women contributing to the Boniface correspondence (and some contemporary *litteratae*) now seem to have entered the canon of early medieval Latin writers: for Bugga, Burginda, Eangyth,

Ecgburg, Hygeburg, and Leofgyth, e.g., see Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 80, 105–6, 142, and 365 (nos. 172–3, 248, 252, 536, and 1016).

Although his central subject matter is essentially beyond the purview of *YWOES*, Michael Herren issued a noteworthy Celtic Latin study during 1995 ("Virgil the Grammarian: a Spanish Jew in Ireland?," *Peritia* 9 [1995], 51–71). Herren's article will bring readers of this column up to speed in following the course of the most recent scholarship on the *œuvre* of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus (fl. 650). This Virgil is the obscure grammarian (and grammatical parodist) who advocated inscrutable techniques of word- and sound-mutilation (*scinderatio fonorum*) that he claimed to have learned during study with the otherwise unknown Galbungus, among other masters. Herren's main purpose here is to challenge Bernhard Bischoff's thesis that Virgil was a Spanish Jew, fluent in Hebrew, who was educated on the Continent before emigrating to Ireland. Herren sets out the full dossier of evidence to support the view that Virgil (for OIr *Fergal*?) was Irish by birth and that his basic training and early audience should be situated in Ireland, while acknowledging that he probably "spent some time on the continent or otherwise had contact with continentals" later in life. But Herren notes that "Virgil's early tradition is . . . generally Insular . . . into the eighth century," citing "the almost certain use of Virgil by Aldhelm" and "unambiguous citations in Boniface and Bede."

A recent insular Latin study by David R. Howlett, the first of a half-dozen by this author to receive notice in the present section of the 1995 *YWOES*, champions the spelling *idama*, as against *iduma*, as the earliest documented form of a recherché term (and ostensible hebraism) meaning "hand," noting that "[a]ll four of the early manuscripts [of Hiberno-Latin *Altus prosator*] read not *iduma* but *idama*, a spelling which correctly represents . . . the vowel *a* . . . [of] the dual form of [Hebrew] *yad* 'hand' [i.e., *yadaim*]" ("Insular Latin *idama*, *iduma*," *Peritia* 9 [1995], 72–80). Howlett's commentary—which includes some detailed analyses of dating problems, stress systems in rhythmic verse, biblical and patristic borrowings, and palaeographical evidence for the use of insular exemplars—mainly addresses Celtic Latin compositions dated to the seventh century. In the course of his discussion, Howlett offers remarks on the earlier, British Latin prose of Gildas; difficult terms in the vocabulary of Aldhelm; several Latin–Old English glossaries; and Anglo-Latin and Old English texts in charters of the tenth and (possibly) eleventh centuries. It should be noted that the spelling championed by Howlett in a Hiberno-Latin context has had no effect on the relevant entry in his own recently completed inaugural volume of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*—vol. 1, ed. R. E. Latham and Howlett (1975–97) [hereafter *DMLBS*]—where the establishment of the headword *iduma* (at I, 1202) might appear to exemplify the limited authority accorded Celtic Latin sources in that work, also recently noted by Donald A. Bullough (as cited below, under "Alcuin"). This may arise largely of necessity, given the mandate of the

forthcoming, Dublin-based *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources*.

b. Aldhelm

IN A 1994 ARTICLE not yet reviewed in *YWOES* ("Aldhelm and Irish Learning," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (*Bulletin du Cange*) 52 [1994], 37–75), Howlett offers detailed analyses of five items of Aldhelmian interest: two letters written by Aldhelm (*Epp.* III and V, to Wihtfrith and Heahfrith respectively); two letters by others addressed to Aldhelm (*Epistolae* VI and IX in the Aldhelmian corpus, the latter from the Irish monk Cellán of Péronne [ob. 706] and the former from a correspondent, now anonymous, who addresses Aldhelm rhetorically in language appropriate to a pupil's solicitation of a teacher and thus has been identified, in this article as elsewhere, as "a student"); and a fifth letter, addressed to one Feradach by the shadowy Irish "textual critic" Colmán (for the phrase, see Sharpe, *Handlist*, p. 89 [no. 198]), a letter whose format and content lead Howlett to suspect that "Colmán had read Aldhelm's letters to Acircius [conventionally identified as Aldfrith, king of Northumbria (685–705)] and Heahfrith." (This observation might conceivably assist in the establishment of the chronology of Colmán's career, which at present has been dated no more closely than to c. 600–900.) Howlett's analyses pay close attention to the accentual patterns, alliteration, rhyme, and other formal features of these letters. The typographically enhanced texts which Howlett establishes here and elsewhere in his recent work, in my view, largely succeed in reanimating the pulseless impression of early medieval Latin prose conveyed by modern printed texts.

Howlett's commentary includes some noteworthy textual criticism as well. In the letter to Heahfrith, he would emend Ehwald's reading *Ehfrido* to *Heahfrido* (following a text in BL Cotton Domitian ix, fols. 2–7 [?Christ Church, Canterbury, s. xi 1]), noting also that a corroborative reading, *Haehfrido* (in BL Royal 6. A. vi [?Christ Church, Canterbury, s. x ex.]), is mangled in Ehwald's apparatus. Howlett (in the light of some recent work by Michael Herren) maintains that the adjective *digna*, which begins Ehwald's text of the poetical *tour de force* that serves as a postscript to Aldhelm's *epistola*, might be regarded better as the last word of the prose of the letter itself. This would allow the first two lines of the closing verse to be recited as heptasyllables, thus exhibiting a form reminiscent of Hiberno-Latin rhythmic verse and enhancing the sly denigration of the learning of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus that Howlett detects in their diction. (Elsewhere, Aldhelm might be seen to challenge the prominence of the hebraizing Virgilius with his own etymological interpretation of Solomon as *pacificus*.) Howlett's remarks on meter also indicate that the last two lines of the poetical postscript show Aldhelm composing at least one elegiac couplet beyond the seventeen recently identified by Lapidge and Andy Orchard (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 78). Five pages of the present article are given over to a rendition of the text of the letter to Heahfrith *per cola et commata*, in which Howlett reproduces features of the cited

Royal and Cotton manuscripts as well as those in OB Digby 146 (SC 1747) (s. x ex., provenance Abingdon). Howlett concludes that in this letter Aldhelm "claims not only equality with but superiority over an Irish Latin tradition already more than a century old."

Howlett bolsters this conclusion in his analysis of the letter to Wihthfrith, an English student whom Aldhelm knows is about to leave for Ireland, where Aldhelm's comments (in Howlett's view) seem to suggest that "the corrupting influence of pagan literature and the sexual licence of the Irish show Ireland to be a dangerous and seductive place for young Englishmen." The letter from Cellán, Howlett feels, may reflect an Irish author's attempt to get his own back in the face of Aldhelm's various criticisms. (Herren also has posited previously at least one "gibe" directed at Aldhelm in Cellán's letter.) Howlett detects coarse challenges to Aldhelm's masculinity in references to his enrichment "by studies appropriate to female readers (*lectricibus studiis*)" and other comments, and he suggests that Aldhelm perceived the import of these taunts and thus chose to describe himself ironically in a response to Cellán (his *Epistola X*) as *tantillus homunculus* ("such a very little manlet"). He sees the whole exchange as "the record of a witty needle-match" between English and Irish scholars, and goes on to suggest that the Hiberno-Latin *Hisperica famina* may even have been composed in the circle of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus as a response to Aldhelm's attacks.

In addressing the eternally problematic question of the nationality of the anonymous correspondent who praises Aldhelm's skills as a teacher educated "a quodam sancto viro de nostro genere" ("... by a certain holy man of our race")—a correspondent who seems to number himself among the ranks of foreign travelers (*peregrini*)—Howlett does not commit himself absolutely to the view that the letter-writer is an individual of Irish extraction (*Scottus*). Howlett (following Herren) translates a phrase that has been supplied or altered in the salutation of the transmitted text of the letter, *Scottus ignoti nominis*, as "a person of unknown name." He remarks, however, that "it is difficult to imagine that an Italian or Greek [correspondent, who had just mentioned Aldhelm's teacher Hadrian—or, Howlett seems to imply, Theodore] would praise an Anglo-Saxon for journeying to Rome... [and so] many have inferred that the writer of this letter was an Irish student," later concluding that the "composition reads like a straightforward request from an Irish student." Having recently revived the suggestion (previously raised by Lapidge and others; see below) that the *peregrinus* may have been "a fellow-exile of Hadrian or Theodore" (*OEN* 29.2 [1996], 84), I should acknowledge that Howlett's exposition of the letter here does indicate clearly that wherever the correspondent was resident at the time of writing, it was not in Rome or at any Mediterranean center. The correspondent asks to consult a single book owned by Aldhelm for a period of no more than two weeks ("... qui non est maior acceptorio duarum septimanarum") and proposes to obtain a messenger and

horses (*ministerium . . . equosque*) to facilitate the consultation. Clearly, we must imagine a student of some means, even if no sea-journey is mentioned, and it is not made clear whether the correspondent wishes to stay with Aldhelm or to have the book fetched and brought to him.

A suggestion in the 1979 Lapidge and Herren translation *Aldhelm: the Prose Works*, drawing on earlier scholarship by A. S. Cook and R. L. Poole, considered that the "remark that Aldhelm had been to Rome may possibly suggest that [the correspondent] . . . was Italian; the 'man of our race' would then presumably be Hadrian, who was African in origin, but who lived most of his life in Italy." The suggestion is elaborated later in the same volume, where it is remarked that "[i]t seems far less likely that an Italian would journey the great distance to England to improve his Latinity than that an Irishman would cross the channel, or—in the more plausible case—come to Malmesbury from some Irish settlement in England or Scotland . . . [I]n any case, our author is not writing from his home country," and, moreover, "[w]e hear nothing of Italians (or Africans) studying in England in this period." The recent research of Hohler, however, as summarized above, indicates that Hadrian (almost certainly) and Theodore (quite possibly) personally escorted various compatriots as *peregrini* in their removal to England, and both men may have been followed by others. Would an Irish student who numbered his intellect among the "minds of foreign travelers (*peregrinorum mentes*)" have regarded himself as a *peregrinus* on a scale comparable to an Anglo-Saxon visiting Rome if he were resident in a Celtic region of the British Isles, or even in England? The writer's high praise of Aldhelm's native ability (*ingenium*) as commensurate to his expertise in matters of Greek and Roman learning would then stand apart from all of the other the Irish dispatches considered here by Howlett. On balance, it does seem possible that the letter-writer was a foreign ecclesiastic from a Mediterranean region who was resident in England—say, at Canterbury or an associated center, after the departure of Aldhelm and after the death of Theodore—who wished to consult one of the rare texts obtained by Aldhelm during his studies at Canterbury. If so, the phrase *etiam Graecorum more* ("... even in the Greek fashion") and perhaps also the inscrutable phrase *turbulentus magister* might have a poignant resonance with respect to Hadrian, who was presumably still installed at the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul. (See further Stevenson, "Theodore and the *Laterculus*," as cited in "Early Anglo-Latin," at pp. 211–13.)

The recent research on the Boniface correspondence carried out by Wallace, however, as summarized above, might tend to support the views of Howlett and others crediting the possibility of Aldhelm's tutelage under an Irish master. Wallace, as noted, addressed Tangl's conclusion that certain items in Vienna 751 have been revised to create a series of formulary (or "model") letters. On this assumption, it seems possible that the following phrases were all inserted by a single reviser: *Scottus ignoti nominis*, which perhaps should be taken to mean

"an Irishman whose name is not widely recognized" (rather than ". . . is not known"); the allusion to the "certain holy man" (*quidam sanctus vir*) who taught Aldhelm, which now presumably obscures a proper name that was once spelled out in full in a lost exemplar; and the reference to the "certain book" (*libellus quidam*) which the correspondent wishes to read, presumably replacing the name of a specific text. (It would make little sense to propose an elaborate mission to consult a small book without naming that book.) It would then equally be clear that the reviser who made these changes thought (or wished his readers to think) that the name of Aldhelm's correspondent and the nationality of Aldhelm's teacher were both Irish. It is not clear where such an hypothesis, if accepted, would leave the word-count which appears in Howlett's microscopic analysis of the text of *Epistola VI*.

Apparently without recourse to recent studies of Aldhelm's poetry by Neil Wright and Andy Orchard (see *OEN* 19.2 [1986], 50; 20.1 [1986], 103–4; and 29.2 [1996], 77–85), Francisca Del Mar Plaza Picón issued a 1995 paper discussing some aspects of Aldhelm's metrical writings ("Algunas consideraciones sobre el tratado métrico de Aldhelmo," in *Actas I Congreso nacional de latín medieval (León, 1–4 diciembre de 1993)*, ed. Maurilio Pérez González [León: Universidad de León, Secretariado de publicaciones, 1995], pp. 611–17). The essay includes a summary of the treatises *De metris* and *De pedum regulis*, which Aldhelm conjoined with his poetical *Enigmata*. Del Mar Plaza Picón also offers specific comments on topics relating to elision (such as *sinalphá* and *ecthlypsis*); the handling of *caesurae*; and Aldhelm's varying debts to Donatus, Sergius, and Pompeius.

c. Bede

IN AN EXPANSIVE and admirably informative 1994 Jarrow Lecture, issued as a perfect-bound monograph in its printed form, Éamonn Ó Carragáin assesses the influence of the city of Rome and its traditions on Bede's Northumbria—and on the Anglo-Saxon world generally—in the second half of the seventh century and the first half of the eighth (*The City of Rome and the World of Bede*, Jarrow Lecture 1994 [Newcastle upon Tyne: n.p., 1995]). The subject of English–Roman contacts in the early Middle Ages naturally raises questions about Anglo-Saxon attitudes toward pilgrimage, and Ó Carragáin notes that Bede's verdict on the subject is mixed. The active life of travelers such as Ceolfrith (*ob.* 716), abbot of Wearmouth–Jarrow, allowed other residents of Bede's community to enjoy their contemplation. Bede has high praise for pilgrims who bring back books, relics, papal documents, and sacred art—or escort skilled emigrants to England, including architects, glass artisans, and chant-masters—but he heaps scorn on tourists who derive little spiritual profit from the journey and return empty-handed (*Homilia I.xiii* [CCSL 122, 93]). Among the pilgrims whose efforts Bede appreciates most highly, no known visitor to Rome was more prolific in the importation of religious resources than Benedict Biscop (*ob.* 690), whose full career is reviewed here by Ó Carragáin.

Biscop, at an age of about 25 years, departed with Wilfrid on the first recorded devotional pilgrimage to Rome conducted by an Anglo-Saxon party (c. 653–4), when neither man had yet made a religious profession and Wilfrid was probably still a teenager. (The pair separated on the road.) About fifteen years later, Biscop would personally accompany Theodore and Hadrian when they left Italy for England on 27 May 668.

Ó Carragáin's lecture is in large measure concerned with the importation of liturgical resources to England from Rome in the earliest centuries of the Anglo-Saxon church. Some especially engaging comments draw attention to the probable incorporation of entries from what is known as a Roman station list into an archetype of the early Northumbrian lectionary system, which may be dated to the period of Biscop's early journeys (c. 650) and, Ó Carragáin believes, almost certainly involved documents that were in use at Wearmouth–Jarrow. In the system known as the Roman station liturgy, the pope customarily celebrated mass away from the Lateran, at another basilica (or "station") in Rome, on about 160 days of the year. By recalling details of the pope's station circuit in liturgical readings, participants in the Anglo-Saxon liturgy who had never visited Rome might gain a sense of the topography of the city. In the words of Ó Carragáin, the station system "implied that the city was a microcosm of a church," and this concept may have been reinforced in English sanctuaries by the placement of altars. (In support of this last point, Ó Carragáin cites an Anglo-Latin inscription on a cross-slab, as edited recently by Rosemary Cramp.)

Ó Carragáin notes that the archetype of the early Northumbrian lectionary system—limited mainly to New Testament readings—may be recovered in part from reflexes preserved among an important group of gospel manuscripts. Ó Carragáin's useful review of the resources in question, whose identities are notoriously hard to establish on the basis of entries in standard catalogues, may be summarized (and extended slightly) as follows:

(1) A manuscript whose four lists of gospel lections, based on a model purportedly imported from Naples or Lucullanum (by s. vii 2 [i.e., ? 668 × 678]; "comes of Naples") are treated at *CLLA*², p. 229 (no. 405), i.e., the present BL Cotton Nero D. iv (Lindisfarne, s. vii/viii [i.e., c. 700]; provenances at Chester-le-Street by s. x ex. [i.e., c. 883 × c. 995] and at Durham and perhaps Ripon [Lowe] by s. xii [Ker]; "Lindisfarne Gospels," "St. Cuthbert Gospels," or "Book of Durham"; siglum Y; *CLA* II², 20 [no. 187], with II², 49, and suppl., 47);

(2) a direct or closely related copy of texts in the preceding item, whose gospel list is treated at *CLLA*², p. 229 (no. 406), now in BL Royal 1. B. vii (?Northumbrian center, s. viii 1; provenance ?Christ Church, Canterbury; "Codex Regius"; *CLA* II², 27 [no. 213], with II², 50, and suppl., 47);

(3) a later witness to texts in the first item, now in Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 41 (s. x), noted in Cyrille Vogel's *Medieval Liturgy*, tr. and rev. Storey and Rasmussen (1986), p. 337;

(4) various liturgically predicated marginal notes and marks observed throughout the codicologically (mainly) integral but palaeographically diverse copy of the gospels—breaking down by main hands into three sections comprising (a) fols. 1–23, 34–86, and 102; (b) fols. 24–33 and 87–101; and (c) fols. 103–134—in Durham, Cathedral Library, A. II. 16 + Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 2981 (18) [single *membrum disiectum*] (Northumbrian center, s. viii; provenance at Durham by s. xiv [Lowe]; *CLA* II², 9–10 [nos. 148a–c], with II², 47, and suppl., 46; see next item for *CLLA*²);

(5) various lectionary marks in Durham A. II. 17, fols. 103–11 (Wearmouth–Jarrow, s. vii/viii [i.e., 690 × 716]; provenance at Chester-le-Street by s. x, and later Durham; *CLA* II², 10 [no. 150], with II², 47, and suppl., 46), all of whose reputedly Gallican lectionary annotations (s. viii–ix [Gamber and Vogel])—along with those of the preceding item (Durham A. II. 16)—are treated briefly at *CLLA*², pp. 177–8, at 178 (no. 260e); and

(6) liturgical instructions in the original gospel leaves of a book elsewhere augmented (at fols. 1–9, 10–21, and 95–6) by the addition of canons and prologues on restoration leaves, i.e., the present Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 68, fols. 22–94 and 97–170 (Italian [?Campanian] center, s. vi; “Burchard Gospels”; provenances at Northumbrian center by s. vii/viii [i.e., c. 700]), and Sankt Kilian at Würzburg by s. viii med.; *CLA* IX, 52 [no. 1423a], with IX, 69, and suppl., 65), whose lectionary annotations (Northumbrian center, s. vii/viii, purportedly based on a Roman model dated to s. vi/vii) are treated at *CLLA*², pp. 230 (no. 407).

In particular, Ó Carragáin stresses the fact that the lectionary annotations in Würzburg M. p. th. f. 68, fols. 22–94 and 97–170, also allow the reconstruction of the early Northumbrian lections and stations for Holy Week. The Würzburg provenance of that gospelbook (attributed to its importation from England by Burchard, bishop of Würzburg [sitting 741/2–53]), he adds, might also put us in mind of the earliest surviving comprehensive list of Roman lections (gospels and epistles), accompanied by a treatment of station churches, which has been copied out in an Anglo-Saxon script datable to the first half of the eighth century or slightly later. This occurs in Würzburg M. p. th. f. 62 (English center [or English *peregrinus* on Continent: Lowe], s. viii 1 or s. viii med.; later provenance Würzburg; “comes of Würzburg”; *CLA* IX, 50 [no. 1417], with IX, 68, and suppl., 65), whose intriguing lists of readings, which have most commonly been identified as summaries of mass lections—but which arguably derive from an idiosyncratic (or badly attested) group of office lections or other *lectio continua* readings—are treated at *CLLA*², pp. 431–2 (no. 1001: “epistles”) and 447–9 (no. 1101: “gospels”). I would note further that these lists (ed. G. Morin in *RB* 17 [1910], 41–74) may provide one of the earliest witnesses to Old Testament lectionary practice in Anglo-Saxon England, and that nearly every entry which includes an *incipit* and an *explicit* appears to go back to a collection of lectionary texts set out *in extenso*, thus perhaps

deserving further scrutiny with an eye on the early text of the Vulgate.

Most of the comments which Ó Carragáin includes regarding the lections associated with the stationary liturgy also involve gospel readings, and in this connection he submits valuable observations concerning the manner of the placement of gospelbooks on altars in different liturgical ceremonies discussed by Bede, such as the “opening of the ears” (*apertio aurium*), and on the ambulatory carrying of the gospel codex in the stationary liturgy at Rome, a duty performed by Wilfrid’s close friend in the city, the archdeacon Boniface (Stephen of Ripon, *Vita S. Wilfridi* v and LIII)—conceivably connected with a leaden seal from Whitby inscribed *bonifatii archidiacon[oni]*. Ó Carragáin’s discussion of ceremonies of the mass takes full note of the Roman *ordines* and other related texts that have been edited to date, noting that “stage-directions and *ordines*, when written down at all, were recorded only in relatively unorganised, informal collections” and stressing the importance of “the personal experience of the cleric who had ‘been there’ (at Rome, some other cathedral city, or some great monastery).” Ó Carragáin also notes a series of related codicological developments in Rome c. 650–700, when “liturgical texts, previously transmitted in informal collections (*libelli*), began to be recorded in organised manuscripts: gospel lectionaries, epistle lectionaries, antiphonaries, sacramentaries,” citing a recent study by Antoine Chavasse (“Évangélaire, épistolier, antiphonaire et sacramentaire: les livres romains de la messe aux VII^e et VIII^e siècles,” *Ecclesia Orans* 6 [1989], 177–225, repr. in his *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^e au VIII^e siècle* [1993], 153–229). In this connection, Ó Carragáin also cites a recent critical and synoptic work by Chavasse (*Les lectionnaires romains de la messe au VII^e et au VIII^e siècle*, 2 vols. [1993]) and an English translation of the so-called first Roman *ordo* (*Ordo Romanus primus*, ed. and tr. Edward G. C. F. Atchley [1905]).

In his comments on Anglo-Saxon monasticism, Ó Carragáin offers the striking observation that “the veneration which Anglo-Saxons had for St. Benedict and his Rule (a veneration much earlier and stronger than was felt by any communities of monks in Rome itself) was inspired less by the inherent qualities of the Rule than by the praise of St. Benedict in [the *Dialogi* of Gregory I] . . . and by their sense that, of all the authors of monastic rules, Benedict was most closely associated with Rome and the Papacy,” contrasting early English practice with that of “the conservative Roman monasteries, who did not begin to adopt [Benedict’s *Regula*] . . . until the tenth century.” Ó Carragáin substantiates this view of early Anglo-Saxon Benedictinism by reference to recent research on Northumbrian monasticism by Klaus Zelzer (see *OEN* 24.2 [1991], 43 and 50). Remarking on Wilfrid’s memorization of the Roman psalter, Ó Carragáin notes that this course of study would have introduced the English ecclesiastic to a seventh-century system in which “the psalms were still sung solo at the [m]onastic office. Individual monks in turn, in order of seniority, chanted the psalms from memory, while

the brethren ruminated in silence on the text of the psalm being sung. Psalm singing was a service rendered by an individual singer to his community; the community responded by communally singing the antiphons before and after the psalms." (Ó Carragáin here cites two important articles by Joseph Dyer: "The Singing of Psalms in the Early-Medieval Office," *Speculum* 64 [1988], 535–78, and "Monastic Psalmody of the Middle Ages," *RB* 99 [1989], 41–74.) Subsequently, Ó Carragáin envisages a scenario at Wearmouth–Jarrow in which "monastic school-work was necessary for, directed towards, and completed by, the correct performance of the canonical hours."

The treatment of monastic psalmody here includes a fine, detailed analysis of the psalms and antiphons whose texts are cited in the scene (in *Vita S. Ceolfriþi xxv–xxvi*) depicting Ceolfriþ's final departure, with the Codex Amiatinus packed as a gift, on the journey to Rome that sadly would see him die en route to the holy city. Regarding sources for the biography of Ceolfriþ, Ó Carragáin cites arguments to show that the *Vita S. Ceolfriþi* (which I have not found in Sharpe's *Handlist*) was not written by Ceolfriþ's successor Hwætberht (*ob.* 744), but rather is an early work of Bede himself; he also cites a recently reprinted English translation of this work, *The Life of Ceolfrið, Abbot of the Monastery at Wearmouth and Jarrow*, tr. Douglas Samuel Boutflower (Sunderland: Hills, 1912; repr. Lampeter: Llanerch Press, 1991).

In a discussion raising issues relating both to the mass and to the Divine Office, Ó Carragáin considers four new feasts introduced in Rome c. 650–80 (commemorating Christ's Coming into His Temple; the Annunciation of the Lord; the Dormition of the Virgin Mary; and the Nativity of the Virgin). He suggests that John the Archcantor may have introduced some of the new customs when he visited Wearmouth in 679, further addressing some specific Anglo-Saxon responses to problems posed by several aspects of these new feasts. Ó Carragáin also notes in passing that Bede continued to respect the liturgical tradition of celebrating the Annunciation at the spring equinox of the Julian calendar (25 March) even though he had concluded in the course of his own chronological inquiries that the equinox actually fell on 21 March. Roman influence also affected Northumbrian cults of the Cross and saints' relics during this period. Providing a full bibliographical treatment of a recent architectural debate, Ó Carragáin suggests that Wilfrid's recollections of his first trip to Rome may have inspired him personally to introduce the use of a special type of crypt to house saintly relics in two Anglo-Saxon churches (St. Peter's at Ripon and St. Andrew's at Hexham). Wilfrid quite possibly had been influenced by the construction of a similar oratory at St. Peter's in the Vatican. Ó Carragáin also includes comments on the debts of Anglo-Saxon liturgical practices to texts in the "old Gelasian Sacramentary" and also "in 'Gelasians of the eighth century' dependent on Paduense-type Gregorian sacramentaries which must have left Rome before the [papacy] . . . of Gregory II (715–31)." Drawing on some of the most important gleanings

of his years of work on the unevenly attested "Old English Crucifixion Poem" (now known from the Ruthwell Cross inscription, the Vercelli Book *Dream of the Rood*, and some minor witnesses), Ó Carragáin reviews the efforts of Pope Sergius I (687–701) to promote the cult of the Cross. He relates these papal reforms to surviving witnesses to the Crucifixion Poem, perhaps "the earliest important poem in the English language of which a text survives," whose composition is dated here to the late seventh century. In the course of Ó Carragáin's detailed explication of the early context of the Crucifixion Poem—which includes citations of recent scholarship, including some monographs on the *inventio Crucis* legend—he considers "whether perhaps one of the functions of the Ruthwell Cross was to provide an epitome of central yearly events in the community's liturgical life . . . so that members of a small isolated monastery would always be reminded, as long as they lived under its protecting shadow, that physical pilgrimage was unnecessary," a conjecture which neatly relates his inquiry to the previously treated topic of travel to Rome.

As his discussion of vernacular poetry in the context of Latin-based liturgical culture may suggest, Ó Carragáin does not hesitate to confront difficult questions bearing on the interpenetration of oral and written traditions, or on the coexistence of Old English and Anglo-Latin texts. In his discussion of the Ruthwell Cross inscription, for example, he lays admirable stress on the neglected Anglo-Latin elements in the text. He also cites a recent argument by Elisabeth Okasha that Bede distinguished between "Latin, the written language, and the vernaculars, the spoken tongues" (in her essay "Vernacular or Latin?," in *Epigraphik 1988*, ed. Walter Koch [1990], pp. 139–47). In this connection, Ó Carragáin further cites recent work by Janet Coleman and Mary J. Carruthers, as well as studies collected in the volume *Memoira: der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (1984). In connection with oral tradition in the transmission of scripture, he cites William A. Graham's monograph *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (1987). He also addresses "the role of memory in the transmission of early medieval chant," citing recent work by Michel Huglo (*Les livres de chant liturgique* [1988]) and K. Levy ("On Gregorian Orality," *Jnl of the Amer. Musicological Soc.* 43 [1990], 185–227). His comments on chant complement some of those offered recently by Christopher Hohler (see above), notably in speculation about how traditions of Greek chant may have carried over into Latin liturgical singing through the mediating efforts of Theodore and Hadrian (here citing L. Brou, "Les chants en langue grec dans les liturgies latines," *Sacris erudiri* 1 [1948], 165–80, with a supplement in *Sacris erudiri* 4 [1952], 226–38). Ó Carragáin's wide-ranging study also includes substantial discussion of controversies involving monotheletism, the dating of Easter, and other regionally divergent practices (whether eastern and western or Celtic and Anglo-Saxon) in the early medieval churches.

Werner Jaeger's 1935 edition of Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti metrica* (and its preface in prose) has long been seen to present one of the best texts ever established for an Anglo-Latin composition in hexameter verse. But, as Michael Lapidge reports in a recent article, the text produced by Karl Strecker's pupil includes one outright typographical error (*penestrasse* at line 796) and, in a trial collation of the full text with the readings of two manuscripts, Lapidge finds that Jaeger's *apparatus criticus* fails to report a total of thirty nonorthographic variants, involving about 1.5% of the total number of lines in the poem ("Prolegomena to an Edition of Bede's Metrical *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*," *Filologia mediolatina* 2 [1995], 127–63; not repr. in Lapidge's recent collection *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* [cited above in "Early Anglo-Latin"]). Furthermore, Jaeger does not normalize the orthography of individual readings to conform to Bede's own guidelines in *De orthographia* (e.g., in printing *conponens* rather than *componens*), although the editor is rather zealous in his normalization of the spelling of personal names to conform to Late West Saxon usage, as against the language of Bede's own eighth-century Northumbrian milieu. Finally, Jaeger's edition overlooks three of the twenty-one manuscripts preserving the poem now known to survive. Jaeger knew of the existence of the copy in Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 24 (1128) (?Rochester or ?Christ Church, Canterbury, s. xi/xii; later provenance Rochester), at 68r–87v, but for some reason failed to consult its witness. Moreover, two texts of the poem are preserved in manuscripts that were unknown to Jaeger: (1) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 1133 (Benediktbeuern, s. xii), at 101r–136v, the discovery of whose copy of Bede's poem was announced recently by F. Stella, "Un inedito sommario biblico in versi: il *De conditione mundi*," *Studi medievali* 32 (1991), 445–69, at 447 (new to *OEN*); and (2) the fragmentary copy, comprising about 175 lines, whose *disiecta membra* now reside in Budapest and Berlin (treated in *CLAXI*, 2 [no. 1589], with XI, 30; refining the entry in Gneuss, "Preliminary List," at 50 [no. 792], Lapidge, following *CLA*, gives the pressmark of the fragment in Berlin's Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz as "Grimm-Nachlass, Konvolut 132, 1").

The last-mentioned, fragmentary copy is also the earliest overall, having been executed in the second half of the eighth century in Phase II Anglo-Saxon set minuscule at an English center on the Continent, most plausibly at Fulda—where a sixteenth-century library catalogue and a report by a correspondent of the early editor Henricus de Hondt ("Canisius"; c. 1531–1610) seem to place an otherwise unidentified copy of the metrical *vita*. The newly discovered Munich witness appears to have no independent value for the establishment of the poem's text, offering a transcript that seems wholly dependent on the one preserved in an earlier, extant Munich manuscript (or an exemplar or a close copy). This Munich text forms part of Jaeger's favored "alpha-group," and the Budapest–Berlin fragments by and large bear out the impression that the alpha-group does preserve a text that is "closer to

what Bede wrote" than is the version now represented by four Canterbury manuscripts exhibiting a group of revised readings apparently introduced by c. 950. Nevertheless, Lapidge brings to light a number of cases in which various manuscripts, including representatives of the Canterbury redaction, preserve readings that are (in some sense) superior to those found among the editor's alpha-group. Some of the judgments offered in this analysis advert to literary criteria, and in most of the arguable cases that involve alternative readings the assumption seems to be that Bede will have been unlikely to have produced anything other than the superior reading—which is certainly reasonable in cases of metrical variation, and perhaps so in cases involving variation in sense as well. There also appears to be an assumption here—again reasonable, but perhaps deserving separate discussion—that after completing his extensive revision of an earlier draft of his metrical *vita* of Cuthbert (see *OEN* 24.2 [1991], 41), Bede issued only a single fair copy of his text, a copy that reflected his intentions in every detail, and he never undertook any subsequent revision of these hexameters. But Lapidge certainly succeeds in identifying some unambiguous failings of Jaeger's alpha-group, including a serious textual loss by eye-skip and an error caused by the misconstruing of an open-topped *a* in an insular script as an instance of *u*.

Lapidge's study is frequently concerned with the hypothesis, never before adequately substantiated, that Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti metrica* was preserved and transmitted in England over the course of the Scandinavian incursions of the ninth century. Alternatively, it is possible that knowledge of the metrical *vita* had been eradicated in the poet's native land by c. 850, and that all extant English copies of the work reflect the reintroduction of the text to English libraries, drawing on continental survivors, from the time of the late ninth-century Alfredian revival (or subsequent decades). One candidate for the distinction of preserving a text transmitted continuously on English soil is the version represented by manuscripts that Lapidge would assign to a "Durham redaction" (Jaeger's beta-group). Lapidge, however, finds that the evidence here is ultimately inconclusive.

Lapidge's most exciting discovery in this regard involves the cited witness, never collated by Jaeger, now at Trinity College, Cambridge, which Lapidge dates to "the late eleventh or very early twelfth century" (not in Gneuss's "Preliminary List"). Put simply, the Trinity text may document uniquely a hitherto unrecognized, native English textual tradition in the transmission of the *Vita S. Cuthberti metrica*. This tradition, it appears, was affected neither by the interventions of continental copyists nor by the revisions made at Canterbury. Many of the personal names in the Trinity witness, moreover, conform to the conventions of Northumbrian orthography, and there are errors apparently reflecting misconstrued characters and abbreviations in an early exemplar copied out in an Anglo-Saxon script. These may bear witness to the antiquity of some of the readings in the Trinity manuscript, as may the volume's preservation of

the unique complete copy of the eighty-two-hexameter Anglo-Latin poem known as the *Martyrologium poeticum* (JCL, p. 556 [no. 12488]; "Metrical Calendar of York"). The inclusion of this item suggests that its exemplar and, presumably, the exemplar of the accompanying copy of Bede's metrical *vita*, may have been "transmitted directly from York to Kent," the Trinity witness thus preserving an approximation to an early Northumbrian form of Bede's text. Unfortunately, Lapidge notes, this late copy also includes some substantial errors.

Lapidge includes valuable commentary on all of these manuscripts, including supplementary bibliography, wholly superseding the perfunctory discussion of palaeographical and codicological issues in Jaeger's edition. With respect to Jaeger's methodology, Lapidge brings to light a telling case in which the editor stumbled badly because he did not waver in holding to a manuscript-wary, text-centered approach—resembling approaches adopted by many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editors of classical Latin texts, which had exerted an influence on Jaeger's mentor Strecker. Jaeger concluded on purely textual grounds that two very late witnesses containing closely related and yet (in some respects) conspicuously divergent texts had been copied from two separate exemplars. These two exemplars, Jaeger thought, ultimately derived from a single redaction of Bede's poem, but independently they had acquired enough variants along separate lines of transmission to occupy distinct positions in the editor's stemma. In fact, as Lapidge demonstrates, one of the two manuscripts almost certainly preserves a copy made *directly* from the other! Jaeger paid insufficient attention to issues of library-history and codicology, and so he failed to recognize the significance of the two witnesses' common Parisian provenance. As Lapidge notes, "it is virtually impossible that *two* Anglo-Saxon manuscripts [representing distinct branches of a single redaction of Bede's poem] . . . should have been available in Paris in the sixteenth century." If he had looked more closely at some essentially non-textual issues of manuscript transmission, Jaeger would have recognized that one of the two witnesses was copied from the other "by a scholar with enough knowledge of Latin to correct [his exemplar's] . . . eccentric spelling and frequent errors." For *OEN* readers who have occasion to teach methods of textual criticism, this example is one of several in Lapidge's article that might prove useful in a classroom setting.

A pair of articles issued by William D. McCready in 1995 argue for a thorough revision of the received critical opinion that the prolific encyclopaedist and exegete Isidore of Seville, seemingly alone among patristic authorities, incurred Bede's disapproval on a wide scale ("Bede, Isidore, and the *Epistola Cuthberti*," *Traditio* 50 [1995], 75–94, and "Bede and the Isidorian Legacy," *MS* 57 [1995], 41–73). The common view in recent years has been that the English author was alarmed by Isidore's errors and felt duty-bound to correct the Spaniard's information in a number of major and minor points of scientific and doctrinal detail. McCready directly confronts

the most persuasive item of evidence for Bede's distrust of Isidore: the report of Bede's passing by the self-described *condiscipulus* and *collector* Cuthbert, later abbot of Wearmouth–Jarrow (*ob.* after 764), in his *Epistola de obitu Baedae*. This declared eyewitness testimony has encouraged the belief that even when Bede was approaching the point of his death, he was preparing a response to points in Isidore's writings with which he took exception (termed *exceptiones* in the received text of Cuthbert's letter). Countering this view, McCready notes that even without emendation, medieval Latin *exceptio* can convey a sense ("outtake" or "excerpt") close to that of *excerptio*. But, offering a useful update on the state of research on the transmission of Cuthbert's *Epistola*, McCready finds that "the shorter and more authoritative branch" of continental European manuscripts and a wide majority of insular manuscripts "uniformly endorse *excerptiones*" as the actual reading of the Northumbrian author's letter. Regarding Cuthbert's bald assertion that Bede was hoping to correct error (*mendacium*) in Isidorian texts as part of his final literary undertaking, McCready notes that Michael Lapidge has recently demonstrated that at least one notably unreliable set of extracts from Isidore's *Etymologiae* was circulating by c. 700. Bede's goal, most plausibly, was to prepare a more reliable Isidorian epitome than was available in his day.

Most impressively, McCready's new views have earned the endorsement of Paul Meyvaert, who (along with a group of authorities including Charles W. Jones, T. Julian Brown, Pierre Riché, Michael Lapidge, and Roger Ray) had countenanced previously the general notion that Bede distrusted Isidore. In a response transmitted in his capacity as a reader of McCready's *Traditio* paper, Meyvaert indicated that he "would no longer maintain that Bede was hostile towards Isidore," noting that Bede's *Homilia* II.iii (on Matthew: see CCSL 122, 203–4) confirms "the reading *excerptiones* in Cuthbert's text," particularly if it is used "to describe the making of excerpts from known authorities in order to prevent the less learned from falling into error." McCready goes on to bolster his conclusion by offering detailed comments on every passage that has ever been adduced as a major example of Bede's dissent from Isidore's arguments. Addressing some aspects of a recent study by Alessandra Di Pilla (see *OEN* 27.2 [1994], 64), McCready accepts that Bede is silent regarding some details of Isidore's astronomy and tends to defer to Pliny's astronomical writings, along with the *De astronomia* of Hyginus, once they have been abstracted from the "Stoic religious framework" that supports them. But he goes on to show that elsewhere Bede "adopts wholesale Isidore's explanations for a number of natural phenomena." Even if Bede does not reproduce some allegorical interpretations found in Isidore's *De natura rerum*, he does admit similar figural readings elsewhere. His occasional silences thus do not signal any telling point of divergence in the world-views of the two authors. Departures from Isidore's views in Bede's own treatise *De natura rerum*, and in his chronological treatises *De temporibus* and *De temporum ratione*, all are seen by McCready

to involve slight changes of emphasis, augmentation of information, removal of ambiguity, or simplification, as well as some diplomatically conveyed differences of opinion concerning problems that were widely acknowledged to be controversial even in the early Middle Ages. McCready cites numerous points in Bede's *Expositio Actuum apostolorum* at which he cites Isidore uncritically, and the criticism Bede levels at one of the Spanish exegete's views in the *Retractatio in Actus apostolorum* is not specifically directed at Isidore but at Bede's own failure to carry out additional research. *Inter alia*, McCready includes some detailed comments on Bede's handling of information in a *rota* or astronomical diagram in Isidore's *De natura rerum* (cf. *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 108–9, for comments on the earliest post-patristic reflexes of the diagram), and on the supposed reliance of both Aldhelm and Bede on the so-called “middle recension” of Isidore's scientific treatise. In the conclusion to his *Mediaeval Studies* article, McCready states, “Bede certainly did not consider Isidore immune from correction,” but characteristically he “treated Isidore the same way he did his other authorities.”

Neatly complementing Arthur G. Holder's 1994 English-language translation of Bede's *De tabernaculo* (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 98–9), Seán Connolly issued another useful translation a year after Holder in the same series, one which renders the closely related Bedan treatise *De templo* into English for the first time (Bede, *On the Temple*, tr. Connolly, introd. Jennifer O'Reilly, *Translated Texts for Historians* 21 [Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press, 1995]). As is made clear in a valuable introduction to Connolly's translation—by Jennifer O'Reilly, who certainly deserves coauthorial status in full citations of the work—these self-standing commentaries in fact comprise only two out of fully six substantial treatments of sacred architecture by Bede, the other four occurring in the *Commentarius in Ezram et Neemiam*; in *Homilia* II.i (a Lenten sermon on John II.12–22); and in *Homiliae* II.xxiv–xxv (both celebrating the anniversary of the dedication of the church at Jarrow). Just as *De tabernaculo* offered the first western exegesis of Ex. xxiv.12–30, *De templo* embodies the first sustained Latin treatment of the building of Solomon's temple described in III Kings v.1–vii.51, whose narrative Bede explicates in a methodical, verse-by-verse commentary. (For Bede's exegesis of sacred architecture in *De tabernaculo*, see notices of Holder in *OEN* 24.2 [1991], 41–2; 26.2 [1993], 65; and 29.2 [1996], 98–9.)

Attempting to convey a sense of Bede's “architectonic sentence structure,” where exceptionally long sentences may even run across chapter breaks (as in clausulae bridging chs. XIII–XIV and XXIV–XXV), Connolly's translation favors “fidelity over elegance.” One liberty involves his incorporation of individual *capitula* from the chapter-list preceding Bede's commentary into the main body of the work. Connolly gamely tackles the problems of interpretation arising out of uncertainties about the meanings of architectural terms that are rendered variously in the biblical and patristic traditions. The single Latin term *porticus*, for example, can cover the

semantic fields of distinct terms denoting vestibules, gateways, porches, or colonnades in Hebrew and Greek sources, and it is not always easy to determine what Bede had in mind. O'Reilly's introduction presents some engaging parallels with other insular Latin texts, noting that the denunciatory tone of an Old Testament prophet adopted by Bede in *De templo* xviii.16 parallels a specific use of architectural metaphor by Gildas. Although Stephen of Ripon's *Vita S. Wilfridi* invoked “the models of Moses' Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple in the account of the founding of Ripon,” Bede himself is wholly silent regarding the construction work undertaken by Wilfrid, even as he praises the ways in which Wilfrid's collaborating builder Acca “enriched the fabric of the church.” Precluding any possible charge of image-worship (and anticipating a passage cited here from the image-related polemic of the late eighth-century *Libri Carolini*), Bede defends sacred art as “a living writing” for the benefit of those who have not learned to read, noting that “what the Law forbids is not the making of images” but “the idolatrous purposes” to which they may be put. The volume under review profits from all of the following: full discussion (and expansive indices, enhancing the utility of Hurst's CCSL edition) treating biblical and patristic sources—notably Josephus, Gregory I, Jerome, and Isidore; pointers to important interpretations in early exegesis (the outer and inner temple as the Old and New Testaments; apostles, teachers, and saints as pillars of the church; and so on); a detailed, illustrated discussion of a problematic drawing of a tabernacle—with some temple-like features—in the Codex Amiatinus (see above), a drawing which is “cast in the Jewish and Early Christian tradition of architecturally ambiguous images”; textual criticism relating to Hurst's edition; and a full, twelve-page bibliography.

In a study that is mainly concerned with patristic and Celtic Latin issues, Thomas O'Loughlin notes that some misleading remarks in Bede's survey of the sites of the Holy Land, *De locis sanctis*, are largely responsible for the modern impression that an earlier treatise by the Hiberno-Latin author Adomnán (c. 685 [i.e., ? 683 × 686]), known by the same title, rests entirely on an eyewitness report of the traveler Arculf (O'Loughlin, “Dating the *De situ Hierosolymae*: the Insular Evidence,” *RB* 105.1–2 [1995], 9–19). A close reading of Adomnán's own words reveals that he based his work primarily on existing written works, having called on Arculf's witness mainly to resolve ambiguous points and to provide supplementary evidence. This conclusion removes an obstacle to the early dating of an anonymous patristic work of sacred topography, known as *De situ Hierosolymae vel Iudaeae* (CPL³, p. 740 [no. 2326]), written after 419, which displays significant verbal congruence with passages in Adomnán's work but—O'Loughlin argues—need not give the lie to the Hiberno-Latin author's advertence to Arculf's report. Moreover, O'Loughlin calls attention to evidence for the eighth-century Northumbrian circulation of the treatise *De situ Hierosolymae*, which Bede apparently knew independently of Adomnán's *De locis sanctis*. He also announces his forthcoming edition of a

previously unknown version of Adomnán's work, significantly longer than the text established by Geyer in 1898 (and reproduced with a limited number of changes in a 1958 text published by Bieler, subsequently reissued in CCSL 175, 175–234), which "may well have been the original."

Noting that the use of finger gestures as an aid to counting procedures continued even after the invention of writing, often to "bridge language barriers between foreign merchants and their customers," Burma P. Williams and Richard S. Williams print full texts of all known ancient and early medieval references to the use of sign language in the representation of numbers, and the authors provide all of their examples with English translations ("Finger Numbers in the Greco-Roman World and the Early Middle Ages," *Isis* 86 [1995], 587–608). These passages include Bede's *De temporum ratione* 1 (agreeing with earlier authorities in all details except in its treatment of the number six, where Bede agrees with Macrobius) as well as the *Romana computatio* of 688, which Charles W. Jones held "almost certainly existed before Bede and was a source of Bede's knowledge." (For these texts, Anglo-Latin specialists will still wish to consult Jones's *Beda's Pseudepigrapha* [1939], pp. 22–3, 53–4, and 106–8, and the same scholar's *Beda's Opera de Temporibus* [1943], pp. 179–81 and 329–31.) The Williamses also solve a brief riddle that may be traced back at least as far as Symphosius and later crops up in Alcuin's *Disputatio Pippini regis cum Albino*: "Seven from eight equals six" (cf. PL 101, col. 979: ". . . de octonis subito rapuit septem, et remanserunt sex"). According to Bede's scheme, "[t]he number 8 is indicated by lowering the ring finger and the small finger of the left hand; 7 is shown by lowering just the small finger. Raising the small finger to remove '7' leaves just the ring finger lowered, which is the symbol for 6."

Ana Isabel Magallón García has issued a study addressing the development of the concept of orthography in the early Middle Ages, which reached a milestone with the publication of Bede's *De orthographia* (of uncertain date), as well as related discussion appearing in his *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis* ("Evolución del género de *Orthographia* hasta Beda," in *Actas I Congreso nacional de latín medieval* [as cited under "Aldhelm"], pp. 293–9). Magallón García includes comments on almost every discussion of orthography (or spelling patterns generally) found among the works collected in Heinrich Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (1855–80), including such neglected figures as Terentius Scaurus (citing in this connection some recent work by A. M. Tempesti and Vivien Law). As recent general sources on the emergence of orthography, Magallón García cites Elmar Siebenborn's *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien: Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik* (1976) and Robert A. Kaster's *Guardians of Language: the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (1988). Moving beyond Bede's achievement, Magallón García includes brief comments on the Anglo-Latin authors Tatwine, Hwætberht, Boniface, and Alcuin. Later in the same collection, a linguistic study by Antonio María Martín

Rodríguez, drawing on a 1992 Ph.D. dissertation treating verbs that convey a sense of giving (*dare*, *tradere*, *promittere*, etc.)—which was restricted to archaic and classical Latin literary texts—now applies the author's sophisticated techniques of quantitative assessment to the same semantic field in Bede's *HE* ("Los verbos de 'dar' en la *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*," in *Actas I Congreso nacional de latín medieval*, pp. 587–93). One striking conclusion reached by Martín Rodríguez involves the alternation of *polliceri* and *promittere* in early Latin prose and poetry, where prose authors (including Cicero, Livy, and Sallust) favor *polliceri* by margins of two to one (or greater), whereas poets (including Vergil), largely because of metrical constraints, favor *promittere* by similarly wide margins. (In this connection, Martín Rodríguez cites a study by Pierre Flobert touching on Alcuinian topics, *Les verbes deponents latins des origines à Charlemagne* [1975].) Interestingly, Bede's usage in the prose of *HE* stands much nearer to the distribution observed in the poetic sources analyzed here by Martín Rodríguez, conceivably influenced in part by a close study of hexameter verse early in the Anglo-Latin author's life.

Several additional studies of Bede's exegetical and hagiographical writings may be noted briefly. In connection with a detailed theological study of Bede's views on the dispensation of unction in the sacerdotal ministry, Gianni Caputa explores the Anglo-Latin author's understanding of the mystic fusion of Christ and the Mother Church ("Il ministero della 'Madre Chiesa' a servizio del sacerdozio comune secondo san Beda il Venerabile," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 108, 128–45). In the *Commentarius in Apocalypsim* and other exegetical works, Bede distinguishes between two fundamental principles: the unity of the Holy Spirit, which confers the unction, and the unity of Christ's body, notably its divine head and limbs, over which the unction is poured. Bede's theology here owes a debt to the writings of Tyconius (c. 400), as mediated through Augustine. Caputa further considers the means by which the Mother Church disseminates communal ministry among all the faithful, addressing this topic under three main headings: preaching; rites of initiation (catechetical study and baptism); and the Eucharist. Caputa cites several of his own related studies, including two on Bede that have not yet appeared in *OEN*: "Il sacerdozio dei fedeli nella *Explanatio Apocalypsis* di s. Beda il Venerabile," in *Sacerdozio battesimale e formazione teologica nella catechesi e nella testimonianza di vita dei Padri: convegno di studio e aggiornamento Facoltà di Lettere cristiane e classiche (Pontificium Institutum Altioris Latinitatis), Roma, 14–16 marzo 1991*, ed. Sergio Felici, Biblioteca di scienza religiosa 99 (Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1992), pp. 173–94; and "Il Cantico nella teologia di san Beda il Venerabile," in *Lecture cristiane dei Libri Sapienziali: XX. incontro di studiosi della antichità cristiana, 9–11 maggio 1991*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 37 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1992), pp. 461–81. (For all three of Caputa's cited studies, see the Italian-language abstracts by Paolo Chiesa, in *Medioevo latino* 16 [1995], p. 54 [nos. 491–3], with

17 [1996], p. 49 [no. 500], whose summaries assisted substantially in the preparation of the preceding notice.)

In a discussion of the miraculous element in Bede's accounts of insular bishops ("Bede: the Miraculous and Episcopal Authority in Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Downside Rev.* 392 [1995], 219–32), Simon Coates draws on the work of several recent students of Bede's miracle-stories, including Paul Cavill ("Signs and wonders' and the Venerable Bede," *Evangelical Quarterly* 88 [1988], 31–42—new to *OEN*). Coates argues that Bede views miracles as reflective of the personal efficacy of certain bishops, which could rival the powers of doctors or even kings. Bede probably "was aware of a link between episcopal power and the ability to work wonders," but "did not perceive miracles to be central to the . . . authority of every bishop in Anglo-Saxon England." Coates draws a distinction between "vertical" miracles, which "relate directly to the saint's individual relationship with God," such as visions or dreams, and "horizontal" miracles, which relate to affairs on earth and typically involve accounts of healing or saintly control of fires and storms. Bede's bishops' miracles are predominantly horizontal, attesting to the importance of their practitioners' pastoral work and the promulgation of liturgical practices: "Bede seems to have recognized that episcopal cults developed because of the interaction between, rather than the manipulation of, social classes." Detailed comments address the episcopal contexts of miracles attributed to Aidan, Chad, Cuthbert, John of Beverley, and Mellitus. Coates notes further that Bede's "account of Theodore is noticeable for its absence of miracles."

d. Alcuin

IN THE CONTEXT of a thorough study of Alcuin's *Epistola CLXXII* (here dated to February or early March 799, pushing back the estimates of Dümmler and Heil by about two months; cf. *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 104; ed. MGH ECA II, 284–5), Donald A. Bullough discusses Alcuin's "Augustinian" views on memory and their relevance to the medieval cultivation of "episodic memory," mooted recently by Patrick J. Geary and others ("Reminiscence and Reality: Text, Translation, and Testimony of an Alcuin Letter," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 5 [1995], 174–201). Bullough finds that Alcuin's views on memory are articulated most fully in a prosimetrical tract whose title is given here as *De ratione animae* (PL 101, cols. 639–49, esp. at col. 642). Also edited in part as Alcuin's *Epistola CCCIX*, to Gundrada (MGH ECA II, 473–8), the text of this tract, Bullough suggests, is best consulted in an unpublished, 101-page Ph.D. dissertation by John Joseph Mark Curry, "Alcuin, *De ratione animae*: a Text with Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Translation" (Cornell University, 1966; cf. *DAI* 27 [1966], 1800A; still available on UMI microfilm). Curry's edition, I would note, claims to draw on collations of readings in forty-nine of the fifty-two manuscripts known by the editor to preserve Alcuin's work, and includes a translation into English. Moreover, Richard Sharpe has recently issued a normative listing citing twenty

extant manuscripts that include copies of the work, as well as two untraced but attested copies (*Handlist*, p. 38). *YWOES* readers may note that the form of the title preferred by Curry and Bullough (*De ratione animae*) differs slightly from the form (*De animae ratione*) given by Sharpe and found in the first iteration of the Fontes Anglo-Saxonici-SASLC guidelines (*Abbreviations for Sources . . .*, comp. Michael Lapidge [1988]), following PL and MGH. The span of columns which I have given above for the PL text, reflecting the compass of Dümmler's MGH edition, differs from those provided both by Sharpe and in the 1988 guidelines. Regarding the abbreviated text found among the MGH edition of Alcuin's letters, note that Dümmler's text includes only two of the addenda in verse ("Qui mare . . ." and "Te homo . . ."), i.e., those treated in *ICL* at pp. 591 (no. 13293) and 712 (no. 16078), while excluding three included in PL at cols. 649–50 ("Miserere Domine . . .," "Candida florigeris . . .," and "Versibus exponam . . ."), these being treated in *ICL* at pp. 89 (no. 1869), 433 (no. 9692), and 760 (no. 17138). All five of these items are edited among Alcuin's *Carmina* as a discrete group (MGH PLAC I, 302–4 [no. 85, pts. i–v]), but reports in *ICL* and MGH make it clear that such integration is hardly typical of the manuscript tradition.

Bullough's article includes several tantalizing allusions to standard dates and attributions that may need to be revised, sometimes jarringly revised, in the light of the scholar's most recent research. These now await full codification in the announced expansion of Bullough's 1980 Oxford series of Ford Lectures, said to be forthcoming under the title *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation*. The most stunning revision of received opinion on offer here, tucked away in a footnote on the penultimate page of the article, involves Bullough's conclusion that Alcuin did not join Charlemagne's circle shortly after his visit to Parma in March 781, but rather that he did so in 786, four or five years later than has been maintained commonly in the past. If Bullough's new date is accepted, and if account is taken of the time Alcuin spent in England over three years of the last decade of the eighth century (790–3), it appears that Alcuin's celebrated span of nearly sixteen years at court as Charlemagne's advisor (781/2–96) must now be reduced to a period of about seven years. Only two of these years (or thereabout) will have been spent at a permanent royal residence, the palace at Aachen established in 794.

Bullough also provides dates significantly earlier than any that have appeared previously for the two main witnesses to the epistolography of Alcuin in the so-called T group of manuscripts (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 105–6): Troyes 1165 (s. ix in., and not s. ix ex. or ix/x) and BAV Reg. lat. 272 (s. ix, and not s. x). The Tours origin countenanced by Bullough for Troyes 1165, together with the early ninth-century dating (s. ix in.), would seem to bring its witness to the text of *Ep. CLXXII* very near to the event of that letter's composition by Alcuin (at Tours, in early 799), but Bullough documents the existence of an even earlier, though evidently incomplete, text that once formed part of a collection compiled at Tours in

799/800, now known from three copies preserved among the members of the so-called K group of manuscripts. He also cites a neglected English witness to the text of *Ep.* CLXXII and to the distinctive sequence of letters that is the hallmark of the T group, now in London, Lambeth Palace, 218, pt. III (i.e., fols. 131–208) (Bury St. Edmunds, s. x), while postulating a significantly *later* date for another descendant of the T group (BN lat. 5577), the origin of this manuscript being assigned tentatively by Bullough to the lower Loire region in the eleventh century (as against the dating to s. ix/x championed for BN lat. 5577 by Dümmler, Wilmar, and Bouhot).

Contributing to the “written conversations” that typify an exchange of letters conducted by Alcuin and Charlemagne from 796 until 802/3, *Ep.* CLXXII itself may be grouped specifically with the discussion of scientific topics carried out by the two correspondents over the years 796–9, which is mainly concerned with problems in astronomy and chronology. The traditional status of *Ep.* CLXXII as the capstone of that exchange may be called into doubt by Bullough’s redating (which assigns it to February or early March of 799), but it is not ruled out of the question. Bullough, again adverting to his forthcoming monograph, is prepared to move back the dating of the reputed penultimate member of the scientific exchange (Alcuin’s *Ep.* CLXXI, usually placed after March of 799) to a point as early as February of that year. In any event, the main item under discussion here (*Ep.* CLXXII) ranges over “four or five different although loosely-connected topics,” including the following: contemporary figures such as Felix of Urgel, Angilbert of Saint-Riquier, Peter of Pisa, Leidrad of Lyons, and the eastern Frankish scholar Einhard; Alcuin’s youthful journey to Rome and Pavia; complaints about perceived *rusticitas* at Tours; and some problems in recreational mathematics. Bullough feels that the letter’s miscellaneous character and fairly loose structure serve to distinguish it from the carefully drafted Alcuinian *epistolae* that were sometimes reproduced as formulary or “model” letters in later collections. Its contents might even bear comparison with those of some of the self-contained notes, or *epistiunculae* (Alcuin’s term), “which were dashed off in a hurry, even to the king, because time was short—notes that were not intended to say anything in particular, or were written to accompany some gift or a batch of previously-composed letters.” Nevertheless, few of Alcuin’s letters may be viewed as “business letters” comparable to the various petitions and workaday instructions to associates that constitute the bulk of the aforementioned scholar Einhard’s correspondence.

Bullough’s command of Alcuiniana has reached the point at which any footnote in a given study may approximate to a separate excursus on a particular Carolingian subject. In the present article, the following may deserve to be signaled most clearly for regular readers of *YWOES*: Bullough’s demolition of longstanding opinions regarding the supposed influence of the vernacular on Alcuin’s use of forms of *habere* with the infinitive, citing the recent *Corpus epistularum Latinarum papyris tabulis Ostracis servatarum* (*CEL*), ed. Paolo Cugusi, 2

vols., *Papyrologia Florentina* 23 (Florence: Gonnelli, 1992); semantic analyses of Alcuin’s use of the term *calamus* (“reed,” “straw,” or “pen”) and the phrase *species dictionum*, the latter referring to some unidentified rhetorical or grammatical texts, probably involving Greek–Latin entries (which Bullough here seems inclined to consider mainly in connection with the circulation of texts “at the Frankish Court” and not with Alcuin’s later importation of books to Tours); comments on punctuation (engaging some recent opinions offered by Malcolm B. Parkes in his *Pause and Effect: an Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* [Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1993], and by David Hiley in his *Western Plainchant: a Handbook* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993]—both new to *OEN*); provocative comments on two manuscripts containing entries in handwriting characterized by Bernhard Bischoff as “Austrasian” (and specifically arising c. 775–815 west of the Rhine in an area centering on Ingelheim and Aachen but excluding Mainz and its region), i.e., Berlin Diez. B Sant. 66 (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 113), which Bullough compares to a “school miscellany” in Paris BN lat. 7530 (Monte Cassino, s. viii 2 [i.e., 779 × 797]; later provenances Benevento and Rheims; *CLAV*, 15 [no. 569], with V, 56, and suppl., 54), and an exegetical text in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, II. 2572 (s. ix in. or s. ix 1; provenance Stavelot), on fols. 1v–17v, which Bullough sees as possibly containing a hitherto undetected witness to a debate, arising in Italy between Peter of Pisa and a Jewish scholar named Iulius, which addressed the content of Daniel 1–xi; and additional comments on Alcuin’s relationship with Peter of Pisa; Peter’s possible knowledge of a very rare Old Latin (pre-Roman) northern Italian text of Psalms; and Alcuin’s possible study of Statius’ *Silvae* at York.

In addressing previous critical speculation about the cited debate between a Christian and a Jew, Bullough, while acknowledging that “themes in the Book of Daniel are clearly topics which an eighth-century Christian scholar might be interested in ‘disputing’ with a Jewish one,” takes issue with the view that brief comments by Alcuin on the debate between Peter and Iulius, with related comments on a debate between Felix of Urgel and an unnamed Moslem scholar (*Sarracenus*), indicate that the English author was concerned with a perceived “double threat” to Christianity posed by Islam and Judaism. Bullough’s analysis here runs counter to opinions encountered in the scholarship of Aryeh Grabois, Benjamin Kadar, and, more recently, John Cavadini (in his book *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820*, Middle Ages Ser. [Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1993]—new to *OEN*; but cf. the notice of Cavadini’s dissertation in *YWOES* at *OEN* 25.4 [1992], 18).

Three articles published during 1995 by Nicholas Orchard addressed Alcuin’s activities as a liturgist with a special interest in feast-day masses (“An Anglo-Saxon Mass for St Willibrord and Its Later Liturgical Uses,” *ASE* 24 [1995], 1–10, “The English and German Masses in honour of St Oswald of Northumbria,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 37

[1995], 347–58, and “A Note on the Masses for St Cuthbert,” *RB* 105 [1995], 79–98). Collectively, these studies discuss Alcuin’s role (both as an author and as a reviser of liturgical texts) in the production of eight discrete compositions or bodies of work intended for use in masses commemorating a diverse group of saints: new masses celebrating St. Martin, fourth-century bishop of Tours (Alcuin’s home from 796), and St. Vedastus, a later continental European figure; masses in honor of the early Anglo-Saxon saints Oswald (Northumbrian king of Bernicia and Deira [ob. 642]), Cuthbert, Willibrord, and Boniface; a group of antiphons, responds, and hymns in honor of Richarius, another continental saint; and the mass-lectionary known as the “comes of Alcuin,” one reflex (or congener) of which, from Saint-Riquier (printed at PL 30, cols. 487–532 [503–48]), is cited by Orchard in passing. In connection with Orchard’s suggestions regarding Alcuinian chant-texts for Richarius, it should be noted that these items were not edited integrally with Alcuin’s *Carmina* in the first volume of MGH PLAC; they are cited here by Orchard from the *Chronicon Centulense* of Hariulf of Aldenburg (PL 174, cols. 1215–1366, at 1250–1), where they appear to be cast in the form of epigraphic verse, and one item (*incipit* “Posthabito mundi . . .”) seems not to have been treated—or cross-referenced?—in *ICL*. (For the others, see *ICL*, pp. 68, 305, 327, 374, and 662 [nos. 1425, 6800, 7322, 8366, 14880].) I would note that texts from this body of verse also are printed at MGH PLAC I, 374.

Orchard’s most striking revelations involve a mass for the feast of St. Willibrord (7 November) preserved most fully in BN lat. 9433 (Echternach, s. ix ex. [i.e., c. 895–900]; “Sacramentary of Echternach”; *CLLA*², pp. 412–13 [no. 920]) and in Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, 1946 (Echternach, s. x in. [i.e., ? c. 1000] or s. xi 1; *CLLA*², p. 525 [no. 1391]; “Antiphoner-Sacramentary of Echternach”). The common origin of these two manuscripts at the Abbey of Echternach (in modern-day Luxembourg) reflects their joint celebration of the Anglo-Saxon emigrant Willibrord (see above), founder of that establishment, whose cited mass is published in a new edition in Orchard’s *ASE* article.

Orchard explains that by c. 800 texts for a saint’s mass normally gathered together four prayers “invoking the saint’s intercession” (collect, secret, preface, and postcommunion), which served as “the backbone around which the chant and readings were arranged.” These texts were supplemented in some cases through the introduction of occasional prayers (*aliae orationes*), prayers brought in at the conclusion of the service (*super populum*), and prayers recited at vespers on the feast day proper (*ad vespervas*) or in the Hours of the day preceding the feast (“vigil” prayers). All of these prayers were regularly gathered in a single book, such as a sacramentary or missal, employed by the officiating priest (or *celebrant*) of the eucharistic mass. The full version of the mass for Willibrord, which (Orchard remarks) is an original work by a gifted writer and not some hastily assembled modification of a “ready-

made” mass, contains all four standard prayers as well as two prayers *ad vespervas* and one *super populum*.

No evidence has come to light to show that new masses for Willibrord were composed over the decades immediately following the missionary’s death in 739. It is tempting to speculate that Alcuin, who wrote a major bipartite (prose-poetic) work—or *opus geminatum*—commemorating the saint, the *Vita S. Willibrordi*, was responsible for the new mass-texts that were transmitted to the abbey founded by the saint (at Echternach). Such a transmission would hardly be implausible. Alcuin’s *opus geminatum* on Willibrord was written for Beornred, a relative of the saint, who served as abbot of that continental abbey from 775 until 785 before serving as bishop and then archbishop of Sens. Orchard sets out a number of verbal parallels with Alcuin’s prayers for St. Martin, which occur among a body of prayers that has been associated only rarely with the Anglo-Latin author’s canon despite the fact that “the attribution to Alcuin of votive masses is (apparently) secure” (Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 36–46 [no. 87], at 46), and despite the continuing availability of these Alcuinian materials in a reliably edited text: *Le sacramentaire grégorien: ses principales formes d’après les plus anciens manuscrits*, ed. Jean Deshusses, 2nd–3rd ed., 3 vols., Spicilegium Friburgense 16 [3rd ed., 1992], 24 [2nd ed., 1988], and 28 [2nd ed. rev., 1992] (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1988–92). Supplementing specific comments by Deshusses (at II, 25–8, esp. at 25–6) associating Alcuin’s activities with nearly three dozen liturgical items, Orchard cites Alcuinian texts and other texts from Tours in discrete liturgical forms to which Deshusses has assigned the numbers 3199, 3201, 3511–15, 3517–21, and 3532–6 (forms which constitute parts of integral groups treated at II, 260–1 and 308–12 [nos. 291–2, 355–6, and 358]). Orchard sets out additional verbal parallels with the texts composed in honor of St. Richarius (noted above), and he cites Alcuin’s prayers for St. Vedastus as providing another neglected example of his composition of texts for the mass (ed. Deshusses, I, 690–1 [nos. *58–*63], i.e., *vigilia Sancti Vedasti* and *depositio Sancti Vedasti*). In keeping with his normal practice, Sharpe does not treat the briefer examples of Alcuin’s *liturgica* individually in his cited *Handlist* entry, but he does cite (at p. 44) Alcuinian *sermons* for Willibrord and Vedastus that supplement the references supplied by Orchard.

Discussing the later fortunes of Alcuin’s masses, Orchard notes that Alcuin’s mass for St. Vedastus was subsequently adapted for use as the earliest known mass for St. Omer (Audomarus). He suggests that Alcuin’s pupil, friend, and successor at Tours, the sometime dialectician Frithugils (see below under “Comprehensive Works”) helped to spread his mass-texts farther afield. Positing the possible intermediary efforts of Alfred’s associate Grimbold, monk of Saint-Bertin (ob. 901), or even of Æthelwold, the later tenth-century bishop of Winchester (see below), Orchard establishes that the mass for Willibrord was known at Winchester by c. 1000, where its text was modified and reassigned to St. Birinus, as attested, e.g., in the English sacramentary now in Rouen,

Bibliothèque Municipale, 274 (Y. 6) (?Peterborough or Ely [Orchard], or ?Christ Church, Canterbury [Gneuss and Dumville], s. xi 1 [i.e., 1014 × 1023]; provenance Jumièges; "Missal of Robert of Jumièges"), also exerting an influence on the contents of Le Havre, Bibliothèque Municipale, 330 (New Minster, Winchester, s. xi 1 [Orchard] or s. xi 2 [Gneuss]) and of CCCC 391 (Worcester, s. xi 2 [i.e., c. 1064/5]; "Portiforium [or Breviary] of St. Oswald"). Finally, Orchard offers a full treatment of the circulation of the texts originally composed for Willibrord down to the sixteenth century in post-Conquest English monuments and in continental witnesses.

Commenting on the preservation of no fewer than five distinctive masses for St. Cuthbert (*ob.* 687) in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, followed by numerous commemorations of the saint in the post-Conquest period (many with Durham connections), Orchard, in his *Revue bénédictine* article, acknowledges that one pressing question remains: "What was the Durham mass for Cuthbert in the Anglo-Saxon period?" The search for the identity of the mass for Cuthbert in use at Durham, the center that eventually came to be associated most prominently with the saint's widespread cult, takes Orchard back to a period (c. 700) when Cuthbert's mass, wherever it had arisen, was probably "old Gelasian" in character, that is, "it consisted solely of collects." In subsequent decades and centuries, "benedictions were borrowed and prefaces provided as required." The likelihood that a mass for Cuthbert was composed in his own century (or very shortly thereafter) is enhanced by the circumstance that the collects are fairly stable in the five surviving pre-Conquest witnesses, whereas the proper prefaces vary widely. The witnesses in question occur in the following manuscripts: the cited Rouen 274 and Le Havre 330; CCCC 183 (?Winchester, s. x in. [Ker] or s. x 1 [Gneuss]; provenance at Chester-le-Street in s. x 1 [i.e., 934 × 937]; later provenance Durham); Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College 100 (Δ. 5. 15), pt. II (Ramsey [Orchard] or Winchester [Gneuss, following Bishop], s. x med., with additions at Durham, s. x ex.; later provenance Durham); and OB Bodley 579 (SC 2675) (northeastern France, s. ix/x, with later additions; provenance at Exeter by s. xi med.; "Leofric Missal"). Citing specific verbal parallels with Alcuin's masses for St. Martin, Orchard suspects that the preface now preserved in Rouen 274 (the sacramentary of Jumièges provenance) "may well have been composed by Alcuin, either at York or on the continent." Alcuin's familiarity with this mass for Cuthbert may be attested further by his adaptation of its postcommunion prayer as the *super populum* of his own mass on St. Vedastus. In any event, the basic text, before Alcuin's revision, may well go back to an archetype emerging with the earliest cult of Cuthbert (whose feast is attested in the early eighth-century *Kalendarium S. Willibrordi* [see above]). It may remain impossible to say, however, if the central and southern German associations of the text witnessed by Rouen 274, centering by the ninth century on Fulda, reflect its early importation to continental Europe by Boniface and, perhaps,

its later transmission by way of Alcuin to Hrabanus Maurus. (Orchard includes a valuable footnote summarizing all known southern and northern English manuscripts whose importation to the Continent may be associated with Boniface's mission.) Alcuin's *Epistola* CCL (MGH ECA II, 404–6) mentions his dispatch of a mass for Boniface to Baugulf, predecessor of Hrabanus as abbot of Tours. Orchard traces the circulation of the prayers represented by Rouen 274 well into the post-Conquest period, analyzing a group of more than thirty-five witnesses. He concludes that their texts were revised further at some point, perhaps in the course of their transmission through Brittany. In a different connection, Orchard suggests that the Winchester text exemplified by Le Havre 330 may have been derived from a Breton import. And further connections with Brittany emerge in Orchard's comments on a "West Country" form of the mass (edited here), preserved in a continental manuscript, the present BN lat. 12052 (s. x 2; "Sacramentary of Corbie [or Ratoldus; or Saint-Vaast]"), a sacramentary owned by Ratoldus, abbot of Corbie (*ob.* 986), whose copy of the cited mass-text may have arrived at Corbie by way of Brittany.

Turning to his central concern with pre-Conquest Durham usage, Orchard accepts that CCCC 183 was given to the well-traveled community of Cuthbert during the time of its residence at Chester-le-Street, and he accepts that its mass for Cuthbert was employed in some capacity "at Chester-le-Street in the last decade of the tenth century." Revisions to some items in CCCC 183 were made by the same scribe who added the text of a mass for Cuthbert to the cited Sidney Sussex manuscript (on 13v13–14v), as identified by Bishop. But, in Orchard's view, neither of these monuments preserve the elusive Durham mass for Cuthbert. Orchard characterizes the former as a typically West Saxon form, transmitted by way of Athelstan's court, which will have been used at Durham to commemorate the translation of Cuthbert's relics and not his feast day proper. He sees the latter as a special, late production which "may have been written for Oswald," bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York. Orchard concludes that the rudiments of the local Durham mass for Cuthbert are in fact preserved in a monument not yet mentioned, the present Durham, Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, fols. 1–88 (West Saxon center, s. ix/x [Corréa] or s. x in. [Gneuss], with later additions; provenances at Chester-le-Street and Durham; "Durham [or St. Cuthbert] collectar," "Durham Ritual," etc.). With the texts preserved on the last four leaves (fols. 85–8) of the third of three quires added to this collectar at some time after its arrival at Chester-le-Street (by c. 970), the provost Aldred introduced (in Orchard's view) local Durham prayers for Cuthbert's feast-day mass, thus "making the newly-acquired collectar . . . usable on the 20 March and at the same time stamping it as Durham property." Rejecting Bonner's earlier argument that the prayers "were unknown to the Durham community before [Aldred's efforts]," Orchard concludes that Bonner's view "makes a nonsense of the situation" and that the "prayers must be Durham prayers."

Orchard's work on this article seems to have been completed before the appearance of Alicia Corrêa's recent edition of the Durham collectar, which includes the following remark: "As it stands, the incomplete mass-set [for Cuthbert] could not have been used in the mass. These entries make more sense when we assume that Aldred copied them during his travels . . . in Wessex (as indicated by the colophon), and that he had intended to introduce them within the full Cuthbert mass which was customarily recited at Chester-le-Street" (see *YWOES* 27.2 [1994], 66–7; cited at pp. 78–9).

Finally, in his third 1995 article of Anglo-Latin interest, Orchard champions Alcuin's composition of an additional mass celebrating an Anglo-Saxon saint, the early martyr King Oswald, the standard version of whose mass (as found in the sacramentary of Jumièges provenance, Rouen 274, and not in the New Minster, Winchester, book preserved as Le Havre 330) incorporates phraseology from the eighth-century "Gelasian" sacramentary (probably compiled in Francia c. 740–70). In Bede's accounts of the martyrdom and early cult of Oswald—which include a gruesome scene in which the king's pagan slayers set up his head and arms as trophies on stakes—it is stated explicitly that masses for Oswald had been composed by c. 690 (see *HE* III.ix–xiii and IV.xiv). Moreover, Orchard cites other early evidence for the saint's cult (including information in Willibrord's *Kalendarium*). But he suspects that all the extant masses for Oswald date from later periods. Corroborating lexical evidence to suggest Alcuin's authorship of the standard version of King Oswald's mass, Orchard notes that the Northumbrian king is the subject of a long passage in Alcuin's *Versus de sanctis Eurboricensis ecclesiae*. Typically, Orchard offers a generous review of post-Conquest English traditions as well as continental European reflexes. In particular, he offers valuable comments on a sequence in honor of Oswald, which contains musical notation, found in a gradual from Bishop Cosin's Library, now accessible as Durham, University Library, Cosin V. v. 6 (?Christ Church, Canterbury, s. xi ex.; provenance Durham), and an adaptation of a mass for Oswald to commemorate the feast of a continental saint, Quirinus, as well as the adaptation of a mass for Cuthbert to mark the translation of the same saint, both found in a continental manuscript (now Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 48 [Tegernsee, s. xi 2]).

Two additional items on Alcuin may be noted briefly. John I. McEnerney offers a new critical text of Alcuin's *Carmen LX*, one of five poems (with *Carmina LXVII–LXIX* and *LXI*) that are often grouped together because of their exuberant celebration of nature and, in particular, their use of seasonal imagery, notably in evocations of the fertility of springtime (John I. McEnerney, "Alcuini carmen 60," *Res Publica Litterarum* 13 [1990], 179–81). In establishing the elegiac couplets of Alcuin's verse, McEnerney offers two well-informed emendations, retains some medieval Latin spellings, and punctuates the text so as to emphasize Alcuin's cultivation of lines that are "end-stopped deliberately to give a staccato effect and [to convey] . . . a pleading tone." He discusses

unusual metrical features, some involving the length of final syllables, and offers a very full treatment of Vergilian echoes. One problem, McEnerney notes, involves the subject matter of the poem, which laments the encroachment of silence between friends. No serious breach, however, has ever been detected in the exchange of letters between Alcuin and the poem's recipient, his lifelong friend Angilbert, lay-abbot of Saint-Riquier (near Abbeville) from 789 or 790. In another metrically informed study, Julián Solana Pujalte has recently issued a prosodic analysis of the scansion and other treatment of final *-o* in the poetry of Alcuin, and related topics ("Tratamiento prosódico-métrico de la *o* final de palabra en la poesía de Alcuino y Teodulfo," *Romanobarbarica* 13 [1994–5], 125–43). The discussion by Solana Pujalte benefits from the inclusion of seven tables, analyzing the evidence for the following: different parts of speech; hexameter and pentameter lines; trochees and dactyls; and so on. Alcuin's usage is compared throughout with the usage observed in the verse of the poet's Visigothic contemporary Theodulf of Orléans. The practices of Alcuin and Theodulf are strikingly similar, the handling of dactyls (much more prominent in the first foot of Alcuin's hexameters) providing a notable exception. Finally, I would note that a 1991 study by M. Forthomme-Nicholson included in the *OEN* bibliography for 1995, treating Alcuin's possible familiarity with some tenets of Pelagianism, has in fact received prior notice in this column (see *OEN* 26.2 [1993], 68).

e. The Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

1995 SAW THE APPEARANCE of Anselme Davril's masterly edition of an Anglo-Saxon service-book known as the Winchcombe Sacramentary, issued in a 461-page volume to members of the Henry Bradshaw Society as a double installment for the years 1993–4 (*The Winchcombe Sacramentary (Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, 127 [105])*, ed. Davril, Henry Bradshaw Soc. 109 [Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 1995]). Now accessible as Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, 127 (105) (Winchcombe or Winchcombe community at Ramsey, s. x 2 [i.e., ? after 975: Lapidge] or s. x ex. [Davril]; provenances at Mont-Saint-Michel by s. x/xi [i.e., 991 × 1009] and at Saint-Benoît at Fleury by s. xi in. or s. xi 1), this liturgical monument is the earliest sacramentary produced in Anglo-Saxon England that survives intact—except for the first two leaves of the first quire, which have been lost. The very title of the volume under review represents a scholarly assertion of considerable magnitude, as in recent years every aspect of the association of Orléans 127 with the famous monastic center at Winchcombe, Gloucestershire, has been called into question, most notably in arguments addressing four main concerns: (1) the manuscript's precise place of origin, whether at Winchcombe or at another center, such as Ramsey; (2) the identity of the community that produced (or commissioned) the sacramentary—most plausibly, still, the monks of Winchcombe, even if this question (for reasons that will become clear) must be separated from the

question of the place of origin; (3) the intended recipients of the manuscript, especially if it is to be regarded as a presentation-copy or some other sort of gift, and, ultimately, the geographical location of the book's intended congregation—whether resident in England (and thus presumably affiliated with the Winchcombe community) or continental Europe; and (4) the textual affiliations of the contents of the volume and, again, whether these are typically English (and thus unique in their witness to early Anglo-Saxon liturgical practices) or typically continental European in character.

The short answer is that Davril, as his title affirms, accepts that the primary associations of Orléans 127 must remain with the community established at the refoundation of Winchcombe Abbey (c. 969) by Oswald, the active reformer who was bishop of Worcester for more than thirty years (961–92), retaining that episcopate even over his two decades of service as archbishop of York (971–92). As Léopold Delisle recognized in 1886, only one Anglo-Saxon saint is celebrated in this service-book's sanctorale: Kenelm (Coenhelm or Cenhelm), the obscure and quite possibly fictive child-martyr who, according to legend, would have succeeded his father, King Coenwulf (ob. 821), to the rule of Mercia at an age of seven years, had not the boy's own sister arranged for his murder. When this crime was revealed to the pope by a dove bearing a letter written in Old English—and interpreted by an Anglo-Saxon visitor to Rome—the child's body was recovered and interred at Winchcombe with that of Coenwulf, whose reign had seen the initial foundation of the monastic community (c. 798). Kenelm's name is mentioned with insistence in several different liturgical contexts in Orléans 127, receiving special emphasis through the use of colored ink, capitalization, and other effects. As the establishment at Winchcombe was in fact the *only* Anglo-Saxon center dedicated (jointly with the Virgin Mary) to St. Kenelm during the reform years, its involvement in the production of the sacramentary in some capacity is beyond reasonable doubt.

Shortly after the death of the monastic patron King Edgar in 975, as Michael Lapidge has noted in a recent essay, Ealdorman Ælfhere, an antimonastic reactionary leader in Mercia, drove out the monks of Winchcombe and their abbot, Germanus, by force. (For the cited essay by Lapidge and a reprint, see *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 73–6, at 74 [no. 14].) During the period c. 978–c. 992, the community received asylum at Ramsey, Huntingdonshire, whose abbey (somewhat surprisingly) remained the only English house dedicated to St. Benedict over the full course of the tenth-century Benedictine reforms. As early as 1940, David Knowles suggested that the Winchcombe Sacramentary actually may have been produced at Ramsey by displaced Winchcombe monks, who naturally will have remained faithful to their patron saint. This argument has been extended greatly by Lapidge in his cited essay, where it is related to a number of additional manuscripts that seem to reflect the fortunes of Abbot Germanus and the Winchcombe monks. Generally speaking, Lapidge's detailed argumentation adduces *single* connections

between Orléans 127 and several other manuscripts—manuscripts whose associations with the Winchcombe community's asylum at Ramsey are in turn supported by *multiple* connections. The single feature that is adduced most often as characteristic of Orléans 127 is its commemoration of Kenelm, its most notable feature apart from this being the prominent veneration of the Ramsey patron St. Benedict—whose significance is hard to gauge in the context of a Benedictine reform. Davril, however, makes the point that the Winchcombe Sacramentary is not badly named, even if the origin of the volume in a scriptorium on the grounds of its eponymous abbey must be rejected. And Lapidge's arguments might be introduced profitably in the classroom to illustrate the need to distinguish between *Text-* and *Schriftheimat* in the study of medieval literary history.

The absence of Anglo-Saxon saints in the Winchcombe Sacramentary (other than Kenelm) also demands comment. Apart from some unusual liturgical forms commemorating the Invention of the Cross and the Passion of John the Baptist, ostensibly derived from Gelasian usage, the sanctorale is notable for its nearly complete adherence to the reformed Gregorian usages promoted by Carolingian liturgists. As Davril demonstrates, the temporale in the volume is also massively Gregorian. In the words of Lapidge (as cited), "one might suspect that Orléans 127 was simply a copy of a Frankish sacramentary, into which the commemorations of St. Kenelm had been interpolated." In his introduction to the volume under review, however, Davril reveals that the sacramentary displays seventeen points of agreement with other English books for which no continental parallels have come to light; nineteen other forms that are more widely distributed but nevertheless may be characteristically English; and fully twenty-four forms for which no counterparts whatsoever have been identified in any document, English or continental. Davril thus concludes that the Winchester Sacramentary provides a unique window on Anglo-Saxon liturgical practices from the eighth century to the tenth. This may be the most momentous gleaning in the introduction to this edition. But, Davril notes, even if the volume was produced by members of the Winchcombe community (whether at home or at Ramsey), it may not have been produced for their personal use. The apparent removal of the most conspicuous English features (such as native saints) and the high degree of conformity to the ninth-century model of the reformed Gregorian sacramentary, as well as its so-called *Supplementum Anianensis*, might suggest that Orléans 127 was prepared to be sent abroad as a presentation-volume. This supposition may be borne out by the book's early provenances at Mont-Saint-Michel and Fleury.

Davril's edition includes more than one hundred pages of synoptic tables as well as full indices of liturgical forms and personal names. This double HBS volume, however, fails to provide an integral table of abbreviations, a comprehensive bibliography, or a general index. Some of Davril's abbreviated cross-references may thus prove hard to trace. Generally

speaking, most users will be able to find the most important manuscript sigla on pp. 27–9 of the introduction, and will be able to infer other forms of abbreviation from Davril's discursive comments at pp. 15–16.

In a 1995 *ASE* article ("The *Regularis concordia* and Its Old English Gloss," *ASE* 24 [1995], 95–130), Lucia Kornexl presents some major gleanings from her comprehensive, 703-page edition of the "customary," or compendium of customs for monks and nuns, known as *Regularis concordia* [hereafter *RC*], an edition which made available the text of a glossed copy now in the British Library (see the notice in *YWOES* for 1993, in *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 65–7; also, see the end of this notice for a new citation of the manuscript). In general, Kornexl regards *RC* as a document of an "advanced phase" in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine reforms of the second half of the tenth century, the crucial dates for which she sees as those marking the reign of Edgar (959–75), a king who was dedicated firmly to the monastic cause, and the elections of Dunstan as archbishop of Canterbury in 960, of Æthelwold as bishop of Winchester in 963, and of Oswald as bishop of Worcester (961) and as concurrent archbishop of York (971). Æthelwold most plausibly translated Benedict's *Regula* into Old English "around 970" and, if we accept the date of 973 preferred by Symons and others for the synod at Winchester that promulgated *RC*, its publication appears to form part of a burst of codification (and, with the addition of the Old English gloss, of vernacularization) that brought the most important strictures of the reform into wider distribution. The literary-historical tradition of Dunstan's authorship of *RC* begins with a hearsay report, in a letter written by Anselm of Canterbury in the 1070s, to the effect that the archbishop "instituted" some sort of monastic rule ("*Audivi quod sanctus Dunstanus regulam vitae monachicæ instituerit . . .*"). As archbishop, and as a participant in the cited synod, Dunstan clearly deserves some credit for the promulgation of *RC*, and special provisions in the customary that mention Dunstan by name confirm that he influenced the final form of the text. In line with recent scholarship on the subject, however, Kornexl views Dunstan's personal authorship of the whole work as unlikely, seeing Æthelwold as the document's main architect and primary author. She detects specific contributions of Æthelwold in the stipulations of frequent prayers for the royal couple and in some very personal comments on the "*Kyrie eleison* custom" performed over the final days of Holy Week. There are traces in *RC* of the "compromising tone" that is perhaps reflective of the middle period of the reform. Whereas Æthelwold had unceremoniously ejected secular clerics from the Old Minster at Winchester in 964, *RC* envisages members of the "lay congregation sharing in the celebration of the principal mass on Sundays and other special services."

Although the text of *RC* refers most often to male devotees, many of its customs were intended for nuns as well as monks. Kornexl records a neglected item of evidence for female use of the customary in the occurrence of an added phrase, *uel eam*, above a masculine pronoun in the so-called T

version (for which see below). Other signs of the practical use of the text include the physical constitution of the so-called F witness, which Kornexl sees as providing important clues regarding the use of self-contained manuscript booklets in Anglo-Saxon England. (The following comments summarize some of Kornexl's opinions—whose crucial aspects are indicated below by the use of italics—which are slightly at variance with conclusions, set out in *YWOES* for 1993, as cited, that seemed to arise inductively out of the full accumulation of evidence in her book; I apologize for any possible misrepresentation of Kornexl's complex arguments in my previous notice.) The absence of any epilogue for *RC* in the F copy—an epilogue which Kornexl seems to indicate was available to its Christ Church scribes—left room for the addition of three standardized obituary notices and two neumed chants for the dead, which are deliberately interspersed with the concluding text of the customary, which itself treats provisions for the death of a monk on the last two leaves of this copy. Similarly, Kornexl maintains that the table of contents as well as those chapter headings which are present in T but absent in F all represent original features of *Regularis concordia*, having been written out in full at the stage of the original drafting of the document. She claims that their absence in F is also bound up with the practical nature of its text. But, in contrast to the situation with respect to the absent epilogue, Kornexl seems to suggest here that these features were omitted at a stage of transmission earlier than that of the execution of the Christ Church transcription of F. At a point at which T includes a table of contents, the phrase "*hic inserenda sunt capitula*" in F ("the *capitula* ought to be inserted here") thus *does not*, in Kornexl's view, represent an instruction to compose (or find a copy of) a list of *capitula* which had not been drawn up previously (or was not immediately available to the scribe), but simply appears "rather nonsensical in this context"—insofar as such headings, she concludes, were available at Christ Church even if no space had been left in F for their insertion. Although the sort of guide to readers that could be offered by a full apparatus of *capitula* was evidently judged otiose by individuals involved in the transmission of the F text, another sort of guide present in F, that is, its *more full* citation of liturgical texts in cues for recitation, bears further witness to the practical nature of its text.

The earliest exemplar of *RC*, Kornexl suspects, was probably produced in Æthelwold's scriptorium in the Old Minster at Winchester. Although both of the extant witnesses to this hypothetical archetype, F and T, were produced at Christ Church, Canterbury, around the middle of the eleventh century, she believes that they represent fundamentally separate branches of the textual tradition, insofar as they go back to two *different* transcripts, each of which was produced at an early stage in a wholly discrete act of copying from the single Æthelwoldian exemplar. In other words, F and T cannot be accorded relative positions in a single line of transmission, as they represent two wholly distinct lines of

transmission. Moreover, within these separate lines, "each of the two surviving texts has gone through an unknown number of copying stages." F and T, in Kornexl's view, cannot easily be used (jointly or separately) to provide evidence for the alteration of the text of *RC* over time.

Kornexl views the Æthelwoldian exemplar of *RC* as having been assembled hastily and as having embodied "a rather haphazard collection of individual points, loosely sketched out and then perhaps regrouped by means of symbols." Some of the ostensibly "early" *lectiones difficiliores* of F are simply corruptions introduced by misprision of instructions in this unpolished exemplar. The T reflex, although appearing more polished and more complete on the whole, has its own share of "haphazard" (and plausibly early) features, Kornexl finds, and these also appear to have been copied uncritically from Æthelwold's draft. The main force of the argumentation set out here is to deny F any special authority in the reconstruction of the Old Minster archetype. Kornexl is critical of several aspects of the F-based 1984 edition ascribed here to T. Symons, S. Spath, M. Wegener, and K. Hallinger (even if Symons's role "remains largely obscure"). Kornexl's own citations of *RC* in this article mainly advert to the T-based 1953 edition of Symons or her own recent T-based edition, where distinctive features of the F witness are accorded the status of "variant readings" and relegated to the critical apparatus. Nevertheless, Kornexl acknowledges that the F text attests to some Latin variants that actually are corroborated in T by means of traces preserved in its Old English gloss, and that the Latin text in T does embody some readings which "very likely qualify as later additions."

The presence of an Old English gloss in T may put us in mind of the Anglo-Saxon classroom, but Kornexl concludes that the volume preserving the text "seems to fit the concept of a library copy much more than that of a genuine classroom": the glossed text of *RC* in T has been relegated to the end of what appears to be a work of practical reference, embodying a compilation of standard Benedictine texts. Sir Robert Cotton largely obscured this arrangement when he moved the copy of *RC* from the back of its volume to the front. Kornexl nevertheless suspects that the glossed text (perhaps in other copies) formerly served an instructive purpose for residents of a monastery who were "unliterate" or "not (yet) completely at home" with Latin: "*RC*, unlike the Benedictine Rule, had no place in the daily Office, [but] it must have been part of the curriculum in reformed English monasteries at least for some time after its composition, the Old English interlinear version aiding in the comprehension of the Latin original." Kornexl disputes Patrizia Lendinara's recent contention that "Latin was the language of instruction; the vernacular had no place in ecclesiastical schools." She suggests that certain glosses in *RC* may have served as "vocabulary definitions, firmly imprinted in fixed combinations on a student's mind, that would be recalled automatically when the corresponding Latin signal word turned up," and, later, that perhaps "as a consequence of its derivation from classroom techniques, the *RC* gloss in

general exhibits a strong tendency to illustrate the [morphological] structure of the *lemmata* by replicating it" (as in OE *beforangangan* glossing Latin *praecedere*, and so on). The tendency toward literal rendering is seen also in forms such as "[OE] *letania* [glossing a form of Latin *letania*, 'litany'], with dat. pl. *-an* for *-um*," which reside in "a sort of Latin-Old English twilight zone that is notoriously difficult to penetrate." Such examples remind us "that the world of liturgy and monasticism was essentially Latin-dominated and that there was probably something like an Anglo-Latin/Old English monastic jargon."

Supplementing my earlier *YWOES* notice of Kornexl's full edition (cited above), I would draw readers' attention to the following features of the present article: source-critical comments on connections between *RC* and the *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores* of Theoderic of Fleury (and, later, Amorbach), and its indebtedness to Fleury customs generally; comments on Ælfric's *Epistola ad monachos Egheshamienses* (an "abbreviated and supplemented" version of *RC*, now assigned the title *Epistola de ecclesiastica consuetudine* by Sharpe: *Handlist*, pp. 25-6 [no. 53], at p. 26); comments on the main categories of glosses drawing on the classifications of Gernot Wieland and others (only so-called "commentary" glosses are not represented); some intriguing "double" glosses, and also some alliterating pairs and formulaic collocations in glosses; comments on glossing activity at the Christ Church scriptorium throughout the reform period; and notes on traces of Kentish vocabulary and the scarcity of "Winchester words" in the texts accompanying T in its British Library codex (here citing unpublished work by Helmut Gneuss). Finally, Kornexl's article provides the raw materials for yet another attempt to establish standard citations for the two main witnesses to *RC*, an undertaking that was rendered exceedingly difficult centuries ago by Cotton's codicological tampering:

(1) for T: BL Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 117-73 + fols. 3-116 (Christ Church, Canterbury, s. xi med.), with the text of *RC* at 3r-27v;

(2) for F (in the original "*RC*-booklet"): BL Cotton Faustina B. iii, fol. 158 + BL Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 174-6 + Faustina B. iii, fols. 159-98 + Tiberius A. iii, fol. 177 (Christ Church, Canterbury, s. xi med.), with the text of *RC* at Faustina B. iii, 159r-198r + Tiberius A. iii, 177r-v.

The now-dismembered *RC*-booklet, preserving F, originally comprised five quires in eight (Tiberius A. iii, fols. 174-6 + Faustina B. iii, fols. 159-95) and one in four (Faustina B. iii, fols. 196-8 + Tiberius A. iii, fol. 177), with Faustina B. iii, fol. 158, described by Ker as a probable "flyleaf," now characterized by Kornexl as "the front part of a cover provided for the *RC*-booklet," betraying telltale "[s]igns of wear." Even here, some clarification is in order: Kornexl, citing codicological and art-historical arguments by M. O. Budny and R. Deshman, has excluded a leaf from the T witness, i.e., Tiberius A. iii, fol. 2, whose celebrated, symbol-laden illustration (on 2v) now faces the first page of *RC*. This happy

juxtaposition appears to be no more than a result of Cottonian tampering. The exclusion from the model reference given above for the F witness of a single page, i.e., Faustina B. iii, 198v, may appear slightly pedantic: it is true that the page (198v) contains no text from *RC*; but, without Cotton's dismemberment, the page would probably be viewed simply as space left blank (as a result of a large hole in its lower half) within the main sequence of leaves containing the copy of *RC* now concluding at Tiberius A. iii, 177r-v. Finally, Kornexl also notes that a late sixteenth-century copy of *RC* (now in BL Harley 552), which has facilitated the reconstruction of the original *RC*-booklet (preserving F), was not, as Ker thought, made by Laurence Nowell, but rather by an anonymous amanuensis of Matthew Parker.

Two major articles published during 1995 by Antonia Gransden address the late tenth- and eleventh-century hagiography of Edmund, the Christian king of the East Anglian territories who was martyred by Scandinavian assailants in 869/70. Gransden's two fifty-odd-page studies respectively treat the earliest work devoted to Edmund, that is, the *Passio S. Eadmundi* (*BHL*, pp. 359–61, at p. 359 [no. 2392]), written by the Frankish scholar Abbo of Fleury (born c. 940 and slain in 1004 in a quarrel with some citizens of Gascony), and a later treatise, the *Liber de miraculis S. Eadmundi* (*BHL*, pp. 359–61, at p. 360 [nos. 2395–6]), of uncertain authorship, whose composition evidently postdates the death of Baldwin, abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, on (or very shortly before) New Year's Day, 1098 ("Abbo of Fleury's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*," *RB* 105 [1995], 20–78, and "The Composition and Authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi* attributed to 'Hermann the Archdeacon,'" *Jnl of Med. Latin* 5 [1995], 1–52). Gransden's study of Abbo's hagiography considers at length the claim of the continental author's *Passio* to be regarded as an Anglo-Latin work, insofar as it may have been composed on English soil during Abbo's relatively brief stay at Ramsey (during 985–7) and would meet the expectations of an audience subject to the reforms of Dunstan and his collaborators. In particular, Gransden counters arguments positing a specifically continental origin and milieu for the work, as set forth principally in the scholarship of Marco Mostert, most recently in Mostert's *The Library of Fleury: a Provisional List of Manuscripts*, *Middleleeuwse studies en bronnen* 3 (Hilversum: Verloren, 1989)—new to *OEN*. For citations of three further studies by Mostert discussing Edmund, Abbo, Fleury, and several English centers, including Ramsey, see *OEN* 20.2 (1987), 69, and *OEN* 21.2 (1988), 56 and 59–60.

Mostert has characterized Abbo's hagiography as a sort of *speculum principum*, whose view of the Anglo-Saxon Edmund as an exemplary Christian king would have appealed to a continental European audience much in the same way that some of the author's other works had done, notably those promoting the political philosophy of Hugh Capet and Robert the Pious, such as the *Apologeticus ad Hugonem et Rodbertum* (PL 139, cols. 461–72, following the seventeenth-century

edition of Pithou) and *Collectio canonum* (*ibid.*, cols. 473–508, following the seventeenth-century edition of Mabillon). (Forthcoming editions of both of these works, announced by Robert-Henri Bautier, seem not yet to have appeared.) Gransden, however, counters parallels drawn by Mostert between the *Passio S. Eadmundi* and Capetian views on kingship by adducing similar passages in English sources dating from the tenth century or before. She notes further that one of Abbo's principal sources of information was the testimony of Dunstan, the dedicatee of the *Passio* itself (whose death on 19 May 988 provides the work's *terminus ante quem*), Dunstan also being the recipient of at least two surviving acrostic poems by Abbo. (The poems, listed in *JCL* at pp. 489 [no. 10987] and 700 [no. 15822], are now edited by Scott J. Gwara, "Three Acrostic Poems by Abbo of Fleury," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 2 [1992], 203–35, at 215–26 [new to *OEN*].) These acrostics might be seen to lend some credibility to Leland's report of a book containing fully seventy acrostics dedicated to Dunstan by Abbo (see Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 1–4 [no. 1], at p. 1). Other evidence of Abbo's solicitation of English sources occurs in the *Vita et martyrium S. Abbonis abbatis* of Aimo of Fleury (*BHL*, pp. 1–2, at p. 1 [no. 3]), which implicitly refers to conversations between Abbo and King Æthelred II, a tradition perpetuated in a later note by Henry of Kirkstead—for whom see below. Gransden detects another, perhaps more plausible, informant of Abbo in the person of Oswald, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, who had studied at Fleury. Further engaging Mostert's views, Gransden sets out a group of passages in Abbo's *Passio* whose political import bears close comparison with aspects of Anglo-Saxon royal practice. Some of the concerns are quite broad (the ideal of free election; the sacerdotal nature of kingship; and so on), but one is quite specific: details of the Anglo-Saxon coronation *ordo*—Abbo's informant Dunstan officiated at two royal coronations—include verbal parallels with a ring-giving formula from the ceremony for Ælfthryth, the only English queen consecrated during the tenth century. Gransden concludes that Abbo certainly started work on the *Passio* (at least at the information-gathering stage) in England, and that it is largely irrelevant where he completed the work.

Building on these points, Gransden sees promotion of East Anglian ecclesiastical (especially diocesan) reform as the main goal of the work, reform which may have included the establishment of an episcopal see at a church dedicated to Edmund—possibly the one at the community at *Beadericesworth*, the township "which in the course of the eleventh century became known as Bury St. Edmunds." Gransden notes, however, that this place-name fails to appear in Ælfric's vernacular version of the *Passio*, composed c. 1000 (*DOE* ÆLS (Edmund) = Cameron, "Preliminary List" [in *A Plan for the DOE*, ed. Roberta Frank and A. Cameron (1973)], p. 75 [item B.1.3.31]), perhaps indicating that this allusion to the interests of Bury St. Edmunds emerged as a later interpolation. Though the idea may be traced back to one of her own

early studies, Gransden now doubts that the *Passio* was composed specifically to mark the reform of a secular establishment into a Benedictine community, a possibility recently explored by D. N. Dumville with respect to the abbey at Bury St. Edmunds (*English Caroline Script and Monastic History* [1993], pp. 77–8).

Gransden's lengthy study includes full discussion of the content, sources, and textual transmission of the *Passio S. Eadmundi*. The main Anglo-Latin works adduced in her source-study are Bede's *HE* and *Regularis concordia* (both offering mainly very general parallels), but Gransden includes engaging comments on a passage that evidently goes back to a lost forerunner of the eleventh-century Anglo-Latin *Historia de S. Cuthberto*, possibly produced as early as c. 945. Here as elsewhere, however, Gransden acknowledges that there are similar episodes in continental sources, and in this regard she notes that as many as four of Abbo's hagiographical sources occur in the so-called Cotton–Corpus Legendary (or *Passional*), the reflex of a huge hagiographical compilation made in northeastern Francia before c. 900, whose Anglo-Saxon circulation is now attested in manuscript only from c. 1050 (i.e., in the copy now preserved in BL Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 1 + vol. 2, fols. 1–180 and 187, with CCC 9, in toto [Worcester, s. xi med. or s. xi 2, i.e., c. 1050 × c. 1075]). Nevertheless, Ælfric was able to consult a forerunner of the Cotton–Corpus witness as early as c. 1000. Moreover, if Michael Lapidge's recent localization of the matrix of saints commemorated in the *Passional* to the archbishopric of Rheims holds good, the collection might well have entered Abbo's purview during his study at that center in the 970s. Gransden suggests reasonably that “[i]f a copy of the prototype of [Cotton–Corpus] . . . was at Ramsey during Abbo's visit, it seems not impossible that it arrived there through his agency.”

The evidence of manuscripts appears to place the text of Abbo's *Passio S. Eadmundi* in England before c. 1000. Gransden offers detailed comments on three practical, quarto-sized volumes produced at Anglo-Saxon centers, whose hagiographical prose is divided out into lections. The earliest English witness to the *Passio* occurs in a manuscript from Bury St. Edmunds, now London, Lambeth Palace Library, 362, at fols. 1r–11v. Gransden, citing the opinions of Michelle P. Brown and Teresa Webber, offers a significantly earlier date (s. xi 1 or s. xi med., as opposed to s. xi 2 [accepted by Gneuss and others]) for the copy's “free-flowing English Caroline minuscule,” a revised dating which would now qualify the Lambeth book for consideration as the item (*sancte Eadmundes uita*) recorded in a brief list of books at Bury, included among an inventory and rent-roll inscribed in an added quire of the present Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197 (?Worcester, s. x 2; provenance at Bury St. Edmunds by s. xi 1), i.e., fols. 106–9 (Bury, s. xi med.–s. xii 1), in entries at 107r–v (s. xi med. [i.e., 1045–65]). These possessions were apparently acquired before Leofstan became abbot in 1045, or very shortly thereafter. The proposed identification of Lambeth 362 with the booklist entry was previously rejected by Lapidge

and by Gransden herself on the basis of the received dating of the manuscript. Pushing the date for the circulation of the *Passio* in England back even farther, Gransden reveals that the text in Lambeth 362 presents orthographic peculiarities that point unambiguously to the existence of a lost exemplar in the sort of Anglo-Saxon square minuscule script that was “still in occasional use in the late tenth century.” Finally, the Lambeth witness preserves a distinctive sequence of texts, which Gransden views as the earliest known configuration, wherein the prose of the *Passio* is followed by two hymns and a mass, all celebrating Edmund, and, as its last item, Abbo's letter to Dunstan. By contrast, Abbo's letter, more naturally fulfilling a prefatory purpose, precedes the *Passio* in a second important early English witness to the work, now Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, G. K. S. 1588 (4^o) (Bury St. Edmunds, s. xi 2 or s. xi ex.; later provenance Saint-Denis at Paris), with the *Passio* at fols. 4v–28r. (Gransden—citing the opinions of Brown, Webber, and Dumville—admits a slightly wider range of dates than does Gneuss [s. xi ex.])

Intriguingly, Gransden's survey of more than a dozen of the numerous continental witnesses to the *Passio* finds that all but two of these present hybrid texts that may be traced back to an exemplar of the earlier Copenhagen version of the text, with its characteristic ordering of material, and not to the Lambeth configuration nor to the third-stage recension typified by a copy in BL Cotton Tiberius B. ii, fols. 2–85 (Bury St. Edmunds, s. xi/xii [Gransden] or s. xi ex. [Gneuss]), with the *Passio* at fols. 2r–19v. (This third-stage text, Gransden finds, forms the basis of all later English copies of the *Passio* but one.) It thus appears that the text represented by the Copenhagen witness circulated in continental Europe early on, quite plausibly from a point during Abbo's lifetime. But, I would note, the fact that *none* of these continental copies bears witness to the *earliest* state of the text, as exemplified by Lambeth 362 and its own distinctive ordering of the items in Edmund's hagiographical dossier, would seem to provide the strongest evidence yet adduced to support the distinction of the *Passio S. Eadmundi* as one of the very few works in Abbo's substantial canon that was completed and published first on English soil.

Gransden's wide-ranging survey also contains a thorough review of the diffusion of the cult of St. Edmund. Gransden notes the existence of numismatic evidence to show the commemoration of Edmund on coinage issued shortly after the king's murder in 869 (citing Philip Grierson and Mark Blackburn, *Medieval European Coinage, with a Catalogue of the Coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, I: the Early Middle Ages (5th–10th Centuries)* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986]—new to OEN). The survey carries right on through to the central Middle Ages, and in tracing the spread of the cult during the post-Conquest period Gransden reveals that the veneration of Edmund's relics spread abroad as far as Italy. An appendix to the article treats the sojourn of Baldwin, abbot of Bury St. Edmunds (ob. 1097/8), in Lucca, where he stopped on a journey to Rome. Baldwin's efforts to

promote the cult of Edmund in Lucca seem to have led to the inclusion of copies of the *Passio* in a number of *de luxe* Luccese passionals. As late as 1239, an inventory from St. Martin's cathedral in Lucca records the ownership of some human remains, preserved in a silver reliquary, believed to include Edmund's own severed head. Related aspects of Edmund's cult, some of them quite gruesome, are discussed in two articles cited by Gransden: her own study "The Alleged Incorruption of the Body of St Edmund, King and Martyr," *Antiquaries Jnl* 74 (1994), 134–68, illus.; and Norman Scarfe, "The Body of St Edmund: an Essay in Necrobiology," *Proc. of the Suffolk Inst. of Archaeol.* 31 (1970 for 1969), 303–17, illus., repr. in his *Suffolk in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1986), pp. 55–71 (both new to *OEN*).

The second substantial 1995 article by Gransden treating the hagiography of Edmund, cited in full above, addresses the longer and shorter versions of the anonymous *Liber de miraculis S. Eadmundi* (*BHL*, pp. 359–61, at p. 360 [nos. 2395–6]), a post-Conquest work of uncertain date, possibly falling outside of the scope of this column. The prologue of the treatise invokes the happy *memoria* of Baldwin, abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, who died in 1097/8. Similarly, a later paragraph adverts to the good *memoria* of William's queen Matilda, who died in 1083. Strictly speaking, as Gransden herself has noted, the application of the term *memoria* in Anglo-Latin usage was not restricted invariably to the deceased. There are cases in which it is adduced with reference to benefactors, those lying sick, travelers, and others away from the immediate environs of authors and liturgists. Attempts have been made at times to attribute the *Liber de miraculis* to authors working earlier than 1097/8 (or 1083), including an assignment of the work to one *Hermannus archidiaconus*, with a supposed *floruit* dated to c. 1070, by the fourteenth-century cataloguer Henry of Kirkstead (see *OEN*29.2 [1996], 90). The elusive ecclesiastic Herman(n) elsewhere has been variously identified as an archdeacon serving under Herfast, bishop of West Anglia (sitting at Elmham during 1070–2 and at Thetford during 1072–84); as Herman, bishop of Ramsbury and Sarum (*ob.* 1078); or as a monk of Bury named Herman, as mentioned by Lanfranc (*ob.* 1089) in his *Epistola XLVII*. Gransden now clears the field with respect to the question of authorship with her suggestion that the comment of Henry of Kirkstead was, at core, reliably informed, but that his attribution to Herman(n) reflects a misreading of a valid reference to one Bertram the Archdeacon (*Bertrannus archidiaconus*), a foreign hagiographer active in England during the 1090s. Bertram's career is attested by Goscelin (*ob.* after 1114), precentor of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, in the tenth chapter of his *Libellus contra inanes S. virginis Mildrethae usurpatores* (see further Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 79 [no. 163] and 178 [no. 489]). Regarding the early "union catalogue" of Henry of Kirkstead, now assigned the normative title *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis* by Sharpe (*Handlist*, p. 172 [no. 462]) and elsewhere identified as the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiae*, Gransden notes the appearance of important comments by Richard H. Rouse and Mary

A. Rouse in the recent *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, ed. Rouse and Rouse, *Corpus of British Library Catalogues 2* (London: British Library, 1991), at pp. xxi–xxii, xxx, xlv–xlvii, xlix, lx–lxvii, cxxviii, and cxlviii.

Gransden offers detailed analyses of the rhyming prose and unusual vocabulary that are prominent stylistic features of the *Liber de miraculis*, associating specific terms wherever possible with entries in the completed fascicles of *DMLBS* (or, where necessary, R.E. Latham's earlier *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List* [1965]). It is clear, however, that recent critical attempts to put distinctive labels on later Anglo-Latin stylistic traits are starting in their multiplicity to hamper the ability of working scholars such as Gransden to offer clear and concise commentary on these literary concerns. In one extraordinary footnote, Gransden refers to "examples of hagiographers who wrote in the 'Biblical' style . . . [and] loved unusual words . . . ; for similar examples see Lapidge, 'Hermeneutic Style.'" But none of this should be seen to detract from Gransden's thorough investigation of several related matters of literary and cultural history: the oral and written sources of the *Liber de miraculis*; the historical value of the treatise, especially when viewed as apologetic for Baldwin's agenda; and some striking cultural indices offered by the post-Conquest work, as in a reference to stereotypically "greedy" Normans. Gransden sets out a full apparatus of textual variants she has uncovered that are not recorded in existing printed editions by Martène, Durand, Liebermann, and Arnold. Especially engaging are Gransden's comments on the "short version" of the *Liber de miraculis* (not noted explicitly in Sharpe's *Handlist*), preserved in two self-contained, single-quire booklets, both originally circulating as unsewn gatherings, which are now respectively bound up as BN lat. 2621, fols. 84–92 (including a noteworthy example of a tipped-in singleton) and OB Digby 39 (*SC* 1640), fols. 24–39—the latter possibly containing a direct copy of the text in the former. Both witnesses to the short version of the *Liber de miraculis* seem to have been produced c. 1100. Gransden champions an English origin for BN lat. 2621, fols. 84–92, on the basis of the following considerations: the booklet's textual contents have been copied out in an ostensibly Anglo-Caroline script (as corroborated by an instance of Anglo-Saxon *wynn*); the booklet was apparently consulted directly as an exemplar for the copy of the *Liber de miraculis* in Digby 39, fols. 24–39 (or some lost but very closely related copy of the hagiography that once existed in England); and the possible English origin of an added *explicit* on the last page of the matter treating Edmund. (Gneuss does not include BN lat. 2621, fols. 84–92, in his "Preliminary List," but he dates OB Digby 39 to s. xi ex., with a provenance at Abingdon by s. xiii; Gransden dates both to s. xi/xii.) The *Liber de miraculis*, as addressed in Gransden's accompanying source-study, has value for knowledge of earlier Anglo-Latin literature despite the relatively late date of its hagiography on Edmund. Gransden detects traces of the following sources: a "lost work . . . [on] St. Edmund's miracles and cult" composed late in the reign of Æthelred II (before 1016); a range of

eleventh-century charters and other diplomatic sources, some of them forged; possibly Goscelin's *Vita S. Ivonis* and *Miracula S. Ivonis* (treated as a single item at *BHL*, p. 685 [no. 4621], and by Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 151–4 [no. 395], at p. 152); a continental work by Haymo of Saint-Denis at Paris, *De detectione corporis beati Dionysii martyris* (*BHL*, pp. 328–33, at p. 332–3 [no. 18]), which possibly influenced the rhyming prose of the *Liber de miraculis* and perhaps even the course of the 1095 translation of Edmund's relics; and the anonymous *Passio S. Æthelberhti regis et martiris*, composed c. 1100 but drawing on earlier material (see *BHL*, pp. 395–6, at p. 395 [no. 2627], discounting the erroneous attribution to Osbert of Clare; cf. also Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 409–10 [no. 1145], at p. 410)—this last item now preserved uniquely within still another notable example of a single-quire hagiographical booklet, the present CCC 308, fols. 1–8 (s. xii in.), on 1r–7v (see M.R. James in *EHR* 32 [1917], 219–20 and 236–44). Gransden suspects that Haymo's work had been imported to Bury by Baldwin himself, in a copy which survives in Cambridge, Pembroke College 24 (?Paris region, s. xi 2 or s. xi ex.; provenance by c. 1100 at Bury St. Edmunds), at fols. 361r–374v. The two versions of the *Liber de miraculis S. Eadmundi*, now most plausibly attributed to Bertram the Archdeacon, are not likely to receive scrutiny comparable in depth to that accorded them here by Gransden at any point in the near future. But one *desideratum* most surely remains, for which this article may well set the stage: a careful reediting of their texts.

Among the *atti* of a 1990 conference on medieval Latin textual criticism, Michael Lapidge expands on some of the text-critical discussion in the 1991 Oxford Medieval Texts edition of Wulfstan of Winchester's *Vita S. Æthelwoldi* (which Lapidge coedited with Michael Winterbottom), some aspects of which were addressed in a previous *YWOES* notice (*OEN* 26.2 [1993], 70–2; "Editing Hagiography," in *La critica del testo mediolatino: atti del convegno (Firenze 6–8 dicembre 1990)* [Società internazionale per lo studio del medioevo latino], ed. Claudio Leonardi, Biblioteca di medioevo latino 5 [Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 1994], pp. 239–58). The long discussion of Lapidge's primary hagiographical study-example is here framed by some extremely valuable commentary on the intractable problems that emerge when an editor attempts to produce a critical text of a saintly *vita* preserved in multiple copies, especially in copies produced after c. 800. Lapidge notes that "[i]n the period before about 800 it is unlikely that saints' *vitae* were widely used to provide lections for the Night Office." In this connection, it might be remarked that from the sixth century on there are uneven indications of the liturgical recitation of martyrs' legends, especially among usages in characteristically non-Roman centers and most often in feast-day masses (but also rarely in the Divine Office). Nevertheless, Lapidge's assertion that "[u]p to about 800 . . . the saint's *vita* was not used in any way in the liturgy" is correct insofar as early Roman practice never made provisions for the *ad hoc* excerption (or other adaptation) of

integral saints' lives for liturgical use in a manner comparable to those made for some other types of texts, including scripture. In other words, hagiographical works in the early Middle Ages were not numbered among the amorphous body of liturgical and devotional texts that were characteristically treated as variable texts (or, in the tentative terminology in use among recent critics, "changing," or "fluid," or "living" texts). At the codicological level, a book devoted to a single saint, called a *libellus*, was used to preserve "a 'fixed' type of text whose function was to supply matter either for private reading or for public reading in the monastic refectory." Lapidge describes surviving *libelli* that contain Anglo-Latin texts celebrating Felix, Cuthbert, and Swithun.

With innovations introduced by Pope Hadrian I (772–95), as recorded in *ordo Romanus* xii (c. 800), "the reading of *passiones* (on all saints' days, presumably)" was instituted in Rome. (I would note that the roughly contemporaneous Roman *ordo* xvi has some similar stipulations in this regard.) Lapidge, following C. W. Jones, estimates that around six hundred saints' lives were produced up to c. 800; many thousands more had emerged by c. 1200. A major impetus for the proliferation of hagiographical texts (after c. 800) was the need to accommodate lections of restricted duration to the three nocturns of the Night Office. This development necessitated the compilation of saintly reading-books, termed *passionals* or *legendaries*. (Lapidge cites a recent study by Davril, "La longueur des leçons de l'office nocturne: étude comparative," in *Rituels*, ed. P. De Clerck and E. Palazzo [1990], 183–97.) The earliest extant Anglo-Saxon *passional* is the present BN lat. 10861 (?Canterbury, s. ix 1), containing an unordered sequence of eighteen martyrs' legends. Lapidge sees the eleventh-century Cotton-Corpus legendary (see above in the notice of Gransden) as exemplifying an early stage in a process in which, initially, the spans of lections were marked out in the margins of *libelli*; then full texts from *libelli* were gathered in compendious collections such as Cotton-Corpus (or the fragment of a twelve-volume legendary now in BL Arundel 169 [s. xii 1]); and, finally, new texts, extracts, and redacted texts were composed to fill out later medieval *legendaries* or *breviaries*.

Five such central medieval or later *breviary* texts constitute the main body of evidence available to an editor of the *Vita S. Æthelwoldi* of Wulfstan of Winchester (composed c. 996). Lapidge here offers a cautious and thoughtful discussion of the difficult editorial problems inherent in the establishment of an Anglo-Latin text using post-Conquest sources that emerged at points after the liturgical use of hagiography had engendered "fluid" textual traditions in the transmission of *vitae*. One potentially controversial aspect of the Lapidge-Winterbottom edition is its normalization of the spelling of certain words throughout the *vita* on the model of the orthography observed in an Anglo-Saxon hagiographical monument (the previously mentioned Swithun *libellus*)—possibly Wulfstan's autograph. Lapidge himself is led to wonder, "Is such normalization, *against* the evidence of the

manuscripts, a legitimate editorial procedure?" In the light of the discussion offered here, the procedure does not seem particularly problematic. Certainly, any critical edition beyond the semi-diplomatic will seek to provide a consistent orthography, and what is at issue here rarely goes beyond a distinction between *aeclesia* and *ecclesia*. More challenging problems arise in evaluating the status of additional names, narrative details, or even entire episodes that occur in sources such as the following: the otherwise abbreviated Anglo-Latin *Vita S. Æthelwoldi* of Ælfric of Eynsham (Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 25–6 [no. 53], at p. 26); a much later (c. 1350) abridgment in the unprinted *Sanctilogium Angliae, Walliae, Scotiae et Hiberniae* of John of Tynemouth (see Sharpe, *ibid.*, pp. 333–4 [no. 949], at 334); an idiosyncratic copy (albeit one made from an important, but now lost, Winchester witness) executed by Orderic Vitalis (1075–c. 1143); the heavily redacted hagiographical compendium now preserved as BL Lansdowne 436 (Romsey, Hants., s. xiv med. [Lapidge] or s. xiv in. [Ker]); substantially altered texts in a large English legendary now on the Continent (Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, I. 81 [s. xiii]); and in innumerable breviary redactions.

In view of the complexity of these issues, it may seem remarkable that the Lapidge–Winterbottom edition ever saw the light of day. And Lapidge's thoughtful discussion in the article under review may make a judgment expressed in an earlier notice in *YWOES* seem unnecessarily harsh ("... an eclectic arrangement whereby the editors print a monolithic critical text and cite variants from all five known manuscript witnesses": *OEN* 26.2 [1993], 70–2, at 72). But the fact remains that for all of the many pages of discussion treating editorial issues here and in the edition itself, we still have not received a clear indication that the editors, for better or worse, chose one of the surviving copies of Wulfstan's work as a basis for their critical text and proceeded systematically to justify each and every deviation from that witness on probabilistic grounds. There are hints here that the restrictive editorial conventions of the Oxford Medieval Texts series played a role in the evolution of the edition, as did, perhaps, the ready availability of a single-manuscript text of Wulfstan's *vita* by Winterbottom (in *Three Lives of English Saints* [1972]). More significantly, Lapidge's trenchant analyses (here and in his most recent article on Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti metrica*, treated above) suggest that traditional methods of stemmatically grounded textual editing may not be up to the task of establishing unified critical texts of medieval hagiographical works. It is telling, perhaps, that Lapidge announces here that his forthcoming *Cult of St Swithun* will try to offer a "complete dossier of all the hagiographical texts—redactions and breviary lections included" and will record "all the variants of all manuscripts in the apparatus criticus to each text."

Covering much the same ground as a recent note by Scott Gwara (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 115) and arriving at strikingly similar conclusions, David R. Howlett and Anthony Harvey discuss the problematic term *iornum* (or *iornus*), which occurs as a *hapax legomenon* in the Anglo-Latin hexameter poem

Altercatio magistri et discipuli, where "a Welsh schoolmaster is attacked by a pupil for misrepresenting the good poetry of the ancients, composing bad verse, and seeking vainglory" ("An Attack on the Welsh Master Ioruert," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin du Cange)* 52 [1994], 281–5). Howlett and Harvey would associate the term with the Welsh adjective *iort* ("diligent"), suggesting that "[the letter] *n* may be a scribal blunder for *t*." Gwara, however, has possibly more plausibly associated *iornum* with the very common Old English adjective *georn*, also meaning "eager" or "diligent." (We are, after all, dealing with an Anglo-Latin poem, adopting a distinctly anti-Cambrian stance, which may well have been directed at a predominantly English audience.) Be that as it may, the interpretation and emendation championed by Howlett and Harvey have now been codified in the *DMLBS*, where *jortus* appears as a possibly ghostly headword (I, 1504). Nevertheless, all parties appear to agree that the term in some way plays off the epithet *piger* ("lazy [one]") in the preceding line. Howlett also notes that "[a]t the climax of the student's first attack on the master the poet arranged his words and ideas chiasmatically," setting out one of his finest specimens of balanced composition in Anglo-Latin. The analysis involves no letter-count and takes account of nearly every word in the cited passage, which occurs precisely where it might be expected—at a telling moment in a rhetorical speech.

Howlett also issued a discussion of six complex Celtic Latin texts in a 1995 *Peritia* article ("Five Experiments in Textual Reconstruction and Analysis," *Peritia* 9 [1995], 1–50). Comments of interest to Anglo-Latinists include a brief comparison of a heading in the Hiberno-Latin *Egloga de Moralibus in Iob* of Laidcenn mac Baíth (in Howlett's rendering, more fully identified as Laidcenn mac Baíth Bannaig of Clúain Ferta Mo Lua) with similar headings in copies of Anglo-Latin and Old English texts; a typographically enhanced text of the *Lorica* ascribed to Laidcenn (*incipit* "Suffragare trinitatis unitas") reproducing features of the copy in the Book of Cerne (see above under "Early Anglo-Latin"), at 43r–44v; and speculation that the Celtic Latin poem *Adelphus adelpha meter*—one copy of which occurs in CUL Gg. 5. 35 (St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, s. xi med.), at 420r–v—may have been composed by Israel the Grammarian, probable native of Brittany and sometime visitor to the court of Athelstan. On the last point, Howlett notes that Israel's *Carmen de arte metrica* (addressed to Rotbert, archbishop of Trier [930–56], but evidently written during Israel's stay with Athelstan; see Sharpe, *Handlist*, p. 194 [no. 540]) exhibits a form similar to that of *Adelphus adelpha meter*, and he discusses the possibility (accepted by Sharpe, *ibid.*) of Israel's authorship of the *Alea evangelii*, a gospel-based game of dice also known at Athelstan's court. In another article in the 1995 volume of *Peritia* ("The Polyphonic Colophon to 'Cormac's Psalter,'" *Peritia* 9 [1995], 81–91), Howlett discusses an early example—perhaps the earliest—of three-part polyphonic notation, occurring in a Gallican psalter (BL Additional 36929 [Ireland, s. xii med. or s. xii ex.]), which follows the copies of

Canticum trium puerorum and *Canticum Isaiae* that close out the first group of fifty psalms. Although, strictly speaking, the contents of this article are wholly outside the scope of this column, readers may wish to note Howlett's comments on Sarum usage and his exposition of an appealing passage by Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald of Wales or, according to Howlett, Girald de Barri) which celebrates the skills of the Irish in the playing of musical instruments. And, finally, although its subject matter is once again mainly outside the purview of *YWOES*, in a recent discussion of historical writing in twelfth-century England, also by Howlett, several observations of general interest to *OEN* readers may emerge over the course of what Robert W. Hanning (in an accompanying response) describes as an "incontrovertible case for what [Howlett] . . . calls 'the fabrication of sources,' as each [central medieval] writer seeks to outdo his predecessors or contemporaries in claiming exclusive access to super-authoritative, otherwise unknown, enabling texts" ("The Literary Context of Geoffrey of Monmouth: an Essay on the Fabrication of Sources," *Arthuriana* 5.3 [1995], 25–69, with the response by Hanning, "Inventio Arthuri: a Comment on the Essays of Geoffrey Ashe and D. R. Howlett," at 96–100). Howlett notes that the influence of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (and, of course, Bede's *HE*) continued for decades after the close of the Anglo-Saxon period, most notably perhaps in the case of the Peterborough Chronicle (now in OB Laud Misc. 636 [s. xii in., with later additions]), whose annals were augmented in Middle English down to 1154, but also in the works of no fewer than seven twelfth-century Anglo-Latin authors who studied Old English texts: Florence of Worcester (ob. 1118), Eadmer of Canterbury (ob. post 1124), Simeon (or Symeon) of Durham (ob. c. 1130), Geoffrey of Monmouth (ob. 1154), John of Worcester (ob. post 1140), William of Malmesbury (ob. c. 1143), and Henry of Huntington (ob. ?1155). Some of the dubious (or fabricated) citations discussed here involve otherwise unattested Old English sources which twelfth-century authors claim to have consulted at first hand. For instance, William of St. Albans (fl. 1178) claims that his *Vitae SS. Albani et Amphibali* offer "a Latin 'translation' of an alleged Old English source derived from something even more ancient." The sections of the *Gesta abbatum monasterii S. Albani* reliably attributed to Matthew Paris (ob. c. 1259) refer to a book "written out in the Old English or British language," supposedly recovered from a hollow in an ancient wall, which had to be translated by a priest named Unwona. In other comments, Howlett refers to several entries treating notable latinizations of Old English or Middle English words in the *DMLBS*. He affirms Neil Wright's contention that the original form of the preface of Geoffrey's *Historia regum Britannie* included a dedication to Robert, earl of Gloucester, alone. This text was subsequently revised to address Robert and Waleran, count of Meulan, and then was worked up yet again to salute King Stephen and Robert (but not Waleran). Finally, Howlett reviews all of the surviving sources that offer explicit allusions to Arthur before the

publication of Geoffrey's *Historia*, c. 1136/7 (preceded by the *Prophetia Ambrosii Merlini* as a separate *libellus*): the eight (or nine) recensions of the *Historia Brittonum* (in extant versions dating from at least c. 950); the *Vita S. Gildae* of Caradog of Llancarfan (fl. 1100); and, crucially, the "first reference to Arthur in an Anglo-Latin source," appearing fully ten years before Geoffrey's *Historia*, in the form of William of Malmesbury's remarks (in his *Gesta regum Anglorum*) concerning an Arthur who is fully worthy (*dignus plane*) of commemoration. Such commemoration, Howlett maintains, is precisely the *desideratum* that Geoffrey would attempt to supply over the course of the next decade.

f. Comprehensive Works

AN EXHAUSTIVE, 718-page study by Claude Carozzi addresses narratives of the early and central Middle Ages that depict otherworldly visions and various spiritual voyages to the beyond (*Le voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (V^e-XIII^e siècle)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 189 [Rome: École française de Rome, 1994]). Carozzi's book includes a full treatment of Anglo-Latin visionary literature down to c. 800, including detailed analyses of works by Bede, Boniface, Alcuin, and Aedilulf. The first comments on Bede's contributions to the genre occur in connection with Carozzi's analysis of the widely circulating legend of the "Vision of St. Fursa," the *locus classicus* for which occurs in the Hiberno-Latin *Vita et miracula S. Fursi* (Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 111 [no. 384], citing editions in *Acta Sanctorum*; in MGH SRM IV, 423–39; and in William W. Heist's *Vita Sanctorum Hiberniae* [1965]). Supplementing Krusch's incomplete edition in MGH, Carozzi presents a new, three-manuscript edition of the Latin text of the vision in an appendix, noting that another recent edition, by Maria Pia Ciccarese ("Le visione di S. Fursa," *Romanobarbarica* 8 [1984–5], 231–303), came to light when this work was nearly complete. Bede narrates a version of Fursa's vision at *HE* II.xix, and Carozzi's knowledge of the manuscript tradition informs some judgments about the precise form of the text known to Bede. Carozzi also includes some intriguing comments in relation to Fursa's vision on the *topos* of the "cosmic ordeal" (*l'ordalie cosmique*), essentially a sort of baptism by fire. A more elaborate treatment of Bede's approach to visionary literature appears in Carozzi's twenty-eight-page dissection of the account of the otherworldly Voyage of Drythelm (*HE* V.xii). Here as elsewhere, Carozzi stays close to the text, offering a detailed exposition of the narrative, a close comparison with other sources discussed in this work, and, in this case, explicating the complexities of Drythelm's voyage by means of a schematic diagram. In an extraordinary, thirty-one-page dissection of Boniface's *Epistola X* (MGH ES I, 8–15), to Eadburg (abbess of ?Wimborne), Carozzi addresses almost every detail of the Anglo-Latin author's report of the vision attributed to an anonymous monk at Wenlock. Carozzi here offers some comments on possible sources (or analogues) for the Wenlock visionary's description of the world beyond in

works by Prudentius, Aldhelm, and Bede. (Carozzi's mainly well-documented work does not cite a recent study by Patrick Sims-Williams, "The Unseen World: the Monk of Wenlock's Vision," in his *Religion and Literature* [1990], pp. 243–72.) Carozzi notes that Alcuin's *Versus de sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* includes two major visionary episodes, a reworking of Bede's account of Drythelm (at lines 876–1007) and personal testimony by Alcuin (at lines 1602–48) concerning an anonymous Christian youth of York (apparently mentioned under the name Seneca in Alcuin's *Ep. XLII* [MGH ECA II, 85–7, at 86]), who experienced an apparition of a shining messenger and a vision of a beautiful place (*locus pulchris*) shortly before his death. Brief comments by Carozzi point to possible sources for Alcuin's account here in III Kings xvii.17–23 and IV Kings iv.18–35. Carozzi's final major treatment of an Anglo-Latin source involves the hexameter verse of Aediluulf's *De abbatibus*, whose account of the Ecstasy of Merchedeorf forms his work's eleventh main vignette, supplemented by an account of one of the poet's own dreams. As ever, Carozzi's discussion of Aediluulf's account verges on the exhaustive, occupying sixteen pages overall and concluding with detailed discussion of two striking commonplaces in *De abbatibus*: its equation of the monastic cell with a mother's bosom, and an evocation of the harmonies of the celestial liturgy.

The first volume of David R. Howlett's two-book survey of perceived reflexes of "Biblical style" in insular Latin and Old English texts has much to offer students of Anglo-Latin literature, even if the main focus of its discussion is on Celtic Latin monuments (*The Celtic Latin Tradition of Biblical Style* [Blackrock, Co. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995]). The study commences with a fifty-four-page explication of Howlett's notion of Biblical style, which will prove essential to any attempt to come to terms with the contents of this book and its successor (*British Books in Biblical Style* [1997]), as well as several of the articles summarized above, or to make sense of Howlett's central contention "that [early medieval] literary texts might have been composed mathematically." Howlett's main summation of his introductory points may thus be quoted *in extenso*:

Job xxxviii.4–7, Isaiah xl.12, Proverbs viii.22–31, and Wisdom xi.20 state that God created the world as a mathematical act . . . The *Timaeus* states explicitly that God created the world mathematically. Euclid and Boethius both discuss extreme and mean ratio. The Talmud speaks explicitly of the counting of verses, words, and letters of the Hebrew text of the Bible. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero [in his] *De Oratore* both discuss . . . [and] illustrate . . . principles of chiasmic and parallel composition in both symmetry and extreme and mean ratio. Boethius illustrates composition by extreme and mean ratio in his finest poem, an abbreviation of the teaching of the *Timaeus* about the creation of the world, at the very centre of *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. Every one of these texts was known in Late Antiquity and in the Latin West during the Middle Ages.

Whatever readers may think of Howlett's quantitative approach to literary criticism, it will have to be admitted that as an editor of *DMLBS* he knows these texts well, and his judgments on matters of dating, attribution, and textual transmission deserve the close attention of scholars in the field.

Given the expansive nature of this 410-page book, the main points of interest to specialists in Anglo-Latin subjects may be summarized briefly. Howlett accepts the dating of the florescence of Gildas (crucial to the dating of the coming of the Anglo-Saxons) to c. 540 (or "[a]bout the middle of the sixth century"), which is in line with longstanding opinions expressed by John Morris and other commentators, as against dates as early as the 490s or as late as c. 580 suggested by recent critics (see *OEN* 25.2 [1992], 59–60; Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 149–50 [no. 384], has "6th cent."). The most substantial dating criterion remains a reference to the third consulship of the Roman general Aëtius (from 446 until his assassination in 454/5) in a letter quoted by Gildas, and Gildas claims to be writing just over forty-four years after a battle that is implied to have been separated from the time of the letter mentioning Aëtius by a number of events marking out a substantial interval (*multo tempore*). The major external criterion for establishing Gildas's *terminus ad quem* (c. 600) is a reference in a letter to Gregory I from Columba of Bangor, abbot of Luxeuil and Bobbio (*ob.* 615), which mentions the writings of one *giltas auctor* (*Ep.* l.vi).

Regarding Columba of Bangor, Howlett accepts the "solid reasons" that have been adduced by Lapidge for removing the epistolary poems *Ad Fidolium*, *Ad Hunaldum*, and *Ad Sethum* from the abbot's canon and for assigning them to a much later Carolingian poet who names himself in his own acrostic verse as Columbanus, possibly to be identified with a late eighth-century abbot of Saint-Trond bearing that name. Moreover, Howlett accepts arguments advanced by Dieter Schaller and Lapidge for including two poems ("Mundus iste transibit" and "Precamus patrem") in the canon of the Bangor native. (Howlett's policy is consistent with that of Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 90–2 [nos. 201–2].) The commentary here also implicitly points up one of the oddities in modern criticism of Hiberno-Latin poetry: the circumstance that authorities who reject the attribution of the poems *Ad Hunaldum* and *Ad Sethum* to Columba of Bangor (including Lapidge, Sharpe, the compilers of the *Database of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources, 400–1200* [1987], and Howlett himself) persist in identifying that author as *Columbanus*, when the two major attestations to that name-form occur internally in the two named epistolary poems. J.W. Smit has long since demonstrated (*Studies on . . . Columba the Younger* [1971]) that the form *Columbanus* (properly regarded as a diminutive form presenting an equivalent to modern *Colman* as opposed to *Colum*) was preferred by the saint's biographer Jonas of Bobbio (*fl.* c. 650)—who even in his *Vita S. Columbani* includes nineteen unambiguous references to *Columba*—as a result of Jonas's lack of familiarity with Irish onomastics, his inclination to employ a more distinctively declined Latin form (attesting to another sort of limitation in his linguistic knowledge), and, possibly, his desire to avoid any possible feminine connotations of *Columba* above and beyond its grammatical gender. As Howlett notes in the volume under review, "Columban of Bangor refers repeatedly to himself as *Columba* in *Epistolae* I, II, III, IV, and

V." Smit thus referred to Columba of Bangor as "Columba the Younger," in contradistinction to Columba, abbot of Iona (*ob.* 597), "the Elder"; but G. S. M. Walker had previously applied the epithet "Columba the Younger" to a namesake and companion of the Bangor native, a figure who is mentioned in the hagiography of Jonas of Bobbio—and, according to Smit, properly should be named Columbanus!

Turning back to Celtic topics bearing more directly on Anglo-Latin issues, Howlett's discussion of Aldhelm's correspondence with the Irish author Cellán of Péronne was published previously in 1994, in an article which has received notice above (under "Aldhelm"). In his treatments of Carolingian texts, Howlett's introductory remarks on Joseph Scottus (*fl.* shortly before c. 800), an Irish scholar at the court of Charlemagne, include a valuable summary of Alcuin's correspondence with his friend (and former student at York) Joseph. Introducing a letter by another Irish *peregrinus*, Dungal of Saint-Denis and Pavia (*fl.* shortly after c. 800), Howlett notes that "Charlemagne consulted [Dungal] about the treatise *De substantia nihili et tenebrarum* by the Anglo-Saxon Fridugisus." This comment points up the uncertainty that still surrounds the identities of some of the Anglo-Saxon scholars associated with the Carolingian court. For example, Sharpe's *Handlist* (at p. 83 [no. 178]) devotes a substantial entry to Alcuin's sometime pupil Candidus—identified in various sources as Witto, Withso, or Wiz(z)o, and, if English, presumably (following Marenbon) bearing the common Anglo-Saxon name Hwita. (See William G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* [1897], pp. 125, 310, 504, and 583.) Another pupil of Alcuin at York, whom the master called Nathanael, is the previously mentioned Fridugisus—or Fridugis, Fridugilsus, Frithugis, Fredegisus, etc., and, if English, presumably bearing the fairly common name Frithugils (or, conceivably, Frithugisl: see Searle, *Onomasticon*, p. 248). In 1946, Wilhelm Levison could refer casually to "a primitive dialectic . . . written by Fridugis, an English pupil of Alcuin" (*England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, p. 163), and "Fridugisus" (and his singular work on the nature of shadows and nothingness) continues to find a berth in the bibliography of the most recent fascicle (1997) of the *DMLBS*. Frithugils, however, does not appear in Sharpe's *Handlist*, perhaps because the form of his name and his later career might seem to mark him as a continental author. (There is no question that continental European pupils studied at York [see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 102]—or that continental authors with English connections are frequently included in Sharpe's *Handlist*.) Recent work in this area by Mary Garrison will be reviewed in a future column.

In his survey of ninth-century Celtic Latin authors, Howlett addresses some neglected hexameter verse (*incipit* "Vitales qui cupis"; not found in *ICL*) in the *Vita S. Machutis* of the Breton Latin author Bili (Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 226 [no. 825]), and Howlett's useful citations may be augmented by reference to some fairly recent, intensive work on the Anglo-Saxon cult of Machutus (Mahlou or Malo: see

The Old English Life of Macbutus, ed. David Yerkes [1984]). In his comments on a better known ninth-century Celtic Latin work, the royal biography *De rebus gestis Ælfredi*, ascribed internally to Asser, bishop of St. David's and Sherborne, Howlett offers a succinct summary of the case for the authenticity of the work, which, in a year that saw the publication of Alfred P. Smyth's *King Alfred the Great* (see below under "History and Culture"), may bear repeating here:

Welsh spellings of English names, Welsh equivalents of English place-names, frequent use of the Welsh manner of giving directions, much detailed information about political conditions in South Wales, many geographical descriptions of English territory, presumably for the benefit of a Welsh audience, apparent mistranslations of an Old English source, and references to Englishmen as foreigners, to the English language as *lingua Saxonica*, and to Wessex as *Saxonía*.

The bulk of Howlett's remaining discussion is concerned with the question of the integrity of the work, offering a close analysis of the rhetoric of a single episode, the account of the book of Old English poems proffered by Alfred's mother Osburh. Howlett also offers an outline of the whole structure of the royal biography bearing Asser's signature.

Howlett's comments on the *Historia Brittonum* are in line with those in his recent Arthurian study (see notice above), and Howlett here draws on the recent, if now apparently suspended, multiple-volume edition of the *Historia* inaugurated by D. N. Dumville. Howlett cites the name assigned to the alleged compiler of one of the eight (or nine) recensions of the *Historia Brittonum* as "Ninnius" and suggests that the attribution has been promulgated by "an eleventh-century forger attributing the *Historia Brittonum* to Nemnius, a learned pupil of the scholarly eighth-century Welsh bishop Elfoddw, who was apparently responsible for the conformity of the Welsh churches in the dispute about calculation of Easter." The version of the Celtic Latin *Historia Brittonum* recently edited by Dumville, the so-called "Vatican" recension, was promulgated in tenth-century England (during the reign of Edmund I, 939–46), and Howlett comments in another context on the continual interaction of Anglo-Saxon and Celtic traditions over the centuries: "in correspondence of Cellán with Aldhelm and of Radbod with Æthelstan, in dedication of work by Joseph to Alcuin, in patronage of Asser by Alfred, in address of poems from Patrick Bishop of Dublin to Aldwine and Wulfstan at Worcester, . . . British Latin, Irish Latin, and English Latin writers crossed each others' shadows and lived in each others' light." The eleventh-century Patrick in question is Gille Padraig, sometime monk of Worcester and bishop of the diocese of Dublin (1074–84), who addressed compositions in verse to one Eadwine and to Wulfstan II, bishop of Worcester (1062–95). In another case attesting to Celtic (here Cornish) and English contact in the eleventh century, Howlett (citing Lapidge) notes that in the *Vita Prima S. Neoti* the "author's reference to England as *Brittannia Anglica*, . . . his use of Old English sources and his conformity with Cornish orthographic tradition [indicate] that he was a mid-eleventh-century 'British-speaking native of Cornwall who had spent long enough in Anglo-Saxon

schools to learn to read Old English and to adopt the Anglo-Saxon practice of writing Latin ostentatiously.” Finally, Howlett offers some comments on twelfth-century Anglo-Latin authors, which complement his recent remarks on the continuing influence of Old English texts in twelfth-century England (in his cited Arthurian study). Regarding William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntington, Howlett notes that “[s]o extensive were the [Anglo-Latin] materials [at their disposal] that William could disdain some of them, particu-

larly those of whose style he disapproved, like Frithegod’s *Breviloquium Vitae Beati Uuulfredi* and Æthelweard’s *Chronicon*. William was well informed about the works of Ælfric and about the works which had issued earlier from the court of King Alfred . . . Henry even translated *The Battle of Brunanburh* into Latin that reflected elements of Old English poetry” (citing A. G. Rigg, “Henry of Huntington’s Metrical Experiments,” *Jnl of Med. Latin* 1 [1991], 60–72).

P.G.R.

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

AN UNUSUALLY RICH array of books and essay collections appeared in 1995, with particular strength in the areas of liturgical materials, bible/gospel manuscripts, and insular traditions. This trend is epitomized by the late Robert Deshman’s magisterial work, *The Benedictional of Æthelwold* (Princeton: Princeton University Press). Richly illustrated with color plates from the Benedictional (London, British Library, MS. Add. 49598) and 213 black-and white photographs of related images from manuscripts and ivories, Deshman’s book develops the thesis that, given Æthelwold’s reputation as a scholar and the unusually expansive collection of prayers in the Benedictional, there is a complex and subtle relationship between text and iconography that reflects the Bishop’s political and religious beliefs. Deshman begins by reviewing in detail the program of illumination, including the prefatory cycles of miniatures of the infancy, baptism, and later life of Christ and of the saints. He argues that “many of the miniatures are iconographically interrelated on various levels. Certain pictorial motifs and themes recur intermittently in various guises throughout the cycle, a technique that might be called cyclic symbolism.” In the conclusion to each chapter on the miniatures, Deshman provides a synthesis that leads into an important consideration of the sources and structure of the pictorial cycle. He shows that Carolingian influence was predominant, with close connections to Metz iconography as represented on the Brunswick casket. Byzantine art, especially as found in lectionaries, was a second basic source both for themes and the use of illustration according to liturgical principles. Frames for the illustrations were derived from Franco-Saxon models of the Carolingian period in Gospel lectionaries. Hiberno-Saxon iconography reflected in a group of early-tenth-century Winchester miniatures in the Galba Psalter also influenced the general program of the Benedictional. Deshman goes on to show how the iconography was influenced by the reformers’ association of benediction with Benedictine monasticism, a critical factor, he believes, in Æthelwold’s commissioning of the book. Moreover, a number of royal images such as crowns and diadems “can be interpreted as the visual statement of the celestially sanctioned concept of rulership that Æthelwold believed to be the theological rationale for the partnership of the church and the Court during the reform.” The production of the Benedictional marked an important development in the Winchester style of

manuscript decoration, where an integration between frame and picture, between ornament and figure became the new mode. Throughout the analysis, the figure of Æthelwold the intellectual and spiritual reformer looms as the one person who could have conceived this extraordinary book and whose ideas and values are reflected on every page. Deshman adds three useful appendices: on the description, reconstruction, and date of the Benedictional; the iconographic relationship to the Brunswick casket; and the decorative relationship to the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert.

Richard W. Pfaff has edited an extremely useful collection, *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, OEN Subsidia, 23 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan Univ.). In the introduction, Pfaff describes the structure of the entries, noting that it follows the three-part division of liturgical services: the mass, the daily office, and the occasional offices. The author of each entry begins by defining the type of book under discussion, and then reviews in detail the surviving manuscripts. One is struck by the difficulty in establishing firm categories of liturgical books when so few have survived and so little, therefore, is known about Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice. Pfaff contributes the opening chapter on massbooks, in which he shows, for example, that there were at least two important liturgical traditions from Winchester and St. Augustine’s, Canterbury. In the chapter on graduals, K. D. Hartzell discusses three manuscripts containing chants for the mass and notes that each “contains additions of importance made by composers and singers wishing to augment their repertory of pieces.” E. C. Teviotdale contributes the chapter on tropers, and there reviews the three surviving Anglo-Saxon tropers, two of which were produced at Winchester Old Minster as an outcome of the Benedictine monastic reforms. Alicia Corrêa covers daily office books, three collectars and five breviaries, while wrestling with distinctions between the two types. She suggests that the latter may actually have developed from the former. The most complex chapter—on psalters—belongs to Phillip Pulsiano, who divides the surviving books into groups: those psalters written in England in the pre-Reform period, late tenth- and eleventh-century English psalters, twelfth-century psalters containing Old English glosses, psalters brought to England in the tenth and eleventh centuries, psalter fragments, and manuscripts containing important psalter components.

Pulsiano goes on to address the Old English glosses as well as a number of other textual issues in the psalters. In the chapter on pontificals and benedictionals, Janet L. Nelson and Richard Pfaff remind us of the debt to Carolingian liturgical developments reflected in the twenty-one surviving books. These have been the subject of intensive re-examination by scholars in recent years, leading to new conclusions about origins and influences. Sarah Larratt Keefer concludes the volume with a chapter on manuals, which she opens by stating that although no such books survive from the Anglo-Saxon period, references to them by Ælfric and other sources, plus the presence of manual material in massbooks, pontificals/benedictionals, and other collections, supports the assumption that such did exist. She then categorizes and reviews the occasional offices that have survived.

Before leaving the subject of psalters, attention should be drawn to the publication of the second volume in the series, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, appearing as *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 137 (Binghamton: MRTS, 1994). This is *Psalters I*, edited by Phillip Pulsiano, which covers eight psalters, including those known as the Bosworth, Arundel, Tiberius, Vespasian, Vitellius, and Stowe Psalters. As usual in this series, the editor provides updated histories, descriptions, lists of contents, and bibliographies for the manuscripts copied in their entirety on microfiche. The usefulness of this tool cannot be underestimated, especially since, as is evident in the bibliographies, relatively little work has been done on some of these MSS and up-to-date editions are not always available. Pulsiano describes the aims and scope of the microfiche project in "Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile," *MESN* 33: 14-17.

A collection of four papers on Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Norman illuminated manuscripts has been edited by Thomas Ohlgren as part II of a "Survey of Research Past, Present, Future" in *OEN* 28, 3. Each author follows the format provided by Ohlgren: 1) to define the category of manuscripts covered; 2) to survey published scholarship; and 3) to assess what specific work needs to be done to complete the verbal and pictorial documentation of each group of manuscripts. The late Kathleen Openshaw tackles the slippery subject of "Liturgica Miscellanea," pp. B1-B15. After discussing the difficulty of categorizing these manuscripts, Openshaw lists a number of *desiderata* for published descriptions and photo reproduction, cites two individual books as especially meriting further study—the Sacramentary of Robert of Jumièges and the Caligula Troper, suggests some broader studies that are needed, and itemizes the publication status of some forty-three liturgical manuscripts. Gernot Wieland follows with "Psychomachia Manuscripts," pp. B16-B19, in which he lists (with date, origin, and provenance, where these are known) the ten surviving *Psychomachia* manuscripts either written or owned in Anglo-Saxon England. He cites issues such as the prototypes for and uses of the illustrated books as topics in need of further research. In his

contribution on "Old Testament Manuscript Art," pp. B20-B22, Herbert R. Broderick reminds us that the two illustrated manuscripts with Old Testament themes (other than psalters)—the *Cædmon* manuscript and the *Old English Illustrated Hexateuch*—continue to engender debate about the nature and extent of their indebtedness to iconographic precedents and prototypes. This complex issue and the need to re-evaluate the style of both sets of illustrations both require additional scholarly attention. Finally, Richard Gameson addresses "Early Anglo-Norman Illuminated Manuscripts c. 1066-c. 1125," pp. B23-B34 (includes plates). After surveying the enormity of this category and the advantages it brings in terms of greater information about provenance, date, and origin of these books, he notes that surviving books from Bath and Exeter need to be studied as groups and provides a list of eleven manuscripts, all of whose decoration should be reproduced for study by art historians.

In "The Old English Prefatory Texts in the *Corpus-Canterbury Pontifical*," *Anglia* 113: 1-15, Timothy Graham describes the materials that precede the Latin pontifical preserved in *Corpus Christi College*, Cambridge, MS. 44, apparently produced at Canterbury in the middle or third quarter of the eleventh century. Only a fragmentary conclusion of four lines prescribing the conduct of a bishop survives from the first text, but the second, on the symbolism of the church bells, seemingly relates to the rite for consecrating a bell found within the pontifical. Graham draws our attention to a compilation of extracts from Amalarius' *Liber Officialis* including an abridged version of the chapter on church bells matching the material translated in the Old English text, now in London, British Library, MS. Cotton Vespasian D. xv, fol. 102r-v. Graham prints the Latin abridgment along with the Old English text to demonstrate that the translation must have been made from a source of this type.

A number of studies on Insular bibles and gospel books appeared in 1995. Richard Marsden's book, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press) provides a comprehensive survey of the state of bible production and the kinds of books in circulation in the various regions, with the aim of establishing "the developing character of the text or texts of the Old Testament known in Anglo-Saxon England." After an introduction providing a brief history of the Latin bible and of the Old Testament, in particular, as it circulated in Anglo-Saxon England, Marsden looks to the writings of Southumbrian and Northumbrian scholars and to Northumbrian biblical production, for information about the types of texts in circulation. From there he investigates the evidence of part-Bibles from the eighth and ninth centuries, Wisdom books in non-biblical manuscripts, and concludes with studies of texts associated with the tenth-century Benedictine revival. He also considers Old English translations of the Old Testament where helpful in establishing textual types available to the translators. He emphasizes the strength of Carolingian influence throughout the history

of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England, as well as the probability that part-Bibles outnumbered complete Bibles during the period for reasons of utility and economy, even though the surviving evidence does not reflect this.

Following substantial restoration of the two-part Gospel manuscript now in the treasury of the church of St. Catherine in Maaseik, Belgium, the Maaseik Town Council has published (1994) a facsimile entitled *Codex Eyckensis: an Insular Gospel Book from the Abbey of Aldenik* edited by Christian Coppens, Albert Derolez, and Hubert Heymans. Heymans begins with a discussion of the Convent of Eycke (2 km. from Maaseik), its historical and archaeological setting. He notes that embroideries and portions of a reliquary surviving from Aldeneik Abbey, to which the convent was attached, are of Anglo-Saxon origin, a point of potential importance in understanding the Insular connections of the Gospels. Derolez follows with a description of the codex, which dates from the first half of the eighth century. Volume A consists of an Evangelist portrait and canon tables. Volume B includes additional canon tables in a slightly different style and the text. Derolez provides Stegmüller numbers for the prefaces and chapters in a full description of the contents. He notes that the text resembles that in a number of Insular Gospel books associated with Echternach. Derolez further offers a physical description of the manuscript including a reconstruction of the quires and layout, and an analysis of the script termed "round Insular minuscule." Red ink is used on occasion, while artistic initials are written in black. The portraits in A resemble Evangelist pictures in the Barberini Gospels. These and the arches of the canon tables (both styles) show a striking combination of Insular and Mediterranean influences. Although the Gospels have been linked by tradition to two saintly nuns, Harlinda and Relinda, and even mentioned in their joint vitae written c. 850–875, the colophon indicates that the scribe was male. In addition to providing a useful bibliography, Derolez adds a list of major exhibitions where the *Codex Eyckensis* has been displayed. This last point leads to an important issue discussed by Coppens in the section covering the physical actions and ethical implications in conserving the manuscript. It had been gravely damaged by a lamination treatment in 1957 and could have been restored only so far as needed by scholars. However, because it was wanted for display, a more extensive reconstruction was undertaken that included rebuilding the parchment, sewing the leaves together, and making new covers—the coordinated effort of a chemist, two conservators, a codicologist, and a book historian. This facsimile displays the success of the project and makes the book available for study through less intrusive means than handling the damaged codex, after all.

In *Cultural Interplay in the Eighth Century: the Trier Gospels and the Making of a Scriptorium at Echternach*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology, 3 (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press), Nancy Netzer demonstrates how close textual relationships among three Gospel manuscripts—the Augsburg, Maeseck (Maaseik),

and Trier Gospels—show all three to be products of the Insular center at Echternach. These relationships include liturgical apparatus and script style, and indicate a date of c. 720–c. 740 for the Trier Gospels. Two scribe-artists worked on the book, one in an Insular style probably derived at second hand through Echternach, the other Merovingian, probably from Trier. The cross-fertilization of traditions is here quite successful and seems to have had broader influence upon Charlemagne's court school and other scriptoria in the area of Echternach. In developing her thesis, Netzer examines numerous aspects of the text of the Trier Gospels, the construction of the codex, its script, decorated initials, canon tables, and decorated pages. Then in appendices she provides tables and diagrams of the evidence that links the three Gospel books together and underpins her argument. Through careful analysis she is able to provide a new, intensive view of the extent and significance of the scribal enterprise at Echternach. Netzer adds to this work in "Cultural Amalgamation in the Decoration of the Stuttgart Merovingian Psalter," in *From the Isles of the North*, ed. Cormac Bourke (Belfast: HMSO), pp. 119–25. In this essay she considers an eighth-century psalter preserved as Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, MS. Bod Bibl 2*, and notes that, even as the book shows Anglo-Saxon and Frankish influences, a ninth-century addition referring to the *congregatio sancti Willibrordi* links it to Echternach. She concludes that the Insular scribe incorporates forms from the Trier Gospels, and even finds evidence that the influence flowed two ways. This places the production of the psalter at a time and place contemporary with the Trier Gospels. Yet another psalter with Echternach connections is described by Daibhi Ó Cróinín in "The Salaberga Psalter," pp. 127–35 in the Bourke volume. Named for the saintly founder of the nunnery at Langres (Haute-Marne), subsequently transferred to Laon, the psalter dates from the eighth century and can first be traced to St. Jean de Laon c. 1120. Textual evidence associates it with the Anglo-Saxon family of manuscripts containing the *Psalterium Romanum*, and its physical features, especially decoration, are very similar to those in other manuscripts of known Echternach provenance.

Martin McNamara refers to Netzer's work in "The Celtic-Irish Mixed Gospel Text: Some Recent Contributions and Centennial Reflections," *Filologia Mediolatina* 2: 69–108, as he outlines the present state of scholarship and presses the case for further study of an Irish Mixed Text of the Gospels. Whereas much has been done with the Book of Kells, and a group of related texts has been identified, the possible Irish textual connections of the various Gospels produced at Echternach remains to be explored in greater detail. Another study of Irish influence on continental manuscripts is by Susan E. von Daum Tholl in "The Cutbercht Gospels and the Earliest Writing Center at Salzburg," in *Making the Medieval Book: Techniques of Production*, ed. Linda L. Brownrigg (Los Altos Hills, CA and London: Anderson-Lovelace), pp. 17–37. Named for the English scribe/artist

who produced the book, it serves as the leading example of the state of the scriptorium at Salzburg during the nearly forty-year administration of Abbot Virgil from Iona. Tholl describes Cutberch's techniques and materials and shows how they relate to other works produced at Salzburg before the death of Virgil in 784. Their Insular models and restricted resources stand in contrast to the work produced by Frankish scribes under Virgil's successor, Arno of St. Amand. Along with some models from Tours, these books feature classicizing display capitals and antique decorative motifs.

In *The Lindisfarne Gospels: a Masterpiece of Book Painting* (London: British Library), Janet Backhouse presents a small masterpiece of scholarship for the general public. The book is physically small, but even so the reproductions are of high quality and, in general, do justice to the original. Backhouse gives a brief history, lengthier structural description, paleographical analysis, and a comparison with contemporary Gospel books, and concludes with the story of Cuthbert and Lindisfarne all in clear language without talking down to the reader. The story of four later Gospel books from the eleventh century, occupies Patrick McGurk and Jane Rosenthal in "The Anglo-Saxon Gospelbooks of Judith, Countess of Flanders: Their Text, Make-up and Function," *ASE* 24: 251–308. The books in question are Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, MS. Aa.21; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia, MS. 437; and New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MSS. M. 708 and 709. All but the Monte Cassino manuscript can be associated with Weingarten Abbey, the subject of Judith's bequests. The authors explore the prefaces and texts of the books, noting that one scribe wrote most of them following a single text, but that three of the four have been severely edited. At least one of the books seems to have been designed for Judith's meditations on the life of Christ. These are deluxe manuscripts with extensive use of gold and illuminations, each decorated by a different artist. It seems that they were commissioned shortly before 1065 possibly from a group of scribes in Judith's employ, perhaps in York. Codicological descriptions of each book are provided in the Appendix.

Two additional articles deal with ancillary materials to the Gospels. In "The Canterbury Bible Glosses: Facts and Problems," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 281–333, J. D. Pheifer presents evidence to show that the "Leiden Glossary," preserved in a late eighth/early ninth-century manuscript from St. Gallen (now Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS. Voss. lat. Q. 69, fols. 7–46, at 20ra–37ra), and connected with the school of Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury, is part of a larger set of manuscripts containing Canterbury biblical glosses. By comparing the Leiden glosses with the sets in three principal manuscripts: Cambridge, University Library, MS. Kk. 4. 6 (Worcester, first quarter of the twelfth century), fols. 41ra–44vb; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 2685 (NE Francia, second

quarter of the ninth century), fols. 48vb–57vb; and Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M. 79 sup. (Piacenza, second quarter of the eleventh century), fols. 59v–89r, Pheifer demonstrates that the Cambridge and Paris glosses devolve independently from the same source as the Leiden Glossary. Further, although the first and third series of the Milan glosses are reflected in this group, the second Milan series is less so, but instead constitutes the major source of the corresponding section in the Leiden family's most prolific branch, the Reichenau Bible glosses. As to whether, therefore, the second Milan series of glosses from Joshua onward through the Old Testament originally belonged to the English collection associated with the Canterbury school, the evidence that they did occurs in the only contemporary witness to its curriculum, the Epinal/Erfurt I Glossary. Pheifer concludes that "the variety of these collections and their complex interactions are an impressive testimony to the intense educational activity that took place in early Anglo-Saxon England and its outposts abroad." A brief exegetical text on the four evangelists draws the attention of Jennifer O'Reilly in "The Hiberno-Latin Tradition of the Evangelists and the Gospels of Mael Brigte," *Peritia* 9: 290–309. Although this book (London, British Library, MS. Harley 1802) was written in Armagh in 1138, it preserves features of earlier Irish exegesis and Insular practices as reflected, for example, in the Book of Durrow and the Book of Armagh. The exegetical text is indebted primarily to the tradition represented by the so-called Irish Reference Bible and is placed before Matthew 1:18 following the genealogy of Christ, another Insular tendency particularly marked in the ninth century. The Gospels of Mael Brigte, therefore, demonstrate a living tradition of ancient Irish monastic culture in Armagh the year following St. Malachy's resignation of the see and immediately before his introduction of the Cistercian order. A diplomatic transcription of the text is provided by Dr. Sean Connolly in the Appendix.

The Book of Kells receives extraordinary attention in 1995, partly owing to the publication of a collection of essays edited by Felicity O'Mahony entitled *The Book of Kells: Proceedings of a Conference at Trinity College, Dublin, 6–9 September 1992* (Aldershot, Hants., and Brookfield, VT: Scolar for Trinity College Dublin, 1994). The collection opens with an interesting survey by Donnchadh Ó Corráin, "The Historical and Cultural Background of the Book of Kells," pp. 1–32, in which the author identifies those writings which provide information about the ecclesiastical history of early Ireland to the eighth century. Drawing on annals in Easter tables, church legislation, documents related to the problem of the computus and the calculation of the date of Easter, hymnology, and the evidence of classical learning, Ó Corráin conveys a good sense of what can be known about early Irish Christian culture and its close interaction with that of Britain. He also discusses the role and extent of vernacular literature in early Ireland, the importation of texts from Visigothic Spain, the development of a vernacular legal corpus, and the emphasis on a culture of writing that led to high

artistic treatment of holy scripture and the production of numerous biblical commentaries, all by way of a context for the production of the Book of Kells. In "Echoes: the Book of Kells and Southern English Manuscript Production," pp. 333–43, Michelle P. Brown links features in the Book of Kells to a southern group of manuscripts including the Book of Cerne (c. 820–840) and the Book of Armagh (c. 807) to show "a mutual preoccupation with the nature of the evangelists and the ways in which they symbolise Christ's manifestations, and with the harmony of the gospels." In terms of minor decoration, there are common features including zoomorphic run-over symbols, zoomorphic abbreviation bars, inhabited display script, initials with zoomorphic terminals, and mannered minuscule script style which speak to a continued cultural interchange among southern England, Ireland, and the center where the Book of Kells was written. This context has implications for the dating and background of this remarkable production.

Two essays deal with the complex relationships among image, text, and exegetical thought in the decorated pages from the Book of Kells. Carol Farr's work, "History and Mnemonic in Insular Gospel Book Decoration," pp. 137–45 in the Bourke collection, focuses on the picture of the Temptation of Christ, which Farr describes as "a multivalent cosmographic diagram, its layers shaped as signs of salvific history." She shows how three themes coincide here: history and cosmology; depictions of and references to the clergy and their pastoral mission; and depictions of indigenous figures in connection with sacred history. Thus we have the Temple/Tabernacle/Ark of the Covenant images, figures in vestments holding books, and figures in lay costume all serving as an expression of the revelation of the truth of Christian salvation and linking "this truth and its attendant power with the memory of aristocratic tradition." Back to the O'Mahony collection, Jennifer O'Reilly contributes "Exegesis and the Book of Kells: the Lucan Genealogy," pp. 344–97. Using the genealogy of Christ found in Luke as an example, O'Reilly argues that some of the decoration in the Book of Kells "may represent an adaptation into visual form of exegetical techniques and figures." Spaced over five pages, fols. 200r–202r, the list of seventy-seven names is decorated with color, ornament, calligraphic flourishes, and inter-columnar figures. In particular, O'Reilly focuses upon two fish-man figures that have been interpreted by earlier scholars as references to Iona and/or St. Columba. Exegetical tradition, however, allows for additional interpretations and therefore motivates the pursuit of further questions within the larger context of the entire genealogy. The fish-man on fol. 201r appears to be pointing to six birds as a sign of baptism, in reflection of St. Luke's gospel and of the exegetical tradition of Christ's divine Sonship revealed in the descent of the dove at his baptism, and his human ancestry revealed in the genealogy. O'Reilly then looks to scriptural and exegetical associations of the prophet Jonah to elucidate the fish-man figure itself. From there she moves through the portrayal of the Temple, the figure of Abraham,

the heavenly banquet, the new chosen people, the second Adam, the Temptation, and the sacred monogram all depicted on the pages surrounding the genealogy to provide the full context of the iconography. She affirms George Henderson's earlier conclusion that the iconography of the Book of Kells is consistent with the hagiography of St. Columba, "a priest of royal descent and prophetic power."

By way of paleographic information about the Book of Kells, William O'Sullivan contributes "The Paleographic Background to the Book of Kells" to O'Mahony, pp. 175–82. O'Sullivan looks to the Old Latin version of the gospels in Dublin, Trinity College, MS. 55, known as the Codex Usserianus, for characteristics of an Irish half-uncial script style that was developed on the Continent. He argues in favor of Echternach as opposed to Northumbria as a source for certain Insular books. On the other hand, John Higgitt, in "The Display Script of the Book of Kells and the Tradition of Insular Decorative Capitals," pp. 209–33 of the O'Mahony collection, shows that the Kells calligraphers worked in the Northumbrian tradition and may have influenced capitals in early ninth-century Irish manuscripts such as the Mac Regol Gospels and the Book of Armagh. In an appendix Higgitt provides an analysis of the principal forms of the decorative capitals in the Kells display script along with citations of parallel forms where they exist in manuscripts or inscriptions. Further information about relationships in manuscript production is provided by Robert Fuchs and Doris Oltrogge in "Colour Material and Painting Technique in the Book of Kells," O'Mahony, pp. 133–71. Using a binocular microscope and color spectrometer, the authors conducted a technical analysis of the writing and painting materials used in the Book of Kells. In so doing they are able to specify the components of these materials, demonstrate that the same ones were used throughout the manuscript, and show commonalities with the materials used in a number of other Insular manuscripts. A number of these ingredients are also shared with continental manuscripts from the late antique and earlier medieval periods, with the possible exception of lapis lazuli, where its presence has been proved in only five Insular and three Carolingian codices. The authors conclude that the scriptorium of the Book of Kells had access to the entire range of materials available in the British Isles and was exceptional in the richness of its palette. They also find that a unique double-layering technique in applying pigments was used for modeling and for iridescent coloristic effects.

Moving now to the content of the decoration, James Cronin writes "The Evangelist Symbols as Pictorial Exegesis," in Bourke, pp. 111–17. Cronin reminds us that patristic commentators and later Hiberno-Latin writers compared the evangelist symbols with a range of quaternities to stress the central harmony of the four gospels. In the Book of Kells, the four beasts are actually set in the canon tables, where the beasts are depicted as shape-changing, perhaps in furtherance of illustrating quadripartite harmony. Additionally, a single four-symbols page prefaces the gospels of Matthew, Mark and

John, another means of visualizing each gospel as a component of the whole. Nancy Netzer pursues some of these issues further in "The Origin of the Beast Canon Tables Reconsidered," O'Mahony, pp. 322–32. A poem on the evangelical canons by the Irish poet Aileran (d. 655) on fol. 1 of the Augsburg Gospels (manuscript described above in the review of Netzer's book) "strongly suggests that the model of the Augsburg tables contained beasts." This circumstance indicates that beast canon tables probably were known in Ireland in the seventh century and that, therefore, the Kells and Augsburg tables could derive from the same archetype, a copy of which was brought from Ireland to Echternach perhaps by St. Willibrord. It also means that a mid-eighth century date is possible for the book of Kells, since its decoration no longer necessarily posits a Carolingian model.

Robert D. Stevick contributes "Page Design of Some Illuminations in the Book of Kells" to the O'Mahony collection, pp. 243–56, in which he demonstrates that commodulation is characteristic of the designs in the full-page illuminations just as in other early gospel books from the Hiberno-Saxon tradition. He demonstrates how the design of the St. John page is derived, shows how that design accounts for the placement of various features on the page, and accounts as well for the other rectangular illuminations in the Book of Kells. He shows that each design is unique, "yet each is developed from the same small, well defined repertory of relational concepts." This degree of complexity might argue for a relatively late date of production. Douglas Mac Lean seeks the source of the depiction of the classical *pallium* in the Book of Kells in "The Book of Kells and the Northumbrian Type of Classical Drapery," in O'Mahony, pp. 301–10. After noting that the "double drapery" effect (over both arms) depicted on St. Cuthbert's coffin became established as a Northumbrian convention prior to its appearance in the Book of Kells, Mac Lean proposes that Gaelic secular costume may have inspired this feature. Graphic artist Mark Van Stone discusses some of the challenges inherent in the decoration of the Book of Kells in "Ornamental Techniques in Kells and its Kin," O'Mahony, pp. 234–42. Van Stone includes sketches of some of the most interesting patterns and decorative features.

Two further articles expand the consideration of the Book of Kells to its larger environment in the world of manuscript production. In "Studies in Insular Animal Ornament in Late 7th and Early 8th-Century Manuscripts," Bourke, pp. 105–10, Susanne Marx outlines a planned inventory of animal ornament, covering species, details, body shapes, number, combination, and arrangement of animals, with the goal of detecting undiscovered relationships among manuscripts and artists. Jennifer O'Reilly addresses another neglected area in "The Book of Kells and Two Breton Gospel Books," *Irlande et Bretagne: vingt siècles d'histoire*, ed. Catherine Laurent and Helen Davis (Rennes, 1994), pp. 217–27. The Bradfer-Lawrence Gospels (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS. 49–1980) and London, British Library, Royal MS. I. A. xviii, are two late continental books that, like Kells, have rare

textual illustrations. These gospels bear witness to an early Christian, ultimately Irish, heritage of luxury book production, but also show some points of direct contact. Marx continues on the subject of Insular animal ornament in "The Miserable Beasts—Animal Art in the Gospels of Lindisfarne, Lichfield and St. Gallen," *Peritia* 9: 234–56. Using a statistical analysis of the types of animals and their features, Marx concludes that three different artists probably produced the animal art in the Lichfield Gospels, and that this animal art has marked similarities with the Lindisfarne Gospels and St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS. 51. Especially striking are the similarities between p. 1 of Lichfield and the corresponding initial page of St. Gallen 51 (p. 3), evidence not previously observed.

Emphasizing the Celtic contribution to manuscript illumination in the seventh century and beyond, Susan Youngs surveys influential developments in metalworking and enamelling in "Medium and Motif: Polychrome Enamelling and Early Manuscript Decoration in Insular Art," in Bourke, pp. 37–47. Looking at the Book of Durrow, Youngs identifies, for example, the use of separate panels for designs in different styles and depictions of metal frames enclosing checkered patterns typical of millefiori glass as evidence of Celtic influence even as the metalwork itself changed over time. A similar theme occupies Silvana Casartelli Novelli in "Scritture e immagine nell'ambito insulare," in *Testo e immagine nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 41 (Spoleto, 1994), pp. 463–504. In a wide-ranging study, Casartelli Novelli examines the influence of Celtic monasticism on the interplay between text and image, particularly in respect to the Divine Word in the Gospels and typological interpretations of the Old Testament. She discusses illuminated Gospels, monumental sculpture including a variety of standing stones and crosses, fine metalwork, and high crosses, and further traces their influence to the continent. In "11th-Century Welsh Illuminated Manuscripts: the Nature of the Irish Connection," Bourke, pp. 147–55, Nancy Edwards considers two illuminated manuscripts associated with the sons of Sulien, bishop of St. David's (1073–78; 1080–85): the first now known as the Psalter and Martyrology of Rhygyfarch (Dublin, Trinity College, MS. 50) written at Llanbadarn Fawr c. 1079; and the second, St. Augustine's *De Trinitate* (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 199) also written at Llanbadarn Fawr and dated 1085 X 1091. Edwards shows that elements of the decorative style in these manuscripts are found in ninth-century Welsh productions, and additional commonalities appear in five other illuminated Insular psalters from the tenth and eleventh centuries from Ireland and Scotland. Her investigation corrects previous scholarship that has noted Irish influences only.

In another essay from the O'Mahony collection, Eamonn P. Kelly interprets the remains of a metal-covered wooden box, in "The Lough Kinale Book Shrine: the Implications for the Manuscripts," pp. 280–89. The earliest and largest of the surviving Irish book shrines, its decoration combines styles

from the early and late eighth century. The fact that its cover is dominated by a cross suggests that it contained a gospel book, and, given the dimensions, a large, illuminated one. The book probably was enshrined during the late eighth century after the box was completed, and then perhaps stolen and damaged during a Viking raid. Another product of early Insular art is a full-page painted miniature on fol. Vr of the Codex Amiatinus, which was copied before 716 at Wearmouth-Jarrow. It is a portrait of Ezra seated before a large open *armarium* containing nine volumes arranged on five shelves. Such is the setting for Richard Marsden's article, "Job in His Place: the Ezra Miniature in the Codex Amiatinus," *Scriptorium* 49: 3–15. The exact readings of the titles on the spines of the volumes have challenged scholars over the years, who have tried to determine what they say and whether they refer to the nine-volume Bible known to have been in Cassiodorus' house at Vivarium. Marsden argues against a literal reading of the miniature and suggests that the value of the painting was in its symbolism. The reference to Job alludes to the order of books implied by the titles on the spines, where the prophets are out of place in comparison with Cassiodorus' order as given in his *Institutiones*. In Marsden's view, there is no reason to belabor this and other possible anomalies.

A Bobbio manuscript, now Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS. D 30 inf., is the subject of Alessandra Themelly's essay, "Un codice bobbiese del IX secolo tra influssi insulari e rinascenza carolingia: osservazioni sul ms ambrosiano D 30 inf.," *Romanobarbarica* 13: 145–62. Associated with the abbacy of Wala, the manuscript contains Bede's *De temporum ratione* preceded by a liturgical/astronomical calendar written between 836–844. The book is beautifully decorated with, among other features, a striking group of quadrupeds, including lions. Although it is tempting to regard this as the unique survivor of Wala's scriptorium, Themelly observes that nothing in the calendar as originally written links it with Bobbio and, further, that the decoration has Insular elements that link it to the Northern French style at Corbie. The telling evidence re. the origin of Ambrosiana D 30 inf. lies in its similarities to some of the twenty-six books donated by Wala's predecessor Dungal in 830. Stylistic parallels suggest that the manuscript was indeed decorated at Bobbio following Northern French models at hand. Sandra Bruni revisits a late eighth-century manuscript from St.-Amand in "Le Due Versions del 'De orthographia' di Alcuino e il Codex Vindobonensis 795," in *La critica del testo mediolatino*, ed. Claudio Leonardi, Biblioteca di medioevo latino, 5 (Spoleto, 1994), pp. 313–21. Fols. 5r–18v of Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS. 795, preserve the earliest copy of Alcuin's treatise *De Orthographia*, one made during his lifetime. The problem is that this version actually combines Alcuin's work with that of Bede and establishes a separate group of copies. Bruni states that she is preparing a critical edition with stemmata to sort out the question of Alcuin's original version and its accretions.

In "Bücher im Übergang von der Spätantike zum

Mittelalter," *Scriptorium* 49: 169–79, Johanne Autenrieth surveys the salient features of groups of books surviving from the 4th–6th centuries in terms of script styles and decoration, then for the seventh and eighth centuries as well. David N. Dumville elaborates on many of these points in "The Importation of Mediterranean Manuscripts into Theodore's England," in the Lapidge collection, pp. 96–119. After puzzling over the lack of evidence for the importation, reception or use of Half-uncial script in England following the Roman mission, and noting on the other hand the success of the Insular minuscule system, Dumville argues that there must still have been a great many books imported from southern Europe into England throughout the seventh and early eighth centuries even though the evidence is scanty. From there he examines the sources of evidence, from the surviving imported books, to reports of acquisitions by travelling ecclesiastics, to ancient manuscripts that may have journeyed from the Mediterranean basin to England and thence on missions to *Germania*. Having followed out the paleographic evidence, Dumville concludes by suggesting that additional books lacking evidence of a stay in England can be identified as exemplars of English copies by careful collation. A similar challenge is faced by Marco Mostert in "Celtic, Anglo-Saxon or Insular? Some Considerations on 'Irish' Manuscript Production and Their Implications for Insular Latin Culture, c. AD 500–800," in *Cultural Identity and Cultural Integration: Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Doris Edel (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, and Portland, OR), pp. 92–115. Mostert is concerned to sort out strictly Irish productions from what is an Insular written Latin culture. He observes that the number of surviving manuscripts from Ireland before the end of the eighth century is "pitifully small," with liturgical manuscripts predominating and scant evidence of scholarship as such. In the Appendix Mostert provides a list of manuscripts of Irish origin mentioned in *CLA*.

In "Ireland, Tours and Brittany: the Case of Cambridge Corpus Christi College, MS. 279," in Laurent and Davis, pp. 109–23, Helen Simpson analyzes this ninth-century collection of Irish canonical materials that was copied in Tours, passed through Breton hands, and arrived in Worcester around the year 1000, where Archbishop Wulfstan may have consulted it. Whereas several of the texts are unpublished, the collection preserves, among other pieces, the unique copy of the "First Synod of St. Patrick" and an abridged version of the A-text of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*. Corrupt glosses in Irish and at least one Breton gloss, plus a wealth of related manuscript evidence, support a line of transmission and shed light on additional areas of cultural trinfluence in the late ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. David N. Dumville addresses the same subject in "Ireland, Brittany, and England: Transmission and Use of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*," in Laurent and Davis, pp. 85–95. He shows that in ninth-century Brittany, the *Hibernensis* was widely accepted as the text for canon law largely because of its systematic organization and heavy patristic element. The first half of the tenth

century, however, saw a heavy influx of Breton manuscripts into England such that no Breton manuscript of this text is known to remain in a Breton library.

Mildred Budny examines a famous Tours manuscript produced c. 846 in "Assembly Marks in the Vivian Bible and Scribal, Editorial, and Organizational Marks in Medieval Books," *Brownrigg*, pp. 1–15. Using an unusual set of assembly marks that positioned single leaves within the Bible (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 1) as her point of departure, Budny surveys the range of marking systems in medieval manuscripts and concludes by examining artifacts made from rigid materials and early printed books where, in both cases, assembly marks are a relatively common feature. This essay would be especially helpful for anyone beginning the study of paleography and faced with an array of indicators never encountered before. After a thorough survey of such signs and marks, with a multitude of relevant examples cited, Budny concludes that the assembly marks were part of the original production of the Vivian Bible probably made "by someone responsible for assembling the completed components for binding or for distributing the leaves and accompanying tasks to the scribes and artists." William Noel cites evidence to suggest that the Utrecht Psalter was actually unbound so that work on the Harley Psalter could proceed apace, in "The Division of Work in the Harley Psalter," in *Brownrigg*, pp. 1–15. Looking at the working procedure of scribes and artists in the Harley Psalter, including the fact that scribe 2's portion was copied later than those of scribes 1 and 3, Noel proposes that after artist A completed his work hurriedly in quire 1, and the enormity of the project became clear, the Utrecht Psalter was divided up among the artists, whose work then corresponds to the quire divisions in their model.

Richard Gameson's book, *The Role of Art in the Late Anglo-Saxon Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), provides a magisterial overview of the visual arts from the reign of Alfred the Great to the generation after the Norman Conquest. Although this is his focus, Gameson readily draws upon Roman examples and developments as late as 1400 in England as he looks for parallels, influences, and changing tastes. His observations are truly thought-provoking, indicating both the keenness of his mind and the degree to which his topic has been neglected by previous scholarship. He begins with a lengthy chapter on the illustration of texts, in which he points out the importance of visual criteria in signaling the value of a document. Anglo-Saxon artists drew on inherited pictorial cycles when available and displayed a variety of approaches to the problem of physically relating text and image. They used frontispieces, imagery punctuating the text at intervals, and illustration integrated with the text. The art "could help the Anglo-Saxon (layman as well as ecclesiastic) to appreciate a book, to understand its text, to visualize its contents, to meditate upon it, and to remember it." Next Gameson takes up the subject of inscriptions, including the types of message and the arrangement and appearance of inscriptions. He points out that the hierarchy of scripts prevails in a variety of

other settings where the form, content, and arrangement of the lettering is "essential for a just appreciation of its functions, its effect, and its modes of communication." Gameson further explores the challenges put to an artist by the limitations of the physical form within which he was working, the repetition of decorative motifs and certain figural subjects, and the function of religious pictorial narrative. In essence, the goal of the artists was to show the workings of the divine in every event, and the variety of media provided opportunities to convey "the interpenetration of secular and sacred." In considering the subject of Anglo-Saxon pictorial composition, Gameson reviews the frame and its contents, the issue of overlapping within the pictorial composition, the uses of scale, and the function of setting (including landscape, architecture, and symbols). The subject of decoration includes the frame (mainly foliate) and its functions, and decorated initials and their imagery. Many motifs seem to have been used both for secular and religious artifacts, though the latter predominate in survival. Moreover, the quality of monastic artistic achievement was dependent to a large degree on the wealth of the foundation. Kings played a role in this, of course, through their benefactions. Although this summary hardly does justice to the range and subtlety of Gameson's study, it should provide an overall sense of the scope of his work.

A number of informative articles on Old English texts and manuscripts also appears in this year's bibliography. Alex Nicholls has published a two-part study, "The Corpus of Prose Saints' Lives and Hagiographic Pieces in Old English and Its Manuscript Distribution," *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993), 73–96 and 20 (1994), 51–87. Nicholls begins by defining the corpus: 103 distinct hagiographic texts written in Old English prose, preserved in 46 original manuscripts, 16 of which are damaged or fragmentary. He then reviews Ælfrician saints' lives and extended hagiographic pieces, followed by the non-Ælfrician group, in both cases justifying his decisions to include or exclude problematic items. In the second part of his study, Nicholls describes and lists the hagiographic works in the surviving manuscripts. As a result of this survey, he observes that "there was an apparent lack of scribal concern over the functional difference between texts from the *Catholic Homilies* and those from the *Lives of Saints*," nor was there much concern for consistency of authorship within collections. He concludes with an Appendix providing a check-list of manuscripts and a coordinating check-list of texts. On a similar theme, Johannes Söderlind looks for an organizing principle for a damaged collection of Ælfrician texts in "The Old English Homiliary BL Cotton Vitellius D XVII," *SN* 67: 3–10. His analysis shows that, following an introductory group of fourteen hagiographic pieces arranged hierarchically, the collection divides into four additional groups of ten alternating between the *Catholic Homilies* and the *Lives of Saints*. The presence of an anonymous life of St. Pantaleon at the close of the introductory group, along with related linguistic evidence, leads Söderlind to propose Canterbury as a possible place or origin for the manuscript.

Wendy E. J. Collier adds to our information concerning the tremulous Worcester scribe in "‘Englishness’ and the Worcester Tremulous Hand," *Leeds Studies in English* 26: 35–47. Collier reviews the types of passages annotated by the Hand and notes his particular interest in references to the English language and "Englishness" more generally. She suggests that his work had the purpose of assisting with teaching and preaching in the vernacular, and might even imply a distaste for the Normans. The Tremulous Hand makes another appearance in materials examined by R.I. Page, Mildred Budny, and Nicholas Hadgraft in "Two Fragments of an Old English Manuscript in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge," *Speculum* 70: 502–29. The fragments in question, now MS. 557, were identified by Ker as coming from the same scribe and manuscript as another, larger fragment now carrying the shelf mark Pryce MS. C2:1 in the Kenneth Spencer Research Library at the University of Kansas. New conservation efforts have allowed for a full re-examination and publication of the Corpus fragments. These are reproduced, described thoroughly, and edited by the authors. Because related manuscripts share a known or probably Worcester provenance and likewise are annotated by the Tremulous Hand who is often connected to Worcester, an origin there for MS. 557 is likely, though not certain.

"More Ælfric Fragments" by Else Fausbøll (*ES* 76: 302–06) describes and publishes the contents of seven fragments found in Copenhagen in a discarded binding from the Arnamagnæan Institute. At least six with writing have been cut from one leaf, at least five of those horizontally. The text is from the end of Ælfric's homily *In Die Sancto Pentecosten* (Thorpe I, 328) and the opening to his *Sermo ad Populum, in Octauis Pentecosten Dicendus* (Pope XI). This same order is found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 188, the source of Pope XI. Another "lost" Old English copy comes to light in Peter J. Lucas, "The *Metrical Epilogue* to the *Alfredian Pastoral Care*: a Postscript from Junius," *ASE* 24: 43–50. When the antiquarian Franciscus Junius transcribed London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi (the Old English *Pastoral Care*, almost wholly destroyed in 1864), it already was missing the final sixteen chapters. Therefore Junius turned to the version in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Hatton 20, for the remaining text and the *Metrical Epilogue*, checking against the version in BL MS. Cotton Otho B. ii. Junius's transcript is preserved in the Bodleian Library as MS. Junius 53. Owing to a misleading reference in Dobbie's edition, this transcript of the *Epilogue* was omitted from Robinson and Stanley's EEMF edition, and so is reproduced by Lucas. An unusual feature of the Hatton 20 version was copied by Junius, namely that "the first four lines of the manuscript text each correspond to two verse lines, so that the end of verses 2b, 4b, 6b and 8b correspond to a manuscript line-end." This may be evidence of the influence of Latin verse, but in any case throws additional light on the accuracy of Junius' work.

In a different type of search, Michael Lapidge publishes the results of his review of the evidence in "Autographs of

Insular Latin Authors of the Early Middle Ages," in *Gli autografi medievali: problemi paleografici e filologici*, ed. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Pinelli (Spoleto, 1994), pp. 103–36. Lapidge revisits Paul Lehmann's doubts about the identification of any autograph manuscript by an Anglo-Latin author. He reminds us that a few scribal colophons survive, but is unpersuaded by evidence concerning Boniface's handwriting, that adduced for Bede, and for Wulstan *cantor*, as three examples of authors whose hands may be known but not in a copy of their own work. In some instances, a comparison of the text in question with the author's known habits or statements settles the case. Lapidge concludes by affirming Lehmann's scepticism with the expectation that there are still discoveries to be made. George Hardin Brown considers the means of Anglo-Saxon education in "The Dynamics of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 77.1: 109–42. Brown outlines three distinct periods in the teaching of literacy: during the earliest, instruction was in Latin; in the ninth century, translation was the norm; in the tenth century, Latin literacy was aided by the vernacular gloss and translation. Among its many functions, the psalter served as the basic entrée to literacy as it participated in all three phases of instruction. Another essay on books and literacy by Richard Gameson, "Alfred the Great and the Destruction and Production of Christian Books," *Scriptorium* 49: 180–210, reminds us that Alfred was not unusual in his efforts to foster Christian learning and in his understanding of the symbolic function of medieval books. Both in his preface to the translation of the *Regula pastoralis* and in his actions such as attaching a valuable æstel to otherwise plain books, Alfred was fulfilling the role of a Christian monarch to enhance his country's commitment to Christianity. Beyond the supply of liturgical books, which Gameson believes can be assumed, the king provided reading books intended to offer spiritual instruction, materials badly needed in a time of crisis. Alfred's close involvement with the project, and the fact that he chose to use translations as the vehicle, are the unusual features of his commitment. Gameson offers the welcome reminder that scholars should not necessarily link manuscript production with times of relative stability and prosperity—that times of turmoil and destruction could equally motivate the production of books given the theology of the medieval book.

Two articles address issues of legal literacy in Anglo-Saxon England. In "Forgery and the Literacy of the Early Common Law," *Albion* 28: 1–18, Bruce O'Brien reviews the evidence for and against the precocious development of literacy supporting the English legal system prior to 1066. He notes that, whereas the use of writs, charters, and other such documents in the Anglo-Saxon period show a reliance on the written word, the settlement of most legal cases in the early Anglo-Norman period was by oral witness. O'Brien identifies the change as the result of a flood of charter forgeries in the twelfth century, which meant that, until standards of authenticity could be established under Henry II, written evidence

could not be as trustworthy as oral testimony. Patrick Wormald examines the process of assembling an important post-Conquest collection of Anglo-Saxon laws in "Laga Eadwardi: the *Textus Roffensis* and Its Context," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 17: 243–66. He argues that the collection was assembled, copied, and corrected with great care, and that materials from a number of different sources—most notably Canterbury—stand behind it. The *Textus Roffensis* provides evidence of a strong link between canon law and secular law in the early twelfth century even though Old English legislation never achieved codified comprehensiveness of the sort found on the Continent in the twelfth century. As the foundation for the future development of the English justice system, this collection is more forward-looking than has previously been appreciated.

Two further contributions enhance our knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In a short but interesting piece, "Æðelflæd in the *Chronicle*," *OEN* 29.1: 42–44, Paul E. Szarmach notes that the scribe of the C-version (London, British Library, MS. Cotton Tiberius B. i, art. 4, fols. 115v–64) uses a frame of blank annal numbers for the years 896–910 and 925–933 to set off the so-called *Mercian Register* (fols. 140r–141r). By such visual treatment, the scribe accords this account of the life and times of Alfred's daughter a separate narrative integrity and thereby acknowledges its independent origin. There are hints in the syntax of a Latin original for this text and it contains an unusual expression of human sorrow in the *Chronicle*. David Dumville presents a *Facsimile of MS F: the Domitian Bilingual*, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a Collaborative Edition*, 1 (Cambridge: Brewer). This edition of London, British Library, MS. Cotton Domitian A. viii, fols. 30–70 provides scholars with images of the Old English text and Latin translation completed in the twelfth century at Canterbury. As Dumville acknowledges, "the reader will obtain from this facsimile a very fair appreciation of the nature of this manuscript and the challenges which it presents to scholarship." In other words, it is very difficult to read in places owing to trimming, staining, and faint rubrics and marginalia. Whereas Dumville has provided an appendix that lists the distribution of annals by page, it would have helped to print the folio numbers at the bottom of each page as done in the Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile editions, especially since the earlier numbering system on the folios has undergone several revisions in its history and even now needs correction.

Our final group of works focuses on charter evidence. Andrew Breeze contributes a short piece entitled "Old English *peru* 'loaves' in a Westbury Charter of 793–796," *N&Q* 42: 13–14. Occurring in the phrase "six long *peru*" in a list with other items (ale, sheep, cheeses, etc.) owed to the king in exchange for land, this word has been a crux until now. Comparing the food-gifts rendered from estates in medieval Welsh law, Breeze argues that the meaning of *peru* is "loaves" of bread. In "From the Lease to the Certificate: the Evolution of Episcopal Acts in England and Wales (c. 700–c. 1250)," in

Die Diplomatie der Bischofsurkunde vor 1250, ed. Christoph Haidacher and Werner Köfler (Innsbruck, 1995), pp. 529–42, Julia Barrow provides a useful overview of Anglo-Saxon bishops' charters. Barrow divides the survey into three stages. From 678–c. 1050 bishops' charters developed distinctive features such as the chirograph, but addressed a limited range of functions, primarily leases and grants of property. From c. 1050–c. 1150, episcopal acts drew on new models, including papal letters and royal writs. The pointed oval seal came to be adopted as the form of authentication. The twelfth century also marked a jump in demand for episcopal charters from monastic houses. They wanted confirmation charters and permission for their acquisitions of parish churches from lay patrons. In the last period, c. 1150–c. 1250, the features of charters came to be standardized in vocabulary, phraseology, script and layout, with responsibility for production given wholly to episcopal clerks.

Most welcome is *Charters of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanel*, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy), ed. S. E. Kelly. The introduction to the edition is a monograph in itself. Kelly provides histories of St. Augustine's Abbey and of Minster-in-Thanel, whose muniments came to be incorporated into the St. Augustine's archive probably during the first half of the eleventh century. Kelly describes the archive and its history—fifty-three documents of purported pre-Conquest date, including thirty-two Latin and five Old English charters relating to St. Augustine's and its endowment, two documents recording grants of general privileges to the Kentish churches, and fourteen Latin charters favoring the abbesses of Minster-in-Thanel. The latter include five noteworthy ship-toll exemptions. Only one single-sheet document survives. The remainder are preserved in cartularies of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and in Thomas Elmham's history of the abbey from the beginning of the fifteenth century. Kelly reviews the manuscripts and then takes up the question of authenticity, partly in the context of the distinctive diplomatic of Kentish charters and the contamination of the archive in the post-Conquest period. She ends by summarizing what the charters tell us about the estates of St. Augustine's Abbey and the lands and privileges of Minster-in-Thanel. In addition to full bibliographic information and the text of the charters, Kelly provides extensive notes on each item. This is an impressive piece of work packed with helpful information all the way through the appendices and indexes.

M.P.R.

Works not seen:

- Castles, N. J. "The Transmission of Classical and Patristic Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon and Early Norman England." Thesis Univ. of St Andrews. *Index to Theses* 44: 526.
- Chadbon, J. N. "Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS. Junius 85 and 86: an Edition of a Witness to the Old English Homiletic Tradition." Thesis Univ. of Leeds. *Index to Theses* 44: 490–91.

Cooke, J. F. "The Harley Manuscript 3376: a Study in Anglo-Saxon Glossography." Thesis Cambridge Univ. *Index to Theses* 44: 513.

Cox, Bonita Mae. "The Book as a Relic: the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Politics of Sainthood." Diss. Stanford

Univ. *DAI* 56A: 1347.

Withers, Benjamin Carl. "Present Patterns, Past Tense: Structuring History, Law and Society in London, British Library Cotton Claudius B. iv." Diss. Univ. of Chicago. *DAI* 55A: 2187.

7. Names

The Place-Names of East Flintshire, Cardiff, 1994 by H.W. Owen is the first of a series of studies on the place-names of Clwyd (earlier Flintshire and Denbighshire). This is the first of three volumes covering Flintshire including three eastern lordships: Hawarden, Hope and Ewloe. Since the area is adjacent to Cheshire, it shows varying patterns of Welsh and English separation and blending. Old English scholars will be particularly interested in the evidence of Mercian influence from the seventh and eighth centuries and the later Norse settlements in the Wirral. The survey follows the EPNS county surveys in format and completeness. Besides the usual discussion of major names, minor names, and field-names in each area, there is a separate discussion of a large number of unidentified field-names. A list of personal names and a large index and glossary of place-name elements occur at the end of the book. P. Jackson's edition of *Words, Names and History: Selected Writings of Cecily Clark*, Cambridge, 1995 contains, among other materials, thirteen of the late C. Clark's onomastic essays which were previously published. Besides making such materials readily available, Jackson has written an excellent biographical tribute to Clark in his "Introduction" and has provided a useful "Onomastic Index" of personal names and place-names with page references indicating where such names are discussed in this volume of Clark's Works. In *Namenkundliche Studien zum Germanenproblem*, Berlin and New York, 1994, J. Udolph uses place-names to suggest that Germanic developed as a branch of Indo-European in central Germany rather than in the north. The book is most useful to place-name scholars because of its thorough examination of place-name elements and their distribution in Germany, in Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg, in northern France, in England, and in Scandinavia and because of the seventy-five maps showing this distribution. "A Desert-Island History" (*Nomina* 18, 37-45) by F. Colman is a review of *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vols. I and II, *The Beginning to 1066* and *1066-1476* respectively. Although the audience for both volumes is identified as the anglicist, the general linguist, and the general reader, Coleman, writing from the anglicist perspective, generally finds the non-onomastic chapters in Volume I reasonable despite some weakness; R. Hogg's Chapter 3 "Phonology and Morphology" receives high praise though. The non-onomastic chapters of volume II are just listed with regard to contents. However, C. Clark's chapters on "Onomastics" in both volumes receive positive reviews in meeting the aim identified in the "General Editors Preface" in constituting "a solid" account of early English onomastics, covering a "full range" of types of

nomenclations and the types of variation (diachronic, socio-political, regional) to which they were (and are) susceptible.

In *Nordwestgermanisch*, Berlin and New York, 1995, E. Marold and C. Zimmerman collect a series of papers, for the most part presented at a symposium in 1992 at the Nordic Institute of Christian-Albrechts-University in Kiel, dealing with the question of whether or not Northwest Germanic even existed as a distant branch in the development of the Germanic languages before 500 A.D. and with the question of how it should be identified if it did exist. Five of the papers in this volume are included in the bibliography as well. In "Methodological Problems in Germanic Dialect Grouping" (*Nordwestgermanisch*, pp. 115-23), H.F. Nielson shows how scholars such as H. Krahe who use early nominative singular n-stem noun forms to support a Gothic-Nordic theory over a North-West Germanic theory of dialect grouping make three methodological errors: first there was a "etymological extrapolation of a suffix by comparison with another language [already] assumed to belong to the same dialectal group within Germanic;" second, there was an extrapolation across centuries "to determine the phonetic value of a runic form supposed to be a predecessor of a much later literary form;" more importantly, the conclusion was not based on just linguistic considerations, but also on ethnological, archaeological, and historical data as well. In "Is There a Northwest Germanic Toponymy? Some Thoughts and a Proposal" (*Nordwestgermanisch*, pp. 103-14), W.F.H. Nicolaisen calls for a comprehensive survey of the early toponymies of the languages in the areas where Northwest Germanic was alleged to have been spoken and from where it was carried in order to see if there was a Northwest Germanic onomasticon of name models that could be used in the new lands if the conditions were right. He suggests that elements like OE *bliþ* "slope" and ON *bliþ* "slope" in Old English place-names arriving in England nearly five hundred years apart suggest that such a Northwest Germanic onomasticon did exist. In "Die Landnahme Englands durch germanische Stämme im Lichte der Ortsnamen" (*Nordwestgermanische*, pp. 223-267), J. Udolph reconstructs a settlement history of England through the place-name elements: *rip*, *fenn*, *-iþi*, *strut/strod*, *wik*, *skarn*, *riede*, *mar*-, *hor*, *hude*, and *büttel* as they appear in English place-names and continental place-names. The twelve maps with the essay are effective in making his point visually. In "The Light Thrown by the Early Place-Names of Southern Scandinavia and England on Population Movement in the Migration Period" (*Nordwestgermanisch*, pp. 57-75), G. Fellows-Jensen concludes that migration-period place-names in southern

Scandinavia and England do not show close contact between the two areas because of the absence of *lev*-names in England and the absence of names in *ham* with specifics as personal names or group names in *-ingas* in Scandinavia. The exception to that generalization is that names in *-ing* or *-inge* occur in both places and may reflect continuing contacts. In "Zur Offasage" (*Nordwestgermanische*, pp. 187–204), U. Sprenger uses the legend of Offa in West Germanic (OE *Widsith* and *Beowulf*) and in North Germanic (Danish) to show the cultural connections and to argue for the existence of a common Northwest Germanic.

In "What Do English, Frisian and Scandinavian Place-Names Tell Us about the Frisians in the Migration Period?" (*Friesische Studien* II, pp. 97–113), G. Fellows-Jensen surveys some suggestions about modifications of F. Stenton's 1943 discussion of Frisian settlement in England. Fellows-Jensen now is inclined to interpret place-names with terms for Frisians to indicate individual settlers of Frisian origin, rather than small enclaves of Frisians. The article concludes with a call for more research into the type of "frontier crossing place-name," the Germanic *-ingahaim-* names, to gain information about population movements in the North Sea coastal region in the fifth and sixth centuries. In "Language in Contact: Old East Saxon and East Anglian" (*Studies in Anglistics*, Stockholm Stud. in Eng. 85, pp. 259–68), G. Kristensson uses place-name element evidence such as the reflexes of OE *strēt/stræt* to show that the East Saxon dialect originally covered the counties of Essex, Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, and Huntingdonshire and that the East Anglian dialects of Norfolk and Suffolk were divided by the River Waveney, paralleled diocese boundaries, and showed different reflexes of OE *ȝ* and *hw*.

C. Hough has three articles in this year's bibliography dealing with individual place-name elements. In "OE *isern* in Place-Names" (*SN* 67, 145–47), she suggests that both OE *isern* "iron" and OE *isern* "Kingfisher" are possible interpretations for the elements in place-names such as *Isenwell* in Gloucestershire. While the traditional interpretation of the element as "iron" in areas with old iron manufacturing districts such as *Isenburst* in Sussex makes sense, the bird-name is more likely the source of the element in areas where the geological features do not support an interpretation of *isern* meaning "iron". In "OE *græg* in Place-Names (NM 96, 361–365), she points out that *græg* in literary Old English is used to describe the wolf, not the badger. Therefore, she suggests that the OE *græg* in the place names Grazeley, Gresty, and Greywell is the substantive **græg* meaning "wolf" rather than "badger" as Ekwall had suggested and Smith had later repeated in *English Place-Name Elements*. In OE *wearg* in Warnborough and Wreightburn (*Jnl. of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 14–20), she presents a convincing argument that the place-name element *wearg* which is generally accepted as meaning "a felon, a criminal, an outlaw," might better be interpreted as "wolf" which then got extended metaphorically. The second element in both *Warnborough* and

Wreightburn comes from OE *burna* "stream" which would not be deep enough to drown someone efficiently, so the traditional interpretation of the places as "felon stream" or "a stream where criminals were drowned" seems unlikely, particularly since this was not a common method of execution anyway. However, the first element in *burna*-names is often an animal name; this seems to be another example of this phenomenon but with the OE *wearg* being a new addition to the established list of animals.

C. Hough also has three articles dealing with specific place-names. In "*Bonhunt*; an Essex Place-Name" (*Anglia* 113, 207–12), she shows that Ekwall's suggested source for *Bonhunt* as OE (ge) *bann-huntan* "hunter liable to be summoned" is improbable and his other suggested source "Banas huntsman" is only half right. She suggests that **Banan Funta* "Banás spring" is the most likely source for the place-name. In "The Place-Name *Felderland*" (*N&Q* 42, 420–21), she also rejects the conventional derivation of this Kent place-name first recorded in 1226 as *de Feldwareland* from an unattested Old English **feldware* "dwellers in the open country" and cites a similar *feldware* recorded in a list of bird names in an eleventh century glossary. She interprets the letter form as a forerunner of ME *felde-fare* "a species of thrush" and thus suggests that the place-name should be an "open land frequented by thrushes" etymologically. In "The Place-Names *Bridford*, *Brisford*, and *Birdforth*" (*Nottingham Medieval Studies* 39, 12–18), she suggests that the first element in *Brisford* in Wiltshire, *Bridford* in Devon, and *Birdforth* in the North Riding of Yorkshire is less likely to be OE *bryd* "a bride" as cited in Smith's *English Place-Name Elements* than to be an OE **brida*, *bride* "bridle" or OE **bryd* "surging" or OE *brēd* "board" or "plank".

R. Coates has four articles dealing with specific place-names. In "The Place-Name *Owermoigne*, Dorset, England" (*IF* 100, 244–51), he provides phonological arguments that suggest that the first element in this parish-name *Owermoigne* comes from the Proto-Welsh **oirōrus*, *oirōrosou* "wind-gap(s)." He indicates that the place-name may have denoted an area that was much larger in the past than the modern parish though. In "The Two-Goxhills" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 5–13), he derives the parish name *Goxhill* found in the old East Riding of Yorkshire and the old Lincolnshire (both now in the county of Humberside) from an unattested Scandinavian **Gausli* "(at the) gushing spring" seen in the ON verb *geysa* "to gush, rush" rather than Cameron's tentative suggestion of a Scandinavianized OE **geaceslēah* "cuckoo wood." On the other hand, in "English Cuckoos, Dignity and Impudence" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 43–49), he discusses the parish-name *Coxwold* in the North Riding of Yorkshire which he derives from OE **cucuwald* "cuckoo forest" based on the existence of an OE **cucu* before the first attested form from the thirteenth century in the *OED*. Mawer and Stenton had suggested in *The Place-Names of Sussex* its earlier existence also, rather than assuming it was a borrowed Norman term. In "A Breath of Fresh Air through

Finkle Street" (*Nomina* 18, 7–31), he, after discussing seven hypotheses, suggests that the most likely origin of this common, primarily northeastern, English street-name or minor rural place-name *Finkle* is ME *fen(e)kel* "fennel" used in the Anglo-Danish area along with ME *-fenel* "fennel" in other areas. However, Coates rejects the idea that the place-name refers to a place where fennel was grown or sold; instead, he thinks it refers to a place that smells as bad as a place where fennel were grown or sold might smell.

In "The Place-Name Icklingham: the Icenian Dream" (*NM* 96, 113–22), R. W. McConchie agrees with Skeat that the antiquarians were wrong in trying to connect the West Suffolk place-name *Icklingham* with the Icenii, the Celtic inhabitants of East Angolia. After rejecting the other etymologies that have been suggested, McConchie suggests that an OE personal name **Ycel* is a more likely source for the first element. P. G. Gruffydd's "In Search of Elmet" (*Studia Celtica* 28, 63–79) wanders a bit because it tries to include every historical and literary reference to this British kingdom in the southeastern part of the old West Riding of Yorkshire which was south and west of the ancient kingdom of Deira. For name scholars, the most important points that Gruffydd makes are that *Elmet* may derive from *Elfed* meaning "elm forest" and is British rather than old English, that the *Elmet* place-names containing such elements as *Eccles*, *Cumbria*, *Brettas*, and *Walsh* show a substantial Welsh population in *Elmet* after the Anglo-Saxon invasion, that the *Eccles*-names support the hypothesis that *Elmet* was a particularly Christian kingdom after 400 AD, and that much of the secular poetry with references to *Gwallog ap Lleenog* and to *Cadwallon* are connected to *Elmet*.

In "The Hypocorism *Bata*—Old English or Latin?" (*NM* 96, 345–49), D. Porter shows that the *Bata* part of the name of Ælfric *Bata* (who was a student of Ælfric, a monk, and also an author of *Colloquies*) is not of Old English origin and does not mean "bat" or "improver" as has been suggested; instead, Porter provides a more interesting source and meaning: the Latin *bata*, an olive press holding fifty pints, according to Book 16 of Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*. In "Cardinal Berard of Palestrina and a Shropshire Writ of 1060–1061" (*N&Q* 42, 14–16), A. Breeze marshals significant historical evidence to suggest that Bishop *Begard* referred to in a writ by Edward the Confessor issued probably after 25 December 1060 and before 15 April 1061 and known from a fourteenth century copy is really Bishop *Berard* of Palestrina who was a cardinal close to Pope Nicholas II and who was probably sent as one of the two legates to England in 1061 "in a campaign against pluralism, clerical marriage, secular control of the Church, and imperial meddling in papal affairs." In "Gildas; a Solution to His Enigmatic Name?" (*Irlande et Bretagne; vingt siècles d'histoire*, Rennes, 1994, pp. 33–39), P. O'Riain argues that the literary form of the name *Gildas* reflects Irish influence on personal names in southern Wales during *Gildas'* time. In "Osservazioni sui formulari delle iscrizioni britanniche dal V all' VII secolo" (*Romanobarbarica* 13, 283–95), C.

Tedeschi examines the distribution of inscriptions on Christian tombstones in south-west Britain (Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall) as well as in Scotland and France. He discovers some in England in the form of the dead person's name in the genitive followed by *filius* and the father's name, some in the form of the dead person's name in the nominative followed by the formula *hic iacit*, as well as some in a third form based on the first two where the dead person's name appears in the genitive, followed or not followed by the father's name, and the formula *hic iacit*. The distribution pattern of these types in south-west England is shown on one of the accompanying maps.

J. Fields' "Indexes to the Field-Name Sections in *The Place-Names of Surrey* and *The Place-Names of Essex*" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 50–55) were compiled to make use of those two volumes easier and to make them parallel with the other EPNS county volumes from X to XIX by listing the page numbers of the list of local field-names under each parish or township name. In "Early Field-Names in a Norfolk Parish" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 31–42), M. Hesse examines the names of about ninety roads and furlongs mentioned in the thirteenth-century *Cartulary of Creaks Abbey* in northwest Norfolk. Using later sources, she is able to derive most of their locations on a map, and she provides probable etymologies for those furlongs and roads in a five-page appendix to the article. In "The Herefordshire Field-Name Survey" (*Current Archaeology* 13, 11–15), R. Richardson explains how she and a professional map maker, G. Gwatkin, and a large number of volunteers used the tithe maps drawn up in the 1830's by the Church of England in the 260 parishes of Herefordshire to create a brochure consisting of a map and a list of field-names for each parish. The article includes maps showing how field-names in *Castle* helped to identify a motte-and bailey castle and how fieldnames in *Heneage* helped identify a supposed old Saxon palace.

In "Pagan English Sanctuaries, Place-Names and Hundred Meeting Places" (*ASSAH* 8, 29–42), A. Meaney uses place-name evidence to support her hypothesis that the earliest Hundred meeting-places were of three types: primary such as fords which were likely places where people encountered each other naturally on journeys and which later became formalized meeting places, secondary such as stones or other natural landmarks which had also served as places of pagan sacrifices of animals, and tertiary such as pillars which might also indicate where heads of sacrificial victims were displayed before the coming of Christianity. In "*Assandūn* and *Assatūn*: the value of Skaldic Evidence for English Place-Name Studies" (*Jnl of the Engl. Place-Name Soc.* 27, 21–29), M. Townend shows that the *Assandūn* mentioned as the hill in Essex which was the site of a key battle of the Anglo-Danish wars in the 1016 entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* could only be associated with *Ashingdon* in the south and not *Asbdon* in the north-west of Essex. His most compelling argument is the reference in the eleventh-century Icelandic poet Ottarr svarti's *Knútsdrápa* covering the same events to an *Assatūnum* which

would be a normal Scandinavianization of *Assandūn* but not of *Æscendūn*, the OE source of Ashdon. Townend argues that this example points out that Norse skaldic poetry should be used more often as a source for Old English place-name studies. In "Bramham Moor and the Red, White and Brown Battles" (*Yorkshire Archaeol Jnl* 67, 23–50), W. Pearson uses place-names and battle-names to suggest that Bramham Moor in Yorkshire is the site of many battles throughout history, the most interesting to Old England scholars being "Brunanburh" and "Vinheidhr" in *Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar* (which Pearson identifies as being the same battle) and the battles of "Winwæd" and "Maserfelth" described by Bede.

In "A Database for English Placenames" (*Names* 43, 255–274), C. Hough describes the database of Old English place-names and place-name elements available on the mainframe computers at the University of Nottingham over the JANET

(Joint Academic Network) in order to locate all occurrences of a particular word in a place-name or of any two words in combination. The database also identifies the language, source language, part of speech, subject (such as topographical terms or domestic animals etc.), and attestations of each place-name element. For place-names, other data such as dialect, case, location, type, date, meaning, and EPNS reference are given. C. Hough's "Bibliography for 1993" (*Nomina* 18, 152–66) and "Bibliography for 1994" (*Nomina* 18, 167–77) seem comprehensive (since they list my "Names" sections in *OEN* for those years respectively under "Bibliographies; other reference works"). While most of the items in Hough's bibliographies deal with the scholarly study of names in the British Isles or in Germanic languages, the bibliographies are so inclusive that they include books on how-to-name-your baby too.

J. D. C.

8. Archaeology

a. Excavation Reports

A NUMBER OF LARGE publications on individual sites were produced in 1995, several covering excavations decades old but left unpublished due to the pressures of work and lack of funding. Leslie Alcock publishes *Cadbury Castle, Somerset: The Early Medieval Archaeology* (Cardiff: Univ. Wales Press, 1995) to cover the important material which English Heritage chose not to publish (in favor of the material from the first millennium BC). Noting the "holistic strategy" he used to guide excavation, Alcock comments on the cultural divide which makes such separate publication convenient to specialists, while noting that he himself, after retirement, took responsibility for raising funds to publish the early medieval material. We should be very grateful that he did, given that the site comprises the longest known archaeological sequence in Britain. Cadbury Castle gives us not only more information on the fifth-sixth century occupation, but on a closely dated Æthelred II foundation and mint. Alcock notes that all previous accounts for the site are superseded, and that no reconstruction drawings are offered, though references are made to previous reconstructions (for example, he abandons the idea of an elevated lookout tower at the SW gate, widely disseminated among books on "Arthurian" archaeology, including his own *Arthur's Britain*), an omission which may have to do with funding but may just as easily be to avoid predisposing a reader toward one view over another. Such balance and reassessment is a hallmark of Alcock's work: he argues for his own interpretations, certainly, but freely admits when his views have been successfully countered or have changed.

For Anglo-Saxonists, fifth-sixth century Cadbury 11 is important for the insight it provides on early interactions between native Celts and Germanic peoples. Alcock notes that the effort put into work on the ramparts greatly exceeded that at Tintagel or Congresbury, implying a strong political power, but asks whether this is a military site. He questions

the conventional "yes" as based on the "ideology of Germanic/British conflict formulated by Gildas, enshrined in English history by Bede, and given a formal chronological structure by the compilers of the earlier entries in the [ASC]" (148). Only a crossbow bolt testifies to arms, though it is important in the debate on the introduction of this weapon as it cannot be later than AD 550, and is more probably earlier. Status imports of fine tableware and class B amphorae for wine and olive oil, as well as glass vessels, testify to the importance of Cadbury Castle in the early trading network with the Mediterranean. In fact, the radical shift in trade, where the Continent replaced the Mediterranean as exporter, seems to cause the collapse of Tintagel as a major port, and other major centers follow, including Cadbury. This interpretation counters the idea that westward advances of Wessex Saxons caused the collapse. Evidence for some contact with AS, however, exists in metal finds. A metal ring (for suspension?)/pendant decorated on both sides may be paralleled by sword beads (not rings) or a pendant disc from Canterbury Museum; later, the Cadbury piece was adapted with a pin, probably for a leather strap, and is of "westerly" AS (Wessex) manufacture, c. 520–530 or more generally sixth century. Similarly, a button brooch with a face, Avent and Evison's class Bi, dates to 475–525 and is Saxon. Alcock notes "they may mark the presence of Saxon women of status, coming to this major British centre as noble brides, or as prizes of war" (125); this seems a bit odd as a comment, as brooches are eminently portable, and need not be a specifically female piece in grave finds, while the pendant piece has its closest analogues in accoutrements for swords. In any case, the finds need not have brought Saxon women with them.

Cadbury 12 is described as an Æthelredan foundation soon abandoned, but set up as a mint with various marks including CADANBURIG, CADANBYRIM, CADANBY and CADABYR. Its chronology is entirely extrinsic to the site and depends on numismatic evidence dating between

1010 and 1020. Important aspects of the site are the rampart defenses and gate, a cruciform church, and the mint, while finds of a pin beater for weaving, decorated bone plaques and tools point to occupations otherwise not in evidence. The ramparts, best preserved in Rampart F, had a face of roughly coursed Lias limestone blocks and slabs with offsets. They were formed in two stages: first, soil, clay, gravel and rubble were laid on top of the humus, 0.4 m or more deep. Then the wall was added, sometimes on top, but more usually cut down into the earthen buildup, with mortar spread behind for c. 6m; Alcock suggests an intended 20 foot rampart overall. No evidence for streets was found, and though a large number of unassigned post pits E and S of the church may have been for huts, no definite buildings were identified besides the church. However, five keys, some for padlocks but 2 for large chest or door locks, point to substantial buildings. In part, the difficulty of identification of these has to do with extensive subsequent agricultural use: only rock cut marks survived. The range of finds suggests that seemingly missing occupations were present but are as yet unexcavated, or disguised within unassigned postholes.

The most striking architectural evidence came from the rampart gate and from the cruciform building identified as a church. The SW gate had a new surface laid of white mortar mixed with small chips of blue Lias, which may have been bedding if the paving stones were used as a quarry for local villages, as Alcock suggests. On either side of the entrance were walls faced with Lias slabs in mortar, and the passage was narrowed by responds at the outer end. A Ham stone with socket for a gate or door pivot suggests in all a monumental entrance, "probably arched rather than with a flat lintel. Given the known quality of Late Saxon church architecture in the area it is reasonable to believe that an accomplished piece of architecture had been intended" (50). A double-leaved door would close the gate. The cruciform building is in the form of a Greek cross, that is, with equal arms, but the trenches show it would have had what Fernie calls a salient crossing: the central space protrudes beyond the side walls of the "arms." This detail accords with the late Saxon date suggested. The trenches were open long enough for c. 10cm of soil to wash in, and then were deliberately filled with soil, rock and sherds. Thus the building was never completed, though it would seem to be a church in plan. Radford argued that it was a minster, but Alcock counters that it seems too small. The plan, being centralized, fits better with royal chapels, and Alcock proposes exactly that, stating that its unique form and close dating add to its importance, and should place the proposed church among Æthelred's achievements.

The mint is the last important aspect of the site, and no direct evidence for it exists, though Alcock points out that this is not unexpected, as all the tools are portable, and it is a notably "clean" occupation. (The major mint at York has yielded 2 dies and 3 test pieces.) The site does provide numerous ovens and hearths which may be connected to moneying, as well as an interesting collection of tools: a cold

set or chisel (used with a hammer), a file, and small shears such as might cut metal. No coins were found. Dolley, in 1958, had argued for the chronology which provides the 1010–1020 dates Alcock uses, and for a special relationship between the Cadbury, Ilchester and Bruton mints. Ilchester was moved to Cadbury c. 1010, returned c. 1017, and then Bruton mint was founded from Cadbury. But Dolley also characterized Cadbury as an "emergency mint" inconvenient in peacetime because he said it lacked water, with fuel and bullion having to come from afar. Alcock effectively counters these ideas, as natural springs supply Cadbury's summit, and its location at the center of major routes of communication and trade throughout its history make it unlikely to be peripheral in Æthelred's time. It was only 7 miles further from Ilchester and Bruton both, and was at the center of the "largest and densest concentration of Æthelredan mint-towns in England" (166). The London Way was no more than 1 1/2 miles distant. So if not an emergency site, what was it? Alcock argues persuasively for a permanent borough, given the large-scale work on the wall and monumental gate, and the plan for a seemingly royal chapel. Though the latter was not completed, nevertheless, the mint was not abandoned on Æthelred's death, so the borough, as the author terms it, was not dependent on an individual king's will. Cnut's coins were minted here briefly. Alcock suggests two steps in the disengagement: building stops when Æthelred is in Normandy in 1013, or earlier, and then the mint is slowly abandoned, and removed. Alcock appears justified in contending that political developments, not an unsuitable location, played the larger role in why Cadbury Castle was abandoned and turned over for agriculture. Dolley's claims of an unsuitable, unsustainable site for an emergency mint are strongly countered: "It is not unreasonable to suggest that, just as the nickname 'unræd' reflects a twelfth-century view of Æthelred, so the term 'emergency mint' reflects a twentieth-century perspective based on hindsight" (168). Dolley's view "betrays a solidly Insular unawareness of the ubiquity of hilltop towns throughout Europe" (172).

Ken Steedman reports on a two-week rescue "Excavation of a Saxon Site at Riby Cross Roads, Lincolnshire" (*Arch. J.* 151 (1995): 212–306). The long, narrow trench findings were merged with information from aerial photographs of cropmarks from 1980 to expand our understanding of the site. A particularly good illustration (#7) demonstrates the advantage of this approach in such a brief excavation, though excavation is always preferable given the difficulty of interpretation. Prehistoric occupation evidence was found, but most material identified the site as a rural Saxon settlement from the sixth/seventh to mid-ninth centuries. Early Saxon features were evenly distributed along the length of the trenches, while later material clustered in trenches C and D, aligned with two or more adjacent enclosures, themselves repeatedly redefined or renewed over time. Probably the main earliest site was to the SW of the excavation, and the different rates of deposit of finds shows the occupation to have shifted. In fact, the

excavator suggests that the site may finally have been abandoned in favor of migrating up the slope to the present Riby village, as environmental conditions of windblown topsoil and sand during excavation demonstrated the upper site as more desirable and comfortable than that excavated.

Steedman's excavations show us a settlement in which agriculture formed the main part of the economy, though remains of possible sunken-featured buildings (SFBs) could indicate domestic crafts, as some evidence for weaving and metalwork was found. SFBs are no longer claimed as exclusively early; the five found here were datable to both the early and middle Saxon periods. Notably, none of the SFBs registered as cropmarks, underlining once again the dangers of relying too heavily on aerial photography for excavation plans. The five enclosures were irregular but could be contemporary, as no overlap existed, and they may represent family units. Animal bone finds showed that cattle and sheep were present and butchered young for food (though no evidence for primary butchery emerged), so the enclosures may represent stock compounds in some cases. Pottery and the bone suggest this was indeed a domestic site; pottery, however, may have been acquired in trade, for which the site was well placed. The pottery and finds of lava querns from the Eifel region of Germany point to a link with the port of Ipswich (the querns were shipped rough and finished at such *emporium*), while a silver sceatta (probably Frisian, first half of the eighth century, Series E, BMC 4), a Merovingian biconical vessel and a caterpillar brooch reinforce the trade connections. Metalworking slag as well as a generous range of iron objects suggest what the settlement might offer in trade, and loomweights and metal teeth for a wool or flax comb add another. The area overall has produced few excavated sites. Flixborough, S. Humberside, is the most similar in artefactual assemblage, while Catholme, Staffordshire, is morphologically similar, with enclosures for separate farmsteads linked by trackways, but poorer in finds and so, different in status.

A. Boyle, A. Dodd, D. Miles and A. Mudd report on *Two Oxfordshire Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: Berinsfield and Didcot* (Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph No. 8, Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, for the Oxford Archaeological Unit). Berinsfield (pp. 1–197), excavated in 1974–5, is part of what is considered the earliest Saxon settlement in the Upper Thames valley, though the name of the town was only given in 1957 and is not an AS survival. Located near the Roman town of Dorchester-on-Thames, Berinsfield reflects early occupation in the countryside, apparently preferred to any continued occupation of the Roman site. Dorchester became the first see of Wessex in 635, “and this may be indicative of the importance of this area in the evolving West Saxon kingdom” (137). Its founding, however, does not seem to explain Berinsfield's abandonment, along with others in the valley, in the seventh century, as the authors echo Boddington's views: “An amalgam of pressures deriving from landscape, social, economic and religious change may have been at work, and Christianity should not be seen as the

determining factor” (143). The cemetery recovered was incomplete, as the site had been quarried and a road passes over the southern section; 114 burials and 5 cremation deposits were found in a total of five weeks of rescue work, which the authors consider to represent only half to two thirds of the original cemetery. The presentation of each burial and its finds is a model of clarity and accessibility.

Several important points were established regarding social organization, and the cemetery was determined to have held 3 or so households over a sequence of about 5 generations (assuming a 30 year generation). The distribution of grave goods and epigenetic traits showed that while some burial groups represented related individuals, the differences in status and diagnostic genetic features suggested that all members of a household, including relatives and workers, were buried together. The groups themselves were relatively homogeneous, with no one group clearly dominating. Grave goods, of which there were many, demonstrated links of trade and interaction, and also notably, the clearest associations were among grave goods, sex and age, “marking particularly clearly the likely existence of age-related status thresholds” (131). While objects that identify such a threshold can vary from site to site, Berinsfield helps support the findings from three other sites that the threshold between childhood and adulthood for both males and females was age twelve. Notably missing were neonatal burials, as only one was found; perhaps a different method or place was used. (Our assumptions about such deaths may also be exaggerated, or in another vein, the practice of exposure/infanticide would leave little evidence except such an absence. The excavators consider neither option.) Enough children were found here to show that a very high juvenile mortality rate pertained: one in ten died by the age of five. Sex-specific finds, though not always found in a burial, linked brooches with females and weapons with males, though there were some exceptions, as seems to have been the case in nearly every major site dug; males and females carried different knife types (and yes, the males' were bigger). In addition, a new computer program called Socistat was tested to rank finds, yielding interesting results that contradicted received opinion: it gave a high ranking (high status) to non-matching brooch pairs, and to disc brooches (saucer brooches are usually considered higher status). While further testing and research is needed, and perhaps omission of finds for which only one exists on a site, the results are promising. Particularly interesting is that all wealthy graves contained sex-linked grave goods, *pace* those who think an emphasis on class and gender issues is anachronistic and irrelevant.

Some other aspects of the Berinsfield report deserve mention. Several specialist reports were commissioned and completed in the 70's, soon after excavation, while others were written up in the 80's. No reference to work after 1992 is included. Authors were given a chance to revise, but not to attempt any new analyses, as the pressure was to publish an already long-overdue report. Three reports in particular should be noted. The account of brooches (by Anne Dodd, with

John Hines on square-headed brooches) constitutes one of the clearest seen in recent publications, both for covering a large variety of types and for photographic illustration; rarely is the mire of typology as accessible as this example, yet thorough. Elisabeth Crowfoot, long an expert in this area, documents an emerging body of textile evidence: imprints of textiles, and sometimes even a few organic survivals, in the corrosion products of metal objects such as brooches are allowing us to begin reconstructing dress. Thus, we can identify not only that some brooches show both fabric traces above and below, but what those fabrics might be. Uneven threads in the cast imprint suggest flax, while surviving threads identify sheep's wool here. Tablet weaving testifies to decorated edgings being used at the neckline, at the least, and the location of brooches allows mapping of where garments were fastened, and therefore some idea of their shape. In one case, a square-headed brooch overlay two saucer brooches. The pair fastened a twill, possibly woolen, dress, but the larger brooch on the outside fastened a light linen garment. Crowfoot suggests a shawl or hood fastened to the side, but perhaps it is worth considering whether the bodies were loosely shrouded in linen, and fastened with a personal item at the last. A small square-headed brooch at the waist of another burial, which had a mixed pair of brooches at the shoulders, may be another case in point, or a decorative fastening.

The final Berinsfield report noted here is one by Härke on weapon burial. He notes that a "considerable number of shields had been deposited on their own, without the offensive weapons needed to make up a functional fighting-kit" (67), supporting his idea that the ritual is symbolic. He suggests that some families buried with weapons and not others, demonstrated by epigenetic traits in Table 9 (an intriguing and suggestive point, though this Table documents only 12 burials, and does not account for differences in status). No swords were found at the site, which begs the question of why, especially on a site which has a higher proportion of weapon burials than other sites in the Upper Thames region and Wessex: 71% of all males were buried with weapons, though again, the site is incomplete. Importantly, the likelihood of burial with weapons here declines with age, which Härke does not comment on but which certainly suggests other factors beyond the ethnic distinctions he wishes to make. Also, he notes that only grave orientation and burial wealth (undefined: wealthy objects, or a wealth of objects?) correlate with weapon burials. He does not make the specific point here as elsewhere that non-weapons groups would be non-Anglo-Saxon, but the report was commissioned in the 80's and so predates most of his recent work. His ideas are important and worth tracking; the authors of the report overall, however, list his conclusions about social organization as only one among several possibilities.

The second site covered within the Boyle *et al.* volume is the AS cemetery at Didcot Power Station, reported by A. Boyle and A. Mudd (pp. 199–253). A three-week rescue excavation in 1991 found prehistoric and Romano-British pits

and ditches, and a small AS cemetery with two SFBs and 17 inhumations. The SFBs predate the cemetery and are out of use therefore by c. 650. One has evidence of a superstructure and one does not. Both contain pottery sherds and animal bone, with cattle dominating, and sheep/goat and pig represented, marked by butchery and canid gnawing. SFB 38 showed some evidence for weaving, with a weaving pick found, and the excavators consider both were probably used for crafts. The conditions of preservation were very poor, causing some graves to be excavated in soil blocks due to the fragile nature of finds and bones, though at least one grave may have been marked, given a surviving ovoid feature at its head. While remains of men, women and children were found, two graves stand out. The first is of a woman 45+, buried with two ground and polished horse teeth at her feet (identified as gaming pieces), a spindle whorl, an iron-barb spring padlock, iron shears, two knives, and fragments of copper alloy decorated sheet. The other grave, the richest in the cemetery, was of a child some three to five years old. A so-called work box of cylindrical copper alloy with wood fragments and a chain (to keep the lid attached?) was found between the upper thighs, probably showing it was worn at the waist. Hawkes thought of some of these boxes as amuletic, something also suggested for the hollow pendant or locket in the grave, possibly containing amuletic material. The authors consider that since larger cemeteries were often replaced in the seventh century by smaller and more numerous cemeteries possibly used by extended families, Didcot might be such a case. They suggest the site continues, both cemetery and settlement, to the west. In contrast to the Berinsfield report, which stresses the early power of Dorchester and its area, the Didcot report points out that the see was moved to Winchester c. 660, "probably in the face of increasing Mercian aggression," and that the area may have become politically peripheral in the seventh century, "existing as it did on the fringes of the expanding kingdom of Mercia" (243).

M.G. Fulford and S.J. Rippon discuss "Lowbury Hill, Oxon: a Re-Assessment of the Probable Romano-Celtic Temple and the Anglo-Saxon Barrow" (*Arch. J.* 151 (1995): 158–211). Though both the enclosure and the barrow on Lowbury Hill were most recently excavated in 1913–14, the excavator, Atkinson, had concluded that the enclosed site was an upland farm with dwellings, with a later, associated Saxon barrow burial of a male warrior. The 1992 excavations employed magnetic and resistance methods (measuring magnetic anomalies and the amount of moisture present). It was also to test Atkinson's findings in light of more recent assertions that the enclosure marked a Romano-Celtic Temple, and to discover what it could about any remaining stratigraphy in both areas. The two human inhumations were also re-examined. For the temple, excavation revealed that a trench which Atkinson termed a wall was in fact a robber trench, which was overlain by the female burial which Atkinson had called a foundation burial. As a robber trench instead of a wall, the feature changed the interpretation to where the burial

functioned as a *terminus ante quem*; the remains did not have sufficient sexually dimorphic material present for sexing the skeleton with confidence, but the size of it, and the shape of the jaw, suggested a female in excellent health, 45+ and with no trace of osteoarthritis. Radiocarbon dates put the highest probability (at the one sigma level) for date of death as between AD 591 to 655, and so dated the robbing of the wall as previous to this.

The enclosure may have begun as a small rectangular sacred area, perhaps with planted trees as indicated by tree holes. Two slots may mark either a fence, or simply a line; it was suggested that it may have been made by a plough, in keeping with Roman ritual in foundations of temple sites from as early as the mid-first century AD. Subsequently, the earthwork banks now visible were built, with rounded corners paralleled at Silchester. A link with Silchester, the civitas capital, is also suggested by the Oxfordshire wares and tile fabrics, as well as many oyster shells from the South coast. Some sort of building, as yet undiscovered but predicted to be central in the enclosure, is testified to by remains of roof and floor tiles, and many nails. A large number of Roman coins, over 1,000 between Atkinson's and the 1992 excavations, in addition to jewelry, first suggested the site was a temple, and finds of spears, some blunted with knobs, others pierced, were seen as evidence for a temple to Mars. The excavators felt that "given the location of the Saxon burial, it is difficult to believe that building(s), even if ruined, and the enclosure wall itself, did not stand up to the seventh century" (198). The monument may have attracted the burial of a Saxon warrior opposite the entrance to the enclosure; the barrow was built up from debris between it and the enclosure as if deliberately to include Roman finds of coins.

A final short essay by Härke presents his theories on why a seventh-century AS status burial is here, where AS settlement is scarce. The placename suggests both the barrow (*blaw*) and the enclosure (*burh*) were present when the name was created, and he argues that the choice came from an attraction to visible remains, especially those of the British/Celtic past. In the burial, a spear and a bronze hanging bowl with enamel decorations are used as evidence for this attraction to things Celtic, and the placename of nearby Wallingford, ford of *wealþ* (British) people, some 10 km away is added as more evidence, and dated to the seventh-eighth centuries when -ingas names were thought to have originated. (The many possible interpretations of such a name or phrase, however, would seem to make the point of little value.) He explains the AS cemetery there as a population burying their dead with "Saxon" dress ornaments, but without weapons; Härke sees weapons as "an Anglo-Saxon ethnic marker" (204). He sees the status as confirmed by the age (45+, probably much older) and lack of tooth enamel hypoplasia as evidence for health in childhood. The man was in poor health at his death, however, as the rest of the excavation report shows, having possible osteoporosis, osteo-arthritis, periodontal disease and generally poor dental health, and a "spherical

orifice" on his upper right arm, probably a stab wound or "pulsating false aneurysm of the brachial artery following trauma" (188); he probably died from an eventual rupture of the brachial artery. Härke says, "it is likely that this hilltop was chosen for its visible Romano-British past, legitimizing the rule of an Anglo-Saxon noble family over a mixed British and Anglo-Saxon population" (205). He traces the affinity for placement near prehistoric barrows as from a marked increase in social stratification, and a decreasing importance of ethnic difference between immigrant Anglo-Saxons and native Britons. The drop in average stature among Anglo-Saxons at this time he attributes to assimilation of Britons, relating it to the expansion of Wessex and Northumbria. However, as Alcock points out in his Cadbury Castle report reviewed above, such expansion need not explain entirely what occurs on defended sites of the Britons. Härke's ideas about the assimilation of native peoples, weapon burial rites by the Anglo-Saxons, and imitation of Saxon ways of dress by Britons have been published since the early 90's, and deserve serious consideration. But the identification of burials by dress or perceived ritual is a notoriously dicey business, as are his comments on changes in stature when we still know relatively little about the history of nutrition and food resources in the area. Furthermore, the work of Phyllis Jackson (see "Footloose in Archaeology," *Current Arch.* 144 [Aug. 1995]) suggests more reliable ways to test for native and Saxon populations, namely examining the structure of the foot bones, a genetic trait. (Her article and illustrations are also available on the Web at <http://www.archaeology.co.uk/hilites/feet.htm>.) Härke's ideas are suggestive, but not yet convincing; correlation with other aspects should help refine or revise his ideas.

Julian D. Richards, Marcus Jecock, Lizzie Richmond, and Catherine Tuck join forces to discuss "The Viking Barrow Cemetery at Heath Wood, Ingleby, Derbyshire" (*Med. Arch.* 39 (1995): 51-70). Various mounds at the site had been excavated in three older excavations, but in 1992 the RCHME conducted an earthwork survey in advance of tree-thinning by the Forestry Commission. As JDR and LR were already reconsidering the burial rite at Ingleby, the two investigation teams worked together interpreting the mounds and the nearby site of Repton, a monastic site with Mercian royal patronage and burial as well as a mass burial of disarticulated bones discussed by the Biddles as a Viking mass grave. The survey established that the apparent clustering of the mounds into four groups was real, though the meaning remains unclear; kinship groups or chronological groups were suggested. The dating of the mounds to the late ninth-tenth centuries depends on finds of two fragmentary swords and silver wire embroidery or Ösenstitch, while the closest Scandinavian parallels to the ritual involved are with North Jutland.

Several interesting points arose. While some of the mounds were at least partially surrounded by ditches, they may all have been simply quarries for the mounds. Though severe disturbance by animals and root action made accurate recovery of burial layout and provision impossible, nails found in five of

the 15 mounds excavated over the years suggest they held together or decorated wooden objects. The objects would have varied in size and positioning from the evidence known, and with 3 or fewer nails per find, fragments are likely. While some have suggested a shield as the piece represented (though one such burial was definitely a female with numerous goods), and others chests or boxes (but no hinges or clamps were found), the authors make the fascinating claim for sections of a boat. They suggest that using parts of older boats, undoubtedly around from Viking raids, allows for a previously unrecognized type of boat burial, evoking the journey of the dead. The fragments would have served as biers, and the authors note suggestions of clinker-built construction that might confirm this. Certainly their brief reference to the extensive finds of waterlogged timber coffins at Barton-upon-Humber provides a parallel, though to inhumations, not cremations; there, a clinker-built technique, where boards overlapped and were held by rivets, was clear, as even the timber survived. A boat burial was found under York Minster as well, with three oak planks caulked with wool forming a clinker-build platform, and the authors note that charcoal deposits from the Ingleby cremations are almost entirely of oak. Though the writers acknowledge the poor state of survival and varying excavation quality, "regular association of nails with cremation burials at Ingleby points to the use of some sort of crudely constructed coffin or bier" (63).

As for overall contextual and sequential interpretations, the authors think it likely that the populations represented in the mound burials and in the mass grave at Repton were linked, as were some burials with clear pagan attributes at the east end of the church, such as one in which a sword, Thor's hammer amulet, wild boar's tusk and jackdaw bone were buried with the male occupant, and the grave marked by a post or marker. They suggest that bands of Vikings in the second half of the ninth century chose the site for the mounds because "[w]ith its tradition of royal Mercian patronage and its prestige as a focus of pilgrimage, Repton would have provided the perfect location for a demonstration of new spiritual convictions combined with political/military subjugation" (66). They kept their own cemetery because of a "very definite" commitment to paganism, and the form alludes to their homeland. What seems hurried construction on many of the mounds reflects the instability of their position: ostentation marks insecurity, which sounds much like Martin Carver's claims for Sutton Hoo as a deliberate pagan manifesto. Thus we have represented here the historical "instance" of two religious ideologies in opposition and gradual adaptation. When the Viking army spends the winter at Repton, making it part of its fortifications, it begins to practice inhumation for legitimation. Yet the alternative tradition continues, as shown by the empty mounds still raised, as cenotaphs, commemorating those given Christian burial at Repton. Some of them may have converted rather rapidly, as Whitelock argued, as they would be members of the army which over-wintered at Repton in 873-4. The mass grave, containing the bones of

men and women who seem mostly unscathed by war wounds, may be dysentery or flu victims as suggested by others, but the gathering of their bones again testifies to the adaptation to a new ritual of burial. Thus, "Ingleby represents an integral part of the acculturation process" (68), and this intriguing article stands as one which transforms our views by offering new possibilities.

Keith Parfitt's "The Buckland Saxon Cemetery" (*Current Archaeology* 144 [1995], 459-64) is the publication of the 1994 excavation by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust of a recently uncovered area of the mostly sixth- through seventh-century Dover, Buckland cemetery excavated and published by Vera Evison. The 1994 excavations uncovered a rich collection of grave goods including weapons from seven swordsmen's graves; a female burial with a bracteate pendant (one of three from the cemetery); and a very rich female burial retaining fragments of a brocaded head-band interlaced with gold, a rock crystal ball, and a Roman intaglio of rock crystal. The bracteates indicate Scandinavian influence, although overall the influence of Northern France and the Rhineland is most in evidence. The graves excavated included those of men, women and children, and, while varying greatly in status, provide evidence of a generally wealthy community. A detailed catalogue of the finds is being prepared, as is a second monograph on the cemetery.

In the same volume of *Current Archaeology* is Ron Shoemith and Richard Stone's "Burials at Hereford Cathedral," 400-05. The excavations, undertaken in advance of construction of a basement for Hereford Cathedral, uncovered the remains of a Saxon road, a cellar, twenty-one burials, and a charnal pit—along with much evidence of later medieval activity (including a plague cemetery). The Anglo-Saxon evidence is particularly interesting as the site is just downriver from the Saxon monastery of St. Guthlac, and its extensive cemetery.

D.H. Heslop, et al. report on "Excavation within the Church at the Augustinian Priory of Gisborough, Cleveland 1985-6" (*Yorkshire Archaeol. Jnl.* 67 [1995], 51-126.) The excavations, done in advance of remedial work at the church, covered 600m sq. of the nave and west end of the church of St. Mary, Gisborough, and uncovered evidence of three successive churches, plus an unexpected level of Saxon occupation. A forthcoming report will deal with the survey of the extant structure, its historical and architectural context, and the results of earlier excavations. Most of this report covers the later medieval evidence (the priory was founded 1119-24); however Phase I spans the period of Saxon occupation. The evidence for Saxon occupation consists of a series of six post-pits (interpreted as either the remains of a building or a substantial fence), two linear features, fragments of Saxon pottery, and a sceat issued jointly for Eadberht of Northumbria and his brother Ecgbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, c. 737-58. Phase I was covered by a level of agricultural activity, and Phase II includes evidence for the construction of a Norman church, a building of uncertain use, and a series of burials.

While there is much in this report to interest scholars of the Norman through Gothic period, particularly as concerns the development of the site, there is relatively little of interest to Anglo-Saxonists—aside from the unexpected discovery of occupation in the area.

"The Hassocks Cemetery," *Sussex Archaeol. Collections* 132 (1994), 53–85, by M.A.B. Lyre, is a report on all known surviving vessels within Roman and Saxon fabric series from the Roman and Early Saxon cemetery destroyed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most of the article (pp. 55–74) is devoted to the Roman cemetery and its pottery, covering 153 Roman pots, finds of coins and metalwork, and includes a brief historical introduction and a substantial bibliography. The Saxon cemetery, centered just to the east of the Roman one (with some overlap) included warrior burials with grave goods, although most burials were cremations in pots. The burials were dated to the sixth and seventh centuries. The finds include knives, shield bosses, an axe and spearheads, along with twenty-nine pottery vessels of seven different fabrics—many of these are now in the Griffiths and Cunliffe collections in Brighton Museum. The report includes illustrations of four iron spearheads which have disintegrated over the years, but are here reconstructed from early descriptions and photographs. The pottery is interpreted as largely of "local household production", however, "fabrics C.1 and 2 are . . . of superior quality and associated with stamped and otherwise decorated wares. They may have been some of the products of a more organized industry" (81).

Paul M. Barford presents his personal views on "Re-interpreting Mucking: Countering the Black Legend" (*ASSAH* 8 (1995): 103–9) to refute problems he sees as stemming from the writers' not having participated in the dig itself. He critiques a 1993 article by P. Dixon (*ASSAH* 6: 125–47, "The Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Mucking: an interpretation") and the larger official publications to defend the method of excavation, and also to attack speculations and reconstructions which do not take account of either conditions at the site nor unpublished material in the archives. Barford himself was an area supervisor at Mucking who was also involved in post-excavation, and he is able to raise issues disastrous to Dixon's arguments. Dixon claims that mechanical digging took off over 1.5m of soil including post-Saxon stratigraphy, and that the area was poor agricultural land for fifteen centuries (this after discussion of damage from the ploughing out of the site!). But while the site was cleared to the level at which archaeological deposits became distinguishable, Barford notes that often this meant the area was under-dug by machine, and that excavators especially did not relish the hand-clearing involved after the machines were through. He details errors in Dixon's published plans and stratigraphy (which at times Barford says apparently invent soil layers that were not there), captions to photographs (including one which attacks the depth to which a mechanical dragline is excavating, ignoring the fact that the picture is of one of the machines owned by the quarry whose activities occasioned the rescue dig in the first

place). But more important than demolishing Dixon's contentions are Barford's points about the implications of this site and its publication. He claims that those writing the published reports, none of whom excavated the site, are both promulgating a false accusation of poor excavation, and using it to justify lack of funding for processing data. (He notes that one of the writers, for example, was formerly an administrator of HBMC publications.) He cites the difficulty he has, now excavating on the Continent, in accessing the Mucking archives for details to refute published claims, and notes that Dixon clearly did not have available the material he needed to complete his interpretations either (the archives are in the BM). Along the way, Barford demonstrates the type of reconstruction his knowledge could allow for by reconstructing a GH, based on memory because he has no access to the archives. His version has plank walls, wear patterns on the floor, and backfill between the walls and roof to support the former; he also favors interpreting the structures as larders or storerooms rather than dwellings or workshops. His most important argument is that if there is no full publication of Mucking, one of the most important and completely excavated sites in Europe, the data are not only not available, but he questions whether future interpreters "will similarly be led astray by the published accounts supposed to access material held in archive" (108–109). If Barford is only half correct in what he says, a serious misrepresentation of Mucking is being presented as acceptable scholarship and publication. The ability to check and refute any such publication, including in a reviews such as this one, will be limited to those who can spend the necessary weeks or months or longer tracking down individual points through the archives, surely not the best we can do after the years of effort involved in excavating and post-excavation work.

The British Museum has issued a revised edition of Angela Care Evans' *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial* (London, 1994). The book presents some of the new discoveries from the 1984–92 excavations directed by Martin Carver, in advance of the full report on the site due out shortly. However, while the volume contains new material, it contains few new interpretations of either site or artefacts. This is likely due to the fact that the bibliography has not been sufficiently updated. It does include *The Age of Sutton Hoo* (1992), and the collected *Sutton Hoo Research Committee Bulletins* (1993), but does not include *Voyage to the Other World or Sutton Hoo Fifty Years After*, both also published in 1992. This means that important work by Alan Stahl, Roberta Frank, and others is not taken into consideration. Stahl, for example, notes that the coins originally contained in the purse are all from separate mints, but that this need not mean that they were "carefully selected to form a collection" (88). Evans also states somewhat controversially, and without qualification that *Beowulf* was "written in Old English in the first half of the 8th century" (111). Moreover, she insists on maintaining the connection between the poem and the burial that Roberta Frank has (most recently) shown to be erroneous.

b. Theory And Archaeology

K.R. DARK has written a readable and useful introductory text in *Theoretical Archaeology* (Cornell UP pbk \$19.95, hbk \$49.95). He avoids excessive jargon while including a 400 term glossary to key phrases, and limits his aims: he did not attempt a "corpus of theory" or "a total overview of all theoretical archaeology," but instead "concentrated on introducing concepts and explaining their basis" which in his opinion "form the core of archaeological theory, rather than those [topics] which are aspects of method, or relevant only to specific situations" (2). Such ambitious coverage by this editor of the *Journal of Theoretical Archaeology* is managed in two hundred pages, with generally useful and appropriate illustrations or diagrams as clarification. After a brief history of archaeological concepts and theory, he looks in his first chapter at the identity and purpose of archaeology, discussing disciplinary boundaries and overlappings, whether it is a science, an art, or some hybrid field, and various ideologies which have had an impact on its development. Dark begins here because "how we do archaeology is a product of how we define archaeology, and why we do archaeology is encompassed within both of these aspects" (35), that is, application and theory are inevitably co-dependent. Subsequent chapters cover the framework of archaeological reasoning (sources of data and ways of knowing, such as contributions from anthropology and history, or the natural sciences); classification and the measurement of time; social archaeology (including the organization of society, of physical space, of state formation or political centers); economic archaeology; cognitive archaeology (Renfrew's "archaeology of mind," involving among many aspects belief, perception and decision-making); and finally, theories of cultural change (invasion, diffusion, acculturation, etc.). The discussions of middle-range theory and newer forms such as cognitive archaeology are particularly notable. Coverage of the common recent labels processual (in all its forms) and post-processual takes place early in the text and then regularly in specific discussions. But inexplicably, these terms are omitted from the glossary and the index (the latter is fairly skimpy), though they are surely terms an amateur would run across and try to look up.

Dark attempts to use examples from sites or studies from several countries, briefly discussing ideas contributed by American and European theorists and archaeologists, but clearly the book is a British account, and Dark's own specialization in early Britain provides many examples for his discussions. This is not to suggest the book suffers from imbalance, as the author has tried to be evenhanded and representative; in fact, for Anglo-Saxonists and early medievalists, the many examples taken from these periods may enhance applicability and understanding. Though the announced audience is undergraduates, amateurs and those working in fields which might have a use for archaeology, a reader may at times wish for more detail than was provided, since reducing discussions to bare bones makes many of the concepts blur together or fail to stick. To his credit, Dark cites frequently and widely the

work of important proponents in specific contexts; a few sentences explaining an approach will be followed by two to four references which can satisfy a curiosity for how such concepts are applied or theorized in detail. (Editors, however, should have made sure that references to common names, such as Thomas, had initials before them; in this case, there are three Thomases in the bibliography. They should also have caught the one "howler" in coverage of social archaeology, where Dark refers to invisible funerary customs such as depositing bodies in rivers or "sailing them off—like Hrothgar in *Beowulf*—in a burning boat" [93]: surely someone should have known it was Scyld he wanted to cite.)

At times, the effort to be introductory makes comments too vague and general to be useful, a fault repeated in the glossary (though rarely), as with "Marxian: founded on Marx's interpretations," the sort of definition undergraduates try to sneak into a test when they do not know particulars. The weakest sections are the conclusions of each chapter, which are so general as to be useless. A reader skimming them in a bookstore to get a sense of the book would get no synthesis, no summary, no help, and one wonders whether the press (Duckworth in the UK, Cornell here in the US) required these of an unwilling author. The final two pages of conclusions are similarly unnecessary. Since the author frequently notes when a concept is hotly debated and when it is something that a diverse range of approaches shares, he already had solid material to pull together for a concluding statement, one suggestive of areas of common agreement despite theoretical differences. Why not do so? Overall, though, this is a very handy book to have, informed, surprisingly readable and well done. For those lost in the terminology of current debates, or wondering how literary theory has impacted archaeological theory, or just needing a text that pulls together in one place an overview of major trends in an interesting field, this book certainly fills a niche too long empty, and does so accessibly and painlessly.

John Bintliff and Helena Hamerow edit *Europe between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brit. Archaeol. Reports, International ser., 617. Oxford, 1995). The volume is the product of a symposium on "The Transition from the Late Roman to the Medieval Period in Europe" held by the Department of Archaeology at Durham in 1993. Their introduction to the volume, "Europe between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Recent Archaeological and Historical Research in Western and Southern Europe" (1–7), introduces not only the volume but also the issues raised by both the original symposium and the published papers. Bintliff and Hamerow set the stage for what follows by noting the problems inherent in the term "transition", and by raising aspects of the complex merging of the "barbarian" and late Roman societies of the transition, or Migration, period. They also do a nice job of drawing the papers together while simultaneously setting them within the larger context of the developmental models current amongst archaeologists today. On the negative side, there are editorial problems, most

obviously sentences that suddenly shift subject.

The purpose of Hamerow's own "Shaping Settlement: Early Medieval Communities in Northwest Europe," (8–37), is to consider how the changing nature of Germanic settlements beyond and at the fringes of the Roman frontier "reflects wider changes in Germanic societies from the end of the Roman Iron Age to the Carolingian/early Viking periods" (8). She is particularly concerned with space and how analysis of the spatial order of settlements dating from the fourth through ninth centuries may be reflected in their social and economic structures. The basic unit of analysis is the household, and she identifies an understanding of the relationship between household units as fundamental to any analysis of settlement structure. In addition there are certain features shared by most settlements—paths, boundaries, and units ("discrete features such as buildings, pits and wells")—that aid analysis. Hamerow wisely notes that size is not a reliable indication of settlement type, most obviously because it is not always certain that a given site has been completely excavated, and multi-period sites, the size and nature of which change over the years, are also possible; nor is the size of a farmstead a reliable indicator of the wealth or status of its owner. Most of the paper is devoted to a detailed analysis of five main forms of settlement (row settlements, perpendicular settlements, poly-focal settlements, grouped settlements, single farmsteads) based on selected examples of each from Jutland, Drenthe, Gelderland and Lower Saxony. Analysis of these sites indicates that: 1) cardinal points were an important factor in the design and organization of settlements and buildings, 2) law codes reveal the importance of the individual *curtis* or *villa* within the settlement, 3) (not surprisingly) settlement type can vary regionally and chronologically. This leads her to conclude that "by the eighth century, a less flexible, increasingly normative use of space is apparent in the layout of both individual farmsteads and whole settlements" (13). She also makes the tentative suggestion that row settlements show the "greatest dimensional coherence" of any of the sites analyzed. Hamerow sees the view that Anglo-Saxon settlements are poorer, more scattered, and less easily analyzed than their continental counterparts as mistaken, arguing that both Anglo-Saxon house-types and settlement layout can be paralleled on the continent, and that similar characteristics can be observed despite differences in scale. While she does not provide an analysis of specific Anglo-Saxon sites, she observes that: "An apparent gulf . . . appears to exist between the settlements of early Anglo-Saxon England and those of the continental homelands. Yet when we consider the far-reaching changes which affected so many continental settlements during the fifth century, the comparison with the settlements of early Anglo-Saxon England seems less far-fetched. The reasons for these changes and differences in settlement patterns are complex, and not simply a matter of ethnic identity. The paper includes a good bibliography and is well-illustrated with site plans, though text and illustration could be better integrated.

The Bintliff/Hamerow volume also includes Christopher Scull's "Approaches to Material Culture and Social Dynamics of the Migration Period in Eastern England," 71–83. The migration period is here defined as the mid-fifth to late sixth century, and Scull introduces his topic by noting that it is so large and complex that he can offer only a summary of current issues and arguments. The paper begins with an examination of the way in which our analysis of material culture is still heavily dependent on written sources, primarily the histories of Bede and Gildas, and then moves to a consideration of the ways in which contemporary agendas and post-processual approaches alter our view of both the period and its material culture. Scull is particularly interested in "culture history" vs. post-processual archaeology, as exemplified by the new tendency to see the migration period as one of continuity and process rather than one of simple migration and invasion. His view is that there is no reason to reject "population movement" as a form of process, and that "migration theory" is a useful tool in archaeological analysis. This paper is specifically concerned with an analysis of burial practice and the way in which it displays "powerful evidence" for regional variations in culture that may well reflect migration and settlement. While not everyone will agree with his views, Scull does provide a rational and well-argued questioning of the popular notion that reading differences in the material record as indications of ethnic difference is simplistic and a product of modern imperialism, although he admits that other processes are also likely to be at work.

On this issue Scull concludes that no one model is sufficient. His view is that once settled in the mid-fifth century, the cultures of the new settlements began to diverge and take on insular characteristics and forms, and that during the late-fifth to mid-sixth century insular identities, expressive of new affinities and new social and political alignments began to emerge (76–77). The paper ends with a warning: "By focusing on a particular time-span (which in this case is punctuated by the end of the Western Empire) and defining it as an 'age of transition' we are by implication defining what went before and what came afterwards as periods of equilibrium, and we are therefore in danger of losing sight of continuous and dynamic processes of change" (80).

Sutton Hoo appears again in Edwin and Joyce Gifford's "The Sailing Characteristics of Saxon Ships as Derived from Half-Scale Working Models with Special Reference to the Sutton Hoo Ship," *International Jnl of Nautical Archaeol* 24.2 (1995), 121–31. The Giffords state that their aim in building the models discussed here was "to explore, and as far as possible, to measure, the performance under sail and oar of working models of Saxon ships, and in so doing to provide historians with an indication of the likely voyaging capabilities of the originals" (121). Both the seventh-century Sutton Hoo ship and the ninth-century Graveney ship were reconstructed, but only the Sutton Hoo ship is discussed in this paper (the Graveney ship is published elsewhere). The two ships were chosen because similarity in their plan and construction

suggested that both were built to sail, and the good results obtained from trial of the models seems to bear this out. Half-sized models were built from the same materials used for the original ships, and allowance was made for the effects of reduced scale on speed and water resistance. (The displacement ratios and other calculations they used are given [p. 124] for those who understand that sort of thing.) *Sæwulfing*, as the Sutton Hoo model was named, proved stable and easy to launch, sail and land from the start—although three different types of rudder and keel projection were tried. The Giffords conclude that “the Sutton Hoo ship was a first-class sailing vessel, fast and seaworthy, highly developed for voyaging from shallow rivers and creeks over sandbars and along coasts where emergency beach landing would be practical when caught in a storm on a lee shore” (131). As whoever was buried in mound one probably knew, this was a well-designed and well-built ship.

Karen Høiland Nielsen’s “From Artefact to Interpretation Using Correspondence Analysis,” *ASSAH* 8 (1995), 111–43, builds on and provides a critique of the 1992 book *Chronological Studies of Anglo-Saxon England, Lombard Italy and Vendel Period Sweden* (ed. Lars Jørgensen. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen), and that book’s treatment of the issue of fine chronological sequences. Nielsen begins by taking the Jørgensen book to task for including analyses based on secondary research along with analyses based on primary research, but nowhere does she make clear what the qualitative difference between the two is. The paper includes a lengthy consideration of the software used in calculating fine chronologies via correspondence analysis that will be tedious for the non-specialist, although there is a clear and useful discussion of the variables used for chronological analysis on p. 145. Nielsen does succeed in making her point that “the result of a seriation, or an attempt at a seriation, of a given group of finds, depends heavily on the ‘typology’ we choose to make, or rather the variables we chose to analyze in relation to the combination of finds we select” (138). As a whole, however, the paper will have little meaning for those who have not read Jørgensen’s book.

c. Regional Studies

CHRIS LOVELUCK’S “Acculturation, Migration and Exchange: the Formation of an Anglo-Saxon Society in the English Peak District, 400–700 AD,” 84–98 (also in Bintliff/Hamerow, see above), examines mid- and late seventh-century barrow burials in the Peak District, arguing that barrows should not be taken as an indication of the high status of either the dead person or his/her lineage, without a consideration of the social, cultural and regional contexts in which the barrows were constructed or reused. Nor should the view that barrows are the graves of a colonizing elite, or that grave wealth equals social status be accepted without question. As the title indicates this a regional study and its conclusions are not generally applicable, however in the Peak District the barrows are the only known Anglo-Saxon remains and they therefore have

much to tell us about the formation of Anglo-Saxon society in that region. Loveluck notes, for example, that the luxury grave goods found in the barrows may be indeed be evidence of wealthy settlers, and he admits that there certainly was some immigration into the area, alternatively they could also be a sign of an indigenous population using new Anglo-Saxon luxury goods as a way of retaining their local elite status under external Anglo-Saxon pressure and immigration. As he points out, there are elements of continuity in the burials: the presence of antlers and quartz pebbles, internment, and certain aspects of grave construction; however, not all barrows containing Anglo-Saxon objects show these elements of continuity, and differences between them and the barrows that do may be telling. Loveluck agrees with Fowler’s suggestion that the Peak barrow burials represent a mixed society of native British and Anglo-Saxon immigrants, but adds that, “The sudden appearance of precious metal and other exotic commodities in both barrows with native characteristics and those following an exclusively Germanic tradition, suggests that there were specific reasons for their use and that regional resources were being exchanged to enable their procurement” (88). The Peak District was a major source of lead, and Loveluck notes that documentary references to the use of lead in the early church (by Wilfrid, among others) are contemporary with the Peak District barrows. Unfortunately the theory remains merely plausible, as there is no concrete evidence to suggest that lead was exchanged for luxury goods. Moreover, any exchange there might have been would have been short-lived as by the early eighth-century lead production was under the control of Mercian ecclesiastical estates (90).

Danny Gerrets writes of “The Anglo-Frisian Relationship Seen from an Archaeological Point of View.” *Friesische Studien II*. Ed. Volkert F. Faltings, Alaister G.H. Walker and Ommo Wilts. Beiträge des Föhner Symposiums zur Friesischen Philologie vom 7–8 April 1994. Odense: Odense University Press, 1995. 119–28. The article opens with a brief summary of the major research to date on the terp region in the coastal area of the northern Netherlands and North Germany, and the proposed models of Anglo-Frisian interaction within the area that have resulted from this research. Gerrets then moves to a summary of the 1991–93 excavation campaigns at Wijnaldum, which uncovered the remains of a settlement spanning the period second/third century AD to the ninth century AD, and allowed archaeologists to chart the development of one site over a lengthy period of time. Gerrets makes a good case for the development of power centers in the area, but the reader has to work hard to follow the flow of an argument that jumps confusingly back and forth between discussion of individual sites, regional development, and the broader historical picture.

In “The North-West Mercian *Burhs* a Reappraisal,” *ASSAH* 8 (1995), 75–86, David Griffiths considers D.H. Hill’s 1969 proposal that the *Burghal Hidage* provided evidence of a close connection between the length of defenses “and the formula that every hide in a county supported one

man for the *burh* defenses, and that every *pole* . . . required four men to defend it" (75). Griffiths believes that the formula works for Chester, mathematically if not archaeologically. The paper then considers the history of Chester including the possible relationship between the Roman and Anglo-Saxon towns, and the range of building types known from a late-Saxon context. A similar combination of documentary and archaeological sources is brought together in a brief consideration of the Anglo-Saxon towns of Rhuddlan, Manchester, Eddisbury, Runcorn and Thelwell. Griffiths' main thesis is that the traditional interpretation of the *burhs* as a line of frontier forts is too one-dimensional and overly dependent on the Ingimund legend (which he may portray as too exclusively the product of the Irish annalistic tradition). He concludes that while the *burhs* did have a military function, "to overstress the defensive frontier argument is to neglect the fact that the West Saxon kingdom, and its client Mercia, were in a phase of territorial expansion in the early tenth century. The close link between the *burhs* and nearby estate centres . . . and the rapid establishment of functioning hinterland, is a more convincing case for a policy of wider territorial annexation and control" (84).

In "Early Medieval Landscape: Lindisfarne—a Case Study," *Index to Theses* 44 (1995), 525, K. Walsh reviews the state of research on the medieval landscape of the northeast, with special attention devoted to paleoenvironmental and economic reconstruction. Within the area of the case study Walsh's focus is on the settlement site at Green Shiel, and he attempts to reconstruct the early medieval environment—which research reveals was very different from the modern environment—as closely as possible.

d. Architecture And Engineering

RICHARD GEM examines evidence for "Staged Timber Spires in Carolingian North-East France and Late Anglo-Saxon England" (*JBA* 148 (1995): 29–54, pls. V–IX). While Carolingian masonry churches have been well studied, Gem turns to a group of buildings for their elaborate timber constructions, to learn what we can about the relationship between Carolingian examples and later AS forms. Few details survive, but timber spires probably existed as early as the sixth century, and in the mid eighth, continued as a tradition or perhaps were experiencing a revival. Gem details accounts of times and places, such as St-Wandrille in the 730s, to the 860s at St Bertin, with its *tristegum* or three staged spire surmounted by a fourth level; the latter example, described in enough detail to attempt a reconstruction, comes from the *Miracula Sancti Bertini* (c. 900). He goes on to discuss possible iconographic influence from depictions of and references to the Holy Sepulchre, also discussed by Heitz, showing a three-storeyed aedicule with receding stages. Carolingian and Ottonian ivories show just such forms. Gem argues, "It would still be a leap for this image to be transferred from illumination or ivory-carving to monumental construction specifically in timber: but this result could have been achieved

in a dialogue between the patron interested in the image and the carpenter skilled in the erection of lofty timber structures" (40). Certainly the St-Bertin details suggest a spire as tall as the church already was, in part assembled or fitted together on the ground, having a central mast and a circular support system.

As for AS evidence, in the late eighth and ninth centuries, no contemporary examples comparable to the Carolingian forms are known. Gem uncovers some examples of segregated bays to the east at Canterbury, in a ninth century church found in the cathedral excavations, and at Repton (in the plan existing by 873). In addition, he discusses Alfred's post-878 foundation of Athelney abbey, where some of the community was recruited from France. Without excavations or contemporary accounts, he must rely on William of Malmesbury, who describes it as having four posts in the ground to bear up "the whole contrivance" or *machina*, a term usually referring to a bell cote or spire of wood. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know if the tower dates to Alfred's time, or nearer to William's, and the "new mode of building" he finds interesting is likely to be the centralized plan with four "chancels of rounded work" (41). Gem also notes that Abbot Æthelwine (1024x1032) of Athelney vowed to build a tower if he returned to see the abbey's tower again, so that both a new and an old one existed in his time. In the later AS period, 900–1066, the article uses documentary evidence, reproductions in art and surviving buildings to suggest the possibility of wooden spires. At Winchester, Bishop Ælfheah, 993–4, built a tower with five stages, windows and arches, while the *Benedictional of Æthelwold* shows Æthelwold at the altar, with a three stage spire including bell cote and weather cock, above him. Censor covers from Canterbury, Pershore and London also depict a spire, with the Pershore example illustrated as demonstrating the form of the Sompting church spire as AS, though the once held view that AS carpentry survived there is now disproven. The Junius 11 (what Gem still refers to as the Caedmon Genesis) depiction of Noah's ark is also used to show three receding stages in a presumably wooden form, as is the BL MS Cotton Tiberius c.VI, f. 13v illustration of the three Marys at the Sepulchre, dating c. 1050 from Winchester.

Gem finishes by looking at post-Conquest survivals of spires, the earliest being late twelfth-century work in Canterbury Cathedral, and another mid-thirteenth-century example at All Saints Church, Maldon, Essex. Both do show a central mast and horizontal wheels that parallel the Carolingian timber structures examined earlier. But whether they are a survival of insular traditions, or an introduction from the continent leaves us "not yet able to offer an answer" without further work (50). As always, Gem is careful to trace a particular architectural aspect, examining a wide range of material both documentary and material; despite the lack of survival of any examples, he has made a suggestive case for the probable history of this form in AS England. Perhaps, though, not all the influence came from the Continent as he imagines it. He invariably looks more to Western Europe than to

Northern Europe for comparison. The account of Ælfheah's work at Winchester describes the *turris* as *rostrata* by *toli*, which Gem tentatively translates: "The summit displayed features described as *toli*, which appear to have been cylindrical and to have incorporated arcades: the relationship of these to the tower is contained in the word *rostrata* (literally, having a beak or prow), which could indicate either that they flanked the tower or that they projected above it" (45). Yet the Scandinavian influence seen in the Junius 11 Noah's ark, as well as the term here of *rostrata* as beaked, suggests that a look at the origins of forms culminating in stave churches, with their pagoda-like tiers often ending in stylized heads or beaked faces, might be another place to consider for influence on such details.

John Blair traces the sources of the structures at Yeavinger back to square ritual enclosures of the Romano-Celtic (shrines and burials) and possibly Roman (square-in-square temples) eras in his "Anglo-Saxon Pagan Shrines and Their Prototypes." *ASSAH* 8 (1995), 1–28. His concern here is solely with the typology of shrines and not with the nature of pagan religion, and he is specifically interested in square ritual enclosures, which he believes may be explained "in terms of the absorption by the English of an Iron Age and Roman tradition which survived through fourth-century Christianity into Dark Age Britain" (3). Square enclosures have precedents in both Celtic and Roman religious practice, and he is not concerned with which one might have influenced the Anglo-Saxons most, but rather with establishing a ritual precedent with which the Anglo-Saxons would have been familiar. From the documentary evidence, which consists of Bede's account of Coifi and Rædwald, Gregory's advice to Augustine, and Aldhelm's letter to Heahfrith, Blair derives three possible types of pagan religious features: 1) trees, orthostats or wooden posts; 2) fenced or hedged enclosures; 3) roofed structures. All these features are, of course, later incorporated into Christian religious sites in the form of crosses, enclosures and churches; moreover, as roofed structures appear to be a late form of pagan shrine they may in fact be influenced by the architecture of the Christian church. Archaeological evidence from across Britain leads him to divide square-plan enclosures into six types of site—four ditched enclosures and two fenced enclosures—ranging from the later Iron Age and post-Roman periods to the early seventh century AD. Some sites are identified very tentatively, with Category A, groups of square enclosures not associated with graves, being perhaps the most problematic as there is rarely enough evidence to establish the date and nature of the site precisely. Despite problems of date and the limited nature of the evidence, Blair concludes that, "A good case can be made that this idiom was mediated to the English through a continuing tradition of rural shrines, though the copying of surviving Roman stone temples may have reinforced it; in either case the sources were insular rather than continental" (19).

Christopher Salisbury's "An 8th-Century Mercian Bridge over the Trent at Cromwell, Nottinghamshire, England,"

Antiquity 69 (1995), 1015–18, is the first of his two articles on the Cromwell bridge. In this paper Salisbury reveals that new evidence from tree-ring dating proves that a timber-framed bridge previously thought to be Roman is actually the earliest known Saxon bridge in Britain. The dendro-date was provided by the sole timber to survive from five massive bridge piers (reported to be each about twenty-nine feet long) discovered in 1882 five miles downstream from Newark, and blown up in an effort to improve navigation on the Trent. "A Bridge too-old—A Mercian Bridge over the Trent at Cromwell, Nottinghamshire" (*Trans. of the Thoroton Soc. Of Nottinghamshire* 99 [1995], 121–23) Salisbury's second article on the Cromwell bridge, contains very much the same information as the *Antiquity* article, and is certainly far less accessible—at least to American readers.

Philip H. Dixon's "Entrances to Sunken-Floored Structures in Anglo-Saxon Times," *ASSAH* 8 (1995), 99–101, is a brief but interesting look at SFBs (or *grubenhäuser*). Dixon points out that only rarely have the entrances to SFBs been recorded, and proposes a reconstruction with a wooden threshold within a worn hollow, based on GH81 at Mucking. He also calls for more care to be taken in the excavation of SFBs as an accurate recording of original soil levels is crucial to the reconstruction of entrance systems.

e. Inscriptions

R.I. PAGE's *Runes and Runic Inscriptions: Collected Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Viking Runes*, edited by David Parsons, pulls together articles dating from before his thesis was completed to just before publication of this collection (Rochester: The Boydell Press, 1995). Not wanting a festschrift, Page agreed to this volume and added postscripts which are "my immediate reactions to aspects of the papers that need updating, or to criticisms that call for response" (16). In turn, David Parsons edited, Carl Berkhout researched known and forgotten Page pieces, and Sir David Wilson joined them both in a warm foreword and preface. The collection reminds us of how valuable a scholar we have in Page, and how useful it is to have not only his articles collected together, but his comments in looking back at them. The collection contains two pieces not previously published. One, the first, was written for the volume in 1994, "Quondam et Futurus," and opens with Page's "surprise at re-reading my first articles and finding how much I have forgotten in thirty years" (1). He then surveys some current issues in runic studies, discussing Derolez' views on the English runic corpus and the relationship of runic to roman script, the fifteenth rune transliterated as "x," and Odenstedt's book on the Older Futhark, before finishing with a look back at how changed are the distribution maps with which he began his work. New finds change the field immeasurably, often embarrassing those who write with authority on such a small amount of material. And so Page ends by presenting seven clear and practical suggestions for future discussion of runic studies, not without humor and the rueful wisdom of re-reading one's work. The seventh is the one he

stresses: "use the subjunctive more often. An indicative is perilous to runologists though it may be tempting, and many have yielded to temptation" (13). Would that we were all so careful.

The other new piece in the Page collection is a paper read in May of 1987, "*Runeukyndige Risteres Skriblerier: the English Evidence*" (295–314). Considering the debate among Scandinavian scholars about the significance of runic inscriptions for literacy, Page takes the topic to the field of English runic inscriptions and notes, "None of it seems to have struck the English writers on literacy in Anglo-Saxon times. Nor is that surprising, for runes play a much smaller part in early English than in Scandinavian" (296). Yet he goes on to survey inscriptions on various monuments and artifacts in an attempt to see whether we can speak of literate rune carvers. Examining the Ruthwell cross, he notes that the layout of the runes, often in two or four letter rows without word separators, makes reading difficult even for the literate. Asking if the text might therefore be read by one who could read to those who couldn't, he imagines someone like a guide showing the monument, knowing the text from long experience and so untroubled by the layout. On the other hand, he also surveys examples where inscriptions seem not to require an audience. Runes placed against the body on a sword (Chessell Down), inscriptions without wear on marker stones at Hartlepool, some even within the graves under the skull—these suggest no audience is needed, or some non-human audience is expected. Rune stones, however, do seem at times to expect a reader, as when they request prayers from passersby. But do the runes on Cuthbert's coffin, mixed with roman letters and cut so delicately as to be hard to read, ask for a human eye to read them, or are they something of a litany, not to be read?

He then turns to the rune-masters themselves, and once again, marshals evidence for careful and apparently literate carvers alongside those who seem incompetent. Looking carefully at the many unintelligible inscriptions in runes, he studies each piece on its own terms to see if we are witnessing runic "doodling," perhaps as proof that someone knew runes at all, or as practice, or as a personal invocation, or as a cryptic or magical inscription with no recoverable message. He discusses the layout of pieces as different as Hartlepool stones, where carvers "recognised the principles of dithematic name formation" (308) and divided names accordingly, and the setup of the Kirkdale sundial and its inscription, showing less care for the "tidiness in a text" (310). Yet when he examines the scribe of a legal miscellany of the late eleventh/early twelfth century, he finds many errors due to eye-skip, misreading and dittography, concluding "the scribe of MS [CCCC] 383 is no more illiterate than the carver of Great Urswick [a quite terrible example of runic "skill"], but he is not noticeably less" (309). He admires the rune-master of the Franks Casket, who experiments with ways to lay out his runes, and shows his literacy not only in runes but in the roman inscription he cuts, with a sensitivity to "demotic" pronunciation of Latin in his spelling. Page uses the inexplicable philological forms, such as

flodu on this careful piece, as a warning not to assume an error when we lack an explanation. The implication for him is that inscriptions may use different patterns of spelling than manuscripts, a potent warning against comparing linguistic forms. He concludes that AS inscriptions won't suggest by themselves a literate society, but how runic literacy did exist alongside the roman, and "some may suggest, quite strongly, the probability of limited lay literacy. . . . Each inscription needs studying within its context, expressed as precisely as possible. And we must not assume error or illiterate practice too easily" (313). No one could accuse Page of not taking the physical and material artifacts which give us our inscriptions seriously. One of his great strengths has been to take each piece on its own merits and in context when we have one, and give them their due. Certainly no one interested in AS epigraphy or in intersections of material and textual culture can afford to ignore this collection, and it is a pleasure to browse through the lifelong contributions of a most singular scholar.

Elizabeth Okasha's *Corpus of Early Christian Inscribed Stones of South-West Britain* (London: Leicester University Press, 1993) is the first systematic study of the inscribed stones of Devon and Cornwall. The corpus includes 79 extant stones: 58 from Cornwall, 20 from Devon, one from near the Devon border in Somerset, and ten stones now lost. It consists largely of "pillar-stones" (category 1), some of which may not actually be Christian monuments, and inscribed crosses (category 2), with only a few stones falling into category 3 (those stones that don't fit into either category 1 or 2). The inscriptions are almost exclusively in Latin, and are largely commemorative. Okasha defines the Early Christian period as the years 400–1100, which may be a bit broad for some but, as she notes, these are monuments which cannot be closely dated with any certainty. She does, however, suggest that category 1 stones range in date from the fifth/sixth to the eleventh century, while category 2 stones are ninth- to eleventh-century, a difference in dating which implies that some distinction between what is considered "Early Christian" and what is considered "Early Medieval" might indeed be useful. There is a good consideration of possible sources for the monuments (Romano-British, Continental, Irish, Welsh) and a balanced discussion of the likelihood of each. Not surprisingly, evidence for Irish influence is strongest. The introduction is brief but informative, with the bulk of the book quite rightly consisting of an illustrated catalogue of the monuments. Individual entries include information on location, text, history, and bibliography, as well as a general discussion of the monument. Entries throughout are very clearly written, well-organized, and immensely useable. With the exception of the lost stones for which no visual record survives, each entry is illustrated with a photograph or drawing. The quality of the photographs, however, varies enormously between entries.

In "Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England: the Evidence from the Inscriptions" (*ASSAH* 8 [1995], 69–74), Okasha makes

the important point that inscriptions should be central to any analysis of literacy in Anglo-Saxon England. "Firstly, they are examples of the practical application of literacy in Anglo-Saxon society. Secondly they provide information about some of the cultural conditions of the society that produced them. Thirdly, they suggest some of the ways in which literacy was regarded in Anglo-Saxon England" (69). While her hypothetical accounts of how texts might have come to be inscribed on objects are pure fiction, they do raise some interesting possibilities with regard to both artists' methods and the role of the patron in Anglo-Saxon England. Many people may well have been involved in the production of an inscribed object or monument, not all of them necessarily literate, although the fact that patrons went to the trouble to commission inscribed objects indicates an interest in literacy that was independent of whether or not the individual involved could read. Differences in voice, length and content also indicate a variety of audiences for inscriptions. Some commemorative monuments, for instance, were clearly designed to be more public than others. Her argument that no one in eighth-century Northumbria could read the inscriptions on the Ruthwell cross (assuming that the inscriptions are all eighth-century) is less convincing. As Éamonn Ó Carragáin has shown, the texts contain complex liturgical references, and it is unlikely that they would have been added simply to lend prestige to the monument, or for the purely celestial audience Okasha suggests (73).

Thomas Bredehoft provides "A New Reading of the Lancashire Ring," *ELN* 32.4 (1995), 1–8. The famous gold and niello ring in the British Museum is inscribed "†æDRED MEC AH EanRED MEC agROF". The meaning of the inscription is also discussed by Okasha; however, while Okasha was interested in what the ring revealed about literacy and methods production in Anglo-Saxon England, Bredehoft is interested in why it combines letters from the runic and Roman alphabets. He does not accept the runes as having magical qualities, and argues instead that the names of the five runes can be read in order as a second level of the inscription, a method of reading that, as he states, was clearly intended when runes were introduced into larger Latin-lettered Old English texts. Bredehoft emends the inscription to read:

Ædred mec ah; Eanred mec agrof.
Æsc nied[ab]ac; giefu, feoh.

(Ædred owns me, Eanred engraved me. Ash rejoices [or compels?] oak; a gift property.)

He interprets the inscription as a gnomic phrase relating to gift giving. Although this requires the addition of an inflectional ending, Bredehoft argues (and certainly not all will agree) that any Anglo-Saxon would have supplied it automatically as part of the process of reading.

See also under "Sculpture" the Higgitt section of Tweddle's *Corpus* volume.

f. Sculpture

RICHARD HINGLEY, John Hunt, and Michael A. Stokes, "A

Fragment of Anglo-Saxon Cross-Shaft from Whitchurch, Warwickshire" (*Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeol. Soc. Trans.* 99 (1995), 65–70), is the publication of what the authors feel may be a section of a cross-shaft (or alternatively part of the lower arm of a cross-head) discovered during a survey of the parish. All four faces of the fragment are covered with interlace and knot patterns, indicating that the "shaft" was probably decorated with uninhabited interlace. The piece is dated to the tenth or eleventh century based on Rosemary Cramp's typology of interlace ornament. The authors suggest that a second stone decorated with interlace ornament and set into the wall of the nave at Whitchurch may be part of a grave-slab, but they don't supply the evidence for this. They do note, however, that there are no exact parallels for either sculpture. The article includes a brief discussion of the placename Whitchurch (Witecerce), and the fact that its inclusion in the Domesday Book implies the existence of an Anglo-Saxon foundation.

Jane Hawkes makes an excellent argument for reinterpreting the iconography of the Wirksworth slab in "The Wirksworth Slab: An Iconography of Humilitas," *Peritia* 9 (1995), 246–89. Hawkes description and identification of the scenes on the slab is both thorough and accurate, however her identification of sources and parallels for the various elements of the slab's iconography is less believable. The author shows such a marked reliance on Schiller's iconographic studies that one wonders if she is familiar with works not reproduced in the Schiller volumes. Moreover, while scenes might be visually similar (and Hawkes does provide some fine and provocative visual parallels), the paper provides no evidence that there were contacts, either direct or indirect, between Anglo-Saxon England and the regions in which the proposed prototypes were created. Some explanation of the means by which images and styles were transmitted across the early medieval world would be particularly welcome in her consideration of how scenes that are apparently unique in Anglo-Saxon England at this date—the burial of the Virgin, or the Harrowing of Hell, for example—may have been inspired by earlier works. Hawkes states: "the iconographic models lying behind most of the scenes identified on the Wirksworth slab have their origin in Eastern art, particularly the work of the Syro-Palestinian provinces of the sixth century. In some cases these types were present in Western centres, but it also seems they were types that were never subsumed into the more popular Western repertoire" (261). So how and why did they come to be adopted in Anglo-Saxon England? Unfortunately for a paper that relies on our ability to accurately read the images, the quality of the illustrations is very poor.

Dominic Tweddle, Martin Biddle, Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle, et al. *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture, 4: South-East England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1995. This fourth volume in the British Academy *Corpus* catalogues over 200 pieces of Anglo-Saxon sculpture from the large architectural roods (as at Romsey) to tiny fragments. It is generously illustrated with over 700 photo-

graphs, mostly of a very high quality. The volume covers Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Kent, London, Oxfordshire, Surrey and Sussex, and includes the particularly important sites of Canterbury and Winchester. Much of the material is not widely known largely because, as Tweddle points out in his chapter on earlier research, study of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in the south of England has been left primarily to local antiquaries and archaeologists and the south has produced no scholars to compare with W.G. Collingwood or Romilly Allen in the north. The introductory material includes valuable chapters on the history and geology of the region by H.R. Loyn (history) and Bernard C. Worssam (geology). Tweddle's discussion of the development of sculpture in the south-east to 1100 (divided into three chapters) is excellent and gives a fair and well-balanced account of the controversy surrounding the date and provenance of many of the earliest (or probably earliest) pieces. Amongst these are of course the Reculver fragments—so problematic that they merit their own chapter. A full consideration of the debate centered around these fragments is necessary, yet, as with the treatment of the Bewcastle cross in the Corpus volume on Cumbria, it also tends to focus readers' attention on one problematic "masterpiece," possibly at the expense of other works. Tweddle makes, and has made in the past, a good, though not watertight, case for dating the Reculver fragments to the ninth century, but those who were unconvinced in the past will continue to be so. The excavated sculpture from Winchester is also given a separate chapter, written by Martin Biddle and Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle. This separation does distract somewhat from the developmental path sketched out by Tweddle in the preceding chapters, but is the necessary consequence of the volume's combination of the separate but related research of Tweddle and the Biddles. The benefit, of course, is that no one is as familiar with the different sites and individual works as these three scholars.

John Higgitt provides an informative chapter on the inscriptions in Latin lettering, of which there are far fewer in the area covered by this volume than in the areas covered by the previous three volumes in the Corpus. Higgitt notes that inscriptions surviving in the south-east are all from the very late Anglo-Saxon period. This, along with the relative overall scarcity of inscriptions, he believes to be the result of the intensity of later development in the south (108).

Because the volume covers a larger number of counties than the other Corpus volumes, and because sculpture within these counties is more widely distributed, the catalogue is not arranged by county but divided into three sections: 1) Kent, Surrey and Sussex; 2) North of the Thames; 3) Hampshire and Berkshire. While at first glance this is somewhat unwieldy, the arrangement does have the advantage of combining groups of stylistically related works. A handy table of sites by county, as well as a form and motif table is included at the end of the catalogue. Equally useful is the list of all sites in catalogue order that precedes the actual catalogue text. The catalogue entries themselves are of a uniformly high standard. Descrip-

tions are concise and accurate, and problems of interpretation (e.g. the Reculver fragments or Winchester Old Minster—the fragment carved with a recumbent figure and an animal's muzzle) are presented clearly and with full bibliographic references. The volume is a first-rate addition to the Corpus series.

g. Metalwork

SEE ALSO Leahy on the Flixborough hoard, under "Miscellaneous Artefacts."

Philip J. Wise and Wilfrid A. Seaby publish "Finds from a New Productive Site at Bidford-on-Avon, Warwickshire." *Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeol. Soc. Trans.* 99 (1995), 57–64. The site at Bidford houses both a pagan cemetery and a Middle Saxon settlement, and the finds published here include an Anglo-Saxon gold mount, coins, strap ends and fragments of decorative metalwork. The authors believe that the mount is decorated with a calf's head worked in red glass and filigree—but there is no reason to assume a "calf's" head, and indeed it may be possible to read the design as purely decorative. Style, technique, and comparative material all indicate an eighth-century date, and the suggestion that the mount was originally attached to a hanging-bowl or some sort of ecclesiastical object seems reasonable. However, identification of the image with the symbol of St. Luke is not convincing, particularly as no parallels for such an image of the symbol are offered. From the mid-80s on the Bidford site has also produced a saucer brooch, a fragment of a second brooch, fifteen coins, and nine pieces of bronze metalwork, all ranging in date from the eighth to ninth century. Wise and Seaby state that, "Although not as 'productive' as some of the 'productive sites' in East Anglia, where several hundred objects have been found, the site at Bidford does represent an exceptionally high concentration of Middle Saxon finds in a Warwickshire context. The authors therefore advance the theory that this is a productive site, defined as a market where cattle, sheep, horses and other commodities were bought and sold" (60). They postulate that the metalwork fragments were used and lost during the exchange of goods. While this scenario is certainly possible, they provide little evidence for the existence, date, or extent of the market.

Michael Pindar's "Anglo-Saxon Garnet Cloisonné Composite Disc Brooches: Some Aspects of Their Construction," *Jnl of the Brit. Archaeol. Assoc.* 148 (1995), 7–28, is the first structural survey of the eighteen known (seventeen extant) examples of garnet cloisonné composite disc brooches. Pindar here considers only the techniques used in producing the brooches and does not touch on matters of style or date. He detects two basic methods of construction depending on whether the metal used was gold or copper-alloy, the main difference being that in the case of copper alloy brooches the subsidiary dividing walls of the cells were not soldered to the base plate or the outer walls of the cell-work, but were presumably set into an adhesive paste along with the garnets and backing foils—nor was the rim soldered to the base-plate. It is also likely that on the copper-alloy examples the top

surface of the cloisonné was not ground and polished. Secondary differences also occur on the individual components of the brooch—the rim, back-plate and fittings.

This article includes very instructive and easily understood diagrams and a complete catalogue of the seventeen surviving brooches. Pindar's close study of construction technique allows him to identify possible workshops within each series and also to confirm Sonia Chadwick Hawkes' suggestion that brooch and filigree might sometimes be the product of two different craftsmen. Finally, and more tentatively he concludes that the copper-alloy brooches might not be, as previously assumed, simply a less sophisticated development of the gold brooches. He quite rightly points out that the assumption that skills decline towards the end of a style is popular, but that we must also remember that not all craftsmen were equally skilled, and that: "While we know practically nothing about the jewellers or their circumstances, it is possible that Anglo-Saxon society could support very few of them, even in the context of the taste for displays of gold, and it may simply be that different skills and traditions evolved in different workshops. Perhaps this happened in response to different demands from the patrons, and to differences in the circumstances under which the craftsmen operated, as well as to changes in the availability of raw materials" (27).

Steven Ashley and Andrew Rogerson write on "Further Examples of Radiate and Related Brooches from Norfolk," *Norfolk Archaeology* 42 (1995), 219–20. Their discussion is limited to five continental copper-alloy brooches of the early Anglo-Saxon period (all metal detector finds), with special attention to brooch feet. A brief description and drawings of all five objects are included. While no specific dates are provided for the pieces, the authors point out that, along with other forms of evidence, the brooches will help to illuminate the complex association between Norfolk and the continent in the early Anglo-Saxon period.

Sally White's "A 7th-Century Gilt-Bronze mount from East Preston, West Sussex," *Sussex Archaeol. Collections* 132 (1995 for 1994), 195, is a report on a mount uncovered in a private garden in 1992 and now in the Worthing Museum. The mount is circular and decorated with Style II animal ornament, indicating a date in the early seventh century. White suggests that it was probably originally attached to a box or shield.

"Iron Working from Some Medieval Irish Sites," *Peritia* 9 (1995), 221–33, by Mark Hall, provides an analysis and discussion of iron tools and weapons from three sites: Gransha (Down), Killerdadrú (Tipperary) and Moyne (Mayo). The paper is based on earlier work by the author and B.G. Scott. Their metallographic studies of iron objects from a variety of Irish sites suggest that: "not all the smiths understood the material they were working with. It is quite possible that some items studied were made by full-time metalworkers, possibly the *goba* of the Irish law tracts, while other items were made by part-time metalworkers who were primarily farmers" (222). Alternatively Hall notes that different types of steel could have been used for objects requiring different types of cutting

edges. The three sites examined are of three different types; Gransha is a rath, Moyne a graveyard, and Killerdadrú a possible ecclesiastical enclosure. Together they provide a good range of artefact type. Most of the objects proved to be of good to excellent quality, although there was some variability. For those interested in Anglo-Saxon ironworking Hall notes that a similar variability is observed amongst Anglo-Saxon artefacts—although the types of cutting edges produced in the two areas were quite different. The paper includes a thorough discussion of the author's methodology and the nature of the tests applied to the items.

h. Pottery

SEE ABOVE under "Excavations" for Hassock's Cemetery report by Lyre.

Mark Leah writes of *The Late Saxon and Medieval Pottery Industry of Grimston, Norfolk: Excavations 1962–92*. East Anglian Archaeol. Report, 64. Dereham, Norfolk: Norfolk Museum Services, 1994 (with a host of contributors). This volume brings together a rich variety of sources in order to illuminate the pottery industry at Grimston, to determine the characteristics of that pottery, and to assess its distribution. The report is organized primarily by site so that individual sites are considered in separate chapters, with discussion of artefacts, environmental evidence and documentary sources presented separately. Both the pottery excavated and the evidence for its production dates from the eleventh through sixteenth centuries, with the industry apparently at its height in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The chronology of the industry is uncertain and there are gaps in the record, one being the earliest phase of the Saxo-Norman overlap; consequently there is very little information on pottery of the Anglo-Saxon period, but for those interested in the late Anglo-Saxon contribution to later medieval culture the report makes interesting reading. Site 24054 will be of particular interest as two pits, one structure, and pottery of late tenth and eleventh-century date were uncovered here. Leah states that: "Although the quantity of pottery assigned to Period O [tenth–eleventh century] was less than 3% of the site total by sherd number and weight, eleventh-century Grimston-Thetford ware comprised more than 41% by sherd number and 49% by weight of the ceramic assemblage from the site. The majority of this was residual in later contexts, but serves to indicate the proximity of more substantial Period O activity. The virtual absence of wasters and kiln furniture shows this activity to have been domestic rather than associated with potting" (58). Not much more can be said about the Anglo-Saxon assemblage, but it is discussed on p. 81 and illustrated in figure 63.

Maureen Mellor's "A Synthesis of Middle and Late Saxon, Medieval and Early Post-Medieval Pottery in the Oxford Region" (*Oxoniensia* 59 [1994], 17–217) covers over 700 sites in the Oxford region known prior to 1988, and identifies fourteen major ceramic traditions, all examined within the larger context of possible networks and areas of distribution. This is a well-organized and very clearly written

paper that includes a thorough description of the survey methodology and the various types of sources used as an introduction to a chronological presentation of the material, and easy to use maps and diagrams. The objective of the survey was twofold: 1) to draw together information on all the major ceramic traditions operating in England between the ninth and seventeenth centuries, to isolate and identify their formal and decorative elements, and to identify regional series of vessel forms within each ceramic tradition; 2) to identify production centers and suggest patterns of marketing and distribution networks within given regions. It is hoped that this will both provide archaeologists and historians with a series of models of distribution networks and stimulate and point the way towards further fieldwork in the area. The gazetteer covers material from both published and unpublished sites, fieldwalking, and private collections. Evidence from documentary, topographical, field- and place-name studies is also included. Anglo-Saxonists will be particularly interested in the chapters on the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods (chapters 4–6). Mellor identifies three major traditions in existence by the late ninth century, with one possibly originating in the late eighth century (Shelly Ware, Late Saxon and Early Medieval West Oxfordshire Ware & Early Medieval Oxford Ware, Late Saxon and Early Medieval South-West Oxfordshire Ware). By the early tenth century a fourth tradition (St. Neots type—possibly a regional import) appears. The vessels are predominantly cooking and storage pots, and a very detailed analysis of the fabric and technology of each is provided. By the late eleventh or early twelfth century five new ceramic networks had emerged (Wallingford Ware, Late-Saxon and Medieval Oxford Ware, Abingdon Ware, Banbury Ware, Early-Late Medieval South-East Oxfordshire Ware) and distribution of ceramic traditions became more localized. The evidence suggests that decoration of locally produced wares also begins at this time.

"A Collection of Late Anglo-Saxon Pottery from St. Mary's Church, Walbarton," *Sussex Archaeol. Collections* 132 (1995 for 1994), 194, by Chris Place and Mark Gardiner, is a short article concerned with a limited excavation of the churchyard of St. Mary's, Walberton undertaken by the Field Archaeology unit of University College, London. The excavation uncovered 65 sherds. The late Saxon material was largely Adur valley DA and DB ware. The collection, now in the Littlehampton museum, is closely paralleled by pottery excavated at Botolphs, and from the Chapel Street kilns, Chichester.

i. Numismatics

In "An East Anglian Penny of About 830 A.D.," (*Mariners Mirror* 80 [1994], 326–7), David Hill discusses what seems to be the earliest representation of an Anglo-Saxon ship. The penny, now in the Norwich museum, shows a ship with rudder, a cross-topped mast, and triple ropes extending from mast to prow and stern. Hill notes that the design on the coin is close to designs on coins from Quentovic and Dorestad, but believes that the Anglo-Saxon penny is inspired by rather

than simply a copy of the earlier examples. The Anglo-Saxon ship is unique, though it is unclear whether its unique nature is the result of local modifications or whether it is a representation of a specifically East Anglian type of ship.

Catherine Karkov raises the question of "Æthelflæd's Exceptional Coinage?" (*OEN* 29.1:41) by using the iconography to support the thesis of Blunt, Stewart and Lyon (1989) that three exceptional types of Edward's coins were the Lady of the Mercians' way of denoting products of her mints. Of the three motifs (the Hand of God; fronds, flower or rosettes; and towers) found paired with the obverse *Eadweard rex*, Karkov focuses on the towers. Æthelflæd not only lost four of her closest thegns at the gate of Derby, but in Chester in 907, her army ambushed and slaughtered the Viking attackers at the city gates. While Karkov's conflation of towers with gateways is certainly possible but not necessarily a given, another point makes her suggestion of the iconography as fitting very attractive. The type of such tower iconography comes from Roman city gates coins, which when linked to the Roman past of Chester, might add a link of "the new Mercia with the glory that was Rome." This coinage seems to justify adding Æthelflæd to the list of coins issued in the name of various medieval women which Stahl published ("Coinage in the Name of Medieval Women." In *Medieval Women and the Sources of Medieval History*, ed. Rosenthal. Athens: U Georgia P, 1990, 321–41). Though Stahl focuses on surviving coinage with the actual names of women on them, if Æthelflæd's coinage is added, hers is the earliest surviving in Europe; all other examples cited by Stahl for the period of AS culture are from Byzantium, though we know that various abbesses were allowed to mint coins during this time (e.g. Gandersheim). Edward seems to have removed the coinage described after Æthelflæd's death, suggesting both that joint leadership was invoked previous to this, and that he did not want to suggest such a possibility after her death.

Mark Blackburn covers the whole of Europe, not just Anglo-Saxon England, in "Money and Coinage," *The New Cambridge Medieval History II*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 538–59 (ignore the misprinted page numbers in the table of contents). This is a well-written and concise essay in which the various geographical areas that made up early medieval Europe are all given equal treatment, and the reasons for change and development are always spelled out. The chapter is a must for anyone interested in the place of Anglo-Saxon coinage and exchange in early medieval Europe. Blackburn identifies the period 700–900 as one of radical change, and is careful to give us both a broad overview and a balanced consideration of the specifics. In general: "Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries can be divided into two broad regions, the coin-producing areas in the west and south where coinage circulated in specie, being normally counted out in transactions, and the areas to the north and east with their bullion economies in which imported coinage and other forms of precious metal were used together by weight" (539). More specifically, and perhaps most importantly, at least for Anglo-Saxonists, this is the

period that sees the replacement of gold by silver coinage and the adoption of the penny as the standard currency throughout Europe. Although the Merovingians were the first to introduce the silver penny, the word (*pening*) is first attested in England in the laws of King Ine of Wessex and in glosses from the school of Hadrian and Theodore at Canterbury. Because of its scope the paper necessarily provides only a brief summary of the chronology and development of Anglo-Saxon coinage, but readers are directed to crucial recent work (particularly by D.M. Metcalf) that has done much to clarify minting practices and the circulation and chronology of coins in Anglo-Saxon England.

Cyril Hart's "The *Aldewerke* and Minster at Shelford, Cambridgeshire," *ASSAH* 8 (1995), 43–68, focuses on the numismatic, historical, and archaeological evidence for the identification of the Sceldfer mint with Shelford, Cambridgeshire, a topic on which the author acknowledges there is unlikely to be any certainty in the foreseeable future. A brief history of Shelford into the Anglo-Norman era is included as an introduction. There are only two surviving Sceldfer coins, both minted 890–95, and unusual because of their identical dies. Hart argues that neither they nor the Sceldfer mint can be analyzed outside of the larger context of the St. Edmund series of coins and their predecessors. His conclusion is twofold: 1) that the St. Edmund series shows an underlying unity of shape, ornament, and development that suggests that the coins were cut and distributed from just a few centers (specifically Bury St. Edmunds), and 2) that the *Aldewerke* in Great Shelford may have been a Viking foundation that became a center for minting Earl Sihtirc's coins (63). While both hypotheses are possible the evidence, as Hart himself notes, remains inconclusive.

See also Alcock under "Excavations" for a discussion of Æthelred's mint at Cadbury Castle.

j. Miscellaneous Artefacts

KEVIN LEAHY's "The Flixborough Hoard," *Current Archaeol.* 141 (1995), 352, is a very brief account of the two lead vessels

containing a hoard of Anglo-Saxon carpenter's tools and a copper-coated iron bell discovered on 4th Feb., 1994 during sand extraction from the face of a sand pit. This is an extremely important find due to the range of tools included—"what must be a complete carpenter's tool kit"—and to its probable association with the nearby monastic site of Flixborough.

Ian Betts, Nick Bateman and Gina Porter discuss "Two Late Anglo-Saxon Tiles and the Early History of St Lawrence Jewry, London" (*Med. Arch.* 39 (1995): 165–70). The pale clays and similar designs of the tiles suggest they were made on the same site, possibly somewhere in the Winchester area as they closely match examples found there. Raised ribs divide the tiles into sections which are filled with varied lead glazes, producing what are called polychrome relief tiles. They are not worn, nor in their original position, being found in a dumped deposit within the burial ground of St Lawrence church, contemporary with several nearby eleventh-century buildings. The deposit dates from the hiatus between a 1040 phase of interments and an 1140 phase, dated by dendrochronology. Deposits associated with the hiatus were brought in from outside to raise ground level, so the original location of the tiles may be the nearby church, or another, such as St Pauls (though the latter burned, and there is no sign of burning). Manufactured between the mid tenth and later eleventh century, the tiles may have been used to face a wall, altar or retable. The possibility exists that a recently discovered Roman amphitheater, in which the timber buildings cluster, may have been used to delineate a late Saxon private estate, and the church may have been associated with that estate, explaining the unexpected adornment of it. "The ecclesiastical and historical significance of the church of St Lawrence needs to be revised in this light" (169) say the authors, though perhaps reassessed is closer to the mark, as we cannot prove that the tiles actually relate to this church.

To be reviewed next year: all articles from *Isles of the North*.

C.K.

K.W.-C.

Appendix: History and Culture 1994

a. Stenton's *Anglo-Saxon England*: The Fiftieth Anniversary

Frank Stenton rightly holds an honored place in the study of Anglo-Saxon History and it was appropriate that his old university, Reading, should have paid tribute to his name by holding a colloquium to reflect on the significance in 1993 of his *Anglo-Saxon England*, first published fifty years before. Donald Matthew, with the assistance of Anne Curry and Ewen Green, has now edited the proceedings, together with the Stenton Lecture for 1993 delivered by Henry Mayr-Harting, in a small volume entitled *Stenton's "Anglo-Saxon England" Fifty Years On*, Reading Historical Studies 1 (Reading: University of Reading). James Campbell's paper for the volume discusses "Stenton's *Anglo-Saxon England*, with Spe-

cial Reference to the Earlier Period" (pp. 49–59). As a good historian, Campbell has examined the files of Oxford University Press and found that Stenton accepted the commission to write *Anglo-Saxon England* on 2 November 1929. It was published in 1943 and has yet to be superseded. Oh happy times that still respected the *magnum opus* and the lengthy gestation period that it usually needs! Unfortunately, though the book saw two further editions, "it was never significantly revised" (p. 51), which means that it contains some errors as well as outdated historical perspectives and interpretations. Stenton was able to sum up some major works that had appeared between 1890 and 1904 (bracketed by Earle and Plummer's edition of the Chronicle and Stevenson's *Asser*). He brought to his work primary research on the East Mid-

lands undertaken for the Victoria County History and, perhaps more importantly, a first-hand knowledge of Old English (a skill still found wanting in some current historians). "Stenton was extraordinarily skilful in combining narrative and interpretation, description and comment in an intricately even flow" (p. 54). He continuously incorporated original learning, often using "pieces of evidence which are doubly illuminating" (p. 54). Much remains useful fifty years later. Campbell concludes by observing that Stenton's father was born twelve years before Victoria was queen and Stenton himself was very much a Victorian, being born in 1880. He thus had the opportunity to assimilate primary sources and master the secondary literature in an era when *YWOES* would have been unnecessary. One suspects, however, that "Victorian" does not have much resonance for Americans: it would have been interesting also to hear the judgment of someone from the United States on this monument to the early history of England.

Stenton's *Anglo-Saxon England* was "the first fully integrated account, in which evidence drawn from every available source of information was deployed to its best effect, combining breadth of vision with command of detail, and clarity of exposition with power of analysis" (p. 83). Such is Simon Keynes's succinct assessment of this great monument in his contribution to the volume, entitled "Anglo-Saxon History after *Anglo-Saxon England*" (pp. 83–110). Keynes notes Stenton's strong portrayals of the reigns of Offa, Athelstan, and Cnut. Strangely enough, Edgar did not inspire him, perhaps, as Keynes suggests, because he treated ecclesiastical separately from political history (pp. 86–7). Keynes identifies four areas where he feels Stenton's "own approach to the subject is showing its age" (p. 90): first, Stenton had a tendency "to convey the impression that events were driven from the centre, by kings, and in particular by the successive kings of the West Saxon dynasty" (p. 90); second, Keynes questions the desirability of maintaining "a distinction between 'political' and 'constitutional' history, on the one hand, and 'ecclesiastical', 'social' and 'economic' history, on some others" (p. 92), particularly harmful in his view to a just appraisal of Alfred and the kings from Edmund to Edgar; third, there is "a certain insularity" (p. 93) about Stenton's work which underrates Carolingian influence and fails to provide Continental touchstones for us to evaluate "what is distinctive or what is commonplace in the Anglo-Saxon world" (p. 94); fourth, "Stenton did not give much space to discussion of the principal written sources on their own terms, as works produced under particular circumstances and intended to serve purposes other than the instruction of posterity" (p. 95). To Keynes now falls the task of writing a new history for the period from 850 to 1087. He notes that "the evidence of charters will be accorded due prominence in a new account of the period" (p. 99). As an illustration he provides tables of attestations of the secular hierarchy in the reigns of Cnut, Harald, and Harthacnut and of cabinet ministers in British Conservative governments from 1979 to 1994 to show

the ebb and flow of power at the center. The new work will need "a healthy injection of chaos theory" (p. 104); a greater interest in the middle years of the ninth century; a focus on the functioning of an itinerant monarchy in the tenth century; an examination of the relationships between kings and land-owning aristocrats in the reigns of Edmund through Eadwig using prosopographical techniques; and a re-examination of the late tenth-century monastic houses with an assessment of Æthelred's reign on its own terms. Since Keynes has yet to embark on the task of writing the new survey, his paper will be of considerable historical interest when his new book appears. Will O.U.P. permit him fourteen years to write it?

The editors place first in the volume Henry Mayr-Harting's Stenton Lecture, "Two Conversions to Christianity: The Bulgarians and the Anglo-Saxons" (pp. 1–30). The Bulgars were Turkic nomads with a warrior aristocracy who were still pagans in the 860's. Also in the Balkans were the Slavs, who had arrived in the sixth century and become Christianized, and the Greeks. As in England, pagan peoples had settled in a former Roman province; but for the Bulgars, to accept Christianity from their underlings, the Slavs, was less acceptable than it had been for the Anglo-Saxons to receive it from the Celts—nor were they eager to receive it from the Byzantines. In 862 the Bulgar khan, Boris, made contact with the Carolingian Louis the German, with consequent misfortunes for himself. The Moravians also had a part in the resulting imbroglio. Out of it came "the Greek liturgy, dressed in the Slavic language, and written in a Graeco-Slav alphabet [i.e., Cyrillic]" (p. 7). Greek was avoided: its use would have symbolized Greek dominance over the area, whereas for Æthelberht of Kent the use of the Latin liturgy "was a symbol of independence from, and parity with the Franks" (p. 8). Mayr-Harting then considers the issue of resistance and reaction to conversion, having noted that royal conversion did not necessarily carry the aristocracy along with it: "[W]e may suppose that the anxieties occasioned to members of the Bulgar aristocracy by Christianity involved the abandonment of commemoration and ritual propitiation of their ancestors and gods, especially no doubt the sky-god Tangri, their version of Woden, in dangerous, not to say humiliating times. It was these anxieties which Christian mission had to overcome" (pp. 15–16). In 866 Pope Nicholas I had answered 106 questions posed by Khan Boris in a letter called the *Consulta Bulgarorum* and this reveals how the papacy sought to meld Christianity with Bulgarian social mores. "[W]hile Nicholas I set his face against the Bulgarian familial structures and marital relationships which in any way clashed with ecclesiastical law, he accepted with modifications the warrior ethic" (p. 16). This is a paper more directly about Bulgaria than England, though Mayr-Harting explains that this approach "is in a sense a way of speaking about the Anglo-Saxons" (p. 2).

b. Collected Studies

THE LATE KARL LEYSER concentrated on Continental history

in his writings but did not ignore links with Anglo-Saxon England. His work, therefore, provides a useful entrée into the thought world of continental Europe and its attendant modern French and German scholarship. It thereby holds the potential for prompting new perspectives in Anglo-Saxon historiography, which for linguistic and other reasons has tended (with some honorable exceptions) to be insular. His *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries* (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon) is a collection of thirteen papers, which Timothy Reuter in an act of *pietas* has assembled and translated from various published and unpublished sources. The volume opens with a topic that very much reflects a contemporary England that is still sorting out its relationship with those living on the other side of the Channel: "Concepts of Europe in the Early and High Middle Ages" (pp. 1–18). "Three Historians" (pp. 19–28) is a brief synopsis of the life and works of Nithard, Widukind of Corvey, and Thietmar of Merseburg, whose work Leyser draws on elsewhere in this book. His insightful paper, "Early Medieval Warfare" (pp. 29–50), from the *Battle of Maldon* volume edited by Cooper (to which "[m]inor alterations and additions have been made to footnotes" [p. 29]), was reviewed in the 1993 *YWOES* History section. Another paper on a martial theme is "Early Medieval Canon Law and the Beginnings of Knighthood" (pp. 51–71), in which Leyser explores both how "common attitudes and conventions, shared between great men and their *milites*," came into being and the presuppositions that lay behind this development (p. 52). He notes that leaders were expected to fight in person in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, as in the case of Edmund Ironside and Harold (p. 54). Symbolism played its role in providing military status, notably possession of a military belt. Leyser helps us place in perspective the well-known account of the crimes of Helmstan, who was guilty of the theft of a belt, and reminds us that belts were bequeathed in Anglo-Saxon wills (pp. 55–57). The Carolingian Church, which became increasingly militarized in the ninth century, prescribed the loss of such symbols ("the frequent link between the abandonment of arms and horsemanship is worth noting" [p. 60]) and also imposed penances for certain major offenses such as incest. These factors provided the background for the development of knighthood. "For the formation of knighthood and the beginnings of an international knightly society it is also worth remembering the sheer scale of warfare in western, central and southern Europe during the last third of the eleventh century" (p. 68). Those intent on seeking a late date for *Beowulf* might like to read this paper to see whether it provides them with aid and comfort.

For Anglo-Saxonists the most valuable paper is likely to be "The Ottonians and Wessex" (pp. 73–104). In 929 × 930 Otto I married Edith, daughter of Edward the Elder and his second wife, Ælflæd. (Edith was thus the half-sister of Athelstan.) A number of European historians memorialized the event and Leyser examines what they have to say. He notes

that kingship in east Francia was "a very recent phenomenon" (p. 77). Edith brought with her a long royal pedigree, which could offset any claims from the west Frankish Carolingians. Her presence evoked tensions at court, however. Otto's father had spurned archiepiscopal anointment and his queen, Mathilda, something of a parvenue compared to Edith, had in consequence been denied coronation and ecclesiastical unction—whereas Leyser inclines to the view that Edith was crowned and anointed with Otto at Aachen in 836 (p. 87). Mathilda favored her younger son, Henry, but Otto in fact became king and may subsequently have played an indirect part in West Saxon politics: King Edmund permitted Bishop Dunstan to return to his court after he had fallen from favor, possibly because Otto's envoys were visiting the kingdom at that time (ca. 943) and may have offered Dunstan sanctuary. Edmund needed Otto's support and could ill afford having an antagonistic refugee at his court. Embassies between the two courts in the 940's show the importance of the links between them (pp. 92–93). By Edgar's reign Otto's interests had shifted to Italy and Byzantium. Edgar sent envoys to him, perhaps in the autumn of 972 (p. 96), possibly "to inform themselves about imperial styles and ceremonial or to confirm that their own were of equal standing" (p. 97): Edgar's coronation and anointing at Bath followed in 973. There is evidence for trading links (Leyser presents an original gloss on the law code IV Æthelred to illustrate this [pp. 100–02]) and the cults of St. Ursula in Cologne and of St. Oswald, an ancestor of Edith, must have been derived from English sources. Though these ties subsequently weakened, Edward the Confessor and Henry III offered each other mutual support in the following century. Art and economic historians and those interested in coronation rituals may wish to revisit this paper as it rearranges and adds some material to the German version that appeared in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* in 1983.

"The Anglo-Saxons 'At Home'" (pp. 105–10) is a meditative review of the second edition of Dorothy Whitelock's *English Historical Documents, c. 550–1042*, in which Leyser's surprise at the omission of the Tribal and Burghal Hidage, synodal legislation, and papal privileges is as understandable today as it was when he wrote in 1981—and so too is his dismay at the price of the book. Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the second edition and there are now important studies on all the omitted categories of texts. A new edition, published at a price that students and teachers alike can afford, is called for.

Several of his papers do not directly concern Anglo-Saxon England. "Liudprand of Cremona: Preacher and Homilist" (pp. 111–24) and "Ends and Means in Liudprand of Cremona" (pp. 125–42) deal with an historian whose links were with Byzantium rather than the far west of Europe. The first paper considers a recently discovered sermon of Liudprand which specialists in the writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan might like to peruse in order to explore whether there are any intellectual links with these Anglo-Saxon authors. "*Theophanu Divina*

Gratia Imperatrix Augusta: Western and Eastern Emperors in the Later Tenth Century" (pp. 143–64), "987: The Ottonian Connection" (pp. 165–79), and "Maternal Kin in Early Medieval Germany" (pp. 181–8) also focus on Continental sources and topics. This last paper shares an interest in matters anthropological with the penultimate paper in the volume, which is one that might act as a stimulus to Anglo-Saxonists of diverse interests. In "Ritual, Ceremony and Gesture: Ottonian Germany" (pp. 189–213) Leyser draws on anthropological perspectives as a starting point for discussing ceremonial and ritual in the Ottonian world, where both are much more prominent in contemporary writings than they had been in ninth-century sources. He posits the reason for this as coming from a trend back towards a more oral society "where communications by ritual gesture and ceremony grew in importance and took on an enhanced functionality" (p. 194). Banquets, fasting, boasts, promises and oaths of mutual aid, dress, gesture, and the judicial duel all are examined in this rich and provocative paper.

The volume concludes with Leyser's inaugural professorial lecture at Oxford entitled "The Ascent of Latin Europe" (pp. 215–32), where he moves from the regional analyses of the *Annales* school of historians (Braudel, Duby, Fossier, *et al.*) to a consideration of three European historians from just after the turn of the millennium whose writings "unfold new forms of self-awareness, new ways of portraying both themselves and social relations" (p. 219): Adémar of Chabannes (who devotes a chapter of his *Chronicon* to the Irish and Ireland [p. 221]), Rodulf Glaber, and Thietmar of Merseburg (who knew of the Danish attacks on Anglo-Saxon England [p. 230]).

Although there are a number of misprints in this volume (at least five in the final chapter), all praise must go to Tim Reuter for so unselfishly giving of his time to decipher Leyser's crabbed penciled notes, hunt down sources for missing footnotes, and update references to editions. He has collected some stimulating papers in an accessible form which will act as a memorial to a fine historian.

c. General and Theoretical Studies

WHILE RECENT YEARS have seen the publication of numerous studies of early literacy, the nature of oral culture remains elusive. Michael Richter sheds some light on the topic in *The Formation of the Medieval West: Studies in the Oral Culture of the Barbarians* (Dublin: Four Courts; New York: St. Martin's). Richter identifies three aspects of oral culture: music, gesture, and (improvised) words; all three are distorted in surviving evidence which is written, primarily Latinized, and often conditioned by religious bias. Despite attempts to suppress it as unchristian, oral culture remained vibrant and even enjoyed a high degree of respect among both laity and many clergy. Richter focuses primarily on Continental cultures and secondarily on Ireland; less is said specifically about Anglo-Saxon England, but most of his conclusions apply to the whole of Western Europe.

Gerald Bonner provides a general overview of early Eng-

lish religious history in his chapter on "Religion in Anglo-Saxon England" in *A History of Religion in Britain*, ed. Sheridan Gilley and W. J. Sheils (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell), pp. 24–44. Bonner touches briefly on many of the important figures and events of the period 597–1066, and the suggestions for further reading at the end of the volume provide a good starting point for those wishing to pursue the subject further. His essay is surprisingly clear and pleasant reading given the span it must cover, and those with little or no background in this area will find it a useful introduction to an enormous field.

Recent years have witnessed vigorous debate about how best to edit Old English texts, and editorial practice has tended to proceed in the direction of diminishing intervention and increased respect for features of the manuscript witnesses. While such tendencies have value for the philologist and the paleographer, to the historian they may be questionable, as David N. Dumville argues in "Editing Old English Texts for Historians and Other Troublemakers," in *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, ed. D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), pp. 45–52. Dumville's paper makes the key point that specialists in different disciplines require different types of information from the texts that they consult. Given that easy readability will be one of the main concerns for the historian, he will appreciate editorial modernization of punctuation and capitalization, and emendation where necessary in the interests of sense. Noting that it is unreasonable to expect historians to be fully proficient in the Old English language, Dumville laments that the Early English Text Society discontinued its early practice of including modern English translations in its editions. He recommends that the Society should start a series of translations of those texts of which it publishes editions, a suggestion that many historians may welcome. More controversial is Dumville's call for editions of "reconstructed" texts, that is, of states of texts that can be deduced, or that the historian believes can be deduced, from surviving manuscript witnesses, but that cannot be found in any manuscript. Such reconstructed texts are, of course, to be included in the Collaborative Edition of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* of which Dumville is one of the General Editors, and the first of them has recently seen print in Patrick Conner's *The Abingdon Chronicle* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1996). Ensuing scholarly evaluation of the latter will indicate whether the enterprise is worthwhile. In the meantime, Dumville has succeeded in articulating several key issues for historians, who will applaud his call for editors to be more aware of the varied scope of the interests of those likely to consult their editions.

d. Southumbria in the Early Anglo-Saxon Period

THE CHRISTIANIZATION of the Anglo-Saxons, beginning with the conversion of Kent, is the focus of two papers that respectively underline the role that Franks and native Britons may have played in the process. In "The Mission of Augustine of Canterbury to the English" (*Speculum* 69, pp. 1–17), Ian

Wood notes that the only early narrative account of the mission, that in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, cannot be taken at face value as there is evidence that some of the information it passes on had been embroidered, probably by Canterbury tradition, before reaching Bede; in its account of the mission, the *Historia* is no more than a secondary source, one, moreover, "with a particular ecclesiastical ax to grind" (p. 4). A significant amount of understudied primary material concerning the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons is available in the letters of Pope Gregory the Great. These indicate Gregory's concern to involve the Frankish Church in the English mission, and reveal a depth of Frankish engagement largely ignored by Bede. In 595—two years before Augustine's mission—the pope wrote to Candidus, his agent in Gaul, and asked him to buy Anglian boys and send them to be educated in monasteries (presumably Frankish ones). A series of letters written between 596 and 601 reveals Gregory's concerted effort to rouse support for Anglo-Saxon conversion from a wide sector of the Merovingian episcopate and from the three royal courts of the Merovingian realm. His enthusiastic praise of Syagrius, Bishop of Autun, and of the regent Brunhild indicates that significant Frankish support must have been forthcoming. Evidently Gregory relied on Brunhild for the promotion of Christianity just as he relied on other queens, notably Theodelinda of the Lombards and, indeed, Bertha, the Frankish queen of Æthelberht of Kent. In a revealing comment in a letter to Kings Theuderic and Theudebert, Gregory writes that he has learned that the Angles wish to be Christianized, thereby implying that it was they, rather than he, who set the process in motion; if this was so, Bertha and her bishop, the Frank Liudhard, no doubt played a role in preparing the ground.

Like Ian Wood, Rob Meens, in "A Background to Augustine's Mission to Anglo-Saxon England" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 23, pp. 5–17), stresses that much is excluded from Bede's account of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. Sometimes, however, more can be inferred than is explicitly stated, and such is the case, Meens holds, with Augustine's questions to Gregory on matters of ritual purity, questions included within the so-called *Libellus Responsionum* that Bede incorporated into the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. The questions—nos. 8 and 9 within the *Libellus*—focus on the impurity associated with childbirth, menstruation, and sexual activity. Some historians believe that such questions could have arisen only after the introduction of Greek rules of purity and impurity articulated by Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury (669–90), and have therefore concluded that the *Libellus* is not a genuine work, but was put together for Bede by Nothelm of Canterbury, using materials not all of which were authentically Gregorian. However, Meens shows that very similar issues of purity feature in Insular penitential literature of the sixth to eighth centuries. His conclusion is that questions 8 and 9 were indeed addressed by Augustine to Gregory, and that they were prompted by beliefs about ritual purity that Augustine encountered in Kent. Those beliefs, Meens suggests, were held

by Christians not associated with the Augustinian mission. He considers, but rules out, the possibility that Irish or Frankish missionaries were responsible, and decides that it is likely that Augustine encountered in England certain Christian Anglo-Saxons whose views differed from his own and who would have been converted by native Britons. "The *Libellus responsionum* can thus be seen as another piece of evidence of missionary activity by the British church. Though Bede explicitly denies any missionary activity by the British, his inclusion of the *Libellus* in his *Historia ecclesiastica* nonetheless offers us the opportunity to detect it" (p. 17).

In 672, the council of bishops that Archbishop Theodore convened at Hertford decreed that thenceforth, an ecclesiastical synod should meet annually "at the place known as *Clofesbo*." Although the intention to hold annual meetings was never fulfilled, nonetheless several councils did meet at *Clofesbo*—in 716, 742, 747, 792, 794, 798, 803, 804 (?), 824, and 825—while during the same period councils were also held elsewhere, notably at Chelsea and *Aclea*. The nature and purpose of all these councils are the subject of a thoroughgoing analysis in Simon Keynes's *The Councils of "Clofesbo"* (Eleventh Brixworth Lecture 1993; Vaughan Paper 38, Leicester: University of Leicester, Dept. of Adult Education). Most of the councils were attended, not only by ecclesiastics, but also by the Mercian king and an entourage of ealdormen and household officials. The preponderance of surviving records from the councils consists of land-grants made by the kings, which prompts the conclusion that the councils were primarily assemblies convened for the purposes of the king. Such a conclusion, Keynes shows, is not justified by a study of the specifically ecclesiastical business, which is less well recorded. Convened by the sitting archbishop of Canterbury and attended at his behest by bishops, abbots, and lesser clergy drawn from the whole of the Southumbrian province, the councils "met principally for the discussion of matters pertaining to the welfare of the church in general and to the observance of the Christian faith" (p. 21), while they also provided the opportunity to elect and consecrate bishops; the king of the Mercians in fact attended not in any official capacity, but on his own account, and took advantage of the occasions to make land-grants before the impressive groups of witnesses there assembled. Keynes's analysis, presented in two tables, of the bishops and abbots who, from their attestations of charters, can be seen to have been present at the councils, shows that the councils were truly deliberative meetings of the whole Southumbrian Church. That *Clofesbo* was the most favored meeting-place no doubt reflects respect for the pronouncement of the Council of Hertford and veneration of the memory of Archbishop Theodore, but must also be linked to the political geography of the period. Although since the sixteenth century various towns, among them Mildenhall in Suffolk and Brixworth in Leicestershire, have been suggested as the location of the elusive *Clofesbo*, Keynes concludes that there is simply insufficient surviving evidence to enable identification to be made. However, he suggests that it is most likely that *Clofesbo* lay somewhere in the east Midlands,

within the territory of the Middle Angles. He incorporates into his study a discussion of what is known of Middle Anglian minsters in the eighth and ninth centuries, and considers lucidly the possibility that *Medeshamstede* (the later Peterborough) was the focus of a Middle Anglian monastic "empire" that took shape in the late seventh century and endured until the ninth.

The status of women in Anglo-Saxon society is reckoned by many to have surpassed that of their Anglo-Norman counterparts (but see also the review below of Pauline Stafford's "Women and the Norman Conquest"). Among the major indicators of women's status are the Anglo-Saxon law codes. Two chapters of the early seventh-century code of King Æthelberht of Kent have generally been interpreted as giving a woman the right to walk out on a marriage while retaining a portion of her husband's property, as Carole A. Hough notes in "The Early Kentish 'Divorce Laws': A Reconsideration of Æthelberht, chs. 79 and 80" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 23, pp. 19–34). Problematically, this interpretation rests upon assigning to the verb *bugan*, which occurs in ch. 79—*Gif mid bearnum bugan wille, healfne scæt age*—the meaning of "to go away," a meaning otherwise unattested in the surviving corpus of Old English. Hough proposes that the verb here has its normal meaning of "to live, to dwell," and that the two chapters deal not with the rights of a divorcee, but with those of a widow following her husband's death: if she wishes to dwell with her children by him, she will receive half his property, whereas if she wishes to take another husband, her rights are reduced. Hough persuasively supports her reinterpretation by showing that comparable legislation concerning widows occurs not only in later Anglo-Saxon law-codes, but also in Continental Germanic codes from the late fifth century onwards.

e. Northumbria, the Celtic World, and the Continent

PETER J. FAIRLESS's *Northumbria's Golden Age: The Kingdom of Northumbria AD 547–735* (York: William Sessions) aims to provide "a concise account of people and events from the beginning of the kingdom to the time of Bede" (p. vi). The book does not seek to break new ground, but presents a useful summary largely based on Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Celtic sources. Five chapters on the political history of the period and on the progress of Christianity in the region set the scene for individual chapters on the Synod of Whitby, St. Cuthbert, St. Wilfrid, St. John of Beverley, St. Willibrord and the mission to the Continent, Northumbrian monasticism, and the history of Wearmouth–Jarrow from the foundation until 716. The general serviceability of the book as a sound basic introduction to the period is somewhat marred by the author's reluctance to punctuate his sentences with commas, a flaw that requires the reader to peruse some sentences several times over before their meaning becomes clear.

Early Celtic Christianity by Brendan Lehane (London: Constable) is a re-titled reprint (minus the illustrations) of Lehane's *The Quest of Three Abbots: Pioneers of Ireland's*

Golden Age, first published in 1968. The earlier title represented the book more accurately, for the work's principal purpose is to narrate the lives and missions of the Irish abbots-saints Brendan, Columba, and Columbanus, drawing largely on the *Voyage of St. Brendan* and the *Lives* of Columba and Columbanus by Adomnán and Jonas. There is little in the book that is directly relevant to Anglo-Saxon England, although ch. VI, "Iona and Lindisfarne," briefly sketches the early history of Lindisfarne and contrasts the Celtic brand of Christianity introduced there with the Romanizing influence emanating from the south of England, and ch. IX, "Trial," provides an account of the Synod of Whitby. The book is intended for the general reader rather than the specialist, and of course lacks the fruit of the last thirty years' research.

In "The Death of Aethelfrith of Lloegr" (*Northern History* 30, pp. 179–83), Craig Cessford argues that later Celtic sources, judiciously used, can significantly supplement Bede for certain key events of early Anglo-Saxon history. The *Historia Ecclesiastica* records that King Æthelfrith of Northumbria (592–616) was defeated and killed by the army of Rædwald of East Anglia in a battle fought by the River Idle on the Mercian border. Triads 10 and 32 of *Trioedd ynys Prydein* ("The Triads of the Island of Britain")—of which the earliest manuscripts are thirteenth-century, but which existed in oral form at least from the ninth or tenth century—state that Æthelfrith was slain by the British chieftain Sgafnell, son of Dissynyndawd. The Bedan and Celtic accounts need not be contradictory; Cessford observes that Rædwald's forces may have included Britons, just as, in 633, Penda of Mercia was to ally with Cadwallon of Gwynedd to defeat Æthelfrith's successor Edwin. The triads describe Æthelfrith as "king of Lloegr," not as king of Bernicia, Deira, or Northumbria; Triad 10 identifies Dissynyndawd's sons as chieftains of Bernicia and Deira. Cessford follows E.P. Hamp in interpreting "Lloegr" as meaning "having a nearby border," and in his view the use of the term in the triads reflects a Celtic view that acknowledged Æthelfrith's power over Bernician and Deiran territory but conceded no legitimacy to his position; rather, the sons of Dissynyndawd were the legitimate rulers. The triads therefore suggest, significantly, that a native British aristocracy survived in Bernicia and Deira into the early decades of the seventh century. The triads and other Celtic sources "provide an alternative point of view, which can be used to supplement the conventional Anglo-Saxon history presented by Bede" (p. 183).

While Scottish royal interest in ecclesiastical matters from the mid-eighth to the early twelfth century is the principal topic of Benjamin T. Hudson's "Kings and Church in Early Scotland" (*Scottish Historical Review* 73, pp. 145–70), the article incorporates discussion of the active role played by Northumbria in the affairs of the Pictish Church in the period following the Northumbrian takeover, in the early seventh century, of some of the lands of the southern Picts. The establishment of Northumbrian overlordship led to the creation of an episcopal see at Abercorn, and although Anglian

control of the area was broken by the Battle of Nechtansmere in 685, the continuing influence of the Northumbrian Church is demonstrated by the letter that the Pictish King Nechtan wrote to Abbot Ceolwulf of Wearmouth–Jarrow ca. 710, asking for advice on the calculation of Easter and other matters, and requesting the despatch of architects. Evidence of continuing pro-Anglo-Saxon tendencies among the Picts is provided by the alliance formed in 756 between King Óengus mac Fergusa and Edwin of Northumbria; Óengus's name, indeed, appears in the *Liber Vitae* of the community of St. Cuthbert, as do the names of two ninth-century Pictish rulers, Causantín mac Fergusa (d. 820) and Eóganán mac Óengusa (d. 839). It is possible that the see of St. Andrews was established during the eighth century; the dedication of the see is suggestive of Anglian influence, for dedications to the apostle were few among the Gaels, but not uncommon among the Angles. The establishment of St. Andrews may therefore be another reflection of the willingness of Pictish princes to be guided by the Anglo-Saxon clergy.

Knut Schäferdiek's study of Anglo-Saxon missionary activity on the Continent in the late seventh and early eighth centuries ("Fragen der frühen angelsächsischen Festlandmission," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 28, pp. 172–95) presents a significant reappraisal of hitherto accepted aspects of that activity. The principal historical sources are chapters 9–11 of Book V of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and Alcuin's *Life* of St. Willibrord, together with some material in Eddius's *Life* of St. Wilfrid. Apart from Wilfrid's brief period of activity in Frisia in the winter of 678/9, the chief missionary impulse came from Anglo-Saxons living in Ireland, notably from the monk Egbert at Rathmelsigi who, while prevented from undertaking a mission himself, was responsible for despatching Willibrord and others. Schäferdiek contends, against Wilhelm Levison's view, that Alcuin's *Life* of Willibrord has no independent merit as a source, but that it is dependent upon Bede's account; differences between the two texts—for example, Alcuin's contention that Willibrord went first to Utrecht, which contradicts Bede's statement that his group traveled first to Francia and only subsequently to Frisia—can be imputed to Alcuin's literary and hagiographical remodeling of his source. Bede inserts into his description of Willibrord's mission accounts of the missions of the two Hewalds among the Saxons, and of Swithberht among the *Boructuari* (who dwelled between the Lippe and the Ruhr). His interweaving of this material has prompted the traditional view that these two missions were spin-offs from Willibrord's. However, closer examination suggests that this may not have been so. Bede says of the Hewalds, not that they came from the same monastery as Egbert and Willibrord, but only that they "had long lived in exile in Ireland"; their missionary impulse may have been independent from, if similar to, that proceeding from Rathmelsigi. As for Swithberht, Bede records that, after receiving episcopal consecration from Wilfrid in England, he quickly left his field of activity in Frisia and proceeded to work among the *Boructuari*. Schäferdiek proposes that Swithberht

was not sent to Wilfrid by Willibrord's group as Bede states, but that Wilfrid sent him to Frisia in the 680's, some years before Willibrord's mission there. On this view, Wilfrid hoped that Swithberht would continue the work among the Frisians that Wilfrid himself had begun in 678–9, but a change in the Frisian rulership meant that Swithberht met with hostility there, and so changed the field of his activity. Schäferdiek's reappraisal thus diminishes the relative importance of Willibrord's mission by dissociating from it other missions traditionally linked to it, and calls for a more nuanced assessment of the apparently unitary narrative presented by Bede.

The history of Willibrord's mission has latterly been the focus of significant interest in the Low Countries, where two books have appeared in recent years. One, edited by G. Kiesel and J. Schroeder, emanated from Echternach in 1989 in celebration of the 1250th anniversary of Willibrord's death, while the other, having a Dutch title, has tended to escape the attention of English-speaking bibliographers: *Willibrord, zijn wereld en zijn werk*, ed. P. Bange and A. Weiler, *Middeleeuwse Studies* 6 (Nijmegen, 1990). Marios Costambeys now looks at the charters recording donations of land to Willibrord in "An Aristocratic Community on the Northern Frankish Frontier 690–726," *Early Medieval Europe* 3, pp. 39–62, and shows that there is much that might interest an Anglo-Saxonist who does not wish to remain insular. Hitherto Willibrord has been interpreted as an agent of the Frank, Pippin II. Costambeys points out that of the twenty-eight donation charters that survive from the saint's time, the five issued by the Pippinid family were given to the monastery of Echternach, while all those issuing from other grantors were given to Willibrord himself. Costambeys suggests that these other charters provide evidence of a native elite who used this method to retain some initiative while yet supporting the Franks. What may interest Anglo-Saxonists is Costambeys's analysis of some of the dispositive clauses of these charters, which he suggests do not simply parrot their Roman models but reflect the distinctive features of land-holding in the area of modern northern Belgium and southern Holland formerly known as Toxandria. He notes (p. 49, n. 50) that "[a] comparative study of the private charter formulae of the eighth century would be immensely valuable." He argues that the charters "provide a narrowly-defined example of written language as a reflection of agrarian society" (p. 51) and discusses their inclusion of such words as *mansus*, *mancipia*, *casata*, and *casatus*. He concludes that in this area the distinctions between a lord's reserve (or demesne) and tenements were blurred and that the evidence "suggests a long-established estate structure" (p. 56). He also points to the existence in the charters of a couple of Germanic legal words of putative Toxandrian origin which "demonstrate the essential role of orality in the process of charter redaction" (p. 58). Much of the work on vernacular words in Latin sources was done in the last century (mainly by German scholars): it is perhaps time for someone to look again at Anglo-Saxon Latin sources now that we have the resources

of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. And there is also a place for seeing whether Toxandrian estate structures as evidenced in the early charters can throw any light on our exiguous early Anglo-Saxon sources.

Among the major Anglo-Saxon foundations on the Continent was the abbey of Fulda, established by St. Boniface in 744. Madge Maureen Hildebrandt Klais's 1993 University of Wisconsin doctoral dissertation "The Royal Abbey of Fulda and the Politics of Carolingian Education" examines the role of Fulda in the eighth and ninth centuries as a center for the conversion of pagans, for monastic reform, and for the preservation of Latin learning. The reform initiatives of Charlemagne required an expanded liturgical service which posed a challenge for missionary monasteries like Fulda whose primary educational focus had been outward, on the training of priests for pastoral work and the education of the laity in the basic tenets of the faith. The dissertation presents a case study of the relationship between education and society in the Carolingian world. (Abstract only seen: *Dissertation Abstracts International* 55A, p. 689.)

Jürgen Sarnowsky poses two questions concerning Anglo-Saxon relations with the Continent in his "England und der Kontinent im 10. Jahrhundert" (*Historisches Jahrbuch* 114, pp. 47–75): Did Scandinavian attacks hinder England's contacts abroad? How did the evolution of English kingship affect ties to the Continent? After exploring four forms of tenth-century contact between England and the Continent (political/military, religious, cultural, and economic), he concludes that, although Viking activity impeded travel, Danish attacks necessitated long-term cooperation across the Channel and thus helped forge permanent links between England and Continental kingdoms. The development of English kingship aided the process as increasingly powerful Anglo-Saxon kings conducted diplomacy and contracted marriage alliances, sponsored religious and cultural reform, and regulated trade.

A comparison and contrast between Anglo-Saxon and Frankish models of society forms the subject-matter of Timothy E. Powell's "The 'Three Orders' of Society in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 23, pp. 103–32). Powell notes that Anglo-Saxon writers, unlike later Continental writers, treated the division of orders as functional but not hierarchical. Yet English treatments varied: King Alfred used the model to support meditations on royal responsibilities; Ælfric, to explain the duties of each order; and Wulfstan, to demonstrate the interdependence of the parts of society. The brevity of their references hint that writers expected audiences to recognize the notion. Powell finds in the Three Orders not a *mentalité* waiting to surface but a flexible model; rather than passively accepting an ideology, English writers explored its implications for their own engagements with their political and historical circumstances.

f. The Scandinavian Connection

THE SCANDINAVIAN WORLD and its impact on Anglo-Saxon England were the focus of a richly varied assortment of books and papers appearing in 1994.

Cultural Atlas of the Viking World, ed. James Graham-Campbell (London: BCA), is a magnificently illustrated collaborative volume with contributions by the archaeologists Colleen Batey, Helen Clarke, and Neil Price, and the Old Norse specialist and runic expert R.I. Page. The book presents an informed synthesis of current knowledge of Scandinavian activity in and beyond Europe during the Viking age, with deep historical background and with particular attention to the material remains of Viking culture. Neil Price describes the two eras of Viking attacks on and presence in England on pp. 122–42 and 207–14, while Helen Clarke mentions on pp. 85–8 the visit to King Alfred's court by the Norwegian merchant Óttar/Ohthere, an episode described in the Old English *Orosius*. The book offers no significant new information about the Vikings in Anglo-Saxon England—such is not its purpose—but has the special merit of providing a broad perspective through which the English situation can be seen in the total context of Viking interaction with the various parts of the British Isles and other areas of Western Europe.

Niels Lund's *De bærger og de brænder: Danmark og England i Vikingetiden* (i.e. "They plunder and they burn": *Denmark and England in the Viking Age*; Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1993) presents an overall survey, in Danish, of Danish engagement with England from the late eighth century until 1085, the year of St. Cnut's failed attempt to invade England. The book divides into three parts, respectively covering the Viking attacks of the ninth century, the Danelaw in the tenth century, and the period initiated by the new wave of attacks at the end of the tenth century. The quotation in Lund's title of course comes from the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. There is, indeed, plentiful quotation from contemporary and later English and Continental materials throughout the book, but always in Danish translation only, and without precise references to whereabouts within the sources the quoted passages occur. This characteristic, and the absence of footnotes, establish that the book, which includes good illustrations of runestones and several helpful maps, is intended more for the Danish general reader than the specialist scholar.

Henry Loyn's *The Vikings in Britain*, a concise general survey of the Viking impact on the British Isles ca. 800–ca. 1100, has been republished in the series Historical Association Studies (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell). (The original version of 1977 was reviewed in *OEN* 12:1, pp. 83–4.) For its new edition, the text has been shortened in order to conform to the series requirements, and some sections have been completely rewritten. However, the basic structure of the argument remains unchanged, Loyn's stated purpose being "to reveal the English experience in full British and Irish context and to interpret the early stages of Danish settlement in England as a significant migration" (p. viii). A strength of the book is its judicious use—notably in ch. 6, "The Effects of the Scandinavian Invasions on Britain: The Problem of Settlement"—of linguistic and place-name evidence to chart the extent and the nature of Scandinavian settlement.

Poul Holm, in "Between Apathy and Antipathy: The Vikings in Irish and Scandinavian History" (*Peritia* 8, pp.

151–69) provides a survey of the historiography of the Vikings in Ireland, beginning with the mid-seventeenth-century antiquarian Keating and continuing to the late 1970's. He emphasizes the role played by archaeology in uncovering material remains that altered the perceptions of historians, but also draws attention to the influence of nationalist views on many assessments of the Viking role in Anglo-Saxon England, for example on analysis of relations between the Scandinavian kingdoms of Dublin and York.

Several essays concern historical topics in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press; Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press). Many of the papers in the volume were first delivered in 1990 at a conference held at the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, while others were subsequently commissioned in order to add coverage of topics not included in the conference program. In his "Introduction: Cnut in Context" (pp. 1–9), Alexander Rumble draws attention to the surprisingly small amount of attention Cnut's reign has attracted from twentieth-century historians: a gap of eighty-one years separates the biography written by L.M. Larson in 1912 from that by M.K. Lawson (reviewed in *YWOES* last year). Developments during the intervening period in archaeology, numismatics, epigraphy, and other disciplines have significantly increased the range of material that can usefully be assessed for the study of Cnut's reign. However, research in any one of these fields has often been isolated from the others, while study of Cnut's reign in England has tended to be separated from consideration of his role as king of Denmark and Norway. Rumble explains that the present book aims to be interdisciplinary and international in scope, and thereby to accomplish a rounded assessment of Cnut's achievement. His "Introduction" includes, on pp. 3–5, a useful table listing, in parallel columns, the principal events of the years 1001–42 in England, Denmark, and Norway.

Two studies in the volume relate specifically to Cnut's Scandinavian territories. The broader overview is provided by Peter Sawyer in "Cnut's Scandinavian Empire" (pp. 10–22). He relates Danish dominance of Scandinavia during this period to the Danes' occupation of the most fertile territory in the area, capable of supporting a denser population, and to Danish control of the entrance to the Baltic, and the economic benefits resulting therefrom. Sawyer sketches the period of Danish expansion under Harald Bluetooth (ca. 958–ca. 987) and Swein Forkbeard (ca. 987–1014), a period that saw Denmark extending its overlordship over parts of Norway and Sweden, and that ended with the Danish conquest of England in 1013, followed by Cnut's accession. Sawyer relates Cnut's decision to make England—the principal source of his wealth—his home base to the subsequent loss of Danish control over Norway. After becoming King of England, Cnut visited Scandinavia for brief periods only. Although he led a successful expedition to Norway in 1028, driving out King Olaf, and in 1030 overcame Olaf's abortive attempt to return, he then made the crucial mistake of ruling not through a native jarl but through his son Swein and the boy's mother

Ælfgifu of Northampton. This unpopular move provoked Norwegian resistance and in 1034 led to the complete loss of Danish control over Norway, which became independent for the next 300 years. Cnut's preoccupation with England and his misjudgment in dispensing with the under-rule of a Norwegian jarl thus had significant, and longlasting, effects upon the Scandinavian political landscape. In 1042, indeed, "not only was the West Saxon dynasty restored in England, but Magnus, king of Norway, was accepted as king by the Danes" (p. 22). Sawyer's article is supplemented by an "Appendix: The Evidence of Scandinavian Runic Inscriptions" by Birgit Sawyer (pp. 23–6). She notes similarities in the wording of certain runic inscriptions in parts of Sweden with the wording of Danish inscriptions, and proposes that the Swedish inscriptions—some fifty-six in number—commemorate Swedes who served a Danish king. Swedish inscriptions also commemorate Swedes who traveled abroad, and some of these men would have taken part in expeditions to the west and east led by Swein and Cnut.

Niels Lund, in "Cnut's Danish Kingdom" (pp. 27–42), focuses specifically on Cnut's Danish territory and on how his English experience affected the way he governed Denmark. It was only following his brother Harald's death in 1018 or early 1019 that Cnut became King of Denmark. Before this, coins bearing Cnut's name were struck in Denmark, but, Lund argues, this tells us less about who was actually in power in Denmark than about how the mints and the coinage were managed. Cnut visited Denmark just four times after becoming its king. The first occasion was in 1019–20. The letter that he wrote to his English subjects on this occasion, and that is preserved in the York Gospels, suggests that while he was in Denmark, he succeeded in warding off the danger of future attacks against England. He is believed to have done this by imposing more effective control over Denmark. Lund rejects C. A. Christensen's theory that Cnut achieved this by granting the Danish bishops control over the *navigia* (administrative units each responsible for supplying a ship) within their dioceses—in his opinion *navigia* may not even have existed at this date—and suggests instead that Cnut entrusted the government of the kingdom to one or more earls, just as he had split England into four earldoms and had left Thorkell in overall command while he was in Denmark. Possibly earls Regnold and Halfdan, or Sired and Thrym, who occur as occasional witnesses to Cnut's charters in England, may have held office in Denmark. After considering Cnut's other three visits to Denmark, Lund surveys the general influence of Cnut's reign on the government, institutions, and culture of Denmark, and underlines the importance of Cnut's English experience in providing him with models for the changes he sought to effect in Denmark. In particular, Cnut introduced a Danish coinage modeled on the English system in which types were centrally controlled and exchanged at regular intervals; and he magnified Anglo-Saxon influence on the Danish Church by continuing and enlarging on his father Swein's policy of appointing Anglo-Saxons, or Danes trained in England, to Danish bishoprics.

The nuts and bolts of Cnut's governance of England are the focus of the important study "Cnut's Earls" by Simon Keynes (pp. 43–88). Acknowledging the poverty of much of the source material for the history of Cnut's reign, Keynes bases his study on the evidence of the charters. Some thirty-five survive, of which eighteen are authentic, while most of the rest include authentic elements. Keynes presents a table listing all the earls named as witnesses in the charters, and noting the position in which each earl occurs in each witness-list. He then provides historical information about each of the earls in turn, considering first those of Scandinavian, then those of English origin. He follows this with an analysis of what can be learned from the witness-lists about Cnut's methods of governing England, methods that passed through several distinct phases. In the early part of the reign, Scandinavian earls were prominent, with Thorkell of East Anglia being the most important until he was outlawed in 1021. In the period 1021–3, primacy among the earls passed to another Scandinavian, Eiríkr of Northumbria. From 1023 onwards it is the Englishman Earl Godwine of Wessex who dominates the scene: he is consistently listed first among the earls in the witness-lists, and in the early 1030's there is often only one other earl listed, namely Leofric of Mercia, another Englishman. Godwine's rise to prominence is recorded also in the *Vita Edwardi Regis*, where his advancement is associated with Cnut's return to England after one of his Danish expeditions. Keynes suggests that this was the expedition of 1022–3 and that Godwine accompanied Cnut on that expedition and helped him to quell a rebellion in Denmark, for which Cnut rewarded him by granting him special status once back in England. Godwine was a "new" noble, whereas Leofric, whose power rivaled Godwine's from the early 1030's, was the son of an ealdorman. In the last years of Cnut's reign Godwine and Leofric formed a "double act" that had repercussions thereafter: "Cnut himself was doubtless the master of the particular circumstances which had produced this highly-charged result; but the same could not, of course, be said for his successors" (p. 88).

David Hill, in "An Urban Policy for Cnut?" (pp. 101–5), briefly considers how Cnut's reign affected aspects of urban life in both England and Denmark. In England, no overall policy is discernible, nor was there the need for one, as the country already possessed an efficient urban network provided by royal initiative over a century before. Cnut's actions regarding his English towns—actions that in any case are poorly recorded—resulted from his response to particular circumstances that arose. There is some evidence for urban growth during his reign, with coins appearing for the first time with the signatures of Frome and Steyning; while the changed strategic situation led to the abandonment of emergency boroughs established during Æthelred's reign, such as that at South Cadbury. London was punished for its loyalty to Æthelred and his family by the special geld of ten and a half thousand pounds imposed on it in 1018; Winchester, by contrast, was the recipient of embellishing building projects.

Unlike Edward the Confessor, who made the towns central to his governance of England, Cnut showed no particular urban interest in his English itinerary. However, "if the Danes were not important at this time to the urban history of England, the English may have been vital to the urban history of Denmark" (p. 104), by providing models for Danish development. It may have been at this time that Denmark adopted the administrative system of the *herred*, probably based on the English hundred, and late in Cnut's reign a royal coinage on the English pattern was introduced in Denmark, with mints in eight towns.

Nicholas Hooper's paper "Military Developments in the Reign of Cnut" (pp. 89–100) continues his exploration of an issue he first addressed in 1985, in "The Housecarls in England in the Eleventh Century" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 7 [1984], pp. 161–76; see *OEN* 20:1, pp. 131–2). He there challenged the view that Cnut's housecarls were, in effect, a body of mercenary troops who served the king as a standing army. In the present paper he maintains and refines his earlier contention. The housecarls, in his view, should not be seen as a standing army—that is, a permanent body of soldiers who serve only for pay—because, although they received money and probably possessed a corporate identity, their essential function was that they were "the personal followers of Cnut and his royal successors up to 1066, and of their earls" (p. 90). Initial circumstances of Cnut's reign dictated that the housecarls were kept on a military footing for some years and were thereby indistinguishable from a standing army, but thereafter Cnut began to demobilize them by granting them land on which to live. Although in this and subsequent reigns they are mentioned from time to time as military enforcers, they occur also as witnesses to royal charters and as the recipients of land-grants. Overall, the evidence "shows that housecarls formed the retinues of kings and earls, and that they could be employed as agents of government" (p. 94). In Hooper's view, they fall within the tradition of the military households maintained by earlier English monarchs, for example Edwin and Alfred (as well as by Continental rulers). The housecarls were bound to Cnut partly by pecuniary reward, but also by personal loyalty, and this set them apart from standing armies. However, there was another group that perhaps *can* rightly be viewed as a standing army: the lithsmen ("fleet-men"). The employment of a paid, armed Scandinavian fleet first occurred during Æthelred's reign, and the monarchs' use of such a fleet is mentioned occasionally in the records until 1051, when Edward the Confessor abolished the tax of heregeld that supported the fleet. Lithsmen are never mentioned as land-owners; they could be paid off *en masse* and when this happened they took their ships and disappeared from the scene. All this suggests "that they were a permanent force, a standing army, in a way that the housecarls were not" (p. 98).

Two Scandinavian sources, Óttar *svarti's* verses in praise of Cnut and the Danish history compiled in the twelfth century by Sveinn Aggeson, describe Cnut as ruling over Ireland as well as his other dominions. As Óttar was a contemporary of

Cnut and intended his eulogy to be presented to the king, his claim concerning Cnut's relationship with Ireland ought to have some basis in fact. Benjamin Hudson, in "Knútr and Viking Dublin" (*Scandinavian Studies* 66, pp. 319–35) suggests that a king of one of the Viking towns in Ireland may have acknowledged Cnut's overlordship, and proposes Sigtryggr Silkbeard, King of Dublin (ca. 989–1036), as the most likely candidate. Sigtryggr is known to have had problems with other powers in Ireland, notably the rival Viking leader Ívarr of Waterford and Brian Boru, so could have welcomed an alliance with the powerful Cnut. A link between the two rulers might also explain why when, during Sigtryggr's reign, the bishopric of Dublin was created, it was apparently made dependent upon Canterbury: two late eleventh-century bishops of Dublin, Patrick and Donatus, acknowledged the primacy of Canterbury *more antecessorum suorum*. Sigtryggr may himself have spent time in England, for Hudson suggests that he is identifiable as the otherwise enigmatic *Sihtric dux* who witnessed three charters (Sawyer nos. 962, 963, and 971) granted to Crediton in the late 1020's and early 1030's. Collaboration between Sigtryggr and Cnut may have had broader implications. Noting that the Annals of Tigernach record a joint Dublin–English raid on Wales in 1030, Hudson suggests that Cnut could have assisted Sigtryggr to establish on Anglesey the Dublin colony that was led by Sigtryggr's son Óláfr. Yet another result of a link between Sigtryggr and Cnut could have been the foundation of the church of St. Bride outside of London, for Hudson feels the church may have been built to serve a community of merchants from Dublin whom Cnut allowed to establish a trading station on the banks of the Thames.

g. Late Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest

A STUDY OF THE LAND-HOLDINGS of eleven Anglo-Saxon queens from the time of King Alfred's queen Ealhswith until the Norman Conquest forms the focus of Marc Anthony Meyer's article, "The Queen's 'Demesne' in Later Anglo-Saxon England," in *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis L. T. Bethell*, ed. Marc Anthony Meyer (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon, 1993), pp. 75–113. Meyer's final conclusion is that there was, in effect, nothing that may truly be called the queen's demesne, as with certain notable exceptions, estates were not passed down from one queen to another. One factor militating against the development of queen's demesne was that queens frequently outlived their spouses and thereby retained, after the succession of a new queen, many estates with which they had already been endowed. Notably, the Conqueror allowed Edward the Confessor's widow Eadgyth—one of the richest landholders in the country—to retain the bulk of her pre-Conquest holdings; William's own queen Matilda obtained much more restricted holdings. Meyer's study shows that queens tended to receive their estates in two ways, as grants either from their royal husbands or from their kinsmen. During the tenth century, the second way was the

more important: for example, both King Edmund's two wives Ælfgifu and Æthelflæd, and Ælfgifu the wife of King Eadwig, received the majority of their estates from their own kindred, rather than by the king's gift owing to their queenly status. Further, many estates held by individual queens were not held *in perpetuum*, but slipped in and out of their control, as with the estates of Cooling and Osterland in Kent which were problematic holdings for Eadgifu (Edward the Elder's last queen) until she finally granted them in perpetuity to Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury. Meyer demonstrates that the extent of a queen's influence was often related to the extent of her land-holdings, and the ways in which she managed them: Abingdon Abbey was refounded by Æthelwold ca. 954 thanks to a grant by Eadgifu (now dowager queen) from her own resources, and in the early years of Æthelred's reign, Ælfthryth increased her influence by founding the nunneries at Amesbury and Wherwell on land she apparently obtained by virtue of her royal status. Meyer rounds off his study with a shire-by-shire table listing the various queens' holdings. The table shows graphically the general discontinuity of holdings from one queen to another, and the vast extent of Eadgyth's land-ownership.

Stimulated by the prosopographic work of such scholars as Robin Fleming, Simon Keynes, and Ann Williams, interest in the non-royal ruling elites of tenth- and eleventh-century England has increased in recent years. Peter A. Clarke now adds to these researches with his monograph, *The English Nobility under Edward the Confessor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press). Domesday Book proves to be the best source for studying those with leadership positions in Edward's reign, especially the *eorlas*, a class that was briefly to produce a king in the person of Harold. Charters are scanty for the reign; there are a number of wills extant, but these are mainly of East Anglian origin. The primary source is Domesday Book—not that it is without its problems, which Clarke acknowledges in his introductory chapter. But it records pre-Conquest land-holdings and the financial values it assigns estates give "a reasonable approximation of the actual value of an estate to its lord" (p. 12). Earls' estates are examined in his second chapter: in Edward's reign five of the richest landholders were earls and of the twenty largest estates recorded in Domesday Book half had been held by earls or their wives. Within this class, power was even more concentrated in Edward's final years: four families dominated, with the Godwines holding land valued at £5,000 and Leofric's clan £2,400, leaving Siward's and Ralph's far behind with land worth £350 and £170 respectively. Clarke's justification for treating the estates of earls' families as a whole (pp. 15–16) seems reasonable. More controversial and worth further investigation is his questioning of the "comital manors" first identified by F.W. Maitland: "The comital manors, if they can be said to exist at all, seem to have been given to the earls to hold for their life (at least) in spite of the fact that the extent of the earldoms themselves could be quite flexible, and could change from year to year" (p. 22). Most of the rest of this chapter is devoted to a detailed examination of

the location and extent of the holdings of these four major "earlish" families (the adjective is an unattractive coinage but it is hard to think of an alternative). Employing the distinction made by the *Liber Eliensis* between *proceres* and lesser thegns, Clarke then investigates those below the rank of earl with land worth more than £40, which placed them in the *procer* class (not *procere* as on p. 34). Not surprisingly the main cause of land changing hands was the death of its owner, though, Clarke notes, in Domesday Book "this aspect of land transfer is almost never mentioned" (p. 47). Church lands were not so subject to the vagaries of mortality and he shows convincingly that older monasteries such as Bury St. Edmunds and Glastonbury had consolidated their holdings to a greater degree than newer foundations such as Westminster. He extends this observation to the holdings of lay persons, noting that "a small number of the larger estates recorded in Domesday had not been long in existence by 1066" (p. 55) and the holdings of someone like Robert fitz Wymarc, who was related to Edward and only rose in position during his reign, were scattered like those of Westminster.

Less fruitful is Clarke's examination of the nature of the dependent relationships disclosed by the four Domesday circuits that record these. He does not, for instance, consider whether the Domesday commissioners in these circuits may have interpreted Anglo-Saxon evidence through Norman eyes: if this were so, the evidence would be unreliable. He suggests that if service was owed to a lord, that lord had a greater chance of controlling the property after 1066. "Where no service was due, the land was considered to have been held directly by the lessee; where service was due, it was treated as if it had been held by the lessor" (p. 71). He holds that "in the majority of the cases recorded in Domesday, lordship was primarily a personal rather than a tenurial relationship" (p. 85). This latter observation takes one to the heart of a problem with this book. Clarke is very good at assembling data; what one misses is any sense of what it was *like* to be a lord. What is the content of that adjective "personal"? After a brief examination of the county of Cambridgeshire, where he is able to draw on the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*, he devotes a long chapter to the landholders and the kingdom under Edward the Confessor. There are occasional arresting observations here (more information about Saxon landholders' careers survives from after Edward's death than from many years of the reign itself [p. 116] and the piecemeal nature of revolts against William may be because Anglo-Saxon landholders only revolted when they saw their own property being threatened rather than their rebelling first and then having their lands confiscated [pp. 118-19]). But the chapter tends towards a dry recitation of facts. Although there is a useful outline of thegns' rights and duties (p. 130), Clarke claims that the duties of the stallers "cannot be closely defined" (p. 127). He then cites their titles (*pincerna* and the like [pp. 127-8]) without giving content to these words and relegates a list of secondary studies of earls to an appendix.

One thus looks forward to his chapter on "Pre-Conquest

Conditions Compared with Those on the Continent," only to find that this is the weakest part of the book. *Adelsgeschichte* is a rich and flourishing field amongst Belgian, French, and German historians but none is cited in the original language and there is a heavy reliance on Tim Reuter's collection of translated studies, *The Medieval Nobility* (Amsterdam, 1978). In his conclusion Clarke questions the claims of David Roffe and Peter Sawyer that there was continuity of estate structure from pre-Conquest into post-Conquest times. He observes that many tenants-in-chief had more than one important Saxon *antecessor* (p. 155), so that in 1086 "larger estates were more common" (p. 156), although these were not all made up of existing Saxon estates. One wonders whether debate has really been joined here as it is likely that Roffe is referring to the structure of individual manors rather than the landholdings *en masse* of individual lords. William did change, however, the patterns of landholding by granting large blocks of his kingdom to individuals such as Odo of Bayeux and Earls Roger and Hugh to help defend his new kingdom, with castelries elsewhere forming compact estates. Clarke also notes "some quite substantial estates . . . [that] comprised a little land from many different pre-Conquest estates" (p. 158). Furthermore, "whilst . . . in 1086 all significant tenants-in-chief had some proportion of their land held by subtenants, this was not true for the period before the Conquest" (p. 160). These post-Conquest tenants-in-chief could call upon such men to support them and the relationship was quite different from the pre-Conquest ties between lords and their men. With wealth and power being more widely distributed in the reign of William, "the power of any individual or small group could be more easily curtailed" (p. 162), unlike the earls of Edward's reign, who had far more freedom of action. The volume concludes with two hundred pages of data on landholdings abstracted from Domesday Book. It seems likely that this will be a book that will be quarried by other specialists rather than read by, say, undergraduate students. One hopes that Dr. Clarke will now write a synthetic article for *History Today*, which will bring alive to a general readership the nature of the leadership class in Edward the Confessor's reign and some of the general developments that have been so closely analyzed in this study.

One of the most influential and controversial figures during the reign of the Confessor was his Archbishop of Canterbury, Stigand. In "Archbishop Stigand and the Eye of the Needle" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 16, pp. 199-219), Mary Frances Smith re-examines Stigand's career. Contemporaries said little about this last Anglo-Saxon Archbishop of Canterbury, but later chroniclers labeled him a simoniac or worse. Smith notes his irregular appointment—and compares those of some sainted reformers. Stigand's tremendous landholdings included royal gifts and estates he inherited as well as church lands gained by encroachment or lease. While some clerics begrudged the leases, others used them to win Stigand's generous patronage. Stigand earned resentment both for his wealth and for confirming leases of Canterbury lands on terms

highly favorable to lay aristocrats. Finally, when William the Conqueror deposed the archbishop for political reasons, houses lost lands associated with him, and some rewrote their ties to him. Stigand also suffered from changing values; twelfth-century chroniclers deemed earlier courtier-bishops wicked. Smith finds Stigand not the extortionist of later legend but a shrewd dealer caught by shifting circumstances and perceptions.

Martha Rampton's paper "The Significance of the Banquet Scene in the *Bayeux Tapestry*" (*Medievalia et Humanistica* 21, pp. 33–53) explores the Tapestry's scene 48, depicting Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, presiding over an aristocratic feast. This scene, surprisingly, interrupts the battle narrative; moreover, written accounts of the Conquest mention no banquet, nor was feasting before battle customary. Feasts both symbolized and reinforced solidarity, but usually after a conflict; the scene therefore illustrates the solidarity of clergy and aristocracy before the invasion. Rampton also finds parallels between the Tapestry's iconography and contemporary depictions of the Last Supper. She concludes that the scene represents the Mass William attended before the invasion (related in the *Gesta Guillelmi* of William of Poitiers) as well as a feast. Harold betrayed William as Judas betrayed Christ, so God and His earthly representatives sanction the invasion. The scene thus draws on associations of both community and sacrament to aid the Tapestry's overall effort to legitimize the Conquest.

In "1066 and the Introduction of Chivalry into England" (in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press], pp. 31–55), John Gillingham argues that eleventh-century Norman society was more chivalric than its English counterpart and that the Conquest increased chivalry in England. Defining chivalry as an honor code preserving life and limb of defeated aristocratic enemies, Gillingham contrasts Norman politics with English blood feud and Norman punishment of rebels by exile and confiscation with English mutilation and execution. (The few aristocrats mutilated or executed by Norman dukes or Anglo-Norman kings were particularly treacherous.) Gillingham also compares the English with the Celts to isolate the factors which made these "savage" societies unchivalric, and ultimately he connects chivalry with socio-economic development: aristocratic bodies merit preserving when there are towns and castles to redeem them.

Pauline Stafford's "Women and the Norman Conquest" (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th Ser., 4, pp. 221–49) finds that the Conquest had less effect in other spheres: she argues that the Conquest did not end a "Golden Age" of high status for women both because that "Golden Age" never really existed and because the tenth to twelfth centuries display more continuity than change in women's status and experiences. Stafford shows that the evidence is more varied than the historiography indicates: inheritance, marriage, and royal intervention helped some noblewomen and hurt others, both before and either side of the Conquest,

with marriage and inheritance practices remaining stable until the late twelfth century. Stafford also questions modern estimations of status; for instance, owning land could be good or bad, making women pawns or giving them power depending on circumstances. Stafford concludes that women's history must replace generalizations with contextualized analysis of specific cases.

W. M. Aird, in "St Cuthbert, the Scots and the Normans" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 16, pp. 1–20), offers a revisionist interpretation of the role of the community of St. Cuthbert in the violent and unhappy politics of Northumbria in the latter half of the eleventh century. Over-reliance on Symeon of Durham has skewed our perception of the community's policy which, in Aird's view, was a continuation of its earlier practice of seeking royal patronage in order to ensure its preservation. Writing in the first decade of the twelfth century, Symeon sought both to justify the replacement in the 1080's of the governing body of married priests and monks by a Benedictine community and to attack Bishop Ranulf Flambard (1099–1128), who was making assaults on the community's privileges and properties. Other sources survive that put a different cast on events. Aird suggests that the church was not involved in the revolt against Tostig in 1065 nor did it oppose the Normans; in fact, "it seems that the members of the church of St Cuthbert made every effort to distance themselves from the rebels" (pp. 15–16). He rejects Symeon's account of the Conqueror's visit to Durham in 1072 in favor of one that portrays William as becoming the community's patron. He suggests that the community in 1093 recruited another patron in Malcolm III of Scotland. Aird questions whether the reform of the community in 1083 was as dramatic as that portrayed by Symeon. One would have to turn to Aird's 1991 Edinburgh doctoral dissertation to assess the validity of this last case, though the "abundance of references to aged clerks from whom Symeon gleaned his information" (p. 19) appears to support his argument. This paper should stimulate fruitful debate among other specialists in eleventh-century Northumbrian history.

h. Regional, Local, and Church Studies

JOHN BLAIR's *Anglo-Saxon Oxfordshire* (Stroud and Dover, NH: Alan Sutton) is a model of local historical investigation that makes full use of archaeological, numismatic, and place-name evidence in addition to documentary materials (which for significant parts of the period are scanty). Oxfordshire did not exist formally until late in the Anglo-Saxon period: the first written reference to *Oxnaford scire* occurs in 1010–11, and Blair holds that the origin of the shire probably dates to 1007, to the shiring of Mercia carried out by Earl Eadric Streona. Necessarily for a rounded account, Blair extends his study beyond the limits of Oxfordshire to embrace the whole Upper Thames area and south-western Middle Anglia, so that his coverage includes parts of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire. The Upper Thames area was, he holds, the homeland of the West Saxons, or rather the

Gewisse as they were first known, who appear to have subjugated other local groupings during the sixth century and whose principal residence, archaeology suggests, was probably at Benson (some twelve miles south-east of Oxford). Conversion to Christianity came in the 630's, during the reign of Cyneigils, when the Italian missionary Birinus arrived in the region and was granted Dorchester as his episcopal seat. The rise of Mercian power later in the seventh century forced the *Gewisse* southwards to the area with which the West Saxons are more traditionally linked. Between the late seventh and the mid-eighth century, during the period of Mercian dominance, there was established in the Oxfordshire area a network of minsters (including Abingdon, Bicester, Charlbury, Eynsham, Thame, and St. Frideswide's in the future Oxford) that provided devotional, and eventually economic, foci for the surrounding territories. The clarity and incisiveness with which Blair reconstructs this development is one of the strongest points of his book. Before the existence of parishes in the modern sense, the minsters, he holds, were—in this region as elsewhere—the centers of great “mother-parishes,” and influenced secular as well as religious life by the growing range of their social and economic activities. From the tenth century, however, as larger territories were broken up, a new pattern emerged wherein the lords of small manors busily founded private churches on which parishes were later based. Throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, the economic life of the area diversified: well situated during the era of Mercian supremacy to act as an exchange route linking the natural resources to the north and west with the commercial outlets to the south and east, the region produced agricultural surpluses and evolved a noteworthy pottery industry which apparently supplied London to a significant extent. The town of Oxford itself Blair believes to have been founded late in King Alfred's reign by Æthelred of Mercia and his wife, Alfred's daughter, the Lady Æthelflæd; they probably recruited surveyors and engineers from Alfred's team for the purpose. Blair charts the social and economic growth of Oxford until it established itself as a significant provincial town, and he links its prominence as a political meeting-place in the eleventh century—it was here that important councils met in 1015, 1018, 1035, and 1065—with its strategic location on the ancient frontier of the Thames, within easy range of Mercia, Wessex, and the Danelaw.

Ever since William Somner's *A Treatise of Gavelkind* (London, 1660) it has been common knowledge among English historians that Kent is different from other parts of England: apart from free tenure with partible inheritance, the absence of common fields, the presence of dispersed settlements, and the survival into the eighteenth century of the *lathe* as an administrative unit have given it distinctiveness. But why? Here historians have differed and P. S. Barnwell has now entered the controversy with a stimulatingly synthetic perspective based on wide reading of specialist studies in “Kent and England in the Early Middle Ages” (*Southern History* 16, pp. 1–20). Noting that Jolliffe's explanation for these differ-

ences based on the posited settlement of the area by the Jutes is invalid and that the alleged wealth of Kent is inadequate as an explanation, Barnwell observes that Kent's varied topography also does not provide a sufficient cause for the changes. He posits that elsewhere the creation of royal *burhs* in the Midlands and the south may have required agrarian reorganization to support the military resources necessary to fight the Vikings; the break-up of large federative estates to create new secular lordships may have required greater productivity from the land; and new ecclesiastical lordships may have encouraged single-heir inheritance to discourage a population explosion in the smaller, less diverse estates. Barnwell proceeds to explore how Kent differed in these respects. To write a synthesis today is an act of bravery (or folly) and many will cavil at the specific arguments adduced. But in looking to the creation of *burhs* as a causative factor in agrarian reorganization, Barnwell could well be on to something, though one might be inclined to look back beyond Alfred to eighth-century Mercia to find the initiator of such a change.

According to St. Albans tradition, chiefly enshrined in the writings of Matthew Paris, King Offa founded St. Albans Abbey in 793 as an act of atonement for the murder of King Æthelberht of the East Anglians, a suitor for the hand of Offa's daughter Æthelflæd. Frank Kilvington's article “Offa, King of the Mercians,” written to commemorate the 1200th anniversary of the foundation, appears in a local publication, *The Alban Link* 39 (September 1993), pp. 9–13. The author, a former headmaster of St. Albans School, outlines the principal events of Offa's reign—the extension of his power and influence over much of England, the construction of Offa's Dyke, relations with the Continent (particularly with Charlemagne, whom Kilvington suggests Offa sought to emulate), the visit in 786 of a legatine mission from Rome—before briefly discussing the details of Matthew Paris's account of the circumstances, some of them miraculous, surrounding the foundation.

The beginnings of one of the more important houses to originate during the Benedictine Reform period are the subject of Cyril Hart's “The Foundation of Ramsey Abbey” (*Revue Bénédictine* 104, pp. 295–327), which traces Ramsey's early days through its principals, particularly Bishop Oswald of Worcester and Germanus. (Hart disputes several points in Michael Lapidge's account of Germanus; compare Lapidge's “Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter,” in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies Presented to Helmut Gneuss*, ed. Michael Korhammer [Cambridge, 1992], pp. 99–129.) He details early benefactions to the abbey and explores how politics enabled reform there while Oswald's other attempts failed. Hart argues that Ramsey owed its success as a model reform house largely to Fleury's influence, which Germanus helped transmit. Because of the sources' biases, omissions, and confused chronology, much remains unclear about Ramsey, but Hart gives a broad picture of the house's early development and fills in some of the details.

Lesley J. Abrams's 1992 Toronto doctoral dissertation "The Pre-Conquest Endowment of Glastonbury Abbey: The Growth of an Anglo-Saxon Church" is a major study, based on charter material and Domesday Book, of the pre-Conquest estates owned by one of the richest religious houses of Anglo-Saxon England. The charters in question are, apart from four single-sheet diplomas dating from the Anglo-Saxon period itself or (in one case) soon after, known only from reports in William of Malmesbury's *De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie* or from copies in Glastonbury's two fourteenth-century cartularies; as Abrams acknowledges, discretion must be exercised in assessing whether or not the late medieval copies modified the text of the originals on which they were based. A further significant source is a thirteenth-century listing of the contents of an earlier, now lost cartulary (the *Liber terrarum* or *Landboc*) which Abrams suggests could date from as early as the late tenth century, although it could also have been a post-Conquest compilation; the listing indicates that this cartulary included about ninety grants not found in extant documents. The greater part of the dissertation comprises an alphabetical directory of the more than two hundred estates (in seven counties) associated with the Anglo-Saxon abbey, with an enumeration and analysis of the sources relating to each estate. There is also extended discussion of those grants formerly preserved in the abbey's archive that were made to private individuals by kings from Centwine onwards; Abrams shows that although many of the territories thus granted subsequently passed into the abbey's ownership, it is by no means clear that all did so. Overall, the documentation reveals some fluctuation in the extent of Glastonbury's endowment. The earliest known grants of land to the abbey belong to the late seventh century. A dearth in royal grants for about eighty years beginning ca. 860 need not mean that the abbey ceased to exist during that period as a result of Viking depredations, as some have concluded; Abrams thinks it more likely that it continued to function, perhaps in a debased or secularized form. A series of grants during the reign of Edmund (939–46) was associated with the resurgence of the house under Dunstan's abbacy. Few royal grants occurred in the eleventh century: following Æthelred's reign, there was only one for the rest of the Anglo-Saxon period. Domesday Book reveals that by the mid-eleventh century the abbey owned a healthy portfolio of property, but Domesday also indicates the loss of some of that property by 1086. While the extant materials thus enable the historian to gain clear insights into the broad changes in the abbey's fortunes, the documents are frequently extraordinarily difficult to analyze and interpret accurately, and one of the greatest strengths of Abrams's dissertation is the frankness with which she acknowledges the complexity of her source material and the circumspect caution with which she advances her conclusions.

Precious information about endowments to religious houses can sometimes be found in obituary lists. Such lists also provide insight into how those houses remembered their Anglo-Saxon past, as Robin Fleming shows in "Christchurch's

Sisters and Brothers: An Edition and Discussion of Canterbury's Obituary Lists," in *The Culture of Christendom*, ed. Meyer, pp. 115–53. Fleming's article considers the Anglo-Saxon benefactors commemorated in four obituary lists of Christ Church, Canterbury, dating from ca. 1100 to the early fifteenth century: London, British Library, Cotton Nero C. ix, fols. 19r–21v (B); Cotton Galba E. iii, Part II, fols. 32r–34r (G); Cotton Nero C. ix, fols. 3r–18v (N); and Arundel 68, fols. 10r–52v (A). She provides an edition of the first three of these, and records the significant information from the fourth. While B, the earliest of the lists, stands on its own, the others are interrelated, for, as Fleming shows, the late thirteenth-century G and the fifteenth-century A both draw on a common source (with A preserving the content of that source more accurately), while A also shares information with N. What she has failed to notice is that the common source for G and A survives as the twelfth-century London, British Library, Royal 7 E. vi, as has now been pointed out by Simon Keynes in his facsimile edition of *The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey Winchester* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1996; see p. 60, n. 91); most of the commemorative entries in the Royal manuscript have been erased, but enough survives to indicate that they served as the source for the information recorded in G and A. Altogether, the obituary lists studied by Fleming name over one hundred Anglo-Saxon lay men and women, eighteen kings, kings' sons, and spouses, and twenty-one pre-Conquest abbots, bishops, and archbishops. They therefore "provide one of the largest and most comprehensive accountings of a community's benefactors before the Norman Conquest" (p. 115); and significantly, they often specify the benefactions, which range from grants of estates, pastures, woodland, and urban property, to gifts of church plate and gospel books. Many of the land-grants are also documented in surviving charters, and of especial interest is Fleming's consideration of differences in the way the grants are recorded in the charters and the obituary lists, the latter showing how the grants were memorialized in the collective Christ Church consciousness. In several cases, the obituary lists omit to mention the original grantor, but refer instead to those lords, kings, and kinsmen whose permission, immediately or after a generation, allowed the community to take up its grant. The Christ Church community apparently had a different historical memory of its endowments from the one presented in the charters. "The yearly, communal commemoration of specific grants is self-consciously royalist (usually either Mercian or West Saxon), and there is an acute appreciation of the role of archbishops in the acquisition or restoration of estates" (p. 122). As the same bias is presented in many of the writings stemming from the period of the tenth-century reform, it is possible that the information on endowments found in the obituary lists was originally shaped in the second half of the tenth century. The lists provide a fascinating insight into "the community's own version of its endowment, its patrons and its past" (p. 123).

Paul Gerhard Schmidt's article "König Harold und die

Reliquien von Waltham Abbey, Essex: die Reliquienliste in B. L. MS Harley 3776" (in *Anglo-Saxonica: Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der englischen Sprache und zur altenglischen Literatur. Festschrift für Hans Schabram zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus R. Grinda and Claus-Dieter Wetzel [Munich: Fink, 1993], pp. 75–90) provides an edition, with brief introduction, of the list of the relics of Waltham Abbey in the mid-fourteenth-century MS Harley 3776, fols. 31r–35v. The Harley list copies a lost exemplar drawn up after an inspection of the relics in 1204. The opening section of the list is in hexameters—perhaps intended for liturgical recital—and records eighty-five relics donated during the Anglo-Saxon period, fifty-nine by the abbey's founder Earl (later King) Harold, the remaining twenty-six by Ealdred, Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York. Schmidt's work largely duplicates that of Nicholas Rogers, whose 1992 article "The Waltham Abbey Relic-List" was reviewed in last year's *YWOES*. Schmidt has no equivalent for Rogers's useful, in-depth discussion of the content of the list. His edition is, however, more accurate than Rogers's, if not error-free. His item 77 should read *De spina sancti Petroci* (not *Petri*); within his item 165, he has omitted *sub* before *Waltero abbate*; and item 318 should end *clerici de Bassingeburne* (not *Basungeburne*). At item 82, his *vestigia tantum olei ostendens* (as against Rogers's *vestigia tam . . .*) is correct, and at item 155, his *que tamen simul per se posita sunt* wins out over Rogers's *quem tam simul . . .*

i. Historiography

FOUR WORKS discussed British, Anglo-Saxon, or Scandinavian historiography. In *The English Conquest: Gildas and Britain in the Fifth Century* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press), N. J. Higham scrutinizes the allegorical details and scriptural parallels which abound in *De Excidio Britanniae* for clues about Gildas and his Britain. From these materials and his deductions, Higham concludes that Gildas wrote around 480 in far southwest England, not the sixth-century north, as some hold. He also reads *Mons Badonicus* not as a battle sealing British success but as the last British victory in a war the Saxons won. The resulting truce left many Britons slaves and a few free but ruled by British tyrants whom Gildas deemed too weak and wicked to uproot the Saxon invaders. *De Excidio* is thus a hortatory book intended to inflame Britons to virtue, so that God's favor might return to them and bring them victory over the pagans.

David N. Dumville's paper "*Historia Brittonum: An Insular History from the Carolingian Age*," in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter, *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 32 (Vienna and Munich: Oldenbourg), pp. 406–34, offers an overview of, and a focus on key questions in, a text on which Dumville completed his doctoral thesis in 1975 and on which he has published extensively since. Originating in 829/30, *Historia Brittonum* provides a short history (or pseudohistory) of the British Isles down to the late

seventh century; it was to be influential on Anglo-Norman historians, notably Geoffrey of Monmouth. The title by which the work is now known is almost certainly not authorial, and one of Dumville's most compelling points is his insistence that the work is a history of Britain rather than of the Britons, for the author pays significant attention to Gaels, Picts, and Saxons as well as to Britons, and affords recognition to the contemporary situation of these other groups within the British Isles. Given that the central core of *Historia Brittonum* concerns struggles between Britons and Anglo-Saxons, it is remarkable that the Welsh author does not take a more negative view of the Germanic invaders; indeed, Hengest is treated with respect, emerging as a more astute leader than Vortigern. The author was significantly open to Anglo-Saxon culture, and Dumville proposes that he was a resident of the Anglo-Welsh border, an ecclesiastic, perhaps even an interpreter. He was probably a speaker of Old English, and had access to Anglo-Saxon sources on which he drew strongly for his account of post-Roman British history. Significant Irish sources must also have been at his disposal, as is evident from his stray remarks about Irish settlements in western Britain, his comments on the Irish saints Patrick, Brigit, and Columba, and the indications that he used a Victorian Paschal *cursus* of Irish provenance. More problematic is the question, long debated, whether the author knew Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Dumville adduces certain parallels to suggest that he did, and urges that the account in the *Historia Brittonum* of how Rhun ab Urien evangelized Northumbria, in the process spending forty consecutive days baptizing the inhabitants, can best be understood as a deliberate challenge to Bede's account of Paulinus's conversion of the Northumbrians, during which the missionary spent thirty-six days baptizing the people.

The impulse behind historical writing in the reign of King Alfred is the subject of Anton Scharer's paper "König Alfreds Hof und die Geschichtsschreibung: einige Überlegungen zur Angelsachsenchronik und zu Assers *De rebus gestis Aelfredi*," which, like Dumville's article, appears in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (pp. 443–58). Scharer argues that Alfred commissioned the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Asser's *Life* to depict him as divinely chosen for kingship and to promote harmony and loyalty at court, where Alfred's nephews may have had some support. The *Chronicle* emphasizes Alfred's direct descent from Cerdic while ignoring most other dynasties' claims, yet Kent receives exceptional interest—because Alfred's grandfather Egberht had Kentish royal blood from the female side. Asser's *Life* depicts Alfred as chosen by emphasizing Alfred's illness, which recalls the sufferings of Gregory the Great and Christ. Scharer concludes by noting that Alfred's interest in education developed late, perhaps as court scholars convinced him that education was an effective means of promoting his ideas at court.

Elizabeth Ashman Rowe discusses Snorri Sturluson's treatment of history in "Historical Invasions/Historiographical Interventions: Snorri Sturluson and the Battle of Stam-

ford Bridge" (*Mediaevalia* 17, pp. 149–76). Snorri's *Heimskringla* juxtaposes the "good" Norwegian kings St. Óláfr and Mágnus with Haraldr *harðráði* ("tyrant") to demonstrate that kings fighting for Christianity succeed, but those seeking worldly gain come to ruin. While his nostalgia for the heroic age occasionally undercuts Snorri's criticism of Haraldr, he generally presents history ironically. Snorri's history also comments on current events: Norway should not conquer Iceland because Iceland is already Christian and the two states can maintain peaceful relations, as the Æsir and the Vanir co-exist in *Heimskringla's* foundation myth of Scandinavia. Though he rejects Haraldr, Snorri presents not the English Harold but William the Conqueror as divinely sanctioned. For Snorri, Normandy, a young Scandinavian state experiencing great success independent of older kingdoms, suggests possibilities open to an independent Iceland.

j. Anglo-Saxon Law

ANGLO-SAXON LAW, its relation to Continental law, and its reception and modification in the Anglo-Norman period formed the subject of a significant group of studies.

Maurizio Lupoi's massive *Alle radici del mondo giuridico europeo: saggio storico-comparativo* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato) seeks to isolate certain key concepts in the legal codes of the Germanic tribes and to consider their contribution to the evolution of "European Common Law." The book covers the period from the fifth century to the eleventh, and Lupoi interweaves into his overall picture a discussion of some significant Anglo-Saxon legal terms, which he sets in context: for example, *æ*, *dom*, *lagu*, and *riht* (pp. 489–90). He argues powerfully for a basic equivalence between OE *riht* and Latin *iustitia*, while noting that the full semantic range of *riht* exceeded that of *iustitia* (pp. 533–36). His discussion of *útlab* derives the term from Old Norse *útlagi* and notes its first appearance, under Scandinavian influence, in the laws of Edward and Guthrum (pp. 491–93). He does not conceal differences between Anglo-Saxon and Continental law-codes, distinguishing, for example, the penal preoccupations of the laws of Æthelberht from the Burgundian and Visigothic codes and the *Pactus legis salicæ* (p. 97). Two of his six *Excursus* are on Anglo-Saxon topics: "Observations on the Anglo-Saxon Charters" (pp. 191–226) and "The Anglo-Saxon Writ" (pp. 387–408). In the first, he notes that the formulae of Anglo-Saxon charters are much more variable than those found in Continental charters. Nonetheless, he detects the occurrence in the Anglo-Saxon documents of certain forms of expression that can be related directly to those typical of the papal chancery, and he links this to the role played by the Anglo-Saxon Church in the evolution of the Anglo-Saxon charter. In his *Excursus* on the English writ, he agrees with F. E. Harmer in dating the origin of the writ to the eighth century, and divides its evolution into three periods: from the eighth century to the mid-tenth, when the writ was a generic epistolary form of varied use in so far as concerns the status of sender and recipient and the object and scope of the

document; from the second half of the tenth century through the eleventh and into the twelfth, when the writ, without losing its epistolary function, became the instrument whereby the king assigned rights of property or other rights, or more generally gave notice of his will; and from the twelfth century, when the writ assumed its definitive, specialized form as the means of initiating causes to be heard in the royal courts and of despatching administrative orders. He notes the occurrence within writs dating from the second period of formulae redolent of the papal chancery, and, as with the charters, he attributes this characteristic to ecclesiastical influence on the shaping of the form of the document.

Anglo-Saxon law became a significant focus of interest for legal thinkers within a generation or so of the Norman Conquest, as Patrick Wormald shows in his fundamental essay, "Quadripartitus," in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy*, ed. Garnett and Hudson, pp. 111–47. *Quadripartitus*—the name (which may date only from the sixteenth century) reflects an original plan, never realized, for a four-part work—is a two-part legal compilation drawn up early in the twelfth century, of which the first, and much the longer, part comprises a Latin translation of Anglo-Saxon laws, while the second part consists of contemporary material. *Quadripartitus*, which was incorporated into the important thirteenth-century "London collection" of English laws, became "the usual means of access to Anglo-Saxon law from its compilation under Henry I until the appearance of Lambard's *Archæionomia* in 1568" (p. 112). Wormald's analysis confirms and extends several conclusions first reached by Felix Liebermann in the late nineteenth century. *Quadripartitus* survives in nine manuscripts altogether, four of these being copies of the "London collection," and paradoxically, it is the later manuscripts that reflect the earlier state of the work, which appears to have evolved in stages, with various of the author's drafts having somehow been released into circulation and having thereby spawned copies. *Quadripartitus* is one of several indications of twelfth-century interest in Anglo-Saxon law, others being the *Textus Roffensis* still preserved at Rochester Cathedral and the collection from St. Paul's Cathedral, London, now Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383. Wormald agrees with Liebermann and L.J. Downer that the author of *Quadripartitus* was also responsible for the *Leges Henrici Primi*, and that the *Leges* replaced the originally intended third and fourth parts of *Quadripartitus*. In Wormald's opinion, the author of *Quadripartitus* would have been a first-generation member of England's new French-speaking elite, and must have served in some judicial capacity. The author believed that Anglo-Saxon laws had relevance for the practice of justice in his own time, and his work played a significant part in shaping the self-awareness of English Common Law in succeeding centuries. His Latin, however, can be impenetrable, and Richard Sharpe's "Appendix: The Prefaces of *Quadripartitus*" (pp. 148–72) provides a notable service in furnishing translations of all three prefatory sections (none of which made it into the final recension of the work, if Wormald's

analysis of the evolution of *Quadripartitus* is correct). Regarding the date of the work, Sharpe shows that Liebermann's proposed *terminus a quo* of 1113 is almost certainly mistaken, and that Book II of *Quadripartitus* is datable between 1108 and 1118; the work as a whole could even have been begun before the accession of Henry I in 1100.

Key differences between Anglo-Saxon law and Anglo-Norman law as it developed by the thirteenth century are the subject of the 1993 University of Michigan doctoral dissertation by Peter Don Tjapkes, "The Old Testament and Medieval English Law: The Decline of Law as Revelation from 995 to 1215." Basing his study on pre- and post-Conquest sermons, poetry, legends, and historical narratives, as well as on the laws themselves, Tjapkes relates such Anglo-Saxon procedures as judicial ordeals to an underlying idea that laws

and legal practices should be a reflection, or revelation, of invisible truth. He concludes that the loss of this idea impacted upon many of the legal changes that took place in England by 1215, and relates this loss to a post-Conquest decline in the status of the Old Testament and Hebrew law. (Abstract only seen: *Dissertation Abstracts International* 54A, p. 2693.)

N.G.D.
T.C.G.
D.A.E.P.

[N.G.D. wrote the reviews of Bonner, Gillingham, Hart, Higham, Powell, Rampton, Richter, Rowe, Sarnowsky, Scharer, Smith, and Stafford; D.A.E.P. those of Aird, Barnwell, Campbell, Clarke, Costambeys, Keynes ("Anglo-Saxon History"), Leyser, and Mayr-Harting; T.C.G. wrote the rest, and coordinated the whole.]

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
Research in Progress Report

Each year, the editors of the *Old English Newsletter* solicit information concerning current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications. The Research in Progress reports are an important collaborative enterprise, recording information of common interest to our colleagues. Please complete the form below (type or print clearly), and return it to Phillip Pulsiano, Department of English, Villanova University, Villanova, PA 19085 (PULSIANO@usic.vill.edu). If the subject of your project is not obvious from the title, please add a note indicating its best classification. For dissertations, please provide the name of the director.

Name _____

Address _____

Academic Affiliation (if not above) _____

a = article; b = book or monograph; d = dissertation; IP = in progress; C = completed; TBP = to be published in / by.

1. Research in progress (aIP, bIP, dIP):

2. Research completed (aC, bC, dC):

3. Research to be published in / by (TBP):

How to reach the Old English Newsletter

Effective immediately, for all business correspondence including publication information, subscriptions, back orders, *Subsidia* information, OR to notify *OEN* of an address change, please contact:

Publisher, *Old English Newsletter*
Medieval Institute
Western Michigan Univ.
1201 Oliver Street
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3801
PHONE: 616-387-8832 FAX: 616-387-8750
e-mail: mdvl_news@wmich.edu
website: <http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/oen/index.html>

As of volume 30, the editorial operations of *OEN* have moved to the University of Iowa. All correspondence regarding the editing of *OEN* including submissions should be sent to:

Jonathan Wilcox
Editor, *Old English Newsletter*
Department of English
Univ. of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
PHONE: 319-335-1913 FAX: 319-335-2535
e-mail: jonathan-wilcox@uiowa.edu

To request information concerning the *Year's Work in Old English Studies*, or to send comments and suggestions, write the *YWOES* general editor:

Peter S. Baker
Department of English
Bryan Hall
Univ. of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

To submit abstracts of papers given at conferences, or to receive information about the annual appendix of conference abstracts in the Spring issue, write:

Robert L. Schichler
Department of English
Arkansas State Univ.
State University, AR 72467-1890
FAX: 870-972-2795
e-mail: rschich@toltec.astate.edu

For information about the *Old English Bibliography* featured in each Summer issue, write:

Carl T. Berkhout
Department of English
Univ. of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Send *Research in Progress* information concerning current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications to:

Phillip Pulsiano
Department of English
Villanova Univ.
Villanova, PA 19085
e-mail: pulsiano@usic.vill.edu

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
1201 OLIVER STREET
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-3801

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT 478
KALAMAZOO, MI