

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
Peter S. Baker

VOLUME	31
NUMBER	2
WINTER	1998

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

VOLUME XXXII NUMBER I

Winter, 1998

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

Associate Editors:

Peter S. Baker
Department of English
Bryan Hall
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

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: Ginger Makela
Assistant to the Publisher: Joshua Westgard

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 Baker and Berkhout respectively. Correspondence regarding business matters and subscriptions 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 University. The Departments of English at the University of Arizona, the University of Iowa, and the University of Virginia support *OEN*. *OEN* receives no financial support from the MLA.

Copyright © 2000
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

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

1996

by

Richard Abels (United States Naval Academy)

John David Cormican (Utica College)

Susan E. Deskis (Northern Illinois University)

Nicole G. Discenza (Hillsdale College)

Janet Schrunk Ericksen (University of Minnesota, Morris)

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)

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

Peter S. Baker

University of Virginia

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES 1996

IT IS NO EASY MATTER to succeed Joseph B. Trahern as editor of *The Year's Work in Old English Studies*; his wisdom and genial editorial skills have guided this publication through many years of spectacular growth in the volume of literature on Anglo-Saxon England and have kept it on a remarkably consistent schedule. The fumbblings of the present editor, by contrast, have made this issue the latest in the history of *Old English Newsletter*. My goal for the next few years, then, is to return YWOES to its former schedule and, if possible, to advance that schedule by some months.

This year the YWOES team is joined by Richard Abels of the United States Naval Academy. Professor Abels has made great progress towards bringing the History section (which has appeared late for the last several years) up to date. History 1996 will appear in two sections, the first in this issue and the second next year, and thereafter History will be on the same schedule as the other sections. The work of bringing History up to date has also been advanced by Timothy Graham and Nicole Discenza, who contributed History 1995, which appears as an appendix to this issue.

The Archaeology and Numismatics section is missing a number of items this year, due to an unusual series of mishaps, including a lost parcel and a disk error (an aspect of malign Fortune specific to the Information Age). Kelley Wickham-Crowley performed heroically at the last moment to make the section as complete as possible; items that are still missing will be included in next year's issue.

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. In addition, this year's issue contains contributions by Chris Harris of Florida State University (section 3.b.) and Joseph B. Trahern (section 3.a.). I would also like to acknowledge the help of Elizabeth Bryan, my graduate assistant at the University of Virginia.

Contributors to YWOES 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 be sent to Professor Peter S. Baker, Department of English, Bryan Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903.

CONTENTS

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects		a. General Interest	112
a. History of Anglo-Saxon and of Old Norse Studies	5	b. Late Roman and Celtic Britain and the Early Kingdoms	115
b. Cultural History	7	c. Kings, Administration, and Law	117
c. Research Resources	8	d. The Church, Saints, and Religion	120
d. Anglo-Norman	9	e. Norman Conquest and Settlement	127
e. Modern literature	10	7. Names	131
f. Exhibitions and Tourist Sites	10	8. Archaeology and Numismatics	
g. Varia	11	a. Excavations	135
h. Essay Collections	12	b. Regional Studies	138
2. Language		c. Urban Studies	141
a. Lexicon, Glosses	13	d. Architecture	142
b. Syntax, phonology, and Other Aspects	17	e. Death and Burial	146
3. Literature		f. Artifacts and Iconography	147
a. General and Miscellaneous	24	g. Production and Craft	150
b. Individual Poems	35	h. Numismatics	150
c. Beowulf	50	i. Miscellaneous	151
d. Prose	62	Appendix: History and Culture, 1995	
4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works		a. Reference and General Works and Collected Papers	153
a. Early Anglo-Latin (excepting Bede)	69	b. Editions and Textual Studies	156
b. Bede	75	c. Sub-Roman Britain, the Anglo-Saxon Settlement, and the Pictish and Celtic Worlds	161
c. Alcuin	83	d. Anglo-Saxon Paganism	163
d. The Ninth Century	84	e. Slavery in Anglo-Saxon England	165
e. The Tenth-Century Reform and Beyond	86	f. The Early Anglo-Saxon Church	166
f. The Later Eleventh Century	95	g. Wessex and King Alfred	172
g. Comprehensive Works	99	h. The Tenth and Eleventh Centuries	173
5. Manuscripts, Illumination, and Charters	102	i. The Conquest and Beyond	177
6. History and Culture		j. Local and Regional Studies	181

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. History of Anglo-Saxon and of Old Norse Studies

THE CATALOGUE accompanying an exhibition on the history of Trinity College, Dublin, includes a biographical essay by Richard A. McCabe on James Ussher, one of the college's early graduates ("Learned to a Miracle": James Ussher," *Treasures of the Mind: a Trinity College Dublin Quartercentenary Exhibition*, ed. David Scott, London, 1992); the exhibition itself included an engraving of Ussher (reproduced in the essay), several early editions of his works, and one manuscript of his work. McCabe provides an overview of Ussher's scholarship, but his primary concern is the religious conflicts in and during Ussher's life.

Steven E. Smith, in "Sir Robert Bruce Cotton, 'Ingrosser of Antiquities'" (*AB Bookman's Weekly* 97 (10 June): 2298–2308), offers an admiring summary biography of Cotton and a brief history of his book collecting. Smith utilizes and expands upon the entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, adding to it, in particular, discussion of Cotton's methods of acquiring manuscripts.

Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, and the *Laws of the Anglo-Saxons* (Costerus, n.s. 108, Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi) is Raymond J.S. Grant's attempt to provide more user-friendly access than Liebermann offers to Anglo-Saxon law codes, and to do so in a more reliable and extensive edition than those previously available. The book begins with brief overviews of Anglo-Saxon law in general, then of the collections II and V Athelstan, Iudex, Alfred and Ine. Grant's ensuing biographical coverage of Nowell, Lambarde, and, very briefly, Somner stresses the existence of two Laurence Nowells, one the Dean of Litchfield and the other the antiquarian and copyist of Anglo-Saxon laws. The heart of the book is the laws themselves by way of Nowell and Lambarde. After an introduction to the manuscripts and editions, and after a clear and useful explanation of his own editing practices, Grant prints "the texts of the Anglo-Saxon laws found originally in BL Cotton Otho B. xi and transcribed in BL Additional 43703 by Laurence Nowell (Nw1 and Nw2) in 1562 alongside those printed by William Lambarde in his *Archaeologia* of 1568"; Liebermann, in contrast, was "unaware of the existence of most of the Nowell transcripts" (i). The fonts and layout of the texts themselves appear highly readable. Grant concludes with a list of manuscript rubrics and a select bibliography.

In "The Compilation of a Seventeenth-Century Kentish Manuscript Book, Its Authorship, Ownership and Purpose" (*Archæologia Cantiana* 115 (1996 for 1995): 389–411), Paul Lee describes in detail the physical appearance and the contents of Literary Manuscript B2 in the Canterbury Cathedral archives; he corrects the contents list of C.E. Woodruff's 1911 published description and supplies three appendices:

"Contents and Measurements," "Watermarks," and "Hands." The manuscript, in both English and Latin, contains material ranging in date from the late fifteenth to the seventeenth century and in content from abbey accounts to a macaroon recipe. Manuscripts nine and ten (of the eleven total) have Anglo-Saxon connections. Nine is a sixteenth-century copy of the Laws of Alfred, Athelstan and Ine; ten is a seventeenth-century copy of Theodosius' *Gesta servatoris*, accompanied by a note that seems to identify its source as a Canterbury manuscript. Lee disagrees with Woodruff's assignment of the Anglo-Saxon laws to William Somner's hand and instead points to Lambarde, suggesting that this text might even have been a draft for Lambarde's *Archaeologia*. Lee concludes that the collection, in content and presentation, reflects the professional interests of the compiler, perhaps a Chancery lawyer with Protestant inclinations and antiquarian interests; he proposes, with precise local, historical, and familial connections, Somner as that compiler.

With a delicate blend of praise and criticism, as well as a blend of biography and scholarly critique, Patrick Wormald reviews Maitland's work on Anglo-Saxon law; his comments were initially given as the 1995 Raleigh Lecture on History (Patrick Wormald, "Maitland and Anglo-Saxon Law: Beyond Domesday Book," *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.* 89: 1–20). The assertion that Maitland, like many of his contemporaries, "drastically underestimated the power and the aggression of the Old English state" (6) forms the basis of Wormald's lecture, but Wormald focuses on why Maitland might have believed what he did. Where Maitland was wrong, Wormald assigns a substantial portion of blame to the *Leges Henrici Primi*—Maitland's "usual incubus" (16). In explaining the basis of Maitland's misinterpretations, Wormald offers his own revisions, in particular on the relationship between private justice and the role of lords, on the non-Frankish origins of "the jury of presentment," and on the concept of punishment before 1066. One of Maitland's central weaknesses was his desire "to equate the beginnings of state intervention with the birth of legal professionalism" (18). The audience most receptive to the essay will be one already familiar with Maitland and his work, though Wormald does include clear explanations, as well as a "Maitland parody" involving Ælfric as "an inveterate rustler" to help explain Anglo-Saxon "communal responsibility," in contradiction of Maitland's position on the frankpledge (11).

The subtitle of Robert Powell's *The Life of Alfred, or, Alured* (Ed. Francis Wilson. Stamford: Paul Watkins) neatly summarizes the perspective of this seventeenth-century biography; it describes Alfred as "The first Institutor of subordinate government in this Kingdome, and Refounder of the

University of Oxford" and presents his life "Together with a Parallell of our Sovereigne Lord, King Charles, untill this yeare, 1634." The editor's own subtitle then announces that Powell's work is "the first modern account of Alfred the Great." For Alfred, Powell presents unqualified praise, enumerating and elaborating upon the virtues and accomplishments of this king of "exemplary goodnesse" and "watchfull providence in government" (13, 22)—the work is, as Wilson notes, hagiographical. Powell links Kings Alfred and Charles in their support of the Church, of scholarship and the arts, and of law. Wilson suggests that Powell's admiration for Charles is qualified on several points, but the tone of the work is largely laudatory for both of this "paire of Peereless Princes" (37). The edition is a transcription of the original 1634 edition, including marginal notes, variant spellings, and most of the irregular punctuation; Wilson adds, with his introduction, a reproduction of the title page and four pages of the text, as well as several engravings.

Reverence for Alfred did not mean reverence for all things Germanic; the status of Old Norse in seventeenth-century England was not high, as Judy Quinn and Margaret Clunies Ross show in "The Image of Norse Poetry and Myth in Seventeenth Century England" (*Northern Antiquity: the Post-Medieval Reception of Edda and Saga*, ed. Andrew Wawn [Enfield Lock, Mddx., 1994] 189–210). Interest in Norse material is evidenced by three English scholars in the 1670s, Robert Sheringham, Daniel Langhorne and Aylett Sammes, who directly or indirectly drew on Peder Hansen Resen's Latin translations of the *Edda*, *Völuspá*, and *Hávamal*; Sammes's *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata* (1676) is "the first substantial work in English to treat Northern mythology" (194). Much of the period's discussion of Norse material, however, came in debates about poetic origins and the superiority of particular forms. Rhyme was given a pejorative northern pedigree and associated with Odin in particular. Quinn and Clunies Ross include substantiating excerpts, many along these lines, from Lord Roscommon's "Essay on Translated Verse" (1684): "from some Mossie, Idol Oak/ In Double Rhymes our Thor and Woden spoke" (200). Such visions found further elaboration in works such as Dryden's play, *King Arthur, or, the British Worthy*; Quinn and Clunies Ross quote in full Dryden's imaginative scene of pagan sacrifice to the Germanic gods.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Norse mythology was faring better, but even so, N.F.S. Grundtvig was unable "to turn ancient Norse mythology into an accessible store of modern national imagery" for Denmark (41). His attempts to do so, documented largely in unpublished manuscripts, are traced by Flemming Lundgreen-Nielsen in "Grundtvig's Norse Mythological Imagery—an Experiment That Failed" (*Northern Antiquity: the Post-Medieval Reception of Edda and Saga*, ed. Andrew Wawn [Enfield Lock, Mddx., 1994] 41–67). Though the motivations for Grundtvig's efforts changed, he consistently and enthusiastically tried to find a way to integrate Norse myth into contemporary culture,

as is suggested, for instance, by a plan for a work to be entitled *Snorri's Edda for Everyday Use*. Lundgreen-Nielsen attributes Grundtvig's failure to the rise in valuation of literary originality, to Grundtvig's emphasis on the universal symbolism of events, to his declaration of *Völuspá* as the work of a fifth-century Norse Homer, and to his complex, contemporary-focused interpretations of the material. The dominance of Classical mythology and the political and literary environment of nineteenth-century Denmark also worked against him. In an "Ironie Postscript," Lundgreen-Nielsen notes that one phrase of Grundtvig's that survives in popular use, "Freedom for Loke as well as for Thor," misrepresents Grundtvig's perception of Loke not as evil, but as a blend of human impulses.

Grundtvig's admiration of Old English is the subject of Bent Noack's "Grundtvig and Anglo-Saxon Poetry" (*Heritage and Prophecy: Grundtvig and the English-Speaking World*, ed. A.M. Allchin et al. [Aarhus and Norwich, 1994], pp. 33–43). Noack describes the history of Grundtvig's study of Anglo-Saxon, both of the language and of manuscripts, literature, and history, in Denmark and on visits to England. Besides an edition and Danish translation of the *Phoenix*, Grundtvig produced hymns taken from Old English with varying degrees of adherence to and reworking of the originals; the connections are one of Noack's main interests. Anglo-Saxon Christianity was, for Grundtvig, a point of connection between English and Nordic history, between ancient and contemporary Christianity, between Christianity and Germanic settings and culture. In Anglo-Saxon Christianity and literature, Grundtvig found, Noack asserts, an attitude and presentation in concert with his own ideas.

S.A.J. Bradley, "The First New-European Literature': N.F.S. Grundtvig's Reception of Anglo-Saxon Literature," *Heritage and Prophecy: Grundtvig and the English-Speaking World*, ed. A.M. Allchin et al. (Aarhus and Norwich, 1994) 45–72, poses and addresses two questions: briefly put, what did Grundtvig bring to the study of Anglo-Saxon literature and culture and what did he take away? Bradley argues that Grundtvig had "some sort of symbiotic relationship with Anglo-Saxon literature" that is most evident in his creative writing (52). It is on this relationship that Bradley focuses. He draws on Grundtvig's philosophical formulation of the meaning of *Ordet* [the Word] and his developing intellectual positions, on his assessment of *Beowulf* and on his poetry and sermon-style compositions to demonstrate connections between Grundtvig and the tropes and perspectives of Anglo-Saxon literature. Though Bradley acknowledges that "such subjective enthusiasm" might have been "distasteful," Grundtvig "was nonetheless one of the most dynamic respondents of any time to Anglo-Saxon culture viewed in historical retrospect, a remarkable phenomenon in nineteenth-century European culture, drawing upon a genuine insight into the Anglo-Saxon literary mentality" (70). He is, in Bradley's view, significant to the study of Anglo-Saxon literature and the study of "the diverse cultural roots of the new Europe" not so

much as a traditional scholar but as a reader of what he perceived as still vital literature.

In "Stridige stykker snild jeg forbandt": Grundtvig's Creative Synthesis of Anglo-Saxon Sources," *Grundtvig Studier* (97–127), Bradley more specifically explores Grundtvig's impulses and attitudes towards the poetic nature of Old English language and literature, and toward history and nationalism; he examines Grundtvig's creations and synthesis of Old English poems, the ways in which Grundtvig was influenced by Anglo-Saxon literature and thought, and his attempts to influence modern interpretation of Anglo-Saxon literature and culture. Grundtvig cast himself as a promoter of the poetic, in opposition to dull pedantry. He saw himself, in Bradley's words, as a scholar addressing all of Denmark and beyond, whose "mission is not simply to inform, but to polemicise; to elicit from his ancient sources a wisdom, both religious and political, relevant to the age in which his readership lived"; he was to be both poet and model of response to this poetry, and "to link together what others might see as discrete or even conflicting materials and motivations—all this, as though he were at once both a latter-day Caedmon and a latter-day Father of the Church" (101). The focus of Bradley's eloquence is Grundtvig's Old English poem on creation and redemption, which Bradley includes in full and translates, and for which he provides an extensive reading and note-like discussion.

John Lingard's is a relatively unusual voice among nineteenth-century perspectives on the Anglo-Saxon church. Peter Phillips, in "John Lingard and *The Anglo-Saxon Church*" (*Recusant Hist.* 23: 178–89), traces, particularly in the context of religious politics, Lingard's life and his work on editions of his thematic history, first titled, in 1806, *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. Lingard, who taught himself Old English, worked against the idea of a British church of native rather than Roman basis. The foundations for Lingard's scholarly work were laid, suggests Phillips, at the Douai library, before the French Revolution pushed Lingard to England. Phillips' discussion and characterization of Lingard's work show a nineteenth-century historian with eighteenth-century-style rationalist tendencies. Perhaps no point better illustrates this than Lingard's desire to improve the believability of the biography of St. Dunstan by toning down the work of Osbern, "an injudicious biographer" (186).

On more recent history and the current directions of Old English scholarship, Bruce Mitchell, in an interview with Antonio Bravo, laments the dearth of critical bibliographies and updated editions. On criticisms directed towards his own scholarly position, in particular those of Christina von Nolcken (*Modern Philology* 89 (1991): 25–35), Mitchell asserts that his motivation is not fear of or threat by new approaches, but a belief in the necessity of judging new critical methodologies "by their results." The interview is published as "On Old English Studies Today" in *SELIM* 4 (1994): 133–39.

Whether or not the historical position of OE in the classroom will continue to change is the subject of Peter

Jackson's "The Future of Old English: A Personal Essay," which first appeared in *OEN* in 1992, not long after Valentine Cunningham's arguments against Old English as a compulsory subject for first-year Oxford students ignited public debate. Jackson neatly summarizes the various sides of the discussion at this stage and its extension beyond Oxford; in the republication of his essay (*SELIM* 3 (1993): 154–67), Jackson appends an amplification and update of comments about ongoing syllabus review at Oxford and an outline of points of agreement among the debaters. Old English, he concludes, for the moment, seems to have a secure place in the Oxford English curriculum.

b. Cultural History

ALLAN J. FRANTZEN achieves three distinct things in "Between the Lines: Queer Theory, the History of Homosexuality, and Anglo-Saxon Penitentials" (*Jnl of Med. and Early Modern Stud.* 26: 255–96): he provides a very clear introduction to and critical overview of queer theory; he suggests, by way of an exploration of Anglo-Saxon penitentials, that Anglo-Saxons might have had a more extensive set of social and sexual categories than has been generally supposed; and he identifies directions for further research. About the penitentials, Frantzen notes that while generally comparable to Latin and Irish examples, the Anglo-Saxon penitentials less extensively deal with homosexuality. When they do address the subject, the Anglo-Saxon texts present homosexuality within the framework of a gendered social code. Since codes directed at the behavior of boys exist in each of the Anglo-Saxon penitentials, Frantzen devotes some attention to these strictures and their implications for social status; he also explores at some length the terminology in references to various sexual offenders. The article is far from an endorsement of queer theory as it is most widely known, but Frantzen does argue for some usefulness in the new perspectives queer theoretical approaches might elicit. He asserts a need for balance, for scholars to seek out theories that might be helpful in providing new ways of understanding history (specifically, Anglo-Saxon England) and for those engaged with or enamored of the theories to know texts and history more thoroughly.

Frantzen's attempts to extend the methodological range of Anglo-Saxonists continue in "The Fragmentation of Cultural Studies and the Fragments of Anglo-Saxon England" (*Anglia* 114: 310–39). Traditional Anglo-Saxon scholarship, argues Frantzen, has not taken advantage of the potentially illuminating approaches of cultural studies; he demonstrates his point with examples from the Anglo-Saxon penitential that he titles, for greater ease of identification, *Scritiboc* (also known as the *Confessionale Pseudo-Egberti*) and the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Drawing on a 1987 essay by Richard Johnson, "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" Frantzen first summarizes and discusses what is meant by the term "cultural studies" and how Johnson's four-part circuit model, "embracing all phases of the creation and reception of texts or objects," works (312). Concentrating on Anglo-Saxon literature as cultural,

material and textual fragments, Frantzen explores pieces of the *Scriptboc*, asserting that "especially [in] its conditions of production and its insertion into lived culture," the handbook "becomes a curious record of scribal practice and, perhaps, textualized memory"; from fragments within it, "[c]ertain contingencies of penitential practice are evoked more vividly than . . . by complete catalogues of sins in which inadvertent oral traces have been eliminated" (330–1). Frantzen argues that in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Wulfstan, by invoking slavery, raises issues of social and moral order and stability; the threat of slaves who escape from Anglo-Saxon owners, in particular, Wulfstan sets up in parallel to the Danish-English conflict. In doing so, however, contends Frantzen, Wulfstan not only makes clear that social order cannot be neatly controlled, but also defines a range of power for the escaped slave.

Robert Boenig argues against the prevailing definition of the Anglo-Saxon harp as a lyre ("The Anglo-Saxon Harp," *Speculum* 71: 290–320). The amassed evidence, which Boenig reviews, remains undefinitive, and though he acknowledges that "the question is still open," Boenig "suggest[s] that the frame harp has the greater claim to the role of the Anglo-Saxon harp" (291). The assessment of the evidence begins with the largely inspecific (in terms of type) references to the harp in Old English poetry, though in an illustration in *Genesis A* appears Jubal playing a triangular harp. From poetic references Boenig moves to archaeological information, focusing on the influential Sutton Hoo lyre, about which he concludes: "If the harps of *Cædmon* and *Beowulf*, however, were not lyres but true harps instead and the lyre a relatively rare German instrument imported from the Continent, then the Sutton Hoo lyre's inclusion in the hoard makes greater sense" (305). Boenig proceeds to examine harp references in OE glosses and translations of the Psalms and in iconographic examples (reproduced illustrations are included); he explores such topics as translations of *cithara*, the sounds of each harp and how each instrument was played. His argument covers much detailed ground in support of the claim that for much, if not all, of the Anglo-Saxon period, the most common harp was the triangular frame harp.

R.I. Page's *Chronicles of the Vikings: Records, Memorials and Myths* (London: British Museum, 1995) is something of an anthology of translated excerpts, sorted according to their relevance to features of Viking life and accompanied by interpretation and by discussion of historical context. Page draws extensively on runic inscriptions, more circumspectly on Eddic and skaldic verse and on *Íslendingabók* and *Landnámabók*, and, most cautiously of all—largely for "introductory and comparative material" (30)—on sagas; he also delicately utilizes texts from outside of Scandinavia for help in constructing this Viking cultural history. The focus is on immediate, internal accounts of Viking society—"what they were prepared to admit publicly"—or on indirect observations rather than on the "latter-day picture" presented in such sources as the Kings' Sagas or the Sagas of the Icelanders

(6–7). Page's categories include land issues (possession and settlement), heroic ideals, social class, law, and religion. *Chronicles of the Vikings* is an erudite introduction to and overview of the social structure of Viking civilization, with full explanations of terms, notes on translations, a list of the major texts quoted, and a full index.

Myths of national origin, particularly those associated with the physical landscape, are István Bejczy's subject in "Willibrord and the 'Tree Fall': a Historiographical Myth of the Origins of Dutch Civilization," *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies* 16.1 (1995): 1–5. Bejczy starts with a c. 1440 chronicle that connects Willibrord's conversion mission to a sudden loss of dense Dutch forests, dubbed by some fifteenth-century historians as the Wild Woods without Mercy. Subsequent transformations of the myth in the sixteenth century reduced the Wild Woods to a grove, recast the story of their destruction in more historically plausible terms, and separated the tree fall myth from Willibrord and national conversion; Bejczy describes the movement as a decline from national myth to "ordinary history" to "mere legend." The tree fall then became linked instead to a late ninth-century gale and to the founding of the Dutch state, an idea promoted especially by a seventeenth-century historian, Jacob van Oudenhoven. "Holland made a supra-regional myth its exclusive regional property," and, in doing so, Bejczy asserts, created a national symbol of an ongoing secular, "Hollando-centri[c]" and "claustrophile" Dutch identity (4).

Early nineteenth-century accounts of Arthur stressed his place in Celtic history, separate from and often directly in opposition to poetic, legendary presentations. Against this background Maike Oergel examines the presentation of Arthur in Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* and Morris's poems in *The Defence of Guenevere*. Both works present an Arthur largely derived from later medieval rather than Celtic material and associations. Other nineteenth-century literary texts, including ones by Scott and Arnold, show a fusion of Germanic and Celtic, a link taken up by Wagner. Oergel concludes that though the Celtic associations of Arthur might have been at odds with nationalistic English impulses, Arthur in the nineteenth century became an English literary hero ("Cultural Origin and the Presentation of an English Past: How Celtic a Figure is King Arthur in 19th Century English Literature?" *Celtic and Germanic Themes in European Literature*, ed. Neil Thomas (Lewiston, NY: Queenston, Ont., and Lampeter, 1994) 77–93).

c. Research Resources

HELMUT GNEUSS's *English Language Scholarship: a Survey and Bibliography from the Beginnings to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (Med. & Renaissance Texts & Stud., 125. Binghamton: MRTS) is a concise and well-organized reference that anyone fairly new to teaching History of the English language might find valuable; Gneuss's suggestions for further research may also be of particular interest. Drawn originally from a lecture, the book is a revised version of a 1990 edition

in German. The brief survey is laid out by period with subsections covering major developments in language study. "Grammars of Latin and English" and "Synonymy, Rhetoric, Glossography, Translation and Borrowing," for instance, appear in the five and one-half page Anglo-Saxon section; Gneuss swiftly and clearly sketches three stages of language study in Anglo-Saxon England, reviews Latin learning and Anglo-Saxon grammars, then turns to a useful outline of the other language study interests of the period. The historical survey is followed by a selective bibliography arranged under seventy-one headings, with an extensive range of topics, such as "Biographies of linguists," "Irish Latin grammarians," "Shall and will," and "The beginnings of English palaeography." A full index to each part is included.

Many Anglo-Saxonists will surely be grateful for (and relieved that someone else is doing) the SASLC work on Jerome. Theodore H. Leinbaugh, Debra Best, John Brinegar, and John Black ("St. Jerome at UNC," *OEN* 29.3: 17–24) provide a two part update on their progress, and updates since 1996 can be found at <http://www.unc.edu/depts/jersaslc/>. Leinbaugh explains the ground they have so far covered, some 647 references to Jerome. Best, Brinegar, and Black then survey their OE findings on Jerome (Anglo-Latin remained to be covered). The authors have discovered that for OE poetry, Jerome's biblical commentaries and reference works were less widely used than might have been expected, and "there is no clear case in which an Anglo-Saxon poet took material directly from Jerome rather than from apparently more popular and better known sources" (20). More frequently cited in Alfred's and in Alfredian work, Jerome there plays the role of translation and clarification aid. For Ælfric, based on published works only (as is standard for SASLC), Best, Brinegar, and Black have found the concentration of Jerome references in the homilies. Each category of influence is complicated by the difficult question of whether Jerome's works were known directly or indirectly, yet the project suggests not just where Jerome might have been known, but also where concentrations of Jerome-like ideas might have existed.

Catherine N. Ball's "An Introduction to the Internet for Anglo-Saxonists, Part 1," *OEN* 30.1: 17–19, provides a brief explanation of what the Web is and does—though for really new users, a more extensive set of glossed terms might be necessary, and her assertion that dial-up connections limit access to Web graphics is, unsurprisingly, already largely outdated. Ball lists the online addresses for three of the most useful sites for Anglo-Saxonists: The Labyrinth, The Online Reference Book for Medieval Studies, and her own wonderful Old English Pages. She also explains the basics of how search engines work and directs readers to the newer, more restricted search engine Argos (<http://argos.evansville.edu>) for a "Limited Area Search of the Ancient and Medieval Internet."

Antonio Bravo has collected a bibliography of books published in Old and Middle English studies from 1992 to 1995. Despite the overlapping date range in each title, "Old

and Middle English Bibliography 1992–94" (*SELIM* 4 (1994): 179–87) and "Old and Middle English Bibliography 1993–95" (*SELIM* 5 (1995): 166–77), the bibliographies work jointly, without repeated entries.

d. Anglo-Norman

THE "inclination of Anglo-Normans from the eleventh and twelfth centuries to import hundreds of words from Old English into Latin" is the linguistic background against which D.R. Howlett "suggests that Old French literature began not in Paris or the Île de France in Francien dialect but in England in Anglo-Norman dialect" (vii). In *The English Origins of Old French Literature* (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, and Portland, OR: Four Courts), Howlett systematically examines the oldest surviving French literature, dividing it into categories such as Law Codes, Historians and Pseudo-historians, Hagiographers, Adventure Narratives, Romances, Wisdom Literature, and Scientific and Technical Works. Each text he introduces with a brief description; this is followed by the text itself or an excerpt (often a prologue or epilogue) and Howlett's brief, numerically-focused analysis of its composition pattern. That analysis derives from the "ten fundamental rules of composition in Biblical style" and its five adjuncts, or "optional elements of Biblical style," which Howlett outlines at the beginning of the book and specifies as "remarkable . . . in [their] uninterrupted use" in Old English and Anglo-Latin (9–11); the examination of Old French texts is prefaced also by three examples of Norman Latin writing, against which to judge post-1066 French writing. Howlett's firm conclusion is that all of the earliest Old French texts "were written to meet needs perceived in England," "[a]ll were written for English patrons," and "[m]ost have Old English or Anglo-Latin precedents" (162).

Sarah Larratt Keefer explores Old English and Old French distinctions of an equine rather than literary nature in relation to the Bayeux Tapestry; see section 1g. More centrally focused discussions of the Bayeux Tapestry are by Alain Labbé, "La tapisserie de Bayeux et la chanson de geste: deux regards sur l'événement," *Zeitgeschichte und seine Darstellung im Mittelalter*, ed. Christoph Cormeau, Studium Universale 20 (Bonn, 1995) and Jose Miguel Muñoz Jimenez, "Las pinturas de San Baudilio de Berlanga y el Tapiz de Bayeux: la posible inspiración nórdica del ciclo profano" (*Goya* 253–4: 12–17).

Labbé seeks to extend established parallels between the Bayeux Tapestry and the *chanson de geste* with an examination of details of setting and battle scenes. His comparisons show that both the Tapestry and the texts stylize the representation of historical events particularly through the use of the same narrative structures and the same archetypes to legitimize royal power, whether it be the glorious age of Carolingian France or the Norman conquest of England. The main architectural archetype traced in the essay is that of the palace, particularly in the depictions in each of similarly archaic (Carolingian) arches. The arch, in contrast to the

more realistic architecture evoked elsewhere in the Tapestry and the chansons, draws on manifestations of power from the past to reinforce Norman power in the present. The representations of bodies and death in the Tapestry borders, Labbé argues, also include archaic and Carolingian features; the violence of these border images is comparable to older epic tradition, preserved not in courtly romance but in texts such as the "Chanson de Roland." Labbé finds, however, a distinction between the glorified, though gruesome, deaths in the Roland cycle and the more sober and realistic, justified but not glorified, deaths in the Tapestry.

Muñoz Jimenez explores iconographic connections between the Bayeux Tapestry and the late eleventh- or early twelfth-century paintings of San Baudilio de Berlanga. To do so, he somewhat reluctantly engages in the debate over whether Islamic or northern European influences dominate medieval Spanish art. Muñoz Jimenez focuses on the Berlanga paintings, but refers to examples from the Bayeux Tapestry to argue that while eastern influences are incontestable in the Berlanga paintings, they may have come second hand through places such as northern France. The eastern influences evident in the Bayeux Tapestry, especially in the static aspects of border figures, bear marked similarities to aspects of the Berlanga paintings; to Muñoz Jimenez, the parallels suggest a more complicated mixture of influences and routes (Moorish as well as from Rome and Constantinople) than scholars have tended to allow.

Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe have collected and edited nine essays in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars 1066–1109* (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon, 1995), all but one of which are covered under the appropriate headings below. The exception is Tim Tatton-Brown's archaeological report on and discussion of "The Beginning of St. Gregory's Priory and St. John's Hospital in Canterbury" (41–52), accompanied by drawings of the site. Tatton-Brown describes foundations, below the twelfth-century remains of the Augustinian priory, that are traceable to Lanfranc's undertakings of the 1080s, and he notes that remains once associated with an Anglo-Saxon building on the site of St. Gregory's church can now be linked instead to Lanfranc. Above ground are the remains of a large (200 foot long) cruciform building, St. John's Hospital, "by far the oldest hospital in Britain," with workmanship also linking it to Lanfranc (52).

c. Modern literature

JORGE LUIS BORGES' "pure contemplation/ Of a daybreak language," in his poem, "On Beginning to Study Anglo-Saxon Grammar," has been translated into English by Richard Barnes (*American Poetry Review* 25.2: 39). Borges poems like this may encourage a revival of general interest in Old English.

The prose-like poems in Geoffrey Hill's collection entitled *Mercian Hymns* blend Anglo-Saxon history with more recent and with personal history, so that, as Michael Alexander

describes them, "Offa and grandfather are not distinct" in their power, and "[a]ncient weapons . . . mingle with toy aeroplanes." Early medieval and nineteenth- and twentieth-century Mercia are the landscape, real and imagined, for the sequence of poems, originally published in 1971 and now being translated into Italian by Marco Fazzini. A draft of Alexander's preface to that translation ("*Mercian Hymns*") appears in *Agenda* 34.2: 104–6.

Melvin Bragg's very substantial novel, *Credo* (London: Sceptre, 757 pp.), is set in seventh-century England, though it begins in Ireland. The plot moves toward the synod of Whitby and the repudiation there of Celtic Christian practices; the larger religious, political, and cultural issues of the time are explored, as well as the struggles of individual characters within that culture. The main characters are the Irish Bega, later Saint Bega, and Padric, the second son of a Brittonic king, who fall in love but have conflicting missions. She desires to become a nun and promote conversion; he wants to preserve what remains of the Britons' independence. The cast includes Cuthbert (Bega's model), Hild, and Wilfrid (one of the novel's bad guys). Bega's tale follows a saint's life pattern: despite the weak Christianity of her father's court, she develops a desire to be a dynamic force for God; the conflicts Bega faces include the repugnant man her father demands she marry and her subsequent genuine interest in Padric. Padric's own path is complicated by Northumbrian politics as he works to raise an army of Britons against the Anglo-Saxons. Bragg animates theological disputes, early Irish society, Anglo-Saxon politics and life on the margins of pagan and Christian. He attempts to convey and take seriously an early medieval religious mentality, including miracles, visions, and the active presence of devils and angels; the result is a reasonably solidly grounded page-turner.

The subtitle of Frank Schaefer's short novel, *Whose Song is Sung* (New York: TOR), quickly sums up the book: "Or, a Narrative of the Travels of Musculus Herodes Formosus, Known as Musculus the Dwarf, through Barbarian Territories, Including an Account of His Sojourn with the Northmen, and a True Description of the Demise of a Monster Known as the Grundbur at the Hands of the Hero, Beowulf, and certain other Related Incidents, which elsewhere have been Misrepresented." Schaefer's hero is a chatty, rather wry seventh-century Roman dwarf—rather, a Germanic dwarf raised in Rome—who recounts in autobiographical form his adventures. The central narrative is an adaptation of the Beowulf story; Musculus was at Beowulf's side in the fights against "Grundbur" and "his female."

f. Exhibitions and Tourist Sites

BRIAN JACKMAN travels the trail of King Alfred and provides a descriptive (if rather romantically framed) itinerary in "The Great One," *Travel Holiday* May: 60–67. For background, Jackman begins in Oxford with a look at the Alfred Jewel, then travels to Wantage, Alfred's birthplace. From there, the tour, driving and walking, runs along the Ridgeway Path—

"the oldest road in Britain"—and through locations associated with Alfred. Jackman's descriptions include Alfredian history, as well as plentiful remarks about non-Anglo-Saxon sights of interest along the way. The article, complete with suggestions for lodging and food along the route, is detailed enough to use to help plan an Alfred-centered holiday.

Michael Hall describes and briefly contextualizes highlights of the Anglo-Saxon Northumbria exhibition at Newcastle-upon-Tyne's Laing Art Gallery ("Treasures of a Vanished Kingdom" [Northumbria Exhibition, Newcastle] *Country Life* 11 July: 58), including St. Cuthbert's cross, the Lindisfarne Gospels, and the Franks Casket.

The Bede's World museum continues to receive wide and encouraging notice. Nicki Household, in "Memorable Bede" in the *Times Educational Suppl.* 19 May 1995, p. ss21, and Deborah Singmaster, "Museum Dedicated to the Life of the Venerable Bede," published in *Architects' Jnl* 15 (June 1995): 30, provide updates on work at the museum and its goals. Singmaster gives a brief, illustrated description of the planned buildings, with the design and construction credits for them. Household's more extensive description explains the background of the museum, its focus, and its anticipated position as a significant tourist attraction.

g. Varia

In "Hwær Com Mearh? The Horse in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Jnl of Med. Hist.* 22: 115–34), Sarah Larratt Keefer is specifically concerned with the type, or, rather, types, of horse in Anglo-Saxon England and the possibility of changes in type during the period. She suggests that while the horse had continued status as a luxury possession, its appearance moved from the shorter, stockier Icelandic-style to a larger Arabian-style with greater endurance. Her claims derive from exploration of archaeological evidence (the Sutton Hoo remains of a horse, in particular), manuscript illustrations (showing horse to rider proportions and horse features), Old English verse and Anglo-Saxon Chronicle references, and wills, all approached with due skepticism and acknowledgment of what cannot be proved. The evidence plausibly points to breeding programs and foreign (oriental) bloodstock in England by the end of the tenth century and perhaps "as early as 885" (124). The distinction, then, between English and Norman horses at the time of the Conquest and as depicted in the Bayeux Tapestry is not vast; both, she argues—refuting previous claims—show oriental bloodstock, though the Norman horses specifically appear to be of Iberian descent while the Anglo-Saxon appear to be of Arab, or true oriental, descent.

The historicity and/or fictionality of Egill's participation in the Battle of Brunanburh is Magnús Fjalldal's subject in "A Farmer in the Court of King Athelstan: Historical and Literary Considerations in the Vínheiðr Episode of *Egils Saga*" (*ES* 77: 15–31). The traditional position, influenced by details of royal lineage and geography, is that the whole passage is based in historical fact. Fjalldal explores and neatly delineates the foundations of that stance, as well as various

positions that modify or refute historicity. On one side are Sigurður Nordal and those who have attempted to marshal evidence for the connection of Vínheiðr with Brunanburh; the other side's quarrels with that evidence are first chiefly marked by Alistair Campbell's edition of *The Battle of Brunanburh*. Fjalldal provides a critical overview of the debate, ending with a point by point response to Bjarni Einarsson's assessment of the poet's knowledge of English sources. He then evaluates the literary maneuvers of the episode, including contrasts, dramatic scenes, and the creation of suspense, to complete his argument that the Vínheiðr episode does not rest on the historical facts of Brunanburh. Instead, the *Egils Saga* account of Athelstan's court is created in opposition to references to Harald's and his sons' courts; the episode's "imaginary vision of an English court" is "a literary counterpoint with a thinly veiled political message" (31).

Hartwig Mayer identifies an Old English parallel to the opening lines of Walther von der Vogelweide's *Ersten Reichstons*, which begin, "Ich saz ûf eime steine" (*"Mestus in lapide: Beda Venerabilis und Walther von der Vogelweide 8,4ff."* *Seminar* 31 (1995): 283–87). Mayer reviews previous discussions of the passage and its medieval illustrations before turning to a parallel in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. In chapter 12 of Book II, in Bede's account of Edwin's vision, appears the phrase *mestus in lapide*, as well as *residensque mestus*, both of which become *unrote on stane* in translation to OE. Mayer suggests that "sad on a stone" might be a Germanic formula, and that Walther's text, then, draws on Germanic as well as the previously identified ancient and Christian traditions. The miniature in the "großen Heidelberger Liederhandschrift" illustrates Walther's "steine" as a hill, presumably influenced, writes Mayer, by iconographic tradition more than by Walther's actual word.

In the *Estoire de saint Aedward le rei*, Victoria B. Jordan identifies three concurrent and connected narrative modes, each of which offers a distinct presentation of the life and sainthood of Edward the Confessor ("The Multiple Narratives of Matthew Paris' *Estoire de saint Aedward le rei*: Cambridge, University Library MS Ee.iii.59," *Parergon* n.s. 13.2: 77–92). On each page of the manuscript appear an illustration, the poetic text, and, in between, one or more explanatory rubrics. The rubrics do not always correspond to the image they accompany, yet they serve as a summary version of the longer poetic version of the story, which in turn is selectively illustrated. In their separate forms, each is both a continuous narrative and a somewhat disjointed series of episodes. Jordan describes each narrative and the rhetorical principles of its composition; she explains how each achieves independence and maintains connection to the other narratives. In the layout of these modes and their potential visual/aural interplay, Jordan suggests that the compiler addresses various audiences, including one that might not have been able to read French.

Andrew Breeze, in "Master John of St. Davids, Adam and Eve, and the Rose amongst Thorns" (*Studia Celtica* 29 (1996

for 1995): 225–35), investigates the literary resources of a twelfth-century poet at the Welsh house of St. Davids and the identification of that poet as one Master John. Breeze focuses on two texts, an Adam and Eve poem and a Marian passage from a poem usually attributed to Taliesin. He provides the Welsh and a translation for 104 of the Adam and Eve poem's 144 lines to argue, in a line-by-line accounting, that it draws primarily on a *Vita Adae et Evae*. Breeze also links the poem to the legend of the rods of Moses and to Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britannia* and suggests that versions of these and of *Vita Adae et Evae* were part of the twelfth-century St. Davids library. In the same library, he argues, was a copy of Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale*, evidenced in the description of Mary as the rose blooming from the thorny line of Eve; Breeze reviews the place of Sedulius in early medieval Britain to explain how this text might have arrived at St. Davids.

Perhaps the most memorable part of the legend of St. Kenelm is the cow's tender vigil over the saint's unmarked grave, an image of which is included in a set of tracings, newly published by Miriam Gill, from a lost cycle of late fourteenth-century paintings in a Worcestershire chapel ("Kenelm Cunebearn . . . Haudes Bereafed': a Reconstructed Cycle of Wall Paintings from St. Kenelm's Chapel, Romsley" (*Jnl of the Brit. Archaeol. Assoc.* 149: 23–36). The tracings, made in 1845, combined with sketches made the same year by a pair of schoolboys, show "the only known narrative treatment of [the Kenelm] legend in medieval art" (24). Gill carefully describes and offers an interpretation of each of nine paintings and suggests what their arrangement in Romsley Chapel might have been. Two pieces, she notes, may not have been part of the cycle; one further scene, of angels carrying the saint's headless body, does not appear in literary accounts of the saint's life, but perhaps identified the chapel itself as the site of Kenelm's martyrdom—his connections to Romsley are suggested in some Latin versions of the legend by the account of an Old English line written on a parchment that drops from the heavens to the pope. Gill, after a survey of English Kenelm representations, concludes with an assessment of the place the saint and the paintings of his life might have occupied in local historical terms.

E.G. Stanley points out, in "How the Elbing Deprives the Vistula of Its Name: an Unnoticed Reference" (*N&Q* 43: 258–9), an eighteenth-century German reference to the voyages of Wulfstan and Othere. Christian Ulrich Grupen refers, in 1764, to a 1744 edition by Andreas Bussaeus of the voyages. The citation, dealing specifically with the source of the Vistula, includes Grupen's erroneous reading of "the Frisches Haft (his Trusen mere 'Truso sea') [a]s static" (258).

As Stephen Pollington himself describes it, his *Rudiments of Runelore* is a layman's introduction to runes, largely, though not exclusively, by way of examples in Old English poetry; he supplies texts and translations of his examples, as well as futhark transliterations. Pollington touches on various futharks and their uses, and offers a re-interpretation of what are known as the TIW runes from the cemetery at Spong Hill,

Norfolk. By bisecting vertically each of the runes and checking various linguistic possibilities, Pollington argues that the runes, rather than being a dedication to the god Tiw, are an encrypted protection formula of the "Common Germanic *alu* formula" type. *Rudiments of Runelore* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norf.: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1995) includes a brief bibliography.

Pollington's *The English Warrior from Earliest Times to 1066* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norf.: Anglo-Saxon Books) is the sort of book that undergraduates like to find as they begin research projects. It is aimed at non-specialists, includes a glossary and facing page translations of the Brunanburh, Finnsburg, and Maldon poems, and pulls together material from a wide range of primary and secondary sources for a tripartite overview of warriors, weapons, and warfare. Pollington cites literary (Old English and Old Norse) and archaeological sources; he offers various tables of such things as sword types, shield components, and OE poetic terminology for weapons, as well as illustrative sketches and schematic drawings. The range of time and circumstance Pollington covers leads to some generality and speculation; the book includes a selective bibliography, but not bibliographic notes.

The second edition of Pollington's *An Introduction to the Old English Language and its Literature* (2nd ed. Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norf.: Anglo-Saxon Books)—the first edition was covered in YWOES 1994—has much-clarified sectional divisions as well as some useful additions and corrections. Interspersed among the original explanations are now distinct sections on Old English dialects, pronunciation, vocabulary, semantics, and meter; Pollington has also significantly expanded the discussion of inflections and the literary examples, which are better organized. The book, a beginner's guide, should now be more useful.

The audience appreciation of Wilbur W. Sauer's playful take on Bede's thoroughgoing approach to scholarship may be limited—unless many medievalists are also woodworkers? In "Evil Spirits and the Barley Corn Rule" (*Fine Woodworking* March/April 1992, pp. 114 and 116), Sauer outlines and attributes to Bede a fanciful account of mischievous demons in the woodshop.

For anyone who has ever wondered what a Yeats poem would sound like in OE or had the urge to translate, for instance, the Gettysburg Address into OE, the listserv discussion group ENGLISC is the place to read and try such translation exercises. William Schipper and Sarah Higley ("ENGLISC: a New Listserv Discussion Group." *OEN* 30.1: 16) explain the list's origins from an ANSAX-L debate about postings in dead languages and describe some of the questions such translation activities raise. To subscribe, send the message "sub englisc YOUR NAME" (without quotation marks) to listserv@morgan.ucs.mun.ca.

h. Essay Collections

THE TWELVE ESSAYS by Helmut Gneuss in *Language and History in Early England*, Collected Stud., 559 (Aldershot,

Hants, and Brookfield, VT: Variorum) have, except for one, appeared previously elsewhere. The new publication is "Latin Loans in Old English: A Note on their Inflexional Morphology." Starting from the assertion that OE had fewer inflexional endings than conventional descriptions imply, Gneuss suggests that Latin loanwords can help illuminate inflexional tendencies and larger developments in the history of Old English. He provides a brief overview of borrowing practices, noting that, for instance, many Latin loans occurred early in Old English and the majority of noun borrowings fell into the masculine *a*-class. As he reviews areas already well-defined by research (such as that regarding the gender of loanwords), Gneuss also suggests areas in need of further research.

Collected essays and reviews by Karl Schneider concerning runes, particularly runic inscriptions, in Anglo-Saxon England are collected in "Runstafas": *Runische Zeugnisse zur Sprach-, Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte vor allem der Angelsachsen. Aufsätze und Rezensionen 1956–93* (Münster: Nodus, 1994). All thirteen essays and the eight reviews have previously appeared elsewhere (many in festschrifts). The collection includes an index.

M.J. Toswell and E.M. Tyler are the editors of *Studies in English Language and Literature. 'Doubt Wisely': Papers in Honour of E.G. Stanley* (London and New York: Routledge). The twenty-nine essays in the collection are divided into the categories of "On language and linguistics," "On words and phrases," "On the interpretation of a single text," "On taxonomies, genres, and sources," and "On assumptions"; an index is included. Each essay dealing explicitly with Old English is reviewed under the appropriate heading below.

In *The Middle Ages in the North-West* (Oxford: Leopard's Head, 1995), Tom Scott and Pat Sarkey have collected thirteen essays ranging from Nick Higham's on "Territorial organization in pre-Conquest Cheshire" to Elizabeth Baldwin's "Selling the Bible to pay for the bear: the value placed on entertainment in Congleton 1584–1637." Higham's and two others specifically concerned with Old English, one by David N. Klausner dealing with battle poetry and the other by Alan Thacker on "The cult of king Harold," are reviewed in the appropriate sections below.

David Hill and Alexander R. Rumble edited and contrib-

uted to the essays in *The Defence of Wessex: the Burghal Hidage and Anglo-Saxon Fortifications* (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press). The book contains eight sections, each with one or more essays, four appendices, and extensive figures; see the appropriate sections below. The final piece in the collection is Hill's alphabetical "Gazetteer of Burghal Hidage sites" (189–231), which includes for each site in the Hidage the modern name and location, background and description of site and situation, the Burghal Hidage entry itself (with "discussion of it; mints; and Domesday references") and a sketched plan of the site.

The fifteen essays in *Teoria e pratica della traduzione nel medioevo germanico*, edited by Maria Vittoria Molinari et al. (Padua: Unipress, 1994) include five immediately relevant to Anglo-Saxon studies, each of which is reviewed below.

The twelve essays in *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, ScriptOralia 53 (Tübingen: Narr, 1993), edited and with an introduction by Ursula Schaefer, came out of a 1992 conference of the same name in Friburg. The essays are arranged under three headings: Monastische Schriftkultur, Schriftlichkeit und Magie, and Verschriftungen und Verschriftlichungen; the four specifically Anglo-Saxon in focus are reviewed in subsequent sections.

Remembrances of Peter A.M. Clemoes, James E. Cross, Robert Deshman, and Tauno F. Mustanoja were published this year.

J.S.E.

Works not seen:

Deary, Terry. *All about Bede: the Life and Times of the Venerable Bede 672–735 A.D.* Sunderland: Wear Books. [for children]

Graham, Timothy. "The Richard Rawlinson Center for Anglo-Saxon Studies and Manuscript Research." *MESN* 34: 4–6.

Petilli, Nicola. "Electronica germanica. Note sull'uso dell'elaboratore nell'ambito della filologia germanica." *Medioevo e Rinascimento* n.s. 5 (1994): 215–23.

Szarmach, Paul E. "Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture." *MESN* 34: 2–4.

2. Language

a. Lexicon, Glosses

A. Bammesberger's "On Fresh Fish in Some (Indo-) European Languages." (*Jnl of Indo-European Studies* 24, 399–408) posits a **p-* in **pisk*. Given this, Gmc **frisk-* might have derived from IE **prisk-* which could be analyzed as **pr-* and **-isk-*. Bammesberger notes that with animal names and phenomena in the natural world etymologies often remain unclear due to untraceable semantic changes and frequent phonological and morphological innovations.

G. Bartelt's "A Note on Old English Kinship Semantics" (*Jnl. of Eng. Ling.* 24, 116–22) provides a componential analysis of OE kin terms à la Lounsbury. Bartelt makes no claims for the usefulness of the componential analysis as a useful exercise for understanding the nature or importance of kinship in OE society.

J. Bately's "Towards a Middle English Thesaurus: Some Terms Relating to FORTUNE, FATE, and CHANCE" (*Middle English Miscellany*, pp. 69–82) presents lists of ME

words for the concepts of Lat. *fatum*, *fortuna*, and *praedestinatio*. She notes that by 1500 only a quarter of the words which represent these concepts are of OE origin.

E. Bernárdez Sanchis' "Inteligibilidad léxica entre antiguo inglés y antiguo nórdico." (*Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 1 [1993], 25–37) claims an 80% mutual intelligibility between OE and ON speakers. He bases this claim on two OE texts which contain sections representing the speech of Norsemen: *The Battle of Maldon* and *The Voyage of Obthere*. For comparison, he has translated these texts into ON.

C. Biggam's "Old English *peru* and Modern English *tharfcakes*" (*SELIM* 5[1995], 109–15) accepts Breeze's 1995 argument that *peru* means 'loaves' and expands the support for it by claiming *peru* as a cognate to OE *peorf* which occurs not only as an adjective 'unleavened' but also as a noun 'unleavened bread'. Further, *peru* also contains an element of obligation which relates it to OE **purfan* especially when used in religious contexts.

A. Breeze presents to us four articles relating OE and one of the Celtic languages. His "A Celtic Etymology for Old English *claedur* 'clapper'" (*SELIM* 5[1995] 119–121) suggests that a Welsh origin from *cladr* 'stave' is much more satisfactory than a Gmc. one for this rare OE word. If this non-Germanic origin is accepted, then OE *claedur* is clearly not related to NE *clatter*. The fact that the other known Welsh loans occur in the three glossaries where *claedur* occurs also supports this non-Germanic origin. Breeze continues in the Welsh origin vein with "Old English *breol* 'reel': Welsh *rheol* 'rule'" (*SELIM* 5[1995], 122–26) with his argument that OE *breol* is derived not from Gmc **brehula-* as posited by some scholars, but Welsh *rheol* 'rule'. Thus, Lat *regula* > Old Welsh **reol* > OE *breol*. This interpretation is supported by the archaeological evidence which suggests that the earliest reels were sticks. Breeze concludes that OE *breol* is another instance of a previously unrecognized Celtic loan in English. In "Irish Beltaine 'May Day' and *beltancu*, a Cattle-rent in pre-Norman Lancashire" (*Eigese* 29, 59–63) Breeze notes that *beltancu* is neither completely Celtic nor completely Germanic in its origin. Its presence in pre-Norman Lancashire is due to Irish-Viking settlements in the area. In "Old English *estas* 'relishes' in the Flintshire Domesday" (*N&Q* 43, 14–15) Breeze explains that *besthas*, rather than being of Welsh origin, is in fact a variant of OE *estas* 'delicacies.' Still, even as an OE word, it reflects Welsh custom, a part of food rent. *Enllyn* 'relish' was a common enough concept in law and religion. If this is the case with *besthas* then we can see a Celtic custom in an English form in a Celtic area conquered by the English.

C. Dalton-Puffer's "Middle English Is a Creole and Its Opposite: on the Value of Plausible Speculation" (*Linguistic Change under Contact Conditions* pp 35–50) contends that ME may fit the criteria for both a creole and a recessive language. Although the work contains little on OE, Dalton-Puffer's conclusion that the terms "creole" and "recessive language" are perhaps too general or applied too liberally

serves to remind us that we must have clearer methodology and guidelines for classification of languages which may have undergone extensive contact with other languages.

X. Dekeyser's "Loss of Prototypical Meanings in the History of English Semantics or Semantic Redeployment" (*Leuvense Bijdragen* 85, 283–91) discusses how core meanings get lost in English and why the loss occurs. His findings contradict those of Geeraerts that peripheral meanings are lost more often than core ones. Dekeyser demonstrates that, at least in his data, the oldest or historical meanings are lost most frequently. Also, in each case where a core meaning is lost, there is another lexical item available to express that meaning. Loss of core meaning seems to occur because speakers prefer unambiguous conceptualizations.

H. Diller, in "Joy and mirth in Middle English (and a little bit in Old): a plea for the Consideration of Genre in Historical Semantics" (*Middle English Miscellany*, pp. 83–105) takes his cue from the Social Constructionists and examines the role of literature in the interpretation of terms representing emotion in ME. By studying changes in lexical items representing emotions, we might develop insights into the emotion system of OE and ME societies. In order to do this, however, utterances must be examined in context. Diller presents four levels of context: genre, text type, situation, and syntactic context. Of these four types, genre and text type are the two most important, but least often considered. His study focuses on ME *mirth*, *joy*, and *wynne*. In OE *wynn* is used more widely than *myrþð*, which appears as a term for 'joys of heaven', rather than as 'a collectively festive mood' as it occurs in ME. A different distribution for OE and ME of these terms is not surprising.

J. McN. Dodgson's "OE *weal*-stilling," (*The Defence of Wessex*, pp. 176–77) discusses the meaning of this compound found only in the Burghal Hidage. While analysis of the form is not problematic, the analysis of its meaning is. The meaning of *weal* 'wall' is reasonably clear. OE *gesteal*, OHG *stal*, ON *stallr* all have the sense of position or place to stand or foundation. After finding ModE *stilling* as a mining term meaning 'walling of a pit shaft' he concludes that *weal*-stilling represents a term for a retaining wall or some similar structure.

A. Fischer in "The Vocabulary of Very Old English" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, 29–41) defines Very Old English as the OE in those manuscripts of the 12th and early 13th centuries which are copies of earlier OE manuscripts or which contain English glosses of those earlier mss. Specifically, he draws his data from MS Bodley 343 and the Royal and Hatton copies of the West-Saxon Gospels, and the Worcester scribe with the tremulous hand. Fischer concerns himself with lexical modernizations, a neglected area. He concludes that although the frequency of these modernizations varies from manuscript to manuscript, the words being modernized tend to be the same.

Y. Fujiwara's "Old English Lexical Categories and Word Order," (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, pp. 13–27) rejects the concepts of possessive dative and

inversion of a preposition and its object and argues that the two are essentially parallel. Possessive datives occur before prepositional phrases. Fujiwara proposes that the inverted prepositions are really adverbs because they often occur immediately before verbs, are capable taking various positions in a sentence, and often take part in alliteration. If these inverted prepositions are adverbs, then possessive datives are really best categorized as adverbial modifiers.

L. Goossens, "From Three Respectable Horses' Mouths: Metonymy and Conventionalization in a Diachronically Differentiated Data Base" (*By Word of Mouth*, pp. 175–204) in a synthesis and expansion of three of his earlier works investigates instances of metonymy involving the word for mouth in Ælfric, Chaucer, and Shakespeare. Goossens divides these instances into five types: i) what is said/words/speech, ii) X's words=X as speaker, iii) speaker, iv) speech faculty, and v) metonymic expressions with the verb.

A. diP. Healey's "Reasonable Doubt, Reasoned Choice: the letter A in the *Dictionary of Old English* (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, pp. 71–84) discusses some problem definitions in the letter A of the DOE. She considers *AHRINAN*, *AMBIHTMANN*, *ANTID*, *ASSEDUN*, and *APOLWARE*. Each word presents a different problem of definition, a definition insufficient for its range of citations, an unsupported definition, conflicting opinion about the definition, spelling of the headword, and a varying range of opinion as to the definition of a *bapax legomenon*.

A. diP. Healey's "Dictionary of Old English 1995" (*MESN* 34, 7–8) reports the progress of the DOE project for 1995. She notes that even though fascicle E is nearing completion, there are still a few questions about which words to include under E headwords since some obvious ones begin with G, e.g. *geadigan*. A 1995 version of the Electronic Corpus is now available.

J. Holland in "Dictionary of Old English: 1996 Progress Report" (*OEN* 30.1, 14–15) brings us up to date on the progress and funding of the DOE project. The letter E, the sixth fascicle, was published. The web corpus will be available outside of the University of Toronto community through SEENET and the University of Michigan Press. Funding continues, but so do the problems. However, the project is listed among the highest priority items in the University of Toronto fundraising campaign.

In "An Old English Etymon for Modern English *Drake* 'Male Duck'" (*Neophilologus* 80, 613–15) C. Hough rejects 'dragon well' as the etymology for Drakewell. Other place names containing 'drake' as dragon generally do not occur with water terms; they occur with words for hills, valleys or mounds, the common dwelling places of dragons. Hough then proposes an OE **draca* 'drake' as the etymon of ME *drake* in the sense of male duck and of ModE *drake* 'male duck', since ME *drake* has two senses 'dragon' and 'male duck'.

C. Kay's "A Lexical View of Two Societies: a Comparison of the Scots Thesaurus and a Thesaurus of Old English" (*Studies in Scots and Gaelic*, pp. 41–47) discusses the varying

methods of classification for the two titular thesauri and the relationship of classification to cultural variation in the ST. The OET attempts to be comprehensive while the ST does not, but the ST also is diachronic to the extent that it includes obsolete words. After a discussion of how various categories were decided upon, Kay presents the sub-categories of each thesaurus.

T. Leuschner, in "Ever' and Universal Qualifiers of Time: Observations from Some Germanic Languages" (*Lang. Sciences* 18, 469–484), investigates the synchronic and diachronic variations in words meaning 'ever', particularly the changes in the development of the 'always' meaning. English *ever*, NHG *je*, and Dut. *ooit* can all be derived from PGmc **aiw*. Leuschner discusses the distribution and uses of these words in the modern languages and then traces their respective etymologies. He concludes that Dut. and NHG developed early a distinction between the PAST and FUTURE expressions of 'always' and 'ever'. English, on the other hand, was more neutral.

A. Liberman's "The Century Dictionary: Etymology" (*Dictionaries* 17, 29–54) discusses the hitherto unheralded role of Charles Payson Gurley Scott in preparing the etymologies for the *Century Dictionary*. Liberman reviews the history of some etymologies and the correction or lack thereof of known errors.

M. Markus' "On the Growing Role of Semantic and Pragmatic Features in Middle English" (*Linguistic Change Under Contact Conditions*, pp. 161–178) argues that some ME semantic and pragmatic features cannot be attributed entirely to French influence.

J.A. Mazo's "A Good Saxon Compound" (*Folklore* 107, 107–108) notes that William Thoms may not have been the coiner of the word 'folklore'. Three OE manuscripts use OE *folclar* to gloss Lat *omelia* 'homily.' OE *folc* had a wider semantic range than ModE *folk*. There is no attestation of 'folklore' from the 11th century until Thoms' use of it, but we can't be certain that Thoms did not know of OE *folclar* nor can we be certain that Thoms did not reinvent the compound.

M. Ogura's *Verbs in Medieval English: Differences in Verb Choice in Verse and Prose* (Topics in Eng. Ling., 17. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter) presents her study of verb choice and survival in terms of morphological conflict, word length, and semantic range. The data for the study came from thirty-one OE texts and twenty-six ME texts. Ogura draws the verbs from many different semantic fields including but not limited to *be-verbs*, verbs of motion, verbs of saying, of thinking, of knowing, of seeing, of causing and making, of possessing, of obligations and necessity, of helping, of teaching, of giving, of killing, and of living and dwelling. Copious examples accompany each section and an index of OE verbs appears at the end of the work. Ogura finds five main points that arise from her study: 1) morphological ambiguity can be a strong cause of syntactic and semantic changes. 2) Many changes appear greater than they actually are, owing to morphological changes (i.e. variant spellings). 3) Native conflicts

are often more important and influential than the conflicts between native words and loan words. (4) Alongside actual loan verbs, it is Old Norse influence that reinforced Old English cognates of infrequent occurrence and caused morphological replacements. (5) Most of the replacements of one synonym by another, either native or foreign, are made rather easily because of the common syntactic features.

E. C. Polomé's "About the IE (Mainly Gmc) Lexicon on 'Food and Drink'" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 485–92) discusses various fields involving food: terms for eating, terms for drinking, terms for food preparation, and terms for food items. Old English is used by way of example along with other languages such as OHG, ON, OIr, Lith, Grk, and Lat. Polomé concludes that many food related words in these IE languages are most likely of non-IE origin. Polomé's "Diachronic Stratifications of the Germanic Vocabulary" (*Insights in Germanic Linguistics, I: Methodology in Transition*, pp. 243–264) locates IE as the oldest layer of the Germanic vocabulary. The words which cannot be shown to be IE fall into two classes—*Wanderwörter* and "Relic Terms," terms that spread with the object and words which survived, presumably by lack of contact with other cultures or by the isolation of the language, respectively. OE is mentioned in the copious examples. After discussing various axes of social and linguistic contact, he continues with a discussion of the effects of contacts with the Romans.

D.W. Porter's "Old English *goldhordus*: A Privy or Just a Treasurehouse?" (*N&Q* 43, 257–58) supports Wright's original interpretation of OE *goldhordus* as both 'treasurehouse' and 'privy.' Porter notes that an apparently ignored glossary list for the Antwerp/London glossary helps confirm Wright's interpretation. A Latin-Latin glossary list on folio 43v of Antwerp/London supports Wright's original interpretation. In addition the MS Harley 3286 contains a cognate gloss where Lat. *ypodromum* is glossed as both 'treasury' and 'privy.'

In "Wulfstan: an Old English Document and Its Indo-European Implications" (*The Indo-Europeanization of Northern Europe*, pp. 247–54) A. Poruciuc discusses Wulfstan's account of his voyage to Estland. Poruciuc finds the account useful for its information about a Baltic-Germanic relationship, as evidenced by Wulfstan's discussion of cultural practices and our recognition of linguistic similarities in cognate words such as OE *medo* and Lith. *medus* or OE *cyning* and Latv. *kungs*. The origin of the Baltic peoples might also be traced through some of the practices Wulfstan reported, which seem now to be derived from the Kurgans or Scythians.

J. Robert's "Lazamon's Plain Words," (*Middle English Miscellany*, pp. 107–22.) concentrates on the vocabulary of the Caligula manuscript of *Brut*, and takes issue with some of Oakden's classification of Lazamon's vocabulary as 'poetic' because they appear only in the *Ancrene Wisse* group. Roberts notes that these words could just as easily be used to support her claims that they were current, common words in the 13th century and that Lazamon's vocabulary is clear and simple. The lack of French religious loans in the text is not because

he shunned French, but because religion was not his topic. Although a large number of words for military equipment was available from English, Lazamon used the same small set repeatedly. Roberts uses data from the *Thesaurus of Old English* to support her claims about the simplicity of Lazamon's vocabulary.

A.R. Rumble's "OE *waru*" (*The Defence of Wessex*, pp. 80–81), an appendix to the book in which it is found, discusses why OE *waru* 'defense' might occur in the Burghal Hidage Calculation, a fiscal text. He explains that OE *waru* referred not only to physical defenses, but also to the obligation to pay for the maintenance of such defenses.

P.G. Rusche's dissertation, "The Cleopatra Glossaries and Their Sources" (*DAI* 57A, 2496), is an edition of MS Cotton Cleopatra A. III. His introduction "examines the literary sources that were used to compile the glossaries" at St. Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury. It is apparent that the Abbey "had a leading role in book production of the period and had access to continental centers for ecclesiastical texts".

W. Sayers, in "The Etymology and Semantics of Old Norse *knorr* 'cargo ship': the Irish and English Evidence" (*Scandinavian Studies* 68, 279–90), rejects Falk's argument that ON *knorr* refers to the knotty wood used in the construction of such ships. Drawing support from Mlr and OE cognates, he shows that *knorr* in the sense of knob probably referred not to the wood, but to the nail heads visible on the ships. Moreover, knotty wood probably would not have been used in construction due to the difficulty in working it. Clearly "Scandinavian nautical technology had a profound impact on Irish ship-building," e.g. Ir. *cnairr* and ON *knorr*. Although this technology had a lesser influence on OE, one does find OE *cnearr*.

J.R. Schwyter's *Old English Legal Language: The Lexical Field of Theft* (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution*, suppl. 15. Odense: Odense UP) is the publication of his thesis reviewed in the 1995 YWOES.

K. Shields' "A Proposal Regarding the Etymology of the word *God*" (*Leuvense Bijdragen* 85, 69–74) argues that *god* arose as a euphemism. Either because of restrictions on the use of the word for divinity or a semantic specialization of **deiwo-s* (> PGmc **Tiwaz*), some new form was necessary. PGmc **guðom* can be traced back to IE **gho-ut-óm*. Shields explains this as a compound of **gho*, a demonstrative meaning 'that, or that one' and **ut* an adverbial element meaning 'upwards'.

K. Takauda's "Semantic Consideration of Future Tense Markers (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language* pp. 543–55) examines WILL and SHALL diachronically and argues that *will* may be considered a marker of future tense while *shall* is primarily a modal showing 'obligation'. *Will* moves from a non-deictic 'volitional' to a deictic 'future'. *Shall* remains non-deictic in its meaning.

The English summary of T.V. Toporova's *Semanticheskaja struktura drevnegermanskoi modeli mira* (Moscow: Radiks, 1994) says the book investigates the semantic structure of the

Old Germanic model of the universe. Toporova draws most of the data from the *Olc. Elder Edda* and the *Edda* of Snorri Sturluson. Copious examples of terms from various Germanic languages are also used. "The main aim of the investigation is to reconstruct the principles of nomination of the key concepts in the Old Germanic languages, to describe the mechanisms of origination and functioning of these concepts and to analyze the archaic logic of the subject of the langue impressed in the semantic motivations, which were actual for the certain epoch" (184).

P. Vaciago's "Old English Glosses to Latin Texts: a Bibliographical Handlist" (*Medioevo e Rinascimento* n.s. 4[1993], 1-67) is an attempt to provide a partial bibliography of the manuscripts containing OE glosses. Vaciago provides an Index of Latin texts and a bibliography of works which deal with entire glossaries.

M. Voss' "Altenglische Glossen aus MS British Library, Cotton Otho E.i." (*Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 21, 179-203) improves on Meritt's (1961) edition of the Latin-Old English gloss material in MS British Library Cotton Otho E.i. Voss doubles the number of entries by using excerpts from Otho by Twyne and Junius as well as the dictionaries of Somner and Lye.

K.T. Witczak's "The Pre-Germanic Substrata and Germanic Maritime Vocabulary" (*The Indo-Europeanization of Northern Europe* pp. 166-80) argues for the existence of three substrata in the area of Scandinavia, Jutlandia and Northern Germany: a non-IE layer, a pre-Gmc IE layer, and proto-Germanic. Witczak arrives at this conclusion based on a study of the various consonant shifts and discrepancies within the time periods for each shift. Witczak's order for the phonological processes of proto-Germanic is pre-Germanic lenition, proto-Germanic consonant shift, and proto-Germanic lenition. After discussing the substrata of the languages, Witczak examines whether or not the maritime lexical field can be said to be non Indo-European and borrowed from the non-IE languages of Scandinavia. He concludes that eighty-four percent of the Germanic maritime vocabulary is native; consequently he dismisses the claim that Germanic maritime vocabulary is of non-IE origin.

A. Wollmann's "Scandinavian Loanwords in Old English" (*The Origin and Development of Emigrant Languages*, pp. 215-42) while focussing on loans, provides information about inscriptions, place names, and personal names to support the existence of an Anglo-Norse emigrant language. After demonstrating that some of Peters' questionable loans are indeed not loans, Wollmann provides a list of 40 headwords which are Scandinavian loans attested in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to expand Peters' list. Phonological problems apparent in Peters' list of loans are considered next. Wollmann concludes that the creole theory of Middle English is not feasible based on the OE textual evidence, but he doesn't discount the possibility that such a creole could have existed in a spoken form in some areas.

b. Syntax, phonology, and Other Aspects

J. Anderson's "The Representation of Vowel Reduction: Non-Specification and Reduction in Old English and Bulgarian" (*Studia Linguistica* 50, 91-105) demonstrates that a notational system which attempts to represent vowel reduction must underspecify the type of reduction whether syntagmatic or paradigmatic. The fixed root or initial position of the tonic accounts for the fact that OE vowel reduction is almost wholly syntagmatic, regardless of the notational system. Some evidence exists for potential paradigmatic reduction, but this evidence is sporadic. Anderson uses Bulgarian as his example of a language with extensive paradigmatic reduction.

M.D. Arnold's abstract for "Case, Periphrastic 'do' and the Loss of Verb Movement in English," (*DAI* 56A, 4376) explains that the dissertation uses Government and Binding theory and some aspects of Chomsky's Minimalist Program to explain the spread of *do*. Arnold notes that "derivational economy as a core component of the linguistic faculty is central to *do*'s spread." Three proposals form the basis of the analysis. OE verbal prefixes became reanalyzed in such a way that prepositions took on their formal properties. Caseless prepositions emerged as a result of the loss of the distinction between Dative and Accusative cases. A novel incorporation mechanism emerged which led to the increased use of *do*.

A. Bammesberger's "Editing Old English Runic Inscriptions," (*Anglistentag 1993*, pp. 503-15) considers the Undley Bracteate and the Derbyshire Bone Piece with respect to the problems of editing runic inscriptions. The editorial problems with the Undley Bracteate are minor, but do demonstrate the need for giving all possible interpretations along with a drawing of the runes. The Derbyshire Bone presents more significant problems. The interpretation of runes 12 through 25 is generally agreed upon, but the others are open to debate. Once again, it appears necessary to provide all possible interpretations of the futhorc, an alphabetic arrangement of the words, and a lexicon.

Bammesberger's "The Preterite of Germanic Strong Verbs in Classes Four and Five" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 27, 33-43) attempts to account for the various alternants of the preterite of Germanic strong verbs. For classes four and five there are two versions of a strong alternant and one of a weak alternant. He traces these back to the IE perfect paradigm for the short root vowel forms. The long root vowels appear to represent innovations. Bammesberger assumes that the *ē* in the weak alternant of Gmc classes IV and V arose in V because certain zero grades of roots could not have resulted in a vowelless cluster C_1C_2-u- .

R. Clamons, in "This, thence, thus, and also there, thou, they: Problems for the Conventional Formal Analysis of a Middle English Sound Change" (*Chicago Linguistic Society* 31.1: *The Main Session* pp. 97-109) discusses the development of the initial *edh* in pronouns, demonstratives, and adverbs in English. Functional and phonological facts led to the emergence of initial *edh*. All of these words function to

point to specific areas in a discourse. It appears that English adopted a specific phonic pattern for a specific pragmatic function.

F. Colman's "Morphology: Old and Middle English—Derivational and Inflectional," (*Middle English Miscellany*, pp. 3–28) re-examines the issue of whether or not the OE suffix <-ian> of class II weak verbs was derivational or inflectional. Colman proposes that <ian> actually represents two morphs <i> and <an>. In this case, <an> marks the infinitive, as it does elsewhere in OE. What <i> marks is the question. Seemingly, <i> has characteristics of both inflections and derivations. As an exponent which is closest to the root, {i} represents a lexical subclass of the primary category P (predicative, after Anderson) and expresses tense in weak II verbs.

F. Colman's "Names Will Never Hurt Me" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, pp. 13–28), suggests that proper names form an onomastic system and rejects the idea that proper names may come from any major category of the lexicon. Grammatical and natural gender play a role in personal name forms, but natural gender seems to prevail in this area, at least in late OE. OE *gifu* f. is an example here. On coins *Gifu* when referring to a moneyer seems to occur with an <E>, perhaps a masculine ending by analogy. In addition, personal names show a reduced set of phonological oppositions. Kentish personal names present a problem for this neutralization of vowels. The article suggests that there is more reasonable doubt about dialectal boundaries, especially when the boundaries are based in part on evidence from personal names.

J.M. de la Cruz's "Old English Noun Declensions" (*SELIM* 3[1993], 26–42) presents an explanation of the reasonableness of the OE noun system for students confused by it and the historical terms attached to it. de la Cruz shows how the OE declensions were derived from IE and vary from Lat because of their history.

M. Cummings' "A Systemic Functional Approach to the Thematic Structure of the Old English Clause" (*On Subject and Theme* pp. 275–316) discusses the applicability and usefulness of a systemic functional approach to the discussion and identification of theme/rheme in OE. He takes as his texts of study Bethurum's edition of Wulfstan's sermon on salvation history and Ælfric's sermon *De initio creaturae*. Cummings concludes that Halliday's functional systemic approach is a reasonable model since it can be easily and successfully applied to OE. The results from the four narrative sections from Bethurum show that themes are most often marked in independent clauses while they are much less likely to be marked in subordinate clauses. The results are similar for Ælfric. Afterwards, Cummings briefly discusses three traditional approaches, Andrew, Bacquet, and Mitchell to clause order and how his IFG approach may help clarify some of their interpretations. Finally, he includes an appendix of examples from both the Bethurum and Ælfric texts illustrating marked and unmarked types.

A. Curzan and E. Saameño, "The Middle English Prepositional Passive: Analogy and GB" (*NM* 97, 169–87) after

discussing Government and Binding treatments of prepositions and the concept of reanalysis, reject reanalysis as a purely syntactic phenomenon. Instead, it is a lexical phenomenon and interacts with the grammar. In OE and ME we find prepositional stranding in three types of clauses. First, it often occurs in relative clauses relativised on the object of prepositional verbs with no other object. Second stranded prepositions occur in passive relative clauses relativised on the direct object, the object of the preposition, or in the case of prepositional verbs with direct object in addition to the object of the preposition. Active infinitive clauses relativised on the object of a simple V_{prep} show preposition stranding as do attributive-infinitive clauses also of a simple V_{prep}. Examples of each type and subtype are presented for OE and ME. How the prepositional passive of ME developed from these three strands is the central question of the work. The authors conclude that prepositional passives developed through a non-metalexical analogy from transitive prefixal structures which could be passivized.

In "Third Person Pronouns in *The Peterborough Chronicle*" (*NM* 97, 301–14) A. Curzan uses the three sections of the *Peterborough Chronicle* to outline the changes in pronouns from late OE to ME. The changes reflect both the oft discussed loss of distinction between the dative and accusative with respect to object positions and the shift from grammatical to natural gender.

A. Danchev's "Notes on the History of Word Final /g/ in English" (*Linguistic Change Under Contact Conditions*, pp. 55–79) concludes that no conclusive evidence exists for word final /g/ being caused either primarily by external or internal factors. For /g/ we must not discount the external or contact factors as playing a role in its emergence. Relatively few /g/ final words can be traced back to OE due to the narrow range of phonetic environments where /g/ was permitted in the final position. Additionally, no certainty exists with respect to the values of OE <-cg> and <-gg>. Most /g/ final words then are probably borrowed. Danchev lists evidence for borrowing from Celtic, Scandinavian, Latin, and French along with evidence of various other word formation processes for the origins of English words with final /g/. Many of these words fit the /C/(/C/) + /N/ + /g/ pattern, a productive pattern for word formation since Early Middle English.

X. Dekeyser's "WH- and THAT: Two competing Strategies in the History of English Relative Clause Formation," (*Leuvense Bijdragen* 85, 293–302) shows the expansion of (case-coding) WH- in ME and its spread to ModE. WH-relativization began in what Dekeyser calls "difficult slots" of the case hierarchy. In ME that was in prepositional phrases. It expanded from there into other slots in the English of 1551–1600, being less common in the prepositional phrase position and more common in the subject and object positions. Thus, Dekeyser confirms Maxwell's claim about the spread of WH- from the more difficult positions in a case hierarchy to the simpler positions. Moreover there was a shift away from WH in present-day spoken English where speakers tend to make

more use of ZERO relatives.

M. Durie's "Early Germanic Umlaut and Variable Rules" (*The Comparative Method Reviewed*, pp. 112–34) proposes that variable rule analysis may help eliminate some of the exceptions to otherwise well formulated rules dealing with sound change. Still, the use of this technique calls for a revision of the notion of "regular." Durie uses the exceptions to the rules for the PGmc short vowels to explore the possibility that variable rule analysis might be able to treat the large number of exceptions to the umlaut hypothesis as systematic. He finds that only about 80% of the changes adhere to Gmc $*u > o$. The twenty percent which are exceptions seem to vary from language to language. Since variable rule analysis is a statistical technique, it can tell us nothing about the speakers or a particular theory of how changes occurred. He concludes that a particular change can be both conditioned and yet not 'regular' in the commonly used sense of the word.

In "The Runic Script" (*The World's Writing Systems*, pp. 333–39) R.W.V. Elliott briefly discusses the development of the various futharks with a separate section on the Anglo-Saxon futhark. Elliott provides some comparisons of the various runic systems and mentions changes within and among systems. The work is a useful introduction to readers unfamiliar with various systems or with the history of runes.

T. Eythorsson's abstract of "Verbal Syntax in The Early Germanic Languages" (*DAI* 56A, 3103) describes the dissertation as investigating the "evidence for verb movement in the earliest stages of the Germanic languages. In Goth and OE verbs do not move to C when complements are topicalized, but in ON, OHG, and OSax, movement to C is obligatory when topicalization occurs." He claims support for his case from these various languages and from runic inscriptions from the "northern part of the Germanic linguistic area."

O. Fischer's "The Status of *to* in Old English *to*-Infinitives: a reply to Kageyama" (*Lingua* 99, 107–33) rejects Kageyama's 1992 interpretation that OE *to*- should be an element in the AGR node. Fischer applauds Kageyama's attempt to link several synchronic problems with OE *to* to one another and to explain the appearance of three new, seemingly simultaneous, constructions in ME. She first reviews Kageyama's analysis and arguments and presents her counter-arguments. For Fischer, *to* is part of the infinitival phrase and cannot be moved as Kageyama claims. *To*, if it does not appear before the second infinitive, was never there and should not be postulated as being there and then moved. After this conclusion, Fischer moves on to argue, using some of her own examples and some of Kageyama's, that *to* should not be considered as part of AGRP. *To* clearly governs only the first infinitive and not the second since according to Fischer, the two are not coordinated. The ME constructions Kageyama terms simultaneous appearances are not.

Fischer's "Verbal Complementation in Early ME: How Do the Infinitives Fit In?" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994 pp. 247–70) investigates how relevant the syntactic-semantic

context of the infinitive is in early ME and clarifies the status of the *to*- infinitive in early ME. For Fischer, diachronic fuzziness does not explain the variation in bare and *to* infinitives. She argues that the two types of infinitives retained separate meanings. In early ME *to*- infinitives indicated an indirect relationship between the matrix verb and the infinitive; the zero-infinitive most commonly marked a direct relationship. Table 3 of the article provides a clear illustration of the relationship among bare, *to*-infinitives, and THAT clauses in OE and ME. Infinitives in OE and early ME are still largely nominal. Fischer proposes that *to* is a preposition and that the *to*-infinitive is a unit.

R.M. Hogg's "Old English Open Syllable Lengthening" (*Trans. of the Philol. Soc.* 94, 57–72) argues that open syllable lengthening of /æ/ in OE is purely phonetic and can help to account for the variations between /a/ and /æ/ in the strong adjective declensions. These variations do not follow from the restoration of /a/. Open syllable lengthening in OE becomes, under this account, a precursor to open syllable lengthening in ME. Hogg's "Tertiary Stress in Old English: Some Reflections on Explanatory Inadequacy" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 3–12) reminds us that sometimes an explanation which accounts for all occurrences may not be a very satisfactory one. In this case, Hogg first postulates tertiary stress as accounting for four problems in OE phonology: "(a) certain exceptions to the rules governing medial palatalization of Germanic $*sk$; (b) so-called palatal diphthongization of back vowels; (c) apparent failure of First Fronting . . . (d) the failure of vowels in certain suffixes to undergo some changes associated with unstressed syllables" (3). He notes that he is not concerned here with metrical stress, or with ictus or with poetic forms. Tertiary stress is an unsatisfactory explanation because it is *ad hoc* and fits the cases individually without providing a more general statement which takes all four problems into account. Still, an explanation, even an unsatisfactory one, which solves more problems than it leaves is better than no explanation at all.

L. Iglesias-Rábade's *El uso del inglés y francés en la Inglaterra normanda y plantagenet (1066–1399)* (Monografías da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 166 Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1992. 198 pp.) presents us with a socio-linguistic approach to changes in English from the Norman conquest to the era of the Plantagenets. Iglesias-Rábade argues that there was not a bi-polar distinction between Normans and native Englishmen. He discusses the functional history of interactions between French and English rather than presenting another structural history.

K. Kaminashi's "Old English Stress and Lexical Phonology" (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, ed. S. Chiba, pp. 125–46) applies the theoretical framework of Lexical Phonology to the problem of assigning word stress in OE. Kaminashi concludes that word stress occurs at the lexical level in OE for both primary and secondary stress which are also both assigned cyclically. The extraprosodicity

of word-final consonants, the generation of secondary stress caused by adding an inflectional suffix, and two types of stress contours for separable and inseparable verbs help support this interpretation of stress assignment for OE.

D. Kastovsky's "Categorical Restructuring of the Weak Verbs in Late Old English and Middle English" (*Middle English Miscellany*, pp. 29–45) adopts Wurzel's 1984 idea of inflectional class rather than the traditional word and paradigm model to help explain the restructuring of the weak verbs. Inflectional class is "constituted by the global distinctness of a given paradigm from other paradigms" (33). The normal distinctions of weak verbs, strong verbs, and irregular verbs are, according to Kastovsky, oversimplifications. Instead, six different sets of verbal paradigms exist for Germanic: 1) class 1–4 of the weak verbs where a stem-formative marks the class; 2) verbs which have the stem formative in the present (like class 1) but not elsewhere, and are weak due to the weak preterite/second participle; 3) verbs which lack a stem-formative but which have a dental preterite and some irregularities; 4) strong verbs with a weak present; 5) strong verbs without a stem-formative and with ablaut; and 6) the irregular verbs whose behavior and form is unpredictable. By the OE period stem formatives had been lost or were absorbed by the base or inflectional endings. This loss set the stage for reclassification within the verb system. In OE only classes 1 and 2 remained more or less intact. Class 4 disappeared; and class 3 had only a few verbs which also possessed some of the qualities of classes 1 and 2. Thus, OE lost an external class marker and the class of a verb was no longer entirely predictable from external markers. Internal and implicational markers were now the basis for class membership. Class membership had shifted to a lexical property. ME had four categories: 1) verbs forming their preterite and past participle with a segmental morpheme; 2) verbs forming preterite and past participle with a dental stop and stem allomorphy; 3) verbs forming preterite and second participle by ablaut; and 4) individual irregular verbs. Of these, only class 1 seemed productive. The result of this process is that English verb morphology is now morphologically conditioned. Rather than classifying verbs by global characteristics, we use one diagnostic criterion. Regular verbs are the default; irregular verbs have to have their various inflections specified.

Kastovsky's "Verbal Derivation in English: A Historical Survey or Much Ado About Nothing" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 93–117) focuses on the predominance of affixless derivations in English verbs and traces the reason for their existence back to IE. The dominance of affixless derivations for verbs seems to be related to the lack of diversity at the functional-semantic level. OE verbs have a stem-based morphology. The imperatives argue for a zero allomorph. The gradual disappearance of final unstressed syllables resolved the ambiguity between word formation and inflection. Stem-formatives not only had the function of a derivative, but also of creating inflections.

In "Subjecthood in Impersonal Constructions in Early

English" (*Chicago Linguistic Society 32: Papers from the Main Session*, pp. 165–78) H. Kim investigates whether or not one of the NP arguments in an oblique case in impersonal constructions has the role of subject. The oblique experiencer in impersonal constructions seems to assume the role of subject. Other languages contain non-nominative subjects. Kim rejects Cole's and Allen's examples and arguments for nominative objects and oblique subjects. Subject-to Subject Raising, reflexivation, and conjunction reduction are all rejected as causes of, or conditions for, oblique case subjects, as is the null subject hypothesis. Subject-object-order in topicalization, subject-object-order in nexus questions, and infinitival deletion are the main subject properties for impersonal constructions.

W.F. Koopman in "Evidence for Clitic Adverbs in Old English: An Evaluation" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 223–45) evaluates possible clitic adverbs in 12 OE prose texts which cover the entire OE period. Some personal pronoun objects in OE can be syntactic clitics; the same may be true for some adverbs. Koopman investigates for presence of clitic adverbs in the same environments proposed for clitic pronouns, which he terms positions A, B, and C. Frequency tables of his findings provide a clear idea of the results. Only 15 of 912 adverbs occurred in all three positions. A list of these with their frequencies is provided. Koopman explains how some of these potential clitics are not clitics at all. Moreover, a pronounced contrast with the distribution of full NPs is not found with the adverbs as it is with the pronominal clitics. On these bases, Koopman decides the arguments for OE clitic adverbs are questionable at best. More work remains to be done before the existence of clitic adverbs in OE can be confirmed or dismissed.

R.M. Liuzza's "Orthography and Historical Linguistics" (*Jnl of Eng. Ling.* 24, 25–44) discusses the intersection of language and writing. In addition to outlining various theories of writing, he discusses problems which arise when one assumes that writing patterns should mirror speech patterns. The rules of an orthographic system must be described before one can reliably use a text for studying a language, even though these rules may not be readily transparent.

C. Lopez, M. Jose, and B.M. Naya in "On the Use of the Subjunctive and Modals in Old and Middle English Dependent Commands and Requests" (*NM* 97, 411–21) extract the commands and requests from the *Helsinki Corpus* for their study. Through the use of frequency tables and examples, they demonstrate that subjunctive mood dominates in OE and early ME, a condition most likely having to do with time reference. A subsequent decrease in the subjunctive is paralleled by an increase in the indicative, most with modals. This choice of modals is motivated by a desire for more emphasis and specificity than is possible with the subjunctive.

J. Martin Arista's "Analogy in Functional Syntax" (*SELIM* 4[1994], pp. 59–73) uses *batan* to explain the role of analogical change in functional syntactic representation. The semantic, morpho-syntactic, and pragmatic levels of change are consid-

ered. Arista examines 2,100 passive clauses in which a form of *hatan* occurs with or without a copula from OE to LME. *Hatan* is rare in LME, with *nemned*, *clepud*, or *callud* being preferred. At the morphosyntactic and semantic levels, the acquisition of the passive form by *hatan* led to the middle voice being lost. This change occurred after the quantitative valency of the predicate increased, a change in the lexical fund. The COP Support Rule began to apply. *Wesan* in *hatan* passives seems to have acquired AUX status before gapping was acceptable. The changes seem to have been motivated by pragmatic concerns; the speakers desired "to provide *hatan* clauses with a position of special pragmatic value, the interverbal position." (70) Consideration of all of these levels is necessary to explain the role of analogy in functional syntax.

T. Matsushita's "Phonetic Motivations for Middle English Lengthening in Open Syllables," (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, pp. 147–67) lists by consonant type and terminal environment words which undergo OSL in ME and their OE cognates. From these examples, Matsushita draws four conclusions about OSL in ME. First the short low /ɑ/ and then mid /e/ and /o/ are lengthened most frequently. The high vowels generally did not participate in lengthening. Second, OSL generally occurred when preceded by /k/, /g/, /v/, /l/, /r/, or /ð/. Third, /r/ and /g/ which became /w/, was finally incorporated into a lengthened vowel or diphthong form, a conditioning environment for the OSL of high and non high vowels. Finally, certain sounds /t/, /s/, /θ/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/, /b/ seem not to be conditioning factors for OSL as few examples of OSL occur with these sounds.

A.M.S. MacMahon's "On the Use of the Past to Explain the Present. The History of /r/ in English and Scots," (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 73–89) attempts to show that some synchronic processes which seem arbitrary may be historically principled. She chooses English /r/ for her study. Her data comes from published sources back to 1740 and from the *Linguistic Atlas of Scotland*. The work contains nothing specific on OE.

D. Minkova's "Verse Structure as Evidence for Prosodic Reconstruction in Old English" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 13–37) discusses the associations between verse structure and stress assignment and the limitations of verse evidence for prosodic reconstruction. The analysis of OE stress involves phonological, morphological, and metrical parameters. Minkova questions the assignment of a one-to-one relationship between ictus and lexical stress, but the central focus of the paper is on the problems of tertiary stress. Minkova proposes a "scale of stressability": morphological salience >> syllable weight >> syllable position. As one moves down the level of stress from primary to tertiary, the non-metrical clues disappear, making the determination of stress difficult. From least to most stressable we find disyllabic derivatives, derivational morphemes, and grammaticalized word internal morphemes.

B. Mitchell and S. Irvine's "A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax. Supplement 1989–1992," (*NM* 1–28, 121–

61, 255–78) provides 283 new additions to their "Critical Bibliography of Old English", a useful endeavor.

K.S. Miyamae's "The Perfect Construction Revisited: Its Historical Development" (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, pp. 57–70) reviews the various theories concerning the origin of the perfect construction. In the course of the review, Miyamae considers how its appearance and word order change within the construction contributed to the change in OE word order from SOV to SVO. The perfect construction appeared as *have*+O+pp and shifted later to *have*+pp+O. In the shift, either O was postposed or pp was preposed. The direction of the change and which constituent caused the change are the focus of the Miyamae's investigation. The second order was co-occurring with the first by sometime in the Eighth Century. In fact, Miyamae lists Mitchell's six possible arrangements of these constituents where patterns i and iv are those mentioned above. The grammaticalization of *have*, where *have* lost its case assigning quality, was the first change. With this change, something had to assign case to the object, in this instance, it was the pp.

C. Montes Mozo and M.P. Fernandez Alvarez's "Prevervation in the Old Germanic Languages: A Research Project" (*SELIM* 4, 94–117) presents a preliminary report of what will become a larger study of prevervation in the Germanic languages. This particular work focuses on preverbs with verbs of motion in Goth, OHG, and OE (Goth and OHG much more than OE). While worthwhile, the work makes some questionable assumptions about the nature of modern linguistics in general e.g. "linguistics is based . . . on the grammatical habits of a language which lacked productive syntactic prevervation" and OE linguistic studies in particular, e.g. "no Old English text has been computerized [sic] yet."

M. Ogura's "Old English *habban* + Past Participle of a Verb of Motion" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, pp. 199–214) discusses the use of *habban* with the past participles of (*ge*)*faran*, (*ofer*)*faran*, (*ge*)*fēran*, (*ge*)*gan*(*gan*), *cuman*, *standan*, *wunian*, *beon*/*wesan*/*weorðan*, *standan*, *wunian*, *sittan*, and *weaxan*. In each section, Ogura lists instances of the past participle of each word's occurrence with *habban* and with *beon*/*wesan*, if it occurs, and how the two constructions may be differentiated. In some of the cases, there appears to be no semantic or aspectual difference between the two constructions. In OE, the construction *habban* + past participle was restricted to specific verbs. The choice between *habban* and *beon* may have been a stylistic rather than semantic one. Those verbs which took *habban* had three features in common: a transitive as well as an intransitive use, expressed an action rather than a state, and were prefixed verbs or gained transitivity from prefixed cognates.

B.R. Page's "Nonlinear Phonology and the Development of Post-Consonantal Resonants in Word-Final Position in West Scandinavian and Germanic" (*Insights in Germanic Linguistics, I: Methodology in Transition*, pp. 231–42) reviews the previous work on the titular topic and rejects some part of most arguments. Page uses a nonlinear framework to support

the findings of Sagen (1979), since nonlinear phonology makes use of licenses, it can help to explain some of the phonotactic problems which appear with an epenthetic vowel in a voiceless environment. Page, after reviewing evidence in ancient and modern Scandinavian languages and West Germanic, especially OE, reaches three conclusions. The use of the nonlinear phonology framework adequately describes developments in postconsonantal non-syllabic word final resonants and epenthetic vowels before such resonants. Second, the reconstruction of syllabic resonants in this environment for West Germanic is questionable. Since postconsonantal resonants were not syllabic in early West Germanic, reconstructing them as nonsyllabic in Gothic is reasonable.

In "The Language of the Anglo-Saxon Settlers" (*The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, pp. 141–56) D. Parsons considers linguistic and inscribed archaeological evidence to determine whether or not pre-OE was more or less uniform. Although evidence can be adduced for both sides—Parsons discusses this—based on dialect geography, Parsons concludes the latter, despite a clear close connections between OE and OFris.

C. Peeters' "Germanische Lautprobleme" (*IF* 101, 258–60) discusses sound changes and their representations. When a phoneme changes from one stage of a language to another, there are only two possible outcomes: the change results in one sound or more than one sound. In the case of splits, the conditions under which the variant sounds occur must be precisely described since all changes are conditioned in some way. Peeters concludes that the distinction between spontaneous and combinative changes is not necessary.

H. Penzl's "Ist das nordisch-westgermanische Runen-germanisch das 'Ur-Altenglische'?" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 27, 137–45) concludes that it is possible to reconstruct a pre-Old English. However, researchers should not consider this the same as North-West Germanic. Certainly one cannot verify that the forms of the Nordic West Germanic runic inscriptions are actually Ur-Old English.

R. Perez Llorido's "On the Grammatical Domain of Gapping in Old English: Syntax and Pragmatics" (*Diachronica* 13, 319–46) uses seven OE texts to investigate whether gapping occurs at a purely syntactic level or whether it may be partially a pragmatic process. Perez Llorido uses Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, *Orosius*, *Boethius*, *Cura Pastoralis*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *Lives of Saints*, and the second series of *Ælfric's Homilies*. Asymmetric coordination and the application of the rule to non-adjacent coordinated sentences provide evidence against a strictly syntactic formulation of gapping. Discourse rules would seem to be more appropriate for explaining some of the instances of gapping. Perez Llorido presents in table 3 of his work what he perceives as the number of instances where gapping is pragmatically controlled. Sixty-three of two hundred and forty-one examples are pragmatically controlled in the eight texts studied. The higher percentages occur in the non-religious texts. The evidence leads to the primary conclusion that word order would seem to be

at least somewhat dependent on pragmatic and textual principles.

C.V.J. Russ' "Umlaut in Frisian and the Germanic Languages: Some Thoughts on Its Genesis and Development" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 501–12) discusses in detail umlaut in OFris phonology and morphology and then reviews umlaut in OHG, OE, ON, Dut, and Old Low Franconian. Using Nielsen's interpretation of Sapir's concept of drift, Russ notes three trends. First, through the loss of conditioning factors, umlauted vowels in the older Germanic languages tend to be phonemicized when the factors which conditioned the fronting are lost or changed—the loss of *j*, the syncope of *i* and *î*, and the merger of unstressed vowels in *-e*. In OE, OFris, and some Central and Upper German dialects, the new front rounded phonemes merge with their unrounded counterparts. Second, umlaut tends not to become grammaticalized, except in NHG. Finally, some of the Gmc. languages show relics of umlaut alternations. These trends hold true for Frisian; thus, the umlaut process in Frisian fits well into umlaut process in Germanic languages.

J. Smith's *An Historical Study of English: Function, Form and Change* (London and New York: Routledge, xvii, 225pp. ill.) is intended for upper-level students who have a basic knowledge of the history of English and want a more detailed explanation. Smith's approach is dynamic and functional, discussing the why as well as the how of language change in English.

P.V. Stiles' "Old English *uncet* and *incit*" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 557–68) discusses the dual forms of the personal pronoun attested only in Anglian or Anglian colored texts. Since few scholars who mention these dual forms offer an explanation of their origin, Stiles attempts one. The *-et* and *-it* inflections of the duals are related by analogy to the **-ik* of the plural forms.

In "Old English Short Diphthongs and the Theory of Glide Emergence" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 57–72) R.P. Stockwell attacks the position that breaking is an instance of Sapirian phonetic drift which continues throughout history. This position holds that back glides emerge after front vowels in OE and later after any other vowels. Stockwell argues that long vowel breaking was assimilation rather than vowel epenthesis. He rejects all existing accounts of short vowel breaking based on their failures to cover one or more of six criteria, usually the criterion which requires that the theory account for moric weight assignment, for which explanations of breaking must account. These criteria, Stockwell argues, need to be rank ordered.

S. Suzuki's "On the Syllable Weight of -VC# in Old English: A Metrical Perspective" (*English Historical Linguistics* 1994, pp. 39–55) argues against three views: that -VC# is light, heavy, neither light nor heavy. Suzuki proposes that -VC# is both light and heavy. *Beowulf* is the primary source for data to support this argument. For -VC#, syllable weight is context dependent. If -VC# is stressed or preceded by a short

stressed syllable, it is heavy and bimoric; in other contexts it is monomoric and light. -VC# is unique in this respect since other strings maintain a constant mora count.

M. Terajima's "On VC Syllable Structure in the History of English" (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, pp. 183–89) discusses how the VC syllable structure has changed in its syllable weight. Terajima presents evidence that OE VC syllables are more closely related to V type syllables than to other syllable structures. The paper, however, focuses mostly on syllable weight in ME and the problems of OSL. Examples from *Ormulum* and *Brut* are used to support the argument. The shift from a light syllable in OE to a heavy syllable in eME played a major role in MEOSL.

E. van Gelderen's "The Reanalysis of Grammaticalized Prepositions in Middle English" (*Studia Linguistica* 50, 106–24) focuses on the prepositions *for(to)*, *to*, and *on*. The work adds to the consideration of the relationship between grammaticalization and reanalysis. van Gelderen argues that these prepositions lose their specific function as prepositions indicating location in three ways: by moving from preposition to complementizer (*for to* and *to*), to inflection (*to*), and to aspect marker (*on*). In the case of *for* the move is to C; for *for to* it is to C, I, or AGR; *to* moves from AGR to I. The syntactic effect of these grammaticalizations is a structural change which ultimately means a word order change.

M. Voss' case study "Kent and the Low Countries Revisited" (*Linguistic Change Under Contact Conditions*, pp. 327–63) discusses hypotheses concerning Continental Germanic features purportedly found in Kentish. Voss tackles one by one Nielsen's list of post-invasion correspondences shared by Kentish and the Continental Germanic languages. Voss finds no strong linguistic or extralinguistic evidence to conclude with certainty that the changes covered by Nielsen occurred first on the continent and then were brought into Kentish via language contact. The copious notes and bibliography are useful to any one interested in pursuing the topic further.

B. Wårvik's "Participants Tracking Narrative Structure: Old English *þa* and Topicality" (*Topics and Comments: Papers from the Discourse Project*, 115–39) uses examples from *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, Series II*. Frequency tables and chi-square results for topicality and participant status of subjects, the status of participants in clauses marked by *þa* vs other clauses, and topicality of major participants in clauses marked by *þa* and other clauses, help Wårvik demonstrate that OE *þa*, as a discourse marker, signals foregrounding and high topicality, tracks major participants, and signals the progress of the story-line. These functions add continuity to the discourse. The study successfully shows the interaction between two text structuring forces, grounding and participant continuity. Wårvik's "Peak-Marking in Old English Narrative" (*Organization and Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference*, pp. 549–58) taking Longacre as a starting point, lists and illustrates various peak markers in OE narratives. *þa* acts as a peak marker in a variety of ways: it occurs in unusual contexts; it increases in frequency with foregrounded storylines; it

decreases in frequency when the work shifts from narrative to description; it works to express 'suddenness'; it occurs with intensifying elements such as *hwæt*, *efne*, and *eft*; and it occurs with correlative constructions. Moreover, its use as a peak marker helps to explain some of the odd positions in which *þa* occurs, such as SV *þa*, and V *þa*. Other peak-markers in OE include the combination of negation and *ac*, and *op þæt*. Shifts from narrative to dialogue also may mark peaks in OE.

L. Wright's "Middle English {-ende} and {-ing}: a Possible Route to Grammaticalisation" (*Linguistic Change Under Contact Conditions*, pp. 365–82) studies ME business writing, specifically those writings containing two languages, in an attempt to trace the rise of {-ing} and the loss of {-ende}. Both of the suffixes were available for forming deverbal nouns in OE. Only in ME did {-ing} acquire its verbal character. In ME {-ing} developed more fully its function of forming a derived nominal, a function rarely seen in OE, but common in late ME. By the Fifteenth Century, {-ing} was being used in all of its modern functions. Wright discounts the phonetic/orthographic confusion explanation for the rise of {-ing}, especially with Anglo-Norman scribes. She proposes that there was first a visual convergence between the Latin gerund and the English present participle/verbal noun markers. This opened the door for {-ing} to indicate both functions otherwise represented by a Latin morpheme. Even though the potential for overgeneralization exists, investigators need to pay more attention to such macaronic writings when looking for the source of morphological changes and innovations. Wright does not argue for this sort of writing being the only influence.

N. Yamada's "A Syllable-Based Approach to English Historical Phonology" (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, pp. 191–210) rejects most aspects of Clements 1990 Dispersion Principle and instead puts forth the hypothesis that, when change occurs, stressed syllables tend to be strengthened and unstressed syllables tend to be weakened. Yamada supports this hypothesis with examples from all periods of English, including OE. Moreover, Yamada isolates six strengthening changes associated only with stressed syllables and four weakening changes associated almost always with unstressed syllables. Four conclusions are drawn from the work: changes in stressed syllables are generally in complementary distribution with those in unstressed syllables; the strengthening and weakening changes enhance the salience of stressed syllables; relative markedness of syllables depends on the presence or absence of stress; and phonological changes seem to require that their triggers and undergoers be on the same phonological level. Yamada concludes his study with a discussion of problems for which his hypothesis cannot account or for which it was never intended to account.

K.T.

Works Not Seen

Bammesberger, Alfred. "Der Kontrast /x/-/a/ im altenglischen Vokalsystem." *Anglia* 114, 236–249.

- Bjorvand, Harald. "Nominale Stammbildung des Germanischen. Maskuline Verbalnomina: a- Stämme oder i- Stämme?" *Drei Studien zum Germanischen in alter und neuer Zeit*. Ed. John Ole Askedal and Bjorvand. Odense, 1995. pp. 1-68.
- Blake, N.F. *A History of the English Language*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1996. xv, 382p.
- Chiusaroli, Francesca. "Il colore dell'oro: per un'indagine sulla terminologia dei colori nell'inglese antico." *Lingue speciali e interferenza*. Ed. Raffaella Bombi. Rome, 1995. pp. 129-56.
- Ciutacu, Sorin. "Glimpses into the History of English Modal Verbs." *Studii de limbi si literaturi moderne*. Ed. Hortensia Pălog et al. Timisoara, 1994. pp. 202-09.
- Crilly, Josephine. "Turning to Nod Goodbye." *Verbatim* 32.1, 8-10.
- Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax, II*. Ed. Höskuldur Thráinsson et al. Dordrecht, Boston, and London.
- Lendinara, Patrizia. "L'attività glossatoria del periodo anglosassone." *Les Manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen âge*. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse. Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 615-55.
- Krogh, Steffen. *Die Stellung des Altsächsischen im Rahmen der germanischen Sprachen*. Studien zum Althochdeutschen, 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 413pp.
- Lancri, Annie. "Syntax du génitif en vieil-anglais et stratégie énonciative." *Faits de Langues* 7, 177-86.
- Molinari, M.V. "Traduzione e funzione poetica dei composti nominali anglossoni." *Teoria e pratica della traduzione*, pp. 83-105.
- Moskovich-Spiegel Fandino, Isabel. *Los escandinavos en Inglaterra y el cambio lexico en ingles medieval* (Mongrafias, 28 Universidade da Coruna, Servicio de Publicacions, 1995)
- Mottausch, Karl-Heinz. "Germanisch gangan 'gehen' und die starken Verben mit a aus *o." *Historische Sprachforschung* 76-109.
- Del Lungo Camiciotti, Gabriella. *Introduzione alla storia della lingua inglese*. Collana di filologia germanica, 7. Milan: Mursia, 1994. 252 pp.
- Princi Braccini, Giovanna. "Termini germanici per il diritto e la giustizia: sulle tracce dei significati autentici attraverso etimologie vecchie e nuove." *La giustizia nell'alto medioevo (secoli V-VIII)*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 42. Spoleto, 1995. II, 1053-1207.
- Waxenberger, Gabriele. *Die Zuordnung der altenglischen Substantive zu den Flexionstypen untersucht am Buchstaben D*. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, ser. 14: Angelsächsische Sprache und Literature, 315. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, xxii, 458 pp.)
- Yamagata, Hiromitsu. "The Vocabularies of Aelfric and Wulfstan Revisited: a Computer Analysis of their Use of and." *Essays in Linguistics and Philology Presented to Professor Kinsuke Hasegawa on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. Akira Baba et al. Tokyo, 1995. pp. 629-39.

3. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous

Textbooks and Translations

JOERG O. FICHTE and Fritz Kemmler's *Alt- und mittenglische Literatur: Eine Einführung*, 2nd ed., Literaturwissenschaft im Grundstudium 6 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994; pp. xi + 432), revises a 1980 text that was not reviewed in *YWOES*. Despite the title, this is not an introduction to medieval English literature but a reader prefaced by a 124-page grammar geared specifically toward the needs of those studying the given texts. The grammar is devoted mostly (and about equally) to phonology and morphology, with a shorter section on syntax. There are ten non-normalized Old English texts, mostly prose and all standard fare for readers, with brief introductions; detailed, separate glossaries for Old and Middle English; and an abbreviated bibliography.

Louis J. Rodrigues' *Anglo-Saxon Didactic Verse* (Felinfach: Llanerch, 1995; pp. 231) is the sixth in his series of text-cum-translations for nonacademics. Twenty-one poems or extracts are edited—whether from manuscripts, facsimiles, or existing editions is unspecified—and brief introductions to each are provided.

Language and Poetic Form

G.A. LESTER's *Language of Old and Middle English Poetry* (New York: St. Martin's, 1996; pp. vii + 182) is another in the series *The Language of Literature* edited by N.F. Blake, and like others in the series it is intended for the use of "non-specialists and general readers" (p. vii), or more precisely in this case "the general reader and beginning student" (p. 3). This aim dictates that "language" here should have a narrower meaning than usual: Lester gives little attention to aspects of language study (such as phonology and morphology) that would be difficult to discuss if one's aim is to avoid linguistic terminology, generally focusing instead on poetic structure and rhetoric. Moreover, in sheer page count about as much of the book is devoted to the cultural and historical backgrounds of language study—manuscript contexts, political and cultural history, external history of the language, major literary works and genres—as to the analysis of the language itself of Old English poetry. Discussion of Old English is divided into poetic lexis and semantics (Chap. 4) and rhetorical and structural patterns (Chap. 5), in each case on an isolative, taxonomic basis (moving from variation to structural interlace to envelope patterns, etc.). I have reviewed the book elsewhere

(in *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998) 1022–23), where I concluded that in spite of some linguistic misconceptions it is “an honest, workmanlike fulfillment of the improbable guidelines laid out for this series.”

Drawing on the multilayered model of Functional Grammar, Ricardo Mairal Usón and Javier Martín Arista, in “Underlying Predications and Latin-Old English Translation: Two Predicates under Scrutiny,” *SELIM* 3 (1993), 43–56, examine the Old English translation of Latin *deliberare* and *amitto* as *ðencan* and *gewitten* (sic). They believe the semantic mismatches in translation support their proposed Scalarity Principle: “Those predicates higher on the scale (paradigmatic) tend to take an ample range of complementation patterns as well as a wide semantic scope whereas those lower on the scale (syntagmatic) tend to have a reduced amount of patterns; and, accordingly, its semantic scope is narrower” (49). Yet the latter example seems to me flawed, since *amitto* means ‘die’ only with *vitam*, while *witan* alone can have that meaning; hence the intransitivity of the latter. Also on the subject of translation, in “Further Observations Concerning the Translation of Anglo-Saxon Verse,” *SELIM* 4 (1994), 124–32, Louis J. Rodrigues reproduces and analyzes four popular translations of *The Dream of the Rood* 28–56 and chastises the failings he perceives in each, including archaic vocabulary, unexampled inversions, and dullness.

Metrical studies continue to thrive, though there is less than usual to report here, since the major works of the year, a hefty monograph by Seiichi Suzuki and several articles in C.B. McCully and J.J. Anderson’s *English Historical Metrics*, are treated below in the section devoted to *Beowulf* (in 3.b). Nonetheless, a few other items should be noted, including two articles by Benjamin H. Carroll, Jr. The intent of “Old English Prosody,” *Jnl. of Eng. Ling.* 24 (1996), 93–115, is “to describe a quantity-based system of stress and rhythm that seems to underlie the five types of alliterative verse and make them metrically equivalent, with a regular beat and without insuperable hazards for any present-day reader of Old English” (93). The most innovative aspects of this analysis concern the treatment of compounds and other plurisyllables. Carroll posits three distinctive metrical quantities (long, half-long, and short) and three levels of stress, which vary considerably according to context, as under Pope’s system. Thus, in *Cædmon’s Hymn* the first two syllables of *herigean*, *heofon-rices*, and *meotodes*, which all receive primary stress under Sievers’ system, have different durations. Primary stress is dissociated from alliteration, so that a heavy verse such as *water wæt and ceald* bears secondary stress in the first two positions and primary in the last. Carroll finds evidence for this analysis in the rhyming of final syllables in such verses in *The Riming Poem* and in the inversion of modifiers in phrases like *weorc smiþa* in the coda of heavy verses, since such inversion is not permitted in the onset of the verse. Lexicalized compounds like *elmhtig* and *moncynn* (as opposed to less conventional compounds like *gūðræs*) receive level stress, and in verses like *weard Scyldinga* there is tertiary stress on the ultima, none on

the penult. The duration of endings is also generally longer than many internal syllables, or even initial ones. Carroll makes some of the same points in “On Secondary and Tertiary Stress in Old English Verses,” *JEGP* 95 (1996), 313–21. But here he argues more concretely that “a convincing vocalization of three successive stress-bearing syllables in a falling pattern was as impossible for speakers of Old English as for speakers of Modern English” (316). Though the pattern ought to be expected, he argues, verses like **hilt bord-wyrðe* do not actually occur, although similar verses with a resolved first lift or short penult are common. Once again stressing ultimas rather than penults in dead compounds (and even some live ones), he reanalyzes verses like *þær wæs Æschere* and *gehyrde on Bēowulfē* as belonging to type B rather than C, and verses like *mæg Ælfheres* and *eorl Bēowulfes* to type D4 rather than D2 and D1, respectively. Though I am unconvinced of this, the issues are intriguing, and worthy of examination, particularly in the light of Old English patterns of syncope and unstressed vowel reduction.

In “Metrical Stress on Alliterating Finite Verbs in Clause-Initial *a*-Verses: ‘Some Doubts and No Conclusions’,” *Studies in English Language and Literature. “Doubt Wisely”: Papers in Honour of E.G. Stanley*, ed. M.J. Toswell and E.M. Tyler (London and New York: Routledge, 1996; xiii + 545), pp. 186–98, H. Momma considers conflicting opinions on the metrical value of finite verbs, alliterating and otherwise, in the only place where it can be ambiguous whether or not they are stressed—in the on-verse. She reiterates an earlier, valuable observation that verbs with a greater semantic burden tend to precede pronominal *Satzpartikeln* at the beginning of the verse clause, while the more auxiliary-like the verb seems, the likelier it is to follow them. She explains this distribution by the hypothesis that semantically more significant verbs run a smaller risk of being taken for stressed elements when they appear before the *Satzpartikeln*. Thus although she intends her method to be an emulation of Stanley’s habit of offering wide-ranging skepticism in the guise of open-mindedness, her views actually favor Bliss’s analysis, under which the initial verb in a verse like *geaf him ðā mid Gēatum* (*Beowulf* 2623a) is unstressed despite the alliteration. She does conclude, however, that there is no reason not to assume ambiguity and inconsistency in Old English poets’ treatment of these verbs.

In “The Metre of the *Chronicle*-Verse,” *SN* 68 (1996), 143–76, Julie Townsend defends the five alliterative *Chronicle* poems edited in *ASPR* (excluding the rhyming *Death of Alfred*) against the charge of poetic ineptness by focusing on the sophistication of the poems’ metrical properties. She finds that the poems conform well to the standards of earlier compositions like *Beowulf* both in broad features and in detail. For the most part even the distribution of verse types is similar, and when this is not the case it is possible to discern a particular effect being aimed at. Townsend also defends textual emendation on the basis of meter.

In “Modifying Sievers: A Theory of Word Groups in Old English Meter,” 1996 diss. Univ. of Western Ontario, *DAI*

57A (1996), 2458, James Keddle rejects the metrical analyses of E. Sievers and A.J. Bliss and allows "all six possible Types in a simplified form," leading to "a radical revision of aspects of resolution and the role of the half-stress." The theory incorporates syntactic elements allied to the views of G. Russom and C. Kendall. The cultures concerned are Old English, Old Icelandic, and early Irish in Karin Edith Olsen's "Metaphorical Language in the Early Poetry of Northwest Europe," 1995 diss. Univ. of Toronto, *DAI* 56A (1996), 4765. Olsen argues that metaphors in these cultures' literatures are not merely ornamental but reflect different modes of perception and aesthetics. Individual chapters consider the metaphorical density of the three cultures' poetry and some metaphoric clusters pertaining to the sea.

Textual and Source Criticism; Dating Studies

In "Textual Boundaries in Anglo-Saxon works on Time (and in Some Old English Poems)," in the Stanley Festschrift (as above), pp. 445–56, Peter S. Baker outlines modern conventions in regard to the way the sections of a work are formed and the divisions indicated, and he shows how the copy of Ælfric's *De temporibus anni* in Cambridge University Library Gg. 3. 23 violates them, the front matter falling partly in the end of the preceding text and partly within the first chapter of the work, and the first chapter heading being displaced by the title of the work as a whole. Similarly, in Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* topic sentences frequently appear not at the beginning of a paragraph, where we would expect them, but at the close of the preceding one. Due to the addition of material at the beginning, computi in manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries frequently bear titles that occur well within the work rather than at the start. So also in regard to the Cædmon Manuscript, modern division of the contents into five discrete poems is unsupported by the scribal treatment of the material, whereby *Genesis A* and *B*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* comprise (apparently) one *liber* of consecutively numbered fitts, while *Christ and Satan* is presented as another *liber* unto itself. In many textual varieties (computi, penitentials, etc.) scribes also felt free to rearrange internal sectional elements. Baker concludes that modern conceptions of the discreteness of texts are not wholly applicable to Old English works and their subdivisions, and in fact Anglo-Saxon scribes seem often to have intended to promote continuity between texts at the expense of absolute textual divisions.

Pharaoh's magicians, usually called Iamnes and Mambres in Latin texts, are mentioned briefly in several Old English works: the illustrated Hexateuch, the Old English Orosius, Ælfric's sermon *On Auguries*, and the anonymous life of St. Margaret. In "Traditions concerning Iamnes and Mambres in Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 25 (1996), 69–89, Frederick M. Biggs and Thomas N. Hall study these and the known Latin and Midrashic references to the magicians in order to determine whether the Old English texts point to the existence of lost sources, or whether the references in them can be derived from an apocryphon known from two fragmentary Greek

papyri, along with the related Latin texts and their Old English translations as represented in *The Marvels of the East*. The relevant passage in the *Marvels* in fact appears to have circulated independently of the rest of the work. If there were no unrelated lost apocrypha we must assume that Old English translators and scribes have introduced mistakes in the course of transmitting the material or have corrected corrupt exemplars or have simply invented details; and Biggs and Hall do conclude that there is no good evidence for a separate, lost tradition.

Daniel Paul O'Donnell, in "Manuscript Variation in Multiple-Recension Old English Poetic Texts: The Technical Problem and Poetical Art," 1996 diss. Yale Univ., *DAI* 57A (1996), 2469–70, argues that the extent of scribal intervention in the transmission of poetic texts is of three degrees, depending on context. Scribes are least faithful in copying anthologies of verse, more faithful in regard to poems embedded in prose texts, and most faithful in all other contexts.

[R.D. Fulk's "Inductive Methods in the Textual Criticism of Old English Verse" (*Medievalia et Humanistica*, New Series, Number 23, 1–24) is a complex and wide-ranging essay which attempts to examine the larger significance of the textual uses of induction through the context of the editing of Old English poetic texts. After a detailed discussion of the probabilistic nature of textual emendation in regard to metrical evidence, Fulk goes on to point out that a high proportion of Dobbie's emendations in *Beowulf* demonstrate "the co-occurrence of syntactical obscurities with problems of meaning, alliteration, and/or meter." He asserts that since this high rate of co-occurrence cannot be accidental, probability argues for attributing these irregularities not to authors but to scribes. He then goes on to a broader consideration of probability theory as a part of the scientific method, observing that the central controversy in the textual criticism of Old English verse "is merely one more manifestation of a much larger debate across a range of disciplines." Noting with approval Dumville's assertion that good editions reflect cooperation and collaboration among specialists of various sorts, Fulk argues persuasively against the conservative position that texts should remain unemended because we cannot be certain that we have made accurate judgments about them, asserting probabilism once more and endorsing a "cooperative enterprise involving a modicum of respect for, and a great deal of mutual, pointed probing of, the conclusions of diverse fields." This learned essay resists summary, but it needs to be read by editors and linguists as well as by students of critical theory and historians of criticism. It is likely to generate a good deal of further study.

Two nicely complementary essays in Robert E. Bjork's *Cynewulf: Basic Readings* (New York: Garland) can be productively discussed together here. R.D. Fulk's "Cynewulf: Canon, Dialect, and Date" and Patrick W. Conner's "On Dating Cynewulf" inform and are informed by one another although they reach somewhat different conclusions. Fulk's review of scholarship on the canon is sensible and thorough and he

concludes that Cynewulf likely wrote only the four poems to which his signature is attached, though he concedes the possibility (following Donoghue) that he might have attached his signature to poems he found in the cases of *Christ II* and *Fates of the Apostles* or that the runic signature to *Fates*, which occupies a separate leaf, might once have belonged to another poem, now missing, as Sievers once asserted (but then changed his mind). He surveys the evidence for dialect and notes that the balance of probability favors Mercian origin over Northumbrian. On dating, Fulk notes that in his *History of Old English Meter* he concluded that Old English verse could be divided into four chronological groups, but that Conner's findings (see below) undermine the distinction between the second and third. Fulk now believes, therefore, that the works of Cynewulf stand between the Junius poems and *Beowulf*, on the one hand, and the poems of the century following the Benedictine Reform on the other. The bulk of Conner's essay is devoted to an examination of the relationship of *Fates of the Apostles* to a text of the *Martyrologium* of Usuardus, written about 875. If indeed it was used by Cynewulf, and Conner's evidence does seem so to indicate, then an early- to mid-ninth century dating is no longer possible. Conner would put the *terminus a quo* "at saec. ix/x, because one of Cynewulf's most likely sources could not have been available before the last quarter of the ninth-century and, in its augmented form, very probably was not available in England before the middle of the tenth century." He accepts the conventional *terminus ad quem* as the end of the tenth century—the *terminus ad quem* for the two manuscripts in which the signed poems appear. Conner and Fulk differ on the relevance of Cynewulf's rhymes to the problem of dating, but the two essays together make a highly attractive case for a tenth-century date for the poetry of Cynewulf and for the revision Fulk makes in his own chronology of Old English poetry based on Conner's evidence set forth here.

J.B.T.]

Orality, Literacy, and Formulaic Theory

In "Oralità e traduzione—Riflessioni sulla cultura 'germanica' arcaica," *Teoria e pratica della traduzione nel medioevo germanico*, ed. Maria Vittoria Molinari et al. (Padua: Unipress, 1994), pp. 29–42, Marcello Meli sets out to show that "translation" is a valid concept even in oral culture. In demonstration of the principle as a macrotextual phenomenon, juxtaposing cosmogonic passages from the *Wessobrunn Prayer*, *Beowulf* (90–98), and *Völuspá*, he hypothesizes a process of translation in an oral setting connecting such texts. A microtextual example is the correspondence of poetic compounds in Germanic languages (e.g. OE *heofonrice* and *middangeard* beside Olcel. *himinríki* and *miðgarðr*). He argues that such resemblances may result not from a unified prehistoric *Dichtersprache* but from lexical diffusion emanating from certain unspecified, prestigious cultural centers. The probability of translation as a preliterate process is guaranteed by recitation in a court environment, by the social prestige of encomiastic and heroic

verse, and by the polyglossia attendant on the seminomadic conditions of early Germanic life, all of which was disrupted by the advent of manuscript culture. Other Old English texts considered briefly are *Genesis B* and the Alfredian Boethius.

Gail Ivy Berlin argues that the Anglo-Saxons employed two methods of committing texts to memory, the oral and the literate, in "Memorization in Anglo-Saxon England: Some Case Studies," in *Oral Tradition in the Middle Ages*, ed. W.F.H. Nicolaisen, Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies 112 (Binghamton: CEMERS, 1995), 97–113. The examples left to us, however, are not always readily categorizable under one or the other method. Among the lettered, the problem of memorization is often presented as involving practice in writing and reading along with oral recitation. Accounts of Ss. Godric and Leofgyth portray them as engaging in a great deal of rote memorization of scripture reinforced by oral iteration. Variation in the wording of Ælfric's three English versions of the pater noster, however, suggests he had "a more fluid notion of what could count as an adequately memorized text than we have at present" (p. 107). Among the unlettered, memorization depended upon listening, and in the case of Caedmon it appears that the oral poet did not need to retain more than a general sense of the memorized material. Yet lettered and unlettered memorizers (King Alfred as a boy and Caedmon are her examples of the latter) both "made use of or had access to writing as a first step in the formation of memory" (p. 113).

In the same volume, Jeremy Downes, in "Or(e)ality: The Nature of Truth in Oral Settings," pp. 129–44, begins with a relativist definition of truth and applies Graham Oddie's notion of most truth as legisimilitude ("conformity to the laws of the universe") rather than verisimilitude ("likeness to the 'whole truth' of every 'accidental fact'") to the differences between Unferth's and *Beowulf*'s accounts of the swimming contest with Breca. The two representations have a similar sequential order, but Unferth's truth centers on the competition between the two men, while *Beowulf* portrays the contest as one between men and sea. Truth is established from positions of power, which may comprise knowledge, rank, age or force; knowledge is *Beowulf*'s base of power when he reveals his familiarity with Unferth's sorry career, and so offers a more legisimilar account. In accordance with Walter J. Ong's dictum that in oral culture narrative must be memorable, *Beowulf* tells a better story than Unferth, describing the excitement of combat and creating a more "correct" oral performance by employing a "hero on the beach" typescene. Finally, the truth is often to be established by the use of a "trace," a device that ostensibly links the legisimilitude of an account to a verisimilar "fact." For example, Grendel's arm is proof of *Beowulf*'s victory. Similar devices in *Beowulf* are Grendel's head, the sword hilt, and the shield made all of iron.

Francesca Chiusaroli touches on some of the same themes as Berlin and Downes in her *Storia, memoria e conoscenza nell'Inghilterra medioevale: Dalla verità della parola all'autorità del testo scritto*, Episteme dell'Antichità e oltre 3 (Rome: Il

Calamo, 1995; pp. 428). In thirty-nine chapters she studies the transition from orality to literacy as represented in Old English literature, and she finds the effects of the change profound, pervasive, and dramatic. Part I, "The Period of Orality," deals almost exclusively with *Beowulf*, regarding it as the best available representative of prehistoric oral conventions. By virtue of its vocabulary and formulas the poem serves as a mine of evidence for her assertion that words were of extraordinary efficacy in such an oral culture. All knowledge was acquired orally; hence the prevalence of formulas based on the verbs *hýran* and *frinan*, the latter of which in particular folds together in its semantic development the processes of asking and learning by word of mouth. The poet who utters such formulas portrays himself not as a "maker" but as a conveyor of knowledge received orally. So, too, oral communication in *Beowulf* can be a complex process with a rigid set of protocols, as exemplified by the series of intermediaries the hero faces in approaching Hrothgar, and by the differences between his interactions with such go-betweens and with the king. The value of words is evident as well in the nature of public events (singing, mourning, boasting, giving royal leave) and in the way animals and inanimate objects are given voice. Singing is of particular importance, since it is not merely entertainment but serves as the means of conveyance for historical memory. Chiusaroli's boldest claims pertain to the relation of truth to orality. Because *dōm* depends upon the oral transmission of received opinions, figures such as heralds and poets are institutionally granted the status of truth-tellers, so that they "dictate and impose the rules of the true and the false, and no one dare question their authority" (p. 145). The advent of literacy as an epigraphic phenomenon (treated in Part II, "The Period of Writing") altered all that, transferring the truth value of orality to itself and associating the old poems with paganism, so that written sources arrogated to themselves the claims of memory to authority. The arrival of literacy was a true revolution, a complete break with the past: the original function of runes, she asserts (*pace* Griffiths, below), was arcane and mystical, so that they did not afford any type of true literacy. Under the new dispensation, then, runes degenerated into a literate game suitable for cryptograms, and even the meanings of *rūn*, *stæf*, and *writan* changed. The use of oral formulas such as those containing *hýran* and *frinan* in literate compositions is merely conventional—they appear even in the Blickling Homilies and the homilies of Ælfric—as they had lost their original function, and new, literate formulas, including *ūs secgað bēc*, arose beside them. The more prosaic nature of later poems is attributable to literate influence, since they derive their language and themes from homiletic literature in prose. Chiusaroli sees a general debasement of the word in literate culture, so that knowledge conveyed orally acquires the stigma of slander and deceit—*dōm* gives way to mere rumor. Only books, then, are trustworthy, and new formulas (e.g. *beorn bōca glāw*) arise to express the new realities. Part II closes with some close readings of three poetic types. The Chronicle poems illustrate a new

attitude that moves beyond the homiletic basis of the new poetry and weds history directly to verse. The riddles, too, though obviously a literate genre, recreate an aura of oral tradition as part of their mystery. Finally, *The Phoenix* exemplifies the truth value of writing for a literate poet, since he excises the most miraculous elements of his Latin source, treating Lactantius' poem as a documentary source to be explicated in the manner of any historical account.

Adam Brooke Davis' "Language as Affective Medium and as Modelling System: Anglo-Saxon Script Charms and the Condition of Magic," in *Schriflichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Ursula Schaefer, ScriptOralia 53 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993), 127–54, is an attempt to show that on the continuum of orality and literacy the Old English magical charms occupy a mediate position. Offering a brief account of human prehistory, he identifies string and bowls as inventions that define humanness, and he takes them as emblems of the oral phase of history, the former representing connection and the latter differentiating subject and object by defining human space. Anglo-Saxon medico-magic involves "bowl-making" in the sense that it aims to define a space in which healing may be performed, a space made familiar to us as the "magic circle." Davis examines several charms to show how they occupy a space on the oral/literate continuum in which "the textualization of white space, its correlation with semantic space, is . . . sporadic, incomplete, but most certainly underway" (p. 143). The development of medicine (a literate practice) and the demise of magic are not far removed in time from this point. The distinction Davis draws between pre-textual and textual periods in history may be captured, respectively, as an opposition between language as affective medium, in which "the magical mind does not divide speaker from speech, nor speech from the things spoken about," and as modeling system, in which textuality "employs the principles of visual redundancy to model space" (p. 146). Finally, Davis takes issue with E.G. Stanley's critique of the "search for Anglo-Saxon paganism," finding his views oblivious to their own cultural contingency.

Intertextuality and Culture Studies

T.A. SHIPPEY offers both wit and good sense about gnomes in "Miscomprehension and Re-Interpretation in Old and Early Middle English Proverb Collections," in *Text und Zeittiefe*, ed. Hildegard L.C. Tristram, ScriptOralia 58 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994), 293–311. Despite the canon wars and the stigmatization of ethnocentric readings of Old English literature, a genre as central to Anglo-Saxon thought as proverbs is still sadly neglected. Here Shippey reiterates and reinforces the argument he advanced in *Poems of Wisdom and Learning in Old English* (1976) that the use of gnomes in verse is often in disregard of sense and context. That is, poets tend (in E.A. Havelock's words) to a "total loss of objectivity" in the application of maxims, rating the truth value of gnomic utterances more highly than their contextual appositeness. He illustrates this principle with examples of Old English maxims that do not correctly translate their Latin source but

substitute different but related cultural values, for instance when the Latin *Distichs of Cato* advise the elderly to remember what it was like to be young and the Old English translator instead advises the old to share their wisdom freely. Thus, the gnomic value of a maxim seems to matter more than its accuracy as translation. The process of translation involves three steps (recognizing that a statement has gnomic intent, what that intent is, and what one's own cultural equivalent is), and at each step there is opportunity not only for Old English translators to go astray, but for modern readers to misunderstand, as several examples offered demonstrate. The same situation obtains in regard to Middle English wisdom texts, which evince a transition in the tradition, since they incorporate older, presumably oral maxims, but then very often misinterpret them, demonstrating the supersession of discrete, literate modes of thought. The two traditions differ in that the earlier is "oral, naive and prudential, the other professional, moral and self-interested" (p. 307). Such texts thus may reveal more about the nature of medieval literacy than those with which medievalists are typically preoccupied.

The puzzling thing about *Gísla saga* is why the hero chooses to admit to his guilt in the killing of Þorgrímr, albeit in a riddling *vísa*, in the hearing of the man's widow. As prolegomenon to addressing that mystery Joseph Harris examines the use of recondite styles in Old English and Old Icelandic verse in "Obscure Styles (Old English and Old Norse) and the Enigma of *Gísla saga*," *Mediaevalia* 19 (1996 for 1993), 75–99. The focus is solely on verse that is *intentionally* obscure (or seems likely to be so), a category that excludes *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Riming Poem* but includes some charms and riddles, *The Husband's Message*, and Cynewulf's runic signatures. The bulk of the article is devoted to Norse matters, especially to obscurantism in eddic and skaldic verse, to the place of *Gísla's* riddle within the structure of the saga, and to the apparent contradiction between realistic saga style and the riddling nature of the verses that the sagas contain. Harris shows how John Lindow's idea of an elite interpretive community for skaldic verse helps to make sense of *Gísla's* actions.

In a book that derives from a series of lectures given for a non-specialist audience at Oxford in 1994, *The Germanic Hero: Politics and Pragmatism in Early Medieval Poetry* (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon, 1996; ix + 188), Brian Murdoch studies the nature of the hero exclusively as it is presented in early Germanic verse. The heroes examined are mostly Continental and Scandinavian, but Byrhtnoth and Beowulf are also treated. Murdoch argues that it is the hero's sense of duty that is continually tested in heroic literature. In *Maldon* neither Byrhtnoth's *ofermōd* nor his men's desire for fame is of really central importance; what matters instead, and what amounts to the real test of heroic stature, is the obligation to keep faith and do one's duty. Fame (as accomplished by the poem itself) in return for prowess, rather than being the chief end of heroic accomplishments, is merely a gratifying consequence of them. Murdoch's analysis of *Beowulf* is at odds

with several orthodoxies at once. The two chief problems to be explained are the centrality of the monsters and the poem's "disjointed structure." The importance of the monsters resides in their status as a political threat. The first part of the poem, in fact, before the introduction of the hero, may be seen as a demonstration of the fragility of political structures, exemplified in the building of the Danish nation and the hall Heorot, followed by the havoc wreaked on both by Grendel. As for structure, Murdoch rejects moralizing interpretations that hang the structure of the poem on one or another virtuous theme: Unferth is neither the embodiment of discord nor an extension of Grendel's malice, the dragon's hoard is not cursed, and the final word of the poem does not attribute excess to the hero. Instead of critiquing heroic values, the poet focuses on such feats of political balance as Hrothgar and Beowulf maintained in their long reigns, providing their peoples the opportunity to live in "happily uninteresting times." Hence "the fulcrum upon which the whole work balances" is the unassuming group of verses "syððan Bēowulfe brāde rice / on hand gehwearf; hē gehēold tela / fiftig wintra . . ." (2207–9).

In *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 18 (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996; pp. ix + 212), Hugh Magennis surveys the images specified in the title and attempts a historicized reading of them by placing them in the context of the receptive textual community of the period in which the major poetic codices were copied. This he identifies as a monastic one but one also familiar with vernacular lore and traditions and accustomed to a societal structure built around lords in their halls. Hence the hall and the *burh/civitas* dominate the complex of Old English poetic images referring to community and perversions of it. Magennis provides a convenient chapter summary: "We begin with hall and feasting as cherished images of good life in the secular tradition of Old English poetry and in the related Old Norse tradition. This material provides the subject of ch. 2, which also examines attitudes to drinking and drunkenness in the literature. The third chapter focuses in particular on the highly suggestive and challenging quality of imagery of community as it appears in *Beowulf*; in this context, ch. 3 also returns to the theme of treachery and betrayal. Then follow two chapters looking at texts in which the imagery of hall society has a problematic significance. As described in ch. 4, transformations and alternative perspectives are evident in ironic images of hall life in secular poetry, but the imagery of community functions in a more complex way in those poems in which its significance appears altered or inverted. In ch. 5, the opposition between communal and personal values is explored, a theme not normally associated with Old English poetry but strikingly illustrated in two poems with female speakers, *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife's Lament*. The 'mythic' world of *Beowulf* is described in ch. 6, with the hall at its centre, surrounded by the threat of the wilderness. The other definitive feature of this mythic world is the sea, a symbol on the one hand of the unknown, on the other of both

separation and communication. In this chapter it is argued that aspects of the use of landscape in *Beowulf* strongly recall the *Aeneid* and it is also suggested that the concept of the *locus amoenus*, 'lovely place', as found elsewhere in Old English, as well as Latin, literature, can be read as present in the poem in inverted form. Chs. 7 and 8 examine aspects of the treatment of community in two types of Christian narrative poetry, biblical poetry and hagiography" (pp. 33–34). These two chapters focus respectively on *Genesis*, *Judith*, and *Daniel* and on *Juliana*, *Andreas*, and *Guthlac*, finding that communal images in the former but not in the latter are derivable from antecedent Latin traditions. Since Magennis regards the poetic texts he treats as undatable, he deals with their reception context rather than their production. But in the concluding chapter he turns to three datable late texts, the anonymous *Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, and *The Battle of Maldon*. He finds that Ælfric's version of the Seven Sleepers legend, unlike the anonymous one, is concerned less with community than with government and its responsibilities, as in Ælfric's other works. In *Brunanburh* the emphasis is on power and order, while in *Maldon* it is on the personal relationship between Byrhtnoth and his men, expressing community and solidarity against foreign aggression. The book, it should be noted, incorporates with minor changes Magennis' article "Treatments of Treachery and Betrayal in Anglo-Saxon Texts," summarized here last year.

Another thematic study by Magennis, "Occurrences of Nuptial Imagery in Old English Hagiographical Texts," *ELN* 33.4 (1996), 1–9, supports Stephen Morrison's contention that "Old English writers employ such imagery in the lives of virgin martyrs not because of an interest in the love which it ostensibly expresses but in order to portray the conflict between the saint and her enemies" (1), though he disputes Morrison's view that erotic details in Ælfric presage later tendencies in devotional literature. Ælfric in fact epitomizes Anglo-Saxon conservatism in regard to such imagery, even in his treatment of the *sponsa Christi* motif, since the erotic elements of it derive from Ælfric's sources. Attention is also given to nuptial images in the anonymous life of St. Margaret and Cynewulf's *Juliana*.

Gabrielle Knappe's *Traditionen der klassischen Rhetorik im angelsächsischen England*, *Anglistische Forschungen* 236 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1994; pp. xx + 573) is a study of the knowledge, application, and function of classical rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon England. In Part I (pp. 1–42), Knappe finds considerable development in rhetorical tradition, marking the "ars bene dicendi" of early antiquity (ca. A.D. 100) as the point of departure for late antique and early medieval traditions, and in England itself she distinguishes three periods, the age of Alfred and the eras before and after. From a survey of scholarship on the three periods Knappe concludes that it is reasonable to assume neither intensive study of antique rhetoric in pre-Conquest England nor ignorance of it, and especially not on the grounds of any assumed Christian distrust of the subject. Even in antiquity the mutual influence of rhetoric

and grammar on each other can be discerned, and for Anglo-Saxon England it is necessary to distinguish "rhetoric" in the earlier, purer sense and "rhetoric in grammar." Only the assumption of such a distinction can explain how Anglo-Saxons without the benefit of rhetorical study in its antique form managed to employ rhetorical strategies associated with such study. As argued by Martin Irvine in his 1982 doctoral dissertation, the grammatical model had usurped some of the functions of the other by late antiquity, so that we find a general displacement of antique rhetoric in the early Middle Ages. Part II (pp. 43–109) then aims to trace the weightiest developments of rhetorical study through late antiquity, augmenting and systematizing the chronological inventory of James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1974). Although there is nothing like unitary development, expressive aspects of rhetoric show increasing liberation from earlier constraints, with increased attention especially to *inventio* and *elocutio*, entailing the teaching of independent rhetorical figures in support of the latter. Literary structure displaced communication in the hierarchy of rhetorical concerns as the latter came to be associated more and more with writing, a development in accord with Christian purposes, which placed greater value on interpretation than on literary production, and so naturally valued grammar more highly than rhetoric in its earlier sense. Yet grammar inevitably absorbed elements of rhetoric, since the task of grammar became the preservation and understanding of the literary inheritance (Vergil, the Bible) and the justification of the style of Scripture. Part III (pp. 111–321) studies Anglo-Saxon manuscript remains, references to relevant texts, and works of instruction in order to present a picture of the place of classical rhetoric in the educational plans at various cultural centers in the three periods. Evidence for direct Old English familiarity with the antique tradition of Ciceronian rhetoric, and with late antique compendia, commentaries, and (for the most part) catalogues of schemes and tropes, is quite negative. Probably, though, Isidore of Seville's brief synopsis of rhetorical art in his *Etymologiae* and Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis* were known already in the age of Bede and Alcuin, as were the figures used by Cassiodorus in his *Expositio psalmorum*. The situation was not much different in Ireland and on the Continent. The Anglo-Saxons had no discoverable Christian antipathy to antique rhetoric, but they saw no occasion to suit its theories to their own pedagogic conditions. Bede's *Liber de schematibus et tropis* draws on Donatus' *Ars maior* III and on Cassiodorus—or, rather, on a handbook of rhetorical figures based on his commentary on the Psalms, a handbook for the existence of which Knappe finds evidence also in the Leiden Glossary—but it is firmly in the grammatical tradition, and cannot be called a rhetorical work. Alcuin is unlikely to have gained his knowledge of the antique rhetorical tradition while still at York. Bede's work was reintroduced to England, along with Remigius of Auxerre's commentary on it, after the disruptions of the first Viking onslaught, and a certain amount of study of rhetorical figures was a standard element of grammar

in the third period, as evidenced by Abbo of Fleury's *Quaestiones grammaticales*, Ælfric's grammar, and Byrhtferth's *Manual*. Knappe identifies the sources for these, showing that none of them reveals any direct access to rhetorical works in the antique tradition, and that all subordinate rhetorical study to larger grammatical aims. While Part III is concerned with the "theoretical adaptation" of classical rhetoric in England—that is, with English knowledge of the tradition—Part IV (pp. 323–467) examines the practical application of such knowledge. The aim of this portion of the book is thus quite a bit more conjectural, seeking evidence of the use of classical rhetoric (or the components of it incorporated into the Old English grammatical curriculum) in textual production, in both prose and native verse. The search is conducted under the headings of three rhetorical components, *elocutio*, *inventio*, and *dispositio*. In regard to the first, familiarity with classical rhetoric is especially clear in verse translations from Latin, including, according to Knappe, *Judith* and the works of Cynewulf, but also such an original composition as *The Dream of the Rood*. But Knappe also perceives such figures as anaphora, antistrophe, and paronomasia in the elegies and in heroic verse such as *Andreas*, *Beowulf*, *Brunanburh*, and *Maldon*, mixed with native rhetorical devices like litotes and kennings. The same mixture is observable in prose, where the use of rhetoric is tied to discursive function: Ælfric's aims in his homilies are exegetical, and he uses metaphor and stylistic figures, while Wulfstan's aims are hortatory, and he relies more on sound devices. In regard to *inventio* and *dispositio* Knappe distinguishes rhetorical formulas and motifs from structural and performance features. The use of prosopopoeia in *The Dream of the Rood* and of encomium in various compositions may be taken as evidence for study of Priscian's *Praexercitamina* in the Old English grammatical curriculum. Knappe studies several texts, including *Beowulf*, *The Seafarer*, and Alfred's preface to *The Pastoral Care*, to discern the possible influence of classical models of *dispositio*, but she concludes that such influence is unlikely. Closing this portion of the book, she examines the larger structural characteristics of some homilies, especially those of Ælfric, and finds that despite their adherence to Latin models, they do not show any remarkable influence of Ciceronian rhetoric, which would have been of severely circumscribed value to preachers. This is a well-constructed volume and easy to use.

In "Cynna gemyndig: Sitte und Etikette in der altenglischen Literatur," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 30 (1996), 19–59, Gabriele Müller-Oberhäuser takes issue with the primitivist view of Old English culture promulgated by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century cultural historians. Singling out Norbert Elias' 1939 view of West European civilization as a story of undisturbed progress with its twelfth-century origins in the elaborate forms of etiquette that attended the rise of chivalric culture, Müller-Oberhäuser sets out to discover whether in Old English literature "there was anything like 'courtliness' or 'etiquette', and if so, in what form, with what function" (p. 21). Before proceeding to the texts she offers an

anthropological and sociological account of court etiquette as a universal phenomenon with discrete historical expressions, an account to which she brings politeness-related elements of the work of Geoffrey Leech, Erving Goffman, and Florian Coulmas. Next she seeks evidence of especially lavish behavioral models in literary texts and attempts to show that texts like *Beowulf* and gnomic poems show a surprising degree of commonality in this regard. Poetic diction is rich with terms of politeness (*gedēfe*, *tela*, *cymlice*, etc.) and its opposite. In heroic verse the meadhall is the site of courteous behavior, and in view of Germanic attitudes toward the treatment of guests, Unferth's behavior in *Beowulf* is problematic (though Carol Clover's explanation of this as ritual/convention goes unremarked). Seating arrangements, a significant cross-cultural aspect of courtesy, are highlighted in several early medieval works—none is specifically addressed—and Wealhtheow's method of distributing mead and her role as adviser to Hrothgar mark a code of polite behavior. Müller-Oberhäuser lays emphasis on the oral context of the Danish court as a site where good conduct can be learned only by imitation, and she finds evidence of some of the same features of courteous conduct as those already mentioned in wisdom literature, which she divides into two types, fatherly advice (like the *Distichs of Cato*) and royal wisdom (as with *Solomon and Saturn*). Relying heavily on the views of Gunhild Zimmermann's *Four Old English Poetic Manuscripts* (summarized here last year), she argues that the surviving verse served an educational function in regard to manners in a society in which upward mobility was enabled by the changing conditions of the Danish invasions. The article appears to be intended for a non-specialist audience, as it assumes no prior knowledge of Old English literature.

M.J. Toswell's contribution to the Stanley Festschrift (as above), is "Tacitus, Old English Heroic Poetry, and Ethnographic Preconceptions" (pp. 493–507). She reiterates the standard argument for the unreliability of Tacitus's *Germania* as a source for understanding the Old English heroic code, attempting "to delineate the circumstances in which Tacitus created his short ethnography of the Germans, to consider when his information is trustworthy and when it is not, to review briefly the reception history of this document, . . . and to reconsider the question of how the *Germania* can be a useful lens to turn on the surviving poetry and prose of Anglo-Saxon England" (p. 493). The *Germania* is intended above all to instruct Tacitus' fellow Romans in right behavior—in battle, in public life, and within the family. Toswell points to archaeological evidence that contradicts Tacitus' description of the material conditions of early Germanic life (luxurious grave goods, iron-tipped weapons) and finds motivation for his misrepresentations in his didactic purpose. On the basis of parallels in Tacitus' other works she concludes that his descriptions in the *Germania* of the obligation to die by one's lord and of chiefs leading the way into battle are noble fictions, and everything he has to say about Germanic women is suspect because of his severe view of Roman women's behav-

ior. Only when his political biases are not obviously served by his account—for example in regard to *wergylde*—is he trustworthy. Finally she traces in brief how the book has served in turn the purposes of Romanticism, German nationalism, and Nazism.

Also in the Stanley Festschrift, in "The Idea of the 'Christian Epic': Towards a History of an Old English Poetic Genre" (pp. 342–61), Ivan Herbison "traces the origins and development of the idea of 'Christian epic' in Old English scholarship, discusses the implications of its use in criticism and its application to Old English poetry, and assesses its relevance and value as a generic term" (p. 342). He recounts the gradual acceptance of the conception of *Beowulf* as "native epic" in nineteenth-century German criticism and contrasts this with the way English critics (who at first tended to categorize all Old English compositions as romances) by and large preferred to think of the poem as having developed under the influence of Latin learning. Herbison finds Grimm responsible for the nineteenth-century consensus that secular epic preceded the Christian variety. The result was a critical habit of rummaging through Old English religious lyrics and narratives in search of Germanic antiquities. "Christian epic" as a genre was first recognized by Ettmüller, followed by a host of minor critical figures, so that the category was well established by the end of the last century. Yet the problem of defining the canon of "Christian epic" is a difficult one, since the genre may include scriptural narratives, versified hagiographies, and (according to some) those poems about Christ that contain narrative elements. The concept is thus nebulous, describing a collection of compositions that "are far from homogeneous in structure, content, tone, or thematic development" (p. 354). Finally Herbison traces the legacy of this nineteenth-century concept into twentieth-century criticism.

Antonio Bravo García and Pedro Gonzalo Abascal turn the tables on historical critics of the Robertsonian stripe in *Héroes y santos en la literatura anglosajona* (Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Oviedo, 1994; pp. 250), arguing that Ælfric's English saints (Alban, Oswald, Æthelthryth, Swithin, and Edmund) show many of the native Germanic qualities of Old English epic heroes. The Introduction aims to define hagiography as a genre, survey the Anglo-Saxon hagiographic remains in Latin and Old English, and establish a method of analysis on the basis of formal properties rather than didactic qualities. Hence the authors are interested first and foremost in characterization, which, though flat and static in these texts, combines older Germanic and Christian traits. Though the differences between heroic poetry and hagiography are admitted to be considerable, in terms of characterization they consist primarily in relative conformity to ancient pagan notions of heroism. Each genre shows the clear influence of the other on it, but heroic influence on hagiography is more marked than the reverse. The first chapter offers background information on Ælfric—his life, works, language, and prose style, along with a brief discussion of Ælfric manuscripts—and then each succeeding chapter takes up one quality of epic

heroes, exploring its manifestations alternately in heroic and hagiographical works. The desire for fame (Chap. 2) is of considerable importance in both genres, though for saints it is not an end in itself. But the miracles ascribed to the mediation of saints, in confirming the sanctity of their lives for future generations, are a variety of *dōm*. The pagan virtues of the good ruler are exemplified not just by *Beowulf*, Hrothgar, and Byrhtnoth, but by Ss. Edmund and Oswald, just as loyalty (Chap. 3) is demonstrated by Ss. Alban, Swithin, and Æthelthryth. The principle is also manifested in the loyalty of the saints to Christ and of the faithful to Christ's saints. The *comitatus*, with its bonds of loyalty, is figured in the saints' lives in two ways. God is the *pēoden* and the saints his *dugub*, whose deeds of loyalty are Christian works of piety. So also the saint has his/her followers, who receive benefits in the form of miracles, and the mass itself is a kind of banquet comparable to feasting in the meadhall. In Chap. 4 the authors revisit R.E. Kaske's theme of *sapientia et fortitudo*, examining *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon* to show that the two virtues intersect in the third virtue of prudence (the antithesis of pride), since bravery is not the same as fearlessness. The theme, they note, is not exclusively Christian in nature, but is rooted also in the Tacitean *comitatus*, and hence cannot be separated from considerations of loyalty. In the five saints' lives the theme is emphasized by means of typical Anglo-Saxon contrast between the saints' possession of these qualities and their opponents' contrary vices. They find wisdom and fortitude are perhaps best expressed in characters' attitudes toward death (Chap. 5). The two genres differ, though, in that belief in *wyrd* produces fatalism and tragedy at the epic hero's death, but optimism at the saint's death. Still, the saint resembles the epic hero by dying in pursuit of the good of her/his people. The volume is rounded out by texts (based on Skeat's edition) and Spanish translations of the five saints' lives. The same authors (in reverse order) offer an English-language version of the material of Chap. 4 in "*Sapientia et Fortitudo* in the Anglo-Saxon Epic Heroes and in Ælfric's English Saints," *SELIM* 3 (1993), 72–102.

In Christopher Grießhaber's *Godspelles Gifu: Das Evangelium der Gnade in den Gedichten Cynewulfs* (Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, 1996; pp. iv + 324), a 1995 University of Freiburg dissertation, he laments the nearly exclusive critical focus on the literary, allegorical, and typological qualities of Cynewulf's works and focuses instead on their theological content. The runic epilogues are, in his view, expressions of the poet's own religious experience and the characters of the wider narratives are reflections, interpretations, and corroborations of Cynewulf's personal engagement with his faith. Grießhaber's aim, moreover, is not simply to discern personal religious experience in the poems but to identify the relevance of that experience for present-day readers. He formulates three postulates at the outset: "(1) Old English poetry, and especially the Cynewulf canon, played a decisive role in the propagation of the faith and was essentially catechetical in orientation; (2) the poems at times exhibit certain aspects of

the theology of grace, to which Cynewulf gives literary form; and (3) the central point of faith for Cynewulf was a *personal* theology of grace in the context of the confession of sins, penance, and forgiveness" (p. 17). The book also is trifold in structure. Part I (pp. 25–87) offers cultural and religious backgrounds to the Anglo-Saxon period, covering the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain, the author's views on the relative Christianity or paganism of Old English verse, and Anglo-Saxon Church history in brief. Part II (pp. 89–204) mounts an argument for Grieshaber's interpretation of Cynewulf's purpose in the context of Old English catechesis, of the relations between prose and verse traditions, and of analogous aims in the homilies of Ælfric. A new proposed chronology of Cynewulf's works traces a didactic curriculum: *Elene* serves as an introduction to the dogmas of the faith, *Christ II* teaches about the central Christological tenets of the Resurrection and Ascension, and *Juliana* represents the saint as model of believer. The *Fates*, composed last, serves as an "imitatio-catalogue" and reveals Cynewulf himself in an apostolic function. Part III (pp. 205–89) focuses more specifically on the theology of grace, first in historical perspective (as represented in Scripture, in patristics, and particularly in the opposing views of Augustine and Pelagius), and then in the four poems. Here the author argues that the poems portray a spiritual and mystical journey and perhaps also a record of the author's spiritual development: *Elene* concerns conversion to the faith, the recovery of the cross corresponding to the Christian individual's discovery of the same; *Christ II* treats of the call to spiritual service; *Juliana* exemplifies the gift of firm belief; and in the *Fates* the poet discovers solace and hope. Each poem thus portrays an experience of salvation initiated by the grace of God, and in each the poet's personal experience of faith may be deduced from close examination of the runic signatures.

More by assertion than by addressing opposing views, Peter Erlebach, in "Germanic and Christian Elements in the Old English Elegies: A Typological Assessment," *Expedition nach Wahrheit: Poems, Essays, and Papers in Honour of Theo Stemmeler*, Anglistische Forschungen 243, ed. Stefan Horlacher and Marion Islinger (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 79–91, argues that the fatalistic mood of the Old English elegies is Germanic in origin, and the allegorical mode of some of them a later addition. *Wulf and Eadwacer* is the most conservative of the elegies in form and sentiment, and *The Seafarer* the least, with its fully developed *sensus spiritualis*. "The Christian homiletic interpretation, mostly crystalized in the second part or the ending of the elegies, would seem a logical continuation and a completion of the OE elegiac mood" (p. 86). This continuation in fact was almost inevitable, since Erlebach contends that "there was no radical difference between Germanic and Christian thought in the 6th and 7th centuries" (p. 86), and lists Christian texts of the early Middle Ages that would have appealed to the Anglo-Saxon penchant for elegy. Welsh elegies may have been a catalyst for the Old English ones, which he dates to the eighth century on thematic and stylistic grounds.

Thomas D. Hill offers a generic classification of saints' lives in "Imago Dei: Genre, Symbolism, and Anglo-Saxon Hagiography," in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1996), 35–50. He distinguishes "primary" and "secondary" lives, the former referring to texts that are primary witnesses to a saint's life and works, the latter to the "lives of men and women whose sanctity could simply be taken for granted by the author" (pp. 36–37). They may be subdivided on the basis of whether they are intended for liturgical use or private study, works of the former type being shorter and more readily comprehensible, those of the latter being more artistic in conception. Hill laments the relative literary neglect of these works in modern times, which he attributes to limited understanding of the genre's conventions, a situation he sets out to rectify by defining hagiography as sacral romance: like romances, saints' lives are ahistorical, infused with the supernatural, and unrealistic in terms of characterization. Hagiography is also comparable to medieval iconography, in that neither is wholly representational or abstract but portrays an image comparable to Neo-Platonic essence. Hagiography is also figural or typological, in the sense that "its narrative echoes certain specific biblical types and itself prefigures their fulfillment in the lives of the reader and (perhaps) in the drama of the last times" (p. 45). Finally, hagiography is emblematic narrative, a mode "in which inner experience, either psychological or spiritual, is reflected by the external events of the narrative" (p. 45). This is different from typology in that it does not relate two historical events but a biblical object and a general concept, as when the loaves of the multiplication are taken to stand for the word of God. Only by understanding such conventions can we appreciate the aesthetics of the genre.

After reminding us of the notion of the three estates of *laboratores*, *oratores*, and *bellatores* promoted by Ælfric and Wulfstan, Wilhelm G. Busse's "Sua gað ða lareowas beforan ðæm folce, 7 ðæt folc æfter," in *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter* (as above), pp. 58–106, poses, and proposes an answer to, the question "How did the [Benedictine] reformers themselves define their position in late Anglo-Saxon society by the use of the written (and then spoken) word, against the background of an alleged inequality of social function and ranks suggested by their own model of the three orders?" (p. 60). Busse confines his search for evidence to the English writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan, about which he makes two assumptions that he concedes are unprovable: these works were intended for public preaching rather than private contemplation, and the intended audience was aristocratic (lay, ecclesiastical, or both). These works furnish evidence for six theses in support of Busse's contention that the reformers saw themselves as occupying a privileged position: 1. spiritual leadership belongs to the teacher, the role the reformers identified as theirs, inherited from Christ through his apostles; 2. the precedence of teachers over other *oratores* and the members of other estates derives from a divine dictate to

teach; 3. similarly, the laity are obliged to be obedient to God's teachers; 4. what the reformers teach is superior to any other kind of wisdom because it is divine, being derived from Scripture and patristic exegesis; 5. only Benedictine reformers are qualified to be teachers, since only they have sufficient command of Latin, and hence of the book-learning on which true wisdom is based; and 6. the reformers' status is also bolstered by the reward appointed them in the next life. The reformers' repeated insistence on the primacy of the written word is evidence that the point was not yet fully established, and that they had to contend with the authority traditionally invested in oral transactions. *Deor*, *Widsith*, and *Elene* may be read as expressing this conflict between oral and literate subcultures. Another conflict resulted from the reformers' insistence on the expulsion of unreformed monks, since this encroached on aristocrats' control of proprietary monastic houses. Conflict with the aristocracy would also have resulted from the reformers' attitude toward kingship, which they likened to priesthood and distanced from the duties of *bellatores*. Such conflicts may have been "an essential cause of the more turbulent aspects of Æthelred's reign" (p. 97).

Bill Griffiths' *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Magic* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1996; pp. 245) does not advance a central thesis, but surveys supernatural subjects in a series of unnumbered, loosely associated chapters—hence the aggregative nature of the following summary—that tend to range far beyond the shores of Britain in search of evidence for Anglo-Saxon beliefs. Griffiths hypothesizes that originally the Anglo-Saxon pagan gods did not form a hierarchical pantheon in a coherent religious tradition comparable to that of the Olympians. Such a view of the deities was introduced by contact with Roman civilization and later reinforced by the Viking invasions. Instead, Anglo-Saxon paganism was "a mass of unorganized popular belief" (p. 22) in which the gods were perhaps not the chief elements. Worship of the gods is to be associated with the veneration of ancestors, since presumably Germanic deities were euhemerized forebears. Griffiths accordingly examines the evidence of inhumation and of literary accounts, especially in Scandinavian sources, in regard to the role of the deceased in human affairs. Elves and the like have no connection with ancestors, but serve some of the same functions as the pagan gods. Medicine is closely associated with magic: some diseases were thought to be caused by elves and their ilk, and prayers and charms were appropriate treatment with or without herbs or surgical procedures. In agriculture, too, due to ignorance of climate patterns and diseases, religious rites and processions played a significant role. A particularly salient feature of Anglo-Saxon pagan thought is resignation to a universe governed by chance rather than divine providence, a concept best expressed in the idea of impersonal *wyrd*. Griffiths believes that the rationality of early Christianity has been overvalued, and that the claim to worth of paganism as a logical system has been silenced in both ancient and modern times, in the latter case as the result of an unreasoned desire to

see ourselves in the intellectual climate of the Christian period, especially the tenth and eleventh centuries. Bede is subjected to a particularly pointed critique in an attempt to demonstrate primitive aspects of his thought. There follows a survey of the very small number of direct references in surviving texts to magical practices, such as sacrificing to demons, shouting during eclipses of the moon, placing children on the roof or in an oven, and maiming the equivalent of voodoo dolls. Women were particularly associated with augury, and oddments found in early graves may be amulets belonging to the seeress' craft. In the Anglo-Saxon period, applied science is hardly distinguishable from magic: both prescribe a practical line of action, and demand trust from the uncomprehending. Anglo-Saxon science comprises astronomy/astrology (primarily in the form of celestial portents such as comets and eclipses) and calendar construction, which may have had a distinct character before Roman models were adopted. Divination has several avatars, pertaining to dreams, lots, and runes. The last are not inherently magical, but may assume magical functions when used in sortilege, of which Griffiths provides literary examples. The conversion presumably altered attitudes toward animals, since Christianity espouses a particular chauvinism in regard to animal life, regarding humans as the only creatures with souls. Griffiths doubts whether Anglo-Saxons had a concept comparable to the Icelandic *fylgja*, though they apparently believed in shape-shifting. Animals certainly played a role in divination, whether they were dissected or merely encountered on a journey. Finally, Old English poetry, with its repetitions and alliteration, has an incantatory effect, so that the metrical charms may represent one of the oldest forms of Germanic verse. Nearly half the volume is devoted to presenting texts and translations of charms, auguries, and scientific tracts; whether the texts are edited from manuscript (which seems unlikely) or from existing editions is not specified.

Building on an argument of Roberta Frank in regard to *Beowulf* and the Sutton Hoo treasure, Elizabeth M. Tyler sets out to show in "Treasure and Convention in Old English Verse," *NeQ* n.s. 43 (1996), 2–13, that "the prevalence of treasure in Old English verse is a feature of the genre of poetry just as such stylistic phenomena as formulas, variation, and kennings" (2). Even though gold was scarce by the beginning of the eighth century, up to the Conquest verse continues to offer gold as the paradigmatic treasure, and there is surprisingly little mention of the silver on which the Anglo-Saxon economy was really based. So, too, weapons are described as treasure in verse but not in prose, and poetic kings, unlike real ones, are called ring-givers. Tyler concludes that poetry, though often treated otherwise, is a poor source for historical understanding about the post-conversion nobility and their way of life. This article seems to be derived from Tyler's 1994 Univ. of Oxford doctoral thesis, "The Collocation of Words for Treasure in Old English Verse," *Index to Theses* 45 (1996), 1301, which examines the deployment of the words *maðm*, *hord*, *gestrēon*, *sinc*, and *frætwe* in verse as a study of stylistic

constraints and rhetorical features relevant to the question of poetic convention and originality.

The number of North American dissertations completed in the "General and Miscellaneous" category seems to grow each year despite the worsening crisis in academic employment. The dissertations in this category alone outnumber the North American positions advertised for Anglo-Saxonists. A brief summary follows. Susan Marie Kim, in "Monstrous and Bloody Signs: The 'Beowulf' Manuscript," 1996 diss. Univ. of Chicago, *DAI* 57A (1996), 2030–31, is concerned with the problem of identity in the five texts of this manuscript "as it is established through both internal and external difference, or alienation. The difference is between the human and monstrous, but also, internal to human identity, between the self represented in language, which demands dislocation from presence, and the self understood as presence, as the body." Drawing on anthropological theories of conflict and gift-exchange, Heather Suzanne Barkley, in "Exchange and Ritualized Violence: Cattle Raiding and the Spoils of Battle in Early Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Literature," 1995 diss. Yale Univ., *DAI* 57A (1996), 205, argues that the violence involved in the exchange of women, cattle raiding, and the plundering of spoils is ceremonial, an element necessary to a culture's self-definition. The Old English texts treated are cattle-theft charms, *Beowulf*, and *Genesis B*. After reviewing patristic and recent critical views on dreams and indexing all relevant vocabulary in the Old English corpus, Antonia Jane Harbus, in "Dreams in Old English Literature," 1994 diss. Univ. of Toronto, *DAI* 57A (1996), 1610, provides close analyses of poetic accounts of dreams in *Daniel*, *Genesis A*, *Andreas*, *The Dream of the Rood*, *The Wanderer*, and *Riddle 39* to establish the characteristics of Old English dream phenomenology. References to dreams in prose are examined more selectively. In "The Paradox of the Mystical Text: Immanence and Transcendence in Medieval English Literature," 1994 diss. The Claremont Graduate School, *DAI* 55A (1995), 2382–83, Charles M. Jenkins examines Anglo-Saxon mysticism in the form of runes, riddles, and charms, and focuses in particular on the poems of *Cædmon* and *Cynwulf* as mystical texts, the latter expressing transcendental themes in runic form in the signatures. The paradox of the title refers to the textual expression of ineffable experience. In "The Aesthetics of Time and the Ideology of Eternity in Old English Christian Poetry," 1994 diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, *DAI* 56A (1995), 946, Laura Ellen Renick situates *The Menologium*, *Christ I*, *Exodus*, *Judgment Day I*, and *The Order of the World* in a meditative, liturgical context in order to read the poems as Anglo-Saxon monks would. Her particular interest is in how a monastic context would have influenced readers' perception of time as a nonlinear experience. In "The Private Poetry of the 'Exeter Book'," 1995 diss. Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, *DAI* 56A (1996), 2674, Katherine Emma Wicks classifies *Deor*, *The Ruin*, *The Wanderer*, *The Wife's Lament*, *The Husband's Message*, *The Seafarer*, and *Resignation* as "private poetry" expressing "the inward spiritual experience of a single

person," as opposed to "the generally accepted concerns and values of society." The private nature of the works stems in part from their relation to patristic traditions of meditation and exegesis. The Old English texts treated in Insung Lee's "Tradition of Christian Sea Symbolism in Medieval English Poetry and Milton," 1995 diss. Oklahoma State Univ., *DAI* 56A (1996), 3594–95, are *Beowulf* and *The Seafarer*. Lee examines sea imagery in the light of its biblical and patristic uses and demonstrates its continuing vitality in English literary tradition.

Gender Studies

SURPRISINGLY, no studies on gender in the "General and Miscellaneous" category were published this year, but two dissertations were completed. In "Gender Pairs: Gender Construction in Anglo-Saxon Art and Poetry," 1996 diss. Loyola Univ. of Chicago, *DAI* 57A (1996), 1129, Mary Frances Dockray-Miller explores the unacknowledged violence required to keep the feminine subordinate as presented, first, in *The Dream of the Rood*. Disruption of the paradigmatic binary is evident, however, in the representations of Adam and Eve, textual and graphic, in the *Cædmon* Manuscript. Dockray-Miller also studies the Virgin in *Advent* and on the Ruthwell Cross, along with Judith in the *Beowulf* Manuscript, since these characterize a maternal gender performance that also problematizes the outlines of the male/female opposition. Emma B. Hawkins argues, in "Gender, Power, and Language in Anglo-Saxon Poetry," 1995 diss. Univ. of North Texas, *DAI* 56A (1996), 3118, that power in Old English texts is associated not with sex but with gender, so that masculine-coded language pertaining to honor, independence, verbal acuteness, etc., as well as feminine-coded terms (generally opposites) can be associated with either sex in a fluid matrix in which genders easily reverse back and forth. The texts examined are *The Dream of the Rood*, *The Wanderer*, *The Husband's Message*, *The Wife's Lament*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and *Beowulf*.
R.D.F.

b. Individual Poems

Cædmon's Hymn

In "Poetic Inspiration and Prosaic Translation: The Making of *Cædmon's Hymn*" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*. 'Doubt Wisely': *Papers in Honour of E.G. Stanley*, ed. M.J. Toswell and E.M. Tyler [London and New York: Routledge], 402–22), Andy Orchard aims to "illustrate the ways in which the *Hymn* and Bede's story of *Cædmon's* inspiration both represent a blending of traditions, both native and imported, of precisely the sort that is the hallmark of Anglo-Saxon culture" (402). Orchard observes that Bede sometimes echoes Scripture in narrating the story of *Cædmon*. Bede's statement that *Cædmon* became a poet "non ab hominibus neque per hominem," for example, is borrowed from Paul's statement on his becoming an apostle (Gal. 1:1). Orchard also notes similarities between Bede's account of the

inspired Cædmon and the inspiration claimed by some Christian Latin poets, most notably Aldhelm in the preface to his *Enigmata*, and suggests that "Bede has somehow 'Latinised' a native tale" (411). Certainly Bede literally Latinized the hymn, translating it into Latin instead of quoting the OE. Some of Bede's Latin phrases, Orchard points out, are scannable as hexameters. Bede's apparent wish "to lend his version a 'poetic' flavour" (413) may help explain a controversial variant in the hymn: although the earliest OE texts of the hymn have *uerc* as the subject of *scylun*, most later texts insert *we* as the subject, demoting *uerc* to a direct object: "The intrusive *we* 'we' which occurs in some versions of the *Hymn* could likewise be explained as an addition influenced by Bede's use of the first person plural phrase *Nunc laudare debemus* 'now we must praise', which, in turn, he may have included as a poetic rendering of the third person plural *Nu scylun bergan*, sanctioned by the usage of the Psalms, purely because it scans better as the cadence or ending of a rhythmical hexameter line: the 'correct' rendering, *Nunc laudare debent*, would not" (415–16).

Orchard sees Bede's story of Cædmon and the hymn as embodying the shift from secular vernacular traditions to Christian Latin learning. Similarly, Deborah VanderBilt, in "Cædmon and the Translated Word: Orality, Textuality, and Authority" (*Mediaevalia* 19 [1996 for 1993], 299–317), finds that Bede's story of Cædmon and his Latin translation of the hymn, the vernacular versions of the hymn, and the OE translation of Bede all "illuminate early medieval approaches to texts and conceptions of authority associated with texts. Cædmon's *Hymn* is a site where the interaction between Latin and Old English leaves visible traces, where conceptual differences between the two language systems in regard to authority, community and tradition produce this multiplicity of texts and contexts" (300). According to VanderBilt, Bede's aim in rendering the poem into Latin was to render it universal and permanent. Further, he narrated Cædmon's life as hagiography to direct his readers away from the secular and towards the divine. Turning to the OE translation of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VanderBilt describes the influence of orality. "Whereas Bede completely subsumes the narrative into his own voice, the translator maintains a distance from his source, a posture whereby he is a listener to the text which speaks to him. . . . The words of the text are perceived as in some way still emanating from Bede, the textual, authorial voice. The translator does not take them over into himself; they remain speaking to him, and he interacts with them" (308). The translator's attitude toward Bede's work, as VanderBilt explains it, is something of a paradox. The translator reveres Bede's *auctoritas* yet by occasionally adding his own comments invokes the authority of vernacular tradition. Bede's elevated treatment of Cædmon may have fostered the translator's willingness to intervene. "The importance of Cædmon as a transitional figure between secular and religious vernacular poetry noted by many scholars is matched by the importance of Bede's acceptance of Cædmon into the realm of writing and

text; Bede may have as much to do with the subsequent history of Old English poetry as Cædmon himself" (311).

Bede's Death Song

In "Bede's Sterbelied" (*Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch*, 37, 9–30), Alfred Schopf first reviews basic background on Bede, discusses the manuscript tradition of the text, and surveys previous scholarship on the poem. Attributing a riddle-like character to *Death Song*, Schopf seeks to elucidate the syntax by presenting a detailed diagram (15) and to clarify the diction by offering a translation: "Vor der Zwangsfahrt wird niemandem mehr Wissen zuteil als nötig sein mag, um vor seinem Hingang mit Sorge zu fragen, was seiner Seele nach dem Tode als gute oder böse Tat zugerechnet werden wird" (20). "Zwangsfahrt" is Schopf's rendering of OE *neidfærae* (alternately *neodfære* or *neodfere*), which he takes in reference to the departure of the soul at death, not the journey of the soul after death. The "Wissen" that none may have too much of before death—Bede's *naenig uuiurthit // thonscnotturra / than him tharfsie // to ymbhyccgannae / aer his hiniongae*—Schopf understands as Christian learning, especially knowledge of Scripture. "Gute oder böse Tat"—Bede's *godes æththa yfles*—Schopf interprets in reference to the particular judgment of the soul after death, not to the good or evil one does in life. Schopf's analysis is reasonable (if not terribly surprising). Moving on to Cuthbert's narrative of Bede's demise, Schopf distinguishes three phases: in the first, Bede, although ill, is cheerful, his students gathered round him; in the second, Bede's mood darkens—this is the immediate context of *Death Song*; in the third phase, Bede's hope flames afresh and he knows renewed faith in God's goodness. Considering Cuthbert's account as hagiography, Schopf points out various parallels with the death stories of other holy men (including Christ). Finally, he includes as an appendix Cuthbert's *Epistola de obitu Bedae*.

Genesis A

In *Genesis A* 982b–95a the poet describes the slain Abel's blood as soaking the ground and bringing forth the tumescent fruit of evil. "The image of sin as a branching tree is, of course, a commonplace in early Christian literature . . ." (10), writes Charles D. Wright in "The Blood of Abel and the Branches of Sin: *Genesis A*, *Maxims I* and Aldhelm's *Carmen de uirginitate*" (*ASE* 25, 7–19 + plate). "Yet it seems inappropriate, after all, that a crop of evil should be watered and fructified by Abel's blood. . . . One would think that the blood of the first martyr would engender only good fruit . . ." (10). Wright notes, however, that the same motif occurs in *Maxims I* 192–99 and argues that the most probable source for both passages is Aldhelm's *Carmen de uirginitate* 2721–29, which, in turn, may have been inspired by the legend that the earth bore thorns from Abel's blood. The argument is persuasive and learnedly pursued. The picture from the OE *Heptateuch* (BL Cotton Claudius B. iv, fol. 8v) that Wright discusses as another instance of the theme is not precisely parallel, how-

ever, since here Abel's blood simply spurts upon a tall, flourishing plant. (This raises the question of how an artist might unmistakably illustrate the theme. It would require, I should think, two panels.)

Genesis A and B

In "Envelope Patterns in *Genesis A* and *B*" (*Neophilologus* 80, 465–78), Colette Stévanovitch finds that the *Genesis A* poet "constantly reshapes the [scriptural] text, displacing, adding or suppressing verses to convert many episodes or verse paragraphs into envelope patterns" (465). Sometimes an envelope pattern serves to enhance structure, as when the poet rounds off the episode of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt by depicting his departure in terms echoing his arrival (1844–45, 1873–76a). At other times the poet employs an envelope pattern for emphasis. For example, in saying that Abraham slept with Hagar, he stresses that Abraham acted according to Sarah's advice (*idese larum* 2234b, *bryde larum* 2236b). The *Genesis B* poet, not committed to paraphrasing Scripture, uses envelope patterns with greater freedom and complexity. In lines 368–88, for example, he assigns Satan a speech in which "the circular structure reflects Satan's hopeless position as he tries to escape reality through chimerical dreams of vengeance, only to find himself back at the starting-point, the acknowledgement of his hopelessness" (470). Again and again, the poet uses "interlocked envelope patterns" to unveil chiastic coils of evil: in the tempter's crow of triumph (728b–55a), in the tempter's temptation of Eve (551b–59a), in Eve's false vision of God enthroned (600b–09a), and in Eve's temptation of Adam (657a–83). Stévanovitch also argues that the poem as a whole is structured as an envelope pattern, with the account of man's happiness in paradise (part one) and the account of his fall (part three) enveloping the story of Satan's fall (part two). In turn, the "third part mirrors that of the whole poem: in both cases the outer rings deal with man's obedience and then disobedience, and the change from one to the other is to be explained by the central part, describing the disobedience of another character (Lucifer or Eve) who will tempt Adam and bring about his fall" (473). All this is enlightening. However, in arguing that the *Exodus* poet evidently knew *Genesis A* because, like the *Genesis A* poet, the *Exodus* poet employs an envelope pattern featuring *micel*, Stévanovitch pushes the envelope a bit much.

Genesis B

JANET SCHRUNK ERICKSEN, in "Lands of Unlikeness in *Genesis B*" (*SP* 93, 1–20), maintains that throughout the poem

the poet uses the theological concept of unlikeness to represent the difference between sinfulness and innocence and to describe the major characters' shifting relationships to God. Unlikeness is mentioned each time a character sins or contemplates sin. This repetition connects theological and narrative systems at work in the poem, linking each character's perception to the concept of the *regio dissimilitudinis* popularized by Augustine. In *Genesis B*, the metaphor of unlikeness marks the increased spiritual distance from God immediately resulting from Satan's, Eve's, and Adam's sin. (1–2)

In pursuing the point, Ericksen (for some reason) invokes

Gérard Genette's concept of *focalization*, a Frenchified way of saying "point of view," and finds that in *Genesis B* the story is communicated sometimes by the narrator, who sees more than the characters, and sometimes by the characters, each limited to his or her own vision. Fallen from grace, Satan laments how *ungelic* his new home is from heaven (356b). In paradise the tree of good is much different from the tree of evil. "Næs se wæstm gelic!" says the narrator (466b). In rejecting the tempter's command to eat from the tree of evil, Adam refuses because the tempter does not look *gelic* an angel (538b). Turning to Eve, the tempter assures her he is not *gelic* a devil (587b). Eve eats. As she experiences a demon-inspired vision, the tempter tells her that things now appear *ungelic* they did before (612b). Eve affirms to Adam that the evil fruit is not *gelic* anything else on earth (681b). Adam eats also. He also sees things anew, saying that heaven is not *gelic* the hellfire he beholds (795a). Eve and Adam, like Satan, now live in a land unlike God's but for them, unlike for Satan, the future holds hope. "Satan is irreparably in the land of unlikeness, while Adam and Eve can, like Augustine, dwell in the land of unlikeness and still restore their own likeness to God through penance" (20).

In "Old English *swefn* and *Genesis B* line 720" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, as above, 157–74) Antonina Harbus first focuses on the phrase *deaðes swefn*—referring to the forbidden fruit Adam received from Eve—"the only instance in Old English poetry of *swefn* apparently meaning 'sleep'" (158). Harbus takes the occasion to survey all one could dream of knowing of *swefn* and related forms in a wide range of contexts, then turns again to its employment in *Genesis B*:

The use of *swefn* elsewhere in the Old English corpus, particularly in the poetry, suggests that the word typically connoted 'dream'. The etymologically primary meaning 'sleep' is implied only when *swefn* is a gloss to Lat. *sonnus* 'sleep'. How then, can we account for the phrase *deaðes swefn* in *Genesis B*? The sleep of death is a common motif in classical, biblical, and patristic sources. It is also found in other Old English texts. Remarkably, on the three occasions when this motif is invoked, it is expressed as *deaðes slep*, showing that this phrase, not *deaðes swefn*, was the idiomatic choice. We are left with the inescapable conclusion that in *Genesis B*, *deaðes swefn* connotes 'dream of death'. (167)

Consideration of the OS cognate, *sweban*, reinforces the finding since in its three extant instances the term also seems to mean 'dream,' which "suggests that the idea 'dream of death' might have been inherent in the Old Saxon original and retained in the Old English transliteration" (167). Harbus speculates that "the incongruent signals generated by the usual restrictive sense [of *swefn* as] 'dream' and the immediate context of *swefn* [where we expect the sense 'sleep'] produce a paradox within the text, and one, we can only assume, which was purposefully chosen" (169). I see no reason to assume that the translator was being purposefully paradoxical. If the OS text had *sweban*, meaning 'dream,' and if the OE translator construed *sweban* as *swefn*, elsewhere in OE verse restricted to the sense 'dream,' it looks to me like another instance of the OE translator's choosing a literal rather than an idiomatic

rendering. Our problem need not mean his paradox..

Also concerned with the question of translating from OS into OE is Anna Maria Guerrieri, who, in "Adamo nella Babele germanica: un caso tra teoria e prassi della traduzione" (*Medioevo e Rinascimento* n.s. 2 [1991], 1–17), begins with general reflections on preserving "la 'voce' del testo" (3). Following Gianfranco Folena, she distinguishes between "vertical" translating, translating a Latin work into a daughter language, and "horizontal" translating, translating a work from a vernacular language into a sister language, as in the case of *Genesis B*. Guerrieri prints the lines of the OS *Genesis* in parallel with the corresponding lines of the OE poem and discusses similarities and differences: the translator often preserves the original enjambment and often gives a word for word rendering of the OS, at times going so far as to write a kind of Old Saxon Old English, yet he also departs from the OS by reducing the number of syllables in a line and on occasion substitutes an OE formula for an OS phrase. The poetic tension between the OS and OE yields a kind of creative textual conservation, made possible by the fact that the Saxons and Anglo-Saxons shared a basic Christian Germanic culture.

Exodus

IN "Lucano nell'*Exodus* antico inglese" (*Neophilologus* 80, 617–38), Enza Serrentino argues that Lucan's *De Bello Civili* (also known as *Pharsalia*) likely served the *Exodus* poet as a source for lines 447–515, describing the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. Serrentino assembles copious evidence that Lucan's epic was known well in medieval Western Europe, including Anglo-Saxon England. She then arranges parallels between *DBC* and *Exodus* in six overlapping categories: blood, weapons, the vapor of death ("Il Vapore dei Morti"), sea-death, sea-storm, and the representation of the sea. Although most of the parallels claim interest, they are convincing in neither part nor whole. For example, under the category of blood, Serrentino cites *Exodus* 477, "Wæs seo hæwene lyft heolfre geblanden," and *DBC* II, 220, "sanguine caeruleum torrenti dividit aequor." At first blush the parallel looks promising: each poet speaks of something blue mingled with blood. For the *Exodus* poet it is the blue sky. For Lucan, however, it is the blue sea. (A torrent of blood from men slain on land pours into the water.) Again, under the category of sea-death, Serrentino cites *Exodus* 513, "þa mægenþreatas meredeað geswealh," and *DBC*, II, 663–64, "omnia pontus haurit saxa vorax montisque inmiscet harenis." The *Exodus* poet describes sea-death as swallowing the Egyptians. Lucan describes the sea as swallowing boulders thrown into it at Caesar's orders in an effort to block Pompey's escape. (A much better parallel with the image in *Exodus* is close at hand: Heb. 11:29: "Fide transierunt mare Rubrum tanquam per aridam terram: quod experti Aegyptii, devorati sunt.") Serrentino cites the present writer as believing that the *Exodus* poet used Avitus's *De Transitu Maris Rubri* as a source. That is correct. As with *DCB* and *Exodus*, there are many differences in context among the parallels between the

DTMR and the OE poem. Both Christian poets, however, give versions of the same scriptural story; they are on the same page. That is not the case with Lucan and the author of OE *Exodus*.

Judith

MARTINA HÄCKER's "The Original Length of the Old English *Judith*. More Doubt(s) on the 'Missing Text'" (*Leeds Studies in English*, 27, 1–18) is a carefully executed essay arguing that the received text of the poem is virtually complete, that probably "no more than five lines are missing at the beginning" (12). There are two main reasons for holding that the poem was originally much longer than we have it: first, the text is divided by section numbers—X, XI, and XII—implying that sections I–IX are missing; second, the scriptural book of *Judith* is much longer than the tale told in the surviving lines of the OE poem. Häcker challenges the first reason by citing Kevin S. Kiernan's finding that the three section numbers in *Judith* are not in the hand of the scribe who copied the text, by suggesting that the numbers were added by a scribe writing Carolingian minuscule or one writing fifteenth- or sixteenth-century humanistic script, and by citing Rosemary Woolf's alternate arguments that the numbers may have been inserted by a scribe who estimated the amount of material lost based on the length of the scriptural story or that the numbers may be a continuation of enumerated preceding material not belonging to *Judith*. Häcker challenges the second reason in favor of a long poem by maintaining that the extant text of *Judith* shows selective use of the scriptural story: a poet selective within an episode may well have selected *only* an episode as the subject of his poem. (In arguing the point, Häcker holds that *ælfscinu*, applied to *Judith*, does not mean 'beautiful as an elf' but 'beautiful and holy,' and that, unlike in the scriptural story, "Old English *Judith*'s beauty seems natural rather than artificial" [8]; Häcker may have fortified her point by reference to Kathleen Parker's "Is the Old English *Judith* Beautiful?" *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*, sezione germanica, n.s. 2.1–3 [1992], 61–77; reviewed—likely too late for Häcker's use—in *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 36–37.) Häcker also contends that little is lost from *Judith* because what she calls key words balance each other at the beginning of the poem as we now have it and at the end: *tweode* at lines 1 and 345b and *geleafan* at lines 6b and 344b. She further believes that *miltse*, at line 349b, was also used a few lines before the first extant line of the poem since *miltse* occurs in conjunction with *geleafan* in *Judith*'s prayer before she decapitates Holofernes (83–97a). Overall, Häcker (like others) makes a good case. I find it hard to believe, however, that the section numbers were inserted by a scribe who simply guessed at the amount of material lost before the first extant lines or that *Judith* was part of a group of poems whose sections were numbered seriatim; that only a half dozen lines served as the introduction to an otherwise elaborate heroic poem in various ways comparable to *Elene*; that the occurrence of two words, *tweode* and *geleafan*, at the beginning of the poem as we have it and at the poem's end, can bear the

narrative freight with which Häcker burdens them. In brief, I find it easier to believe in a once full-bodied *Judith* than in a *Judith* now missing only the top of its head.

In a wide ranging article, Paul de Lacy considers "Aspects of Christianisation and Cultural Adaptation in the Old English *Judith*" (NM 97, 393–410). After considering early recensions of the story and their background, de Lacy contrasts the Jewish author's beliefs with the Christian poet's: for example, the Christian poet depicts God as more intimately involved with the human world, belittles the value of earthly goods, describes Judith as praying to the Trinity, introduces the concepts of heaven and hell, and stresses the doctrine of "being saved by faith" (397—a formulation that strikes me as glaringly anachronistic). In Christianizing the story, the poet also simplifies the action by omitting reference to Jewish rituals and customs and culture, by reducing the number of characters, and by eliminating subplots. Without discussing the section numbers in the text, de Lacy speculates that about two hundred lines are lost before the beginning of *Judith* as we have it. The poet also introduces many changes in adapting the story to his own culture: he amplifies the feasting scene, eradicates the tactics of deception in the battle and beheading episodes, and demonizes Holofernes and his army. The last point leads de Lacy to consider the question of allegory in *Judith*.

It is evident that a consistent allegory cannot be applied to the interpretation of *OEJ*. However, this does not absolutely preclude elements of the abstract or allegorical. Holofernes does have demonic attributes, Bethuliah does have a 'holy-city' type aspect, and Judith does portray ideals of Christian womanhood. However, it is inadvisable, and soon evident that to extend these interpretations too far results in anomalies. . . . I differ from previous scholars in proposing that the significant processes which motivated the Anglo-Saxon poet to alter events are Christianisation and cultural adaptation. These offer a far more valid account of the imagery and structure in the work than any allegorical interpretation. (407)

De Lacy's article is an odd amalgam of the sophisticated and the naïve. His learning in Jewish, Greek, and OE traditions is ample and apparent. He is not, however, the first to discuss "Christianisation and cultural adaptation" in the poem even if earlier scholars did not use the terms. Many of the differences he notes between the biblical book and OE poem have been noted before, he does not acknowledge that the allegorical elements in the poem are a way of Christianizing the narrative, and he sets up a strawman Dracula—allegory as an absolute—into which he gleefully pumps homemade silver bullets. "To extend too far" any interpretation "results in anomalies." No one has claimed that allegory explains everything in *Judith*. It is but one level and works to the same end as the historical and tropological levels, favored by de Lacy. By setting up such general categories as "Christianisation and cultural adaptation," de Lacy defines an approach in which, in general, he cannot be wrong. But his own specific arguments are not nearly as novel or apodictic as he imagines.

Paris Psalter

M.J. TOSWELL begins "Awended on Engliscum Gereorde": Translation and the Old English Metrical Psalter" (*Transla-*

tion and Lit. 5.2, 167–82) by delineating the importance of translation in Anglo-Saxon England from Latin into OE, then tightens focus on the *Paris Psalter* and "the status of the Psalms as a sacred text; the potential for cultural shift from a Hebrew original by way of several translations into an Anglo-Saxon context; and the very restrictive poetic form into which the translation is made" (171). In discussing the Psalter as a sacred text, Toswell notes that, to judge by the internal evidence, "The translation techniques of one Old English poet show an intelligent and unafraid approach to the Latin text of the Psalms . . . [T]he metrical psalter indicates a desire to take the text to heart, to devote time and energy to its rendition and to its study" (179). On the question of cultural shift, Toswell remarks that, although there is occasionally "some overlay of vernacular tradition" in the *Paris Psalter* (174), "The disjunctive notion of translation, the idea that a translation was not an extension or an explication of the original but a new version, or an alternative version, does not seem to have appeared in this period" (176). In treating the *Paris Psalter* as a metrical translation, Toswell details how the poet construes the Psalmist's frequent plea for mercy, "Miserere mei dominus," at half a dozen places, finding that "the psalter poet, while willing to repeat a locution, was thoroughly conscious of the individual context of each act of translation. The translations vary in length, in metre, and in vocabulary after the first few versions of the phrase" (178). (A point Toswell does not ponder is that the Latin translated in some of her examples is not simply "Miserere mei dominus" but sometimes a longer text. Little wonder that the OE poet's method varies with the context.) Finally, Toswell briefly discusses ME and Renaissance translations of the Psalter and quotes John Donne's tribute to the Sidneys' rendering. Donne says, in part:

The songs are these, which heavens high holy Muse
Whisper'd to David, David to the Jewes:
And Davids Successors, in holy zeale,
In formes of Joy and art doe re-reveale . . .

Gorgeous.

Andreas

CALVIN B. KENDALL's "Literacy and Orality in Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Horizontal Displacement in *Andreas*" (*JEGP* 95.1, 1–18) is a technical study with a dual aim: "first, to argue that *Andreas* shared a traditional, orally-based metrical grammar with *Beowulf*, and second, to suggest that literacy may have been responsible for the development of at least one construction in *Andreas* that cannot be accounted for by the rules of that metrical grammar" (1). Kendall finds that the metrical grammar of *Beowulf* and *Andreas* differs in only two major respects. One is that in *Beowulf* the second lift virtually always alliterates following a preposition in the first weak metrical slot (e.g., *lif wip lice*, 733a), whereas in *Andreas* ten of 103 half-lines do not display this alliterative feature (e.g., *georn on mode*, 66a). The second major difference is that *Beowulf* shows but eight violations of Kuhn's (so-called) laws, whereas *Andreas* shows twenty-nine. Nineteen of the twenty-nine violations

are half-lines that should be clause-initial but are not. Again, nine of the nineteen violations occur in the formula *agef ondsware*. (*Agef*, as a sentence particle, should occur in the first weak position of the entire verse clause, not simply in the first weak position of the half-verse.) Alluding to his subtitle, Kendall says, "I will call the external displacement of a clause-initial half-line with no alliterating sentence particle 'horizontal,' because the absence of double alliteration allows displacement either from or into the b-verse. Horizontal displacement, which violates the rules of the metrical grammar of *Beowulf*, was evidently acceptable to the *Andreas* poet, at least in the case of this formula. And not only to him" (11). Since the formula occurs in similar metrical contexts in *Elene*, *Guthlac B*, and *Juliana*, "It appears to be an innovation which was confined to a small group of literate poets" (13). After considering other instances of offensive horizontal displacement in *Andreas*, Kendall concedes, "There is no reason that such an innovation could not occur in a purely oral tradition" (16). However, since the poets who employ *agef ondsware* are all "bookish," to Kendall "it would seem perverse not to consider as an explanation for horizontal displacement (the most likely explanation as it seems to me) the possibility that one or more of them were experimenting with the visual arrangement of half-lines on parchment. On parchment, particularly when the lines are written out like prose, a horizontally displaced half-line looks like any similar undisplaced half-line, and in the practice of these poets it makes perfectly good sense in context" (16). This is a game at which two can play: on parchment, particularly when the lines are written out like prose, an undisplaced half-line looks like any similar horizontally displaced half-line, and there is as much reason to attribute the stricter metrical grammar of *Beowulf*, whose author Kendall believes was likely both literate and a monk (2), to the *Beowulf* poet's greater bookishness, to his lesser reliance on oral tradition, to his more rigorous devotion to abstract metrical rules.

Kuhn regards *Beowulf* as the most archaic Germanic poetry because it keeps his laws best. I would rather think that *Beowulf* (and similar Old English book epics) represent a tightening up of these laws. This position is inevitably reached if we derive our picture of the technical achievement of the Germanic lay from the evidence we have, i.e., the two early West Germanic lays [*Finnsburh* and *Hildebrand*], and the poems of the *Edda*. These are all less perfect than *Beowulf*. Why then should they be regarded as derived from a poetry technically equal to *Beowulf*? This is to attribute to the ancient lay a perfection unknown in its descendants, and found only in a book poetry of which it is only a partial ancestor.

So Alistair Campbell, "The Old English Epic Style," *English and Medieval Studies Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Norman Davis and C. L. Wrenn (London, 1962), 16, n. 1. For "ancient lay" read *oral tradition*.

Elene

THE UNIVERSITY OF EXETER Press has published another "revised edition" of P.O.E. Gradon's *Cynewulf's 'Elene'*. The first edition was published by Methuen in 1958 (London), then by Appleton-Century-Crofts in 1966 (New York). In

1977 Exeter issued the first revised edition, differing from the original edition only in a brief supplement (81) to Gradon's bibliography. In the new revised edition, Gradon's bibliography (76–80) has been absorbed in and replaced by a bibliography by M.J. Swanton (77–84). Gradon arranged her bibliography by year of publication under these headings: I. Bibliographical Lists, II. Lexicons, III. Manuscript, IV. Editions, IV. [sic] Language, V. Background and Sources, VI. Metre, VII. Authorship, VIII. Runes, and IX. Textual Criticism. Swanton's bibliography is alphabetically arranged under the headings Manuscript, Editions, Translations, Background, and Studies. I like Swanton's new category, Translations, but otherwise prefer Gradon's arrangement as more precisely focused. Further, Swanton has eliminated some potentially useful entries in Gradon, e.g., R[ichard] Simons, *Cynewulf's Wortschatz* (1899). By replacing Gradon's bibliography in its entirety—rather than simply by supplementing it as in the 1977 printing—Swanton obscures her contribution. Still, it is good to have an updated bibliography of *Elene* and especially good to have Gradon's valuable edition available to a new generation of scholars.

"Old English Representations of Helena" is chapter 2 (59–93) of Susan Grace Larkin's doctoral dissertation, "Transitions in the Medieval Legends of Saint Helena" (Indiana University, 1995). Larkin first establishes the importance of Helena to the Anglo-Saxon Church: as the finder of the true cross—of which the English possessed relics—she was mentioned in calendars and in litanies, churches were dedicated to her, and her story was read in the divine office. Further, as "the archetype of royal saints" (59), Helena embodied the Anglo-Saxon ideal of secular and religious power united. From here Larkin turns to *Elene*, demonstrating that Cynewulf reshaped the narrative of his main source, *Acta Quiriaci*, in accord with Anglo-Saxon attitudes:

Cynewulf's Helena was thus a saint who reflected the Anglo-Saxon secular and religious situation. She was noble and under the direction of her king and son. She followed the orders of her son but also led warriors into enemy territory just as Anglo-Saxon noble women did. Further, she resembled Anglo-Saxon missionaries, for she travelled to a foreign land and used her scriptural knowledge and verbal proficiency to convince the Jews to believe. (79)

Helena's story was also told in Old English homilies. In "The Finding of the True Cross," the anonymous author did not stress Helena's heroic adventures as much as the power of her story to confirm basic Christian doctrine. In his "Invention of the Cross," Ælfric downplayed the military aspects of the story in favor of depicting Constantine as an irenic ruler and Helena as a faithful woman who led others to the faith, Ælfric's central intent being to explain and celebrate the spiritual significance of the relics of the true cross. Larkin's survey and synthesis are lucid and learned. (My thanks to R. D. Fulk for furnishing me with a copy.)

Guthlac B

IN "Beccel and the Theme of Death in *Guthlac B*" (*Mediaevalia* 19 [1996 for 1993], 273–97), Phyllis R. Brown argues that

previous commentary on Beccel, Guthlac's servant, has missed the subtle role the poet assigns him: more than a simple foil to the saint, Beccel betokens not only the reaction of the natural man toward death but the potential of grief redeemed by hope:

The poet attenuates the distance between the reader and saintly behavior by showing the two aspects of death not to be mutually exclusive but rather coexistent, just as Guðlac and the servant live together in the fens of Mercia. The poem suggests that the contrastive nature of their relationships (that is, the two views of death and the saint and his servant) is not static but rather in dynamic tension, indicating the perpetual possibility of movement in Christian life between worldly and transcendent perception. (273)

Brown sees Beccel as a character like Dante the pilgrim, like the protagonist in *The Pearl*, and like *Everyman's* Everyman—as someone slow to learn but who slowly learns: “their limited perception functions to make the lesson more accessible to the larger reading audience” (276). As Guthlac learns from an angel, Beccel learns from Guthlac. After focusing on Adam and Eve's fall, on death in the abstract, and on Guthlac's bodily decline but spiritual ascent, the poet shows how the saint's servant begins his own journey towards understanding in three stages: the Easter celebration the two share, their final dialogue, and Beccel's speech to Guthlac's sister. In the speech Beccel both expresses his own sorrow and sense of exile and the classic Christian view of earthly death and celestial life. Brown concludes that the servant is a man

who, like Adam, can turn away from God for selfish reasons but who also, like Christ and Guðlac, can end in glory. Beccel's speech demonstrates that the Christian paradox, “dying He restored our life,” is accessible to man, not only in the abstract but even when death is close to home. It is in large part the weakness of Beccel and the signs of possibility for him to emulate Guðlac that bring home for the listener or reader the possibility that he can do as well as Beccel, striving to be like Guðlac and by extension Christ. (290–91)

It is rare to read an essay, like Brown's, that seems to have been written from *inside* the literature. (Another such essay is George Hardin Brown's “Old English Verse as a Medium for Christian Theology” in the Greenfield festschrift, *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature* [1986]. What do the Browns have in their diet that the rest of us lack?)

Instructions for Christians

SUSAN GRINNA YOUNGS brings forth “A New Edition of ‘Instructions for Christians’: C.U.L. MS li. 1. 33” (Diss. Univ. of Wisconsin—Madison, 1995). In the introduction Youngs carefully discusses the poem's poetics, language, themes, structure (i.e., lack of structure), manuscript context, and historical background. Her main findings on place, date, and purpose:

On the basis of the characteristics of the manuscript itself, the relationship between members of a monastic community and the surrounding laity, and the situation at Ely post-Conquest, it seems plausible tentatively to localize “Instructions for Christians” to the monastery at Ely and to date it during the century after the Conquest. In addition, the purpose and audience of “Instructions for Christians” seems clear. It is aimed at members of the wealthy laity with the hopes of securing donations for the church, in this case specifically for the monastic community at Ely. (34)

The place and date do seem tentatively plausible, but I wonder about the purported purpose and audience. Youngs notes that

the theme of worldly wealth (broadly defined) figures in about a third of the poem (17); this means that the theme does not figure in two-thirds. Further, the poem contains no statement that people should give money to the Church, and monks are but glancingly mentioned (127–31). Alms-giving and wealth-sharing, although important themes, do not govern the work.

In printing the poem, Youngs generally follows the manuscript points and paragraphs. In the manuscript the first verse paragraph appears like this:

Syle ece gode æhta þinra . þone teoðan dæl . he ge tȳþað þe . ȝhé
ðemænig fealðað mycle þa nigone. (fol. 224v)

In Youngs it appears like this:

Syle ece gode æhta þinra
þone teoðan dæl
he getȳþað þe,
ȝ he ðe mænigfealðað mycle þa nigone. (83)

Although abandoning the manuscript lineation, Youngs declines to print the lines according to the modern conventions of OE verse, disguising the fact that the lines are conventional OE verse:

Syle ece gode æhta þinra
þone teoðan dæl he getȳþað þe,
ȝ he ðe mænigfeal[d]að mycle þa nigone.

Youngs remarks that *Instructions* “exists in the large borderland between poetry and prose” (69). Her half-way house linear arrangement seems to me a home for only the poem's prose passages. Otherwise, her edition marks an immense improvement over the three earlier ones (the first an M.A. thesis). I was able to present the manuscript text of the first few lines conveniently because Youngs furnishes photocopies of the folios, complete with a diplomatic transcript (128–55). Detailed study of the manuscript is the great strength of her edition; she notes so many transcriptional errors common to the three earlier editors that it is tempting to say that the second and third editors edited, respectively, the first and the second editions rather than the manuscript text. Youngs is also the first editor to include the macaronic ending to *Instructions* as an integral part of the work. Finally, she includes a translation (114–27) and an exhaustive analytical glossary (156–210). Youngs says, and shows, that the work “can be a valuable source for the state of Old English in the 12th century” (79).

J.R.H.

Battle of Brunanburh

DAVID N. KLAUSNER draws some very broad conclusions about “Aspects of Time in the Battle Poetry of Early Britain” (*The Middle Ages in the North-West*. Ed. Tom Scott and Pat Starkey. Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 1995. Pp. 85–107). He begins with the observation that philosophers from Aristotle to Heidegger have differed on the question of whether time is continuous (infinitely divisible) or atomic (constructed of discrete units). He perceives this same division in early Welsh and English battle poetry, arguing that the poetry of victory represents time as continuous whereas the

poetry of defeat adopts an atomic point of view. *Brunanburh* serves as Klausner's OE example of a victory poem, and his observations about it are apt. He notes that the poet provides a "generalized picture of the battle and its aftermath" (p. 89); this generality is accomplished by the use of non-specific numbers for the combatants, by tracing the path of the sun (thus moving the audience's vision skyward), and by avoiding then (*þa*)-clauses, giving a sense of simultaneity. The *Battle of Maldon*, on the other hand, is more atomic, presenting frequent transitions between "comparatively static tableaux, which . . . proceed in small areas of space between small numbers of individuals" (p. 93). Based on the differences between these two poems, Klausner hypothesizes that the poetry of victory treats time as continuous through breadth of viewpoint, avoidance of conjunctions that specify temporal or spatial relationships between actions, and relatively complex syntactic formulations; the poetry of defeat offers an atomic time through restricted point of view, sequential *þa*-clauses, and simpler syntax. This seems a large generic conclusion to draw from only two poems, but Klausner seeks further evidence in the Welsh corpus. He finds that two of the Taliesin victory poems compare to *Brunanburh* in breadth of viewpoint, reference to the course of the sun, and emphasis on the results of the battle rather than on its events. He suggests that these similarities show "that there was a common repertoire of convention which to a significant extent transcended linguistic boundaries" (p. 100). Klausner offers "the tradition of panegyric poetry" (p. 100) as the source of these elements, but does not specify whether he considers that tradition to be Indo-European or insular in its extent. Finally, and somewhat weakly, Klausner compares the *Gododdin* to *Maldon*, finding both works episodic and atomic. Klausner may be onto something here, but this reader would have preferred a broader study (i.e., encompassing works like *Judith* or the shorter chronicle poems) or one that was narrower in its conclusions.

With his *Three Anglo-Saxon Battle Poems* (Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1996), Louis J. Rodrigues has produced a volume that teachers of OE poetry in translation may well find useful. His translations of *Brunanburh*, *Maldon*, and the Finnsburh Fragment are literal but pleasing, using a four-stress line and light alliteration. Preceding the texts and translations, Rodrigues offers a sensible and informative introduction (pp. 9–20) describing the poems' textual histories, plots, settings, and relative styles. Following the poems are five pages of notes, which mainly identify people and places but in the case of *Maldon* also clarify such lexical items as *eorl* and *franca*. These lexical notes provide some justification for the inclusion of the facing OE text, as they may whet the curiosity of some students into a further study of the language. One can only hope. The select bibliography (pp. 68–71) covers editions, translations, general background, and critical studies, though it is very brief and makes some curious omissions (e.g., Donald Scragg's 1991 collection of essays on *Maldon*). The book concludes with an appendix (pp. 74–81): a text and translation of the Finn episode from *Beowulf*. Unlike Salerno's

translation of *Maldon* (see below), Rodrigues' volume provides the instructor (or self-motivated learner) with the openings to explore many facets of these poems: history, language, style, themes, etc. The price sticker on the copy I examined read £6.50, which, depending on the exchange rate, could be considered reasonable for classroom use or not.

Battle of Maldon

SAMUEL SALERNO, a poet himself, plainly likes the *Battle of Maldon* and wishes more people would read it; short of leaving his translation in hotel rooms, however, I fail to see how he is likely to accomplish his aim (*The Battle of Maldon*. Monterey, CA: Lighthouse, 1996). Professional scholars do not need to be introduced to the poem, and students—whether college or secondary—are apt to find the included OE text superfluous in the absence of a glossary or detailed notes. Should a neophyte happen upon this book, he or she will find a generally readable, usually accurate translation. There are some glitches in both content and grammar: for example, *god gepanc* (line 13b) is rendered as "special thanks" (p. 21) and lines 173–74 of the translation read "I thank thee, O ruler of nations // for the wealth of joy I given me in this world" (p. 33). Lines like the latter might ensure that the poem will remain "relatively obscure" (p. 16). The text and translation are surrounded by a spartan apparatus providing an introduction to the battle's history and geography, a pronunciation guide, a map, two pages on language and meter, and a short bibliography.

In a brief but convincing presentation, Carole Hough solves two grammatical problems of *Maldon*: "*The Battle of Maldon* Lines 20–21." *NM* 97, 383–86. Both *randan* of line 20 and *folman* of line 21 have frequently been emended to more regular forms of the accusative and dative plurals respectively. Hough points out that in OE generally, and in *Maldon* specifically, the singular, rather than the plural, is often used to express a class of things or attributes of which each of a number of people possesses one: e.g., their hand, their life. Thus, *feste mid folman* (line 21a) is translated "firmly with their fist" (p. 385) and the *-an* of *randan* is removed to reveal an accusative singular *hyra rand*, "their shield" (p. 385). Hough does not simply sweep the *-an* away, but redistributes it to the following adverb as an unstressed, intensifying prefix; line 20 then reads: *and þæt hyra rand / anrihte beoldon* (p. 385). This is a concise and elegant solution to several vexing little problems.

In a "winning" move, Jonathan Wilcox cuts through the problem of *Maldon*'s historicity by examining and comparing the rhetoric of other accounts of Viking attacks: those found in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle entries for the reign of Æthelred ("The Battle of Maldon and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 979–1016: A Winning Combination." *Proc. of the Med. Assoc. of the Midwest* 3 [1996 for 1995], 31–50). As Wilcox points out, both the poem and the chronicle are "shaped by predictable elements of thematic structuring", so for modern readers "Exploration of the narrative shaping of the chronicle provides some clue to the narrative expectations of Anglo-Saxon

listeners to the poem" (p. 31). The cynical pessimism of the chronicle appears in striking contrast to the loyal bravery portrayed in the poem as English armies frequently (at least five times between 993 and 1010) flee before battle is even engaged and the treachery of individual English commanders is repeatedly emphasized. By these standards, Byrhtnoth's loyal retainers are "bucking a trend" (p. 32). Wilcox also describes a similarity between the two works in their use of symbolism, comparing the chronicle's bloody clouds and flying dragons to the scene in *Maldon* of the released hawk. Some questions remain unanswered—like the motivation for the chronicler's persistent cynicism or his status as a representative of broader public opinion—but the parallels and contrasts remain provocative and valuable for both teaching (as Wilcox stresses) and interpretation.

Deor

IN THOSE SMALL CIRCLES in which we move, it has become commonplace to hear that medievalists practiced intertextual interpretation long before it was theorized and discovered by the rest of the critical world. The language of such interpretation has gotten fancier in recent years, but the methods and results often seem to have changed very little. A case in point is Juan Camilo Conde Silvestre's essay on "The Spaces of Medieval Intertextuality: *Deor* as a Palimpsest," *Selima* 5 (1996), 63–77. Conde Silvestre spends the first six pages of the article describing the poem and the likely background narrative to each stanza. His conclusion to this section: "*Deor*'s significance could only be grasped if those addressed understood that they were required to stimulate their knowledge of other texts, and to activate the mechanism of intertextuality" (p. 69). In other words, the audience would need to know the stories to make sense of the poem. The second half of the article is more theoretical, using Paul Zumthor's conception of medieval "intervocalité" to explain how *Deor*'s formulas and allusions place the work within a community of discourse. Conde Silvestre goes on to cite Zumthor and A.N. Doane on the issue of mixed orality, making the text of *Deor* an interface between oral and written techniques. The oral techniques having already been discussed, Conde Silvestre adopts the textual relationship—proposed by Markland, Kiernan, and others—between *Deor* and Boethius as an example of written techniques in the poem. He concludes that his argument supports a setting for the composition of *Deor* in the early stages of Anglo-Saxon written culture, when both oral and literate modes were still operative.

Maxims I and II

IN A CLEAR, straightforward essay, Carolyne Larrington analyzes the theme of friendship in the Old Norse wisdom poem, *Hávamál*, compares the Norse treatment to those in OE, and suggests a way in which *Hávamál* may be seen to reflect real-life concerns ("Maðr er Mannz Gaman": The Theme of Friendship in Old Norse and Old English Wisdom Verse." *Celtic and Germanic Themes in European Literature*. Ed. Neil Thomas. Lewiston, NY; Queenston, Ont.; and Lampeter,

1994. Pp. 61–76). Most of the article treats Old Norse poetry, but Larrington does describe two features of friendship in OE poems: its relative absence (p. 73) and its occasional Christianization, as in *Precepts* (pp. 71–72). She explains the increased emphasis on friendship in Old Norse as reflecting a different valuation of social relationships. The OE poems focus on the bonds of kinship and lordship, whereas the friendship between equals defined in *Hávamál* might have gained importance as Viking age Scandinavians embarked on an increasing number of joint trading (and, one assumes, plundering) ventures.

Rune Poem

The Rune Poem: Wisdom's Fulfillment, Prophecy's Reach, tr. Jim Paul (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1996) is a lovely little volume that seems designed to serve either as a very small coffee-table book or as some sort of neo-pagan lectionary. The body of the book is set up in facing pages on which the recto bears a white outline of a single rune on a full-color background (including an impressive amount of brassy-gold ink); the verso offers a translation of the relevant stanza from the poem along with a few sentences of interpretation and musing. The interpretations refer to other poems or tend towards the cultural—"Tacitus notes . . . that these northern people reckoned time by nights" (p. 58)—while the musings often appear self-revelatory—"I feel, in the epithet for the ox's single-minded courage . . . our multimindedness, which both hinders and enables us" (p. 30). The introduction (in which new paragraphs are marked with rubrication) focuses on the mystical nature of the runes but includes other comments about Germanic culture and Old English poetry. The translation, as Paul admits, is rather free.

Seafarer

THE UNIVERSITY OF EXETER has reprinted Ida Gordon's compact and useful 1979 edition of the *Seafarer* (*The Seafarer*. Exeter: Univ. of Exeter Press, 1996). The classroom life of this edition has been extended not only by the fact of the reprinting, but also by the addition of a substantial yet judicious bibliography by Mary Clayton.

The type of careful scholarship represented by Gordon and Clayton is forsaken by Charles Harrison Wallace as he makes a convoluted argument for retranslation of lines 62b–64a of the *Seafarer*: "The Central Crux of *The Seafarer*." *Studia Neophilologica* 68 (1996), 177–84. Wallace presents the lines in question thus—

gielleð anflaga
hweteð onwæl weg hreþer unwearnum
ofer holma gelagu (p. 177)

—and translates them so: "The approaching flier screams. The defenceless soul prepares for the road of death, across the waters of the seas" (p. 180). Both "approaching flier" for *anflaga* and "road of death" for *wæl weg* have been proposed before, so Wallace spends most of his essay justifying "defenceless" for *unwearnum*. He rejects the standard translation of "resistance or reluctance" for the root noun *wearn*,

instead favoring "barrier" based on perceived Scandinavian cognates. Part of speech is dispensed with by wishing it away: "The absence of a barrier cannot be expressed as a noun; and *unwearn* must therefore be thought of as an adjective" (p. 178). The adverbial function implied by the dative ending *-um* only seems to enhance—for Wallace—his preferred translation, as "the cluster of meaning attaching to *unwearn* is, as it were, attracted away from the *breþer* to the *anfloga*. The barrier between these entities becomes an impediment or obstacle, negated because overwhelmed or removed" (p. 178). With similar magic, *hweteð* is transformed from transitive to intransitive simply because "there is an insistent sense of the *breþer* positively wanting to be keen and ready" (p. 179). Wallace perceives lines 62–64 as a turning point in the poem, with the pagan connotations of the screaming flier transitioning to the Christian soul eager for death. He concludes with an appendix of previously published translations of the lines. While Wallace is correct to consider the context of a passage when pondering the connotations of a word, he has, in this essay, too often put the cart before the horse by ignoring philology in his quest for a new reading.

Juan Camilo Conde Silvestre has provided readers of Spanish with a very worthy introduction to three OE elegies and the major scholarship on them: *Crítica literaria y poesía elegíaca anglo-sajona: "Las Ruinas," "El Exiliado Errante" y "El Navegante"* (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1994). His purpose—stated clearly in his preface—is not to present groundbreaking editions or criticism, but to offer a selection of different explications of these poems in order to inform readers about an important area of English philology and a part of medieval English literature (p. 10). He accomplishes this goal admirably through a judicious synthesis of (mostly) English-language scholarship. He admits that his choice of poems is entirely personal, in that he thinks the *Wanderer*, the *Seafarer*, and the *Ruin* best exemplify elegiac sentiment and offer interesting complexities in style and theme. Conde Silvestre's first chapter discusses OE elegy in general. After an introduction to the Exeter Book—its history, language, and dating—he addresses the question of elegy as a genre. Here, as elsewhere, he is even-handed in presenting both sides of the issue, concluding that the weight of scholarly tradition favors recognition of the genre, but that differences among the poems make absolute categorization problematic. He raises important elegiac issues (e.g., loyalty and the *comitatus*, Christianity *vs.* paganism, the nature of time, the power of fate), citing standard studies all the way. The second half of the chapter describes common features of OE poetry: metrics, kennings, variation, and formulas. Each of the next three chapters functions as an introduction to one of the elegies (in the order of the book's title) and has the same basic structure. The first paragraph treats the poem's placement in the manuscript, the next presents scholarly opinions about dialect and dating, and then a few pages are devoted to a topic of particular importance to that poem (e.g., the number of speakers in the *Wanderer* or the relationship between the

Ruin and such genres as the elegy and the *encomium urbis*). The bulk of each chapter, however, is comprised of an explication of the poem, especially its structure and themes. Again, Conde Silvestre sublimates his own voice in favor of educating readers about the major lines of interpretation on each poem. The explications are straightforward, but do include side discussions of various relevant topics. For the *Wanderer* (Chapter III) and the *Seafarer* (Chapter IV) a contentious issue caps the explication: the expression of Christian or pagan values in the former and the use (or non-use) of allegory in the latter. Each chapter then concludes with a few pages on diction and style. The next section of the book consists of an Appendix of OE text and Spanish translation of each poem. The OE texts are deliberately unremarkable and I am incompetent to judge the felicity of the translations. The book concludes with a 17-page Bibliography which, as it reflects the scholarship cited throughout, is solid if not especially zippy or up to date. In sum, Conde Silvestre has produced a very respectable and appealing introduction to one segment of OE poetry and its attendant scholarship.

Not seen:

Conde Silvestre, Juan Camilo. "The Semiotics of Allegory in Early Medieval Hermeneutics and the Interpretation of *The Seafarer*." *Atlantis* 16.1–2 (1994), 71–90.

Wanderer

THE IMAGERY of binding in the *Wanderer* is familiar territory to students of the poem, but Patrick Cook has re-entered it with satisfying results in "*Woriað þa winsalo: The Bonds of Exile in 'The Wanderer'*," *Neophilologus* 80 (1996), 127–37. Cook presents no startling observations; instead, he manages to tie together some fairly familiar interpretations into a coherent system of imagery and theme. The essay, though brief, argues two theses: first, that the wanderer's unsuccessful search for "a protective and life-nourishing enclosure" leads him to "internaliz[e] the forms of hall-enclosure" (p. 128) until he may reach the security of heaven; second, that this movement "dramatizes a transition from the pre-Christian world of the Germanic *comitatus* . . . to the more individualistic guilt-culture of Christianity" (p. 127). The first thesis is supported more convincingly, as Cook adduces such features as the wanderer's memories of rituals (that is, his mental re-enactments of them) and the fettering of his mind to argue a "continual interweaving of physical and mental space" (p. 128). Thus, line 78a—*woriað þa winsalo*—requires no emendation or tortured explanation, because the "winehalls may not really be wandering, but the self-enclosure replacing them assuredly is" (p. 129). The imagery of bondage is also given Christian reference as "Satan's fetters" (p. 130), making the speaker, through his sins, at least partly responsible for his own restricted situation. Cook goes on to a discussion of *wyrd* as an antagonistic, not neutral, force in the poem which threatens the enclosures of both self and hall. *Wyrd* is overpowered by

God as *Metud*: Cædmon's Creator and the protector of Hygelac's *giftol* (p. 133). Most of these themes and images are tied together, at least potentially, in the serpentine wall scene of lines 97–98, which, Cook suggests, could recall the Germanic world-serpent, the speaker's separation from the *dugub*, or Satan. Finally, Cook engages in a sympathetic interpretation of the *Wanderer*'s oft-maligned ending, mining its diction and imagery for keys to its syncretic sophistication. This is a fast-moving essay, but worth chasing after.

Mark S. Griffith proceeds with greater deliberation and focuses on a smaller piece of the poem, but these characteristics do not at all diminish his carefully crafted argument in "Does *wyrd bið ful aræd* mean 'Fate is wholly inexorable'?" *Studies in English Language and Literature: 'Doubt wisely'—Papers in honour of E. G. Stanley*. Ed. M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler. London and NY: Routledge, 1996. Pp. 133–56. As one might suspect, the answer to the question posed in Griffith's title is "No," an answer arrived at only after a reasoned consideration of a great deal of evidence. Griffith begins by noting that the first three verses of the *Wanderer* attain a proverbial register (he compares them to *A Proverb from Winfrid's Time*) which supports "the earlier meaning of *gebidan* with the full force of the prefix—'to experience'" (p. 135). However, this reading creates a logical disjunction between the optimism of lines 1–2 and the seeming fatalistic pessimism of line 5b. So, Griffith reexamines 5b word by word. The literature on *wyrd* being huge, he concentrates on its interpretation by the *Wanderer*'s editors and translators, finding that the editors favor "lot" while the translators "usually seem to view [the clause] as an expression of a gloomy northern fatalism" (p. 138). Griffith thinks it likely that the word means something slightly different in each of its four appearances in the poem; he cites the trope of *traductio*, but is careful not to insist that the poet was trained in classical rhetoric. Coming to *bið*, Griffith simply and succinctly points out that the verb "expresses invariable fact" (p. 141). His most surprising and interesting revelations come with respect to *ful*, not usually considered a problematic word. Griffith discovers that although *ful* in *Wanderer* 5b is usually translated as an absolute (e.g., "fully"), it is most often (90 of 92 occurrences) used in the poetry as an intensifier ("very"). He concludes that *eall*, *ealles*, or *eallunga* would be the expected absolute, so the unusual intensifier draws attention to itself. Finally, Griffith discusses three hypotheses regarding the derivation of *aræd*: 1) an adjective meaning "resolute" (rejected for lack of evidence); 2) a scribal error for the adjective *anræd* (rejected on semantic grounds); and 3) an adjectival past participle of *arædan*. The last possibility has sometimes been faulted for producing metrical irregularity, but Griffith argues that the syncopation in the form is merely scribal and that the fully suffixed form produces a verse type (Bliss's 1A1c) found elsewhere in the shorter poems of the Exeter Book. However, *Wanderer* 5b contains an extra syllable (*ful* again), which Griffith accounts for unconvincingly as a "stretching" of the meter to call attention to the unusual adverb, thus "giv[ing] a new edge to

what otherwise sounds like a blunt commonplace" (p. 146). In determining the translation of *arædan*, Griffith adduces the *Letter of Alexander* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, concluding that "an Anglo-Saxon Latinist might well have understood *wyrd* and *arædan* . . . to mean *fatum* in the sense 'lot, portion' . . . and *statuere* in either the sense 'to establish by authority, decree' or 'to settle, arrange'" (p. 148). Thus, he favors translating *Wanderer* 5b as "one's lot is very settled" or "one's lot is highly ordered" (p. 148). After a brief discussion of medieval views on will and grace, Griffith finally interprets the *Wanderer*'s introductory lines: "because the *anhaga* frequently searches for, or is often privileged to live to see, the grace of God, and because he has for long endured the miseries of life in isolation on the ocean, his portion can be seen as highly ordered, and shaped both by his choice and by divine disposition" (p. 150).

Rounding out a good year for the *Wanderer*, Antonina Harbus offers a coherent and appealing reading of its "somnial sequence" ("Deceptive Dreams in *The Wanderer*." *SP* 93 [1996], 164–79). The dreams are marked as non-revelatory by their timing (during the day) and subject (material memories). The first dream (lines 41–44) appears to the passive dreamer as a result of his uncontrolled sorrow; the second (lines 49–57) is actively induced by his mind. The negative connotations of dreaming—sin and death—are carried over into the second half of the poem by the repetition of lexemes (*geond-*, *brim*) and motifs (darkness). This continuity reinforces the metaphor of life as a dream and the epiphany that truth is arrived at only after awakening "into the reality of eternity after the sleep of death" (p. 178). Harbus brings little new evidence to bear on her interpretation, but her treatment of the poem's details is deft.

Wife's Lament

FIONA GAMESON and Richard Gameson admit that precise interpretation of the *Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* may eternally remain matters of dispute; therefore, they concentrate on explicating that which lies beyond dispute: the emotive power of the poems ("*Wulf and Eadwacer*, *The Wife's Lament*, and the Discovery of the Individual in Old English Verse." *Studies in English Language and Literature: 'Doubt wisely'—Papers in honour of E. G. Stanley*. Ed. M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler. London and NY: Routledge, 1996. Pp. 457–74). After translating the poems and briefly discussing some of their cruces, the Gamesons describe the methods by which emotion is brought to the fore. These include the use of the first person, a focus on loss, longing, and grief, and the construction of miserable or isolative settings. The authors go on to consider the poems' emphasis on individual emotions, deciding that in this they resemble later works like *Ruodlieb* or the letters of Heloise more than they do contemporary works from England or Scandinavia. They see in the *Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* counterevidence to Colin Morris's claim (*The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200*, 1972) that a sense of individualism does not develop before the mid-

eleventh century. They conclude with the suggestion—clearly marked as speculative—that the poets' willingness to express emotion makes the *Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* "eminently compatible with female authorship" (p. 469).

In a mercifully brief paper, Jackie MacLelland rejects what she calls the "theories of inflection and theme" (pp. 30–31) in favor of "the subtle influences of cultural indoctrination on our perception of the narrator [of the *Wife's Lament*]" (p. 30; "The Cultural Myth of Gender in 'The Wife's Lament.'" *Mount Olive Review* [Winter/Spring 1993–94], 30–32). Influences as varied as the medieval church and modern psychology have conditioned "us" to expect passivity as a female role. These "cultural blinders" have led to "our" examining the speaker's gender through "the lens of mythic anticipation" (p. 32). I wish MacLelland would speak for herself.

Wulf and Eadwacer

IN A STUDY combining literary and historical backgrounds from various northern European sources, J.A. Tasioulas offers a new and interesting reading of *Wulf and Eadwacer*: "The Mother's Lament: *Wulf and Eadwacer* Reconsidered." *Medium Ævum* 65 (1996), 1–18. Tasioulas follows Marijane Osborn and Dolores Warwick Frese in favoring an interpretation of the speaker as a mother lamenting for her son, but redefines that son as an illegitimate child condemned to infanticide. The prevalence and procedures of this custom are documented through literary, legal, and penitential texts from England, Ireland, Iceland, and Finland, from which Tasioulas makes it clear that exposure was suffered by male as well as female infants. The poem's depiction of an unmarried mother grieving for her illegitimate offspring is supported by a detailed reading, parts of which are more convincing than others. For example, it is easier to accept that the speaker's embrace by the warrior brought her joy in its pleasure but sorrow for its result than that said warrior's name—Eadwacer—is an ironic comment on his failure to be "watchful of the speaker's happiness" (p. 8). Tasioulas argues that the child has been placed on an island inhabited by (real or metaphorical) wolves; in keeping with literary tradition, the mother names the child based on his predicament. However, it seems difficult to reconcile this picture of an already abandoned and endangered child with the speaker's repeated statement that her people will kill him *gif* he comes among them (lines 2 and 7). Tasioulas's interpretation of the details of the poem does not necessarily add up to a completely satisfying overall reading, but it does offer an alternative at least as plausible as many others.

S.E.D.

Christ I, II, III

IN "The Advent of Poetry: *Christ I*" (*ASE* 25, 123–34), Edward B. Irving, Jr. champions the case of the more neglected of the two masterpieces of Anglo-Saxon religious poetry, *The Dream of the Rood* and *Christ I*. The latter, he notes, is more often regarded as a liturgical document than as

poetry. Contrary to attempts *a la* Cook to dissect it according to patristic sources, Irving seeks to highlight what he calls "the plain secular artistry of the poet, something of the nature of his imaginative power" (124). In a close reading designed to foreground the poem's aesthetic value, Irving explicates the poet's use of contrasts, antithetical or antiphonal pairs, especially Light and Dark. Such contrasts are further dramatized by personification (125) and dialogue (esp. the Joseph and Mary dialogue) (126), and the poet's use of time, in particular in the seventh antiphon where "all times and tenses seem to become one—once light has been introduced to the darkness through the Incarnation and we move into a timeless eternally present time in the future, expressed in the past tense, when all the gifts have sprouted, the twigs are illuminated, the ancient songs are heard, the hidden is revealed, the prophets' dark words come into light at last" (127). Close readings of antiphons 4—*O virgo virginum*—and 5, on Emmanuel, follow (128–9). Irving's analysis itself borders on the lyrical as he compares the exchange between the angel and Joseph to *Beowulf* (130). He next argues for the appropriateness of the conversation between Joseph and Mary in its context, where as Earendel had been the speaker for the Light, now Joseph speaks for the Darkness (130). In his reading of the ninth antiphon, *O mundi domina*, he again notes the movement within the poem from high to low, supernatural to sublunary, heaven to earth (132). Antiphon 10 takes up the theme of painful separation, whereas the eleventh renders the Upper World most expressly and angels move freely and joyously in space and time: "the angels are seen as a minstrel-race of loud-praising singers, reveling in the happiness of being in God's presence, his *ætwise*, without restraining themselves or holding back, but moving up, down, back and forth, playing as they fly, shoving and crowding in to get closer to God" (133–34). Irving's stated goal, to draw out and demonstrate "the plain secular artistry" of the poet, is achieved in brilliant fashion through his sensitive and impassioned reading of the poem. He closes his argument with a tantalizing and suggestive comparison of the Anglo-Saxon poet to Milton, by citing the latter's 'Morning Hymn,' sung by Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*. While he is not suggesting that Milton was familiar with the *Exeter Book*, he does "find it fascinating to observe the very similar ways in which two good English poets express the inexpressible—the dynamic mysteries of the universe as they are shaped in the Christian imagination" (134).

In "Cynewulf's *The Ascension*: A Critical Edition" (Diss. Univ. of Tennessee. *DAI* 57A, 696), Alice Parham Nunnery follows several previous editors of Cynewulf's corpus with her edition of his *Ascension* (*Christ II*). She justifies her choice of project by pointing out the shift in critical focus since the last doctoral dissertation on the subject appeared (Roland T. Williams, "Cynewulf's *Ascension* (*Christ II*): A Critical Edition," 1974). Nunnery has collated and compared ten previous editions of the poem and incorporated their scholarship into her own construction of a critical context for a reading of the poem. Her edition is based on a transcription of the manu-

script text itself, combined with reference to Chambers' facsimile transcription (BL Add. MS 9607). The dissertation is divided into an Introduction (including sections on the manuscript, transcriptions and editions, the Poet and the Runic Signatures, a reading of the poem, and Cynewulf's Theology. The chapter containing the text itself is followed by an exhaustive section of Notes and Commentary (115 pages in all), a Bibliography and two Appendices: Sources and Abbreviations. A full Glossary is included at the end.

[Maria Augusta Coppola's "ags. *synrust*" (*Helikon*, 33–34 [1993–94] 309–333, offprint republished by *Herder Editrice e Libreria*, 1996) tracks the varied translative interpretations of the Anglo-Saxon compound *synrust*, which interestingly appears only in Cynewulf's *Christ III* but which has nevertheless generated some debate because of controversial readings of the somewhat incongruous passage in which the word appears. Coppola presents a comprehensive review both of philological and theoretical scholarship on the word, suggesting a link between the ways in which the word has been glossed and in which the broader passage have been interpreted.

Maria Augusta Coppola returns to the *Christ* of Cynewulf in "*Swa þæt scire glæs*" (*Helikon*, 33–34 [1993–94] 121–158, offprint republished by *Herder Editrice e Libreria*, 1996), this time for an interpretation of the signs of the beatitude and damnation in *Christ III*. Coppola reads the signs in these verses, both in light of the textual evidence gleaned from the poem itself and from inference suggested by analogous imagery in the broader corpus of contemporary Anglo-Saxon and Latin literature, as a "negative replica, adherent to evangelical dictation to the questioning of the possibility of a return to life for the time necessary to make adequate penance" in order to avoid eternal damnation.

C.H.]

Dream of the Rood

THE DREAM VISION and its appropriateness as a vehicle for the interpretation of symbols forms the focus of Antonina Harbus' study of *The Dream of the Rood* ("Dream and Symbol in *The Dream of the Rood*," *Nottingham Med. Stud.* 40, 1–15). In a close reading of the poem in its meditative and enigmatic context, Harbus demonstrates how the dream frame "can simultaneously elucidate and conceal, as it allows the contradictory issues of visual clarity and symbolic enigma to co-exist in a single structuring and thematic principle" (1). She analyzes first the poem's prologue with its emphasis on the visual aspect of the vision, which she argues prepares the reader for the proper interpretation of visual symbols. The duality of the most significant symbol in the poem, the cross, is furthermore reflected in the two distinct narrative voices (5). Here, too, a naïve dreamer is created, a rhetorical move which allows for a discernible movement from ignorance to understanding in the course of the poem. Harbus traces the verbal parallels linking the dreamer, the cross, and Christ, and takes pains to point out the dual references inherent in all three. A representative instance of this is her reading of the word *gesyhbð* in line 96:

"The ambiguous term *gesyhbð* is used here to evoke both 'symbol' and 'dream' in a deliberate conflation of referents, for in the end the poem is both the exhortation to symbolic exegesis and itself a token of the communication between the Cross and humankind" (9). Ultimately it is precisely this interaction between the verbal and the visual that constitutes the basis of Harbus' reading of the poem: "The poet suggests that the meaning of the symbol must be transferred into words to be apprehended. A poetic meditation on the Cross, explicated in a dream, is the ideal medium for communicating the Cross's symbolic message. The process represents the outcome of successful biblical exegesis or the homiletic explanation, functioning as a model or interpretation" (15).

Rebecca Hinton analyzes the similarities she observes between *The Dream of the Rood* and sacramental Penance in early Medieval Ireland in "*The Dream of the Rood*," (*The Explicator* 54, 77–79). She highlights three areas of similarity: the concept of sin, the object of confession, and the role of the confessor. Hinton identifies the Dreamer's sin as that of dejection, turning to Irish penitentials for a definition (77), and she speculates, based on the Dreamer's own comments toward the end of the poem, that loneliness may be the cause of his despair. According to McNeil and Gamer (*Medieval Handbooks of Penance*) penance (especially in Ireland) had as goal "the reconstruction of personality" (77). Hinton shows how the verbs chosen by the Anglo-Saxon poet indicate "a gradual renewal of the Dreamer's vigor and optimism" (77). Hinton sees the Cross here playing the role of *anmchara*, or "soul friend, confessor," an important component in a successful restorative confession. "Adhering to the model for confessors, the Cross reaches out to the Dreamer—the penitent—by drawing similarities between the two of them" (78). Finally, the 'penance' set by the Cross for the Dreamer, to reveal his visions in words to other men, suits his sin of dejection in that it prescribes "a course of action requiring energy, hope and zeal" and "with the intention of lifting him from his self-centered sadness" (79).

No doubt if Renate Lazlo had her way, this review of her book, *Das mystische Weinfass: ein altenglisches Rätsel des Vercellibuches* (Marburg: Tectum) would appear under the *Riddles* section, below. The title reveals the nature of Lazlo's premise in its reference to the poem as a "Rätsel," for which she feels compelled to provide the "in allen Einzelheiten schlüssige Lösung" (6). According to Lazlo that solution is to be found in a number of literary and artistic analogues, in particular a German riddle from ca. 1500. The two works have in common, she claims, a theme that circulated in exegesis of the second century A.D. as well as in sculpture and painting of the eighth century: the association of wine with Christ's blood and by extension Christ himself. In order to clear the way for her reassessment of the poem, Lazlo rejects the traditional editorial title by referring to it throughout her study as "*das Gedicht Hwæt ic swefna cyst*" (7). Lazlo recognizes that critics have noted the poem's riddlic qualities and possible parallels with the *Exeter Book* riddles, but no one has gone so

far as to read *The Dream of the Rood* as a riddle. This book does just that, and it seems to this reader to be something of a stretch. Again, Lazlo's thesis is that *The Dream of the Rood* is in fact a riddle, and that the poet's use of ambiguous words and neologisms to refer to the Cross (as just about every critic who has read the poem since it was first edited has pointed out) is in reality a cleverly devised ploy to mislead the innocent reader/listener and put him off track. The poem is a *Lehrgedicht* that "enriddles" (*verrätselt*) an entirely different object. That object, we learn, is a wooden winecask. After some 120 pages of (mostly irrelevant) review of criticism on the poem, Lazlo offers her interpretation of it, a detailed line-by-line reading in which she often rejects editorial emendations and accepts the manuscript readings instead, seemingly because they offer her the opportunity to interpret otherwise puzzling words and phrases anew. I shall not rehearse them all here, nor shall I attempt to reconstruct the logic, for example, whereby the *engel* of line 9 becomes the Angles (125), and the *halige gastas* of line 11 the poet's living contemporaries, i.e. the Anglo-Saxons. As for the difficulty of putting Christ in the winecask, as opposed to His climbing on to it (lines 40 and 55, *Gestah he on gealgan* and *Crist was on rode*): "Die präposition *on* mit Akkusativ bedeutet neben 'an, auf' in erster Linie 'in' oder 'in etwas hinein'" (141). While this may be true, the choice between competing meanings with such words (especially prepositions, one could say) must be determined by context, and it seems to this reviewer that Lazlo consistently opts for the interpretation that suits her theory. That theory is grounded in the supposed similarities between a 16th century German *volksrätsel*, which describes a winecask, and the first 78 lines of *The Dream of the Rood*. Lazlo offers further "analogues" in the form of manuscript illuminations and sculpture, all of which associate Christ's sacrifice with wine-making in one way or another, and all of which are rather late, the earliest dating to the late 12th century (*Hortus deliciarum*). The parallels are suggestive and interesting in and of themselves, and one can see the attraction of attributing to the poet of *The Dream of the Rood* a further level of sophistication in his use of metaphor and imagery. But in the end this attempt remains unconvincing. The monograph consists of a brief Introduction, a long section reviewing relevant criticism of the poem, a third chapter devoted to Lazlo's interpretation, followed by a fourth offering the "solution" proper of the riddle. Chapter five discusses the imagery of the mystic winepress in sculpture and illumination, and Christ's association with it. Following a concluding sixth chapter are a topically organized bibliography and facsimile, transcription, and translation (into German) of *The Dream of the Rood*.

Not seen:

Michael Swanton, ed. *The Dream of the Rood*. Exeter: Univ. of Exeter Press. ix, 150 pp. Ill [revised reprint of 1987 edition].

Genesis A and B

PAUL REMLEY, *Old English Biblical Verse: Studies in 'Genesis,'*

'Exodus,' and 'Daniel'. (Cambridge Stud. In A-S England, 16. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. xvii, 476 pp.) will be reviewed in next year's issue.

Phoenix

THOMAS HONEGGER devotes a section of his monograph, *From Phoenix to Chauntecleer: Medieval English Animal Poetry* (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 120. Tübingen and Basel: Francke) to the Old English *Phoenix*. The aim of the study as a whole is to investigate "the function of animals in medieval English vernacular literature by discussing the most important 'animal poems' over a period of 700 years" (3). Honegger's treatment of the Old English *Phoenix* falls under the heading of the *Physiologus* tradition, and is sandwiched in between chapters on the Old and Middle English versions of that genre. In some sixteen pages Honegger reviews the transmission and sources of the poem, provides a brief overview of criticism on selected aspects of it, and gives his own reading of what he identifies as its three primary parts: introduction, "natura," and "significatio." But he first addresses the reasonable question of why this poem should be included in a discussion of the *physiologus* tradition at all. In answer to this, he offers four reasons: that the idea of interpreting animals allegorically was to a large degree propagated by *The Physiologus*; that the poem's structure, its division into "natura" and "significatio," shows parallels with that tradition; that the phoenix is seen as a symbol of Christ in both poems, but that moreover its symbolic reference in the *Phoenix* to the resurrection reveals a connection with patristic writings and ideas; and finally that the phoenix is traditionally one of the *Physiologus* animals. What ensues is an analysis of the poem according to a three-fold scheme of "focal points" in the poem: God, the resurrection of the dead, and the animal itself. Honegger's final conclusion is that the chief function of the phoenix in the poem is to illustrate divine truths, though not without nuance and polysemy: "On the one hand, the phoenix is a real bird; on the other, it symbolizes the virtuous on earth, is used as the symbol of the blessed, and functions as a 'sign' that points to the resurrection of the dead (both immediately after the individual's death, and on Doomsday). Finally, the phoenix is the symbol of the resurrected Christ" (75).

Bengt Lindström offers a triad of emendations for less than straightforward passages in "*The Phoenix*, lines 240–2 and 407–9" (*N&Q* 43, 13–14). He notes that *bræd*, traditionally translated as 'flesh,' really means 'roasted flesh' and suggests instead that the form be emended to *blæd* (breath, spirit, (vigour of) life)), which would allow for a more suitable construing of the line *þonne b(ly)æd weorþeð / eal edniwad eft acenned*. Read thus, the line might also look forward thematically to a later reference in the poem to rejuvenated souls returning to bodies cleansed of sin (518–21). Lines 407–9, Lindström maintains, do not make sense as they stand: *Wurdon teonlice topas idge / agaeld æfter gylte. Hæfdon Godes yrrre, / bittre bealosorge*. This he would repunctuate and emend to read: *Wurdon teonlice topas idge; / aglaec æfter gylte hæfdon. Godes yrrre / bittre bealosorge* ("Their teeth became grievously

active; they suffered misery after their sin, God's anger, bitter anguish'). While it may be seen that this emendation yields relatively good sense, Bengström admits that it is a stretch paleographically. Bengström's third point involves not an emendation of the text but a refining of Blake's glossing of the lines 409–11. The next editor of *The Phoenix* would do well to take all three of these suggestions into consideration.

In *Anglo-Saxon Religious Verse Allegories*, Louis J. Rodrigues translates *The Phoenix* along with the poems *Panther*, *Whale* and *Partridge*. The book includes a brief introduction which discusses the contents of each poem, a select bibliography and Appendices containing texts and translations of Lactantius' *Carmen de ave phoenice*, Ambrose's *Hexameron* (Bk. V, ch. 70–80), and Carmody's Y and B versions of the Latin *Physiologus*. This, Rodrigues reminds us, is the last in his series of "Anglo-Saxon Verse Specimens rendered into Modern English." Like the others it "is intended for a non-academic audience with no great pretensions to a profound knowledge of the complexities of Anglo-Saxon versification, syntax, diction, or whatever else the pseudo-academic reviewer feels obliged to cite have not been adequately accounted for in these renderings" (7). Being myself insufficiently 'pseudo,' I shall forbear from elaborating on the book's shortcomings and merely point out that it contains what appears to be a serviceable translation with facing-page Old English text.

Elizabeth M. Tyler explores the intentionality of verbal patterns in *The Phoenix* in "How Deliberate Is Deliberate Verbal Repetition?" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, ed. Toswell and Tyler, 508–30). While other critics have read such repetition as an indication of oral composition, Tyler investigates its status as a function of conscious authorial design. To test this theory she focuses on the word *frætwæ*, only one of several frequently repeated words in the poem. Her purpose is to determine "whether and how some repeated words stand out as more integral to the meaning of the poem" (508), and whether such repetition is meaningful or accidental. Her detailed examination of all fourteen instances of *frætwæ* in the poem establishes a juxtaposition of associations of the word with Creation and Paradise on the one hand, and Judgment Day on the other (518). She next considers the intentionality of this verbal foregrounding, and observes that collocations involving *frætwæ* and another word almost invariably involve conceptual conventions. These she defines as "the attachment of a context, theme, or subject to a collocation which cannot be explained solely in terms of the semantic fields of the words involved" (522). The convergence of such conventions and verbal repetition can contribute to the sophistication of a poem, a fact which makes the issue of intentionality more complicated. Because such conceptual conventions may lend some instances of verbal repetition a felicitous rhetorical effect, Tyler remarks that "quality need not be an indication of the deliberate nature of verbal repetition" (524). Some occurrences of *frætwæ* seem to contribute little to the poem's symbolism, whereas Tyler also points out instances where their inclusion would have promoted meaningful symbolism by way of verbal foregrounding. She thus

concludes that these gaps must cast doubt on the extent to which deliberate repetition of this word constitutes the most important key to understanding *The Phoenix* (527). Her study does, however, have implications for our assessment of repeated lexis and conceptual conventions in Old English poetry in general, in that it highlights the ambiguous nature of verbal repetition. Tyler's ultimate conclusion is that one should "speak of verbal repetition not in terms of intention but of effect and to replace the notion of deliberate verbal repetition with that of rhetorical verbal repetition" (528).

Riddles

AUDREY L. MEANEY explains why so few readers of Riddle 57 in the Exeter Book have guessed its solution rightly in "Exeter Book Riddle 57 (55)—a Double Solution?" (*ASE* 25, 187–200). Her detailed explication of the riddle is intended to demonstrate that no other solution but "swifts" is possible. To that end she deals with the identity of the riddle's subject "under four headings: appearance, locomotion, habitat and call" (187). Her close scrutiny of each element in this brief poem results in the conclusion that "these are small black creatures which frequent both wooded hillsides and human habitations and which fly in troops calling long, loud, and shrilly" (190). This helps her eliminate a number of other solutions out of hand: bees, gnats, midges, hailstones, rain drops and musical notes do not meet one or more of the elements of this description. This leaves us with some kind of bird, and Meaney next embarks on a detailed ornithological discussion of the possibilities (which include starlings, corvids, hirundines, or swifts). The solution accepted by most who recognize a bird in the poem is the swallow, but Meaney disqualifies the *Hirundo rustica* on the basis of its red throat (a fact with which Aldhelm was familiar, as it shows up in his own riddle on the swallow (*Enigma* xlv)). The swift is almost entirely black, and what little color there is, is difficult to make out from any distance. Swifts are also associated with heights and human habitation (cf. ll. 2 and 5–6). The clincher for Meaney is the bird's 'sang,' which she compares to what naturalists describe as the swifts' "social screaming parties" conducted around the nesting colony (193). Citing naturalist G. White, ("Swifts are no songsters, and have only one harsh screaming note") she contends "that 'sanges rope / heapum ferað, hlude cirmað' also describes these 'screaming parties', and that therefore the solution of Riddle 57 can only be 'swifts'" (193). But Meaney's discussion does not stop here. She notes the solutions posed by Jember and Pulsiano and Wolf, which interpret these creatures as tormented demons of hell. The comparisons drawn by these scholars are apt ones, says Meaney, especially the depictions in early medieval visions of the afterlife and related literature of the demons or lost souls with birds. Pulsiano and Wolf stress the folkloric association of devils and birds, but do not believe the particular species of bird to be of any importance. Here Meaney disagrees, and notes that if this riddle is to carry a double meaning, then "one of the solutions should fit all the details literally and exactly" (195). "Swifts are black, do frequent cliffs and human dwell-

ings, and do fly screaming in troops. The trick of the riddle is that these same words also fit, in a general way, the Christian concepts of demons and tormented spirits, and the connotations of the words point in this direction" (196).

William Sayers challenges the most widely accepted solutions to one of the Old English riddles in "Exeter Book Riddle No. 5: Whetstone?" (NM 97, 387-92). "Chopping block" and "shield" are the two most frequently proffered candidates. "Shield" has seemed to many to fit best because the riddle's unusually high percentage of traditional epic formulas would seem to point in the direction of an object associated with warfare. But Sayers argues that "this accumulation of conventional epic matter alerts the hearer and reader to the possibility of parody and makes likely that the identification of the speaker as a warrior's shield is suspect, since the battlefield context has been undermined through the stylistic hypertrophy of near-clichés, and that a thematic shift, such as from warrior to chopping block, is indeed required to solve the riddle" (387). The shield, says Sayers, is one of the "false bottoms" to the poem (388), and observes that its opening half-line, *Ic eom anhaga* "I am a solitary one," makes it more plausible that the solution is an object "unique in its larger context, such as the chopping block serving a designated domestic function or an entire household" (388). The shield is too ubiquitous an object to make a convincing *anhaga*. Those who favor the solution "chopping block" have argued that the interpretive path of the riddle leads from the highly charged martial context to the no less charged domestic realm. Sayers' solution does this too, but it takes the reader from the battlefield to the smithy, "and thus in a roundabout fashion back to the battlefield" (388). In the remaining page and a half of this note Sayers provides a detailed reading of the poem which it is fair to say establishes "whetstone" as a more than merely plausible solution.

In "Mock-Riddles in Old English: Exeter Riddles 86 and 19" (SP 93, 180-87), Jonathan Wilcox challenges the notion that the Exeter Book riddles conform to a "certain dull uniformity." It is this assumption that has led to frequent emendations that equate the unusual with textual error (180). Here Wilcox posits the existence of a deviant subgenre of mock-riddles in the Old English corpus, and identifies nos. 86 and 19 as its representatives. As readers of the Old English riddles know, no. 86 would be impossible to solve with any confidence if it weren't for its apparent Latin analogue, the Symphosian One-Eyed Seller of Garlic. But unlike the analogue, no. 86 begins by setting a scene of wise men in council, implying that surely such men, *mode snottre*, will be able to solve this riddle. These men, argues Wilcox, are the mock riddle's target. Unlike other riddles that use body parts to first mislead then help provide a solution, this one defamiliarizes the body (181) by presenting one that is grotesque and provides no further clues. Symphosius may provide the answer, but this poem cheats the conventions of the riddle (182) in that it violates the rule that a riddle "is potentially solvable from the information included in the question if the riddlee is able to determine the witty devices for confusion employed to

frame the riddle" (182, citing Pepicello and Green). Wilcox notes that such cheating of convention is itself conventional in a specific genre of riddles, the so-called "neck riddle," which can be solved only by the one setting the riddle. Like the familiar rhyme "As I was going to St. Ives," no. 86 throws out absurdly misleading non-clues, only to provide the real answer in the final half-line, the significance of which has been edited away by the Old English poem's recent editors. Wilcox maintains that the Symphosian solution works when this last half-line is emended: the ms. reads *Saga hwaet ic hatte*, whereas editors have changed this to *Saga hwaet <hio> hatte*. Wilcox contends that one has to read it aloud, that it breaks convention by breaking the frame, that the act of bad faith required by the audience is encouraged by the bad faith of the riddler in presenting dismembered body parts which do not add up to a recognizable body (184). "Rather than stressing the paradox of the inability of the ocularly-deprived garlic-seller to make good his disfigurement, the Old English riddler stresses the difficulty of solving the riddling conundrum both through the scene-setting of the first two lines (which lacks any equivalent in Symphosius) and through the profusion of body parts in the heart of the riddle. The very difficulty and absurdity of the conventional solution provides the clue that the final half-line ought to be taken seriously as it appears in the manuscript" (184-85). This "playful poem," concludes Wilcox, is a parody of the riddling form itself. He finds the same emended half-line in riddle no. 19, and makes the case that leaving it unemended, too, reveals the poem as a mock-riddle. Like no. 86 this one is notoriously difficult to solve, but unlike the other poem there is no Latin analogue to come to the rescue. The runic letters describe objects that don't seem to add up (horse, man, warrior, and hawk) and Wilcox quotes Wyatt's conclusion that the riddle "is not worth the time and ingenuity which have been spent on it" (186). Williamson has come as close as we are likely to get to a solution which accounts for all of the clues, but Wilcox maintains that his solution is in fact "awkwardly complicated" and that he has fallen for the riddler's trick. Solving the clues here is uncalled for. The listener/reader has been fooled by the profusion of riddling devices and when the riddler asks in the final half-line, *Saga hwaet ic hatte*, he is in fact inviting the response: "I am called the riddler, who saw this conundrum which I am now presenting to you" (186).

D.F.J.

c. Beowulf

Text, Language, Meter

FEW WORKS of Anglo-Saxon scholarship have had the bomb-shell impact of Kevin Kiernan's 1981 *'Beowulf' and the 'Beowulf' Manuscript*. It stood in the vanguard of a new interest in the details of manuscript evidence, and it was one of the first and most powerful arguments for the blurring of boundaries between "authors" and "scribes" in Old English literary texts. Kiernan's work unleashed a storm of argument, a salutary and remarkably productive decade of re-examining all the most

entrenched assumptions about the most important text in the OE poetical canon; in the years since its publication, the book's controversial thesis has lost none of its beguiling appeal. A new and revised edition (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996; pp. xxx, 328) contains an appreciative Foreword by Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, introductory "Re-Visions" by Kiernan (pp. xv–xxviii) in which he spars with a few of the critics of the first edition of his book, and a reprint of his 1983 essay for *Anglo-Saxon England*, "The State of the *Beowulf* Manuscript, 1882–1983" (pp. 305–328). This is a handsome publication, and as interest in Cotton Vitellius A.xv continues to increase and to spread to the relatively new field of electronic facsimiles, a particularly welcome one; I can only agree with O'Keeffe's Foreword, which concludes, "it is impossible to engage *Beowulf* seriously without engaging the arguments Kiernan sets forth in this book. For any work of scholarship that is a remarkable achievement" (xiii).

As in most years, Alfred Bammesberger offers brief but wise textual notes on difficult lines. In "The Emendation of *Beowulf*, l. 586" (NM 97, 379–82) he argues that the word usually supplied to fill an apparent gap in a half-line—"no ic þæs [fela] gylpe"—doesn't fit the context well; he suggests that the missing word may have alliterated with either *fegum* or *sweordum* in the previous half-line, and proposes *sopes*. He further asserts that "[i]f we assume that the *Beowulf* text goes back to the eighth century, then it would be thinkable that the genitive singular of an *a*-stem noun still ended in *-æs*. The halfline may have read: *no ic þæs sopes gelpu*, possible written as <noicþæsopæsgelpu>" (381). This might account for the scribal omission. In "Beowulf's Last Will" (ES 77, 305–10) Bammesberger notes that the forms *fremmað* (2800) and *hafað* (2802) are usually taken, without much warrant, as unusual imperative singulars addressed to Wiglaf—now that I have bought this hoard with my old life, the hero says, take care of the needs of the people; command the brave in battle to build a barrow, etc. Bammesberger, like several other critics including Bruce Mitchell and Fred Robinson, considers them to be present plural indicative forms; he disagrees with these critics, however, that the subject of these verbs is "treasures"; "in *Beowulf* treasures are not regularly used for bringing about the well-being of nations," he notes (307). He argues that "the subject for both *hatað* and *fremmað* may be the non-expressed pronoun for third person plural. . . . *fremmað* and *hatað* stand in parallel constructions and both have the same subject *hie* 'they', namely the persons to whom the attribute *heaðomære* 'battle famous' refers" (308).

J. R. Hall's "Beowulf 2298A: 'On þ[ā] westenne?'" (N&Q 43, 254–57) is a model of scholarly detective work. Hall examines all the evidence for the manuscript's original reading in this line, which Klaeber prints as *on þære westenne* (an unusual feminine form). The original reading of the second word is lost in the crumbling margins of the page, and Hall tracks the reading through the Thorkelin transcripts to conclude that the original reading is *þā* (= *þam*). "It seems easier to believe that Thorkelin misread an obscure or damaged *ā* as *æ* and wrongly expanded the tilde as *re* than that he

interpolated *þære* into his transcript in the natural flow of his copying or that the unparalleled collation, *þære westenne*, occurred in the text of *Beowulf*" (257).

Scott Gwara exercises his considerable ingenuity over a line that lesser readers might regard as obvious; in "A Metaphor in *Beowulf* 2487a: *guðhelm toglad*" (SP 93, 333–48), he argues that the phrase describing the death of Ongentheow, universally understood as "his battle-helmet split apart," in fact contains a subtle metaphor. Subtle indeed, since no critic has ever seen it, nor do the context of the lines suggest it, and in fact a parallel passage (2977–81) describing the same action explicitly says the Eofor broke Ongentheow's helmet. Gwara compares uses of *-helm* compounds and finds that "many of them denote a physical or metaphorical covering: darkness, mist, shadow, or disguise" (338); *nibthelm* (Bwf 1789), for example, means "the covering of night." In only a few cases, such as *grimhelm* (Bwf 334) does *helm* literally mean "helmet"; Gwara argues that its use is similarly metaphorical in the passage in question. He further claims that the verb *togladan* must mean "glide away"; in none of its poetic uses "does the verb connote any swift or sudden action, as the *Beowulf* reference could suggest. Instead, *togladan* implies a gradual diminution, wearing away, or degeneration" (345f). But if the phrase doesn't mean what it seems to mean, what *does* it mean? Gwara proposes "Most likely, Ongentheow's valor or animus, literally his 'battle-shroud', ebbs (glides away) as death overtakes him. This battle-covering could represent strength or fortune" (347). This reading is a stretch, certainly, and pretty far from what one must insist is the reasonable literal meaning of the words in question. Even if one can accept the point about *togladan*, noting that it is an intransitive verb, and render the passage "his battle-helm slipped" or something, the literal meaning of *guðhelm* is so appropriate to the passage that any more metaphorical extension of the meaning might be said to be a whisper drowned out in the din of battle. Gwara's metaphorical—almost metaphysical—reading may, at best, come along for the ride as a kind of subtext: more subtle, perhaps, than even the *Beowulf* poet is wont to be.

In the modern world so many things are in short supply: clean air, pristine forests, silence, integrity, originality, tomatoes that taste like tomatoes. But there is, unfortunately, no shortage of theories about Old English meter, and we ought to be grateful to those who labor to mark a trail through their wild profusion. Robert Stockwell's "On Recent Theories of Metrics and Rhythm in 'Beowulf'" (in *English Historical Metrics*, ed. McCully and Anderson, pp. 73–94) surveys some relatively new entries into this flourishing market; the "recent" in the title refers to the years between 1987 and 1991, when the essay was first written, so it does not include even more recent works such as Kendall's *Metrical Grammar of 'Beowulf'* (1991), Fulk's *History of Old English Meter* (1992), or Hutcheson's *Old English Poetic Metre* (1995). Stockwell has a pretty full plate with what he *does* include, comparing the theories of Cable (represented by his 1991 *The English Alliterative Tradition*), Russom (*Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory*, 1987), Obst (*Der Rhythmus des 'Beowulf': eine Akzent-*

und Takttheorie, 1987), and Creed (*Reconstructing the Rhythm of 'Beowulf'*, 1990). The search for an ever-more elegant descriptive language for the surviving remnants of the Old English poetic tradition is made more piquant by the need for some mechanism for evaluating and emending defective manuscript readings; what is needed is an agreeable metrical theory that manages to be simultaneously descriptive, prescriptive, and true to the language, traditions and circumstances of performance of Old English. It's no wonder nobody has gotten it right, though some, admittedly, seem to have gotten it more right than others. After more than a century of work, the most important distinction between one kind of theory and another remains the difference between "stressers" and "timers," isochronous and non-isochronous systems—roughly, whether one approaches the verse from the starting-point of grammar or musical performance. The rest, as the tee-shirt says, is just details. Not much has been done to resolve this fundamental difference of approach, and not much will be done; one has little choice but to choose the preferred kind of theory and go from there. Stockwell's survey is for the most part fair and insightful; he concludes that Russom and Cable are "very much alike, principally because they both allow substantial numbers of extrametrical syllables to be ignored"; Obst counts all syllables and observes isochrony, "at a certain cost in the resulting complexity and loss of conceptual elegance," and Creed's rigidly isochronous framework "has serious internal inconsistencies" (91). Most of the theorists surveyed by Stockwell are also contributors to the volume in which this essay appears; there is no end in sight to the making and re-making of metrical theories. (Other essays from this volume by Thomas Cable, C.B. McCully, and Geoffrey Russom, though listed in the *Beowulf* section of the 1996 Bibliography, do not really deal with *Beowulf* and are reviewed under "Literature: General and Miscellaneous" above).

There is no point in trying to summarize Seiichi Suzuki's 500-page *The Metrical Organization of 'Beowulf': Prototype and Isomorphism* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 95. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996; pp. xxiv, 537). Those who are interested will have to read it for themselves; for the rest of us, let this suffice: Suzuki, relying only on the metrical evidence of *Beowulf* and with a structuralist's concern for underlying patterns, reduces Sievers' five types to three, roughly represented by /x/x, //xx, and /xx/. Sievers' types B, C, and D are included under a single metrical type, the second; there are (needless to say) numerous subsets under each of Suzuki's three main types (and very few attestations of the main hypothetical types II and III). Suzuki's theory is elegantly simple: there are four metrical positions per verse, and two strong positions; the first position must be strong. It relies, however, on a network of elaborate sub-rules concerning resolution, anacrusis, and "heavy drops" whereby a stressed syllable occupies a weak metrical position (a reverse process creates a "demoted lift" whereby a strong metrical position becomes weak, and so in effect, if I read Suzuki right, there are circumstances under which a lift and a drop are indistinguishable) to map this schema onto the complicated

evidence. The book is sophisticated in its theoretical underpinnings, thoroughly documented, graciously if not lightly written, and meticulously researched; if it fails to provide a convincing alternative to Sievers' descriptive types, it is hardly alone in that.

As noted, at the heart of most debates on metrical theory is the relation between meter and rhythm, between abstract principles of poetic construction and the practices of performance. Adhering to either principles or practices requires a great leap of faith—one over the chasm of linguistic ignorance and psychological improbability, the other over the gulf separating our expectations as an audience from those of a medieval listener. Traditionally linguistics has proved a more attractive leap than performance—of the major theorists of OE meter, only Heusler and Pope have really dared to make rhythm the central element of their analysis. Now Wolfgang Obst asks "Can Old English Rhythm be Reconstructed?" (in *English Historical Metrics*, ed. McCully and Anderson, pp. 59–72). He begins with the observation that rhythm—the punctuation of time by regular beats, whether of words or drums or feet—is brought to the text by the reader; it is created by performance and disappears even as it comes into being. To perform a text rhythmically requires the insertion of "silent beats" which are, by their nature, not usually indicated; text is not musical notation. The problem with this, as Obst himself notes, is that with a little ingenuity and a pair of fidgety feet, one can make almost any piece of prose rhythmical: "[h]ow can one pick up rhythm from a written text? The answer is that one can pick it up whenever the distributional evidence suggests that there is something to be picked up, even if this has not been intended by the author" (63). Rhythm is one of those interesting but insignificant side-effects of language, present wherever words are spoken; it becomes significant only when recurring patterns of language force it upon the reader or listener. He then proceeds to search *Beowulf* for just such patterns. First Obst offers a metrical "generative calculus"—he discerns 309 metrical types which account for 96% of the verses (the remaining 4%, or 238 verses, belong to a group of 126 subtypes)—and then analyzes the possible rhythms arising from this model. He concludes with a roundabout acceptance of isochrony, forced upon him (or so he pretends) by verses such as *gūðrinc monig* (838b) which have, in effect, three "lifts" in a row: "if the time stretch between the lifts is equal, no difficulty arises in recognizing a lift, even if it is surrounded by syllables which have a higher stress" (71).

Sources and Analogues

ARCHETYPAL STRUCTURES of plot, historical reminiscences, homiletic pieties, political observations, religious historiography, Boethian laments, dark chthonic monsters: *Beowulf* has more layers than Rome, and like a walk through that Eternal City, a reading of *Beowulf* finds one sometimes lost in a maze of centuries, spun about by the intersecting overlay of diverse structures which once made perfect sense but is now a mess of alleys, ruins, ancient thoroughfares and dead ends. In *'Beowulf'*

and the Demise of Germanic Legend in England (Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition 17. New York and London: Garland, 1996; xvii, 237 pp.), Craig Davis sets out to untangle some of these layers and explain how the poem came to be. His work is both an interpretation of the poem and an account of its circumstances of creation, both a reading in the context of myth and a consideration of the uses of myth and legend in particular cultural settings. His thesis is large but subtle, his book brief but important.

Davis's first two chapters deal with legendary material in general and Germanic legend in particular. Legendary stories of heroes and kings tend to arise, he observes, in parallel to mythic stories of gods; "legendary tradition develops within, or below, a narrative universe whose scope and structure is defined by sacred stories of superior prestige" (7). In the patterns of legend, then, we may discern the silhouette of forgotten myths. As mythic structures change, legends adjust uneasily to accommodate them; the body of Arthurian legends, for example, gradually shifted its structure from a pre-Christian Celtic tradition to a paradigm with strong elements of biblical structure. Such legends retain, Davis argues, traces of their origins: "an ambitious poem of heroic legend like *Beowulf*, though patently the product of Christian Anglo-Saxon culture, is bound to have retained some impression from the old universe of its origin, some implicit typological residue" (10). This structural residue, Davis argues from comparative evidence, is the conflict between a new social structure of coercive national kingship introduced atop the older tribal system, the shift in power to a comitatus-centered warrior kingship from an older agricultural tribal kinship, and to a religion of cruel royal war-gods equivalent to the Norse *Æsir* from an earlier system of tribal fertility gods and goddesses similar to the Norse *Vanir*. This took place at an inopportune time, from the point of view of pagan survival: hastened into existence in England by the exigencies of migration and conquest, the "relatively late and weakly institutionalized development left the culture ideologically vulnerable to the powerful new king-cult introduced by Christian missionaries from Rome" (12). Davis notes the survival through syncretism of pagan practice in Anglo-Saxon popular culture, and suggests that pagan myths and legends of royal king-cults survived in some form as well, though changed. The evidence is, of course, utterly ambiguous—Snorri Sturleson, for example, who furnishes much of what we know about Norse myth, was a Christian, and who can say how much his knowledge of Biblical and liturgical material has influenced his recounting of pagan myths? Davis is content to leave the matter undetermined, and concludes only that "the structure of late pagan cosmology, corresponding to the recent successes of kingship, seems to have left a discernible imprint on the way in which Christian Anglo-Saxon poets envisioned their world" (49).

Though it was not entirely eradicated, the mythology of the late pagan royal cults was supplanted by Christianity; in fact, Davis argues, quite apart from its spiritual consolations, Christianity offered a powerful ratification of the idea of

kingship and the status of the king. Davis considers Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies "as the primary place where competing cultural traditions were explicitly coordinated, rationalized, and prioritized" (xv); Woden appears, "demoted rather than dismissed" (52), in seven of the eight surviving royal pedigrees, worked in among newer figures of authority and prestige like Noah and Adam; "Sceaf, who had once served as the ligature between Germanic myth and Danish dynastic legend in pagan times, was now pressed into service as the link between sacred history and English dynastic legend in Christian times" (62). Old pagan stories continued to be told in some form, Davis notes; "[t]raditions of fallen Germanic gods and legendary heroes were collapsed into a single 'heroic age' succeeding that of the antediluvian patriarchs but foreshadowing the foundation of current dynasties" (65). A poem like *Widsið* illustrates the amalgamation of diverse legends into the service of royal panegyric; the surviving fragments of *Waldere* and the German *Hidebrandslied* dramatize the antagonism of kinship and kingship systems. Davis assumes that "a much larger body of similar pseudo-historical material" once existed but is now lost (85). This material survived at what Davis calls a "lower" cultural register—no longer authoritative legends of royal foundations but historical entertainments of antiquarian interest; such legends "proved far less subversive to correct belief than Louis [the Pious] or Alcuin feared" (86). Furthermore, Davis notes, the surviving legendary material suggests that the old legends were fractured, disjointed, reduced to a hodge-podge; "[o]nly *Beowulf* makes a more ambitious effort at cultural recollection, and attempt to recapture, perhaps even redeem, something of the old legendary world under the new Christian regime" (87).

Chapters 5 and 6 examine the hero's battle against the race of the Grendels. Davis sets himself the dangerous and heroically difficult task of finding the "subtext" of the story, the "deeper point . . . which the poem's audience would have felt emotionally, if not completely grasped intellectually" (89); believing that the genesis of the poem reflects the evolution of Anglo-Saxon culture itself, Davis detects traces of an ur-legend of a shamanistic battle against a death-spirit. In the context of a royalist bias, praising the peace, power, and prosperity of the Scylding dynasty, the poet uses the figure of *Beowulf* to depict "the imaginary exorcism of demons incarnating, with increasing specificity, the force of endemic kindred violence" (xv). *Beowulf*'s underwater battle with Grendel's mother is practically a struggle between the champion of *comitatus* kingship and the earth-mother herself; while Norse paganism could reconcile the *Æsir* and *Vanir* into one relatively harmonious system, "darker doublets of the old earth deities still lurked in ideological backwaters where they were kept at bay by the more progressive powers" (117). Recounted tales like the *Finnsburh lay*, however, remind the audience of the eternal recurrence of kin-slaying, the failure of oath-taking and peace-weaving, the dark violence that remains the heart of the heroic system—all the values supposedly overcome by *Beowulf* in his dispatching of the Grendels. "Grendel and his mother are spirits of primeval necessity. . . . For the

poet and his tradition, they characterize the way things have always been" (130).

But despite his recasting of the old myths into a legend of royal triumph, Davis argues, the poet is trapped by his tale; "[t]he course of events, the inherent pattern of eventuality, embodied in the story of his hero and his hero's people was too darkly deterministic, too deeply governed by the *geosceft grim*, to bend finally to the promises of providential monarchy" (133). And so the dragon, not just a social catastrophe but practically the personification of *wyrd*, eventual and inevitable death, itself, consumes both the hero and the story. Davis suggests that the poem's ending tries to accommodate pagan and Christian apocalyptic elements, depicting the failure of both cosmic and human kingship. Though a rusted royal standard may gleam over the dark horde in the dragon's lair, even the best of kings cannot escape the final manifestation of chaos, death: "[t]he king and his world are devoured by the indifferent and indiscriminate rapacity of the universe" (157). Davis suggests that this dark conclusion "reveals the final failure of the poet himself to adapt pagan heroic legend to Christian expectations of eventuality"; the poet cannot "manage the Boethian leap from the sublunary standpoint of fate to the celestial perspective of divine providence" (159). Davis blames this on the inexorable force of the inherited narrative; others might see it as a mark of the poet's tact and skill to leave the matter of Beowulf's salvation to the judgment of the audience (Davis explicitly rejects this argument—it is that of Fred Robinson's *Beowulf and the Appositive Style*—as "oversubtle" on p. 161, and relegates disputes on such vexed matters as the poem's date, the nature of its religious faith, and the state of the hero's soul to a series of brief appendices). Earlier Davis argues that "the *Beowulf*-poet's overriding interest is secular and political, that area in which late pagan monarchism found itself in closest consonance with the pro-royal Christianity of Pope Gregory and the Augustinian mission. It is not until he must tell the end of his hero's story that the poet is forced to widen his perspective to a view of the universe in which the teleological contradictions between a grimly fatalistic late paganism and a positively providential Catholic Christianity became so painfully apparent" (xiv). Ironically, he notes, "it is only in the evil figures like Grendel and his mother . . . that the poet can confidently link pagan legend to Christian sacred history" (162); with the fate of his ideal warrior-king the poet is less comfortable. For this reason, Davis considers the poem a literary failure—the word "Demise" in his title is deliberately chosen. Scriptural poetry, hagiography, Christian historiography, and national biography overwhelmed the older legendary material; the half-Christianized material of *Beowulf* "simply withered at a formal level of culture in England" (163), and indeed later (probably later) poems like *Brunanburh* and *Maldon* manage to commemorate comitatus loyalty and celebrate royal power with hardly any reference or allusion to the body of Germanic legend.

This is a relatively brief but thought-provoking book; it covers vast ground in an efficiently and elegantly readable way.

Davis is ready to find versions of pagan myth in every corner of the poem, which will make some readers uncomfortable; others will welcome the application of a contemporary and historically-conscious myth-criticism to the complexities of the poem. All readers will be grateful to Davis for the fruitfulness of his excavations in literary archaeology.

Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer Resumes the Tale* (ed. Mary Louise Lord. Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1995. xiii, 258 pp.) is a posthumous collection incorporating parts of a planned sequel to Lord's epochal 1960 work and sections of unpublished lectures; it is less a coherently-argued thesis than a series of ideas and impressions, retrospects and prospects, redefinitions and recollections, rebuttals and revisions. In this it has its value, both as a tribute to the breadth and energy of Lord's life and work, and as a memorial to his continued intellectual engagement with the field he helped define. This is also its limitation, however, in that the work often seems to be merely re-tracing Lord's steps over some quite familiar territory, and does not always enlarge or advance the debate in the areas it addresses.

Early chapters present definitions of different kinds of traditionality, an analysis of the composition and transmission of short non-narrative songs, and a reflection on the possibilities of aesthetic appreciation—recognizing deliberate rather than formulaic repetition, non-mechanical use of epithets, and so on—of Homeric poetry. The middle chapters of the book deal specifically with Old English poetry. Chapter Four, "*Beowulf* and Oral Epic Tradition," reproduces a lecture given in 1990; it is a graceful summary of Lord's thoughts on Old English, and a partial engagement with some of the critics of the early versions of the oral theory, including Derek Pearsall. Lord admits—finally—that there must be such a thing as a "transitional text" somewhere between oral and literate composition (105; he later devotes a chapter, pp. 212–37, to his elaboration of this term), but he does not think that *Beowulf* is an example of one. "[T]he action of *Beowulf* is at base an Indo-European myth," he claims; its "fundamental story, as well as its basic style, belongs to oral traditional literature" (107). Lord detects several general areas—he avoids the term "layers"—in the poem: mythic material, Judeo-Christian elements, and material concerning Germanic legendary history. In the end he returns to a kind of general feeling about the origins of the poem, rather than any specific evidence of text, language, style, or anything else: "*Beowulf* is a complex and magnificent poem setting forth an ancient theme of the establishing and maintaining of order on earth by the action of gods and heroes. As its story was told over generations, it attracted multiforms from the Bible, from other myths, history, and legend, and from other oral traditional genres, all of which served to strengthen the inherited meaning" (111).

Half a century of research on living traditions of oral-traditional poetry has only served to sharpen the distinction between the style of these works and the style of a poem like *Beowulf*; the almost overwhelming power of the oral-traditional hypothesis has been its capacity to expand to include

types of poetry that would, by any other measure, be miles apart. Lord's discussions of Old English poetry demonstrate this astonishing expansiveness. A chapter on "The Formula in Anglo-Saxon Poetry" is a version of a 1986 lecture; it argues against such critics as Larry Benson and Geoffrey Russom in favor of the possibility that the poet of *Beowulf* practiced, at least occasionally, the "thriftness" characteristic of orally-composed verse. The "formula" in Old English poetry turns out to be markedly unlike the "formulas" of Homer or of the various slavonic bards studied by Lord and Parry; Lord labors over and refines the definitions offered by Donald Fry in 1981 and Anita Riedinger in 1985. Reflections on "The Theme in Anglo-Saxon Poetry" begin with the admission that "the work on the theme in Anglo-Saxon poetics got off on what I always thought was the wrong foot" (137); Lord tries to re-define the concept so that it does, in fact, appear in Old English poetry.

At the end of the book Lord has left the debate over the applicability of his theories to Old English poetry in general and *Beowulf* in particular pretty much where it was before he began the book. There is relatively more engagement with his critics, but most of the work is taken up by reiterations of familiar themes—the difference between "memorizing" and "remembering," the conscious avoidance of the words "extemporaneous" and "improvised," the defense of the "quality" of traditional verse, the denial of the word "theory" applied to his theory, the numerous snippets of slavonic poetry shorn of context. The tale is a good one, though often heard before; in good oral-traditional style, when the singer resumes his tale, he tells the same story in different words.

Criticism

AT FIRST GLANCE one would think there was not much more to be said about the gnomic utterances and maxims in *Beowulf*. Like most first glances, however, this one would be mistaken: Susan Deskis's *'Beowulf' and the Medieval Proverb Tradition* (MRTS 155. Tempe, AZ: MRTS, 1996. 178pp.) is an important new look at this familiar topic. What is new in this approach—what, in fact, rewrites the study of the subject from the bottom up—is a consideration of possible analogues for the proverbs in *Beowulf*. Most previous scholars have apparently felt that such things as sources and analogues do not exist in any useful way for maxims and generalizations, which arise from the collective wit of the *Volk*; in the oral-traditional night, they have assumed, all cats are grey. A great deal of the value of Deskis's approach is her exposure of the fallacy of this assumption, and her willingness to consider Latin, including Biblical, sources and analogues for the proverbial material in *Beowulf*; her work crosses the boundaries of folklore and philology.

Deskis relies on formal markers and contextual clues to separate proverbial material from other traditional or formulaic elements in the poem: this is a tricky business, because many commonly-recognized markers of proverbiality—repetition, archaic language, alliteration, unusual syntax—are

masked by the proverb's appearance in a setting like *Beowulf*, where such features are the very stuff of the poem's language. A better indication is the presence of universalizing features—words like *oft*, *æfre*, *seldan*; applications to general situations through words like *se þe*, *man*, or *gumcynnes gebwa*; the appearance of modal verbs like *sceal*, *moste*, and *mæg*—and the use of comparisons ("a is better than b"); using these criteria Deskis counts thirty-one proverbial expressions in *Beowulf*. The study divides these proverbs by subject: The Rule of God; Joy and Sorrow; Fate and Death; Warnings and Advice. In each case Deskis presents analogues to the sentence, suggests the pithier form it may have had before it was adapted into the poem, and considers its function in *Beowulf*. Deskis finds analogues for most of the poem's *sententiae*; she concludes that these were worked into the poem because they were familiar sayings. Deskis finds no conclusive evidence for the origin of such proverbial utterances: many have their analogues in the Psalms, but others are so common as to transcend cultural context altogether; they are no help in determining the elusive origins of *Beowulf*. "Such simple assertions as 'Everyone must die' or 'God and fate determine events'," Deskis notes, "are equally valid in classical, Christian, or medieval heroic contexts, and it is primarily in their proverbial or sentential forms that they move from one to the other" (104). In cases where no analogues are found, as in lines 2029b–31: "Oft seldan hwær / æfter leodhryre lytle hwile / bongar bugeð, þeah seo bryd duge," Deskis argues that the poet is deliberately using proverbial markers to transform non-proverbial utterances into pseudo-proverbs for the purposes of his story, to function—as genuine proverbs do—as a transition from one element of the tale to another and as a means of drawing attention to the underlying pattern of narrated events.

Deskis's work is thorough, well-argued, carefully presented; it sets a new standard for discussion of the sources—literary and popular—and analogues of *Beowulf*. The most appealing aspect of the work is the author's comfort with the idea of movement from Latin to vernacular, and from oral to written, in the circulation of such *sententiae*: "no reliable method exists for determining the essential orality or literality of a given sentence, even when that sentence has become proverbial through the decontextualization of a quotation, or on the other hand, through the translation of vernacular material into a Latin context" (139). This freewheeling approach to the field of analogues—gnomic poetry; collections of proverbs like the *Disticha Catonis*; Biblical, liturgical, and homiletic material; commentaries and classical Latin literature; later vernacular romances—suggests that the sentential impulse was not limited to one place or time, nor did proverbial sentiments remain tied to their local origins. In effect this argument is an epitome of a more complex way of reading Old English literature, ever aware of influences across boundaries of language and culture, context and origin. Proverbs were only, perhaps, the most mobile parts of this trans-cultural circulation, equally at home in oral and literate, Latin

and vernacular, classical and Christian contexts. The common-ground for these varied influences, Deskis argues, was the *florilegium*; a collection such as Defensor's *Liber scintillarum* or Sedulius Scottus' *Collectaneum miscellaneum* shows the same melange of proverbs from various sources as one finds in *Beowulf*. Deskis' approach sketches the routes along which literary influence may travel: "[o]ne would hesitate to ascribe to the *Beowulf*-poet a detailed knowledge of Seneca, Tacitus, and Virgil, or of the complete works of Augustine, but the transmission of *sententiae* from these and other authors through *florilegia* brings them within the possible range of influences on the poet" (146). Deskis's intriguing study offers a sophisticated contemporary model of Old English literary history; it makes an important contribution to the study of *Beowulf* and of traditional literature, and its findings are sure to be cited and studied by scholars of the poem for some time to come.

The same field yields different fruit Todd Runda's "Beowulf as King in Light of the Gnostic Passages" (*SELIM* 5 [1995], 78–90). Runda asks, "is it really fair, then, to judge Beowulf, who lived in a society of warriors over a thousand years ago, by our standards?" (78). His answer, as might be expected, is "no." According to the gnostic wisdom embodied in the poem—he counts twenty-eight passages of gnostic or proverbial content—Runda suggests that "Beowulf is an ideal, both as hero and king" (78). Runda looks, not too closely, at the many passages of proverbial wisdom in the poem and argues that Beowulf ably lives up to the standards of his own society; ignoring a great deal of the poem's own subtlety, Runda accuses scholars who would judge the hero harshly of "fail[ing] to understand the values of a different culture" (88–9).

Beowulf lives, not altogether comfortably, in the space between many worlds—pagan and Christian, heroic and hagiographical, oral and literate, myth and history; most critics, in their course of a necessarily reductive search for meaning, have approached their job as if it were the drawing of boundaries which might contain the poem in one of these worlds or another, repressing or ignoring the traces of contrary voices contained in the text. In a subtle and wide-ranging essay entitled "*Beowulf*: Myth and Monsters" (*ES* 77, 1–14), Joyce Tally Lionarons explores this border-land in which the poem's meanings are built. Lionarons' own essay is strongly built from the ground up, beginning with a complex assertion about the problems of myth—by definition it precedes any particular narrative and is beyond dialogue, but exists in any particular instance only in an historically-situated telling—and with Calvert Watkins's investigation of the semantics of dragon-slaying. Heroes and monsters are reciprocal effects of the same act; one cannot exist without the other and each is defined by its opposition to its opponent. In myth, the death of the serpent ensures that the outcome of violence is consensus—other voices are silenced, reprisal is rendered impossible, and cosmic order is created. This mythic equation has a social variant in which a hostile stranger, a monstrous guest who threatens the host and his social order, is (like Grendel) cast out and silenced by violence—or (like Scyld) conquers and

becomes king; it is this variation of the theme in its more human register that bears on the structure and meaning of *Beowulf*. Grendel, Beowulf, the dragon, and Grendel's mother all play the roles of host and guest; Lionarons examines the many and complex uses of the word *gist* in the poem, including potential ambiguities between *gist* and *gast* (both spelled *gest*), and argues that some of these ambiguities are likely to be deliberate wordplay. The poem's intricate and elaborate exploration of the idea of the monstrous host/guest, Lionarons suggests, serves its "primary theme: the creation and maintenance of a civilized social order in the face of social violence" (11). Social order is purchased at the price of social difference "in the face of undifferentiated and undifferentiating violence" (12); by defining an opponent as monstrous, dragonish, beyond the borders of society, violence is valorized and contained, and order is maintained. The monster-fights in *Beowulf*, Lionarons concludes, work to direct the audience's attention away from the omnipresence of endless human violence found in the poem's "digressions." This work is undone, however, by the poem itself: the sudden surprise of Grendel's mother is an indictment of the process of myth and monology. "Her attack reveals what the text with its insistence on monsters and elliptical allusions to future events cannot quite conceal: not only the historical existence of human blood feuds in Hroðgar's Denmark, but the horrifying seriousness of their threat to continued human existence" (12). Further, the death of Beowulf alongside his dragon at the end of the poem announces quite powerfully that the mythic "solution" to the problem of violence is an impossible one, and the wars whose narratives threaten to overwhelm the hero's story all through the last 1000 lines of the poem will inevitably continue. In the real historical world, human violence cannot be sublated "into the superhuman heroism of myth" (13). In this thought-provoking essay Lionarons has done strong and solid work, negotiating the space not only between contemporary theory and traditional criticism but between the margins and the center of the poem, whatever one chooses to place in those categories.

Exploring similar themes, Eric Wilson's "The Blood Wrought Peace: a Girardian Reading of *Beowulf*" (*ELN* 34, 7–30) is largely a pastiche of familiar observations on the pervasiveness of violence in the poem, the tragic futility of any efforts to overcome feud and transcend bloodshed. Wilson uses Rene Girard's 1977 *Violence and the Sacred* to posit Beowulf as a kind of germanic Oedipus, both violent lawgiver and scapegoat, priest/king and victim in the necessary rituals of violence by which society is established. Sacred violence, according to Girard, establishes order by acting as a tamed surrogate for profane violence; the king or hero, as violent bringer of order, is himself a kind of monstrous embodiment of disorder. This naturally leads, Girard would have us believe, to a kind of ur-confusion between social order and violent aggression, which is why kings are sometimes sacrificed in some very primitive cultures. "Is it possible," Wilson asks, "that violence is the origin of heroism, of civilization? that

without violence, there is no Heorot? no heroic Beowulf?" (7) These are doubtless rhetorical questions, since the answers are so obvious; Wilson somewhat disingenuously questions any efforts to distinguish one from another—violence from civilization—preferring instead the non-dualistic approach that blurs the boundaries between opposites. Of course, saying that opposites are merged and mingled depends first of all on knowing that they are opposites—all blurry non-dualities depend upon a prior non-blurry duality for their identification and interest. *Beowulf* questions the solutions its characters arrive at to contain and control violence; it does not question the necessity of containing or controlling it, and it is clear on what is violence and what is not. Wilson hopes to sweep up the whole poem with the coarse broom of Girard's notions of sacred violence. Giftgiving or treasure "recalls sacrificial rituals because it reinforces the distinctions on which a culture is based" (13). Beowulf's heroic action is a kind of self-sacrifice: he "cleanses the violence by simultaneously playing the role of surrogate victim and the master of the ritual" (19). The blurring of distinctions between Beowulf and his opponents exposes the moral ambiguity of the whole concept of sacred violence; "[i]f Beowulf is right in killing the dragon, was the dragon right in burning Beowulf's house? Who is the hero? who the monster? Are both victims?" (25). Such questions, certainly, have never taken readers very far towards an understanding of *Beowulf*. Girard's own work seems to lie most comfortably alongside the tragic theater of the Greeks, where myth and legend are starkly written, and the Freudian anthropology Girard is troping is most at home. For the Anglo-Saxons the fit seems less exact.

Beowulf often appears to be a relentlessly manly poem, its hero an exemplar of manly strength and action and its female characters reduced to cupbearers and mourners, but Robert Morey argues that "Beowulf also fulfills his society's idealized feminine role: that of peaceweaver or *frīðusibb folca*, the 'peace-pledge of nations'" (in "Beowulf's Androgynous Heroism," *JEGP* 95, 486–96, p. 486). Among men, Morey notes, the bonds of loyalty are "vertical" rather than "horizontal," ties of blood or honor between the lord and his thanes rather than between tribes; "male loyalty across tribal lines is very seldom cited as a virtuous trait" (490). It is the woman's role in heroic poetry to bring about peace between feuding nations, and this is precisely what Beowulf does: "Beowulf's deeds constitute a kind of marriage between Danes and Geats, achieving the sort of détente that Hrothgar hopes for with Heatho-Bards by means of Freawaru's marriage" (492). Moreover, the words used to describe the hero at the end of the poem—*milde*, (*mon*)*ðwære*, *liðe*—"occur in a similar cluster when Wealhtheow speaks of the peace she has fostered in Heorot" (495). Morey suggests that Beowulf, like the saints, exhibits "a fluidity of gender that transcend[s] biological fixity" (494); further, he suggests that Beowulf's encounter with Grendel's mother in the "carnivalized mere" makes him "the feminized object of his antagonist's male-imagined sexual violence" (493). This "structural" feminization of the hero has interesting implications for

further study; Morey's essay suggests that an attentive reading of the spaces between gender and biology in *Beowulf* can offer new and surprising perspectives on the poem.

Speaking of the feminine aspects of the poem, Melinda Menzer's "Aglæcwif (*Beowulf* 1259a): Implications for -wif Compounds, Grendel's Mother, and Other *aglæcan*" (*ELN* 34, 1–6) elucidates the nature of Grendel's monstrous mother by examining other OE compounds with the element *wif*. She finds that "the compound *aglæcwif*. . . suggests that the word *aglæca* does not denote a type of being, human, animal, or monster, as much as a kind of status in the community, like a monk" (4). The compound, if it is like other such compounds in OE, "does not merely refer to the female equivalent of the male or genderless *aglæca*. . .; *aglæcwif* denotes a woman, a human female, who is also *aglæca*" (2). It is good to see speculation on this mysterious character firmly anchored in semantic reality, and anything that moves us closer to a definition of the murky term *aglæca* is useful and important; still it's hard to know what to make of these conclusions—how human are these creatures, really? What would an Anglo-Saxon audience have made of this sort of species-specific definition?

A more sanguine view of the poem's female characters is found in Christopher Fee's "*Beag & Beagbroden: Women, Treasure, and the Language of Social Structure in Beowulf*" (*NM* 97, 285–94), which considers heroic economics and marriage as two sides of the same coin. Women, he notes, are like rings in that they serve "as commodities which are exchanged in order to safeguard a particular social or political agenda" (285). Ring-giving and peace-weaving are two aspects of the same enterprise, Fee argues; women and rings are adorned and ornamented possessions, powerless in themselves, that function to bind men together into a cohesive group—the only difference is that ring-giving takes place within the hall, and peace-weaving is done between formerly-hostile halls. Fee is undeterred by the historical evidence against this reductive view, preferring the literary criticism of Jane Chance to the historical research of Christine Fell: "regardless of the political realities of Anglo-Saxon England, many of Chance's notions resonate well with the semantic context of the poem" (288). If the name "Wealhtheow" has any meaning, Fee further notes, it "serves to remind the audience of [her] status as war booty" (290); slaves, like women and rings, are objects to be possessed. Fee is adamant about applying modern economic notions to the world of *Beowulf*: "[i]f the terms 'purchase', 'bribe', 'barter' and 'sale' seem excessively harsh and mercantile, it may be because such a view dispels many dearly-held romantic assumptions concerning the role of the comitatus in *Beowulf*" (290). Maybe so, but then again it may be because they really are harsh and mercantile, doing little justice to the complex interplay of honor, exchange, loyalty and wealth in the poem. Yet after reading this essay one must certainly acknowledge a degree of bargaining and bartering in the act of ring-giving, and a political agenda in the making of marital alliances, and Fee is

right to place in the foreground those aspects of exchange which are sometimes left in the background.

Archaeology has recently come to understand what literary criticism has been saying for some time—things are charged with symbolic meanings. The swords in *Beowulf* are not just heroic props, they are bearers of profound significance. In "The Ritualized Presentation of Weapons and the Ideology of Nobility in *Beowulf*" (*JEGP* 95, 175–89), David C. Van Meter notes that "the conferring of weapons serves as a central symbolic gesture, and thereby evokes the ideology that unties the Anglo-Saxon nobility in a collective conceptualization of both its societal power and role" (175). Swords and arms signify nothing short of nobility itself, Van Meter argues; the rituals of inheritance, investment, and gift-giving serve to "reify" and thereby regenerat[e] the political structure among the nobility" (182). Passing on a weapon, however, creates a dynamic mutual bond in which feuds and sorrows are shared along with triumphs and glory. Arms carry obligations with them, as the story of Hengest and the failure of Beowulf's last companions illustrate. Beowulf's use of Unferth's sword Hrunting, Van Meter suggests, symbolically deflects and assuages the failure of that nobleman's duty of revenge, showing "the dichotomy between the ideal of noble behavior and the reality of potential inadequacy" (188).

In "*Gled Man at Heorot: Beowulf and the Anglo-Saxon Psalter*" (*Leeds Studies in English* 27, 49–68) Robert Lawrence Schichler convincingly argues for the scriptural resonance of the imagery of the horned hart in *Beowulf*. Relying on illustrations in the Harley, Bury, and Utrecht Psalters, and translations in the Paris Psalter, Schichler notes that the hart or its horn is commonly used as an image of royal generosity, not just in the text of the Psalms but in their Anglo-Saxon illustrations; the generous just man is described, in the Paris Psalter, as a gracious "glæd man," as is Hrothgar in *Buƿ* 367b, inhabiting a shining hall not unlike the poem's Heorot. Schichler traces these parallels in some detail, noting their origins in the *Physiologus* tradition as well as the Bible; he argues that the presentation of Hrothgar as a just and generous ruler in *Beowulf* is not just a Germanic conceit but one with powerful biblical parallels: "the hart—as opposed to its traditional enemy, the dragon, whose harsh, greedy nature approximates Heremod's—seems a fitting vehicle for conveying the qualities of leadership that Hrothgar, as well as the Christian poet, highly values: companionship, cooperation, and sharing" (58).

John McNamara looks again at the hero's swimming-match in "Legends of Breca and Beowulf" (*Southern Folklore* 53, 153–69). McNamara suggests that the episode "so far has not been fully understood" (155), a conventional but in this case not entirely convincing place to start an argument; he believes that "folklore" will explain what has heretofore baffled literary critics. McNamara suggests that we consider each of the two divergent accounts of the swimming contest as a legend: "Unferth and Beowulf—and, of course, Breca himself—could be described as giving performances of different

versions of a complex legend" (157). Beowulf, as audience for Unferth's telling of the legend, gets to function as the "corrector" of the story, winning by rhetorical power rather than truth. McNamara asserts that the label "legend" explains the episode and explicates the stories involved: the circulation and source of such legends is as important as their content, and more important than their veracity: "the audience would infer that Unferth's knowledge of the swimming contest has to have migrated from the land of the Heatho-Ræmas in southern Norway, apparently to the land of the Brondings, and thence directly or indirectly to the Danish court" (158). Breca's own account of the story, McNamara suggests, places him in a good light, and Unferth's version of it "has come to him from widely circulating oral tradition" (162—this is an unwarranted assumption, surely?). Beowulf's recounting of the tale does not question its facts, but shifts its focus from victory in the contest to the difficulties of fighting sea-monsters, and the reasons behind Unferth's recounting of a story unflattering to Beowulf. This is certainly a valid and interesting point, not really that different from the one made by Carol Clover's "The Germanic Context of the Unferth Episode" in 1980. But it's a good point nonetheless, and like a good legend, worth hearing again. Beowulf's nautical contest with Breca is also the subject of a brief note by Stephen Marino ("*Beowulf*," *The Explicator* 54, 195–8). Marino agrees with such critics as Earl, Robinson, and Wentersdorf that the challenge is probably a rowing match rather than a swimming match. He further points out that the phrase "on sund reon" (*Buƿ* 512 and 539) might well be read as "onsund reon," that is, "rowed healthy"; Marino hears echoes of *onsundron* 'apart' and *onsundness* 'integrity' as well. "The implications on Beowulf's character as a hero in the contest are broadened with this translation," he suggests (196).

Carl Lindahl's "Beowulf, Old Law, Internalized Feud" (*Southern Folklore* 53, 171–91) sets itself a daunting task: "to resituate the hero and the poem, insofar as possible, in their original social and poetic contexts and to strive to discover how the work and the man would likely be read in the native terms of their first audience" (172). He does this through the magic of "folkloric re-readings" of the poem and its near relations: (*Finnsburb*, *Waldere*, and various Icelandic sagas and Eddic poems). This is entirely sensible and nothing new, of course, though Lindahl goes on about it as if it were his very own invention. Choosing only sagas and poems that contain characters mentioned in OE poems like *Widsith* or *Deor*, and are constructed with similar scenes, dramatic situations, and narrative concerns, Lindahl considers these works "part of the same, farflung narrative constellation" (174) as *Beowulf*. More important, Lindahl argues, all these works "represent the conservative position" in a long struggle between loose tribal organizations and rising centralized monarchies (175); all uphold the honor—if not the triumph—of the old tribal ways against the rise of kings and empires. Among these works *Beowulf* stands out, according to Lindahl, because "Beowulf is mythically undercommitted, a man who tries to survive the traps

of dying tribal culture altogether by abandoning all of their virtues—that is, all of the enslaving commitments that had been virtues in more tribal times, but which had become fatal flaws as tribes expanded to fend off centralized assaults” (176; emphasis in the original). These “enslaving commitments” include fosterage, comitatus, and marriage; “nowhere in his poem does Beowulf take advantage of any of these institutions” for the purposes of “maintaining or expanding [his] familial-tribal power base” (180). Lindahl tries to depict Beowulf as a kind of heroic-age lone wolf who resists the fatal and corrupting entanglements of society. Lindahl proceeds to support this portrayal with a series of curious misreadings: “Beowulf announces that he has come to repay a debt incurred by his father Ecgtheow” (in fact it is Hrothgar who announces this); “Hrothgar’s wife Wealhtheow attempts to set up a situation in which Hrothgar takes on Beowulf as a ‘son’ (in fact she anxiously attempts to *prevent* such a situation); ‘Beowulf’s relations to Hygelac seems particularly distant in the context of the familial terms with which his relationship to Hrothgar is described’ (lines 2145–51 do not support this interpretation). Lindahl reads the dragon-fight as another feud, an inevitable entanglement that the hero, despite his efforts, cannot avoid. For the record, Lindahl believes that *Beowulf* was written in the tenth century (184); he draws some broad parallels between Beowulf and Edmund, including the following: “like Beowulf, Edmund died in an internalized feud contracted by a member of his comitatus” (185). Surely this is a case of the *mutandi* being *mutati* beyond recognition? For all his interest in “folkloric re-readings,” Lindahl argues that the message of the poem, in any case, is topical and political: “ultimately Beowulf’s art of conflict avoidance translates into an art of alliance avoidance that dooms his people” (187).

Michael S. Nagy’s “A Reassessment of Unferð’s Fratricide in *Beowulf*” (*Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Midwest* 3 [1996 for 1995], 15–30) suggests that perhaps critics have been too hard on this strange character, too quick to establish “exterior categories to which his character can be forced to conform in one way or another” (16). Admittedly, Unferð’s odd behavior in the poem—belligerent in one scene, cowed in another, silent in the rest—positively invites scrutiny and affords an irresistible opportunity for critical speculation; and few can resist the urge to analyze and interpret his role in the poem. Additionally, the narrator’s charge of fratricide seems to place Unferð firmly in the ranks of the kin of Cain. Nagy urges us to step back from our moral revulsion and enter the murkier world of heroic society, to view Unferð in the context of the poem and of Old English poetry generally, where ideas of absolute good and evil are harder to find. In heroic poetry, he argues, loyalty to one’s lord can take precedence over any family relationship, as in the fragment known as *Waldere* or the Cynewulf/Cyneheard story in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: What one observer might describe as fratricide, another might call heroic loyalty. Nagy argues that we ought to take the Danes at face value when it comes to Unferð: “if Hroðgar and Hroþulf know about

Unferð’s admittedly treacherous past, but trust in his spirit and remain his liege lords anyway, they give tacit approval to the deed he has done” (23). Unferð, he reminds us, is “not a stock figure in a morality play, but a Germanic character who, though flawed, must be viewed contextually as such through the eyes of his liege lord” (26). Whether or not one agrees that we ought to regard Hrothgar’s opinion as equivalent to the author’s judgment, Nagy convincingly demonstrates that the character’s dark complexity cannot be reduced to a single clear statement.

For a casual reader of *Beowulf*, one of the most vivid images in the poem must be the sight of Grendel’s severed arm, snapped sinews and steely nails, dangling from the rafters in Heorot; it is a bit startling to return to the poem, examine the passage closely, and realize how fuzzy that image really is. In an eminently sensible article entitled “Grendel’s Arm and the Law” (in *Studies in English Language and Literature*, ed. Toswell and Tyler, pp. 121–32) Rolf Bremmer considers the passages in question, and places the dismemberment of Beowulf’s opponent in a cultural context. By a close reading of the relevant passages Bremmer determines that Grendel’s arm is hung up outside the hall—not “under” the roof, as line 836 might imply, but *ofer* the roof, as line 983 states. Bremmer notes the relatively common motif of displaying an enemy’s head, but refuses to link the display of a severed appendage to the cult of Woden—“the custom of exposing some body parts of slain opponents is too universal to be connected with any religious cult” (126). Instead, he suggests, its significance is legal: “it is an essential characteristic of preponderantly oral societies that they present legal procedure by means of symbols or signs whose meaning could be supposed to be commonly known. Exposing severed body parts of opponents in a clearly visible way was just one expression of such a presentation” (127). The hand of a fraudulent moneyer, for example, was nailed up above the mint, in what must have been a pretty grisly advertisement for the quality of one’s coins. Grendel’s arm was positioned outside Heorot, Bremmer concludes, so that it could be seen by all. It is clearly visible—Hrothgar notices it right away—and its visibility is the core of its “function as signal and testimony” (128).

E.L. Ridsen’s “The Gosforth Cross Narrative and *Beowulf*” (*Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Midwest* 3 [1996 for 1995], 1–14) takes off from his 1994 *Beasts of Time: Apocalyptic ‘Beowulf’*. Ridsen here notes the “syncretism” of the ambiguous imagery on the 10th-century Gosforth Cross, apparently combining both pagan and Christian symbols, and likens this to the complex world of *Beowulf*. Both embody (in a phrase Ridsen borrows from Bugge via Richard Bailey) “the pagan iconography of Christian ideas,” combining tales and motifs from both the Bible and the northern myths; both make use of apocalyptic and eschatological imagery. In reality, perhaps, neither the identification of the carvings on the cross nor the tenth-century origins of *Beowulf* are as certain as Ridsen makes them out to be, but his point about the poem—that it comes from a cultural milieu in which Christian and

pagan expressions and images mingled, the latter used in service to the former—is well taken. Nowadays the Church calls it “inculturation.” “[O]ne gets a picture,” Ridsen concludes, “of tenth-century Christianity in England as existing in a syncretistic state with a substantial population incompletely converted, and with an active conversion effort (or at least an active confusion and conflation) still taking place, an effort that did not reject the Germanic past, but used it in art and literature to teach Christian doctrine and history and to deal with the ever-present problem that *lif is læne*” (12). There are questionable assumptions in the first clause: to be “complete,” must conversion be cultural as well as spiritual? did early medieval missionaries really work like their nineteenth-century counterparts, putting trousers on the natives? Apart from these cavils, Ridsen’s work has great value, drawing attention to the peaceful co-existence and fruitful conflation of two cultural genealogies in Anglo-Saxon England.

Pedro Gonzalo Abascal and Antonio Bravo García compare “Early Christian Funeral Ceremonies and Germanic Funeral Rites in Old English Epic” (*SELIM* 5 [1995], 46–62) and argue that “the Anglo-Saxon audience of epic poems would have seen in the description of the hero’s death and in the description of the hero’s tomb rites some analogies with the early Christian funeral ceremonies and the Christian cult of the saints” (46). Care of the dead in early Christian practice included respect for the grave, provision of some grave goods, banquets over the tomb, wakes and obsequies, processions of mourning women; in *Beowulf* one finds at least some of these elements: a lament, a funeral cortège, a final panegyric. These may reflect nothing more than a universal human response to the passing of a great person in this transitory world, but in the post-conversion context of the audience of the poem they also reveal a tendency to conflate the secular hero and the Christian saint.

In scholarship, as in politics, the violence of a conflict often seems to escalate as the stakes grow smaller, and the zeal of the proponents rises as the integrity and importance of their platform diminish. So it has been with the introduction of that philosophical grab-bag called “literary theory” to Anglo-Saxon studies: much heat, certainly plenty of smoke, but little light; many words, but little said; many *ad hominem* assaults from both camps, but few observations that have improved the way we think about Old English; plenty of emperors, not enough clothes. James McNelis casts a hard but clear light on these recent debates in “The Sword Mightier than the Pen? Hrothgar’s Hilt, Theory, and Philology” (in *Studies in English Language and Literature*, ed. Toswell and Tyler, pp. 175–85). McNelis concentrates his attention on recent articles which discuss the engraved hilt that *Beowulf* brings back from Grendel’s lair, and which forms the occasion for Hrothgar’s famous “sermon” against pride—because this is the only explicitly textual artifact in the poem, it has exerted an irresistible allure on proponents of modern “theory.” McNelis notes first off that recent essays on the hilt—including works by Michael Near, Allen Frantzen, and Seth Lerer—“have

tended to depend on certain assumptions about the hilt or about its place in the poem . . . they depend on the assumption of certain choices among possible readings as an initial premise, in spite of irreducible textual ambiguity in the passages under consideration” (175). All readings, of course, must do this; what bothers McNelis is the forthrightness with which these essays ignore the flimsiness of their initial assumptions. Near’s 1993 “Anticipating Alienation: *Beowulf* and the Intrusion of Literacy,” for example, argues that the hilt casts writing as an evil force, alienating and disruptive, opposed to the cohesive and communal nature of orality; McNelis points out that this interpretation would hardly have occurred to a Christian poet or audience, for whom the written word was the way to salvation. McNelis adduces a parallel in *Solomon and Saturn* 161–3 to suggest that the writing on the hilt indicates only that the sword is magically powered, and thus able to defeat the race of Grendel: “It does not demonstrably suggest that writing as such is evil, but perhaps the ambiguity in both poems is intentional, the equivocal power of writing deliberately stressed. As with so much in Old English poetry, we will probably never know” (180). McNelis deplores the rancor of the theory wars as they are fought in our particular corner of the field, and urges “those who think of themselves as ‘bringing theory’ to those as yet bereft of it” to proceed with caution: they should prepare “not only for increasingly competent resistance to their mode of discourse, but also for the dawning realization that some of the pouches in their saddlebags have been loaded with sand rather than with gold” (182). This is a heartfelt and, overall, a fair essay. (One small correction: McNelis states on p. 183, n. 5, that Near’s essay, which appeared in *PMLA*, was overlooked by the publication you are now reading, but it was not; our Argus-eyed bibliographer recorded its appearance on p. 13 of *OEN* 27.4, and it was duly (and dully) reviewed on p. 46 of 28.2)

Marie Borroff compares two alliterative poems from different ages in “Systematic Sound Symbolism in the Long Alliterative Line in *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain*” (in *English Historical Metrics*, ed. McCully and Anderson, pp. 120–33). She notes that alliterative poetry by its very nature—with words that are “soðe gebunden” (Bwf 871)—tends to elevate collocations and sound-linkages to the level of meaning; “the magical incantatory powers of language lend a validity to connections among words which is quite other than the kind of validity having to do with connections among meanings and aspects of subject matter” (121). Recurring groups of alliterating words tend to take on thematic importance; in the first part of *Beowulf*, Borroff calls attention to the recurring group *Geat, guð, and god*. In *Gawain*, in contrast, the adjective *god* generally appears linked to the hero’s name; moreover in *Beowulf* a small word like *god* can take up a quarter of a metrical line and usually receives metrical stress, while in *Gawain* the same word is generally unstressed, relatively unemphatic, and metrically insignificant. By implication, then, in *Beowulf* the hero’s goodness is solemn and central to the story; *Gawain*’s goodness more or less “goes without saying.” In these two

poems, Borroff concludes, the differing structures of the meter contribute to the construction of meaning: "the rapid, voluble long lines of *Sir Gawain* and the slow-paced, stately measures of *Beowulf* seem alike suited to the stories these poems have to tell, and to the meanings of these stories, locked by two superbly skilled poets in letters tried and true" (132). This is a welcome observation in an age which has all but abandoned formalism, demonstrating that there is still value to be found in reading, closely and slowly, the rhythm of a line of verse.

It doesn't always pay to be first; consider poor Grímur Thorkelin. The Danish scholar who brought *Beowulf* into the world has never stopped paying the price for it, despite some recent attention by Kevin Kiernan and a sympathetic reassessment by J.R. Hall. Mostly Thorkelin has had to endure a kind of rough neglect—his transcriptions of the poem saved the text of *Beowulf* for posterity, but his awful editing was subjected to resounding ridicule by almost every scholar who worked on the poem after him. But Thorkelin deserves more than a passing acknowledgement as the clumsy pioneer of *Beowulf* studies; his work can tell us something about the creation of our field, and thus about the initial trajectories of critical interest that defined the poem for later generations. Robert Bjork presents and translates "Grímur Jónsson Thorkelin's Preface to the First Edition of *Beowulf*, 1815" (*Scandinavian Studies* 68, pp. 291–320). This is a fascinating look at what could be made of *Beowulf* without any sense of the poem's context, meaning, origin, or text; it is *Beowulf* in a vacuum, the nursery of *Beowulf* studies. Bjork offers an introduction that places Thorkelin's ideas in perspective. "[T]he multitudinous errors in the edition itself raised so many hackles that barely a hackle was left for the introductory remarks," Bjork notes (292); he argues that Thorkelin's ideas, no matter how ludicrous they may appear today, are interesting for several reasons: the preface "captures the poignancy of a life's work at least in part retrieved from the ruins of war" (297)—though Thorkelin probably exaggerated the amount of lost work he suffered during the British blockage of Copenhagen in 1807 (Bjork cites Kiernan, who quotes Thorkelin himself on this point). Moreover, Thorkelin's preface shows the romantic nationalism that gave rise to Anglo-Saxon studies on the continent, and thus formed the tools and methods and direction of our discipline. It anticipates later debates over crucial issues, still unresolved, the poem's date, provenance, authorship, and Christian content. Thorkelin's opinions on the first two issues were quickly and thoroughly dismissed; his opinion on the authorship of the poem still has some currency—he believed that no author can be found, and that the Christian elements of the poem were added to an originally complete pagan work. Reading the founders of *Beowulf* studies reminds us, I hope, that we write not just for our own time but for others unknown; our local interests and conflicts, our personal tragedies and triumphs, our sacrifice and self-interest, will shape the course of *Beowulf* studies for the next century, and will—some ages hence—be

of interest only to the antiquarian.

Gad Rausing's "A Comment on 'Beowulf—Gutarnas nationalepos' by Tore Gannholm" (*Fornvännen* 90 (1995), 50–53) reviews Gannholm's edition or translation of *Beowulf* (which is otherwise unknown to this reviewer). Rausing's fascinating but brief note recalls a vanished age of scholarship on the poem, displaying many of what some have thought of as the originary assumptions of *Beowulf* scholarship, long abandoned though not perhaps entirely outgrown: he calls the "Lay of Beowulf" a "saga," ascribes its surviving manuscript to the "9th century," and urges that its historical details be taken seriously; he applauds Gannholm for reviving the epic history of Gotland and deplores the "Swedish-centered interpretation of history" (50). The note is torn from the context of the debate that generated it; it impresses upon me the fact that the poem is still used, in places, for the purposes of cultural definition and national historiography.

Readers of the *New Yorker's* "Talk of the Town" column were no doubt pleased to learn that the author of *Beowulf* was Æthelstan, chaplain in the court of Alfred the Great (reported by John Dugdale, "Who's Afraid of Beowulf?" *New Yorker*, 23 and 30 December 1996, pp. 50 and 52); this according to David Howlett. Knowing the meticulousness of Dr. Howlett's scholarly standards and the power of his argument, undoubtedly this information is presented more persuasively in the pages of *British Books in Biblical Style* than in the *New Yorker*. How Dr. Howlett got to be the subject of a schmoozy and flattering "Talk of the Town" piece would probably make a good story.

Two dissertations deal with the poem, each only tangentially in the course of some larger quest. David Paul Muller's "Oral Noetic and the Communicative Rubric in *Beowulf*" (Diss. Louisiana State University; DAI 57A:207) is more directly concerned with the poem, but it has other fish to fry as well: it advertises itself as "a study at the nexus of two fields: oral tradition and the philosophy of language. . . . It proceeds from the hypothesis that in its present, performative moment, the oral traditional narrative instantiates a moment of communicative meaning evincing characteristics of oral, thus speakerly, and thus intention-vitalized meaning, as defined by linguistic philosophers Austin, Grice, Searle, Schiffer, Strawson, and others." Rochelle Altman's "An Application and a Text: Electronic Research Diplomatic Editions for Computers in the Humanities" (Diss. Arizona State University, DAI 56a, 4594) deploys a new computer program, DIPLOMAT, with *Beowulf* as its test case.

Translations

REPRINTED in a "Revised Edition" is Barry Tharaud's 1990 prose rendering, with its lithographs by Rockwell Kent (Niwot, CO: Univ. Press of Colorado; pp. xxviii, 98). The Preface has been lightly rewritten, but changes in the translation itself are hard to find. This is in some ways more a prose paraphrase than a translation; it might be suitable for younger readers but does not attempt to recreate or even suggest the rhythms and

style of the original.

Lauriat Lane—a great name for a poet—has revealed a work in progress, “A Draft of the First and Last *Beowulf* Cantos” (*English Studies in Canada* 22, 337–39). The translation is relatively precise and the diction only slightly stilted (“boon comrades,” “keened for their king,” that sort of thing). The only odd touch is that Lane treats the poem’s first three lines as a kind of rubric, all in capitals:

WHAT WE CAME TO KNOW OF THE KINGS OF THE FOLK,
THE FAME AND STRENGTH OF THE SPEAR DANES,
HOW THE ATHELINGS ONCE DID SUCH DEEDS:

Perhaps this is not too far off the mark, a typographical equivalent of their function in the poem’s original context, whatever that was.

Seamus Heaney offers a lively translation of lines 286–319 (“The Welcome to Denmark,” in *The Literary Man: Essays Presented to Donald W. Hannah*, ed. Karl-Heinz Westarp. Aarhus, 1996, pp. 7–8). Heaney manages to be precise but not pedantic; he gives the coast-guard a bluff and comical voice:

... “Anyone with gumption
and a clear head has to consider
two things: what’s said and what’s done.
It’s obvious to me that you are a band
our king could rely on.”

In contrast, the narrator’s diction is grandiose, using words like “luminous,” “appointments,” and “majesty.” The tone is sure and true, the rhythm flexible but strong—as usual, Heaney’s masterful voice rings out in every line but does not drown out the distant music of the original. We can only hope that he will gather the fragments of his *Beowulf* translation, which have appeared here and there in the past few years, into a single work.

R.M.L.

Not Seen

Brunetti, Giuseppe, “Il *Beowulf* in inglese moderno: traduzioni dal 1940 al 1990.” *Teoria e pratica della traduzione nel medioevo germanico*. Ed. Maria Vittoria Molinari et al. (Padua: Unipress, 1994) pp. 139–58.

Griffiths, Bill. *Meet the Dragon: an Introduction to Beowulf’s Adversary*. Loughborough: Heart of Albion, 1996. 47 pp. ill.

d. Prose

Sacred Prose

SIX BOOKS made especially significant contributions to the study of Old English prose in 1996. Three of these books deal exclusively with Old English religious prose: J.E. Cross oversaw the editing of *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: ‘The Gospel of Nicodemus’ and ‘The Avenging of the Saviour’* (ed. J.E. Cross with contributions by Dennis Brearley, Julia Crick, Thomas N. Hall, and Andy Orchard; Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 19; Cambridge, 1996; xi, 307 pp.), Erich Poppe and Bianca Ross edited *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular*

Hagiography (Dublin and Portland, OR., 1996; vii, 299 pp.), and Paul Szarmach collected an exceptionally fine volume of essays in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints’ Lives and Their Contexts* (Albany, 1996; xvii, 390 pp. ill.). Another book, a collection of essays in honor of E.G. Stanley, spans sacred and secular prose, and contains articles on both Ælfric and King Alfred: *Studies in the English Language and Literature: ‘Doubt Wisely,’ Papers in Honor of E. G. Stanley* (ed. M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler; New York, 1996; xiii, 545 pp.). Finally, two books (discussed in the next section under the heading of secular prose) take up the topic of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: G. P. Cubbin presents an edition of the D Chronicle in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, 6, MS D* (Cambridge, 1996; clxi, 123 pp. ill.), and Michael Swanton offers a fine translation of the Chronicle in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London, 1996; xxxvi, 364 pp. ill.).

Paul Szarmach’s excellent volume of hagiographical essays covers an impressive range of important topics and opens with a particularly useful essay by Gordon Whatley, “An Introduction to the Study of Old English Prose Hagiography: Sources and Resources” (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 3–32), which surveys the principal research tools needed for investigating Old English saints’ lives and the Latin texts that lie behind them. Whatley’s essay, which he more aptly terms a collection of notes, begins with a list of the texts of individual saints’ lives in Old English and then moves to a brief discussion of some standard bibliographical references for both the Old English works and their Latin sources. He singles out the Italian *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* as one of the best encyclopedias for general information about a particular saint’s origin, legend, cult, and iconography. Whatley also notes the value of Ogilvy’s *Books Known to the English* as the only general guide to the Anglo-Saxons’ use of Latin texts, though much more material will be made available when the work on *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* comes to fruition. Whatley surveys the uses and limitations of the *Acta Sanctorum*, as well as the accompanying monograph series, *Subsidia Hagiographica*, both of which issue from that productive and dedicated group of Jesuit scholars, the Société des Bollandistes. From the *Subsidia* series, two works seem of special importance: Delehaye’s popular introduction to hagiographic literature, *Les Légendes Hagiographiques*, and the handlist of medieval Latin hagiographic texts, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*. Whatley’s essay concludes with a list of manuscripts of English provenance, up to the year 1100, that contains hagiographic texts.

Six essays in *Holy Men and Holy Women* discuss the writings of Ælfric. In “Ælfric as Historian: His Use of Alcuin’s *Laudationes* and Sulpicius’s *Dialogues* in His Two Lives of Martin” (pp. 289–315), Frederick M. Biggs confirms that Ælfric relied on Alcuin’s *Laudationes* as a source for the *Depositio Sancti Martini Episcopi*, a text found in the second set of the *Catholic Homilies*. Patrick Zettel first identified Alcuin as a source whereas earlier scholarship had posited that

Ælfric used Sulpicius as his primary source. Biggs argues that Ælfric may not have consulted Sulpicius's *Dialogues* at all when he composed the *Depositio Sancti Martini Episcopi*. Biggs instead suggests that Sulpicius served as Ælfric's source for his later life of Martin, which was written for inclusion in the *Lives of Saints*. Biggs conjectures that Ælfric apparently came upon Sulpicius later in his literary career. Ælfric undoubtedly regarded Sulpicius's purportedly eyewitness account (he is said to have converted to a life of asceticism late in the fourth century at the bidding of Martin himself) as inherently more authoritative and more accurate than anything Alcuin might report some four centuries later. Given his predisposition to root out error, Ælfric naturally relied on the better authority whenever possible. In fact Biggs points out several instances where Ælfric, in writing his later life of Martin, apparently corrected errors in Alcuin's redaction by turning to readings available in Sulpicius.

Malcolm Godden's article, "Experiments in Genre: The Saints' Lives in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*" (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 261–87), suggests that several major issues confronted Ælfric as he adapted hagiographical material for inclusion in his two books of homilies. Godden defines the first issue as the "problem of the truth content and authority of hagiography, and its relationship to history." Ælfric knew of the Gelasian decree, with its strictures against false and apocryphal texts, but Godden rightly points out that the saints' legends available as sources were "a nightmare area of conflicting versions, uncertain attributions and alarming accusations and counter-accusations of heresy and falsehood." A second issue Ælfric faced centered on how individual saints were to be regarded: whether as allegorical figures, representative believers, historical characters, or spiritual heroes. And a third issue concerned what sort of meaning might be ascribed to saints' lives, that is, the nature of their *sententia*.

Godden adroitly analyzes these various issues as they pertain to the lives of John the Evangelist, Peter, Paul, Andrew, Gregory, and Cuthbert. Godden convincingly suggests that Ælfric's later works reflect a differentiation between his preaching texts and his more overtly hagiographical texts: in his later use of saints' lives, the pretense of preaching fades and yields instead to an increasingly straightforward narrative, albeit a narrative that resists both historical and biographical contextualization. As Godden observes, both "style and narrative technique insist upon the universality of the life of the saint."

Hugh Magennis shares Godden's interest in narrative technique, but examines a much narrower topic in "Ælfric and the Legend of the Seven Sleepers" (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 317–31). Magennis examines this very brief text, which occupies just one page in Godden's edition of the *Catholic Homilies*. More of a summary than a narrative, this text nevertheless illustrates Ælfric's approach to hagiography in the *Catholic Homilies*. To say, as Magennis does, that Ælfric's treatment of the Seven Sleepers focuses on "the essential significance of the legend and disregards everything

else" borders on the tautological: could it offer anything but the essentials given its brevity? And yet Magennis convincingly claims that despite this brevity, the text exemplifies Ælfric's propensity to emphasize the exemplary aspects of the legend while downplaying historical specificity or human individuality.

Narrative technique also forms the focus of Ruth Waterhouse's discussion of the lives of Oswald and Æthelthryth in her contribution to the Szarmach edition: "Discourse and Hypersignification in Two of Ælfric's Saints' Lives" (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 333–52). Waterhouse attempts a theoretical approach and examines models that purport to bridge the gap between the modern reader and Ælfric. She states the problem in the following way:

in any consideration of the three-way transaction between writer or encoder, text, and reader-audience or decoder, any theoretical standpoint now chosen by a reader will necessarily entail a whole complex of selectively differing emphases on how the transaction functions and on its impact.

Waterhouse further elaborates that the so-called "decoder" deals with three areas of concern:

the discourse (the language of the text itself), the "story" of the events befalling the protagonists that each reader will deduce from it and the hypersignification (the thematic elements over and above what is overtly stated) which can be drawn from discourse and story combined.

Waterhouse also notes that Ælfric's translation and arrangement (or, as she puts it, "re-encoding") of Bede's text shift both meaning and emphasis (or "hypersignification"). This richly detailed article might also have included for discussion the important study by J.E. Cross, "Oswald and Byrhtnoth: A Christian Saint and a Hero Who is a Christian" (*ES* 46 [1965], 93–109), which remains an excellent guide to Ælfric's handling of his sources even if it lacks the theoretical orientation that serves as the main focus of research by Waterhouse.

Other contributions on Ælfric in *Holy Men and Holy Women* include Michael Lapidge's "Ælfric's *Sanctorale*" (pp. 115–29), which begins with the reasonable assumption that Ælfric aimed to make the Christian devotions of the liturgical year comprehensible to a lay audience and that his selection of texts was guided by the significance of the feasts. The *sanctorale*, consisting of feasts celebrated each year on the same day of the Roman or solar calendar, forms the focus of the article, and Lapidge excludes from consideration Ælfric's *temporale* (consisting of those Sundays and associated days linked to Easter). In the First Series of the *Catholic Homilies* (probably issued between 990 and 994), nineteen of the forty items are specified for a particular feast in the *sanctorale*. In the Second Series of the *Catholic Homilies* (presumably issued not later than 994), fifteen or sixteen of the forty items are specified for the *sanctorale*. And, lastly, Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* contains twenty-nine items designated for the *sanctorale*. From this record, Lapidge reconstructs Ælfric's liturgical calendar and comments on its various omissions and eccentricities. Ælfric, for example, omits the evangelist Luke, the apostles Matthias and Barnabas, and, from the Doctors of the Church, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. Moreover, Ælfric

sometimes commemorates saints on dates not found in any surviving Anglo-Saxon calendars. Lapidge demonstrates that Ælfric's use of the so-called Cotton-Corpus Legendary explains some, but not all, of these peculiarities. As Lapidge notes, further investigative work seems necessary to explain Ælfric's practice.

Joyce Hill's contribution on Ælfric, "The Dissemination of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints: A Preliminary Survey*" (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 235–59), analyzes the chief manuscript witness to this collection of the texts, British Library, Cotton Julius E. vii, as well as Skeat's important edition of this manuscript. She then provides a tabulated survey (similar to those lists compiled by Pope in his edition of the *Supplementary Homilies* and by Scragg in his analysis of vernacular homilies and prose saints' lives) of the occurrence of the Julius E. vii texts in all other manuscripts. Hill draws primarily on the work of Ker's *Catalogue* to produce her listings, but she improves upon his work by offering a better and more detailed system of categorization. Her analysis of the distribution of texts yields the conclusion that the saints' lives generally appear in a relatively small number of manuscripts, whereas the non-hagiographic material (which more readily lends itself to adaptation) generally finds more widespread manuscript distribution.

In "Hermits and the Contemplative Life in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Holy Men and Holy Women*, pp. 147–75), Mary Clayton also touches on Ælfric but surveys a much broader range of religious ideas and practice. She argues that in the early Anglo-Saxon period—particularly because of the influence of the Irish Church—the ideal of the contemplative life deeply influenced the Christian community. Some of the most devout members of the Church renounced the world (and at times their native land) in order to devote themselves to prayer and ascetic practices. In the later Anglo-Saxon period, this ascetic and anchoritic ideal seems to have been countered by the call to the cenobitic life, perhaps because the Benedictines favored a sense of community over individualism. Ælfric, in particular, lauds the teacher or preacher rather than the contemplative hermit. Ælfric also avoids extolling the virtues of eremitic saints in his writings, and he therefore offers no narrative accounts of Antony, Paul the Hermit, Mary of Egypt, Hilary, Paphnutius, Guthlac, and other saints (surely known to him) representative of the eremitical tradition. By avoiding these saints, Ælfric seems to reveal his predilection for the new religious ideals advocated by the Benedictine Reform movement.

Paul Szarmach's own contribution to this fine gathering of essays, "St. Euphrosyne: Holy Transvestite" (pp. 353–65), analyzes the life of this saint, once thought to have been written by Ælfric but now relegated to the anonymous tradition. Szarmach rightly believes that by drawing attention to this work, it might be possible to retrieve it for "the future canon of prose works that are to be actively read both for cultural meaning and literary style." Szarmach's perceptive analysis of this saint, who reputedly lived as a man for more

than thirty years in a monastery, will help to reclaim this work for future study and reading. Szarmach's admirable record of bringing such texts to the attention of scholars will surely widen the canon of Old English prose studies, as will his indefatigable editorial contributions to so many important collections of essays on Old English prose studies.

Two additional books for the year 1996 highlight apocryphal writings. Certainly one of the most intriguing contributions to the study of Old English prose in recent years comes in the form of a collaborative effort led by the late J.E. Cross with assistance from Dennis Brearley, Julia Crick, Thomas N. Hall, and Andy Orchard: *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: 'The Gospel of Nichodemus' and 'The Avenging of the Saviour'* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 19; Cambridge, 1996; xi, 307 pp.). Source analysts, as Cross observes, are satisfied if they can identify an "immediate source" for a vernacular work—which means a text (often printed in a modern edition) that closely approximates the text used by the translator or composer. The editors of this book report a unique discovery: now, and for the first time, they present the very manuscript text of the source for two apocryphal narratives: *Euangelium Nichodemi* ('The Gospel of Nichodemus') and *Vindicta Saluatoris* ('The Avenging of the Saviour'). The manuscript source is Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque Municipale, 202, written in the monastery of Saint-Bertin in Saint-Omer in the ninth century. Three different Anglo-Saxons looked at the manuscript and jotted Old English words on separate folios; the editors of this present edition persuasively argue that the manuscript ultimately traveled to Exeter, where a fourth Anglo-Saxon read the manuscript and composed the vernacular versions of the two apocrypha. It also seems quite possible, as the editors speculate, that this manuscript may well be the unidentified homiliary in Leofric's donation-list, designated as ".i. full spelboc wintres and sumeres." This fascinating and important edition serves as a fitting memorial to the late Jimmy Cross, whose abundant contributions to the study of the sources of Anglo-Saxon literature have so greatly advanced our knowledge of the field.

Another book dealing with apocryphal and legendary narratives, *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular Hagiography* (ed. Erich Poppe and Bianca Ross; Dublin and Portland, OR., 1996; vii, 299 pp.), contains several valuable essays on Old English prose. In her introductory remarks (pp. 1–17), Hildegard L.C. Tristram observes that the insular world in the early Middle Ages (unlike the Continent) welcomed writings in the vernacular, and she explores how these texts were received. She finds, for example, that Irish textual genres related to Biblical exegesis tended to follow the Antiochene mode of exegesis with its emphasis on the literal level of meaning, whereas English texts favored the Alexandrian mode of expounding typological and allegorical meanings. She notes that the collection of essays found in this volume breaks new ground by tracing the reception of a single Carolingian Latin source from the ninth century as it worked

its way through a variety of insular vernaculars. Two essays are of particular interest to students of Old English prose. In "St Mary of Egypt and Ælfric: Unlikely Bedfellows in Cotton Julius E.vii?" (pp. 99–112), Hugh Magennis finds that the anonymous Old English treatment of the St. Mary of Egypt legend does indeed seem oddly nestled in its manuscript context. The reasons for this incompatibility are numerous: the *Life of St. Mary of Egypt* eschews Ælfric's linguistic preferences and his distinctively "Winchester" vocabulary. The *Life* also translates its Latin source more literally than Ælfric tends to do in his normal practice, and it avoids the kind of summarizing so often found in Ælfric. Most importantly, the *Life of St. Mary of Egypt* celebrates asceticism and solitude, an eremitical ideal of monasticism that conflicts with Ælfric's sense of cenobitic community. Ælfric prefers moderation over excessive asceticism, and he throws open the gates of the monastery in order to reach out to a wider community. Unlike Ælfric's typical saintly heroines, St. Mary of Egypt is not a virgin, and she subverts the submissive role often assigned to women by assuming a mentoring role to both a monk and a priest. All these features render her legend most unlike the typical Ælfrician saint's life.

In another essay in the same collection, "Hot Lust in a Cold Climate: Comparison and Contrast in the Old Norse Versions of the Life of Mary of Egypt" (pp. 175–204), Andy Orchard comprehensively surveys the various versions of the life of Mary found in Norse texts and considers their sources and contexts. He also traces the confusion that crops up between Mary Magdalene and Mary of Egypt in the Norse traditions and in the *Old English Martyrology*. Orchard also points out the close reliance of the Old English texts on the Latin version of Paul the Deacon, the one generally regarded as the ultimate source of the many vernacular versions produced in the medieval period.

The collection of essays honoring E.G. Stanley contains one essay on Old English religious prose, Joyce Hill's "Ælfric's Sources Reconsidered: Some Case Studies from the *Catholic Homilies*" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, ed. Toswell and Tyler; London and New York, 1996; pp. 362–86). In her essay, Hill reviews several texts from the *Catholic Homilies* and their sources. Hill, who has made many valuable contributions to the study of Ælfric's sources, continues to point out the importance of the medieval compilations that so often prove to have been Ælfric's more immediate sources when he quotes from or adapts the writings of patristic authors. Cyril L. Smetana broke important ground in this area when he discovered that many authors, including Augustine, Jerome, Bede, and Gregory, were available to Ælfric through the homilies of Paul the Deacon and Haymo of Auxerre. Hill's own work on Smaragdus has made further significant contributions to our understanding of Ælfric's treatment of his sources. In this essay, Hill provides detailed analyses of four of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*: CH I, vii; CH I, xxi; CH II, xxiii (Godden's numbering = Thorpe CH II, xxvi with xxvii) and CH II, xxv (Godden's numbering =

Thorpe CH II, xxix). Hill grapples with the difficulty of identifying ultimate and immediate sources, as well as with the difficulties inherent in defining and using these terms. She concludes by considering the dilemmas of classification: she points out that Malcolm Godden has identified a homily by Gregory as "an immediate source" for Ælfric's Second Series homily for the Third Sunday after Pentecost, CH II, xxiii (or, according to Thorpe's numbering, CH II, xxvi with xxvii), but she demonstrates that this "immediate source" has been filtered through an even more immediate source: the Carolingian homilies of Paul the Deacon and Smaragdus. In charting Ælfric's use of these homilies, Hill provides a more carefully nuanced understanding of Ælfric's use of sources and a better understanding of the roles played by medieval homilies in his compositional techniques than has hitherto been possible.

Two additional items on Ælfric also appeared in 1996. In "Bede and Ælfric: The Sources of the Homily on St Cuthbert," (*Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald; Groningen, 1996; pp. 107–38), B.A. Blokhuis discusses Ælfric's homily on Cuthbert and its indebtedness to Bede's writings on the saint. Ælfric observes that Bede wrote about Cuthbert in both poetry and prose, which would seem to indicate Ælfric's familiarity not only with Bede's *Vita (metrica) Sancti Cuthberti* (written in hexameter sometime between 705 and 716) but also with Bede's two prose works, the *Vita Prosaica Sancti Cuthberti* and the prose account found in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (completed in 731). After a detailed analysis and comparison of Ælfric's homily and its possible sources in Bede, Blokhuis concludes that Ælfric relied on Bede's poetic life of Cuthbert and the account found in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, evidently without reference to Bede's earlier prose account of Cuthbert.

In a brief note on another Ælfrician text, "Ælfric Refers to Bishop Possidius (with the Source)" (*SELIM* 4 [1994], 121–23), Xavier Campos Vilanova notes that Ælfric refers to Possidius (Bishop of Calama from 397 until his death c. 440, and a noted biographer of Augustine) in the Second Series homily on St. Stephen. Vilanova speculates that Ælfric probably used as his source a passage found in Augustine's *City of God* that mentions Possidius in the context of a story about the miraculous cure of a man's illness through the application of St. Stephen's relics.

Wulfstan and Byrhtferth, Ælfric's contemporaries, also appeared as topics for study in 1996. Eugene Green's essay, "On Syntactic and Pragmatic Features of Speech Acts in Wulfstan's Homilies" (*Insights in Germanic Linguistics 1: Methodology in Transition*, ed. Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr, Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, 83; Berlin and New York, 1995; pp. 109–25), offers a linguistic approach to Wulfstan's writings. Green argues that several pragmatic devices help to determine

[w]hether particular speech acts are straightforward or composite in their illocutionary force. For straightforward uses of illocutionary force, a pragmatic device that promotes a sense of unanimity in recognizing Wulfstan's intention is that of inclusiveness. Inclusiveness pertains to whatever linguistic

elements Wulfstan uses to achieve a sense of harmony, comradery, joint purpose or the like with his auditors.

Further linguistic analysis leads Green to conclude that Wulfstan's dependence upon pragmatic devices in Old English is inescapable:

That these devices should readily subsume themselves under such categories as inclusiveness, intensification, and contrastive emphasis stems from the task Wulfstan aims to realize through the genre of the homily.

Another essay, André Crépin's "Lettres et chiffres dans l'éducation du haut Moyen Âge: le manuel de Byrhtferth (composé avant 1011)" (*Educations anglo-saxonnes: de l'an mil à nos jours*; Amiens, 1992; pp. 13–18), begins with the remark: "J'aimerais examiner quelques aspects de l'ouvrage le plus connu de Byrhtferth, son manuel de calcul du calendrier ou comput"—that is to say, Crépin wishes to examine some aspects of Byrhtferth's manual on the calculation of the calendar, his so-called Computus. His very brief essay discusses manuscript Oxford, St. John's College 17, which most fully preserves Byrhtferth's Computus, and Crépin provides a rather desultory description of the manuscript's content. The essay contains no footnotes, but it does cite three works in an appended bibliography: the 1929 EETS edition of *Byrhtferth's Manual* by Crawford and two articles written in 1982, one by Peter Baker and the other by Michael Lapidge. Baker and Lapidge's 1995 edition of *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion* contains the most complete and accurate information on Byrhtferth's writings, but their work was apparently unavailable to Crépin when he wrote his essay. It goes without saying that Lapidge and Baker offer greater specificity and detail; to cite just one example, they date Byrhtferth's computistical commonplace-book (and his own Computus, which forms part of it) to the years 988–96, whereas Crépin merely suggests a date sometime before 1011. Crépin concludes his essay with the assertion that, far from being the result of a disorganized mind, badly mastering its subject matter, Byrhtferth's Manual is an original enterprise ("Loin d'être le résultat d'un esprit brouillon, maîtrisant mal sa matière, le Manuel de Byrhtferth est une entreprise originale, cherchant à montrer l'isomorphisme des structures des diverses disciplines et le parallélisme, l'imbrication, l'identité des chiffres et des lettres").

Four other essays round out the scholarship on religious prose for 1996. In "Listen Now All and Understand": Adaptation of Hagiographical Material for Vernacular Audiences in the Old English Lives of St. Margaret" (*Speculum* 71 [1996], 27–42), Hugh Magennis compares the two extant lives of St. Margaret of Antioch in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library 303. Both versions share a tendency to abbreviate their Latin sources and to emphasize narrative over direct discourse—the same tendency found in much Old English prose hagiography. But the two versions of the Margaret legend differ from each other as well: the CCCC version, significantly longer than the Tiberius version, departs more radically from its Latin source, cultivates alliteration and word pairing, and exploits the device of cumulative sequences based

on repetition of the Old English word *sum*; in employing these various devices, the Old English translator apparently responds creatively to the elevated style of his Latin source. The CCCC version also adopts a more devotional character and a more affective spirituality (possibly under Anselmian influence) than is found in the Tiberius text.

Old English translations of a work by Alcuin find brief mention in an article by Giulio Simone: "Considerazioni preliminari riguardo alle traduzioni in antico inglese e in medio alto tedesco del *De virtutibus et vitiis*" (*Teoria e pratica della traduzione*, ed. Molinari et al., pp. 323–32). Simone surveys some recent scholarship on Alcuin's treatise on virtues and vices, a kind of manual of deportment dedicated to Wido, Count of the Breton March, who conquered Brittany in 799 for Charlemagne. The treatise has short chapters on the practice of such matters as faith, hope, charity, peace, patience, and humility; the chapters serve as a guide to the practical application of the ascetic theology of the Church and seem specifically designed to help Wido achieve eternal salvation. Simone comments on various manuscript traditions, especially a Middle High German text from the twelfth century, and, following a suggestion from Roswitha Wisniewski, he undertakes a comparison of the German and Old English translations (though the comparison yields just a page of discussion in this essay). He argues that the characteristic conciseness of the Latin original becomes lost in the Old English translation and that, at some points, the Old English text seems to him completely devoid of sense ("la caratteristica concisione dell'originale viene perduta nella traduzione e in più punti il testo antico inglese risulta addirittura privo di senso"). Simone has the impression that the German translation shows a deeper understanding of the concepts found in the Latin original ("una più approfondita comprensione dei concetti espressi dal testo latino") than the Old English translation, but, in the absence of a new critical edition of *De virtutibus et vitiis*, further comparison between the German and Old English translation traditions would, in his opinion, be neither useful nor productive, so he simply leaves matters there.

Phillip Pulsiano questions the long-standing assumptions concerning the originality of the *Vespasian* gloss and the direct dependence of the *Junius* gloss upon it in his essay "The Originality of the Old English Gloss of the *Vespasian Psalter* and Its Relation to the Gloss of the *Junius Psalter*" (*ASE* 25 [1996], 37–62). After a meticulous examination of such factors as the omission of letters, the repetition of glosses, stray letters, and errors of copying, Pulsiano concludes that the *Vespasian* gloss is in fact a copy of a lost gloss and that the *Junius* gloss may derive from a lost intermediary: "the confident assertions regarding the primacy of the *Vespasian Psalter* and the direct relationship of the *Junius* and *Cambridge* psalters to this manuscript can and should be challenged."

In "The Sexual Poetics of Translating 'Desire in the Desert' in the Tenth Century" (*Studies in the Humanities* 22 [1995], 86–99 [Ker 182.2(a)]), Kathleen Davis applies the

methods of contemporary post-structuralist theory and cultural studies in order to analyze a tenth-century Old English translation of a Latin moral tale taken from the *Vitae Patrum*. The Old English version of the story, which she translates and titles "Desire in the Desert," was edited in Assmann's *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben* (Darmstadt, repr. 1964); the Latin text is found in Migne, *PL* vol. 73, col. 883–4. Viewing the practice of translation as "productive writing that participates in a culture's ongoing self-enunciation and discursive negotiation of knowledge, [which] therefore contributes in specific ways to the formation of the social, political, or religious subject," Davis examines this rendering of the familiar trope of a hermit's struggle against sexual desire. She envisions the story as an exemplum which provides "a way to conceptualize the denial of sexual desire by translating it into the body of a woman," arguing that this act constitutes a "gendered poetics in which woman is the linguistic and textual space through which man articulates himself." The story itself involves a prostitute, who, in league with the Devil, plots to seduce a solitary anchorite. She arrives at his dwelling claiming (falsely) that wild beasts are pursuing her. Davis provides the interesting if somewhat tenuous suggestion that, despite the fact that the beasts are imaginary, the woman, as the object of irrational desire, is nonetheless "always already being torn apart by the beasts." As the tale continues, the hermit resists the woman's advances by burning his fingers over a candle. The woman dies in response to his self-mutilation, but is later resurrected and lives in purity. In this way, Davis claims, "she becomes the translation of a translation—the metaphor for the eradication of the desire for which she had been the metaphor—and now, de-sexed, she is doubly not-woman." Davis concludes that this process of translation represents a "tradition of sexual poetics" that guided the tenth-century Old English translation of "Desire in the Desert."

Finally, in a brief note, "Two Latin Excerpts (*Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, and Isidore, *Sententiae*) with Old English Translation" (*NEQ* 43 [1996], 389–94), Roland Torkar prints two Latin sentences and their Old English translations; the two sentences appear in Cambridge University Library MS li. 1. 33 immediately following the Old English poem *Instructions for Christians*. These two sentences were published in 1964 by Rosier, but Torkar corrects two misprints in the Old English and what he terms "sense-distorting errors" in the Latin. Torkar also provides an excellent summary regarding the sources and context of the two Latin sentences and their Old English translation.

Secular Prose

TWO OF THE MOST IMPORTANT publications on Old English prose in 1996 focus on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. G.P. Cubbin's meticulously crafted edition, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, 6, MS D* (Cambridge, 1996; clxi, 123 pp. ill.), presents the text of British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, folios 3–9 and 19–86, otherwise known

as the D Chronicle. Details of the manuscript have previously been reported by Howorth, Keller, and Ker; Cubbin adds little that is new to their studies (as he himself concedes), but his comprehensive introduction cogently treats D's relationship to the other manuscript witnesses of the Chronicle (manuscripts A, B, C, and E) and examines the Alfredian origins of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Cubbin surmises that D is basically a copy of the Northern edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, though evidently a copy that has been compared against the Alfredian original: "D, like B, clearly emerges as a combination of two sources" (p. xxvii). More importantly, after a careful examination of the evidence that bears on the possible place of composition, Cubbin concludes that Aldred, bishop of Worcester c. 1046–62, "clearly emerges as the person responsible for the creation of D" (p. lxxix). Ample indexes record the welter of personal and place names sprinkled throughout the Chronicle, though the addition of dates and locale (when known) might have proven even more helpful in the listing of personal names. For example, the name Ælfgyfu appears for entries 955 and 958. The index lists her as the queen of King Eadwig, but in the introduction (p. xxxviii) Cubbin states that Ælfgyfu, in the entry for 958, refers to the mother of the King of Mercia. Was Eadwig (listed in the index as "king of England") married to his own mother? The entry for 958 refers to Archbishop Oda separating Eadwig from his wife Ælfgyfu "because they were too closely related," but this is not a case of Oedipal involvement, and it would appear that Cubbin has confused two different women bearing the same name. Perhaps this sort of error might have been avoided by the addition of further biographical information in the indexes, at least sufficient information to distinguish between the various members of royal houses. Still, given the complexity of the texts and names, this is but a minor cavil to an otherwise superb edition.

M.J. Swanton, editor of recently revised editions of the *Dream of the Rood* and *Beowulf* (with a prose translation), has produced a new translation titled *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London, 1996; xxxvi, 364 pp. ill.). Like most earlier editors, Swanton relies on the Winchester and Peterborough manuscripts, and prints translations from these manuscripts on facing pages. He supplements this material with text drawn from other manuscripts where they vary from the two chief manuscript witnesses. His translation is intended to serve non-specialists and newcomers to the field of Anglo-Saxon studies, whose needs, Swanton believes, may not be adequately met by Garmonsway's translation, which appeared in 1953. Swanton argues that both the expectations and the general knowledge a modern readership bring to the Chronicle have changed since the publication of Garmonsway's edition. To address these needs, he provides explanations of cultural, social, and historical details; as he notes, it cannot be assumed "that the names and significance of former religious festivals, or even an intimate knowledge of British geography can be taken for granted."

Given these aims, one might perhaps expect an even more

copious introduction, with, for example, a fuller explanation of the social and historical context out of which the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle arose. Yet, to his credit, Swanton highlights only the most relevant issues, including such matters as basic historical details and the importance of the Chronicle for the study of the evolution of Old English prose. Moreover, the excellent explanatory and bibliographical notes that accompany the text serve to supplement the introduction, as do the extensive genealogical tables and maps included in the appendices.

The translation itself follows the Old English original more closely than the translation found in Garmonsway. While Swanton's rendering is neither stilted nor overly literal, it does not attempt to "improve" upon the text in those cases where the rather utilitarian prose syntax of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle seems "clumsy, repetitive, or obscure." Swanton's admirable translation thus becomes a worthy successor to and replacement of Garmonsway's now outdated work.

Three essays in 1996 focus on the writings of King Alfred. In "Ulysses and Circe in King Alfred's *Boethius*: A Classical Myth Transformed" (*Studies in the English Language and Literature: 'Doubt Wisely' Papers in Honor of E. G. Stanley*, ed. Toswell and Tyler; New York, 1996; pp. 387–401), Susan Irvine challenges the frequently held assumption that Alfred's departures from traditional classical mythology derive from either his misunderstanding or limited knowledge of his source material. Focusing on the Ulysses and Circe episode, she argues that Alfred's drastic alterations of Boethius' classical allusions serve to emphasize his own themes and concerns. Following the work of Joseph Wittig, she concurs that Alfred's expansions cannot be traced to any commentary or group of commentaries, and she therefore looks for more immediate motivations that Alfred may have had for amplifying his source. She points out that Alfred, in a tradition dating back to the Church Fathers, often utilized classical stories for a didactic purpose and applied moral exegesis to them in much the same way as Scripture itself was interpreted. Taken in this light, Alfred's drastic reshaping of Boethius' Circe episode can be read as a moral tale on the proper role of a king. Irvine argues that, for Alfred, Ulysses exemplifies a king who abuses his royal authority by abandoning his kingdom to pursue Circe with immoderate lust, and, as a result, he comes to resemble a swine in all but his physical appearance. This reading is supported not only by Alfred's virtual reversal of the narrative sequence as it appears in Boethius (shifting the focus to the romantic relationship), but also by Alfred's own overt moralizing before and after the story. Irvine speculates that Alfred, as a king stricken with physical afflictions throughout his life, may have had a political purpose in drawing attention to a tale whose theme emphasized that bad kingship results from vices of the mind, not infirmities of the body. Those interested in narrative theory will also find engaging Irvine's concluding comments concerning the implications of her argument for the status of fiction and the position of the author vis-à-vis the text.

Hans Sauer's essay "König Alfreds Boethius und seine Rhetorik" (*Anglistik* 7.2 [1996], 57–89), provides a brief introduction to Alfred's life and writings, and then takes up King Alfred's reworking of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. Sauer reviews the current state of scholarship concerning the two main manuscript witnesses (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180; London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. vi), as well as a preserved fragment of the text (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 86). After surveying recent studies on the sources and analogues, Sauer comments on Alfred's method of reworking these sources in order to produce a text relevant to his aims and his audience. Sauer then analyzes Alfred's translation techniques with specific reference to several distinctive stylistic practices that, according to the earlier scholarly work of Kurt Otten, can be described as characteristically Alfredian. In particular, Otten notes that Alfred prefers paratactic to hypotactic structures, that he prefers a more concrete style, that he uses a more emphatic mode of expression, and that he makes greater use of antithesis and parallelism than Boethius. Sauer concludes by examining three representative extracts taken from Alfred's writings, one close to the Latin original, one without a Latin source, and one that reworks Old English prose into poetry.

A third essay on Alfred, "La escuela de traductores del Rey Alfredo" (*Livius: revista de estudios de traducción* 2 [1993], 1–14), comes from Antonio Bravo Garcia, who attempts to give a brief survey of the achievement of Alfred and his circle, particularly the success achieved through the effort of Alfred's translators. Without adding anything particularly new to previous scholarly discussions, Bravo Garcia does draw some interesting parallels to the successes achieved by the Toledan school of translators who contributed greatly to medieval learning in twelfth-century Spain. This school had at its head Don Raimundo, archbishop and a leading prelate of the Spanish Christian church, whose patronage resulted in the translation of many important Arabic and Jewish works into Latin. Foreign scholars also came to Toledo to investigate the material at hand, and, under Raimundo's reign, the melding of Christian-Arabian-Jewish culture flourished in Spain. Although Bravo Garcia points out salient differences between the two programs of translation, he does hint at similar cultural achievements inherent in Alfred's educational program. The author cites scholarship, now somewhat dated, by Henry Sweet, B. Ten Brink, and Eleanor Duckett, as well as some more recent scholarship, such as Bately's edition of *The Old English Orosius* (but not her more recent articles) and other work by Yerkes, Keynes, and Lapidge (though not all of the relevant work by others working in this area of study). The essay contains some typographical errors (perhaps introduced by a typesetter unfamiliar with Old English) in its citation of Old English texts: for example, Alfred's Old English preface to the *Liber Regulae Pastoralis* mentions the need to translate certain books ("those that are most necessary for all men to know"), which should read "ða ðe niedbeðearfosta sien callum monnum to wiotonne" but which here reads "tha

the medbethearfosta . . .". Bravo Garcia concludes by calling attention to the efforts of Alfred's circle (here referred to as a "school") of translators, whose efforts, the author argues, have been in some measure neglected or forgotten.

Lastly, in a note on "The Authorship of the Fonthill Letter" (*ASE* 25 [1996], 91–95), Mark Boynton and Susan Reynolds challenge the traditional view concerning the authorship of the Fonthill letter. This correspondence between Edward the Elder and an unnamed landowner, considered by Keynes to be "one of the most interesting of the corpus of documents which illustrate the working of Anglo-Saxon law," contains an account of the proprietary history of five hides of land in Wiltshire known as the Fonthill estate. Recent scholarly debate about this complex legal affair has centered on the identity of the unnamed landowner who composed the letter. Some contend that the author is a certain Ordlafe, mentioned as the successor of the Fonthill estate. This identification remains uncertain, however, because of the ambiguity of pronoun references and the fact that Ordlafe (if he is the author) is referred to in both the first and the third

persons—problems not entirely without parallel elsewhere in the Old English corpus. Ordlafe's authorship, upheld by Whitelock and recently restated by Keynes (1992) and by Gretsche (1994), comes under scrutiny by Boynton and Reynolds; taking their cue from an undeveloped suggestion by Laughlin (1876), they argue against this identification, claiming that the Ordlafe in question was mentioned by the unnamed landowner who composed the letter as a "useful precedent" for his own case and that the two figures are therefore separate individuals. According to their argument, Ordlafe owns not the Fonthill lands but rather another, unnamed estate mentioned by the owner of the Fonthill lands as a relevant legal parallel. Although their reading has certain advantages, the authors' thesis, as they themselves admit, must contend with the connection, first pointed out by Whitelock, of a man named Ordlafe with the Fonthill estate in a charter dated to c. 900. Despite this difficulty, their argument presents a viable and compelling alternative reading of this rather cryptic legal document.

T.H.L.

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

a. Early Anglo-Latin (excepting Bede)

IN A STUDY well-supplied with useful references, Catherine Cubitt argues that ostensible adherence to Roman liturgical practices in early Anglo-Saxon religious centers sometimes belied a surprising diversity of regional influences: Cubitt, "Unity and Diversity in the Early Anglo-Saxon Liturgy," in *Unity and Diversity in the Church: Papers Read at the 1994 Summer Meeting and the 1995 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* [Univ. of Nottingham and King's College, London], ed. Robert N. Swanson, *Stud. in Church Hist.* 32 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 45–57. Whatever Roman texts may be supposed to have circulated over the badly documented decades following the Augustinian mission (c. 600–50), it is clear that by the late seventh century authoritative Roman customs—and their living exponents, such as chantmasters—had been brought to England through the mediation of Benedict Biscop, Wilfrid, and others. Bede shows concern everywhere to promote Roman practices, not least of all in his accounts of Wilfrid. Bede's descriptions of the baptismal ceremony of the *apertio aurium* in his *Commentarius in Ezram et Neemiam* and in his treatise *De tabernaculo*, Cubitt maintains, suggest that he had access to reliable Roman (or Frankish–Roman) "eighth-century Gelasian" mass-texts. During the first half of the eighth century, Boniface's letters reflected a mind steeped in the diction of Roman prayers, and at the end of that period, the Southumbrian Council of *Clovesho* (in 747) attempted to ratify Roman usage on a national scale. English invocations of Roman authority might

even take the form of "Gregorian origin myths" and the like. These ultimately failed to conceal the origin, say, of a fixed sequence for saintly women commemorated in the mass, attributed to Gregory I by Aldhelm, which was in fact a pre-Gregorian custom. By an opposite token, the fixing of the dates of the Ember Fast, credited to Gregory in the *Dialogus* ascribed to Ecgbrecht, archbishop of York (ob. 766), represented a later development. (The ascription to Ecgbrecht seems to be accepted by Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 105–6 [no. 251], at p. 105.)

Complementing recent, intensive research on the introduction of southern Italian (or otherwise non-Roman) practices into seventh-century England with the arrival of Theodore and Hadrian (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 72–6, and 30.2 [1997], 65–75), Cubitt observes that "the series of homilies composed by Bede reveals that a Neapolitan rather than a Roman pericope list was the basis for readings in the church at Jarrow." She notes further that glimpses of both "old" and "new" mass-books occur in the *Old English Martyrology*, the former exhibiting links to the *Kalendarium S. Willibrordi*, preserved at Echternach, and to the group of sacramentary fragments of Regensburg provenance often connected with the Anglo-Saxon missions (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 69). Cubitt calls into question the received association of the Regensburg fragments with the name of Boniface (as in Klaus Gamber's still-essential *Das Bonifatius-Sakramentar und weitere frühe Liturgiebücher aus Regensburg* [1975]), however, asserting that their text-type "belongs to the same ancient Roman family as

that quoted by Aldhelm (also extant in the Stowe and Bobbio Missals) and found in the *Missale Francorum*." Without denying the possibility of the eventual mediation of Hadrian and his satellites in the introduction of such texts into seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England, Cubitt recalls Chavasse's caution to the effect that "refugees from southern Italy were by no means rare in Rome in the sixth and seventh centuries," also citing Gamber's thesis that Paulinus of Nola may have been an especially important source of southern Italian influence on Roman custom.

In an attempt to "highlight the possible role of anonymous but influential women in the transmission of liturgical texts," Cubitt's discussion of Gallican influence on Anglo-Saxon religious practices recalls that the anonymous *Vita S. Bertilae* records that its hagiographical subject, the abbess of Jouarre and Chelles (*ob.* c. 705) who was active in the late seventh- and early eighth-century, sent books and teachers to England. Cubitt stresses in this regard that "Chelles had been refounded from Jouarre by the former Anglo-Saxon slave, Queen Balthild," and she cites recent evidence for English contacts with centers at Faremoutiers, Andelys-sur-Seine, and Rebais, any or all of which may have occasioned the transfer of Gallican liturgical materials to England. Aldhelm also may have been a recipient of Gallican influence as a result of his contacts with Barking, arguably one of the "outliers of Columbanian monasticism"—along with Ripon and Hexham.

As specific evidence of the importation of such texts, Cubitt cites Mayr-Harting's detection of "a Gallican service for the consecration of the altar at Ripon" in Stephen of Ripon's *Vita S. Wilfridi* xvii; fragmentary Gallican *benedictiones* in Cambridge, Trinity Hall 24, fols. 78–83 [lower script] (English center, s. ?viii; E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols. with suppl., 2nd ed. of vol. 2 only [1934–72]—henceforth *CLA*—here in suppl., 4 [no. 1680], with suppl., 68); other fragmentary texts (perhaps from a sacramentary) in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale [hereafter BN], lat. 9488, fols. 3–4 (insular center [i.e., in northern England or ?Ireland], s. viii; *CLA* V, 19 [no. 581], with V, 57, and suppl., 54; not included by H. Gneuss in his "Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100," *ASE* 9 [1981], 1–60 [hereafter "Preliminary List"]); and the evidence of the lost "Rualand fragment" (treated by L.C. Mohlberg in the 1958 edition of the *Missale Gallicanum vetus*, pp. 93–4). Cubitt includes, *inter alia*, important comments on various "Seine basin liturgica," such as the "old Gelasian" sacramentary and the cited *Missale Francorum*. She also calls attention to the evocative description of an Anglo-Saxon celebration of the Night Office (c. 800) in Aediluulf's *De abbatibus* xx. Finally, Cubitt detects the influence of the Irish churches, notably their influence on Anglo-Saxon private prayer, in the Book of Cerne (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 73), among other sources.

Preliminary to the appearance of a monographic study and edition in the series Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, *The Old English Rule of Chrodegang*, Brigitte

Langefeld reconsiders the difficult questions surrounding the earliest Anglo-Saxon knowledge and use of the Latin text of the *Regula canonicorum* of Chrodegang, bishop of Metz from 742 until 766, who also succeeded Boniface as metropolitan of the "Austrasian" church from 754 (*"Regula canonicorum or regula monasterialis uitae?"*—the 'Rule of Chrodegang' and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury," *ASE* 25 [1996], 21–36). Composed c. 755–6, Chrodegang's rule provided something Boniface had never codified in a single work: a structured hierarchy for governance of the ecclesiastic's immediate *familia*—most notably the canons installed in the cathedral, whose duties (such as assisting in the performance of the Divine Office) typically differed both from those of secular religious living away from the cathedral setting and, of course, from those of monastic liturgists. Variation among witnesses to the earliest ("short") form of the text suggests that it disseminated rapidly. The rule influenced the form of eighth- and ninth-century decrees by Frankish councils and was absorbed into the *Institutio canonicorum* promulgated by Louis the Pious in 816–17. An expanded version of the rule, compiled in the second quarter of the ninth century by an unknown author in western France, informs the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscript witness, the present Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8558–68 (van den Gheyn iv.2498), pt. 1 (i.e., fols. 1–79) (Worcester, s. x 1; later provenance Burgundy). Countering received opinion, Langefeld argues that there is no necessarily conclusive reference to Chrodegang's rule in a 786 report by papal legates of some English canons living *canonice*, or in an 813 privilege of Wulfred, archbishop of Canterbury, directed to his *familia* at Christ Church, which stipulates that they should live *iuxta regulam monasterialis disciplinae vitae*. None of these allusions, Langefeld concludes, need be taken to refer to the distinctive *ordo* of canons specified by Chrodegang, and all might simply go back to customs specified by Benedict's *Regula* and other rules.

Preparatory to his forthcoming monograph *The Book of Genesis in the Early Middle Ages*, Michael Gorman discusses the early history (including some insular associations) of the anonymous compilation known as the *Lectiones in Hexateuchum*, a pseudo-Ambrosian—or pseudo-Bedan—exegetical text, until now wholly inedited, drawing heavily on Isidore's commentaries for its coverage of the first six books of the Old Testament (Genesis to Judges): Gorman, "Wigbod and the *Lectiones* on the Hexateuch attributed to Bede in Paris lat. 2342," *RB* 105 (1995), 310–47. In connection with his cited monograph on Genesis, Gorman here supplies an *editio princeps* of the first three chapters of the text's treatment of that book. His article also embodies the first serious attempt to establish the complex textual history of these *Lectiones*, which were treated only indirectly in *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, ed. John J. Machielsen, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina (Turnhout, 1990–) [hereafter *CPPM*], II, 456 (with no. 1048).

The earliest attested state of the text—Gorman's alpha-text, a version equipped with *capitula*—seems to find its best

witness in BN lat. 2342 (Bec-Hellouin, s. xii 2), on 2v–28v, a manuscript which may reflect the use of an insular exemplar. As one symptom, Gorman mentions the H-like symbol that is used throughout the copy to represent the conjunction *enim*. Moreover, he finds that within the text of the *Lectiones* themselves certain borrowings from Isidore correspond to some variants characteristic of a textual family represented by the present Cologne, Dombibliothek, 98 (Tours, s. viii med.; CLA VIII, 38 [no. 1157], with VIII, 65, and suppl., 62), noting that others have adduced “good reasons to suppose that this family was Anglo-Saxon.” Gorman’s beta-text of the *Lectiones*, probably emerging before 750, circulated as a work of Ambrose under the title *Recapitulatio de paradiso*, the nomenclature of this title offering a parallel to the *Recapitulatio de ponderibus*, a treatise on weights and measures drawn largely from Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, which has been associated recently with the Canterbury school of Theodore and Hadrian (*Biblical Commentaries*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and M. Lapidge [1994], pp. 563–5).

All continuous witnesses to the *Lectiones in Hexateuchum*, including BN lat. 2342, were copied out in the twelfth century or later, and Gorman notes that “we might even be tempted to believe that the treatise was put together in the eleventh or twelfth century” were it not for a clear citation of the work in the encyclopedic *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* of Wigbod, an author who, in the words of Richard Sharpe, “accompanied the two papal legates in England in 786 . . . [and] may have been English”: Sharpe, *Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain* (1997) [hereafter *Handlist*], p. 744 (no. 1961). (Wigbod cites a passage witnessing Gorman’s gamma-text of the *Lectiones*.) Intriguingly, the early version of the text witnessed by BN lat. 2342 is preceded uniquely by an ascription to Bede (*Lectiones venerabilis Bedae presbiteri super Pentateucon Moysi*). In the light of a useful, in-depth analysis of every item mentioned in the list of Bede’s works (at *Historia ecclesiastica* [hereafter *HE*] V.xxiv), notably the problematic *capitula lectionum in Pentateucon Mosi* now identified by Meyvaert as non-discursive biblical *capitula* (see below under “Bede”), Gorman, however, concludes cautiously that the title in BN lat. 2342 may well have been invented by a scribe, perhaps as late as the twelfth century, “based on what he had read in the list of works in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.” Urging further study of the sources of the *Lectiones*, Gorman does not reject the possibility of Bede’s authorship altogether, but—discounting such an origin—he would be inclined to maintain (as “a mere guess”) that they “were probably put together in Spain at the end of the seventh century . . . after Isidore and before Wigbod, that is, in the period roughly from 650–750.” Although he cites Michael Lapidge’s recent discussion of an Isidorian encyclopedic epitome circulating early on in Anglo-Saxon England (cited below under “Comprehensive Works,” item 7), Gorman does not offer an explicit statement beyond his comments on Bede regarding the likelihood (or lack thereof) that the *Lectiones* offer another example of an early Anglo-Saxon contribution to the Isidorian tradition. In addition to

Isidore’s exegesis, Gorman documents (for the treatment of Genesis) sources for the *Lectiones* in several widely distributed works by Jerome and Gregory I. Less frequently encountered sources include the *Liber testimoniorum Veteris Testamenti ex opusculis S. Gregorii*, ascribed to Gregory’s secretary Paterius (see the third edition of the Dekkers–Gaar *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (1995) [hereafter *CPL*], pp. 559–60 [no. 1718], and *CPPM* II, 627–8 [nos. 2820–2820d]), and the pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones Orosii et responsiones Augustini* (*CPL*], pp. 149–50 [no. 373a]; *CPPM* II, 74–5 [no. 151]), described by Gorman as “essentially a Genesis commentary based on Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram*,” which may well be “a work from Spain in the second half of the seventh century.”

In another article of considerable early medieval interest—with ramifications for Anglo-Latin studies—Gorman makes great progress in illuminating three versions of a pseudo-Bedan, or pseudo-Isidorian, *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* (*CPPM* II, 450–1 [no. 2026]), again treating the opening books of the Old Testament (here Genesis to Deuteronomy): Gorman, “The Commentary on the Pentateuch attributed to Bede in PL 91.189–394,” *RB* 106 (1996), 61–108 and 255–307. Most significantly, perhaps, Gorman reveals that two well-publicized features of the *Commentarius* occur only in interpolated (or otherwise expanded) passages. These are its rare citations of Origen by name and its reputed inclusion of comments exhibiting “Irish symptoms.” Gorman distinguishes three recensions of this lengthy exegetical text. (He represents these throughout the article by the use of Greek alphabetical sigla, but once again the summary here will employ the terms introduced above in the notice of the pseudo-Bedan *Lectiones*: alpha-text, beta-text, and gamma-text.) (1) The alpha-text, based mainly on Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram*, informs the basic stratum of readings in all extant witnesses to the *Commentarius*. The text of this version has not survived as an independent entity, and must now be reconstructed through comparison of the expanded beta-text with the divergently augmented gamma-text. Gorman concludes that the alpha-text was possibly composed in Spain c. 675, comparing “the *Intexuimus*, . . . [a] Visigothic commentary on Genesis compiled in the last half of the seventh century” (treated in Gorman’s own recent study in *Recherches augustinienes* 30 [1997], 167–277). Gorman’s present article offers an *editio princeps* of reconstructed passages from the alpha-text of the *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* covering Gen. 1.1–III.24. (2) The beta-text, now most easily accessible by reference to a text printed in PL 91, cols. 189–394, was probably completed by c. 725 and is ascribed to Bede in two manuscripts produced by c. 850. This version may be viewed as an interweaving of the alpha-text with a series of passages sporadically reflecting a debt to Jerome but otherwise exhibiting a literalistic and etymologically grounded exegetical technique that is implicated in some of the commentary’s supposed debts to Irish tradition—passages which, when extracted and concatenated separately, Gorman shows, “read as a [distinct] commentary on Genesis.” (3) The gamma-text, still unprinted,

nevertheless has been the subject of recent major studies by Alessandro Azzimonti and Simona Scaccabarozzi. Gorman characterizes this version as an augmentation of the alpha-text—possibly better regarded as an attempt to complete the earlier version—drawing on a diverse selection of authorities, including Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, Isidore, and Caesarius of Arles. Arising along a line of transmission distinct from that of the beta-text, perhaps by c. 750 or 800 at the latest, the gamma-text embodies a corroborative witness to the readings of the alpha-text.

The modern attribution of the *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* to Bede remained credible as late as the first half of the present century, but harsh critiques by Raby, Laistner, and others, caused it to drop out of the standard summaries of patristic literature altogether—even if Gorman's chronology might justify the inclusion of the alpha-text, at least, in a future edition of *CPL* and in any successor to Frede's fourth edition of the *Vetus Latina* companion volume *Kirchen-schriftsteller*, inaugurated by Bonifatius Fischer (1995; [hereafter Frede⁴]; see further the notice of Meyvaert below, under "Bede"). Correcting persistent errors going back to the scholarship of Jones, Laistner, and others, Gorman shows that the *editio princeps* of the beta-text of the *Commentarius in Pentateuchum*, with an attribution to Bede, was issued under the title *Commentaria D. Venerabilis Bedae in quinq[ue] libros Moysis* in 1542 by Willem van den Berghe ("Montanus"; fl. 1538–42), and it was the text from this edition that was reproduced in 1545 by Jean Roigny, and then printed again in 1563—this time following Roigny's borrowed text—by the younger Johann Heerwagen, who died in the following year. (Jones's account is wholly deficient in these and other details.) The version of the text published by the younger Heerwagen formed part of the first compendious collection of Bede's writings, which had been prepared in large measure by his father, the senior Johann Heerwagen ("Hervagius"; 1497–1557/8): *Opera Bedae Venerabilis presbyteri anglosaxonis omnia, in octo tomos distincta, prout statim post praefationem suo elencho enumerantur* (Basel: Hervagius, 1563). Eventually, the text produced through the Heerwagens' efforts was codified by Migne in *PL*, as summarized above. Gorman also notes that the only manuscript pressmark adduced by M.L.W. Laistner in connection with the *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* is faulty; the citation should be rendered as Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 9327–28 (van den Gheyn II.1354), fols. 17–132 (Paris region, s. ix 1; provenance Saint-Laurent at Liège). (Gorman here cites a neglected notice by H. Silvestre, "Le Hand-List de Laistner–King et les mss bruxellois de Bède," *Scriptorium* 6 [1952], 287–95, treating Laistner's *Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* [1943; henceforth cited as *Hand-List*].) Gorman includes a valuable treatment of the transmission-history of Bede's *Commentarius in Genesim* in an appendix and, correcting a substantial error in Jones's standard study of that work, he notes that the first edition of Bede's Genesis commentary was issued in an edition by Robert Winter at Basel in 1538 (as a work of Junillus Africanus), and not in the 1563 work issued

by the younger Heerwagen.

Insular (or specifically Anglo-Saxon) connections of the pseudo-Bedan *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* recorded by Gorman include the following: The late eighth-century *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* of Wigbod, possibly an Anglo-Latin author (see above), repeatedly exhibits parallels to the pseudo-Bedan exegesis. A partial witness to the gamma-text was "copied from an Insular exemplar, or perhaps in a scriptorium under Insular influence," that is, Oxford, Bodleian Library [hereafter OB], Lat. th. d. 3 (SC 31383) (northern Italy, s. viii/ix [Lowe] or s. ix 1 [i.e., c. 800 × c. 825: Ferrari]; early modern provenance Milan; *CLA* II², 37 [no. 250], with II², 52, and suppl., 48). The influence of the pseudo-Bedan *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* in England was later enhanced indirectly by the circulation of borrowings in a Carolingian homiletic resource discussed by James E. Cross in a book-length study (*Cambridge, Pembroke College, Ms. 25* [1987], pp. 76–7). Finally, the beta-text of the pseudo-Bedan commentary is cited (as *Beda in Genesi*) within an apparatus of extracts relating to Bede's *De temporum ratione* [hereafter *DTR*], also studied recently by Gorman (see below under "The Tenth-Century Reform"), associated with the name of Byrhtferth. The present article by Gorman also includes some intriguing comments on non-Vulgate biblical texts and on the identity of the *Ioannes diaconus* who compiled an *Expositum in Heptateuchum*, currently being edited by Anne-Marie Genevois, as preserved in BN lat. 12309 (Corbie [Bischoff], s. ix 2 or s. ix ex. [i.e., c. 875 × c. 900]).

Rob Meens discusses the fortunes of the famously tolerant advice provided by Gregory I in response to queries of Augustine of Canterbury regarding the position of non-Roman customs in the English churches, among other points ("Ritual Purity and the Influence of Gregory the Great in the Early Middle Ages," in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. Swanson [see notice of Cubitt, above], pp. 31–43). Meens notes that the final sentence of the late-recension version of the crucial passage in Bede's *HE* I.xxvii—"Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt, elige; et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere" ("Therefore choose from every individual Church whatever things are devout, religious, and right. And when you have collected these as it were into one bundle, see that the minds of the English grow accustomed to it")—differs in its closing sentiment from a variant and possibly more authoritative form of the text: "... et haec quasi in vasculo collecto, apud Anglorum mens[am] in consuetudinem deponere" ("... and when you have collected these as it were into one pot, put them on the English table for their use"; see the edition in *MGH ECA* II, 331–43, at 334, with vars. marked by siglum *L*; both translations follow Colgrave's renderings, one occurring in his note on the crux; see further *CPL*³, pp. 557–9 (no. 1714), at p. 557. The article also cites some of Paul Meyvaert's classic studies in this area (several collected in his *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* [1977]), and Meyvaert's more recent assertion of the authen-

ticity of the Gregorian *Libellus*, "Le *Libellus responsionum* à Augustin de Cantorbéry: une œuvre authentique de Saint Grégoire le Grand," in *Grégoire le Grand: Chantilly, Centre culturel "Les Fontaines," 15–19 septembre 1982—Actes*, ed. Jacques Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi, Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1986), pp. 543–9, with discussion at p. 550 (new to *OEN*). Meens also mentions Meyvaert's current project to re-edit the text of the *Libellus responsionum*. (The *Libellus responsionum* now has been included among Gregory's authentic works in Frede⁴, pp. 500–4, at p. 504 [item GR-M res], but it was not edited in CCSL 140–140A and is still noted only in passing in *CPL*.⁵) Meens also brings to light a neglected study by Henry Chadwick, "Gregory the Great and the Mission to the Anglo-Saxons," in *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo: XIX Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana in collaborazione con l'École française de Rome—Roma, 9–12 maggio 1990*, 2 vols., *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 33–4 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1991), I, 199–212 (new to *OEN*).

Among other concerns, Meens (following Thomas M. Charles-Edwards) points out that the evidence of the *Libellus responsionum* "suggests that, contrary to Bede's famous statement, the British did make an effort to convert the Anglo-Saxon population." (The cited study by Charles-Edwards is "Bede, the Irish and the Britons," *Celtica* 15 [1983], 42–52 [new to *OEN*].) Gregory's similarly tolerant judgments regarding issues relating to the sexual act, childbirth, and menstruation do not seem to have had a significant impact on the seventh-century Canterbury school, where opinions reflecting traditions of the Byzantine churches (possibly encouraged by Pope Vitalian), along with possible Irish influence, may have reinforced Theodore's stated principle that "giving birth causes impurity" in a woman, along with his judgment forbidding "women to enter church or to receive Holy Communion during menstruation, whether they are laywomen or nuns." Nevertheless, Theodore's canonical and penitential judgments came to circulate beside strictures of the Gregorian *Libellus responsionum* in collections whose textual transmission and current manuscript pressmarks are treated carefully in Meens's detailed study. For example, Meens shows that at least twelve out of the twenty-five main witnesses to the *Recensio discipuli Umbrensiū paenitentiarum et canonum Theodori* (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 71–2) include texts drawn from Gregory's *Libellus*. He summarizes the approaches employed by the compilers of these sources, as well as the authors of some eighth-century and later penitential texts, in their attempts to reconcile conspicuously divergent Gregorian and Theodorian views. Meens concludes that "[i]f Gregory's influence could not abolish these notions about impurity, it did nonetheless succeed in altering them." As is characteristic of Meens's recent scholarship (see, e.g., *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 72–3), this article includes references to some neglected studies treating Theodore's judgments, notably in the recensions known as the *canones Gregorii* and the *capitula Dacheriana*:

Meens's own *Het tripartite boeteboek: overlevering en betekenis van vroegmiddeleeuwse biechtvoorschriften (med editie en vertaling van vier tripartita)*, *Middeleeuwse studies en bronnen* 41 (Hilversum: Verloren, 1994); Reinhold Haggenmüller, *Die Überlieferung der Beda und Egbert zugeschriebenen Bußbücher*, *Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3: Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften* 461 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1991); Letha Mahadevan, "Überlieferung und Verbreitung des Bußbuchs *Capitula iudiciorum*," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung* 72 (1986), 17–75, discussing issues relating to the *Libellus* and Theodore's judgments; Ludger Körntgen, *Studien zu den Quellen der frühmittelalterlichen Bußbücher*, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Recht im Mittelalter* 7 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1993); Franz Kerff, "Das *Paenitentiale pseudo-Gregorii*: eine kritische Edition," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken*, ed. Hubert Mordek (1992), pp. 161–88, whose apparatus also takes note of several monuments in the Anglo-Latin tradition.

Neil Wright, in a previously unpublished essay included in his 1996 *Variorum* collection, provides a new rationale for the belief that the *Acircius* who is named as the recipient of Aldhelm's tripartite work on versification—comprising *De metris*, *Enigmata*, and *De pedum regulis*, which are known collectively as the *Epistola ad Acircium*—is Aldfrith, king of Northumbria (ruling 685/6 × ?705), who "might at some stage have studied Gildas with his godfather, Aldhelm himself": Wright, "Aldhelm, Gildas, and Acircius," in his *History and Literature in Late Antiquity and the Early Medieval West: Studies in Intertextuality*, *Collected Stud.* 503 (Aldershot, Hants.: Variorum, 1995), XIV, 1–28. Noting contrasts drawn by Isidore and Gildas between the terms *circius* and *aquilo* (and similar forms)—which may be rendered roughly as "north-west [wind]" and "northeast [wind]"—Wright suggests that Aldhelm saw Aldfrith, who had certainly studied in Ireland, as the man (*Acircius*) from the northwest (*a circio*, here meaning "from Ireland") who was ruling in the northeast (*aquilonalis*, here meaning "in Northumbria"). Seemingly cementing the identification is Aldhelm's use of the phrase *circionis insula* to describe Ireland in his *Epistola* V (to Heahfrith; see notice of Gwara, below). Wright's essay includes a full discussion of the study of Gildas's writings at Canterbury in the school of Theodore and Hadrian, which possibly included the preparation of the "Gildas-batches" now reflected in glossaries of the Leiden family. Wright also sets out some previously unrecognized Gildasian echoes occurring in Aldhelm's works (from both major parts of *De excidio Britanniae*) and in writings by his correspondents Æthilwald and Cellán of Péronne, along with some newly identified borrowings from Sedulius (one explicating Aldhelm's use of the "double urn of death" *topos*). Some additional discoveries regarding the reading of Aldhelm, Bede, and (especially) Gildas appear in another new essay in Wright's 1996 collection ("Rufinus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gildas," *History and Literature*, VI, 1–38). In the course of his study of Celtic Latin authors both British (such as Gildas) and Irish who made use of Latin translations from the

Greek *Orationes* of Gregory of Nazianzus (see Frede⁴, pp. 736–7 [item RUF Gr]), translations which were made c. 400 by the Aquileian priest Rufinus (*ob.* 411), Wright discusses, *inter alia*, borrowings from some of the Latin versions of Gregory's *Orationes* by Aldhelm and Bede. Their predecessor Gildas, however, possessed an especially deep knowledge of three of Gregory's sermons, as translated by Rufinus: the so-called *Apologeticus* (the Latin *Oratio* I, in the numbering of Engelbrecht's edition in CSEL 46; Gregory's *Oratio* II in the Greek); *De epiphaniis* (Latin *Oratio* II; Greek *Oratio* XXXVIII); and *De reconciliatione* (Latin *Oratio* VII; Greek *Oratio* VI). Wright also discusses Gildas's knowledge of at least one other translation by Rufinus, the Latin version of the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Eusebius of Caesarea, and he identifies some newly recognized Gildasian borrowings from works of Cassian, Jerome, and Orosius (the last known also to Aldhelm).

In the most detailed single-item study of Aldhelm's epistolary published to date, Scott J. Gwara offers a new edition and full discussion of the letter to Heahfrith (Ehwald's *Epistola* V): "A Record of Anglo-Saxon Pedagogy: Aldhelm's *Epistola ad Heahfridum* and its Gloss," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 6 (1996), 84–134. Gwara recalls that the textually well-supported reading *beatae memoriae* (in reference to *Theodorus*) was emended away years ago by Ehwald, who evidently assumed that the phrase could only have been inserted by a reviser at some point after Archbishop Theodore (*ob.* 690) had died—and not, I would infer, that Aldhelm's sometime teacher was at a site remote from the letter-writer. Gwara maintains that the letter was written after Aldhelm had been appointed abbot of Malmesbury (c. 675 × c. 680, in Lapidge's recent estimate) and while Theodore was still alive (and "vigorously challenging anti-Roman interests"), that is, c. 675 × 690. But Gwara adduces new, contextual evidence to show that the letter's closing poetic flourish must postdate the completion of Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate*, generally viewed as a mature work, thus possibly placing the composition of the *epistola* in the later years of the period in question—and, perhaps even more valuably, providing a newly secured later *terminus* for the hard-to-date *Carmen* (i.e., *non post* 690). Gwara retains *digna* as the first word of his new edition of the letter's closing verse, proposing rather to emend *fiat* out of the first line in order to regularize the syllable-count, and, strikingly, he disallows altogether the final two lines of that *envoi* (as established by Ehwald), which would form a rare Aldhelmian elegiac couplet (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 76). In the latter regard, he notes that in Ehwald's text the final two "hexameters [only occur] in Harley 3013" (see below), a witness consigned by Gwara to his delta-branch. The letter itself is most often transmitted in the company of Aldhelm's prose *De virginitate*, and the ostentatious vocabulary in both items provided a suitable subject for hundreds of glosses—variously distinguished by Gwara as lexical, interpretive, textual, and encyclopedic glosses, along with some intriguing syntactic glosses (or construe-marks). The glosses typically traveled with the text, preserving occasional traces of lost authorial

readings (some others to be found in the indirect witness of Lul's correspondence), with the four fully glossed manuscript copies exhibiting all told "about 200 glosses to 150 lemmas." In addition to his fulsome treatment of these Latin and (very rarely) Old English glosses, Gwara offers a stemma and detailed comments on the seven manuscripts preserving *Epistola* V, noting, for example, that Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 68 (35), fols. 173–211 (?s. xiv 1 [James]), proves that "readers copied and consulted Aldhelm's letter alongside biblical exegesis as late as the fourteenth century" and that London, British Library [hereafter BL], Harley 3013 (s. xii 2; provenance northern England [i.e., ? Newminster Abbey, near Morpeth: Ker]) contains some unusual, most plausibly post-Conquest lines of Anglo-Latin verse. Gwara's full set of notes includes some engaging comments on Greek-Latin and Latin-Old English bilingualism, citing C. Myers-Scotton's recent work on code-switching (*Duelling Languages* [1993]) and a neglected early note on the early Germanic associations of an Aldhelmian passage (P. Jones, "Aldhelm and the *comitatus*-Ideal," *MLN* 47 [1932], 378). Finally it may be noted here that an abstract of Gwara's 1993 Toronto dissertation appeared within the June 1996 issue of *DAI* ("Literary Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England and the Old English and Latin Glosses to Aldhelm's *Prosa de virginitate*," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Toronto [1993]; *DAI* 56A [1995–6], 4764). Gwara's dissertation includes descriptions of fourteen English manuscripts preserving texts of the prose *De virginitate*, texts which in his estimation "must derive from one extant ninth-century codex" (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 120–1). The 1,275-page work (which has been assigned an ISBN number: 0-612-02920-4) includes new editions of the Old English and Latin glosses, concordances to previous editions, and almost three hundred "new attestations of Old English words" (for these, see *OEN*, *ibid.*).

Introducing a Variorum edition collecting publications on glossaries by Wallace Martin Lindsay (1858–1937), Michael Lapidge offers an engaging biographical sketch of the scholar's life and labors: Lindsay, *Studies in Early Medieval Glossaries*, ed. Michael Lapidge, Collected Stud. 467 (Aldershot, Hants.: Variorum, 1996), with Lapidge's foreword at pp. ix–xviii. Lindsay, we read, first developed an interest in the publication of glosses shortly before the turn of the century, setting out on a fact-finding journey to Italy in search of Old Irish glosses (ancillary to the compilation of the *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, ed. Whitley Stokes and J. Strachan [1901–3]). At that time, the production of the massive *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (1888–1923)—largely inspired by the writings of Gustav Loewe but mainly executed by Georg Goetz and his students—was already under way in Germany. Whereas Lindsay's continental contemporaries tended to view early glossaries as reliable witnesses to ancient lore, Lindsay himself stressed the secondhand nature of *glossae collectae* reflecting the unsystematic transcription of *lemmata* and *interpretamenta*. In this he clearly anticipated the course of modern scholarship. But whereas members of the German school generally sought to

present their glossaries in semi-diplomatic editions, Lindsay sometimes endeavored to edit his materials so as to produce "critical texts" of disparate glossarial lists, which he presumably took to reflect some lost moments in the processes of their compilation and transmission. Sadly, Lapidge finds, this critical turn has served to limit the utility of some of Lindsay's publications.

The German *Corpus* addressed four main bodies of glosses with English associations: (1) the major witnesses to the "Épinal-Erfurt" group; (2) the so-called "Erfurt II" glosses; (3) excerpts from representatives of the "Leiden family" of glossaries; (4) excerpts from the "Corpus" glossaries. Lindsay complemented this work with his 129-page monograph *The Corpus, Épinal, Erfurt, and Leyden Glossaries* (1921), reprinted here in full. The Variorum volume is supplied with seventy-eight pages of indices, drawing on photocopies of unpublished materials prepared by Lindsay himself. The indices, compiled by Alicia Corrêa, treat *lemmata*, sources (notably in Aldhelm, Adomnán, and Gildas), and general subjects (including valuable entries on "Aldhelm," "Alcuin," "glossaries," and "manuscripts"). Neglected references supplied by Lapidge in his foreword include Giliola Barbero's "Contributi allo studio del *Liber glossarum*," *Aevum* 64 (1990), 151-74, treating extracts from Boniface's *Ars grammatica* in the Carolingian *Liber glossarum*; a new edition of Macrobius, *De verborum Graeci et Latini differentiis*, ed. Paolo de Paolis (1990); and a germane medieval Greek study, Bernard M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age* (1988).

A 1995 study of the use of the term *iustitia* in the early medieval penitential tradition sets out many valuable references to recent scholarship with Anglo-Latin associations: Raymund Kottje, "'Buße oder Strafe?'—zur *iustitia* in den *libri paenitentiales*," in *La giustizia nell'alto medioevo (secoli V-VIII)*, 1 vol. in 2, *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 42 (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1995), pp. 443-74. The references include a comprehensive work by Maria Giuseppina Muzzarelli (*Penitenze nel medioevo* [1994]) and a recent monograph on Spanish penitentials (F. Belzer, *Les pénitentiels espagnols* [1994]). In the study proper, Kottje recalls that the characterization of priests as *medici spirituales* goes back to Columba of Bangor. Kottje finds that the penitential sense of *iustitia* is most often bound up with the inner life of the sinner, impinging on the semantic fields of *remissio* and *indulgentia*. In a punitive sense, the term most conspicuously involves reactions to situations involving the lack of *iustitia* (that is, acts of injustice), notably in cases of exile or self-willed *peregrinatio*—subjects discussed here at length, with extensive bibliography. Specific texts discussed by Kottje with Anglo-Saxon connections include witnesses to the penitential and canonical pronouncements of Theodore; the recently edited *Poenitentialia Oxoniense II* (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], p. 73); and, following Haggemüller's latest typology (see notice of Meens, above), witnesses to the following five traditions: *Poenitentialia pseudo-Bedae* (in two main groups), *Poenitentialia pseudo-Ecgberhti* (three groups), forerunners of

the *Poenitentialia additivum pseudo-Bedae-Ecgberhti* (four groups in two main divisions), the *Poenitentialia additivum pseudo-Bedae-Ecgberhti* proper (three groups), and the *Poenitentialia mixtum pseudo-Bedae-Ecgberhti* (two groups).

A 1991 essay by Claudio Leonardi (with no previous notice in these pages) traces the evolution of the ideal of the saintly life in selected hagiographical works spanning the decades of the eighth century, most of which have Anglo-Saxon associations ("Modelli agiografici ne secolo VIII: da Beda a Ugeburga," in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (III^e-XIII^e siècle): actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome "La Sapienza"—Rome, 27-29 octobre 1988*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 149 [Rome: École française de Rome, 1991], pp. 507-16 and 547-8). Leonardi refers back to discussion arising at a conference in Maubeuge, centering on seventh-century women saints such as Aldegunde, as serving to represent the special problems posed by pre-Carolingian hagiography. (In this connection, Leonardi cites a published collection of the Maubeuge proceedings, *La Femme au Moyen-Âge*, ed. Michel Rouche and J. Heuclin [1990].) In treating its hagiographical subjects, the earlier hagiography, including Bede's prose *Vita S. Cuthberti*, stresses otherworldly *visiones*, private *oratio*, and earthly *praedicatio*, as well as the ideals of *pax*, *humilitas*, and *concordia*. By the mid-century appearance of the *Vita S. Bonifacii* of Willibald, bishop of Eichstätt, *praedicatio* has given way to ecclesiastical *constructio*. By the turn of the next century, the *Vita Willibaldi episcopi* and *Vita Wynnebaldis abbatis*, composed by Hygeburg, nun of Heidenheim (fl. before 800), both corroborate the absolutism of Alcuinian hagiography, wherein official ideology and the primacy of church politics come to occupy many passages of both hagiographical prose and verse. Finally, brief notice may be taken here of Michael Gleason's 1995 Brown University dissertation, treating the Old Norse *Hungrvaka* along with a selection of Anglo-Latin and "Anglo-Saxon" (specifically, Cynewulfian) saints' lives ("The Self-conscious Hagiographer: Literary Ambition and Political Power in Anglo-Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and Old Norse Saints' Lives," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Brown Univ. [1994]; *DAI* 55A [1994-5], 1941). The Anglo-Latin works in question are the anonymous *Vita S. Ceolfriithi*, Bede's *Historia abbatum*, Alcuin's *Versus de sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae*, and Aediluulf's *De abbatibus*, all of which are characterized as "needlessly marginalized texts" containing in each case "large elements of autobiography." Their "five monastic writers"—a group including, evidently, both Alcuin (before his abbatial appointment at Tours) and Cynewulf—"intended to secure themselves a place in literary history as well as to depict the lives of saintly men."

b. Bede

HERMANN JOSEF FREDE, in his 1995 revision of the *Vetus Latina* companion volume *Kirchenschriftsteller* (Frede⁴, p. 593 [sub item KA]; see second notice of Gorman, above), recorded his receipt of an intriguing letter from Paul Meyvaert, dated

30 July 1994. The contents of the letter (sketched out only briefly by Frede) apparently revealed Meyvaert's discovery of nearly complete texts of Bede's long-sought *Capitula lectionum* and *Distinctiones capitulorum ex tractatu beati Hieronimi excerptae*, both of which were presumed for centuries to have been lost to posterity. In fact, some authorities have doubted that any such works ever existed. The titles cited here (and similar titles) were held simply to have emerged as backformations from some cryptic entries in the summary of the Bedan corpus at *HE* V.xxiv (see first notice of Gorman, above), a list inserted by Bede himself and perhaps, Meyvaert now suspects, revised unevenly by some of his associates. Meyvaert's definitive publication of his important discovery appeared in 1995, detailing fully seventy-five discrete texts issuing from Bede's own hand (including some previously unknown authorial revisions and biblical prologues): Paul Meyvaert, "Bede's *capitula lectionum* for the Old and New Testaments," *RB* 105 (1995), 348–80. Its most striking revelation, perhaps, is that all of these newly identified Bedan texts, with only one minor exception, have been in print for decades (some for centuries). Their recovery by Meyvaert offers a clear demonstration of the enormous power now available to scholars in the recent CD-ROM release *CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts* (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 85).

The point of departure for Meyvaert's argumentation is his recognition that Bede's phrase *capitula lectionum* should not be taken to refer to any particular body of discursive exegesis, such as a series of commentaries on the Pentateuch or on other biblical books. The phrase rather reflects Bede's career-long project to compose brief summaries, or *capitula*, indicating the main contents of individual sections within specific biblical books (or *lectiones*, in the sense of discrete "readings"). The sections in question are comparable to modern chapters of the Bible, even if they agree with them only sporadically in terms of the spans of their verses. The summaries of their content, or *capitula*, typically were grouped together in early medieval bibles at the start of a given book, forming a coherent (sometimes numbered) list of entries, the divisions of the sections themselves being indicated throughout the book most often only by the apportionment of blank space and, in some cases, the inclusion of a series of numerals leading back to the preliminary list. The great majority of the discoveries documented here by Meyvaert involve precisely such lists of *capitula*, witnessing carefully distributed series of discrete biblical readings—the very *capitula lectionum* that Bede signaled so clearly centuries ago.

The following paragraphs are intended to provide *OEN* readers with a précis of Meyvaert's main arguments and a guide to the preferred printed editions of the newly identified Bedan texts. The order of the summary follows the Vulgate sequence in the Stuttgart *Biblia Sacra*, ed. Robert Weber *et al.*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (1983), with titles of biblical books (or larger divisions, or variant versions) printed in bold type indicating surviving texts composed by Bede for the book (or

division, or version) in question.

Old Testament: Pentateuch (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers [Numeri], and Deuteronomy: . . . *capitula lectionum in Pentateuchum Mosi* . . .). **Genesis:** The original version of Bede's *capitula* in Genesis may well be lost to posterity, but Meyvaert believes that surviving Theodulfian bibles preserve a revised version of the *capitula*, embodying Bede's own stylistic improvements. Bede's revised Genesis set has been printed among the *capitula* of Vulgate series F, forms *a* and *b*, in the nomenclature (here and elsewhere, unless noted) of the Benedictine edition of the Vulgate Old Testament (*Biblia Sacra*, ed. Henri Quentin *et al.*, 18 vols. [1926–94]), where the Bedan text appears at I, 117–24. Problematically, however, Meyvaert finds that Bede's set of Genesis *capitula* has been omitted from a monument which otherwise includes *all* of the sets Bede composed for the Pentateuch (in Exodus–Deuteronomy), that is, Florence's famous Codex Amiatinus (the bible hereafter identified as Amiatino 1, its current pressmark in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana; see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 74, and discussion of Bede's *capitula* for Exodus, below). Meyvaert suspects that textual conservatism and the prominent placement that any set of *capitula* in Genesis will enjoy "caused Bede's [Genesis] set . . . [to be] replaced by a much older series" in Amiatino 1, specifically the Vulgate series G, form *b*. The major witnesses to Bede's revised Genesis set (in Vulgate series F, form *a*), occurring in two Theodulfian bibles, are Le Puy, Trésor de la Cathédrale, s.n. (Orléans or ?Fleury [Lowe], s. viii/ix [i.e., ? c. 800]; provenance Le Puy by s. xv/xvi; "Le Puy bible"; siglum Θ^A ; *CLA* VI, 20 [no. 768], with VI, 44, and suppl., 57), and BN lat. 9380 (Orléans or ?Fleury [Lowe], s. viii/ix [i.e., ? c. 800 x c. 805]; provenance Orléans by s. xi; "Mesmes bible," "Theodulf's bible," or "Codex Theodulfianus"; siglum Θ^M ; *CLA* V, 18 [no. 576], with V, 57, and suppl., 54). The biblical texts in both of these manuscripts bear verifiable traces of the influence of "Alcuinian" models. (See the cautious comments of Richard Marsden, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England* [1995], p. 21.) The Le Puy bible, Meyvaert suggests, also may reflect insular influence in its use of the term *breves* (roughly synonymous with *capitula* or *lectiones*) in incipits and explicits accompanying all of its *capitula* in the Pentateuch. (The precise sense is not found in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*—vol. 1, ed. R.E. Latham and D.R. Howlett [1975–97; hereafter *DMLBS*], but compare *brevis*, sense 4b, at I, 216–17, whose earliest citation dates from 1453.) **Exodus–Deuteronomy:** Bede's *capitula*, Meyvaert finds, once again are those of the Vulgate series F. Their earliest witness occurs in Amiatino 1, which, Meyvaert suspects, preserves Bede's original versions, whereas the stylistically more homogeneous *capitula* in Theodulfian bibles (see discussion of Bede's Genesis *capitula*, immediately preceding) bear witness to revised versions of the *capitula* of Vulgate series F, most plausibly prepared by Bede himself. The texts in question are printed in *Biblia Sacra*, ed. Quentin *et al.*, II, 57–63 (Exodus: form *a*; cf. form *b*); II, 316–18 (Leviticus); III, 42–7 (Numbers: form *a*; cf. form *b*); and III, 322–30 (Deuteronomy: form *a*; cf. form *b*).

Joshua and Judges (. . . *capitula lectionum in . . . Iosue, Iudicum*): Bede's *capitula* for the books of the so-called Deuteronomistic histories (Joshua–III–IV Kings) are unevenly represented in the sources surveyed by Meyvaert. In the cases of Joshua and Judges, Bede's *capitula* again seem to be quite well-represented, having been preserved both in their original versions in Amiatino 1 and in authorial revised versions copied out in Theodulfian bibles. These Bedan series are printed in *Biblia Sacra*, ed. Quentin *et al.*, IV, 32–5 (Joshua); and IV, 206–12 (Judges: forms *a* and *b*). The evident lack of *capitula* on Ruth is not surprising. Meyvaert, following Bonifatius Fischer, recalls that "Alcuin's Bibles remain the earliest witnesses to provide *capitula* for Ruth." The witness of Amiatino 1 is thus irrelevant here, but it may be worth noting that its witness to the text of Ruth has a reputation for unreliability (see Marsden, *The Text*, p. 147), perhaps suggesting that the text of the book received limited attention in Bede's milieu. There are other cases in which issues of transmission or canonicity may help to account for omissions of certain Old Testament books from the list of Bede's *lectiones* (and, it might be assumed, from his program to compose new *capitula*); see further my comments below on Psalms, Wisdom, Sirach, Lamentations, Baruch, I–II Maccabees, and Daniel. All other Old Testament books mentioned at *HE* V.xxiv in connection with Bede's compositional efforts either lack *capitula* in Amiatino 1 or are supplied in that codex with inelegant, repetitive *capitula* which Meyvaert deems stylistically incompatible with Bede's verifiable work (such as a "series

in Job replete with *De . . . De . . . and Ubi . . . Ubi . . .*).

I-II Samuel (I-II Kings or I-II Reges) and III-IV Kings (Malachim or III-IV Reges) (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in libros Regum . . .*): Forty-three *capitula* on I Samuel (I Kings), appearing at the beginning of Bede's *Commentarius in primam partem Samuelem*, may be dated (with that work) to c. 716. These are printed, with an editorially imposed division into four sections, at CCSL 119, 5-8. Meyvaert suggests that the evident lack of surviving Bedan *capitula* treating II Samuel (II Kings) and III-IV Kings should be associated with the limited scope of Bede's exegesis: "[his] *capitula . . .* may not have been intended to accompany . . . the four Books of Kings" in a biblical manuscript.

I-II Paralipomenon (I-II Chronicles or I-II Verba dierum) and I-II Esdras (Ezra and Nehemiah): The books of the so-called Chronicler's histories (I-II Paralipomenon-I-II Esdras) lack *capitula* in Amiatino 1, but Meyvaert has identified long, multiple-book sets printed among the *capitula* treated by De Bruyne (see immediately below) from a twelfth-century Carthusian bible—or collection of part-bibles—now in four disordered volumes, the present Grenoble, Bibliothèque Municipale, 12-15 (2, 5, 4, 6 [*recte* ? 2, 6, 5, 4: Étaix]) (s. xii; provenance Grande-Chartreuse)—see notice by Raymond Étaix in *Scriptorium* 42 [1988], 49-75, at 61. (For the specific form of the pressmark, see also *Scriptorium* 42 [1988], 264*, and the Grenoble catalogue cited below.) Among these *capitula* (as printed by De Bruyne) Meyvaert identifies Bedan entries for the following: (1) the cited historical books, whose *capitula* head the copies of I-II Paralipomenon, at fols. 210-82 of Grenoble 15 (6), and of I-II Esdras, at fols. 182-210 of Grenoble 13 (5); (2) the book of Job, whose *capitula* head the copy at fols. 106-37 of Grenoble 13 (5); (3) the familiar deuterocanonical series of Tobit, Judith, and Esther, whose *capitula* head the copy at fols. 137-67 of the same volume. I-II Paralipomenon (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in . . . Verba Dierum*): The Bedan *capitula* are printed (under the heading *Carth*) in *Sommaires, divisions, et rubriques de la Bible latine*, ed. Donatien de Bruyne (1914), pp. 125-31 (I Paralipomenon) and 133-7 (II Paralipomenon). I-II Esdras (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in . . . Ezram quoque et Neemiam*): Meyvaert concludes that Bede issued two fundamentally divergent sets of *capitula* in Esdras at different points in his career. The earlier series, he maintains, is represented by the sixty-seven *capitula*, spanning both books of Esdras, as cited above for Grenoble 13 (5) and printed (under the heading *Carth*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 141-3 (I-II Esdras). The apparent later series, more concise and polished overall but exhibiting sporadic verbal parallels with the set just noted, is included in Bede's *Commentarius in Ezram et Neemiam* (composed c. 725 x c. 731). Its *capitula* are printed in CCSL 119A, 237-40 (I-II Esdras). Meyvaert (following De Bruyne) cites six biblical manuscripts integrating the latter, exegetically grounded series, apparently resulting from its *capitula* having been excerpted from Bede's commentary and recast in the form of extrabiblical apparatus for discrete bibles (or part-bibles).

Tobit-Esther (var. lect. *Item in libro Tobiae Iudith et Aester*): Bede's *capitula* for this familiar series are printed from Grenoble 13 (5), under the heading *Carth*, in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 145-6 (Tobit), 149-51 (Judith), and 153 (Esther). The allusion to Bede's *capitula* for these deuterocanonical books occurs only in the text of HE V.xxiv preserved in the famous St. Petersburg Bede (long known as the Leningrad Bede; now St. Petersburg, Public Library, Q. v. I. 18 [Wearmouth-Jarrow, s. viii med., i.e., ? ante 746]; CLA XI, 12 [no. 1621], with XI, 33, and suppl., 67). Meyvaert suggests that the addition was made by Bede's "disciples, . . . who were intent on completing the list" undertaken by their mentor—and accurately so, it would appear. Job (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in librum beati patris Iob*): Meyvaert concludes that Bede's *capitula* in Job are preserved in Grenoble 13, as printed (under the heading *Carth* [*sic*]) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 155-7. Finally, it may be noted at this point in the survey of the Old Testament canon that no standard series of *capitula* in Psalms seems to have been issued before the textual revisions carried out by Theodulf of Orléans (see Frede⁴, p. 593 [*sub item* KA], citing H. Boese, "Capitula psalmodum," RB 91 [1981], 131-63).

Libri sapientiales (Proverbs [Parabolae], Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs [Canticum canticorum], Wisdom [Sapientia], and Sirach [Ecclesiasticus]) (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in Parabolae, Ecclesiasten, et Cantica canticorum*). (Proverbs): Meyvaert suspects that Bede's main series of *capitula* in Proverbs, if the entry at HE V.xxiv is accurate, has either been lost to posterity or awaits discovery in a neglected manuscript. He notes that David Hurst's critical

edition of Bede's *In Proverbia* (CCSL 119B, 23-163) records no *capitula* in circulation with that commentary. Nevertheless, Meyvaert has identified an excerpted series of seven *capitula* drawing on passages "repeated almost verbatim from Bede's commentary" in Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 3 (Marchiennes, s. xii), as printed (under the heading *Eln*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, p. 167. He finds it "hard to decide whether these *capitula* are Bede's compositions or the work of someone who has read Bede's commentary." Meyvaert wonders "whether Bede's *capitula* for Proverbs might be hidden" among seventy-eight manuscripts listed by Laistner, *Hand-List*, pp. 56-62, which are typically left unreported in Hurst's edition. Bede's *capitula* on Ecclesiastes, Meyvaert's finds, seem not to have survived or may await discovery in a neglected manuscript. Song of Songs: Thirty-nine *capitula* in the Song of Songs accompany Bede's *Commentarius in Canticum canticorum* (CCSL 119B, 167-375, at 181-4). Finally, the list at HE V.xxiv records no Bedan *capitula* for Wisdom and Sirach. It might be worth recalling in this connection that Richard Marsden's close analysis of the copies of these books in Amiatino 1 has verified the markedly inferior quality of the texts which they transmit (*The Text*, pp. 158-66). It appears that the two deuterocanonical wisdom books—whose attribution to Solomon had been disputed by Jerome, Cassiodorus, and others—may have attracted limited attention at Wearmouth-Jarrow from Bede, or from any other textual critic.

Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets) (var. lect. . . . in [prophetas] . . . *distinctiones capitulorum . . .*). Bede's composition of *distinctiones capitulorum* on certain books of the later prophets—Isaiah, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets are cited explicitly (see below)—is recorded at HE V.xxiv only among witnesses to the so-called M-text of HE. Meyvaert demonstrates that the Bedan phrase here is virtually synonymous with *capitula lectionum*; that is, these *distinctiones* are simply *capitula* summarizing the content of sections of various biblical books. In the past, it has been assumed frequently that these "*Distinctiones . . .*" were elaborate, lost works of Bedan exegetical prose, and not straightforward sets of non-discursive biblical *capitula*. This misunderstanding has occasioned much error over the centuries, specifically in failed attempts to identify wholly non-Bedan texts that have been transmitted anonymously. Examples include the title *Beda in Esayam*, assigned erroneously to a non-Bedan commentary in Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 254 (s. ix) by a late medieval catalogue, and Leland's attribution to a supposed Bedan *Tractatus Hieronymi in Esaiam* of an item of verse in the *Epigrammata* compiled by Milred of Worcester—though Meyvaert's discoveries need not weigh against the lexically supported arguments for Bede's authorship of the verse in question, as adduced by Patrick Sims-Williams and Neil Wright (see OEN 29.2 [1996], 87-9).

Isaiah (. . . *capitula lectionum . . . in Isaiam prophetam*; var. lect. . . . in *Isaiam . . . distinctiones capitulorum . . .*): Meyvaert is "inclined to view the double mention of Isaiah as a slip" related in some way to the absence of any citations of books of the later prophets beyond Isaiah among the *capitula*-lists in the C-text of HE ("sometimes . . . considered to represent an earlier version"). In any event, he finds that the full series of Bedan *capitula* in Isaiah have been preserved in a five-volume bible, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1-5 (1) (Saint-Amand-les-Eaux at the Scarpe-Elnon union [near Valenciennes], s. xii; "Sawalo bible") and in Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 5 (Anchin, s. xii), as printed (under the heading *Eln*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 185-91. Jeremiah (var. lect. . . . in . . . *partem Hieremiae distinctiones capitulorum ex tractatu beati Hieronymi excerptas*): Meyvaert shows that the evidence of Valenciennes 1-5 (1) and Douai 5 now plainly reveals the reason for Bede's use of the phrase *in partem*: Jerome's *Commentarius in Hieremiam prophetam* treats only the first thirty-two of Jeremiah's fifty-two chapters, accounting in the *capitula* for "a marked change in their nature after [capitulum] number 103"—coinciding with the end of Jerome's less-than-comprehensive *Commentarius*. The *capitula* which Bede derived from Jerome are printed (under the heading *Eln*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 195-203 (nos. 1-103). Regarding Lamentations and Baruch, it should be noted that the former book follows Jeremiah without a break in Amiatino 1, so there is no reason to expect that Bede, having left off his work on Jeremiah part of the way through the book (see previous item), would treat the text of Lamentations. Baruch is absent altogether in Amiatino 1, and was only established in the Vulgate tradition in the wake of the efforts of Theodulf of Orléans (see Marsden, *The Text*, p. 167). De Bruyne prints no *capitula* from Lamentations or Baruch. Ezekiel (no *capitula* cited in HE): Although the citations of Bede's *capitula* at HE V.xxiv do not mention

Ezekiel, Meyvaert concludes that "either Bede or one of his disciples made a slip here, simply including the wrong name, Daniel instead of Ezekiel" (see next item). Meyvaert thus champions Bede's authorship of the *capitula* in Ezekiel now preserved in Valenciennes 1-5 (1) and Douai 5, as printed (under the heading *Eln*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 209-18. I would note that some circumstantial corroboration of Meyvaert's hypothesis occurs in the present Grenoble 14 (4), part of the multivolume set of biblical texts elsewhere witnessing the Bedan *Carth* sets (see above). Meyvaert's proposed Bedan *Eln* series in Ezekiel there occurs at the head of the volume's copy of that book (on fols. 1-58): see the catalogue for Grenoble in the *Catalogue général des manuscrits* . . . (octavo series), ed. Henri Omont, et al., *Départements* (1886-), VII, 5-9 (nos. 12-15), at 7-8 (no. 14).

Daniel (var. lect. . . in . . . *Danibelem* . . . *distinctiones capitulorum* . . .): No *capitula* in Daniel occur in De Bruyne's *Eln* tradition, represented by Valenciennes 1-5 (1) and Douai 5, and Meyvaert, as noted, sees the citation of Daniel at *HE* V.xxiv as an error for Ezekiel. If Bede in fact composed no *capitula* on Daniel, this would represent the most conspicuous lacuna in his continuing project to develop a more homogeneous extrabiblical apparatus. The quality of the text of Daniel in Amiatino 1 exceeds that of Ezekiel (Marsden, *The Text*, p. 168), so it may seem doubtful that any neglect of the book at Wearmouth-Jarrow played a role here. Minor Prophets (Hosea [Osee], Joel, Amos, Obadiah [Abdias], Jonah, Micah [Micheas], Nahum, Habakkuk [Abacuc], Zephaniah [Sofonias], Haggai [Aggeus], Zechariah [Zaccharias], and Malachi) (var. lect. . . in . . . *XII prophetas* . . . *distinctiones capitulorum* . . .): The full series of Bede's *capitula* in the minor prophets, Meyvaert finds, is preserved in Valenciennes 1-5 (1) and Douai 5, as printed (under the heading *Eln*) in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 225-7 (Hosea), 227 (Joel), 227-9 (Amos), 229 (Obadiah), 231 (Jonah), 231-3 (Micah), 233 (Nahum), 235 (Habakkuk and Zephaniah), 235-7 (Haggai), 237 (Zechariah), and 238 (Malachi). Finally, I would note that the deuterocanonical books of I-II Maccabees (I-II Machabei) are witnessed by a reliable text in Amiatino 1 and its apparent exemplar (possibly still extant in the "Durham Maccabees"; see Marsden, *The Text*, p. 182), but they do not seem to have engaged Bede's attention (*capitula* in *Ubi* . . . *Ubi* . . . predominate).

New Testament (. . . *capitula lectionum in totum Novum Testamentum excepto evangelico*). Even though Bede's authorship of gospel *capitula* is explicitly denied at *HE* V.xxiv, the *capitula* accompanying the texts of Mark and Luke in Amiatino 1 are nevertheless reproduced in bulk in Bede's *Commentarius in Marcum* and *Commentarius in Lucam*. Noting the pleasing "literary qualities" of the gospel *capitula* in Amiatino 1, Meyvaert provides both a rationale for Bede's exclusion of the gospels from his compositional efforts and a stylistic benchmark for the attribution of hitherto anonymous sets of *capitula* to Bede. Acts: Meyvaert finds Bede's *capitula* for Acts—as well as those for Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse (see below)—in the witness of a surviving Alcuinian bible, the present Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, B. 6 (?Rheims, s. ix med.; "Codex Vallicellianus"; siglum ΦV), most plausibly embodying Bedan *capitula* from a part-bible (*Teilhandschrift*) "that Alcuin had brought with him from Northumbria." Their text is printed in *Novum Testamentum*, ed. John Wordsworth, H.J. White, and H.F.D. Sparks, 3 vols., corr. ed. of vol. 1 (1889-1954), II, 6-33 (under siglum V; see further Frede⁴, p. 593 [item KA c]).

Pauline Letters (Romans, I-II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I-II Thessalonians, I-II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews): Meyvaert finds a complete series of Bedan *capitula* on the letters of the Pauline corpus in the previously cited Valenciennes 1-5 (1). This manuscript, moreover, contains an incomplete series of biblical prologues (*prologi* or *prefaces*), which serve to introduce entire biblical books. Meyvaert argues that this series of prologues embodies a previously unknown set of texts by Bede himself. This lacunose series can be completed, Meyvaert shows, by reference to a related manuscript, now Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 89 (82) (Saint-Amand-les-Eaux, s. xii). Romans: Bede in all probability composed some twenty-five *capitula* for Romans, but the witness to their text in Valenciennes 1-5 (1) is faulty, breaking off in the middle of the sixth *capitulum* (as printed, under the siglum *Eln*, in *Sommaires*, ed. De Bruyne, p. 315). The remainder of these *capitula*, Meyvaert hopes, may yet come to light in another manuscript. Bede's previously unknown and unprinted prologue in Romans, so far known only from the witness of Valenciennes 89 (82), is issued here by Meyvaert in its *editio princeps*. I-II Corinthians: Bede's *capitula* for I-II Corinthians are printed from Valenciennes 1-5 (1) in

Sommaires, ed. De Bruyne, pp. 320-4 (I Corinthians) and 328-30 (II Corinthians), under the siglum *Eln*. For both books, prologues are printed in *Prefaces de la Bible latine*, ed. De Bruyne (1920), pp. 243 (I Corinthians) and 244 (II Corinthians), again under the siglum *Eln* and deriving from the witness in Valenciennes 89 (82). Galatians-Hebrews: De Bruyne, in his *Sommaires* (hereafter S in references to page numbers) and *Prefaces* (hereafter P), prints the relevant Bedan *capitula* and prologues in Valenciennes 1-5 (1), and the second witness to the prologues only in Valenciennes 89 (82), for the following Pauline letters: Galatians (S=334-6 and P=244); Ephesians (S=338-40 and P=244); Philippians (S=342 and P=244); Colossians (S=346 and P=244); I Thessalonians (S=349 and P=244); II Thessalonians (S=350 and P=245); I Timothy (S=352 and P=245); II Timothy (S=356 and P=245); Titus (S= pp. 361 and P=245); Philemon (S=362 and P=245); and Hebrews (S=362-4 and P=245).

Catholic Epistles (James [Iacobus], I-II Peter, I-III John, and Jude) and Apocalypse (Revelation): The relevant Bedan *capitula* for the Catholic Epistles, as identified by Meyvaert in Biblioteca Vallicelliana B. 6 (see above), are printed in *Novum Testamentum*, ed. Wordsworth, White, and Sparks, vol. 3, as follows: James (pp. 234-36); I Peter (268-70); II Peter (311-12); I John (335-7); II John (381); III John (388); and Jude (395-6). Apocalypse: The Bedan *capitula* for Apocalypse identified by Meyvaert, also preserved in Biblioteca Vallicelliana B. 6, are printed in *Novum Testamentum*, ed. Wordsworth, White, and Sparks, III, 393-7.

Proceeding from the premise that the fundamental activity in many early medieval monastic communities was meditation on scripture in view of patristic interpretation, François Dolbeau has issued a major study addressing Bede's knowledge and use of the *Sermones* of Augustine—that is, the frequently non-liturgical, or "popular," *sermones ad populum* ("Bède, lecteur des sermons d'Augustin," *Filologia mediolatina* 3 [1996], 105-33). Dolbeau's article embodies useful bibliographical summaries of recent scholarship on the canon of Augustine's homiletic, studies of Bede's reading in Augustinian exegesis, and related topics. One of the most important investigations of Bede's exegetical reading (equipped with a useful index) remains Irénée Fransen's "Description de la collection de Bède le Vénérable sur l'Apôtre" (*RB* 71 [1961], 22-70), a thorough study of the Augustinian gleanings assembled in Bede's miscellaneous *Collectio ex opusculis S. Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*. Bede's Augustinian *Collectio* has most often been described in recent literature as inedited or unprinted (as in *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 89, following *CPL*³, Frede⁴, and other authorities), but I would note that Richard Sharpe, following Matthias A. Shaaber, has recently cited a 1499 edition of the work printed in Paris (*Handlist*, pp. 70-6 [no. 152], at p. 71): *Diui Augustini in sacras Pauli epistolas noua et hactenus abscondita interpretatio per Venerabilem Bedam* (Paris: Gering and Rembolt, 1499; rpt. Venice: [n.p.], 1543). (Under scrutiny, however, it appears that these may contain the pseudo-Bedan collection ascribed to Florus of Lyons; but I have not examined the folio editions.) Students of Bede's patristic learning, Dolbeau makes clear, will still need to augment Fransen's references (and those in Dolbeau's own articles) by tracking down citations in publications by Laistner, Löfstedt, Hart-Hasler, McCready, and Di Pilla, and, perforce, in the apparatus of Hurst's CCSL editions and in J.D.A. Ogilvy's well-known 1967 literary-historical survey—with its frequently overlooked supplement (through 1981): Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English, A.D. 597-1066: Addenda*

and Corrigenda," *Mediaevalia* 7 (1984 for 1981), 281–325. Dolbeau further cites three neglected studies on Augustine and Bede (all new to *OEN*): P. Siniscalco, "Due opere a confronto sulla creazione dell'uomo: i *De Genesi ad litteram libri XII* di Agostino e i *Libri IV in principium Genes* di Beda," in *Miscellanea di studi agostiniani in onore di P. Agostino Trapè* [= *Augustinianum* 25 (1985)] (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1985), pp. 435–52; L.T. Martin, "Augustine's Influence on Bede's *Homeliae euangelii*," in *Collectanea Augustiniana*, ed. Joseph C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fleteren (New York: Lang, 1990), pp. 357–69, and J.F. Kelly, "Augustine and Bede on the Gospels," in *Congresso internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione: Roma, 15–20 settembre 1986—Atti*, 3 vols., *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 24–6 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1987), III, 159–65.

Dolbeau has been concerned in several recent projects with the identification of Augustine's authentic sermons and with the establishment of their texts. In the present study, the scholar notes that Bede's writings alternately illuminate and are illuminated by such inquiries. Bede's early medieval florescence insures that his citations of Augustine's sermons sometimes may help to eliminate unauthorial readings from the patristic record, while the proper recovery of Augustinian homiletic by other means may facilitate the textual editing of Bede's own works—including the identification of cases in which Bede himself had recourse to faulty texts. All told, Dolbeau finds citations of fifty-six extant Augustinian sermons among Bede's writings (or, taking account of dubious cases, some fifty-five to sixty sermons). Moreover, a total of nine evidently secure—if untraced—citations in Bede's works seem to reflect seven sermons by Augustine which may yet come to light, and which Dolbeau (in anticipation of a future CCSL edition) unhesitatingly supplies with alphanumeric sigla, having been impressed by the reliability of the witness to the *sermones ad populum* preserved elsewhere in the Bedan corpus. In recent years, Dolbeau's intensive work on the canon of Augustine's sermons—along with research carried out since 1950 by Lambot, Verbraken, Étaix, Olivar, and others—has produced some stunning discoveries. Twenty-six wholly or partially unknown sermons by Augustine were discovered around the beginning of the present decade in a late medieval manuscript (the present Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, I. 9 [s. xv 2]), and these may be used to account for no fewer than eleven out of the twenty-one homiletic extracts in Bede's cited *Collectio*. The peculiar form of an extract from Augustine's *Sermo CCXVIII* quoted by Bede has turned up (so far, uniquely) in a central medieval office lectionary, now Vendôme, Bibliothèque Municipale, 217 (s. xii/xiii). The most recent work on the early transmission of Augustine's sermons suggests that Bede had recourse to as many as three of the major ancient collections. It is almost certain that Bede knew a collection of the "Mainz-Grande-Chartreuse" type (roughly corresponding to the contents of Mainz I. 9, 75r–160v); he probably also knew a collection of the "Mainz-Lorsch" type

(corresponding to Mainz I. 9, 1r–73r and 162r–252v); and it is likely that he knew a large collection resembling the one now in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Weissenburgensis 12 (von Heinemann 4096) (s. ix). Bede probably had further recourse to smaller sermon collections and homiletic commonplace-books. He may have derived some of the references to obscure saints in his *Martyrologium* from headings in such documents. Finally, Bede seems to have obtained his knowledge of three discrete groups of Augustinian texts only at second hand: (1) a series of paschal sermons treated by Lambot; (2) a number of Augustine's polemical treatises, notably *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum*, *Contra Gaudentium*, and *De gestis Pelagii*; and (3) the *Indiculum operum S. Augustini* (or *Operum S. Augustini elenchus*), sometimes ascribed to Augustine's pupil Possidius, bishop of Calama, and perhaps transmitted by the sixth-century author Iohannes Diaconus.

In his contribution to a collection of papers on Bede (originally presented at a one-day 1990 colloquium in Groningen), James E. Cross reins in a vast topic—Bede's influence in England and continental Europe—by concentrating on some undeservedly neglected aspects of the Bedan tradition: Cross, "Bede's Influence at Home and Abroad: an Introduction," in *Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk and Northumbrian*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and Alasdair A. MacDonald, *Mediaevalia Groningana* 19 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1996), pp. 17–29. During his lifetime, Bede's personal influence was restricted somewhat by his limited personal interest in travel above and beyond some information-gathering trips during the production of *HE*. Cross nevertheless offers a full review of Bede's named correspondents and interlocutors, who made possible (for example) his compass-circling discussion of the movement of tides on the western coast of Northumbria and at Whithorn, Lindisfarne, and the Isle of Wight. Despite Bede's own reluctance to travel widely, he celebrates the active life of Benedict Biscop in his *Homilia* I.xiii, the "only homily that [Bede] wrote on an Englishman that he knew." Among authors active in Anglo-Saxon England, Cross includes comments on Bede's influence on Boniface, Alcuin, Byrhtferth, Ælfric, and on the continental hagiographer Goscelin (resident for much of his English career at Canterbury; *ob.* after 1114)—for Goscelin, Cross cites "newly-identified epitomes of longer [saints'] lives" in BL Harley 652, 208r–216v (not found in Sharpe's *Handlist*).

The reception of Bede's works overseas (by way of Cuthbert, abbot of Wearmouth-Jarrow [*ob.* 760]; the York scholars Ecgberht, Ælberht, and, especially, Alcuin; and others) is reflected in the *Homiliae* of Paulus Diaconus (c. 720–99), where thirty-five of Bede's own fifty *Homiliae* form part of this prominent "official" Carolingian homiliary, where all but three of the occasions previously treated by Bede include Bedan homilies, and where eighteen additional citations of Bede by Paulus derive from the *Commentarius in Lucam* and *Commentarius in Marcum*. Cross offers a full discussion of the circulation of Paulus's *Homiliae* in England, where they were sometimes augmented by additional selections from Bede.

The full range of Bede's accounts of saints—in *HE*, in the *Chronica maiora* section of *DTR*, and in his specifically hagiographical works (including his *Martyrologium*)—were frequently excerpted for use in self-standing *vitae* from the time of the *Old English Martyrology* (possibly composed c. 800 or somewhat later, conceivably even during the “dark” period c. 835–85, although witnesses in manuscripts do not emerge until the late ninth century). In connection with Bede's hagiography, Cross cites neglected Bedan influence on Hrabanus Maurus, on Ado of Vienne, and on the anonymous author of Lyons (*fl.* before 806) who produced a *Martyrologium*, preserved in BN lat. 3879 (s. ix 1), which has never been printed in full. (Cross offers only a brief citation; see further Jacques Dubois, *Les martyrologes du Moyen Âge latin* [1978], pp. 39–40, and *Édition pratique des martyrologes*, ed. Dubois and G. Renaud, [1976], esp. at p. vi.) Revealing comments by Cross also illuminate Bede's use of marginal notes to indicate his sources: “At the beginning of an abstracted passage Bede placed the initial letter of his authority's name, and at the end a subsequent letter: thus for Gregorius, G at the beginning, R at the end; for Hieronymus (Jerome) H followed by R.” (Bede's practice is also witnessed indirectly in the early ninth century by Claudius of Turin: see PL 104, cols. 616–17.) When he edited the *Commentarius in Matthaum* of Hrabanus Maurus (issuing the text that would be reproduced subsequently in PL 107, 727–1156), the Douai theologian Georg Colvener (“Colvenerius”; 1564–1649), Cross has discovered, mistook passages drawn from Bede (following “HieRonymus”) as original contributions by “(H)Rabanus”!

Alan T. Thacker argues that Bede's harsh judgments of the Celtic Christianity of the British churches did not extend to the traditions of the Irish, whom he views as a harmless people (*HE* IV.xxiv[xxvi]: *gens innoxia*) even if he may not have had “a coherent attitude to the *gens Scottorum*, the Irish people, as a whole” (“Bede and the Irish,” in *Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 31–59). Any apparent undervaluing of the Irish achievement by Bede may reflect his patriotism and his pro-Roman bias, rather than Hibernophobia as such. Bede condemns Ecgfrith's 684 attack on the Irish (the context of the cited phrase at *HE* IV.xxiv[xxvi]). He never accuses the Irish of Pelagian leanings and, in connection with the Easter controversy, he absolves the Irish of the Roman charge of heretical Quartodecimanism, also noting carefully that the southern Irish churches adhered to Roman usage early on (*HE* V.xxi). Moreover, Bede includes affectionate portraits of Aidan and Chad, along with favorable references to Columba of Iona, Columba of Bangor, and other figures. Thacker (following Marion Gibbs) notes that during the Council of Hertford (672/3), Theodore still referred to himself as *episcopus* (*HE* IV.v), and he would not style himself *archiepiscopus Britanniae insulae* (IV.xv[xxvii]) until the Council of Hatfield (c. 679/80). Thacker also cites Charles-Edwards's important 1983 study of Bede and the Irish (new to *OEN*; see notice of Meens, above, under “Early Anglo-Latin”).

Addressing an ancient scheme that divides the universe

into two great zones (the “astral” and the “sublunar”), Alessandra Di Pilla discusses the treatment of Isidore's cosmography of the sublunar world in Bede's *De natura rerum* [hereafter *DNR*] xxv–LI—i.e., air (xxv–xxxvii), water (xxxviii–XLIV), and earth (XLV–LI)—in her essay “Il mondo sublunare nel *De natura rerum* di Beda,” in *Lingue tecniche del greco e del latino: atti del I° Seminario internazionale sulla letteratura scientifica e tecnica greca e latina* [Trieste, March 1992], ed. Sergio Sconocchia and Lucio Toneatto in collaboration with Daria Crismani and Piero Tassinari (Trieste: Università degli studi di Trieste, 1993), pp. 48–64. Characterizing Bede's *DNR* as something approaching a pastiche of excerpts, and drawing parallels with his early and possibly roughly contemporary *Commentarius in Genesim*, Di Pilla notes that *DNR* may be the author's earliest scientific work, slightly predating his treatise *De temporibus* (dated to 703) and yet nevertheless anticipating his later, much more mature view of natural science in *DTR* (735). The discussion addresses sources in Pliny's *Historia naturalis* (by which Bede's avoids the “cultural baggage” of Isidore's scheme); Isidore's own *De natura rerum* (here including comments on the possible insular origin of the “long recension” of this work) as well as the same author's *Etymologiae* and the pseudo-Isidorian *De ordine creaturarum* (*CPMM* II, 290–1 [no. 1084]). Di Pilla also refers back to one of her own earlier studies—cited also in articles by Dolbeau and Pizzani treated in the present *YWOES*—analyzing Bede's use of Augustine in the Genesis commentary: “La presenza del *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* di Agostino nell'*In principium Genesis* di Beda,” in “*De Genesi contra Manichaeos*,” “*De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus*” di Agostino d'Ippona, with commentary by Gilles Pelland *et al.*, *Lectio Augustini*—Settimana agostiniana pavese (Palermo: Edizioni “Augustinus,” 1992), pp. 99–113 (new to *OEN*). In a study relating to a neglected member of the pseudo-Bedan didactic corpus, Ubaldo Pizzani discusses the handling of the theme of the harmony of the spheres in a brief treatise (or set of scholia) on the *Musica* of Boethius (“L'armonia delle sfere nell'interpretazione dello pseudo-Beda,” in *Lingue tecniche del greco e del latino*, ed. Sconocchia and Toneatto, pp. 128–35). The treatise (printed at PL 90, cols. 909–20, following the Heerwagens' edition), known as *Musica theoria*, may be dated to the ninth century and may have emanated from the circle of Eriugena. It is treated briefly by Charles W. Jones, *Beda's Pseudepigrapha* [1939], p. 85, and at *CPL*³, pp. 457–8 (*post* no. 1384, under item “i”) but has not yet appeared in *CPMM*.

Defining historiography as “the combination of research into sources, disciplinary methodology, and literary expression,” Jan Davidse, in a contribution to the recent collection of papers on Bede originally presented at Groningen, distinguishes three modern characterizations of the author's undertakings in *HE* and other historical works (“On Bede as Christian Historian,” in *Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 1–15). Davidse addresses (1) the “bipartite” or “objectivist” views of Levison, Colgrave, and others, which would identify different passages of Bedan prose as products of

the author's alternate roles as "historian" and "theologian"; (2) the "subjectivist" view, in which the *Bewußtseinseinlage* or *Mentalität* of the purported historiographer "is fully a matter of the spirit" and the "idea of history is formed in subjective consciousness, which is then imposed on the data and on the facts in their natural course" (here citing an essay on Bede by G. Schoebe in *Festschrift H. Aubin* [1965], pp. 625–51); and (3) the "narrative" approach adopted by Suzanne Fleischman and others (some following Hayden White), which would view *HE* (in Nora Chadwick's phrase) as a "cautionary ecclesiastical saga."

A possible recent contribution to the aforementioned "objectivist" view of Bede's achievement may occur in an essay by Brigitte Englisch, who argues that Bede separated his "rational reflections" from theological speculation in an attempt to develop an integrated, empirical natural science in *DTR* and other works ("Realitätsorientierte Wissenschaft oder praxisfernes Traditionswissen? Inhalte und Probleme mittelalterlicher Wissenschaftsvorstellungen am Beispiel von *De temporum ratione* des Beda Venerabilis," in *Dilettanten und Wissenschaft: zur Geschichte und Aktualität eines wechselvollen Verhältnisses*, ed. Elisabeth Strauss, Philosophie und Repräsentation 4 [Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996], pp. 11–34; quoted phrases here follow the supplied English abstract). Bede thus transcended "the limits of early medieval science," as codified among the *artes liberales*. Skipping over Alcuin's discussions of problems of time-reckoning and the still-inedited Carolingian chronological *Encyclopedia* (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 104–8), Englisch summarizes the reception of *DTR* from the ambitious *De computo* of Hrabanus Maurus down to the eleventh-century *De mensura astrolabii* of Hermann of Reichenau. Elsewhere, this well-documented article cites Englisch's own discussion of Bede's scientific achievement in her recent book *Die "artes liberales" im frühen Mittelalter (5.–9. Jh.): das Quadrivium und der Komputus als Indikatoren für Kontinuität und Erneuerung der exakten Wissenschaften zwischen Antike und Mittelalter*, *Sudhoffs Archiv*, Beiheft 33 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994), esp. at pp. 280–350; studies on the use of the abacus, here citing Werner Bergmann's *Innovationen im Quadrivium des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts: Studien zur Einführung von Astrolab und Abakus im lateinischen Mittelalter*, appearing as Beiheft 26 in the same series (1985), a work notable (I find) for its detailed treatment of manuscripts; and translated texts and commentary relating to computistical issues available in August Strobel's *Texte zur Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders* (1984).

1995 saw the publication of a paper by Fidel Rädle, first presented at a 1993 conference in Göttingen convened to discuss seasonal concerns and related issues ("Die Ordnung der Zeit durch den Schöpfer in der Patristik und in den frühen lateinischen Hymnen," in *Rhythmus und Saisonalität: Kongressakten des 5. Symposions des Mediävistenverbandes in Göttingen 1993*, ed. Peter Dilg, Gundolf Keil, and Dietz-Rüdiger Moser [Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1995], pp. 51–61). Rädle includes citations from Bede's *DTR* on the Isidorian connection

drawn between time and temperance (or moderation)—*tempus* and *temperamentum*—and the role of the establishment of the seasons in the elimination of the primordial chaos (here citing extensively Bede's *Commentarius in Genesim* as well as various pre-Bedan hymns).

Pauline A. Thompson reassesses Bede's report that the Anglo-Saxon queen Æthelthryth, though married twice, remained a lifelong virgin—a claim that has been seen in a recent study by Pauline Stafford as part of a strategy to conceal Æthelthryth's sterility while providing a valid basis (non-consummation) for her first divorce ("St Æthelthryth: the Making of History from Hagiography," in *Studies in English Language and Literature: "Doubt wisely"—Papers in honour of E. G. Stanley*, ed. M. J. Toswell and Elizabeth M. Tyler [London: Routledge, 1996], pp. 475–92). Thompson, mitigating the implausibility of Bede's report, recalls that Æthelthryth's father was Anna, king of the East Angles, who had been converted (c. 630 × c. 635) by the Irish missionary Fursa and his Burgundian contemporary Felix. Both of Æthelthryth's marriages were arranged, and both may well have been loveless; her royal husbands may well have had regular recourse to the company of concubines. Throughout this period, the preservation of virginity was a consciously emulated virtue among aristocratic women, especially literate women familiar with hagiographical *exempla*. For example, there is a tradition that the Frankish nun Baudonivia (c. 600), author of the *Vita S. Radegundis*, remained a virgin even as she lived *sub coniugis specie* (see *Clavis Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum*, ed. Rodrigue LaRue, 2nd ed., 10 vols. [1996], II, B-176). Similar reports of virginal women saints, both married and widowed, may well have reached Anglo-Saxon England through aristocratic contacts with Gallican religious centers overseas. Thompson's well-documented study takes note of some recent, complementary work in this area, notably by C.E. Fell, "Saint Æðelþryð: a Historical-Hagiographical Dichotomy Revisited," *Nottingham Med. Stud.* 38 (1994), 18–34; in Peter Brown's *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (1988); in Dyan Elliott's *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (1993); and in an article by Anthony Davies on the "sexual conversion of the Anglo-Saxons" (see *OEN* 26.4 [1993], 20).

After some brief comments on the "rationalist dilemma" in which Plummer and Colgrave found themselves when confronting the historiographical setting of Bede's miracle-stories, Karl Lutterkort offers a detailed discussion of the miraculous element in the prose *Vita S. Cuthberti* and in *HE* ("*Beda hagiographicus*: Meaning and Function of Miracle Stories in the *Vita Cuthberti* and the *Historia ecclesiastica*," in *Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 81–106). Lutterkort maintains that there is more variation between the anonymous *Vita S. Cuthberti* and Bede's rewritten version of that *vita* than has usually been assumed, supporting this conclusion with close critiques of scenes involving the miraculous provision of food and Cuthbert's vision of the ascent of

Aidan to heaven. Analyzing phrases such as *gratia superna*, Lutterkort argues that in the *Vita S. Cuthberti* Bede's miracles are intended to edify his audience by illustrating the operation of divine virtue—his saints possess no supernatural powers of their own. The situation is more problematic in *HE*, where it is difficult to determine, to cite one well-known episode, whether the account of the conversion of King Edwin (*HE* II.xii–xv) constitutes a miracle-story. Lutterkort shows that Bede draws close connections among the miraculous, the organization of the church, and the progression of ecclesiastical history. The account of Cuthbert (*HE* IV.xxv–xxx [xxvii–xxxii]), for example, pays closer attention to the saint's posthumous miracles and cult than do the self-standing hagiographical accounts of Cuthbert.

An abstract of a recent University of Chicago dissertation by Sharon Melissa Rowley indicates that some recent, advanced theoretical approaches have now been brought to bear in addressing Bede's handling of the miraculous ("Reading Miracles in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Chicago [1996]; *DAI* 57A [1996–7], 697–8). Rowley attempts to move beyond "biblical" readings of Bede's miracles in order to circumvent "the ways in which modern constructions of exegesis and the medieval delimit our treatment of Bede's text." She "does not deny that reading Bede's miracles according to the exegetical paradigm provides insight into his sense of history," but believes that this may obscure "miracles as reflective of, and potentially contestatory to, their contemporary context" as well as "the tensions between medieval paradigms and texts." Individual chapters address grace, free will, astronomy, images of defilement, and the "divine obscuring of knowledge."

In a study that touches on the continental fortunes of Bede's accounts of Oswald in *HE* and on the later medieval cult of Oswald, king of Northumbria (ruling 634 × 642), Annemiek M. Jansen suspects that a report by Bede implying that Willibrord took at least one relic associated with Oswald to Frisia c. 690 (*HE* III.xiii) may mark the point at which the saint's cult first reached the Continent ("Bede and the Legends of St Oswald," in *Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 167–78). Eventually Oswald's widespread cult would engender all of the following: Latin sermons and a *Vita S. Oswaldi* (c. 1050) by Drogo of Bergues-Saint-Winoc (near Mons, dép. Nord); popular vernacular reflexes (mainly in German and Icelandic sources), including the so-called Munich Oswald, Budapest Oswald, and Vienna Oswald; and miscellaneous liturgical variants. In general, Jansen finds that the liturgical cult remains grounded in Bede's writings (notably in *HE* III.i–iii, III.vi–vii, III.ix, III.xiii, and IV.xiv). The popular legends, by contrast, draw on multifarious folk traditions, and they possibly bear witness to the influence of later English productions, such as the *Libellus in honorem S. Oswaldi regis* of Reginald of Durham, never edited in full (see Sharpe's *Handlist*, which should be consulted to refine all of Jansen's citations of later Anglo-Latin productions—here at p. 456 [no. 1271]). For previous studies by Nicolas-Norbert

Huyghebaert treating texts that supported Oswald's continental cult, see *OEN* 20.1 (1986), 113, and 26.4 (1993), 20.

A.G. Rigg has issued the first widely available edition and study of a two-part—or, conceivably, two-poem—celebration of Hild of Whitby in Anglo-Latin verse ("A Latin Poem on St. Hilda and Whitby Abbey," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 6 [1996], 12–43). Neither part of the verse treated by Rigg was catalogued in 1977 by Schaller and Könsgen (*Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*, ed. Dieter Schaller and Ewald Könsgen [1977]—hereafter cited as *ICL*). Treated previously in Rigg's own 1966 doctoral thesis, the verse in question was copied out during the fifteenth century, evidently by a Glastonbury monk, in the present Cambridge, Trinity College, O. 9. 38 (1450) (Oxford [Rigg] or ?Glastonbury [Ker], s. xv [Rigg] or s. xv/xvi [Ker]). The cultivation of rhymed ("leonine") hexameters throughout the verse—including complex "single-sound" couplets in the second part (e.g., "Grandis vindicta fuit a Bega benedicta / Istis conflictis; sic est sua cura relicta")—suggests that the composition of the verse must postdate the proliferation of *leonini* in the later eleventh century. Rigg, however, would date both parts to the century of their transcription, drawing a connection with the fifteenth-century "rise in literary interest in Northern saints and antiquities," such as the relics of Hild housed at Glastonbury. Rigg notes that with the minor exception of legendary material attested in the *Liber Eliensis* and *Vita S. Begae* (the latter cited here from an 1842 edition by G.C. Tomlinson), all accounts of Hild down to William of Malmesbury (followed by John of Glastonbury, John of Tynemouth, and others) "follow Bede directly." Both parts of the verse on Hild may independently bear witness to lost hagiography on the abbess "that had already combined [matter from] Bede and the [non-Bedan] legends." Rigg offers no translation of the poem as a whole, but his well-handled textual notes include clear English translations of the most difficult lines.

Discussing the education of women in the early Anglo-Saxon period, Benedicta Ward recalls that Bede's *Commentarius in Habacuc*—an exposition of the Song of Habakkuk, a canticle sung at Lauds every ferial Friday—was composed at the request of an unnamed nun who was resident, it appears, at an establishment conforming to the most recent Roman liturgical reforms: Ward, "'To my dearest sister': Bede and the Educated Woman," in *Women, the Book, and the Godly: Selected Proceedings of the St Hilda's Conference, 1993, Volume I* [Oxford, August 1993], ed. Lesley Smith and Jane H.M. Taylor (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 1995), pp. 105–11. Specific candidates might include Eadburg, abbess of Thanet in Kent, where nuns were busy copying texts for use in the German mission; King Ine's sister Tette, abbess of Wimborne; or another correspondent of Boniface, Leofgyth (Leoba), educated at Wimborne. It is also possible that the correspondent was an unidentified resident of one of the centers at Ely, Coldingham, Ripon (after Wilfrid's Roman reforms), or, perhaps, at Whitby or Barking (assuming a moderation of Celtic influence at these establishments). In

any event, Bede sees no need to simplify his Latin usage for his female audience, and it is probable that women's instruction in *grammatica* was intended "to ensure that they could, for the whole of life, continue to go as deeply as possible" into Christian learning.

Gianni Caputa relates Bede's exegesis of the Song of Songs to other commentaries on the book in a 1992 article that has already received brief notice in this column—in a slightly corrected form, "Il Cantico nella teologia di San Beda il Venerabile," in *Lettture cristiane dei Libri Sapienziali: XX Incontro di studiosi della antichità cristiana, 9–11 maggio 1991* [Rome], *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 37 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1992), pp. 461–81; see *OEN* 30.2 (1997), 84–5, where the cited *Medioevo latino* abstract should be ascribed to Patrizia Del Ciotto. Citing Song I.15–II.2 as a hermeneutic key to the Old Testament scripture, Caputa explores these verses' significance for the themes of contemplative rest and active evangelization (citing Bede's treatments of II.7–17, III.11–IV.1, V.2–6, VII.1, and VII.10–13). In addition to Bede's *Commentarius in Cantica canticorum*, Caputa cites passages from the exegete's *Commentarius in Ezram et Neemiam*, *Commentarius in epistolas septem catholicas*, and *De templo*, and from *HE*. Two additional items treating Bede's use of biblical exegesis may be noted briefly. In connection with his work toward a new edition of the *Commentarius in Matthaeum* of Hrabanus Maurus, Bengt Löfstedt offers source-critical comments involving twelve passages drawn from Bede's *Commentarius in Lucam*, *Commentarius in Marcum*, and *Homiliae* ("Patristica nova," *Orpheus* n.s. 17 [1996], 136–41). He also offers six new identifications of sources for the cited Bedan commentaries, which are to be found among the *Sermones* and exegetical writings of Augustine and in the *Moralia in Iob* of Gregory I. Löfstedt prints and discusses neglected indirect, if early, witnesses to Bede's prose (through Hrabanus) from Princeton, University Library, Garrett 72 and Münster in Westfalen, Landesmuseum für Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte, 540 (both s. ix). A recent Boston University dissertation by Leslie A. King addresses the subject of deafness in early church writings down to Bede ("Surditas: the Understandings of the Deaf and Deafness in the Writings of Augustine, Jerome, and Bede," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Boston Univ. [1996]; *DAI* 57A [1996–7], 1683). The study analyzes a neglected passage on the salvation of the deaf in the context of Jerome's comment on Romans x.17 ("faith comes by hearing") in his *Commentarii in epistulam ad Galatas*. Beyond Bede's well-known story of a miracle of speech involving a deaf and (initially) mute youth (*HE* V.ii), King discusses passages in his *Commentarius in Lucam* and *Commentarius in Marcum*.

1995 saw the appearance of the first complete translation of Bede's *HE* into modern French (*Bède le Vénérable: Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple anglais*, tr. Philippe Delaveau, L'Aube des peuples [Paris: Gallimard, 1995]). The paperback's enthusiastic introduction echoes Eleanor Duckett's view of *HE* as a "new *Aeneid*." Among the end-matter, there is a short

section containing notes and chronological summaries of the succession of kings and bishops, the last of which may prove particularly useful. An uneven bibliography refers to nineteenth-century editions of the Latin text by Giles and Moberly, a sixteenth-century English translation of the Latin by Stapleton, and a seventeenth-century edition of the Alfredian prose *Bede*. Delaveau's work seems to have been produced without recourse to the edition and translation of Colgrave and Mynors. For a two-volume 1982 German version of *HE* by Gunter Spitzbart, essentially a translation of Colgrave–Mynors, see *OEN* 16.2 (1983), p. 100. Finally, John Marsden's attractive, general-interest trade paperback on Bede appeared in a revised edition in 1996 (Marsden, *The Illustrated Bede*, with translations by John Gregory and photography by Geoff Green, rev. ed. [Edinburgh: Floris Books, 1996], illus.). Above and beyond the features of the first edition (see *OEN* 24.1 [1990], 42), the revision includes a new preface; some improvements to the translations; and two new color plates (complementing the existing photography by Geoff Green), both illustrating pages of the St. Petersburg Bede.

c. Alcuin

ACKNOWLEDGING that Alcuin's efforts as an Anglo-Latin riddle author have rarely been cited in connection with the large collections produced by Aldhelm, Eusebius (Hwætberht), Tatwine, and Boniface, Paul Sorrell finds nevertheless that Alcuin's *Carmina* LXIV.1, LXIV.2, XCII.1, and c.3 (all treating hot baths or ovens) show clearly that he took an avid interest in early medieval enigmata, as do some passages in his pedagogical dialogue *Disputatio Pippini regis cum Albino* ("Alcuin's 'comb' Riddle," *Neophilologus* 80 [1996], 311–18). Neglected support for this conclusion occurs in a related pair of texts—essentially forming a prose-poetic *opus geminatum*—consisting of an Alcuinian letter (*Epistola* XXVI) and a complementary verse-epistle (now Alcuin's *Carmen* v). These were composed jointly to commemorate Alcuin's receipt of the gift of a *de luxe* ivory comb from Riculf of Mainz. Sorrell compares the riddles' enigmatic beast (*bestia*) with two heads and sixty teeth ("connected by a single jaw") to subjects depicted in some Old English riddles, bolstering a hypothesis that the riddles copied out in the tenth-century Exeter Book (or similar verse) had been composed by the end of the eighth century. In this connection, Sorrell cites specific verbal parallels in Latin and Old English texts ("*bestia . . . subreperunt*" and "*wiht cwom*" [*Rid* 33 and 86]); and ("*scis . . . quae sit*" and "*rece . . . hwæt . . . sie*" [*Rid* 33]). Other wide-ranging remarks by Sorrell adduce points of comparison with extant medieval combs preserved with St. Cuthbert's reliquary and in the cathedral at Sens.

In a unique study of the northern European transmission of Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis*—a brief ethical manual (*libellus*) composed 799 × 804 for the author's friend Duke Wido, a successful general based in Brittany—Marco Battaglia notes that Froben Forster ("Frobenius"; see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 105) consulted only five codices for the 1777 *editio princeps* of

the treatise: Battaglia, "Osservazioni sulla tradizione del *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis* in Scandinavia," in *Teoria e pratica della traduzione nel medioevo germanico*, ed. Maria Vittoria Molinari, et al., Studi e testi di linguistica e filologia germanica (Padua: Unipress, 1994), pp. 333–57. (See Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 36–46 [no. 87], at p. 411, for documentation of more than fifty extant witnesses as well as ten attested but presently unidentified copies of the Alcuinian treatise.) Battaglia provides a concise summary of the Alcuinian work's contents and its sources in Augustine, Cassian, Gregory I, Caesarius of Arles, and Bede. The bulk of the article is given over to a neglected group of indirect Scandinavian witnesses to the Latin text. Foremost among these is a literalistic Old Norse–Icelandic translation rendering all thirty-five of the treatise's main chapters, a translation whose earliest attestation now occurs in the modern Copenhagen, Københavns Universiteit, Det Arnamagnæanske Institut, AM. 619 (4°) (s. xii/xiii; "Old Norse Homiliary"), on 1r–15r. (See the edition in *Gamla Norsk Homiliebok*, ed. Gustav Indrebø [1931].) The Old Norse version's witness to the Latin goes back at least as far as Norwegian traditions at the close of the eleventh century, even if a precise dating on philological grounds, Battaglia concludes, probably will always remain unobtainable. Three late Icelandic extracts in manuscripts housed within the same collection—AM. 56 (8°), 1r–2v; AM. 685 d (4°), 11r–24r; and AM. 688 a (4°), 1r–2v (all s. xv or s. xv/xvi)—provide supplementary evidence for exemplary Latin readings lost from the earlier Old Norse Homiliary as a result of a major lacuna, along with possible traces of the independent circulation of Alcuinian texts in Iceland (again arising out of Norway). Battaglia also discusses an isolated Icelandic witness to Alcuin's chapter *de iudiciis* in seven copies of *Jónsbók* as well as vernacular reflexes of pseudo-Alcuiniana most plausibly ascribed to Paulus Diaconus.

Drawing on recent work by I Deug-Su and J. Martínez Pizarro, a 1994 essay by Christiane Veyrard-Cosme explores the relevance to Alcuin's hagiography (specifically the *Vita S. Richarii*, *Vita S. Vedasti*, and prose *Vita S. Willibrordi*) of the distinction between *potestas* and *auctoritas*—roughly, secular and ecclesiastical powers ("Littérature latine du haut Moyen Âge et idéologie politique l'exemple d'Alcuin," *Revue des études latines* 72 [1994], 192–207). Alcuin's presentation of the *potestas* of rulers from Charles Martel down to Charlemagne owes much to biblical depictions of Old Testament kings, while the *auctoritas* of the church and its saints is bound up with such "real-world" concerns as conversion and evangelization. Questioning the value of the dichotomy itself, Veyrard-Cosme concludes that it is not necessary to look for either a *speculum principum* or a *speculum clericorum* in Alcuin's *vitae*: his hagiography offers a mirror of the *regnum* of the church, the eternal army of Christ, of which Charlemagne's realm is but one manifestation. Two other recent, related studies by Veyrard-Cosme cited here are "Typologie et hagiographie en prose carolingienne: mode de pensée et réécriture—étude de la *Vita Willibrordi*, de la *Vita Vedasti*, et de la *Vita Richarii* d'Alcuin," in *Écriture et modes de pensée au Moyen Âge, VIII^e–*

XV^e siècles, ed. Dominique Boutet and L. Harf-Lancner (Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure, 1993), pp. 157–86, and "La constitution des figures royales dans l'œuvre hagiographique en prose d'Alcuin," *Lalies* 14 (1994), 263–89.

René Martin offers a close, verse-by-verse commentary on Alcuin's *Carmen* LVIII, characterized here as a medieval Latin flyting (*conflictus* or *Streitgedichte*) between spring and winter that synthesizes both Mediterranean and Germanic traditions ("Au confluent des traditions antique, germanique, et chrétienne: le *Conflictus veris et hiemis* d'Alcuin," *Revue des études latines* 72 [1994], 177–91). Martin's bibliographically generous essay cites sources in Vergil's pastoral verse, Tacitus's *Germania*, Æsop's *Fabula* CCCXLVI, and the seldom-discussed *Chronicon slavosarmaticum* ascribed to one Prokosz (Procosius), last edited in 1827. In a final item of Alcuinian interest, Simon Coates assembles and discusses the full range of passages in Alcuin's writings that provide evidence for his idealization of the ecclesiastical functions and spirituality of bishops ("The Bishop as Benefactor and Civic Patron: Alcuin, York, and Episcopal Authority in Anglo-Saxon England," *Speculum* 71 [1996], 529–58). He sees Alcuin's long poem *Versus de sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* as "the only surviving early Anglo-Saxon hagiographical work that deals with the history of a single episcopal see and its cathedral community." Coates notes the poem's documentation of the attempt of Bishop Bosa (*ob.* 706) to induce the secular clergy in the cathedral at York to live like monks, participating fully in the hours of the Divine Office—which, the anonymous continental *Vita Alcuini* suggests (before 829), included the observance of Compline. Coates sees the poem as a politicized "tract for [Alcuin's] own time . . . designed to offer a blueprint for ecclesiastical reform." Coates calls into question Godman's dating of the long poem to the period of Alcuin's final residence in England (c. 792–3), as opposed to the traditional, much earlier dating to c. 780, that is, to the years immediately preceding his removal to Charlemagne's court. In this connection, Coates mentions McKitterick's recent contention that copies of the long poem did not reach the Continent until the tenth century, suggesting that it was preserved exclusively in England (and presumably at York) over the dark years of the ninth century. The article nonetheless includes extensive discussion of possible sources in Carolingian *gesta episcoporum* and *gesta abbatum* (and also some Ottonian analogues), along with discussion of the poem's evident verbal debts to works of Venantius Fortunatus and Gregory of Tours. Coates also includes comments on Alcuin's official duties as an abbot of Tours (here citing Jean Chélini, "Alcuin, Charlemagne et Saint Martin de Tours," *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 47 [1961], 19–50).

d. The Ninth Century

THE ANGLO-LATIN traditions of the ninth century have rarely been addressed in these pages, not least because the major literary productions of the period—or "near-literary" productions such as letters or the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*—were mainly composed in Old English or, as in the case of Asser's

De rebus gestis Ælfredi, have been classified more precisely as Celtic Latin works. There has been a perception, moreover, that a sort of literary-historical "black hole" has obliterated the central decades of the century or, roughly, the years bounded by the compilation of the *Old English Martyrology* (c. 800 or somewhat later: see notice of Cross, under "Bede") and the production of vernacular texts championed and, in some cases, carried out personally by King Alfred (from c. 885). The most common view is that the ninth-century Viking depredations incurred a wholesale destruction of libraries, schools, and scriptoria. This has been inferred most often from Alfred's famous comment about religious establishments that were *forhergod . . . ond forbærned* (CP, preface: "ravaged [as by an enemy army] and burnt").

Michael Lapidge now has issued a comprehensive survey of the evidence for Latin literary production in England over fifty of the darkest years of the ninth century, a period whose outer limits are c. 835 × c. 885. The study appears in its first publication in a volume of Lapidge's collected essays that receives separate notice below (see below under "Comprehensive Works", item 16). Although it seems that "the production of high-grade manuscripts . . . had come to an end by c. 850," Lapidge nevertheless cites three extant manuscripts produced in England around the middle of the ninth century: (1) a major exemplar of insular half-uncial script, the latest known to survive, now BL Cotton Domitian vii (?Lindisfarne, s. ix 1 [i.e., c. 840], additions of s. x–xi, provenances at ?Lindisfarne, Chester-le-Street, and Durham; "*Liber vitae* of Durham"); (2) OB Bodley 426 (SC 2327), fols. 1–118 (center in ?Wessex [i.e., ?Winchester], s. ix med. [i.e., 838 × 847]; later provenance St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury; *CLA* II², 33 [no. 234], with II², 51—on the basis of a dating to s. viii/ix by Lowe, Ker, *et al.*, now discredited); and (3) OB Digby 63 (SC 1664) (Northumbrian center, s. ix med. or s. ix 2—i.e., 844 [or ?867] × 892; additions of ? s. ix/x [Ker]; provenance by s. xi in. at Winchester [i.e., ? the Old Minster]), the computistical texts in this last item having been copied out by one Rægenbold. Lapidge concludes that it would be "difficult to argue for the continuity of scriptorial practice through the mid-ninth century on the basis of only three specimens." Similarly, he manages to identify only two surviving literary (or near-literary) texts produced during the period in question, one a short poem in hexameters (*incipit* "Hanc portam presens cernis quicumque viator"; not found in *ICL*), perhaps composed as late as 890, the other a letter by Egred, bishop of Lindisfarne datable to the period 830 × 837. All other Latin texts known to have been issued over these dark years offer examples of "pragmatic" or "functional" prose. These comprise *in toto* thirteen professions of faith by Southumbrian bishops and twenty-two single-sheet charters. Partly reinforcing Alfred's words, the poor quality of the latinity manifested by these documents leads Lapidge to conclude, in the light of a very close analysis of every item, that English "schools had ceased to function during the period 835–885."

Turning away from questions surrounding the production

of new works and manuscripts, Lapidge finds that the evidence for the transmission of texts and the preservation of books in England during the ninth century tells a slightly different story. In a detailed survey of the native and continental fortunes of works by Aldhelm, Bede, and other early Anglo-Latin authors, Lapidge finds that certain English works—around a full third of these early compositions—did survive at home over the course of the ninth century. Most notable in this regard are Aldhelm's *De virginiate*; Bede's *HE*, *Vita S. Cuthberti metrica*, and *In Proverbia*; and (perhaps transmitted *exclusively* in native copies) the *Enigmata* of Tatwine and Eusebius, the anonymous *Vita S. Ceolfriithi*, Stephen of Ripon's *Vita S. Wilfridi*, Bede's *Historia abbatum*, and Aedilulf's *De abbatibus*. Nevertheless, more than half (and probably closer to two-thirds) of the earliest Anglo-Latin texts, including many works of Aldhelm and the great bulk of the productions by other scholars associated with the seventh-century Canterbury school, survived *only* as a result of their exportation to the Continent.

Most valuably, Lapidge identifies specific centers whose libraries seem to have survived the Scandinavian incursions, such as Worcester (as witnessed by the preservation of Milred's *Epigrammata* and by Alfred's recruitment of Werferth) and, quite unexpectedly, Scandinavian York. In the latter connection, Lapidge identifies four substantial texts that were evidently preserved at York over decades of Viking administration (from 866): (1) the so-called York Annals; (2) the York-produced *Martyrologium poeticum* (or "Metrical Calendar of York": see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 81–2); (3) the exemplar of a copy of Alcuin's letters in BL Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, fols. 114–79 (York or ?Worcester, s. xi 1); (4) and the exemplar of a copy of a neglected early Northumbrian biblical text now witnessed by York, Minster Library, XVI. N. 6 (?York, s. xiii med.; later provenance York). Byrhtferth also seems to have had access at Ramsey to native copies of seventh- and eighth-century Anglo-Latin texts (perhaps brought by Oswald from Worcester or York), including some rare "computistical verses attributed *nominatim* to Bede that have not survived elsewhere," that is, among the Byrhtferthian passages incorporated into the *Historia regum* produced by Simeon of Durham (*incipit* "Me legat, annales cupiat qui noscere menses"; *Symeonis monachi opera omnia*, ed. Thomas Arnold, 2 vols. [1882–5], II, 3–283, at 23; not in *CPL*³; *ICL*, p. 424 [no. 9480]; Jones, *Beda's Pseudepigrapha*, p. 77). In a new conclusion that may necessitate revision of standard sources, Lapidge suggests that "if the Danes did not destroy books and libraries in York, there is perhaps no need to suppose that they did so elsewhere." Blame for the ninth-century decline "must lie with the bishops, who, had they been sufficiently concerned with Latin learning, must surely have had the resources to acquire teachers, even if such teachers had to be brought in from elsewhere."

Lapidge finds that the ninth-century fortunes of an English book may have been influenced both by its codicological format and by the prominence of the physical space set aside for its use in a church or monastic establishment. In a

particularly engaging excursus, Lapidge identifies the five main settings for the use of books in monasteries: (1) the sanctuary (typically housing *de luxe* bibles and liturgical books); (2) the refectory (minimally decorated hagiographical volumes); (3) the chapter-house (practical copies of Benedict's *Regula*, at least one martyrology, and other sources for the daily readings); (4) the cloister armarium (patristic volumes and other books "for the monks' private Lenten reading"); and (5) the school (pedagogical manuscripts that were often "undecorated and frequently written in a cursive or current grade of script"). Not one Anglo-Saxon schoolbook seems to have survived the ninth century on English soil, but in a tally of extant manuscripts produced before c. 825 and preserved in England over the ninth century—Lapidge counts thirty-one (mainly) intact books and thirty-eight fragments—fully sixty-one percent are found to be biblical or liturgical productions that might well be kept near the altar. Such *de luxe* volumes might well be among the first possessions to be concealed for safekeeping in the event of an attack. Only twenty-seven percent of the English books produced by c. 800 and preserved on the Continent are similarly precious volumes, and there are many representatives of classroom collections. (From continental libraries, Lapidge counts thirty-three extant English books and twenty-seven fragments.)

Lapidge asserts that there is at best only limited evidence for ninth-century pedagogy to be gleaned from Old English texts grounded in Latin literary traditions, such as the verse of the insecurely dated Cynewulfian canon; the poetic *Solomon and Saturn I*; the homily on St. Chad (*DOE* LS 3 (Chad) = A. Cameron, "A List of Old English Texts" [in *A Plan for the DOE*, ed. Roberta Frank and A. Cameron (1973); hereafter "List"], p. 101 [item B.3.3.3]); or the Old English glosses in BL Cotton Vespasian A. i (?Canterbury, s. viii 1; glosses of s. ix med. [Ker]; later provenance St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury; "Vespasian psalter"; *CLA* II², 21 [no. 193], with II², 49, and suppl., 47). Drawing on recent work by Phillip Pulsiano, Lapidge maintains that the glosses accompanying the psalms and canticles of Vespasian A. i were copied over from an exemplar produced before c. 835. (See below under "The Tenth-Century Reform" for Milfull's recent comments on some glosses in Vespasian A. i explicating a group of hymns evidently introduced to the volume as an addendum.) To conclude this notice, it should be mentioned that Lapidge's article also includes comments on problems posed by the corporate ownership of books in monasteries and the private ownership of books in secular establishments (as by a bishop). Such concerns arise in connection with Alcuin's importation to Tours of books from the library of Ælberht, archbishop of York (c. 796), whose ownership Alcuin claimed by right of bequest (see further *OEN* 29.2 [1996], pp. 104 and 110).

c. The Tenth-Century Reform and Beyond

INGE B. MILFULL incorporates a full survey of pre-Conquest liturgical hymnody into a study and edition of a single, monumental set of texts: the Latin hymns and continuous

Old English interlinear gloss of Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32 (Canterbury [i.e., Christ Church Cathedral or St. Augustine's Abbey], s. xi 1), known as the "Durham hymnal": Milfull, *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: a Study and Edition of the "Durham Hymnal"*, Cambridge Stud. in A-S England 17 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), illus. Helmut Gneuss used the "Canterbury-type" main text of the Durham hymnal as the basis of his now-standard enumeration of the hymns of the widely disseminated, originally Frankish "New Hymnal" (whose precise place of origin in the ninth century remains controversial). In many respects, Milfull's work may be viewed as a well-coordinated continuation of Gneuss's project. The Durham witness provides Milfull with a suitable foundation for an apparatus of Latin variants drawn from all four of the other complete (or nearly complete) English copies of the New Hymnal, as well as some collateral witnesses. Moreover, Milfull includes (as *hymni* CXXXIV–CLXII) full editions of the thirty-nine hymns preserved in these sources which do not appear in the Durham manuscript. Finally, a useful appendix contextualizes the Anglo-Saxon circulation of hymns in two additional settings: (a) the post-Ambrosian "Old Hymnal," first encountered in monuments of the sixth century from monastic centers in Italy and southern Gaul, which is an early ancestor of the central medieval, Cistercian "Milanese hymnal" (even if the Old Hymnal was doubtfully compiled as a full cycle of hymns specifically in Milan, let alone by Ambrose [*ob.* 397] himself); (b) the short-lived "Frankish hymnal," arising in the late eighth century or the ninth either in northern or eastern Francia or Alemannia. (The "Mozarabic hymnal," related to both of these items, is mainly left out of Milfull's account in the absence of evidence for its independent influence on English practice.)

Milfull's comprehensive treatment of these texts is facilitated by a definition of *hymnus* which restricts the inquiry to compositions for the liturgy (the daily office, but never the mass), these arising in response to Benedict's assignment of one hymn to each of eight canonical hours—a stricture developed further by Caesarius, bishop of Arles (c. 470–542) and his successor Aurelian. As Milfull acknowledges, the broad Isidorian definition of *hymnus* would accommodate any composition that is "in praise of God, and sung." Excluding from detailed study any text lacking a known context in the Divine Office, Milfull sets aside the following sources: most processional hymns; Bede's hymns (apart from his *Hymnus vi* [*In ascensione Domini*], transmitted to posterity as the seventy-third hymn of the New Hymnal; CCSL 122, 419–23); anonymous Anglo-Latin hymns to SS. Josse (Judoc or Iudocus) and Machutus; hymns attributed to Wulfstan of Winchester in praise of Æthelwold, Swithun, and Birinus (see Sharpe's *Handlist*, pp. 824–5 [no. 2229]); and some neglected, possibly pre-Conquest compositions studied by K.D. Hartzell (not treated in *YWOES*, but cited at *OEN* 9.2 [1976], 83).

Even with these restrictions, Milfull's study includes discussion of some unusual collateral texts. The most impor-

tant may be noted briefly: two major witnesses to the *Expositio hymnorum*, a version of a full (and intermittently expanded) hymnodic cycle which has been drawn from a copy of the New Hymnal and recast as prose; a similar recasting of some "monastic" canticles exhibiting a comparably rearranged word-order and an Old English gloss—evidently produced with a considerable expenditure of effort, even though the unmetrical Latin texts of the canticles in question are essentially prose compositions to begin with; fragments of hymns in now housed in Leeds at the Brotherton Library (s. xi; *olim* Ripon, Cathedral Library, s.n.; Gneuss, "Preliminary List," p. 44 [no. 696]), which Milfull reports as s.n., my own notes showing that these were accessioned as "MS Fragment 2" in 1991; hymns entered c. 970 by three out of some six scribes responsible for addenda to the "Durham collectar" (see *OEN* 27.2 [1994], 66–7, and 30.2 [1997], 88–9); another rare witness to secular usage (which thus "provides hymns for Compline"), that is, the "hymnal for the canons of Exeter" now in BL Harley 2961 (Exeter, s. xi med. [i.e., 1046 × 1072]; "Leofric collectar and hymnal"), at 218r–251r; some instructions for hymnody, influencing English practice, which are included in a text known as *Indicium regule quomodo*, of uncertain (possibly continental) origin, preserved in Cambridge, University Library [hereafter CUL], Ll. 1. 14, fols. 70–108 (English center, s. xi ex.); and references to hymns cited (in translation) in Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* and (in Latin, by *incipit*) in the so-called Old English *Benedictine Office* (*DOE* LitBen 7.1–8 = Cameron, "List," p. 131 [item B.12.7]; as ptd. in *The Benedictine Office*, ed. James M. Ure [1957], pp. 85, lines 6–7 [two items]; 96, line 9; 97, line 14; 98, line 7; 99, line 14; and 100, lines 8–9 [two items]).

Tracking the early history of Anglo-Saxon hymnody, Milfull considers the fifteenth-century report of the contents of a lost copy of the Old Hymnal from St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, provided by Thomas Elmham, monk of Canterbury and later prior of Lenton (*ob.* c. 1427), in his unfinished *Speculum Augustinianum* (following Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 653–4 [no. 1739], at p. 654; published as *Historia monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. Charles Hardwick [1858]; see pp. 96–9 [*De libris*], at p. 97). In accordance with standard Anglo-Saxon usage, Elmham's reference to a hymn *ad matutinas* actually pertains to the observance of Lauds, and the report contains a rare, early witness to the English celebration of Compline in an allusion to a hymn *ad completorium*. Citing a personal communication from Helmut Gneuss, Milfull notes that such characteristically Gallican features of the Canterbury list, which agree with the usage of Lérins against Benedict's *Regula*, may reflect liturgical innovations implemented in Canterbury by Benedict Biscop before the arrival of Theodore and Hadrian. Biscop had been "a monk of Lérins for two years and [subsequently] in charge of St. Augustine's from 669 to 671." With the loss of the Canterbury codex known to Elmham, the earliest primary witness to the use of the Old Hymnal now resides in the Vespasian psalter (see notice of Lapidge above, under "The

Ninth Century"), whose unique appendix of three hymns entered in uncials (by the main scribe)—appearing as the volume's final items, and serving to fill out some blank space on 152r–v and most of the two following, otherwise blank leaves, fols. 153–4—received glosses around the same time as did the main series of psalms and glosses, even if "[i]t is not clear whether the gloss to the hymns is by the scribe or was copied from an exemplar." Indirect witnesses to the Old Hymnal include Bede's *De arte metrica* and allusions to hymns by Aldhelm, by Felix of Crowland, and, perhaps, in the opening of *Guthlac B*.

The complex cycle of hymns in the New Hymnal—wholly superseding the daily repetitions of the fixed series of hymns constituting the Old Hymnal—introduced a more conspicuously differentiated, but still essentially fixed, series of hymns for weekday recitation in the Hours. Such recitation of hymns on "ordinary days" (in the so-called *ordinarium de tempore*) took place over the course of two lengthy divisions of the year, one extending through winter and Lent and the other from the octave of Pentecost until the first of November. (The regularity of this scheme, at least by the period of the tenth-century reforms, is attested in the *Indicium regule quomodo* [see above], in the *Regularis concordia* [c. 970 × 973], and by Ælfric of Cerne Abbas and Eynsham [*ob.* c. 1010], in his *Epistola ad monachos Egneshamienses*) The New Hymnal also laid the foundation for an extended, more variable set of hymns for special feast days and other church holidays (in the integrated *proprium de tempore* and *proprium de tempore sanctorum*—combined in all Anglo-Saxon documents except for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College [hereafter CCCC] 391 [Worcester, s. xi 2]), with certain regional characteristics emerging in connection with the commemoration of saints (in the otherwise fairly stable *commune sanctorum*).

Introduced in England during the later tenth-century Benedictine reforms, texts from the New Hymnal make their earliest known Anglo-Saxon appearances in the cited *Regularis concordia* and in the Bosworth psalter—BL Additional 37517, fols. 4–135 (Canterbury [i.e., St. Augustine's Abbey—see notice of Orchard, below—or ?Christ Church Cathedral] or ?London [i.e., Westminster Abbey: Milfull], s. x 2 [i.e., c. 950 × c. 975: Dumville] or ? s. x ex. [Ker]; additions of s. x/xi; glosses of s. xi in.), whose main hand has been identified in a diplomatic source, the present London, Westminster Abbey Library, Muniments Room X (same range of possible origins, s. x 2 [i.e., post 968]; "Sunbury charter"). The Bosworth psalter and *Regularis concordia* (followed by Ælfric) respectively represent the "Canterbury" (or, perhaps more precisely, "Christ Church") and "Winchester" text-types of the New Hymnal, as identified by Gneuss and discussed at length by Milfull. Complex textual issues emerge in the course of Milfull's analysis of a procedure which saw the introduction of Old English glosses from a characteristically Winchester-type exemplar to the main, Canterbury-type Latin text of the Durham hymnal. An even more involved process led to the integration of texts from a Canterbury-type hymnal and the

prose paraphrase of the *Expositio hymnorum* (based on a Winchester-type hymnal) in the present BL Cotton Vespasian D. xii (Canterbury [i.e., ?Christ Church Cathedral] or ?Bury St. Edmunds, s. xi med.), the resulting, interleaved text being augmented further by a copy of the rearranged "monastic" canticle-text described above and, finally, by the addition of some miscellaneous hymns on an inserted quire.

Addressing the controversies surrounding the origins of the divergent liturgical customs implicit in Gneuss's Canterbury–Winchester distinction, Milfull accepts that the late, though possibly conservative, witness of the thirteenth-century *Consuetudines Floriacenses* (to be distinguished from the more recently discovered, tenth-century *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores*) does seem to show points of agreement between practices at Fleury (sometime residence of Æthelwold and Oswald) and Winchester against those of Canterbury, even if a direct line of influence cannot be proven conclusively. Parallels from Cluny for the customs of Winchester, though tenable, need not reflect the transmission of Cluniac customs by way of Fleury—other possibilities, including direct Cluniac influence, deserve consideration in this regard. Despite Dunstan's residence at Ghent, that center (whose hymns are nowhere attested at first hand) does not seem to have provided the template for the Canterbury-type hymnal, on the evidence of the historically related usage of Saint-Bertin—all of whose early contacts with the English are reviewed here in detail by Milfull. A nexus of centers in Francia to the north and west of the Île de France—most notably Corbie, Jumièges, and Lyre—exerted well-documented influence on Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice. In the end, Milfull characterizes both English versions of the New Hymnal as eclectic compilations, even betraying the influence of strands of German and Italian hymnody at certain points, and incorporating some original Anglo-Latin compositions as well.

Beyond its liturgical function, the Durham hymnal seems to have been used "as a schoolbook," which is hardly surprising given that "[t]he canticles and psalms were among the first things young novices had to learn." One intriguing connection with other aspects of the Benedictine reforms is provided by the hymnal's inclusion of a somewhat inelegant copy of a striking illustration, showing a king surrounded by religious personages and Christian symbols, which faces the opening page of the T-text of *Regularis concordia* (the text in question having been copied out at Christ Church Cathedral). As was mentioned in a notice of work by Lucia Kornexl in the previous installment of *YWOES* (*OEN* 30.2 [1997], 92–3), this illustration has been moved, along with the whole of the T-text of *Regularis concordia*, from its original position about a quarter of the way into its eleventh-century codex to the very beginning of the present BL Cotton Tiberius A. iii. The relocation is a result of tampering carried out in modern times while the volume was in the possession of Sir Robert Cotton. The juxtaposition of the famous illustration and the opening page of *Regularis concordia*, however, had indeed been effected during the Anglo-Saxon period (correcting a detail in one of

my previous remarks), but Kornexl, as cited, has suggested that the illustration may not represent an original accessory of the T-text—a text whose numerous textual problems are hard to reconcile with the high quality of the illustration in Cotton Tiberius A. iii. Moreover, if the drawing accompanying the Christ Church copy of the T-text in the Cottonian volume was executed by an artist from St. Augustine's Abbey (as Mildred O. Budny has argued), then (in Kornexl's phrase) the "different *Mal-* and *Schriftheimat*" evinced by that manuscript (Christ Church and St. Augustine's) parallels uncertainties about the Canterbury associations of the Durham hymnal itself, as mentioned at the start of this notice. The fact that the hymnal includes a copy of the very illustration in question only serves to exacerbate the problem.

The phonology of the Old English gloss in the Durham hymnal is fundamentally Late West Saxon, with some marked Kentish features. Milfull's state-of-the-art analysis of dialectal vocabulary finds clear affinities with the preferred synonymy of the Winchester school, but, following Hofstetter, Milfull uncovers further connections with a select group of Canterbury productions glossing certain Latin prayers, Aldhelmian texts, and the text of Benedict's *Regula*. Even though only one entry in the Durham hymnal has been supplied with musical notation, Milfull manages to establish the tunes of almost a third of its hymns. This feat is accomplished by reference to the groundbreaking work of Bruno Stäblein and is facilitated by the wide distribution of stable melodies (see also below). The latter phenomenon accounts for the expedient nature of sporadic notation that has been supplied as a memory prop, "helping the reader . . . apply a tune he already knows by heart" to a given text, even while the main "musical tradition . . . [continued to be] transmitted orally, in spite of the existence of certain kinds of notation."

Miscellaneous liturgical topics discussed by Milfull include the distribution of hymns in hagiographical *libelli* and the intermittent hymnody of some poorly understood "Little Offices" (involving special Hours of All Saints, the Dead, the Virgin, the Trinity, and the Holy Cross). The offices in question are sometimes performed in a manner that is wholly supplementary to the main round of canonical hours (and variously recited either in private or in choir), and at other times simply involves an augmentation of the main round by the recitation of a special hymn at each Hour. A rare set of hymns for the Little Offices, specifically the Hours of the Virgin, which was evidently "strongly influenced by the Office of the secular clergy," occurs in the codicologically distinct first quire of BL Royal 2. B. V, i.e., fols. 1–6 (s. xi 1; not separately recorded in Gneuss's "Preliminary List"). Other unique texts discussed by Milfull include some initial stanzas intended to establish the melodies of four hymns in one of the two famous "Winchester tropers" (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 114); some eleventh-century marginalia attesting to the earliest known English usage of a hymn for Mary Magdalene, now in a homiliary at Oxford; and a hymn from the New

Hymnal, apparently copied out by a Welsh annotator, in a manuscript now at Cambridge. Milfull's discussion of music and musical notation stresses the ease with which early medieval liturgical hymns, because of their regular metrical (or, at times, rhythmic) forms, may interchange particular melodies.

Scott J. Gwara has issued new editions of four out of the six classroom dialogues, or colloquia, that were printed earlier this century in W.H. Stevenson's *Early Scholastic Colloquia* (published posthumously in 1929 in a volume seen through the press by W.M. Lindsay [for whom see above, under "Early Anglo-Latin"]): *Latin Colloquia from pre-Conquest Britain edited from Oxford, St John's College, MS. 154 and from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 865*, ed. Gwara, Toronto Med. Latin Texts 22 (Toronto: Pontifical Inst. of Med. Stud., 1996). The two dialogue-texts edited by Stevenson but omitted by Gwara are the following: (1) the Anglo-Latin *Colloquia* of Ælfric of Eynsham, as revised by his pupil Ælfric Bata, and their controversial Old English gloss (see notice of Porter, immediately below); and (2) a Celtic Latin (most plausibly Cambro-Latin) colloquy, known as *De raris fabulis* (Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 31 [no. 85]), which circulated in Anglo-Saxon England and directly influenced at least one of the texts edited by Gwara. (Two additional, related items that bear on this tradition are the anonymous metrical *Altercatio magistri et discipuli* and *Responsio discipuli*, whose Anglo-Latin texts recently have been edited by Lapidge and studied by Gwara; see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 115; see further the study of Howlett and Harvey, as summarized at *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 97.) The first item edited here by Gwara comprises a series of dialogues and "sketches meant to be elaborated upon through drills," many on subjects related to the themes of travel and pilgrimage, which "possibly constitute Bata's youthful revision" of the Celtic Latin dialogue just mentioned, as indicated by the text's conventional title *Colloquia e Libro de raris fabulis retractata*—Gwara's attribution of the hitherto anonymous text to the aforementioned Ælfric Bata now having earned the acceptance of Richard Sharpe (*Handlist*, p. 26 [no. 54]). The second item, signed internally by Bata and simply entitled *Colloquia*, dramatizes many aspects of the daily routine specified by Benedict's *Regula*, including also many homely details of Anglo-Saxon monastic life, some rather disturbing (such as violent whippings) and others (relating to the latrine) perhaps best left out of the present account altogether. Most valuable, for many readers, will be some fascinating descriptions of pre-Conquest classroom practices and private study, also discussed recently by David W. Porter (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 114–15). Gwara also draws on an important, sometimes overlooked essay by Pierre Riché discussing evidence for monastic life in the colloquia—see *OEN* 16.2 [1983], 100. Taking issue with an opinion expressed recently by Patrizia Lendinara, Porter (*apud* Gwara) now has concluded that the *Colloquia* of Gwara's second text make no independent use of the cited Celtic Latin *De raris fabulis*, but rather mine the derivative diction of the *Colloquia*

e Libro de raris fabulis retractata here ascribed to Bata. Gwara's third text, second of the two works signed explicitly by Bata, comprises some tortuously worded *Colloquia difficiliora*—characterized here as "pompous dialogues in elevated Latin style"—most notable for their inclusion of grecisms, distinctive word-formations (e.g., adjectives in *-osus*), rhyming phrases, alliteration, and paronomasia. These dialogues prove beyond question that "hermeneutic" Latin was viewed as an acceptable spoken idiom for "monks, visitors, and dignitaries (who might be expected to use high-flown oratory), and on elevated occasions." A similarly recherché colloquy, evidently produced outside of Bata's milieu by the opening years of eleventh century—that is, apparently early enough to have exerted an influence on Bata—is printed by Gwara as his fourth and final item. Gwara sees fit to retain Stevenson's title *Colloquium hispericum*, citing specific narrative parallels with the seventh-century, Hiberno-Latin *Hisperica famina*, elsewhere adducing some reminiscences of Vergil's *Eclogae*.

Gwara stresses the fact that the imitation of natural speech in these dialogues differs fundamentally from the learned diction of earlier Anglo-Latin literary dialogues. The authors of literary reflexes of classroom dialogues, Gwara states, "all looked to the *Ars minor* of Donatus . . . as an authoritative specimen of this genre." Specific examples of such productions cited by Gwara include the following: Aldhelm's *De metris* (which was "planned . . . as a didactic colloquy"); some *Cunabula grammaticae artis Donati*, printed among Bede's *dubia* at PL 90, cols. 613–32, whose compilation by Bede seems to be accepted by Gwara—the item is not found in Sharpe's *Handlist*, and Vivien Law maintains that the *Cunabula* reflect "little or no influence of the Insular grammatical tradition" (*Insular Latin Grammarians* [1982], p. 103, with n. 22); and a range of works by Alcuin, including the *Disputatio de vera philosophia* (PL 101, cols. 849–54) and *Dialogus Franconis et Saxonis de octo partibus orationis* (*ibid.*, cols. 854–902), together sometimes taken to constitute a unified Alcuinian *Ars grammatica* (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 103–4); the *Disputatio de rhetorica et de virtutibus* (*ibid.*, cols. 919–46); and, at least in terms of sources and influence, Alcuin's treatises *De dialectica* (*ibid.*, cols. 951–76) and *De orthographia* (earliest recension: see ed. by Aldo Marsili in *Alcuini "Orthographia"* [1952], pp. 107–20; later recension: cf. PL 101, cols. 902–20; see Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 36–46 [no. 87], at p. 43).

With their emphasis on conversational strategies intended to promote the use of spoken Latin in daily life, the pre-Conquest colloquia edited by Gwara served a purpose in some respects more basic than the relatively advanced, often philosophically informed approaches adopted in the literary dialogues. Gwara finds the *locus classicus* for the mimicry of conversation and depiction of the daily routine in the later Anglo-Latin dialogues, as well as their cultivation of *recherché*—often Greek—vocabulary, among the early medieval *Hermenaeumata pseudo-Dositheana* (attested in some three dozen manuscripts), "a collection of pedagogical materials presumably compiled during the Carolingian period" in their most fully

codified form, but going back to an even earlier body of dialogue-texts prepared "for provincial Roman students seeking to acquire Greek." Some representatives of these *Hermen-eumata* were apparently imported to England in the seventh century by Theodore and Hadrian. The earliest extant witnesses to the Anglo-Saxon cultivation of the classroom dialogue may well be the unprinted question-and-answer exchanges transmitted in Milan M. 79 sup. (see *OEN* 29.2 [1996], p. 73), at 45r-46v and 148v-153r, corroborated by some pseudo-Dosithean glossary entries now preserved in Leiden (see *A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, ed. J.H. Hessels [1906], pp. 47-9 [no. 47]—which fails to identify the source).

There can be no doubt, moreover, that the eleventh-century Anglo-Latin colloquies were implicated in a living pedagogical tradition. They attracted hundreds of occasional glosses, both interlinear and marginal, in Latin and in Old English (*DOE* OccGl 28 = Cameron, "List," p. 230 [item C.28], newly edited by Gwara in an appendix). Although the bulk of these glosses are "lexical"—mainly synonymic—in nature, certain glosses offer "grammatical clues for construing the Latin text." Fascinating examples of the latter include several vowel-omission ciphers (comparable to some word-distortions observed among the macaronic riddles of the Exeter Book) and an intriguing group of "merographs," that is, "abbreviated or truncated forms of words meant to suggest an entire word," such as the merograph *ning*, glossing *gymnasium*, and evidently meant to suggest *learninghus*. Specific literary sources discussed by Gwara in connection with the four pre-Conquest colloquies edited here include the Bible (contributing to some sermon-like *exempla*), Benedict's *Regula*, Isidore's *Synonyma de lamentatione animae peccatricis*, and Ælfric's *Glossary*.

Beyond its status as a valuable edition in its own right, Gwara's monograph should serve well as an inexpensive school-text, which finally will make these fascinating reflexes of Anglo-Saxon pedagogy more widely available to modern students of medieval Latin. The edition should immediately supersede the US\$37.50 AMS Press reissue of Stevenson's text (1988). For some readers, the Toronto text will do duty for the edition now available in the 1997 Gwara-Porter monograph *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: the Colloquies of Ælfric Bata* (notice forthcoming), a Brewer hardback which includes a full introduction and a translation, but no textual commentary. As all of Gwara's pre-Conquest dialogues survive in unique copies, the series which has issued this work, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts, is well suited to their publication. The editorial mandate of that series encourages authors to produce lightly edited, single-manuscript texts that have been emended only to eliminate wholly nonsensical passages.

In an important study of Ælfric of Eynsham's Anglo-Latin *Colloquia* and their controversial Old English continuous gloss—a gloss often held to be Ælfric's work as well (*DOE* ÆColl = Cameron, "List," p. 224 [item C.3])—David Porter seeks to establish a comprehensive, diachronic account of the

development of the work's three notably divergent manuscript witnesses ("Ælfric's *Colloquy* and Ælfric Bata," *Neophilologus* 80 [1996], 639-60). (Porter readily acknowledges that a previous investigation by Patrizia Lendinara, which was concerned mainly with the two witnesses that might appear—at first consideration—to embody the earliest and latest versions of the Latin-Old English text, remains a "meticulous study.") Porter argues that all three copies of the *Colloquia* reflect different stages of revision undertaken by Ælfric's pupil (and namesake) Ælfric Bata (see above). Even the least elaborate version appears to contain Latin additions by Bata (some accompanied by corresponding Old English renderings), and Porter agrees with a conclusion, reached by both Lendinara and Lapidge, that the Latin epilogue of the *Colloquia* is also probably Bata's work. Porter's most provocative stance is seen in his conclusion that Bata may be the original author of the whole of the main vernacular gloss, whose traditional attribution to Ælfric has been defended recently by Lendinara. If Ælfric is the author, he will have glossed a Latin text that somehow had already been expanded by Bata, while making mistakes in rendering his own Latin phraseology that cannot easily be ascribed to a copyist. The earlier of two more elaborate revisions subsequently undertaken by Bata show "in embryonic form the vocabulary-teaching technique that Bata later developed extensively in his own *Colloqui[a]*," that is, the presentation of "lexical alternatives . . . in menu format, several times as paired equivalents (synonyms)." The later revision shows "the same process of elaboration[,] . . . with manipulation of grammatical structures and . . . entirely novel blocks of text" (including matter drawn from his mentor Ælfric's *Glossary*). (On Bata's techniques, see further *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 114-15.) But the surviving copies of these two revisions do not stand in a single line of descent, Porter shows, and at least one additional revision by Bata—now lost, but possibly attested in an extant booklist entry—must be hypothesized in order to account for the state of their texts.

One of the four major early medieval studies issued during 1995-6 by Michael Gorman addresses the later Anglo-Latin tradition. (See above, under "Early Anglo-Latin," for Gorman's two treatments of pseudo-Bedan topics; his 1996 *Scriptorium* study of Augustine manuscripts is beyond the purview of *YWOES*.) Here the industrious scholar reconsiders the origin and sources of an apparatus of "glosses"—perhaps better characterized as discursive extracts or lengthy comments—which serve to facilitate advanced study of Bede's *DTR* ("The Glosses on Bede's *De temporum ratione* attributed to Byrhtferth of Ramsey," *ASE* 25 [1996], 209-32). The texts in question are most readily accessible in PL 90, cols. 685-98 [comments corresponding to *DTR* i], 297-307 [*DTR* ii-iii], 700-2 [*DTR* iv], and 307-518 [*DTR* v-Lxiv], under the heading "Brid. Rames. Glossae," etc. (Similar commentary on Bede's *DNR* is printed in PL 90, cols. 188-256, under "Bridef. Ram. Glossae," etc.) No witness to the compilation has survived to the present day in a manuscript copy, and our knowledge of its content rests, as it always has, on a text issued in 1563 within

the eight-volume edition of Bede's works completed by the younger Johann Heerwagen (among Bedan scientific writings printed at II, 1–212), here drawing on materials presumably assembled by his late father (the elder Johann Heerwagen, or "Hervagius"; see above under "Early Anglo-Latin"). The comments and extracts at issue are printed in this edition as *Glossae De Temporum Ratione: auctore Bridfertho Ramesiensi*. The assembly of the collection has been attributed quite naturally to Byrhtferth of Ramsey (fl. c. 1000) ever since the appearance of this printed text. In publications issued in 1938 and the following year, however, Charles W. Jones, reinforcing a conclusion reached by Karl Classen in 1896, flatly rejected the attribution of the compilation to Byrhtferth, arguing that its entries were "in large part, if not entirely, composed at Auxerre, probably near the year 900" (Jones, *Beda's Pseudepigrapha*, p. 22). Jones cited parallels among glosses preserved in Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 412 (*olim* G. 32; erroneously, "370" [Jones]) (?Auxerre, s. ix in. or s. ix 1 [i.e., c. 800 × c. 825]; annotations by Heiric of Auxerre), and in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Philipps 1832 (Rose 130) (s. ix 2 [i.e. c. 873/4]; provenance by s. xi at Metz; later provenance Paris; glosses by Martin of Laon *et al.*), there at fols. 1–55. Supplementing Jones, Gorman cites a third manuscript deserving consideration in this connection, that is, the annotated copy of Bedan *computistica* known as the "Horblit Bede" and now conventionally identified by the mark Ludwig XII.13 (s. ix; provenance by s. xi at Sankt Maximin at Trier; annotations by Manno of Laon), formerly in libraries at Aachen (Ludwig collection) and Malibu (Getty Museum), but now, Gorman seems to indicate, accessible once again in Trier.

Jones had argued that the attribution to Byrhtferth in the 1563 Heerwagen text reflected the Basel-based printers' knowledge of a secondary treatment of Byrhtferth's works by the antiquary John Bale, who cited works *In Bedam de temporibus*, *In eundem de natura rerum* in the second, expanded edition of his *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum summarium*, published under the title *Scriptorum illustrium Maioris Brytanniae catalogus* (1557–9) by another Basel printer, Johann Oporin (or Herbst; "Oporinus"; 1507–68). (See the recent reprint of writings by Jones—as cited at *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 100–1—at I, 81–97.) Gorman maintains that Jones's hypothesis would require the Heerwagens to disregard the fact that among the materials attributed by Bale to *Bridferthus Ramesiensis* "the incipit of the commentary . . . [*In Bedam de temporibus*, *Lib. I*] is given as 'Spiraculo uitae humanum genus,' a phrase which does not occur among the "anthology or miscellany of citations" treating "Bede's computistical writings as published by [the younger] Heerwagen." Indeed, Peter S. Baker, in a cogent analysis of these problems issued in 1982 (see *OEN* 17.1 [1983], 36 and 100), maintained that the inclusion of the term *spiraculo* points clearly to a copy of Byrhtferth's prefatory *Epilogus* (now edited by Baker and Lapidge at EETS ss, vol. 15, pp. 375–9; incipit "Spiraculo ineffabili dum forent . . ."). Jones, moreover, following Van de Vyver, suggested years ago

(as cited, pp. 94–5, n. 71) that the phrase *uitae humanum genus* is not part of an *incipit* as such but rather emerged as a failed attempt to gloss the term *spiraculo*, introduced most plausibly by Bale himself (and transmitted by Tanner)—perhaps as an augmentation of the laconic entry for Byrhtferth in an earlier notebook (Bale's so-called *Index Britanniae scriptorum*: see the comment of Meyvaert, cited below).

Against Jones's early dating and continental European localization of the compilation, Gorman notes that the ninth-century glosses cited by Jones as its main sources are typically shorter than the entries in the Heerwagens' edition, and that they exhibit a markedly different manner of handling passages drawn from Bede's treatises. Crucially, the citation of Remigius of Auxerre and his younger colleague Haimo of Auxerre as established authorities "could have happened only well after the end of the ninth century," and the erroneous citation of a passage by Haimo as the work of Remigius reflects a textual tradition whose hyparchetype (as B.V.N. Edwards has argued) has survived to the present day in an extant manuscript, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 6227 (Freising, s. x 2). An Anglo-Latin origin for the text ascribed to Byrhtferth conceivably might be indicated by a reference to Britain in a related set of comments and extracts bearing on Bede's *DNR*, also ascribed to Byrhtferth in the Heerwagens' edition (see PL 90, cols. 204–6 [*sub* "Bridferth. Glossae"], at col. 205). Stylistic criteria, Gorman cautions, must be viewed as largely irrelevant to the attribution of an eclectic set of glosses and extracts to a particular compiler. It appears nevertheless that Byrhtferth's reading, so far as it is known, might well be reflected in these commentaries. Gorman supports this conclusion by setting out a comprehensive list of authorities cited by name in the Bedan scholia. Gorman notes the possible silent use of several other sources: Hrabanus Maurus, *De computo*; the anonymous treatise *De computo* printed in PL 129, cols. 1273–372; the pseudo-Bedan *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* (see the second notice of Gorman's work, above); and, validating one aspect of Jones's critique, Martin's cited contributions to Berlin, Philipps 1832, as edited in Jones's apparatus in CCSL 123B. Especially noteworthy in this regard are the commentator's striking use of Macrobius, an author seemingly known only to Byrhtferth (in Lapidge's experience) among pre-Conquest authors, along with citations of the pseudo-Isidorian, reputedly Irish *De ordine creaturarum* (see notice of Di Pilla under "Bede"). If Byrhtferth assembled these materials, we might well expect to find points of correspondence with glosses on Bede's *DTR* (and *DNR*) in Oxford, St. John's College, 17 (Thorney, s. xii in. [i.e., c. 1110–11]), copied "from a collection of works prepared by Byrhtferth himself." Indeed, Baker and Lapidge have called attention to a comment on the jubilee year whose wording recurs in the Heerwagens' text, in the St. John's College 17 reflex of Byrhtferth's *computus*, among passages by Byrhtferth incorporated into Simeon of Durham's *Historia regum*, and in the Byrhtferthian *Vita S. Oswaldi*. S.J. Crawford's 1929 commentary on wording shared by Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*

and the Heerwagens' text—even if this involves “short passages based on familiar material”—has mainly been superseded by the work of Baker and Lapidge, but it is worth pointing out that at least one of the parallels noted by Crawford remains cogent even in the light of these scholars' latest source-studies (EETS ss 15, pp. 1–2 and p. 251, n. to lines 5–6; Crawford, EETS os 177, 8–9, n., adduces two further parallels; cf. Baker and Lapidge, p. 8, with 254–5, n. to lines 83–5). Gorman himself sets out two new parallels involving passages in the Heerwagens' text and Byrhtferth's discussion of *atomī* and other concerns (see notes to lines 202–10 and 211–13 in the Latin text edited in his article's appendix). Moreover, Michael Lapidge, in a communication paraphrased by Gorman, suspects that John Bale, who was resident in Basel over the years 1553–8—that is, around the time of the senior Heerwagen's efforts to assemble materials for the Bede edition (Heerwagen dying in 1557)—personally may have “brought to Basel the [unique] manuscript of Byrhtferth's commentaries[,] . . . acquired . . . from Ramsey after the Dissolution . . . , and it was discarded after . . . [the] edition was printed” by the younger Heerwagen in 1563.

Richard Sharpe, in his recent *Handlist* (p. 81 [no. 174]), states that the present study by Gorman has “vindicated” Byrhtferth's compilation of these computistical comments and extracts. Strictly speaking, Gorman claims here only to reassert (against Jones) the possibility of Byrhtferth's role as compiler, stressing the need to trace the fortunes of the ninth-century materials discussed by Jones, among others, in greater detail. He acknowledges that a very precise definition of the sources used for the compilation remains a *desideratum*. If and when such a summary does appear, it will then need to be subjected to a close comparison with the sources used by Byrhtferth in his verified works—which are themselves imperfectly known. Paul Meyvaert, moreover, has noted (*apud* Gorman) Bale's record of a Byrhtferthian work (*Super opus Bede* [sic] *de temporibus*, li[b]. I. [incipit] “*Spiraculo*”) in a notebook, published under the modern title *Index Britanniae scriptorum* by Reginald Lane Poole and Mary Bateson (1902)—currently available in both a 1989 AMS Press reprint and a 1990 Boydell and Brewer reprint. (Some additional wording from Bale's notebook is reproduced below.) Bale here cites as his source the *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis* of Henry of Kirkstead—a mid-fourteenth-century catalogue of manuscripts and (mainly) Latin texts which survived, Gorman reminds us, only through Bale's mediation. The entry in the text of Kirkstead's *Catalogus*, as established in the early eighteenth century by Thomas Tanner (1674–1735) and published posthumously (*Bibliotheca Brittanico-Hibernica*, ed. David Wilkins [1748], pp. xvii–xliii, at p. xxx), reads: “*BIRDFERTHUS* monachus Ramesiae floruit A.C. . . . et scripsit *Super librum Bedae de temporibus*, lib. i. Pr. *Spiraculo*. 82,” the final numeral indicating the existence in Kirkstead's day of a copy at Bury St. Edmunds. It appears, I would note, that Kirkstead's treatment of Byrhtferth derives from original research and not as a borrowing from the earlier *Registrum*

Anglie tradition, as Gorman suggests. (For these medieval English catalogues, see further *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 90, and 30.2 [1997], 95.) Moreover, Baker points out that Bale's information reflects his knowledge of materials assembled in manuscript by “his friend and contemporary John Leland,” prepared for a work Leland entitled *De illustribus viris* (eventually published as *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. Anthony Hall [1709]; see now Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 275–6 [no. 778], at p. 276, for the title and surviving manuscripts). Leland's passage reads as follows:

De Brightheferto. BRIGHTEFERTUS, monachus Rameseganus, vel, ut quidam volunt, Thorneanus, secutus religiose suæ ætatis studia, ad mathesin, acerrimorum ingeniorum excitatricem, animam applicavit . . . Illustravit præterea scholiis, non de trivio petitis, Bede Girovicensis libellum de *Natura rerum* : in quo, dum tempora supputat, facile ostendit, quantum in expedita numerorum ratione valeret. Multa ibi de *Circolo Paschali*, de *Abaco*, de *Ause* & ejus partibus (ed. Hall, I, 171 [ch. 136]).

This information may be traced back even farther to preliminary materials assembled by Leland (later published as his *Collectanea*), among which we find several items *edita à Bryhtferdo, monacho Ramesiensis cænobii*, including *Eiusdem* [sc. Byrhtferth's] *proæmium & commentariolus in librum Bedæ de temporibus*, most plausibly the very copy of Byrhtferth's *Epilogus* now preserved at Oxford's St. John's College (see above), and accompanying materials. Leland further records a calendar which he is less certain was composed *à Bryhtferdo*, but which he associates with yet another Bedan scientific commentary, this one *in librum Bedæ de natura rerum* . . . *sed sine auctoris nomine*, again to be linked most plausibly to the St. John's College monument (*De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, ed. T. Hearne, 2nd ed. [1774], IV, 97).

The main body of Gorman's article may offer the tidiest solution to the riddle of the *Glossæ* . . . *authore Brightheferto* yet proposed: the Heerwagens owned an authentic Byrhtferthian manuscript, clearly titled with “a heading such as ‘*Glossæ Brightheferti Ramesiensis super librum Bedae de temporibus*.’” They had no need to consult the work of Bale or any other antiquary in preparing this part of their edition. Gorman's “Postscript,” however—citing Meyvaert, Lapidge, and referring to several of the antiquarian issues noted above—raises nearly as many questions as the main study served to answer. A basic question is whether the captions in the Heerwagen edition should be traced back to Kirkstead's report of a Byrhtferthian work *Super librum Bedae de temporibus*, to Leland's report of the *proæmium & commentariolus in librum Bedæ de temporibus*, or to some other source. (It appears, however, that the Basel edition stands alone in citing *DTR* under what now has been accepted as its modern title.) The antiquarian tradition regarding Byrhtferth's commentaries on *DNR* which the Heerwagens' edition might be seen to codify almost certainly began with Leland. The evidence might be augmented by reference to Leland's unpublished manuscripts. The specific wording of the Heerwagens' captions (. . . *Glossæ De Temporum Ratione : authore Brightheferto Ramesiensi*, etc.), however, seems slightly less close to the entries in Leland's works than those in the Kirkstead–Bale tradition

(*Birhtferthus . . . Ramesiae . . . scripsit Super librum Bedae de temporibus*; *Bridferthus . . . Ramesiae . . . Super opus Bede de temporibus . . .*; *Brithferthus Ramesiensis . . .*; and *Bridferthus Ramesiensis . . . In Bedam de temporibus . . . In eundem de natura rerum*).

There is no evidence to show that Bale knew Byrhtferth's *Epilogus* at first hand, or other Byrhtferthian materials in the tradition witnessed by St. John's College 17. It remains possible that all of his information about Byrhtferth was derived at second hand. Specific textual evidence has been set out above to suggest that Bale had trouble interpreting Kirkstead's *Spiraculo* tag as a sensible *incipit* and revised his entry on Byrhtferth for the Basel edition of his own *Summarium*. It is not immediately clear why Bale would have failed to revise his report of the Byrhtferthian *incipit*, among other details of his entry, if he possessed Byrhtferth's original manuscript of the commentaries in question, or any reliably titled copy. (The possibility remains that he only managed to identify the texts at the eleventh hour.) It is certain, however, that the antiquary was present in Basel at a time when he might have been invited to offer an informed opinion about the origin of some anonymous commentaries on Bede's scientific writings that the senior Heerwagen had considered for inclusion in his edition. Even if such a scenario did play out in sixteenth-century Basel, however, it is still not clear that an attribution of the glosses and abstracts in question to Abbo's active pupil Byrhtferth would have been incorrect.

A detailed study by Susan Rankin confronts the void in our knowledge of liturgical music in use at Worcester during the tenth century, notably during the reforms carried out by Oswald, and in the early decades of the eleventh century ("Some Reflections on Liturgical Music at Late Anglo-Saxon Worcester," in *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt, Stud. in the Early Hist. of Britain: The Makers of England 2 [London: Leicester Univ. Press, 1996], pp. 325–48). The investigation is complicated at the outset by the total absence of contemporary witnesses to the music in use at Worcester before c. 1000, with the sole possible (if doubtful) exception of notation accompanying the copy of Benedict's *Regula* in the present OB Hatton 48 (SC 4118), fols. 1–76 (s. viii; provenance at Worcester by s. xi ex.; musical additions of s. x–xii; *CLA* II², 34 [no. 240], with II², 51, and suppl., 48). Rankin adopts a double approach to the problem, analyzing (1) the six major manuscripts executed down to the early thirteenth century preserving chants for mass and office in honor of Oswald, regardless of provenance; and (2) another group of six sources, these including musical texts whose recitation at Worcester may be dated to the decades c. 1060 × c. 1100, regardless of subject matter. Three items receive especially detailed commentary by Rankin: (1) Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 160 (Worcester, s. xiii 1 [i.e., ? s. xiii in.: Ker]; "Worcester servicebook"), which preserves a range of texts for both mass and office commemorating Oswald: mass propers for the feast translation, including a distinctive alleluia whose syllabifica-

tion has been adjusted to accommodate the saint's name; sequences praising Oswald along with the Virgin Mary, conceivably going back as far as the 983 Worcester church-dedication to the Virgin; and responsories showing "concordances with the group on which a cycle of polyphonic organa was composed in Swithun's honour at Winchester . . . probably by Wulfstan" (c. 1000); and the only large-scale composition specifically in the saint's honor, a "deposition office . . . [which] deserves a full study and edition"; (2) an addition (s. xi ex.; not noted separately in Gneuss's "Preliminary List") inscribed on a flyleaf of the present BL Royal 6. A. vii (Worcester, s. xi in.; additions of s. xi ex.), including a single, partly notated responsory text evidently drawn from the deposition office for Oswald, appearing in full only in the later Worcester manuscript just described; and (3) a possible model for the office for Oswald in the form of an office for St. Nicholas in the passion now accessible in the so-called Worcester legendary (the major English witness to Zettel's "Cotton-Corpus legendary"; see notice of Love, below)—that is, in BL Cotton Nero E. i, vol. 1, 153v–155v—from which Rankin deduces that such models to aid the composition of new offices for local saints may well have been put to good use at Worcester by the close of the Anglo-Saxon period.

On the basis of surviving monuments, Rankin identifies a clearly defined, collectively distinctive set of features for the notation in use at Worcester in the later eleventh century, including "pattern[s] of three falling notes (*climacus*)"; neumatic "ligatures" in which strokes are joined up cursorily without the lifting of the pen; and the use of various "looped signs." Liturgical conservatism at Worcester led to the continuation of these practices even when new conventions had emerged (such as those attested by the notation in Durham University, Cosin V. v. 6—see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 89). Rankin suggests on this basis that some of the eleventh-century Worcester chant practices identified here might well go back to the preceding century.

Several other observations in this valuable article may be noted briefly. Rankin finds that the earliest surviving office in verse honoring a local English saint may occur among forms of service for Cuthbert, composed by the early tenth century, in a book produced under the patronage of King Athelstan: CCC 183, fols. 1–95 (West Saxon royal center[s], s. x 1 [i.e., c. 934 × 939] or ? s. x in. [Watson]; glosses of s. x med. [i.e., c. 934 × 942: Ker]; provenances at Chester-le-Street by s. x med. [i.e., ?934], in Northumbria by s. x ex., and at Durham by s. xi ex.), with the cited liturgical matter for Cuthbert on 92v–95v. Rankin gamely confronts the disposition of several layers of notation, dating from the eleventh century (s. xi 1 [or s. xi med.] to s. xi ex.), preserved in the composite manuscript CCC 146 ("Samson pontifical"), comprising CCC 146, pp. [i]–[ii] and 1–60 (Worcester, s. xi/xii) + *ibid.*, pp. 61–318 (Christ Church, Canterbury [following exemplars from Canterbury and Winchester: Dumville and Rankin] or ?Old Minster, Winchester [Ker and Gneuss],

s. xi in.; provenance at Worcester by s. xi ex.) + *ibid.*, pp. 319–30 and [iii]–[iv] (as through p. 60). The effort proves rewarding, as Rankin infers from the distribution of the musical additions that the earliest layer includes psalm notations “made for, or by, a bishop, using the book [i.e., the pontifical and benedictional in CCCC 146, pp. 63–318] to sing from,” features which she “[has] never seen before in an early medieval manuscript”—and which contrast with “quite distinct” signs added after the book’s arrival at Worcester.

Rankin also cites a range of neglected references: A. Hughes, “British Rhymed Offices: a Catalogue and Commentary,” in *Music in the Medieval English Liturgy*, ed. Rankin and D. Hiley (1993), pp. 239–84, including comments on sources certainly produced before 1100 relating to Alban, Birinus, Cuthbert, Edmund, and Mildrith, and also possibly Botolph, Oswin, and Swithun; Elizabeth C. Teviordale’s 1992 University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill dissertation (see *OEN* 26.4 [1993], 20); Teviordale’s article “Some Thoughts on the Place of Origin of the Cotton Troper,” in *Cantus Planus: Papers Read at the Fourth Meeting, Pécs, Hungary, 3–8 September 1990*, ed. László Doboszay for the International Musicological Soc. Study Group “Cantus Planus” (Budapest: Hungarian Acad. of Sci. Inst. for Musicology, 1992), pp. 407–12; Marie-Hélène Jullien, “Les hymnes dans le milieu alcuinien,” in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes: mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine . . . à l’occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*, ed. Louis Holtz and J.-C. Fredouille, coord. Jullien, 2 vols. in 3, Collection des études augustinienes: série Antiquité 132 [= vol. 1], série Moyen-Âge et Temps Moderne 26 [= vol. 2] (Paris: Institut d’études augustinienes, 1992), II, 171–82; S. Rankin, “Neumatic Notations in Anglo-Saxon England,” in *Musicologie médiévale: notations et séquences—actes de la table ronde du C.N.R.S. à l’Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes, 6–7 septembre 1982*, ed. Michel Huglo (Paris: Champion, 1987), 129–44 (which includes an appendix treating manuscripts, with extensive bibliography, at pp. 141–4); and A. Holschneider, “Die instrumentalen Tonbuchstaben im Winchester Troper,” in *Festschrift Georg von Dadelsen zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Kohlhase und V. Scherliess (Neuhausen: Hänssler, 1978), pp. 155–66, illus.

Nicholas Orchard attempts to resolve a long-simmering dispute regarding the provenance of the so-called Bosworth Psalter (see notice of Milfull, above), whose origin at Canterbury in the cathedral priory of Christ Church has been championed by Bishop, Gasquet, and, more recently, Korhammer and Dumville (“The ‘Bosworth Psalter’ and the ‘St Augustine’s Missal,’” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints, and Scholars 1066–1109*, ed. Richard Eales and R. Sharpe [London: Hambledon Press, 1995], pp. 87–94). Orchard, who would vindicate the earlier opinions of Francis Wormald and Neil Ker, now concludes that “[t]he psalter must be attributed to [the] pre-Conquest [Canterbury abbey] of St Augustine’s.” The volume’s codicologically discrete calendar, which Orchard dates to “c. 1000”—BL Additional 37517, flyleaves (i.e., fols. 2–3) (s. x/xi [i.e., ? 988 ×

1012: Wormald]; see above, in notice of Milfull, for the full range of mooted origins)—preserves entries for nine saints buried at St. Augustine’s and celebrated in other documents from the abbey. The *absence* of an entry for Liudhard, culted at St. Augustine’s by c. 1100, and the *presence* of an entry for Salvius of Valenciennes, culted at Christ Church, are not problematic, Orchard maintains, in a calendar compiled as early as c. 1000 under the influence of customs emanating from northeastern France and Flanders (including feasts for Salvius, Omer, and others). Corroborating evidence includes the prominent (and idiosyncratic) commemoration of Augustine of Canterbury himself and of SS. Peter and Paul (dedicatees of St. Augustine’s Abbey); the cancellation of an entry for Euphemia (not culted at the abbey before c. 1100) in a mass-text that was added to the psalter c. 1000–30 (at fols. 135r–137v); and, finally, the psalter’s prominently “monastic” arrangements of psalms, hymns, and canticles. Throughout this article, Orchard adduces points of comparison with texts preserved in a late eleventh-century sacramentary, imprecisely termed the “St. Augustine’s ‘Missal,’” now in CCCC 270, fols. 2–196 (St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, s. xi 2 [Gneuss] or s. xi ex. [i.e., 1091 × c. 1100: Orchard—and Heslop, as cited below under “The Later Eleventh Century”]; additions and deletions of s. xii med. and s. xiii). Despite its relatively late date, this manuscript attests to a number of “old” practices and preserves “the earliest surviving copy of Lanfranc’s version of the Bec sacramentary”—the only other known witness occurring in the late medieval BL Harley 5289 (Durham, s. xiv 2).

David W. Porter issued a pair of articles treating a neglected, four-hexameter Anglo-Latin riddle (*incipit* “Bis bine fiale caritatis nos vocitatur”; not found in *JCL*; edited by M. Förster in *Anglia* 41 [1917], 94–161 [“Die altenglische Glossenhandschrift . . .”], at 155). (The cited articles are Porter’s “Æthelwold’s bowl” and the “Chronicle of Abingdon,” *NM* 97 [1996], 163–7, and “A Double Solution to the Latin Riddle in MS. Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, M16.2,” *ANQ* 9.2 [1996], 3–9.) The verse is preserved as an inscribed entry (s. xi in. [i.e., 1005 × 1016: Porter] or s. x 1 [Ker]) in the fragmented manuscript represented by Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, M 16.2 [Porter; *olim* 47: Ker, Gneuss *et al.*] + BL Additional 32246 (?Abingdon, s. xi in. [i.e., c. 1000 × 1016: Ker]; glosses of s. x in. and s. x 1), on a flyleaf in the part now at Antwerp. Porter’s analysis adduces several double entendres centering on weighing processes and inebriation, which play off a trio of crucial terms: *maiores* (“large weights” or “heavy drinkers”); *caritas* (“value” or “ration of drink”); and *scalae* (“scales” or “drinking-cup”), the last distinction harking back to Isidore, *Etymologiae* XX.v.5 and recalling an entry in one of a group of Latin–Old English glossaries copied out elsewhere in the dismembered manuscript preserving Porter’s riddle (*DOE* AntGl 1–7 = Cameron, “List,” p. 248 [item D.1], here at AntGl 2, *DOE* 675 [= Kindschi 85.17]: *fiala uel scale: bledu*)—a glossary whose debt to the Latin–Old English *Glossary* of Ælfric of Eynsham is revealed here by Porter for the first time, as is the possible compilation of the cited

glossary from the Antwerp–London manuscript by Ælfric's pupil (and namesake) Ælfric Bata, who "was fond of drinking cups and . . . was a reader of the [*Etymologiae*]." For the crucial term *caritas*, see further *Regularis concordia* xxvi (*caritatis gratia*, in the larger ch. I; cf. sect. xxx, in ch. II) and, for possible earlier examples of Anglo-Latin "*caritas*-verse" composed by Frithegod, see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 64–5.

The Anglo-Latin riddle may verify an allusion to the custom of the *bolla Æthelwoldi* ("bowl of Æthelwold") in a thirteenth-century addition to the twelfth-century *Chronicon monasterii de Abingdon*, a custom said to stipulate that each of Æthelwold's Abingdon subordinates should receive the liquid contents of a bowl holding a full gallon and a half of drink twice a day. The evidence of the verse weighs against Knowles's theory that the allusion was forged by a central medieval critic of Æthelwold's regimen, while it strengthens Ker's views, already widely accepted, on the production of the Antwerp–London manuscript at Abingdon. *Inter alia*, Porter's article includes comments on Bata's references to male same-sex relationships in a monastic setting, on various Aldhelmian and Old English riddles, and on the late twelfth- or thirteenth-century *De abbatibus Abbendoniae*.

Lucia Kornexl notes that Benedictine strictures intended to maintain security in a monastery (Benedict, *Regula* XLVIII.17–18) led to the creation of a specific office for the obedientiary who would "walk the rounds" of the establishment—variously called the *circator*, *circutor*, *circumitor*, *circumspector*, *circinnator*, or *excubitor* ("Ein benediktinischer Funktionsträger und sein Name: linguistische Überlegungen rund um den *circa*," *Mittelaltinisches Jahrbuch* 31.1 [1996], 39–60). Kornexl considers whether the term *circa*, occurring twice in the main text of *Regularis concordia* LVII (i.e., at the start of the larger ch. VII, with a third use appearing within a *capitulum* of the F-text), apparently arising out of a type of Latin–Old English *Mönchsargon*, provides an example of "clipping" (*Wortkürzung*) which might bear comparison both with Latin *a*-declension nouns (*poeta*, *scriba*, etc.) and with Old English *n*-declension agentive nouns (e.g., *dema*, "judge")—or possibly even with nominative singular adjectival forms used as epithets or nicknames ("Æðelric þes langa"). Touching on such topics as the level of Latinity in tenth-century establishments and the influence of sources related to the *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores* on *Regularis concordia*, Kornexl concludes that *circa*, unglossed in witnesses to the Anglo-Latin customary, might even be viewed as an Old English loanword (or, at the very least, as a *Zwitterform*) comparable to the term *acolutus*, admitted to the *Dictionary of Old English* and accompanied by the tag "with Lat. inflection."

In a recent collection of essays devoted to the legendary prostitute-turned-ascetic Mary of Egypt, Jane Stevenson offers a full background study and edition of the three witnesses to the Latin *vita* of the saint owned or produced in England up to 1100: Stevenson, "The Holy Sinner: the Life of Mary of Egypt," in *The Legend of Mary of Egypt in Medieval Insular Hagiography*, ed. Erich Poppe and Bianca

Ross (Blackrock, Co. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1996), pp. 19–50, with *Vita Sanctae Mariae Egiptiacae*, ed. Stevenson, *ibid.*, pp. 51–98. All three texts go back to the redaction of the of the Greek *vita* of Mary ascribed (among the acts of the Second Council of Nicea [787]) to Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, deriving more immediately from the Latin translation incorporated into the collection of *Homiliae* assembled by Paulus Diaconus (see the edition of Rosweyde, as reprinted at PL 73, cols. 671–90; see also above under "Bede"). The most distinctive features of the three Anglo-Saxon witnesses are their omission of Paulus's dedication to Charlemagne and intermittent cases of "transposed word-order, with occasional clauses added, or left out." The earliest copy overall occurs in a continental manuscript, now BL Cotton Claudius A. i, fols. 5–36 (continental scribe at English center, s. x med.; later provenance ?Glastonbury; glosses of s. x med. or s. x 2 [i.e., ante c. 1000: Lapidige]), which nevertheless contains several items of Anglo-Latin interest, including Frithegod's *Breviloquium vitae Wilfridi* and Bede's prose and poetic lives of Cuthbert. The version of Paulus's text which eventually found its way (still on the Continent) into the later tenth-century tradition of the Cotton–Corpus Legendary (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 94) may have been drawn out of "a Carolingian passionate with a number of Paul the Deacon's translations." (Stevenson here cites Patrick H. Zettel, "Ælfric's Hagiographic Sources and the Latin Legendary Preserved in BL MS Cotton Nero E. 1 + CCC MS 9 and other Manuscripts," unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Oxford [1979].) An indirect witness to the English circulation of the legend occurs in Goscelin's *Liber confortatorius* (c. 1080–1). As Stevenson concludes, "it appears that pre-Conquest England accepted the story of [the Palestinian monk] Zosimus and Mary in its full, carefully nuanced complexity."

A 1996 publication by David R. Howlett addresses the acrostic signature that runs across the epanaleptic couplets of the twenty-line prologue of Wulfstan of Winchester's *Breviloquium de omnibus sanctis* (see *OEN* 23.1 [1989], 74), first printed by François Dolbeau in 1988 ("Numerical Play in Wulfstan's Verse and Prose," *Mittelaltinisches Jahrbuch* 31.1 [1996], 61–7). Howlett reveals that, beyond the signature, the prologue unquestionably evinces a prominently chiasmic arrangement of words in its individual couplets, with an additional, more subtle chiasmus apparently spanning its whole length. Addressing prior discussion of the significance of the numeral forty-six—corresponding to the number of chapters in Wulfstan's *Vita S. Æthelwoldi*—Howlett notes that the same number of chapters occurs both in Bede's prose *Vita S. Cuthberti* (see *OEN* 24.1 [1990], 41) and in his *Commentarius in Marcum*.

f. The Later Eleventh Century

ROSALIND LOVE published an exemplary collection of post-Conquest saints' lives in 1996, which includes the first major edition of the earliest *vita* of a widely venerated saint, the child-martyr Kenelm: *Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin*

Saints' Lives: "Vita S. Birini," "Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi," and "Vita S. Rumwoldi," ed. Rosalind C. Love, Oxford Med. Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). The practical value of Love's work is very high, both as a guide to the resources now available to scholars of medieval hagiography and as a model for future research. Beyond the forty or so surviving examples of Anglo-Saxon hagiographical *libelli*—discrete manuscripts containing mass-sets and homilies for particular saints in addition to *vitae* or *passiones*—Love considers the earliest evidence for the English use of larger collections known as passionals or *legendaries*. The *terminus ante quem* for the Anglo-Saxon circulation of such collections is fixed in the early ninth century by the earliest surviving English exemplar, BN lat. 10861 (?Canterbury, s. ix 1; see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 96), but this date may be pushed back somewhat, perhaps to a point as early as c. 800, by reference to the *Old English Martyrology* (see notice of Cross, under "Bede"). The use of substantial hagiographical collections in England might even be attributed to the period of Bede's later career (specifically, to c. 725 × c. 731) on the basis of his use of an interpolated version (the *recensio Venusiensis secunda*) of the *Passio S. Felicis episcopi Tubzacensis*, and perhaps even somewhat earlier (say, c. 720), when Bugga requested some *passiones martyrum* from Boniface, possibly to be delivered in a single collection. Going back to an even earlier period, the later seventh century, we now have to reckon with the possibility that Aldhelm consulted a substantial hagiographical collection imported by Theodore. (See the notice of Franklin at *OEN* 302.2 [1997], 68.) The use of anthologies of saints' lives in England thus would seem to antedate by many years the production of the earliest surviving continental *passional*, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 3514, pp. 1–300 (?Soissons, s. viii med.; "Codex Velsleri"; *CLA* IX, 4 [no. 1238], with IX, 61, and suppl., 63).

The late eighth-century liturgical reforms that led to the recitation of saints' legends in the night office are often viewed as catalytic in the proliferation of hagiography from the ninth century. Love's detailed treatment of the issue notes that specific requirements for the observance differed in secular and monastic settings, insofar as the reduced set of lections employed in a secular establishment would accompany nine "responsories [divided] into [three] groups of three, for use at the three nocturns of Matins. The monastic night office on a feast day would have required three sets of four responds and versicles, to match the twelve lessons." Love, however, following Philippart and Dolbeau, now raises the possibility that "the importance of the liturgy has been exaggerated" in recent discussions of hagiography, citing an annotation calling for the reading of hagiography on Euphrosyne in *Refectorio*. Love proposes chapter-meetings, breaks in manual labor, and private study as likely extralitururgical settings for the reading of saints' lives.

In discussing the hagiographical compendia of the later Anglo-Saxon period, Love notes that two of the earliest collections appearing in the wake of the Benedictine reforms occur in BL Harley 3020, fols. 36–132 (?Canterbury, s. xi in.),

now "bound with a *libellus* of Benedict Biscop," and in the fragmentary BL Cotton Otho A. xiii, pt. 1 (s. xi 1). Love is also careful to point out that Patrick Zettel's influential treatment of the "Cotton–Corpus *legendary*" somewhat misleadingly uses this designation to refer to the (abstracted) text of the large "international collection of *Lives*" underlying the contents of the actual Worcester manuscript whose members are now preserved in the Cottonian and Corpus Christi collections (that is, in BL Cotton Nero E. 1 and CCCC 9; see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 94). Even more confusingly, additional witnesses to Zettel's "Cotton–Corpus" collection appear to have been preserved "in other, later, manuscripts." Love attempts to disambiguate this terminology by referring to the eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon monument as the "Worcester *legendary*" while retaining Zettel's "Cotton–Corpus" designation in connection with the international collection. Love, however, calls into question Zettel's conclusion that the continental archetype of the Worcester *legendary* had arrived in England by c. 1000 and was known to Ælfric. Recent research by Morini and Magennis suggests that "in some cases, recensions of Latin saints' *Lives* distinct from those of the 'Cotton–Corpus *legendary*', and preserved in *legendaries* of Continental origin, are in fact closer to Ælfric's Old English translations."

Finally, Love's introductory discussion considers the reasons for the surprising burst of saintly commemoration which arose in the post-Conquest decades. Specific suggestions involve the introduction of "a different set of attitudes towards the appropriate commemoration of saints" from Normandy and attendant "cultural assimilation"; "a desire . . . to see the *Lives* of the Anglo-Saxon saints properly recorded" on the part of both immigrants and native devotees; and, of course, the substantial material advantages to be gained by Norman settlers through "manipulating the cults of England's patron saints" and, for native administrators of shrines, through the cultivation of the "patronage of the powerful."

Of the three *vitae* edited by Love, the *Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi* stands the best chance of preserving some authentic tenth-century traditions bearing on its hagiographical subject, but even so there is no strong reason to credit its central report of the boy-king Kenelm (or Coenhelm), supposedly the son of the Mercian king Coenwulf (ob. 821). Kenelm's murder is said to have been plotted by his sister, Cwoenthryth, whose name is recorded in ninth-century charters (811 × 825), where she appears as Coenwulf's daughter and as an abbess at Thanet in Kent. As the Kenelm of legend is supposed to have been seven years old when his father died (in 819, *recte* 821), his identification with the Cynhelm recorded in Winchcombe-related charters issued 803 × 811 seems unlikely in the extreme. (On the importance of Kenelm's status as patron saint of Winchcombe, see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 89–91.) It is nevertheless possible that the kernel of the narrative on Kenelm goes back to the report of one *Osualdi* . . . *discipulus nomine Vulfuuinus*, cited as a source in the preface of the *Vita et miracula*, and perhaps to be identified with the pupil of Oswald (ob. 992) who appears as a signatory

in more than a dozen charters pertaining to Worcester (c. 981 × 1017). The *memoranda* ascribed to Wulfwine in all witnesses to the preface are stated in a variant text—preserved in one thirteenth-century manuscript—to have been left (*reliquit*) to one Ælfwine (*fratri Alfuino*), an individual apparently living around the time of the composition of the *Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi*. Love considers in passing the possibility that Wulfwine or Ælfwine (or both) may have written some of the surviving hagiography on Kenelm, perhaps including an extant, fragmentary Anglo-Latin *Vita brevior S. Kenelmi* in eight lections (edited here by Love in an appendix) or, in the case of Ælfwine, perhaps even the lengthy *Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi* itself. (Love's skepticism in this regard, however, would seem to jibe with Sharpe's omission of both figures from his *Handlist*.) The problematic *Vita brevior*, preserved uniquely in CCC 367, pt. II, fols. 45–52 (?Worcester, s. xi med. and xi 2) at 45r–48r, shows sporadic but unmistakable verbal parallels with the longer *Vita et miracula*. Love explores several alternative explanations that might account for these parallels: (1) the two texts draw independently on a lost common source; (2) the *Vita brevior* (conceivably to be identified as Wulfwine's *memoranda* or the reflex transmitted by Ælfwine) is wholly anterior to the *Vita et miracula*, as suggested by reminiscences of a Boethian proverb and a biblical or liturgical reminiscence (*preciosa in conspectu Domini* [PsG cxv.15]), whose wording in each case is rendered more precisely in the shorter *vita*; (3) the *Vita brevior* embodies an abbreviation and recasting of a passage from the *Vita et miracula* carried out by a later author; (4) the two texts represent different treatments of Kenelm's legend by a single author, and their parallel passages variously reflect this individual's hagiographical repertoire. Love prefers the last two explanations, contending that the two hagiographical texts "were quite probably the work of one man, or at the very least, . . . [the *Vita brevior*] was an abbreviated reworking of [the *Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi*] . . . , [the two texts having been intended] to serve slightly different purposes."

Love's primary candidate for the single author of Kenelm's Anglo-Latin *vitae* is the continental émigré Goscelin of Canterbury, who arrived in England c. 1058 and died after 1114. Goscelin was a prolific hagiographer who is known to have composed "two versions of a *Translatio* [uel *elevatio*] SS. [uirginum] *Ethelburge, Hildelithe ac W[u]lfbide*, . . . one a good deal shorter than the other." (Such a revision is not noted by Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 151–4 [no. 395], who nevertheless records "two recensions" of Goscelin's *Vita S. Edithae* at p. 152; see further Cross's detection of "epitomes" by Goscelin in BL Harley 652 [noted above under "Bede"].) Setting aside the questions surrounding the authorship and priority of *Vita brevior*, Love champions Goscelin's authorship of the *Vita et miracula* most forcefully, documenting clear verbal parallels that arise in similar contexts as well as a number of more broadly narrative parallels. Love suggests that the hagiographer may have executed the work during a West Country sojourn over the years 1066–75. (This would narrow considerably an internal dating of the longer *vita* to 1045 ×

1075, which may be implicit in a reference to Eadgyth, wife of Edward the Confessor.) Apart from an apparent borrowing from the account of St. Martin in the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, along with various poetic tags, there are few nonbiblical sources in the *vita*. Love includes full discussion of commemorations of Kenelm in calendars, litanies of saints, and mass-sets—the earliest items of evidence (a calendar entry and two litanies) dating from the second half of the tenth century (after c. 969; see *English Kalendars*, ed. Francis Wormald [1934], pp. 15–27 [no. 2], at p. 22 [17 July], and *Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, ed. Michael Lapidge [1991], pp. 74–5 and 203–9 [no. 24]—at p. 205, line 115—and pp. 76 and 219–24 [no. 28]—at p. 219, line 28)—as well as some later, Anglo-Norman office settings, which show familiarity with the following: the *Vita et miracula*; a hymn (*incipit* "O Kenelme, martyr alme"); and a Latin translation (*incipit* "In Clenc sub spina iacet"), by John de Cella, of the Old English "Kenelm couplet" (*DOE* Kenelm = Cameron, "List," p. 43 [item A.48]—whose single cited witness may be augmented considerably now by reference to Love). The last two cited Latin items are not included in the *ICL* repertory.

The most unusual saint's life in Love's collection is the *Vita S. Rumwoldi*, an "infant saint" narrative celebrating the life and deeds of one Rumwold of Buckingham, who, before dying as a baby at an age of three days, had nonetheless managed to perform a number of miracles, including miracles of speech. Although the *terminus ante quem* for the Anglo-Latin *vita* (c. 1050 × c. 1075) is fixed by the text's inclusion in the Worcester witness to the Cotton–Corpus legendary (see above), the events described are attributed to the later seventh century. Rumwold himself appears as a grandson of Penda, king of Mercia (ruling 632–55), and as the son of an unknown king and a nameless daughter of Penda (a figure similar to the latter also being encountered in an Essex *vita* celebrating Osgyth). There is no written evidence for any narrative account of Rumwold circulating before the composition of the *Vita S. Rumwoldi*, but the baby's commemoration in calendars from the later tenth century and the exportation of his cult to Sweden in the eleventh may bear witness to an "informal cult, based on oral traditions." (On this last point, Love cites J. Toy, "The Commemorations of British Saints in the Medieval Liturgical Manuscripts of Scandinavia," *Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift* 1982, 91–103—new to *OEN*.)

One of several hypotheses proposed by Love would hold that the Rumwold *vita* was issued to serve an apologetic purpose for members of such a cult, who wished to answer the criticism that "a preaching baby requires substantial suspension of disbelief by any standard." In fact, Love finds that the ostensibly fanciful hagiography possesses considerable historical interest, insofar as its description of Anglo-Saxon baptismal practices may bear comparison with those described in *ordo Romanus* XI, an addition to the Gregorian sacramentary perhaps made by Alcuin (c. 801 × c. 804), and in a passage in the "Leofric" missal (see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 88). In this connection, Love notes a study of Anglo-Saxon baptism by Arnold Angenendt (in his *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe*

[1984], pp. 176–86) and a recent study by Joseph H. Lynch (*Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* [1986]), who shows that “the duties of the baptismal sponsor increased, until the natural parents of the infant were almost totally excluded from the ceremony.”

Even though its subject is the most ancient saint celebrated among the *vitae* edited by Love—Birinus of Dorchester-on-Thames, flourishing around the year 634 (*ASC* A, s.a. 634 and 650), a foreign missionary who came from parts unknown to evangelize the West Saxons (Bede, *HE* III.vii)—the non-Bedan content of the *Vita S. Birini* may date entirely from the last decade of the eleventh century. Strictly considered, the outer limits for the composition of the life are 984 × c. 1110, as determined by the death of Æthelwold (mentioned in the text as a figure of the past) and the date of the earliest manuscript, OB Digby 39 (*SC* 1640), pt. v (i.e., fols. 57–89) (?Abingdon, s. xi ex. or xii in.), with the copy of the *vita* on 57r–74v. Love, however, drawing on unpublished work by Michael Lapidge, adduces verbal parallels in three distinct hagiographical works (transmitted as a group in two manuscripts)—the Birinus *vita* and two anonymous works, the *Vita S. Swithuni* and the *Miracula S. Swithuni* (the latter preserved in multiple versions). The verbal parallels suggest that “the same hagiographer was responsible for all three texts.” An unprinted, expanded version of the *Miracula S. Swithuni* may be dated internally to 1098 or later, but the crucial evidence for this late dating occurs in a closing addition comprising sixteen miracles, so the composition of the earlier sections of the *Miracula* (and, it follows, the whole of the *Vita S. Birini*) might still be dated to the early years of that decade.

The hagiography on Swithun and Birinus clearly formed part of a revival of interest in the cults of Winchester saints, commencing, perhaps, with the reconstruction work undertaken at the Old Minster in the later tenth century (971 × c. 985) and reaching a crescendo in the second half of the eleventh century. Love notes that OB Digby 39, pt. iv (i.e., fols. 50–6) (s. xi 2 [i.e., c. 1075 × c. 1100]), is a discrete codicological unit preserving *liturgica* for Birinus, including a homily (edited here), mass-sets, and a rubric for a copy of a hymn that has been lost from Digby 39—the last item possibly to be identified as an extant abecedarian hymn (*incipit* “Agmina sacra poli iubilant”), now accepted as a composition of Wulfstan of Winchester. (See Sharpe, *Handlist*, pp. 824–5 [no. 2229], at p. 824, under the entry for *Auxilium Domine qui te*, etc.) It is possible that these items, along with some antiphonal texts celebrating Birinus preserved in New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 926 (?St. Albans, s. xi 2 or s. xi/xii), embody “shred[s] of evidence for an account of . . . Birinus additional to Bede’s, either written or preserved only in oral tradition,” but Love acknowledges that the direction of the influence, if this is even a valid concern, would be hard to establish. More clear-cut sources of the *Vita S. Birini*, possibly known to its author through direct consultation, include the *Vita S. Martini* of Sulpicius Severus, and works of Jerome, Cassiodorus, and Isidore. The author’s indirect knowledge of homiletic works by Leo I and Petrus Chrysologus may have

been derived from an office homiliary, such as that compiled by Paulus Diaconus. It is abundantly clear that Love’s edition of the stylistically ornate *Vita S. Birini* will supersede a text issued recently by David Townsend (see *OEN* 24.1 [1990], 46–7), which was bedeviled by some printer’s errors, among other demerits.

A 1995 article by T.A. Heslop includes a typographically innovative *editio princeps* of the newly recognized text of “the earliest post-Conquest calendar of Canterbury Cathedral,” preserved in a manuscript comprising six leaves *in toto*, now catalogued as OB Add. C. 260 (*SC* 30279) (Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury, s. xii 1 [i.e., c. 1120 × c. 1130]; additions of s. xii and s. xv), a text whose witness to early English usage defied Francis Wormald’s attempts to establish a standard text and dating (“The Canterbury Calendars and the Norman Conquest,” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, pp. 53–85; for Wormald’s brief comment on his decision not to edit the text, see *English Benedictine Calendars after A.D. 1100*, I: *Abbotsbury–Durham* [1939], p. 63). Although dates given for the script used to copy out the calendar have ranged into the third quarter of the twelfth century, Heslop (in consultation with Andrew Watson, Richard Sharpe, and Teresa Webber) now has settled on a date in the 1120s. Moreover, some historiographical corroboration is offered by the pre-Conquest usage documented among texts preserved in a later insertion into an eleventh-century psalter—now BL Arundel 155, fols. 137–70 (s. xii 1 [i.e., c. 1120]), on 141v–143r (*Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 68–9 and 148–52 [no. 13])—and by other witnesses to the surviving corpus of Anglo-Saxon litanies of saints. These “controls” suggest to Heslop that the *text* of the calendar is based on a late eleventh-century Christ Church exemplar “of Lanfranc’s era” (1070–89), whose entries do not seem to have been updated significantly for the later copy. As many as twenty-seven saints’ days seem to have “disappeared” in the years following the Conquest, to judge by this witness, but only seven cases overall involve native English saints, and only three of these cases (those of Augustine of Canterbury, Neot, and Dunstan) are particularly striking. Although there are five additions to the calendar, none introduces a “saint with uniquely Norman associations,” even if the main effect of the changes is to bring the calendar into line with the usage of Lanfranc’s former institution at Bec. The calendar also attests to the *reintroduction* (or, in Heslop’s vivid terminology, “clawback”) of saints who had been purged in the immediate aftermath of the Conquest, including Seaxburg, Grimboldus, and Josse (Judoc or Iudocus). In conclusion, Heslop holds that the Canterbury reforms were achieved “by forbearance from introducing specifically Norman cults as well as a pruning of the Anglo-Saxon.”

Turning to some textual and bibliographical issues, Heslop notes that a 1992 essay by Richard W. Pfaff on calendar revisions from the time of Lanfranc (see *OEN* 27.2 [1994], 70) came to light too late to be discussed at length, but elsewhere he cites a study by Pfaff (extensively addressing later eleventh-century issues) that has not received full notice in

these pages: "The Calendar," in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, ed. Margaret Gibson, T.A. Heslop, and Pfaff, Pubs. of the Mod. Humanities Res. Assoc. 14 (London: MHRA, 1992), pp. 62–87. Disputing a comment in Andrew G. Watson's supplement to Neil R. Ker's *Medieval Libraries* (1987), Heslop maintains that no direct witness to the calendar of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, antedates the thirteenth century. But Heslop suggests that the content of the calendar can be deduced in part from the sacramentary now in CCCC 270, fols. 2–196 (see notice of Orchard above, under "The Tenth-Century Reform"). *Inter alia*, miscellaneous comments here make note of Heslop's forthcoming Henry Bradshaw Society edition of the martyrology in CCCC 57 (Abingdon, s. x/xi; glosses of s. xi [mainly s. xi med.]; various additions of s. xi–xv), among other texts bearing witness to the calendars of several centers. These include Canterbury, whose usages are attested (here supplementing materials published by Wormald) in BN lat. 10062, fols. 162–3 (s. xi l [i.e., c. 1020]), an "unpublished calendar from Canterbury . . . with early additions," and in the privately held Harrod Psalter (c. 1175), photographs of whose calendar are "lodged in the Conway Library at the Courtauld Institute"; Bec, for which Heslop cites *The Bec Missal*, ed. Anselm Hughes (1963); and Mont-Saint-Michel, as documented by Joseph Lemarié and Henri Tardif, "Le calendrier du Mont Saint-Michel," in *Millénaire monastique du Mont Saint-Michel*, I: *Histoire et vie monastiques*, ed. Jean Laporte (1966), pp. 287–301.

In a third new essay appearing in his recent *Variorum* collection (see above under "Early Anglo-Latin"), Neil Wright discusses the use of a wholly obscure adjective, *telesinus*, in a difficult section of the *Vita I S. Neoti*, a work which Wright is inclined to date to the late tenth or early eleventh century, and whose authorship, he accepts, might be ascribed to "a Cornishman working at Ramsey" (Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, p. 39 [no. 117], date the work to "s. xi med."): Wright, "Alfred Burns the Cakes: the *Vita prima Sancti Neoti*, *telesinus*, and Juvenal," in his *History and Literature*, XV, 1–8. The solution to the problem, Wright concludes, may be found in Juvenal's *Satura* VIII, where a form of the personal name Telesinus might be construed (especially in an ambiguously rendered manuscript copy) as an adjective referring to "sea-born" Venus—who, through a kenning-like chain of associations, is implicated in King Alfred's famous burning of the cakes. Beyond his detailed discussion of the use of Juvenal made by the author of Neot's *vita prima* (and knowledge of Juvenal attested elsewhere in the Anglo-Latin tradition), Wright notes the hagiographer's apparent use of Persius's *Saturae*, and he sets out new parallels with passages from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Horace's *Epistulae*, the *Vita S. Martini* of Sulpicius Severus, and the Latin translation of Athanasius's *Vita S. Antonii* made by Evagrius of Antioch (ob. 393; not in *CPL*³; see Frede⁴, pp. 462–3 [item EVA-A]).

A recent study by Dennis Rennard Bradley sets out semi-diplomatic editions of three poems honoring the Virgin Mary as bases for detailed textual commentaries addressing prob-

lems of syllabification, rhythm, line-division (and -subdivision), rhyme, and refrain ("Thrice Blessed Virgin," *Mittelaltinisches Jahrbuch* 31.2 [1996], 81–95). The third item discussed by Bradley, almost certainly of continental origin but preserved in Anglo-Saxon England among the well-known Cambridge Songs, is the lyric "Templum Christi, virgo casta" (*carmen xxxvi*), edited here from the unique copy in CUL Gg. 5. 35, 440v. Bradley's assessment takes note of previous textual criticism by Jaffé, Strecker, and Bulst—but not Spanke (see *Studi medievali* n.s. 15 [1942], p. 118) or Ziolkowski (see pp. 112–15 and 281–2 of the edition cited at *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 110–12). Bradley strongly contests Strecker's decision to strike three closing unrhymed, proparoxytone lines (which approximate to a doxology despite the absence of any explicit mention of the Son), as well as two earlier, long lines whose syllabification may appear problematic. (Octosyllabic, proparoxytone lines rhyming on final -a predominate throughout *carmen xxxvi*, but Ziolkowski, following Spanke, accounts for irregular lines by positing the lyric's use of "free strophe[s]" comparable to verse "by isolated individualists such as Gottschalk of Orbais . . . and Peter Damian.") Bradley's boldest suggestion is that "the prayer for the intercession of the Virgin" previously printed as the last four lines of the first stanza "may constitute a refrain which was intended to be repeated at the end of stanza 2 (and any subsequent stanzas, if such there were)"—apparently including the near-doxology, which seems in Bradley's scheme to emerge as a faulty third stanza. Bradley cites two of his own previous studies on this body of verse, one from 1984 (on "Iam dulcis amica venito"; see Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1985) and 1990 ("Variations on Some Cambridge Songs," *Medium Ævum* 59 [1990], 260–75—new to *OEN*).

An abstract of Victoria B. Jordan's 1995 Boston College dissertation alludes to the "tension between stasis and innovation," whereby hagiography has a "tendency to mould itself within its conventional format to suit the cultural and political values of a specific audience at a particular time": Jordan, "Monastic Hagiography in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England: the Cases of Edward the Confessor and St. Edmund, King and Martyr," unpub. Ph.D. diss., Boston College (1995); *DAI* 56A (1995–6), 4764–5. Works in the Anglo-Latin tradition discussed here include the anonymous *Vita Ædwardi regis* (1066) and later, related productions; Abbo's *passio* on Edmund; and the treatise *De miraculis S. Eadmundi*, now ascribed to Bertrannus Archidiaconus. (For the last two items, see *OEN* 30.2 [1997], 93–6.)

g. Comprehensive Works

FOLLOWING ON THE APPEARANCE of a collection of essays addressing orality and literacy in medieval England—*Mundlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im englischen Mittelalter*, ed. Willi Erzgräber and Sabine Volk (1988), the fifth volume in the series *ScriptOralia*—Ursula Schaefer has edited a group of studies on early medieval literacy for the same series, studies that also dwell frequently on Anglo-Saxon subjects: *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Schaefer, *ScriptOralia*

53 (Tübingen: Narr, 1993). One of the most expansive essays in the collection is a contribution by George Hardin Brown, "Latin Writing and the Old English Vernacular": *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Ursula Schaefer, *ScriptOralia* 53 (Tübingen: Narr, 1993), pp. 36–57, illus. Beginning with a citation of Patrick Wormald's breakthrough study "The Uses of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and Its Neighbours" (*Trans. of the Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., 27 [1977], 95–114), Brown highlights the singular achievement of the earliest Anglo-Saxon *literati*, who encouraged the production of works in the vernacular almost concurrently with the introduction of writing. This occurred, on the evidence of the Old English laws of Æthelberht (drawn up c. 602–3; S.E. Kelly), fairly soon after the crucial moment of the Anglo-Saxon conversion to Christianity. Vernacular literacy was promoted further through the glossing activities of the later seventh-century Canterbury school. Even if separate (Caroline and insular) scripts were used in the final centuries of the period to distinguish Latin and Old English texts, works in the two languages continued to be copied together in the same scriptoria.

Turning to mnemonic concerns, Brown notes that a range of factors, including scarcity of parchment and even poor lighting conditions, occasioned the memorization of psalms and other biblical texts. Brown (following Brian Stock and others) sees "psalter literacy" as an *educative* ancillary to the *performative* orality of the Divine Office, noting specific evidence for the practices of the *psalterati* in the following disparate sources: (1) a rare, early witness to the use of wax tablets as writing media, preserved in Dublin, National Museum of Ireland, SA 1914.2 (Irish center, s. vi 2 or s. vii; provenance Clough, Co. Antrim; "Springmount Bog Writing-Tablets"; *CLA* suppl., 5 [no. 1684], with suppl., 68; Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography*, pp. 130–1 [no. 505]), containing texts of psalms XXX–XXXII (Brown here cites an entry in *The Making of England*, ed. Leslie Webster and J. Backhouse [1991], pp. 80–1 [no. 64]); (2) various forms of syntactic glossing (citing Maartje Draak's monograph *Constructive Marks in Hiberno-Latin Manuscripts* [1957]); (3) an eighth-century Northumbrian copy of Job with interlinear glosses that reproduce passages of patristic exegesis, i.e., St. Petersburg, Public Library, Lat. F. v. I. 3, fols. 1–38 (Northumbrian center or English center on Continent [Ker], s. viii 2; provenance Corbie; "St. Petersburg Job"; *CLA* XI, 5 [no. 1599], with XI, 31, and suppl., 67); (4) two manuscripts containing biblical glosses and exegesis, displaying nearly contemporary vernacular glosses, that is, (a) New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 776 (?Southumbrian center [i.e., ?Canterbury], s. viii med.; early modern provenance Lincoln; "Lincoln psalter"; *CLA* XI, 24 [no. 1661], with XI, 36, and suppl., 67); and (b) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin–Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Grimm 132, Nr. 2 + 139, Nr. 2 (English center, s. viii [Ker], i.e., ? s. viii med. [Lowe]; medieval provenance at ? German center; *CLA* suppl., 3 [no. 1675]), the latter including a word-list relating to the Song of Songs. Brown provides further pointers to five extant eighth-

century Anglo-Saxon copies of Latin texts, all of which reflect significant ninth- or tenth-century Old English glossing activity.

1996 saw the completion of a two-volume set collecting Michael Lapidge's major essays on Anglo-Latin topics (through 1995). The second volume to appear, chronologically covering the earlier period, is Lapidge's *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996) [hereafter cited as *A-L Lit. 600–899*]. The citation of essays included in this collection is sometimes slightly more complicated than in the case of the first published volume, *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900–1066* (see *OEN* 28.2 [1995], 73–6), for the following reasons: one essay, item (1) below, has been revised, retitled, and newly set in type, thus wholly superseding its predecessor; two items, (4) and (11), which seemed in their first appearances to have been generated respectively on an ImageWriter II in need of a new ribbon and a first-generation laserprinter, have been typeset properly for this volume, thereby introducing new spans of page-breaks; item (15) is a newly titled, if otherwise mainly anastatic, reprint of an excursus that first appeared as an appendix to an *ASE* article by R.W. Hunt, but now has broken free of its original setting; and item (16) makes its first appearance in this collection (see notice above under "The Ninth Century"). Nevertheless, I append herewith a "plenary" set of model references for all of these items, which readers may wish to adapt to conform to various stylesheets. Unless noted, all items were included in Berkhout's bibliography for the year of their publication; see further *OEN* 28.2 (1995), 74, for the general scheme.

The full contents of *A-L Lit. 600–899* may be set out as follows:

- (1) M.L., "Anglo-Latin Literature," in his *A-L Lit. 600–899*, pp. 1–35, rev. reissue of "The Anglo-Latin Background," in Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*, with a survey of the Anglo-Latin background by Michael Lapidge (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1986), pp. 5–37 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 21.1 (1987), 101].
- (2) M.L., "Artistic and Literary Patronage in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, 1 vol. in 2, *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 39 (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1992), pp. 137–91 with a transcript of discussion at pp. 193–8, rpt. (without the transcript of discussion) in his *A-L Lit. 600–899*, pp. 37–91 and 499–500 [new to *OEN*].
- (3) M.L., "The Career of Archbishop Theodore," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Lapidge, Cambridge Stud. in A-S England 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 1–29, illus., rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600–899*, pp. 93–121 and 501 [Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1995 (= *OEN* 29.4 [1996], 20); *YWOES* = forthcoming (in "History" for 1995)].
- (4) M.L., "The Study of Greek at the School of Canterbury in the Seventh Century," in his *A-L Lit. 600–899*, pp. 123–39, rev. reissue of art. orig. pub. in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: the Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren in collaboration with Shirley Ann Brown, King's College, London, Med. Stud. 2 (London: Univ. of London, King's College, 1988), pp. 169–94 [Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1990; *YWOES* = *OEN* 25.2 (1992), 60].
- (5) M.L., "The School of Theodore and Hadrian," *Anglo-Saxon England* 15 (1986), 45–72, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600–899*, pp. 141–68 and 502–3 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 21.1 (1987), 108].

- (6) M.L., "Old English Glossography: the Latin Context," in *Anglo-Saxon Glossography: Papers Read at the International Conference held in the Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en schone Kunsten van België, Brussels, 8 and 9 September 1986*, ed. René Derolez (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1992-3), pp. 43-57, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 169-81 [Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1993; *YWOES* = *OEN* 28.2 (1995), 11].
- (7) M.L., "An Isidorian Epitome from Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Romanobarbarica* 10 (1988-9), 443-83, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 183-223 [new to *OEN*].
- (8) M.L., "Theodore and Anglo-Latin Octosyllabic Verse," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Lapidge, Cambridge Stud. in A-S England 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 260-80, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 225-45 and 504 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 30.2 (1997), 73-4].
- (9) M.L., "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31 (1979), 209-31, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 247-69 and 505-6 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 14.1 (1980), 57].
- (10) M.L., "Beowulf, Aldhelm, the *Liber monstrorum*, and Wessex," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 23 (1982), 151-92, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 271-312 and 507 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 17.1 (1983), 89].
- (11) M.L., "Bede the Poet," in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 313-38 and 508, corr. reissue of *Bede the Poet*, Jarrow Lecture 1993 (Newcastle upon Tyne: [n.p.], 1994); anastatic rpt. of orig. pub. in *Bede and His World*, pref. Lapidge, 1 vol. in 2, Jarrow Lectures 1958-93 (Aldershot, Hants.: Variorum, 1994), pp. 927-56 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 29.2 (1996), 87-92].
- (12) M.L., "Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*," in *St Cuthbert: His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, David W. Rollason, and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1989), pp. 77-93, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 339-55 and 509 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 24.2 (1991), 41].
- (13) M.L., "Some Remnants of Bede's Lost *Liber epigrammatum*," *EHR* 90 (1975), 798-820, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 357-79 and 510-12 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 10.1 (1976), 83].
- (14) M.L., "Aediluulf and the School of York," in *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert: Traube-Gedenkschrift*, ed. Albert Lehner and Walter Berschin (Sankt Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1989), pp. 161-78, rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 381-98 and 513 [Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1991; *YWOES* = *OEN* 26.2 (1993), 69-70].
- (15) M.L., "Knowledge of the Poems of Venantius Fortunatus in Early Anglo-Saxon England," in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 399-407, rpt. of his "Knowledge of the Poems in the Earlier Period," appendix to Richard W. Hunt, "Manuscript Evidence for Knowledge of the Poems of Venantius Fortunatus in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 8 (1979), 279-95, at pp. 287-95 and 514 [*YWOES* = *OEN* 14.1 (1980), 61].
- (16) M.L., "Latin Learning in Ninth-Century England," in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 409-54 and 515 [new to *OEN*; see notice above].
- (17) M.L., "The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England, I: the Evidence of Latin Glosses," in *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain: Papers Delivered to the Fifth Annual St John's House Symposium* [Univ. of St. Andrews, 12 May 1979], ed. Nicholas Brooks, Stud. in the Early Hist. of Britain (Leicester: Leicester Univ. Press, 1982), pp. 99-140, illus., rpt. in his *A-L Lit. 600-899*, pp. 455-98 and 516 [Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1983; *YWOES* = *OEN* 18.1 (1984), 108-9].

Lapidge's additional notes include especially useful comments on the seventh-century Canterbury school; on a new *membrum disiectum* from a widely discussed, fragmentary Aldhelm manuscript, here supplementing even Scott Gwara's recent publications; and on Bede's *Liber epigrammatum* (Lapidge's addenda here spanning three pages). As a result of the typographic changes mentioned at the start of this notice, it is less easy to convert the some of the articles' original page-numbers (not reproduced in *A-L Lit. 600-899*) to those of the present volume. In keeping with my previous notice (*OEN*

28.2 [1995], 75), I offer a few conversions for some of the most widely cited items. These are intended to assist owners of the book under review in tracking down existing citations of Lapidge's studies, particularly when they have no recourse to the original versions of articles:

- (2) "Artistic and Literary Patronage": SUBTRACT 100
- (3) "Career of Archbishop Theodore": ADD 92
- (5) "School of Theodore and Hadrian": ADD 96
- (7) "An Isidorian Epitome": SUBTRACT 260
- (8) "Theodore and Octosyllabic Verse": SUBTRACT 35
- (9) "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and OE Verse": ADD 38
- (10) "Beowulf, Aldhelm, the *Liber monstrorum*": ADD 120
- (12) "Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cuthberti*": ADD 262
- (13) "Some Remnants of Bede's *Liber*": SUBTRACT 441
- (14) "Aediluulf and the School of York": ADD 220
- (15) "Knowledge of the Poems of Fortunatus": ADD 120

1996 also saw the appearance of a volume of Gerald Bonner's collected papers (*Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition: Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Collected Stud. 521 [Aldershot, Hants.: Variorum, 1996]). Beyond Bonner's treatments of Augustinian, Pelagian, and related early Christian topics, seven essays address Anglo-Saxon concerns. Two of these are new to *OEN*: "The Christian Life in the Thought of the Venerable Bede," *Durham Univ. Jnl* n.s. 32 (1970-1), 39-55, and a newly typeset version of "St Cuthbert—Soul Friend," originally published in *Cuthbert: Saint and Patron—Lectures given in the Prior's Hall, Durham, February 1987* (Durham: Dean and Chapter of Durham, 1987), pp. 23-44. The latter monograph (61 pp., illus.) also prints two papers by D.W. Rollason: "Why was St Cuthbert so Popular?" (pp. 9-22, illus.) and "The Wanderings of St Cuthbert" (pp. 45-61, illus.), both new to *OEN*. Additional notes supplied by Bonner concern early Anglo-Saxon contacts with the community at Chelles, and Bede's knowledge of Augustine's *De trinitate* and Cyprian's *Epistulae*. The collection benefits from a ten-page index, including an extensive entry on Bede. The five remaining articles of Anglo-Saxon interest, all of which have received notice in these pages, may be summarized briefly by subject—and, unless noted, all items were included in Berkhout's bibliography for the year of their appearance: Bede and medieval civilization (1973; *YWOES* = *OEN* 8.1 [1975], 46); Bede and the apocalyptic tradition (1966; see the brief notice of the Jarrow Lecture for that year in a recent installment of *YWOES*: *OEN* 29.2 [1996], 100); Anglo-Saxon spirituality (1973; Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1974); Bede's legacy (1986; *YWOES* = *OEN* 21.1 [1987], 102); and a review of Wallace-Hadrill's supplementary commentary on Bede's *HE* (1989). Finally, studies by Bonner *not* included in the collection include "The Saints of Durham" (1986; *YWOES* = *OEN* 21.1 [1987], 105); "St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street" (1988; Berkhout, "Bibliography" for 1989); and texts contributed by Bonner to the Durham commemorative monograph *Saint Cuthbert and His Heritage* (1987; see *OEN* 22.2 [1989], 71).

P.G.R.

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, and Charters

WORKS ABOUT MANUSCRIPTS, illuminations, and charters published in 1996 (or thereabouts) are particularly rich in surveys of periods, traditions, productions, and collections. One work that comes close to covering all of these areas is Helmut Gneuss's *Books and Libraries in Early England*, Collected Studies, CS558 (Aldershot, Hants, and Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1996). Comprising eleven of Gneuss's pieces in English and German originally published from 1957 to 1993, many in *festschriften*, the volume covers topics concerning individual manuscripts (such as BL MS. Cotton Otho A.xii), Anglo-Saxon terminology for liturgical books, and the history of libraries, books, and reading in Anglo-Saxon England. Although the essays are printed as they appeared originally, Gneuss provides an updated bibliography at the end of each selection. Because the pieces fit so well together, they provide a particularly useful volume of Gneuss's excellent scholarship.

Further to the topic of manuscript production, Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda published *Tradizioni manoscritte e critica del testo nel Medioevo germanico*, Manuali Laterza, 52 (Rome and Bari: Laterza) in 1994. This ambitious study encompasses three major parts: the characteristics of Germanic scripts from runes through Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, continental, and Scandinavian versions; the production of manuscripts from materials through scriptoria and the copying process; and the editing and reconstruction of texts. Although Luiselli Fadda covers a wide range of topics, she is able to illustrate her points through manuscript details provided by previous scholars. The working bibliography is extraordinary. The third part of the book is noteworthy for its analysis of stemma construction; a review of the alternatives for textual emendation; and a description of types of editions, including the apparatus needed for each. A useful glossary of terms concludes the volume.

David Ganz has published an intriguing essay, "*Temptabat et scribere: Vom Schreiben in der Karolingerzeit*," in *Schriftkultur und Reichsverwaltung unter den Karolingern*, ed. Rudolf Schieffer, (Opladen, 1996), pp. 13–33. Ganz asks, in essence, how men became scribes in the Carolingian period, and answers the question by considering first the extent of continental library collections in the first half of the ninth century. He observes that the burst of manuscript production between 790 and 840 would not have been possible without a focused effort to train scribes. A number of scriptoria were founded during this period to teach formal, often imported script styles. In copies of patristic texts one can see evidence of the teaching process, as the master writes some lines for the student to imitate. Certain monastic rules dictated the process to be followed. Plans for scriptoria indicate how they were organized and what materials they needed. In notes and riddles that survive we can perceive how difficult it was to learn to write and then to produce texts. Moreover, Ganz reminds us that since reading was primarily an oral phenomenon, scribes were enlivening the spiritual well-being of their audi-

ence with their work, a most worthy inspiration.

Studies of specific libraries and scriptoria abound in 1996. In the collection entitled *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford and New York, 1995), Nigel Ramsay contributes an essay on "The Cathedral Archives and Library," pp. 341–407. Only the first few pages focus on the Anglo-Saxon period, and there Ramsay describes the earliest scholars and archbishops who influenced writing and book production at Christ Church. He notes that, with the possible exception of the *Codex Aureus*, now in Stockholm, no books survive from pre-851. However, by c. 1000, some thirty-three extant books, mainly from the late tenth century, can be attributed to Christ Church library, evidence of the efforts of St. Dunstan and his successors. At about the same time, the community there took a new interest in the preservation and study of its archives. Despite a viking raid on Canterbury in 1011, the expansion of the library continued well into the eleventh century. With the advent of Archbishop Lanfranc after the Conquest, attention focused on building a library on the Norman Benedictine model with its systematic collection of the Latin fathers. Nevertheless, the monks retained their role in writing documents and compiling them in cartularies designed to separate the archbishop's holdings from those of the monastic community, a process that continued well into the thirteenth century. In a shorter but important piece from *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon, 1995), Teresa Webber explores "Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest," pp. 145–58. Webber's subject is the distinctive "prickly" script style that developed at Christ Church after the Conquest. After describing its genesis and distinctive features, Webber considers whether this development can be considered a "house style" and concludes that it cannot be so. The variety of practices in punctuation, orthography, letter forms, ruling, patterns, and hierarchy of display scripts within manuscripts written in the prickly style, not to mention contemporary Christ Church books written in other styles or in a combination of the different styles, means that there was no deliberate house style. Rather, it seems that scribes trained within the community learned the distinctive script but worked alongside others who had been trained elsewhere. The focus was on the acquisition of accurate texts rather than on the appearance of the manuscripts, hence the discipline necessary for a "house style" was never desired or achieved. In an appendix, Webber lists surviving manuscripts in the Christ Church style along with contemporary books not in that style.

Richard Gameson contributes another survey in "Book Production and Decoration at Worcester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," in *St. Oswald of Worcester*, ed. Nicholas P. Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London and New York: Leicester U. P., 1996), pp. 194–243. After reviewing in detail

the surviving books associated with Worcester during this period, and noting that there was a steady, modest level of manuscript production rather than a series of bursts, Gameson points to the latter half of the eleventh century during the episcopate of Wulfstan II as the only time a house style of production appears. He further notes that the dearth of manuscript art at Worcester seems to have been the norm in Anglo-Saxon scriptoria at a time when decorated books could be acquired from larger centers that specialized in their production. Gameson concludes with a list of books from the late ninth through late eleventh centuries connected with Worcester including shelfmark, summary of contents, date and an indication of the basis for the ascription. In yet another essay from this Oswald volume, Alicia Corrêa considers "The Liturgical Manuscripts of Oswald's Houses," pp. 285–324. Through a detailed examination of the four liturgical manuscripts associated with Oswald's houses during his lifetime (Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, 100, part 2—pontifical *ordines*; London, British Library, Harley 2904—psalter); Royal 2.A.xx—prayers for public and private liturgy; and Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, 127 (105)—sacramentary), Corrêa is able to characterize some distinctive features of the observances. One such feature is the veneration of St. Benedict, which seems to have appeared at Worcester some fifteen to twenty years before the *Regularis Concordia*. Another is a concern for the individual within liturgical worship emphasized in prayers and the confirmation *ordo*. Corrêa includes tables of unusual prayers in the Winchcombe Sacramentary, and editions of the marginal prayers in Royal 2.A.xx. and the *Orationes post psalterium* from both Harley 2904 and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 12, fos. 145r/v.

Michelle P. Brown's exhaustive study of *The Book of Cerne: Prayer, Patronage and Power in Ninth-Century England* (London: The British Library; Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1996) illuminates the field of Mercian manuscripts from the late eighth through mid-ninth centuries. After providing a thorough description of the MS (Cambridge University Library, MS. Ll.1.10), Brown reviews previous scholarship and then poses a lengthy series of questions that she hopes to answer about the book. In a chapter on "The Archaeology of the Book," Brown describes its construction and relationship to contemporary manuscripts, and finds that prayerbooks follow a similar codicological arrangement, with a particularly close association between the ninth-century section of Cerne and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. 93. In Chapter 3, "The Script of the Book of Cerne," Brown examines corrections, glosses and marginalia including possible evidence of the Worcester "tremulous hand," the features of the basic text hand, a Southumbrian pointed Minuscule script; the hierarchy of scripts in Cerne; and the evidence supporting the existence of one principal artist-scribe for the codex. Chapter 4, "Decoration as Elucidation," begins with an itemization of the components of the decorative scheme: evangelist miniatures, minor initials, *litterae notabiliores*, run-

over symbols, and other embellishments. Brown then considers the role of color, palette and technique, zoomorphic and foliate decoration, and all aspects of the evangelist miniatures. This includes comparison with depictions in other Insular manuscripts, which she describes in detail—a rich resource in itself. She foreshadows her conclusions here by observing that "the evangelist miniatures in the Book of Cerne might be interpreted as multivalent images in which the Evangelists are shown both in human and symbolic guises, in which the human busts also represent Christ in his humanity (the four 'youthful' evangelists reflecting his image) and the symbols represent the facets of Christ's being: Incarnation (Mt.), Passion (Lk.), Resurrection (Mk) and Ascension/Majesty (Jn)." (pp. 108–9) Through these images and other evidence, Brown finds that the central theme of the book "focuses upon the *communio sanctorum*, emphasizing the role of Christ as its head, the participation of the individual within this communion and its function as a vehicle of salvation" (p. 109) In the miniatures and the five display openings to the Gospel extracts, Brown finds a potential allusion to the ceremony called in *aurium apertione*, whereby at Lent "catechumens have the nature and guises of the Evangelists explained to them, and the incipits of the four Gospels are read." (p. 123) Nevertheless one can identify an incredibly wide variety of influences on the decorative scheme just as one can in the text.

In Chapter 5, Brown proceeds through the various textual components of the MS and explores the context of the compilation. The first item, an exhortation to prayer in Old English, is in a southern dialect but not West Saxon. This is followed by the Gospel extracts (in Latin), whose text reveals Celtic, southern English, and Italian affinities. Next comes a Latin acrostic poem, printed by Brown, followed by prayers and hymns drawn from at least two source collections. Of some 74 pieces, only seven are unique to Cerne; the others appear in a wide variety of prayerbooks, liturgical manuscripts, and—most prominently—in the later Portiforium of St. Wulfstan. A Breviate Psalter selected from the Old Latin Roman version follows the prayers. Its rubric echoes the acrostic poem in referring to a certain bishop Oethelwald, who is yet to be identified conclusively. The Book of Cerne concludes with a short, early example of liturgical drama (in Latin) known as "The Harrowing of Hell." Taken together, the texts "may, at one level, be interpreted as a meditation upon the Communion of Saints as a tool for its implementation, the prayers of the user serving to invoke the intercession of all the faithful on his behalf and in turn contributing to the common good of all," though other themes appear simultaneously, most notably a penitential strand and a Paschal element. (p. 148) By means of exhaustive comparative evidence, Brown links the MS to Worcester Cathedral and suggests that it was produced in central or western Mercia, c.820x840. In contrast to other Mercian prayerbooks, the Book of Cerne bears little evidence of female ownership. It remains a distinct possibility that the book was associated with Aedeluald of Lichfield, who may have had ties to Canterbury,

hence the traces of southern influence in text, script, and decoration. This ninth-century prayerbook now survives sandwiched between two sets of materials relating to the Benedictine Abbey of Cerne, Dorset. These materials, dating from the 14th–16th centuries, are the only evidence linking the MS to Cerne. As is obvious from the foregoing description of a very ambitious work of scholarship, Brown's study provides an education in pre-Alfredian manuscript production and decoration that goes far beyond her valuable insights into the Book of Cerne.

A volume of essays published in 1994 by Parker Library Publications (Cambridge) addresses the topic *Conservation and Preservation in Small Libraries*. The editors are Nicholas Hadgraft and Katherine Swift. In an introduction to the collection (pp. 8–113), R.I. Page surveys the development of the Parker Library through numerous bequests of books and assesses its state at the end of the sixteenth century. In another essay entitled "The Conservator and the Scholar" (pp. 15–19), Page argues that there should, in fact, be little distance between the conservator and the scholar. Even so, there are numerous areas for dispute. For example, in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 383, the quires were misassembled and augmented with supply quires during the course of re-binding under the direction of Matthew Parker. As Page suggests, Anglo-Saxonists might prefer a return to the correct order, while students of antiquarian scholarship would prefer to leave Parker's version intact. Other examples illustrate the degree to which Parker manipulated codices but also indicate that some problems may pre-date his ownership. Taking the codex back to its original state thus becomes a questionable enterprise. Mildred Budny contributes an essay entitled "Physical Evidence and Manuscript Conservation: A Scholar's Plea" (pp. 29–46). By means of numerous examples and accompanying photographs, Budny shows how seemingly inconsequential marks, dirt, offsets, holes, patches, and other trace evidence can provide important information about the archaeology of a book. In another essay, "The Conservation of CCCC MS. 197B" (pp. 114–22), Nicholas Pickwoad provides an example of the kind of description desired before conservation, and then of the processes used and the results obtained, all illustrated by photographs. Serving as a test case, this fragment of an eighth-century Northumbrian gospel book required rebinding and repair to the leaves, including reversing problems caused by the sixteenth-century binding.

Pursuant to the theme of manuscript conservation, Timothy Graham has written "Matthew Parker and the Conservation of Manuscripts: the Case of CUL MS li.2.4 (Old English *Regula pastoralis*, s. xi^{3/4})," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10.5 (1996 for 1995), 630–41. Graham focuses upon repair strips made from one or more sixteenth-century official documents, some of which strips preserve the work of a sixteenth-century glossator. Close examination of the physical evidence apparent after the removal of the pasted strips indicates that "at some time before he had the manuscript repaired and rebound, Parker paginated

it and designated it for his son John." (p. 638) He later changed his mind, had the repair strips and gloss installed, and then had the manuscript rebound. On added endleaves he included a Latin translation of Alfred's letter of transmission and of the metrical preface that follows it. Parker sent the manuscript to University Library in 1574. Catherine Hall adds further information to our knowledge of Parker in "Matthew Parker as Annotator: The Case of Winchester Cathedral MS XXB," *Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soc.* 10.5 (1996 for 1995), 642–45. The manuscript in question is an archival book containing transcripts of foundation charters from various cathedrals and monastic houses made in 1535 by John Prise. The texts are prefaced by an index with three omissions noted in Parker's hand. He has also paginated the manuscript and underlined and annotated the text in his typical style. As Hall points out, there is much in these historical materials related to the English church that would have interested Parker.

Four articles in this year's review are devoted to Bede. In an ambitious piece entitled "A Northumbrian Version of 'Caedmon's Hymn' (*eordu*-Recension) in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS 8245–57 ff. 62r²-v¹: Identification, Edition and Filiation" in *Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk and Northumbrian*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald, *Mediaevalia Groningana*, 1 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1996), pp. 139–65, Dan O'Donnell examines a late fifteenth-century copy of "Caedmon's Hymn" and draws connections among it and two other copies in late continental manuscripts. The other versions are in the twelfth-century Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 574, f. 59 and the late fifteenth-century Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Lat. 5237. Through an analysis of the dialectal features of the poem in these three copies, O'Donnell shows that they descend from an early Northumbrian recension, possibly in an Insular manuscript. In addition to providing a new stemma for this group of texts, he provides diplomatic transcriptions of each version and a reconstruction of the Northumbrian recension as it may have existed in the Insular exemplar. In "The Venerable Bede and the 'Church of the English,'" in *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell (Oxford and Nashville, TN, 1992), pp. 13–32, Patrick Wormald argues that Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* played a major role in defining English national identity through its interpretation of the English experience. Its impact can be assessed objectively through the sheer numbers of copies that survive from pre-Conquest England.

Thirdly, Hildegard L.C. Tristram contributes "Vom Abschaben irischer Handschriften im alten England" in *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Ursula Schaefer, *ScriptOralia*, 53 (Tübingen: Narr, 1993), pp. 155–77. Here Tristram examines the passage in *HE* I.1 where Bede declares that, in addition to having no snakes and actually repelling those that arrive by boat, Ireland has produced manuscripts efficacious against poison. When placed in water and given to a victim to drink, scrapings from these cure snake bite. In

considering what Bede means in relating this vignette, Tristram first notes that earlier authors such as Orosius and Isidore included similar material in their works; however, this particular example seems to originate with Bede. Earlier scholars have seen it as a parody of the kind of miracles found in Isidore's *Etymologiae*, but Tristram believes there is a serious message in the vignette. After providing a close reading of Bede's lines and reminding us of the great respect that Bede and his contemporaries held for Irish learning, she recalls other instances in *HE* where miraculous healings take place when relics of saints are mixed with water or otherwise applied to sufferers. Tristram also considers the physical substances involved in manuscript production and the possibility of homeopathic healing properties along the line of those described in other Anglo-Saxon collections of remedies. In the end she concludes that, while most of these analogues are enlightening, this passage also must have had allegorical significance for Bede. Through original sin, every man has been bitten by the snake and suffered from the poison of evil. But every man also has the opportunity to be healed through the written word that can enter through the ear, the eye, or even the mouth to heal the body and soul.

Lastly, Paul Meyvaert contributes "Bede, Cassiodorus, and the Codex Amiatinus," in *Speculum* 71 (1996), 827–83. In this learned piece, Meyvaert explores what Bede knew and didn't know of Cassiodorus and why that matters. Most critically, Bede did not know the *Institutiones*, a work that would have provided a comprehensive understanding of, for example, the images in the Codex Grandior and many other points about patristic literature. Bede did know Cassiodorus's commentary on the Psalms from which he was able to deduce that the Codex Grandior had once been connected with Cassiodorus before it came to Wearmouth. Although this Latin pandect has disappeared, we can learn much about it from examining the Codex Amiantinus, one of three new pandects commissioned by Ceolfrith, appointed abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow in 689. Bede describes the project in his *Historia abbatum* and suggests that the Codex Grandior served as the model for the new books although its Old Latin text was to be replaced by Jerome's Vulgate. Certain features of the Codex Amiantinus can be linked to its model, specifically the triple division of scripture adopted by Cassiodorus, the Tabernacle image with its Byzantine features, and a prologue composed by Cassiodorus. Notable divergences can be explained by Bede's own writings. The image of the Temple is omitted in the Codex Amiantinus because, as portrayed, it lacked verification in the bible. On the other hand, Meyvaert shows that the miniature of Ezra in the new pandect represents Bede's reinterpretation of a picture of Cassiodorus in the Codex Grandior, one that Bede could not identify because he had not read the *Institutiones*. Bede's treatises on the Tabernacle, the Temple, and Ezra provide evidence for these conclusions and indicate how strongly he was inspired by these images even as he knew so little about their genesis.

Two very useful reference tools appear in the collection *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*, ed. Paul Szarmach (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996). Peter Jackson and Michael Lapidge contribute "The Contents of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary," pp. 131–46, in which they describe the earliest multi-volume legendary to survive from England and then reconstruct the two-volume passionnal that underlies it. The original structure was as follows:

January to September (British Library, Cotton MS. Nero E. i, pt. i, fols. 55–208; Nero E. i, pt. ii, fols. 1–55)

October to December (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 9, pp. 61–458; Nero E. i, pt. ii, fols. 166–80)

N.R. Ker demonstrated that the MSS were written at Worcester during the third quarter of the eleventh century. From its contents, the compilation appears to have been made in northern France or Flanders, and dates from the late ninth/early tenth century. But although the compilation was continental, its transmission is documented exclusively in English manuscripts where, for example, the writer Ælfric drew on it when composing his own *Lives of Saints*. Jackson and Lapidge provide a complete list of the contents of the reconstructed legendary including dates of the feasts and BHL references. In "The Corpus of Anonymous Lives and Their Manuscript Context," pp. 209–30, D.G. Scragg surveys the surviving lives not written by Ælfric. He describes each item in manuscript context and notes that many of the pieces in English were composed before the year 1000. Thus the genre was well established prior to Ælfric, though he certainly expanded it through his work. Scragg provides a table showing the manuscript distribution of the anonymous lives. An Appendix, "The Three Anonymous Lives in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303," by Scragg and Elaine Treharne, reviews the evidence for dates and joint authorship of these pieces but does not offer firm conclusions on these issues.

In "The Diffusion of Augustine's Confessions in England during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," from *The Cloister and the World*, ed. John Blair and Brian Golding (Oxford, 1996), pp. 29–45, Teresa Webber points out that "on the eve of the Conquest no copy [of the *Confessions*] was present in England, and none had been there for nearly two centuries" (p. 30). Only in the later eleventh, or possibly early twelfth, century do five datable manuscripts survive from England. Through painstaking comparison of idiosyncracies and marginalia, Webber argues that the dissemination of the text in England depends ultimately upon two manuscripts imported from the Continent during this period. One of the imported manuscripts was copied in Ghent and circulated in the West Country after it arrived in England. The other probably came from Saint-Bertin to the Canterbury area. The copying of patristic texts following the Norman Conquest evidenced a resurgence of interest in these materials which served a variety of purposes. Indeed, the *Confessions* were read as a devotional text, judging from the annotations found in the manuscripts. Goscelin of Saint-Bertin recommended the

work to women and men in religious orders, which may provide a clue to the Flemish origin of England's copies.

In a searching study that challenges recent scholarship, Richard Gameson reviews the evidence for the origin of the surviving manuscripts from Bishop Leofric's donation to Exeter and concludes, among other findings, that the Exeter Book was not produced at that foundation. His study, "The Origin of the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry," *ASE* 25 (1996), 135–85, begins with an analysis of Leofric's inventory. He notes Leofric's statement that Exeter possessed only a few dilapidated service books when he arrived, and then argues that the donation list is consistent with the situation as described, in that it comprises a basic working collection for a bishop served by a community of canons. Next Gameson examines fourteen manuscripts produced by a group of scribes at Exeter sometime after 1050. These again represent basic texts with a large proportion of the survivors in Old English, perhaps a reflection of the poor state of Latin learning there during this period. An additional fourteen books from Leofric's time were acquired from a variety of English and continental foundations. Yet another phase of book acquisition took place during the post-Conquest period, 1075–1125, when thirty-eight surviving books, many comprising works of the Latin fathers, were copied or acquired by Exeter. On the basis of script style, Gameson argues that the Exeter Book, along with five roughly contemporary manuscripts also having an Exeter provenance, do not form "a coherent, self-sufficient group: (p. 162) that would argue for a common origin. In fact, he believes that three items in the group are localizable to Christ Church, Canterbury. On the other hand, the Exeter Book, London, Lambeth Palace MS. 149, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS. 319, seem to have been written by another scribe "at a centre that was not short of resources and that had access to an interesting range of texts both in Latin and the vernacular." (p. 179) Gameson speculates that the place might have been Glastonbury. In light of differing opinions about the resources of Exeter during Leofric's time, no doubt the debate about the origin of the Exeter Book will continue.

A number of works continue the arduous but essential process of reconstructing and interpreting fragmentary material from Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The depressing subject of the Cotton Library fire in 1731 provides the backdrop for Simon Keynes's essay, "The Reconstruction of a Burnt Cottonian Manuscript: the Case of Cotton MS. Otho A. I," *Brit. Lib. Jnl* 22 (1996), 113–60. After describing the events of that terrible night in October and the aftermath, Keynes proceeds to discuss one of the casualties in detail. Cotton MS. Otho A. I contained four distinct texts: (1) an abridged text of Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis*; (2) a letter from Boniface to Cuthberht, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 747, encouraging him toward the kind of clerical reforms recently instituted by the Frankish church and referring specifically to *R P*; (3) the canons of the council of Clofesho convened under Cuthberht in 747, said to have been attended by King Æthelbald of

Mercia; and (4) the text of Æthelbald's charter of 749 extending privileges to unspecified ecclesiastical foundations. Since at least one leaf, separated from the MS before the fire, has survived, it is possible to date the MS to the second half of the eighth century. Moreover, at least one fragment survives from each of the four texts mentioned above, in apparently the same hand. Early descriptions of the MS provide evidence that these four items were rearranged prior to 1696 while it was in the Cottonian library. Because the MS had already lost some leaves prior to rearrangement, it may have contained a fifth text, the famous letter from Boniface (and seven other bishops) to Æthelbald urging him to abandon his evil ways. This letter travels in manuscripts with the letter to Cuthberht, which in turn accompanies the two other documents in Otho A. I. Keynes concludes that "Otho A. I was the product and is thus the enduring symbol of a concerted programme of secular and ecclesiastical reform" guided by Cuthberht and Æthelbald in response to appeals from Boniface. It is essentially a Mercian collection probably assembled during the last decade of Æthelbald's reign, though the present manuscript is not likely the original.

Among shorter pieces, J.E. Cross and Andrew Hamer contribute "Source-Identification and Manuscript Recovery: the British Library Wulfstan MS. Cotton Nero A i, 131v–132r," *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), 132–37. Using photographs made possible by the Video Spectral Comparator at the British Library, Cross and Hamer were able to identify a number of readings from facing leaves where the writing had been obscured. This enabled identification of five items having sources in the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis* (1), the *Excerptiones Egberhti* A (3), and the *Capitularium Collectio* of Ansegius (1). They occur within a part of the MS copied in the early eleventh century, within a collection of ecclesiastical canons and moral statements. In "An Old English Fragment from Westminster Abbey," *ASE* 25 (1996), 201–07, R.I. Page transcribes a strip of parchment from an Old English manuscript, dating perhaps from the first half of the eleventh century. It is now identified as Westminster Abbey Muniment 67209, and Page shows that it preserves a fragment of an otherwise unrecorded composite homily. The first five lines are related to a short passage in Napier's Wulfstan homily XL, *In die iudicii*; the rest is close to part of the homily *In resurrectione Domini* from CCCC 41. These two elements also occur in extant Judgment Day homilies.

Sarah Larratt Keefer contributes an ambitious article entitled "Margin as Archive: the Liturgical Marginalia of a Manuscript of the Old English Bede," *Traditio* 51 (1996), 147–77, in which she describes and interprets the voluminous marginalia in CCCC 41. Although there seems to be no direct relationship between the marginalia and the Old English Bede, they may have been added relatively soon as a means of collecting disparate liturgical texts for later organization and use. This could have been done in a provincial center where vellum and exemplars were in short supply. Keefer organizes the materials into five sections according to the calendar, and

provides a diplomatic transcription and detailed analysis of each text from the Candlemas (Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary) sequence. She shows that the components of the service have been drawn from different texts that may have been idiosyncratic in themselves. The same is true to a lesser degree for the other sections. The marginalia, then, seem to represent a step in the process of liturgical compendia-making, from whence more orderly books arose. The Appendix provides an expanded version of the five prayers from the Candlemas sequence with variants from all known sources.

In another complex piece of detective work, Scott Gwara offers "Drypoint Glossing in a Tenth-Century Manuscript of Aldhelm's Prose Treatise on Virginity," *Traditio* 51 (1996), 99–145. In the second half of the tenth century, Aldhelm's prose work on virginity became one of the most studied books in Anglo-Saxon England and, owing to its difficult style, one of most copiously glossed. In addition to thousands of inked glosses, there were numerous scratched vernacular glosses more cryptic in nature. Gwara observes that these "record only a few initial, medial, or final letters from a word or word group, to help the reader either to recall the meaning of a Latin term, or to determine its function in the sentence" (pp. 100–101). The most comprehensive collection of unprinted drypoint vernacular glosses is found in one of three codices with Canterbury connections, BL MS. Royal 5 E.xi, late tenth century from Christ Church. Gwara provides a new description of the MS and an edition of the unpublished glosses. He argues that this tradition originated at Canterbury about 1025, where the glosses may have been used as study aids or pedagogical tools. The edition itself contains many words/variants of interest.

Further on the topic of glosses, Michael Gorman reviews *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10 (Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), in "Theodore of Canterbury, Hadrian of Nisida and Michael Lapidge," *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), 184–92. Gorman notes the extensive contributions that Lapidge has made in capturing the history of the traveling scholars and their importation of Mediterranean learning into England. On the other hand, he points out the limited influence that the Canterbury glosses of Theodore and Hadrian had on biblical exegesis and the pedestrian nature of many of their comments. As Gorman states, this volume provides a beginning for numerous lines of inquiry even as it reveals the limitations of the glosses themselves. In a brief note on CCC 41, Raymond J.S. Grant demonstrates that Matthew Parker copied a gloss to Book I, Chapter 1 of the Old English Bede from one in Cambridge, Univ. Library Kk.3.18 ["A Copied 'Tremulous' Worcester Gloss at Corpus," *NM* 97 (1996), 279–83]. The original gloss is contemporary with the "Tremulous Hand" of Worcester, which continues on with the Bede glossing in CUL Kk.3.18.

Bernard Meehan has written a beautifully illustrated volume, *The Book of Durrow: a Medieval Masterpiece at*

Trinity College, Dublin (Boulder, CO: R. Rinehart; Dublin, Town House, 1996). In brief chapters ranging from the background, history, date and origin of the MS through comparative analysis of its decoration, and finally to its rebinding in 1954, pigments and ink, and principles of design, Meehan surveys current scholarship and offers his opinions on these matters. In "The Lichfield Gospels: the Question of Provenance," *Parergon* n.s. 13.2 (1996), 121–36, Pamela James looks at the question of origin. After noting that Lichfield Cathedral took possession of the Gospels in the tenth century, and that in the ninth century the book had probably been in Wales, James moves to a comparison of various features with those of roughly contemporary productions from Northumbria, especially the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Book of Kells. She notes that both of these books were associated with local saints, whereas two important events in the second half of the eighth century commemorated St. Chad of Mercia, for whom such a Gospels would have been appropriate. Moreover, the type of cattle in Mercia and therefore the quality of vellum produced explains certain characteristics of the Lichfield Gospels as opposed to those from Northumbria. The vellum, the quiring, the layout of the text, the colored pigments, certain abbreviations, and even textual variants point away from Northumbria. More commonalities exist between the Lichfield Gospels and the Hereford Gospels than with other such books. To James, the evidence points towards the Welsh border for the place of origin, and she argues that Lichfield is the most likely location, from which the MS was stolen and then later returned. Janet Backhouse adds to her work on the Lindisfarne Gospels in "Outward and Visible Signs: the Lindisfarne Gospels," from *The Sense of the Sacramental*, ed. David Brown and Ann Loades (London, 1995), pp. 103–21. She begins by describing the decorative treatment in the MS and then moves to issues of date and origin, tied closely, of course, to the death and subsequent translation of St. Cuthbert in the late seventh century. She characterizes the role of Eadfrith as a craftsman and promoter of Cuthbert's cult, and notes that his exemplar must have been an Italian copy available at Wearmouth-Jarrow. Despite his aims for the highest quality, Eadfrith also included small imperfections as a sign of humility. There are also special touches in the MS that allude to Cuthbert's miracles concerning animals. Backhouse compares the Lindisfarne Gospels with contemporary productions and finds some commonalities which speak to the models and materials that were available to Eadfrith as he sought to honor St. Cuthbert. Lastly, Andrew Breeze contributes a note on the eighth-century gospel book from Christ Church, Canterbury (Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, MS A.135) in "The Stockholm 'Golden Gospels' in Seventeenth-Century Spain," *N&Q* 43 (1996), 395–97. Breeze reviews the evidence for the history of the codex post-Anglo-Saxon and concludes that, despite previous conjectures, it is obscure until January 1690 when the manuscript was purchased by Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeldt, the Swedish ambassador to Spain.

E.C. Teviotdale considers the issue of a Hereford origin of the Hereford, or Caligula, Troper in "The 'Hereford Troper' and Hereford," in *Medieval Art, Architecture, and Archaeology at Hereford*, ed. David Whitehead (London, 1995), pp. 75–81. Although the Troper has been assigned to Hereford on the basis of stylistic affinity with the gospel-lectionary in Cambridge, Pembroke College MS. 302, Teviotdale shows that there are far more differences than commonalities between the two. She notes particularly the use of color, the handling of the drapery and figures, elements of script, and the style of minor decoration as evidence that the two manuscripts were not produced coevally at the same center, and indeed may not be contemporaneous at all. For the time being, then, the origin of the Troper is unknown. K.D. Hartzell examines "An Early Missal Fragment in the British Library," *RB* 106 (1996), 308–18. This is a bifolium in BL Royal MS. 4 A.xiv which contains portions of the temporale for Passiontide (Thursday, Friday, and Saturday). After analyzing the prayers, the lessons, and the chants Hartzell concludes that this fragment of a *missale plenum* is from a Hadrianum-based missal in which the names of the Gregorian prayers have been changed perhaps because the scribe was unhappy with the usage he was given. Hartzell revises the dating to late ninth-century.

Roland Torkar calls our attention to two interesting short pieces following the Old English poem *Instructions for Christians* in "Two Latin Excerpts (*Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, and Isidore, *Sententiae*) with Old English Translation," *N&Q* 43 (1996), 389–94. These texts are found in Cambridge University Library MS. Ii.1.33 from the second half of the twelfth century, possibly from Ely. The first sentence is from the Canon of the Roman Mass; the second is from Isidore's *Sententiae*. Both the Latin and Old English are presented without break. In a sense they provide brief commentary on the preceding poem because both sentences "are concerned with the mystery of predestination and man's hope for salvation," major themes of the poem (p. 390). In the only article we shall consider on runes, Timothy Graham investigates "A Runic Entry in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript from Abingdon and the Scandinavian Career of Abbot Rodulf (1051–2)," *Nottingham Med. Stud.* 40 (1996), 16–24. CCC 57, a late tenth/early eleventh-century copy of the Rule of St. Benedict and other Benedictine texts has an early history at abbey of St. Mary at Abingdon, whether or not it was copied there. A runic entry was made on f. 30v in drypoint which seems to present a personal name, hauarp. Graham links the inscription to the abbacy of Abingdon in 1051–2 to one Rodulf, who had served for many years as a bishop in Scandinavia. However, nothing further is known of the individual named in the inscription. E. Ann Matter makes some excellent observations about the importance of manuscript context for understanding texts in "A Carolingian Schoolbook? The Manuscript Tradition of Alcuin's *De fide* and Related Treatises," in *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (Ann

Arbor, MI, 1996), pp. 145–53. Matter's concern is with preserving the tradition of the miscellaneous collections of the works of Alcuin in Carolingian order when they are published in *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis*. As such, they seem to represent a schoolbook of theology, and should be understood in this format. The importance of Bede as an influence on the continent is the subject of Michael Idomir Allen's essay on "Bede and Frechulf at Medieval St Gallen" in *Beda Venerabilis*, ed. Houwen and MacDonald, pp. 61–80. Allen considers the inventory of the St Gallen library c. 880, along with certain surviving manuscripts, and concludes that, as late as the thirteenth century, Bede was studied and appreciated in the variety of his works available at St Gallen.

Two articles on Breton manuscripts appeared in 1996. In "Des recueils d'interprétation de noms hébreux (suite)," *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), 117–22, Patrick McGurk and Olivier Szerwiniack publish a list of Hebrew names for the evangelist Luke found on fol. 106r–v of BL Royal MS. I.A.xviii. These are compared briefly with the lists from eleven other manuscripts published by Szerwiniack in *Scriptorium* 48 (1994), pp. 216–27. McGurk provides a further description of the Royal manuscript and offers additional evidence in a punctuation mark and the wording of incipits to strengthen the attribution to Brittany in the late ninth/early tenth century. In "The Tenth-Century List of Cornish Parochial Saints' Names in Codex Vaticanus Reg. Lat. 191," *Parergon* n.s. 13.2 (1996), 179–81, B. Lynnette Olson publishes a photograph of fol. 105r of the manuscript. Her purpose is to demonstrate that the tenth-century Insular scribe who corrected two earlier Breton Caroline texts went on to add the list of forty-eight Cornish saints at the end of those texts, though his purpose in doing so remains a puzzle.

A number of items on diplomatic appear in this year's review. A dispute settlement written in the margins of the Lichfield Gospels is the subject of an essay by Glanville R. Jones entitled "'Tir Telych', the Gwestfau of Cynwyl Gaeo and Cwmwd Caec," *Studia Celtica* 28 (1994), 81–95. His goal is to identify the land named "Tir Telych" which was the subject of the memorandum written c. 830–50. Based upon historical and geographical analysis, Jones concludes that the land in dispute resulted from course changes in the river Cothi, the site of early Roman gold workings. Alluvial deposits, at least, remained, hence it became the subject of various tenurial claims from a series of petty kings. These came to be recorded in the Gospel book before it reached Lichfield. Colin Flight treats some disputes over bookland in "Four Vernacular Texts from the Pre-Conquest Archive of Rochester Cathedral," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 115 (1996 for 1995), 121–53. The four documents vary in status with two having been drawn up in the presence of witnesses and two having been drawn up on behalf of the bishop or church of Rochester. Whereas the formal documents are a will and the settlement of a dispute, the others are narratives of long-running disagreements concerning estates to which Rochester had some claim. Flight reviews the history of each of the disputed

estates and examines associated charters that help to throw light on the vicissitudes of ownership. The primary estates treated are Snodland, Bromley, and Wouldham.

Alexander R. Rumble pursues "The Known Manuscripts of the Burghal Hidage," in *The Defense of Wessex*, ed. Hill and Rumble, pp. 36–59. He describes the manuscript tradition of the *stemma* versions A and B, and notes that no full copy of A has survived in an Anglo-Saxon or medieval manuscript, though seven copies of version B are known to exist today. In fact, the earliest surviving witness to version A is the burned BL, Cotton MS. Otho B. xi, the subject of a subsequent note (pp. 59–68) by Patrick Wormald in the same volume. Wormald reviews the contents of the MS as we now know them, describes the relationship to the Parker manuscript, and suggests that the Burghal Hidage was included in this collection of historical materials because it was already seen as an historical monument, the earliest administrative record of English government that survives. In an other chapter entitled "Diplomatic Sub-sections" (pp. 69–74), Rumble describes the component parts of the Burghal Hidage as a document. These include the list of fortifications (in A and B); the calculations relating to the establishment and upkeep of a fortification (A only); and an Appendix in the B version containing the total number of hides in the list of fortifications and additional fiscal statistics for Wessex, Worcester and Warwick.

The past several years have seen the publishing of rediscovered Anglo-Saxon archives from the papers of antiquarians who had copied them. Another such discovery is announced by A.H.J. Baines in "Monks Risborough: New Light from Islington," *Records of Buckinghamshire* 36 (1996 for 1994). 98–102. In a transcript made by John Selden (1584–1654), we find a third tenth-century confirmation charter from a St. Paul's cartulary. In "Late Copies of Anglo-Saxon Charters," *Studies in English Language and Literature*, ed. Toswell and Tyler, pp. 42–70, Christine Franzen takes two charters from Bury St Edmunds that have survived in multiple copies, though not in the originals, arranges their texts historically, and tries to trace the development of Middle English through the successive versions. Unfortunately, the changes in language are not as clear-cut as one would hope for. As Franzen concludes, "The various copies, which in a number of cases appear to be roughly contemporary and from the same region, often appear to give contradictory evidence. The approaches as well are highly individual and show vastly differing levels of comprehension." (p. 68)

1996 also saw the publication of the fifth volume in the Anglo-Saxon Charters series, *Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey*, ed. S. E. Kelly (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. press for the British Academy, 1996). This volume follows the general format of its predecessors. It begins with a brief history of the nunnery at Shaftesbury, founded and endowed by King Alfred before 893. His daughter Æthelgifu became the first abbess, and Shaftesbury continued its close ties to the West Saxon dynasty until the Conquest. The pre-Conquest archive in-

cludes thirty documents: twenty-nine royal diplomas granting or confirming land, and one dispute settlement. These are preserved as copies in BL MS. Harley 61 from the early fifteenth century, where they seem to have been copied from one or more earlier cartularies rather than from original documents. Although they are grouped together at the beginning of the manuscript (fols. 1–22r), the pre-Conquest documents are not arranged in any logical order. The texts themselves are generally poor, a result of repeated copying. Kelly reviews the authenticity of the charters, a high proportion of which appear to be reliable, and discusses the diploma types that are represented in the collection. The introduction concludes with an assessment of Shaftesbury's endowments at the time of the Conquest. Kelly presents the text of each document followed by extensive and enlightening commentary that not only helps to understand the material at hand but also places it in the larger context of Anglo-Saxon diplomatic. For example, regarding item 1, the dispute settlement, Kelly points out that it is one of a very few early diplomas which refers to a formal ceremony, in this case sods from the land in question being placed on a gospel book. Scholars without a specific interest in these documents will profit from reading these analyses. The apparatus includes useful glossaries of Old English and Latin terms from the documents.

Another important EEMF edition appeared in 1996, *The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey Winchester: British Library Stowe 944, Together with Leaves from British Library Cotton Vespasian A.VIII and British Library Cotton Titus D.XXVII*, ed. Simon Keynes, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 26 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1996). Commissioned by Abbot Ælfwine and written at New Minster in 1031 by the monk Ælfsige, the manuscript BL Stowe 944 preserves the corporate memory of the community in the *Liber Vitae*, a combination of records and liturgical materials. Its purpose was to commemorate individuals who had entered into confraternity with the community and to have a place where additional names could be entered. The book is of special interest because of its prefatory statements indicating how it would be used during celebration of the mass, its liturgical texts, and materials related to New Minster's patronage by West Saxon kings. Other components of the manuscript include prefatory drawings (King Cnut and Queen Ælfgifu, the Last Judgment), an historical preface known as the "New Minster Foundation Charter" in the voice of King Edgar, and records that indicate the book was in use until the early sixteenth century. In the introduction, Keynes provides an overview of the New Minster from its founding by Edward the Elder to the Dissolution of Hyde Abbey in 1539. He also provides comparative information from contemporary foundations in England and places the book in context with two other manuscripts known to have been commissioned by Ælfwine and copied at least partly by Ælfsige: Ælfwine's Prayerbook (BL MSS. Cotton Titus D. xxvii and Titus D. xxvi) to which Keynes devotes an appendix, and the Trinity Computus (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS. R.15.32). Full

descriptions of the contents of Stowe 944 and a thorough bibliography complete the volume. Also on the subject of the *Liber Vitae*, María José Mora Sena writes "The Power of the Keys: a Parallel to the Line Drawings in BL MS Stowe 944," *SELIM* 3 (19913), 57–71. Line drawings on fol. 7r have traditionally been interpreted as the Last Judgment. Mora Sena connects them, however, to a twelfth-century Latin miracle regarding a monk of St. Peter's at Cologne. By this interpretation, the scene depicts St. Peter "brandishing his key to frighten away the devil and regain the damned soul." (p. 59) This illustrates the power of absolution granted by Christ to Peter and the Church.

And yet another volume (10) in the collaborative edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle appeared in 1996, *The Abingdon Chronicle, A.D. 956–1066 (MS. C. with Reference to BDE)*, ed. Patrick W. Conner (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996). Here Conner presents the materials that constitute Abingdon's probable contribution to the Chronicle, some of which draw on two Abingdon cartularies, or their sources, for local information. After providing a brief history of Abingdon abbey, Conner describes the four Chronicle manuscripts that contain texts derived from a single source. These are BL MSS. Cotton Tiberius A.vi, fols. 1–35 and Tiberius A.iii, fol. 178 (B); BL MS. Cotton Tiberius B.iv (D); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Laud Misc. 636 (E); and BL MS. Cotton Tiberius B.i (C). Because C is the largest repository of Abingdon materials in the chronicle tradition, it serves as the base text of the edition. In his analysis, Conner analyzes the C text in segments, showing, for example, that C and B were copied from a common exemplar with entries through 946. From this detailed paleographical evidence, Conner concludes that "In or about 1044, much of the extant MS. C was written for Abingdon, probably as a project for the house; the copyists probably compiled MS. C from several sources which did not include MS.B." (p. xxxiv) The exemplar in 1044 was an updated copy from which B was made some sixty-six years earlier. Annals from 983–1048 were added from an exemplar shared with E. D used C as a base text, and they share unique entries for 1065 and 1066. Conner then lists the annals between 956 and 1066 which contain Abingdon materials and notes that every poem in the Chronicle occurs in C within an Abingdon context. Finally, he provides an edition of the reconstructed text of those Abingdon annals in C. There is obviously much food for thought in this ambitious study which overturns some previously-held theories about the relationships among the Chronicle manuscripts.

For the first time in this reviewer's memory, we have an article on maps in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: "World Maps and Easter Tables: Medieval Maps in Context," *Imago Mundi* 48 (1996), 25–42, by Evelyn Edson. In this copiously illustrated study, Edson provides a brief background to the development of Easter tables within the computus and then of the types of illustrations that appear in these manuscripts. One relatively rare type of map, rich in geographical detail, has its earliest appearance in Vat. Lat. MS. 6018, late eighth century.

Bede is not mentioned in this computus, but the map preceding it shows three large continents with the Mediterranean in the center, and more than 130 names included. The Anglo-Saxon map in BL MS. Cotton Tiberius B.v, vol. 1, fol. 56v (c. 1050, perhaps from Winchester) is linked by the scribe to Priscian's translation of the "Periegesis" of Dionysius. It is also loosely connected to two other works in the manuscript, an account of Archbishop Sigeric's itinerary on his return to Canterbury in 990 from Rome (the four stops in Italy), and the Marvels of the East (five marvels shown). These are just a few of the map's interesting features, set as it is amongst materials concerned with the measurement of time and space. The third, post-Conquest, example considered by Edson appears in Oxford, St. John's College, MS. 17, fol. 6, made in 1110 at Thorney abbey. This world map contains 47 names, almost half of them biblical. With its perpendicular arrangement of place names, this version resembles some of the charts found elsewhere in the manuscript. Edson observes that these three maps show a trend towards increasing biblical content, as if the association with the computus pulled their depictions of space into representing time as well.

The Harley Psalter, Cambridge Stud. in Palaeography and Codicology, 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996) by William Noel provides a comprehensive view and interpretation of this puzzling Anglo-Saxon book. Now BL MS. Harley 603, this illustrated Psalter was executed over more than one hundred years from about the mid-eleventh through mid-twelfth centuries at (as Noel demonstrates) Christ Church, Canterbury. Its exemplar for the illustrations and a small portion of the text was the Utrecht Psalter. In chapters dealing with the division of work among artists and scribes analyzed at the level of quires, Noel explores the differing methods apparent in the manuscript. He concludes that certain quires were ruled by artists who gave priority to the illustrations, and others were ruled by scribes who provided sufficient room for a well-displayed text along with space for illustrations. Next Noel addresses the sequence, dates and place of production of the Harley Psalter. He argues that as quire 1 was in the process of completion, the Utrecht Psalter was disbound to allow for more efficient copying. Indeed, the need to make progress is evident in certain features from the early stages of the manuscript. A number of factors, including the demonstrated presence of the Utrecht and Harley Psalters at Christ Church, Canterbury in the twelfth century and the connection of specific Harley scribes and artists, including Eadui Basan, with that same foundation, points to Christ Church as the place of origin for the Harley Psalter. In his analysis, Noel proposes solutions to some of Harley's puzzles. He shows, for example, how, despite the use of the Roman Psalter text elsewhere in Harley, the artist-scribe of quire 9 followed the Utrecht Psalter so closely that he even copied its Gallican text into his portion of the work. The text in general seems to have been secondary to the cycle of illustrations, meant for study by someone who already knew the Psalms thoroughly. With a picture of an archbishop on fol. 2r, the

manuscript may have been designed for Æthelnoth, the first monk to be elevated to the position at Canterbury (1020) after the time of Dunstan. Noel succeeds in demonstrating the complexity of the production of the Harley Psalter and providing insight into its production and purpose. Although it draws on the Utrecht Psalter, the Harley Psalter is a distinct book, having different aims, that now can be more fully appreciated.

Apropos of the preceding volume under review, M.J. Toswell has written about another mid-eleventh century Psalter from Anglo-Saxon England in "The Format of Bibliothèque Nationale MS. Lat. 8824: the Paris Psalter," *N&Q* 43 (1996), 130–33. This Psalter is, unusually for Anglo-Saxon books, a tall narrow volume. It is laid out in two columns, with the proportion of column width to height of writing space at 1:10. A Roman Psalter with facing translation in Old English, the columns actually keep in step with each other and leave blank space where necessary to maintain this. Words are divided inappropriately at the ends of lines in both texts. Toswell demonstrates the unusual nature of this format and proposes that, because of a number of awkward features, the manuscript may be the first attempt at this arrangement of a Psalter. In another article about interesting manuscript features, Timothy Graham writes "The Poetic, Scribal and Artistic Work of Ieuan ap Sulien in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 199: Addenda and Assessment," *Nat. Lib. Of Wales Jnl* 29 (1996), 241–56. Sometime between 1085 and 1091 the scribal artist Ieuan ap Sulien wrote this manuscript at Llanbadarn Fawr (Cardiganshire), in which his own Latin verses surround a copy of Augustine's *De Trinitate*: they precede, follow, and appear in some upper margins of the text. Graham publishes a new verse and more complete versions of two others, all of which appear in the margins of the manuscript, and then discusses the Irish influence he sees on Ieuan's work. Within this context he notes especially Ieuan's use of construe marks, *Adit* glosses, and "knotted wire" initials which characterize this important example of his accomplishments.

In "Building on Belief: the Use of Sacred Geometry and Number Theory in the Book of Kells, f. 33r," *Parergon* n.s. 13.2 (1996), 121–36, Megan M. Hitchens explores the reasons behind the geometric methods employed by Insular scribes, so ably elucidated by Robert D. Stevick and others. Hitchens reminds us of the sacred meaning attached to various numbers and, in particular, uses this information to analyze elements of the carpet page on fol. 33r of the Book of Kells. Various passages from the New Testament contain implicit instructions to scribe-illuminators to ensure that Christ is the foundation stone of their design. Therefore each page in Insular manuscripts is thought to be based upon a square built from a cross and a circle, the circle representing God and the square the four corners of the earth. Regarding the Kells carpet page in question, the six components of the cross relate to the Crucifixion and the eight medallions allude to the Resurrection. The page itself is located just after Matthew 1:17 in the text, recounting Christ's genealogy and

Nativity. According to Hitchens, the use of the interlocking circles known as the *vesica piscis* on this page makes Christ the foundation of the design and enables the expression of the spiritual through the physical form. Cross-carpet pages from the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Book of Kells provide touchstones for Robert W. Bagley in "Meaning and Explanation," *Archives of Asian Art* 46 (1993), 6–26. In seeking to address problems of meaning in Shang bronzes, Bagley adduces animal decoration in Insular manuscripts to raise the kind of questions one should ask. He thinks that the issue of antecedents is important along with function of the images and symbolic meaning. Among other points, Bagley argues that we today can feel much of the same visual power from the images that their creators did even if we, and perhaps they, do not understand why they were chosen.

Edwin N. Gorsuch has published a pair of articles applying his approach to illuminations in different manuscripts: "Emotional Expression in a Manuscript of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*: British Library Cotton Tiberius A XIV," *Semiotica* 83 (1991), 227–49 and "Emotional Expression in an Early Medieval Manuscript: British Library, Cotton Vespasian A I," in *Worldmaking*. Ed. William Pencak, *Critic of Institutions*, 6 (New York, 1996), pp. 23–56. Gorsuch argues in both pieces that Anglo-Saxon artists could and did on occasion react to the content of the material they were illustrating. Even decorated capital initials can be shown, he believes, to embody the artist's emotional response, and he elucidates the sign systems within which individual artists sought expression. The shapes, colors, and decorations of the letters communicate a message. An example of his approach is the identification of the "eared cat" motif, whereby using hairlines and other flourishes the artist may be evoking a cat, and thereby a sense of evil, when he draws a capital H. In "Interaction of Word and Image in Anglo-Saxon Art I: Pointing the Story in the Old English Illustrated Hexateuch," *OEN* 30.1 (1996), 20–23, Benjamin Withers argues that physical spaces created by the opposition of versos and rectos of the open manuscript, BL Cotton Claudius B.iv, frame statements in the text. This practice is reinforced by the depiction of hand gestures in the illustrations to direct our attention to certain passages.

In another perspective on the components of Anglo-Saxon art, E.C. Teviotdale writes "Latin Verse Inscriptions in Anglo-Saxon Art," *Gesta* 35 (1996), 99–110. Teviotdale discusses the nineteen paintings and drawings in seven manuscripts, one carved stone, and one engraved portable altar where newly composed Latin verse inscriptions are included. She argues that the Anglo-Saxons understood this poetry as a written and visual art form. One example cited is that of the figure of St. Dunstan on the frontispiece of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Auct. F.4.32 (St. Dunstan's Classbook), where the poem representing his prayer is placed directly above the figure of Dunstan, prostrate before Christ. And to conclude, Richard Gameson contributes an essay to *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, pp. 95–144, entitled "English Manuscript Art in the Late Eleventh Century:

Canterbury and its Context." In this lengthy study, Gameson investigates the post-Conquest efflorescence of manuscripts particularly in Canterbury, and contrasts the productions and styles of Christ Church and St. Augustine's. He points out that, early on, there were relatively few Normans in the scriptoria, but their styles might be imported via loaned books as the new leadership sought to expand monastic libraries on Norman models with patristic texts. In this evolving situation—as regards script styles, decoration, and physical features—Christ Church tended to adopt Norman practices more quickly, with uneven results, whereas St. Augustine's

continued its older traditions and innovated more slowly, thereby producing more handsome books. The essay is copiously illustrated with plates from the relevant manuscripts. In an Appendix, Gameson sets out lists of selected examples from the two Canterbury centers according to features of preparation and layout, thereby providing an overview of the differences he discusses within his analysis. In so doing he provides new detail about the transition between Anglo-Saxon and Romanesque styles of book production in post-Conquest England.

M.P.R.

6. History and Culture

[Editor's note: "History and Culture" for 1996 will appear in two parts: the first below, and the second as an appendix to "The Year's Work" for 1997.]

a. General Interest

THREE BOOKS covering the entire Anglo-Saxon period appeared in 1996. Diana Greenway has produced for the Oxford Medieval Text series the first complete edition and translation of Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford Univ. Press). It is superb in every respect. Henry of Huntingdon was one of the great twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historians who preserved (and transformed) the Anglo-Saxon past. His *Historia* weaves together a continuous narrative history of England from the coming of the Romans to Britain to the death of King Stephen in 1154 from quotations, summaries, and translations taken from other authors, rounded out by stories derived, probably, from oral tradition. For the Anglo-Saxon period, he relied heavily on Bede and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (using both the E and C recensions), the latter accounting for about 40% of the entire work. But Henry did not slavishly follow his sources. Rather, as Greenway persuasively argues in "Authority, Convention and Observation in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*," *Anglo-Norman Stud.* 18 (1996), 105–21, Henry transformed his materials through the devices of rhetoric, which are "not merely decorative" but "pervade the whole text—its conception and structure, as well as its language. . . . He sees meaning and pattern everywhere in history, as God's purposes are worked out. His account of the past is conceived and expressed as interpretation, wrapped in literary convention, rather than objective record" (110). As Greenway observes in the introduction to her edition, the *Historia* "was intended both to inform and to reform its readers" (lxvi). But moralist as he was, Henry is also a "good read." He is the source of a number of popular tales that constituted 'history' for many English schoolchildren of the previous century (and some of the best material in *1066 and All That*), including the story of how Cnut demonstrated the emptiness of earthly power by futilely ordering the tide not to rise (vi.17), and how Henry I, defying

his doctors, died from a fatal dinner of lampreys (vii.47).

As with other editions in this series, Greenway provides the Latin text with a facing translation. The edition is introduced with a biography of Henry that discusses his education, his activities as archdeacon, and his involvement in ecclesiastical politics. She follows this with a lucid and persuasive discussion of Henry's themes, demonstrating how he wove together his sources so that they would tell the story of the unification of the English monarchy according to a theoretical model in which "disorder and war give way to rule by a king, and wars between petty kings end in rule by a stronger king over a larger kingdom" (lx). Most impressive, however, is her reconstruction of the chronology of composition (lxvi–lxxvii), her analysis of the text's complex manuscript history and transmission (cxvii–clx), and, of course, the edition itself, which successfully reconstructs Henry's sixth and final version, that of 1154, "showing its evolution through its various stages of composition" (clxii). Students of the twelfth century will be especially grateful for Greenway's restoration of books viii and ix, excluded from the 1879 edition in the Rolls Series. These contain Henry's letters to King Henry I, Warin the Breton and Archdeacon Walter, and a book of English miracles essential for understanding the author's theme and purpose. An appendix contains Henry's extant charters. In short, this is an outstanding work of scholarship that belongs on the shelf of every historian of medieval England.

For a number of years now Simon Keynes of Trinity College, Cambridge University, has been performing an invaluable service to Anglo-Saxonists by maintaining and revising *Anglo-Saxon History: a Select Bibliography*. Though I was asked to review the 11th edition as part of the Year's Work for 1996, there seems little point in doing so, for the bibliography is now conveniently available on the internet at <http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/rawl/keynes1/home.htm>. Keynes has structured the bibliography both chronologically and thematically. Each of these categories is further subdivided, with entries arranged chronologically (for the most part). Although modestly titled "a Select Bibliography," there are few substantial omissions through November 1998, when it

was last revised. The site, designed by Gregory Beckelhymer, is easy to navigate and has a useful index of authors but would have been much improved by the addition of a search engine.

Apart from a few short comments, Keynes' bibliography is not annotated. One regrets this; given Keynes' powers of insight, familiarity with the sources, and judicious temperament, an annotated bibliography prepared by him would be of service to student and scholar alike. Larry W. Usilton, *The Kings of Medieval England, c. 560–1485: A Survey and Research Guide* (Landham MD, and London: Scarecrow), tries to fill this need, at least for the study of medieval English kings. He fails. This book is of questionable value even for its intended audience, undergraduates in general surveys of medieval England. The books and handful of articles that he includes in chapter 1 (c. 560–1066) is a mixed bag of serious scholarship and popular accounts, without sufficient distinction drawn between them. The method of selection does not strike me as particularly well thought out. Why include Murray Beaven's 1918 article on the beginning of the year in the *Alfredian Chronicle* and not Kenneth Harrison's important *The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History* (1976) and Janet Bately's magisterial studies of the *Chronicle*? Some of the omissions are, frankly, startling. To find entries for Christopher Brooke's two general surveys of English medieval history and none for any work by Eric John and David Dumville is puzzling to say the least. Even more troubling is the decision to omit references to primary sources apart from Bede's *Historia* and *The Life of King Edward*. How can one take seriously a "research guide" that does not include entries for Asser, the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, or even the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*? The author's decision to list the works alphabetically rather than by reign or date of composition lessens the value even further.

The one survey of Anglo-Saxon history published in 1996 is Eric John's *Reassessing Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press; New York: St. Martin's). As the publisher's blurb on the book reads, "John is one of the most distinguished and provocative of Anglo-Saxonists." He is arguably the most original voice to emerge in Anglo-Saxon historical studies in the generation that followed Stenton. Though sometimes wrong, John has always been stimulating and thoughtful. Those who know and admire his *Land Tenure in Early England* (1960) and *Orbis Britanniae* (1966), as well as his numerous essays on topics as diverse as Beowulf, the Benedictine Reform, and Edward the Confessor and the Norman succession, will find familiar topics and themes here. What one will not find, unfortunately, is the *magnum opus* that summarizes John's distinguished career. The title is a play on words, recalling Sir Frank Stenton's magisterial *Anglo-Saxon England*, and John in his preface makes his peace with his great predecessor (if not with all his followers, of whom he says, "Loyal and devoted they were, but there is precious little evidence that they read him much, still less understood him" (xi)). This comment is typical of John's style in the book, chatty, at times informal, and, occasionally, querulous. John's apparent intention was to reassess Anglo-Saxon history by

approaching its society and politics anthropologically and by placing "the entire Anglo-Saxon experience in its European setting" (2). There is little evidence in these pages, however, that John has read any anthropology after Evans-Pritchard. He is better at providing a Continental perspective, but does so less surely and expertly than, for instance, James Campbell and Patrick Wormald, his co-authors in *The Anglo-Saxons* (1982) (still the best overall survey of Anglo-Saxon history). There is no systematic attempt to "reassess" either Stenton's book, Anglo-Saxon history in general, or, most tellingly, John's own earlier work. Rather, the reader finds John riding some of his old hobby horses. In chapter one, for instance, he repeats his view that the *brytenwealda* was an office possessed with hegemonic power. A note reveals that he has read Patrick Wormald's article contesting this interpretation, but he neither explains nor refutes Wormald's argument for a minimalist position. Nor does he engage David Kirby's and Barbara Yorke's books on kingship and the early kingdoms, both published well before this book went to print, let alone the researches of archaeologists (to which he seems completely indifferent). John's lack of contact with recent trends in scholarship is apparent throughout. It leads him to make assertions such as: "The majority of scholars have felt that [*Beowulf*] is eighth-century but there is a marked difference between those who think it is early eighth-century [his view] . . . and those who think it belongs to the late eighth century" (43–44). His citations for the controversy over the dating of the poem are to Whitelock and Busse and Holtei, though he does casually note that since 1981 "a number of other studies have appeared arguing for a late date for *Beowulf*" (48). The endnotes tend to be chatty, entertaining, and unhelpful. They are placed haphazardly. Rather than directing the reader to the evidence that might support his assertions, John uses them to criticize the opinions of other scholars. It is clear from some of the comments that he wrote the notes some time after completing the text. Even more problematic is the question of intended audience. The book fails as a survey of Anglo-Saxon political history for undergraduates because it assumes too much prior knowledge. Nor does it seem to have been written for a specialist audience, since it treads so much familiar terrain while adding little that is new. In short, this is a disappointing effort from one of the great Anglo-Saxon historians of our time.

A geographically narrower, but ultimately more satisfying survey is Charles Phythian-Adams, *Land of the Cumbrians: a Study in British Provincial Origins A.D. 400–1200* (Aldershot, Hants: Scolar; Brookfield, VT: Ashgate). Applying to "his native heath," the Celtic north-west, the methods that W.G. Hoskins and his successors in the Department of English Local History at the University of Leicester pioneered in landscape studies of the Midlands, Phythian-Adams attempts to reconstruct the history of English Cumbria, the region that comprises Cumberland and the original Westmorland, over eight centuries. Phythian-Adams treats English Cumbria as an identifiable "cultural province" within a natural region,

which was divided by geography and topography into two subcultures, that of the vale of Eden and of the Cumberland littoral. His aim in writing this book was to disentangle boundaries "in terms of their importance, chronology, and readjustment in order to discover how and when the territorial subdivisions of the region (and hence the societies inhabiting them) evolved" (19). Because the border runs through this region, Cumbria "for both English and Scottish historians . . . [has been] relegated to the margins of historical discussion except when that concentrates—and then but rarely—on the specific and therefore geographically restricted theme of 'frontier societies' in the border zone" (16). Another reason becomes amply clear from reading this book: the lack of historical sources. Only the southernmost tip of Cumberland was surveyed in Domesday Book. If this were not daunting enough, there is but a single pre-Norman Cumbrian document, a writ issued after 1055 by Gospatrick (whom Phythian-Adams identifies as the son of Maldred rather than Uhtred, as has usually been thought). The author does a remarkable job in unpacking the historical information in this writ (138–52, 173–83), but this is not a book based on documentary sources. Rather, Phythian-Adams relies on what he terms "forms of extensive evidence," place-name evidence tested against geology, topography, Roman road patterns, pagan and Christian cemeteries, and whatever archaeological evidence he can find (Cumbria is poor even in that) from which he gradually weaves "a gossamer-like web of inferences" (19). From this unpromising material the author reconstructs a settlement and political history of the region that is significantly at odds with the prevailing consensus as represented most prominently by Kenneth Jackson and G.W.S. Barrow. Perhaps the most interesting section of the book is that which deals with the transformation of the British kingdom of Rheged into a part of the Northumbrian kingdom. Emphasizing continuity, Phythian-Adams finds that the fifth-century British kingdom of Rheged was organized on the basis of a number of Romano-British power centers, the most important of which was Carlisle. This pattern of territorial subdivisions, according to Phythian-Adams, shaped all subsequent territorial development until the Norman settlement. The survival of British place names suggests that the Anglian takeover in the early seventh century, which only occurred after piecemeal Anglian penetration and settlement, did not entail, as has been thought, the replacement of the native population. In fact, the Angles "perpetuated British arrangements and intensified further the already established contrasted characters of the region's various subdivisions" (168). Even after its submission to Eadwin, Rheged may still have continued to be ruled by native subkings, and it was probably not until the reign of Ecgrif that the Solway region became formally a part of the *imperium* of Bernicia. "The outcome seems to have been a mixed population, in which Anglian religious culture formally triumphed . . . but which otherwise contrived its social being within what can only be described as an Anglo-Celtic polity" (106).

Similarly, the Scandinavian settlement of the littoral after

920 was relatively peaceful.

Phythian-Adams follows the subsequent fortunes of this region as it passed back and forth between Northumbrian and Scottish control in the tenth and eleventh centuries, until the Normans took firm control over Cumbria in 1092, when the Norman settlement, according to the author, overturned all previous territorial arrangements.

This is an interesting though difficult book. Unless one is expert in place-name studies, it is difficult to assess the strength of the author's arguments and the validity of his conclusions. How is the general reader, for example, to judge his assertion that the absence of place names including the *ham* element cannot be explained by subsequent renaming, because "*ham* names seem to have been extraordinarily durable, and especially so in areas of heavy later Scandinavianization [*sic*]" (88)? Since the arguments in the book are built upon assertions such as this, one sometimes gets the impression of a house of cards. The style of writing does not help matters. Phythian-Adams' prose is often contorted and given to jargon. I found myself reading paragraphs over again in futile attempt to grasp a point. But the book is well worth the effort for what it reveals not only in particular about the history of the Celtic north-west but, more generally, about historical continuity and the transformation of Roman and sub-Roman Britain into medieval England and Scotland.

Despite its title, a number of articles in *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages* (London and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press), ed. Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath, touch upon Anglo-Saxon history, society, and institutions. Two in particular command attention, Susan Reynolds' "English Towns" (271–82), and Christopher Dyer's "Lords, Peasants, and the Development of the Manor: England, 900–1280" (301–15). This volume, the result of a comparative history symposium sponsored by the German Historical Institute in London in 1988, is intended to be a comparative study of significant issues and topics in German and English medieval history. It is not that, since the articles in it deal exclusively with either England or Germany, so that the reader is forced to draw the comparisons that one would have expected from the scholars involved. The purpose of the volume also dictated to a large extent the character of the articles, which are more 'state of the question' pieces than presentations of new scholarship. Susan Reynolds, however, escapes the trap by giving one of her patented attacks on the current state of historical research. "This essay was meant to survey the present position of work on English 'town communities,'" she admits, "[but] it seems to have turned into an attack on what has been done and a demand, which may seem arrogant, for it to be done differently" (282). Reynolds sees current scholarship as reflecting "the preoccupations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" with corporate status, oligarchy and democracy, closed patriciates and craft guilds, with controversies over between free trade and protection, and rights of free association, none of which she sees as particularly important to "climate of ideas . . . detectable in medieval sources" (273). Much of the scholarly discussion about the

legal status of towns, Reynolds maintains in an argument that she has used before on various occasions, is sheer nonsense because it assumes "that words were always used with the same, and invariably exact and consistent, meanings" (275). In other words, *we* have made words such as *burgus* and its vernacular equivalents into technical terms when they were nothing of the sort. Our search for the origins of modern categories has misled us at every step. Take, for example, the case of urban liberties. These, Reynolds points out, were the consequences, not the cause, of town community and collective activity. Historians, similarly, insist upon regarding guilds as primarily economic associations, whereas in the early Middle Ages they seem to have normally been "voluntary clubs, of which the primary function seems to have been drinking" along with the performance of religious ceremonies, especially burials (278). And any attempt to discover the origin of the urban patriciate must contend with the fact that "patrician" is not a word that was used at the time. Our obsession with the dichotomy between oligarchy and democracy, she opines, was not shared by those who wrote our sources. It is clear from Reynolds's piece what her objections are. It is not nearly as clear how she thinks urban history ought to be written, though one might guess that the emphases would not be on institutions and economic categories.

Christopher Dyer's article is more conventional, tracing the development of manors from 900 to 1280. He does not posit a unilinear development, but emphasizes the complexity and variation involved in the process. "It is perhaps more fruitful," he observes, "to think of manorial structures in a 'steady state', with new manors arising to replace those that decayed, rather than to assume a 'big bang' at an early date, perhaps in the seventh century, or the ninth, from which all subsequent developments flowed" (302). The Anglo-Saxon period in particular he finds to be one of contradictory tendencies. The most interesting of his observations has to do with the development of that staple of agrarian history, the nucleated village. The nucleated village, it now appears based on archaeological evidence, developed in England much later than once thought, between the ninth and twelfth centuries. Many of them, moreover, were carefully laid out according to a regular plan. The implications of these discoveries are unclear. In some cases, especially in the north after its recovery from the devastation of William's armies, these planned villages were the handiwork of manorial lords. But in the south the situation seems quite a bit different. Here some village communities even took over the management of manors as collective leasees in the eleventh century. In such cases, the regularly planned village is "evidence not of close seigniorial control but of the limitations of manorial lords, who had to deal with a strong and coherent village community" (306-7).

b. Late Roman and Celtic Britain and the Early Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms

MICHAEL JONES, *The End of Roman Britain* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1996) is an imaginative and provocative study of the collapse of Roman Britain, written in

an engaging style, filled with amusing and wry metaphors, similes, and literary allusions. Until recently, this critical topic has not received the attention it deserves, treated most often either as an epilogue in histories of Roman Britain or as a prologue to studies of Anglo-Saxon England. The question that Jones addresses—"why of all the provinces long occupied by Rome did Britain alone retain so slight an imprint of Roman civilization?" (1)—is historically important, and the answer that he proposes, that Roman Britain was not overwhelmed by a massive Anglo-Saxon invasion but was destroyed primarily from within, as a result of native disaffection, is plausible and well argued. Although I am not convinced that the Anglo-Saxons were quite so irrelevant to the collapse of Roman Britain as Jones would have it ("The Anglo-Saxons and the destruction of Roman Britain are in the same relation as lobsters and Lewis Carroll's 'Lobster Quadrille'—the figure may be danced without them" [253]), the author does effectively challenge the current orthodoxy that portrays Britain as a highly Romanized and loyal province abandoned by a weakened imperial administration to the ravages of barbarians. Whether or not one agrees entirely with his conclusions, Jones has written a significant and original work of scholarship that is certain to stimulate discussion in academic circles.

There is much that is good about this book. Jones's study of the environmental crisis faced by the Britons at the beginning of the fifth century (chapter six) is path-breaking work. It sheds new light on the difficulties faced by the late Roman administrators of the island and supports the author's earlier argument for British discontent with Roman rule. Jones's reconstruction of the events of 340-410 (chapter seven) is clear and readable, and his analysis of the Roman government, or more properly, misgovernment of fourth-century Britain (chapter five) is provocative if not always completely convincing. The first chapter demolishes the older view that Roman Britain was a sparsely populated province overwhelmed by hordes of Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (though Jones's "straw man" is a less imposing figure than he would make it out to be). Chapter three on the logistics of the Anglo-Saxon *adventus* makes an extremely interesting argument about the types of ship available to the fifth-century Angles and Saxons and its implication for the size of the Germanic migration into Britain. (One might object, however, that an initially small immigrant population could have grown into a large one if immigration continued throughout the fifth and sixth centuries, even if the carrying capacity of individual vessels was as small as Jones posits.)

Chapter four, which examines the literary evidence for British hostility toward *Romanitas*, is the least satisfactory. I appreciate Jones's scarcity of sources. Anyone who has worked in the field of early medieval history is very conscious of this problem, and it would be uncharitable, not to mention unreasonable, to demand certain proofs of propositions. Nevertheless, I remain unpersuaded that the writings of Patrick, Gildas, and 'Nennius' demonstrate that there was a general hostility toward Rome and *Romanitas* in late antique Britain.

In each case, Jones seems to force the evidence to conform to his thesis. The most that he can show for Patrick is that the saint was indifferent to secular Rome. Jones is not content with this: Patrick's "silence takes on a particular significance," because it indicates that he and his contemporaries no longer regarded themselves as Roman citizens. But, as Jones demonstrates, "Rome" was synonymous with Christianity for Patrick, which would suggest that he had a *positive* attitude toward *Romanitas*. Jones's treatment of Gildas is also unpersuasive. As Jones himself observes, Gildas was writing a jeremiad, and his characterization of the Romans in charge after Boudicca's rebellion as "whips for the backs of the inhabitants and a yoke for their necks" (128) fits well with the tradition of this genre (cf. *Jeremiah* 28.14; 32.26–44). Jones believes that it is significant that the "memory of this long-past event was still so vivid," but it is even more striking that Gildas provides no more recent accounts of brutal Roman suppression of native rebellions. One need not think that Gildas, writing in an age without strong central authority, necessarily deplored the brutal suppression of rebels, nor that a "scourge of God" would necessarily be conceived as evil by a late antique Christian author. Jones's failure to discuss the so-called "Groans of the Britons" is also disturbing. A fifth-century appeal to Rome for military assistance would seem to be odds with Jones's general portrayal of attitudes. I have even greater problems with the use of "Nennius". Jones believes that the ninth-century *Historia Brittonum* preserves the memory of ancient hostilities toward Rome. He can see no contemporary purpose that would have been served by inventing anti-Roman attitudes. But we know that such attitudes were expressed in the eighth-century *Liber Historiae Francorum*, not because this work preserved memories of ancient antagonism, but because the author wished to emphasize the dignity of the Franks.

My major criticism of the book as a whole is that it seems to lose sight of its announced lodestone: the uniqueness of the British experience. The evidence adduced for misgovernment and environmental disaster in Britain can be applied with equal force to Gaul. The most powerful piece of evidence that Jones presents for Roman misgovernment, in fact, refers specifically to Gaul (the case of Titus Sennius Sollemnis and Tib. Claudius Paulinus, which seems to me to have less to do with corruption and bribery than with the culture of *beneficia* between patrons and clients). Finally, the hostility toward Rome that Jones infers from the writings of Patrick, Gildas, and the Pelagians pales before the explicit criticisms leveled by Salvian and Augustine against Roman misrule in other western provinces. Essentially, Jones does not really answer the question that he posed as the every beginning of this study: why of all Rome's provinces did Britain retain so slight an imprint of Roman civilization? Is it possible that Rome left less of an imprint on Britain than on its other western provinces because, in part, Roman Britain was less urbanized and hence Romanization was more superficial? The answer to this must be sought in archaeology, and Jones is weakest in his command of the archaeological evidence that has been used so

tellingly for this period by Jeremy Evans, Simon Esmonde Cleary, and C.J. Arnold. Nonetheless, Jones has written, I think, an important book that all students of late Roman and sub-Roman Britain will need to read and ponder.

Jones mentions Arthur in passing twice, quoting in both cases Nennius. But Arthur is, of course, the one character associated with sub-Roman Britain that the general audience knows and cares about. The problem is that there is so little contemporary evidence for him that it led David Dumville to declare: "The fact is that there is no historical evidence about Arthur; we must reject him from our histories and, above all, from the titles of our books" ("Sub-Roman Britain: History and Legend") If Frank D. Reno has read Dumville's seminal article, he has chosen to ignore his advice. Reno's *The Historic King Arthur: Authenticating the Celtic Hero of Post-Roman Britain* (Jefferson, N.C., and London: McFarland, 1996) is, as its title suggests, an effort to substantiate the existence of Arthur and to locate him historically. Reno takes to his task enthusiastically, surveying not only the few literary texts that might relate to a historical Arthur, but Roman hillforts, the topography of sites popularly associated with Arthur, and the archaeology of sub-Roman Britain. One of the difficulties that defenders of a historical Arthur have faced is the failure of the one undoubtedly authentic source for the period, Gildas, to mention him. Instead, Gildas's Romano-British hero is Ambrosius Aurelianus. Geoffrey Ashe, among the more prominent Arthurian enthusiasts, identified another known historical figure, a Breton chieftain, Riothamus, who was a correspondent of Sidonius Appollinaris around 470, with Arthur. Reno takes Ashe one step further: "the names Ambrosius Aurelianus, Riothamus, and Arthur *all* refer to the same individual. Stated more explicitly, the terms Riothamus and Arthur are both titles used interchangeably with the proper name Ambrosius Aurelianus" (327). He even coins a name for this "triadic individual," Riardd (*rio-* meaning "king" and *-ardd* meaning "high"). Reno's Riardd became king at 15 under his given name Ambrosius Aurelianus and later fought against the Saxons on the mainland under the title Riothamus. This, according to Reno, explains the regeneration motif associated with the mythical Arthur. It takes over three hundred pages to get to this point. Few specialists in sub-Roman or Celtic Britain will be persuaded. Reno has looked at a variety of primary source texts in translation and secondary sources, but he has used little critical discretion in his choice of scholarship, much of which is outdated. Despite the enthusiasm of the author, this is a book more likely to mislead than to enlighten.

Reno's survey of Dark Age archaeology constitutes the best chapters in the book, but even here one is better off consulting directly the books and articles of Leslie Alcock than relying on Reno's summaries. "The Site of the 'Battle of Dunnichen'," *Scottish Hist. Rev.* 75 (1996), 130–42, is a good example of Alcock's careful scholarship firmly rooted in an intimate knowledge of archaeology, landscape, and written sources for early England, and Patrick Sims-William's "The

Death of Urien," *Cambrian Med. Celtic Stud* 32 (1966), 25–56, shows how one ought to approach the history and legends of the early medieval Britons. The two investigations, in some ways are similar. Alcock seeks to locate the decisive battle in which King Ecgrith fights the Picts. Sims-Williams seeks to discover when and by whom Urien Rheged, a sixth-century British ruler and the hero of later Welsh legend, was killed. Alcock's is perhaps the less ambitious endeavor, and certainly the less interesting to a general audience of medievalists. From the eleventh century to the present, Ecgrith's fatal battle has been known as "the battle of Nechtansmere," based on the authority of Simeon of Durham. Alcock reviews the sources for the battle, analyzes the written accounts as evidence for military action in the battle and for its topographic background, and attempts to reconstruct how and where the battle was actually fought. His conclusion is that Nechtansmere is a misnomer, and that the route to the north of Dunnichen Hill and south of Turin Hill, in the valley of the Lunan Water, is its most probable site. Sims-Williams also carefully evaluates the evidence, mainly of the ninth-century compilation known as the *Historia Brittonum*, and attempts to disentangle its confused chronology, and concludes that Urien's death could have been as early as the 570s or as late as after 592. Of more interest is Sims-Williams' explication of the meaning of the story and what it reveals about how the loss of British sovereignty in Northumbria was interpreted in early medieval Wales. The theme that he uncovers from it is "the self-destruction of the Britons by their failure to unite behind a natural leader" in the face of a foreign invader (37).

c. Kings, Administration, and Law

"ALL recent general works on Anglo-Saxon history, archaeology, government and urban studies stress the importance of the document now known as the 'Burghal Hidage.'" So begins David Hill's bibliographical review of Burghal Hidage studies in the volume dedicated to this critical and unique administrative text, *The Defence of Wessex: The Burghal Hidage and Anglo-Saxon Fortifications* (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press), ed. David Hill and Alexander R. Rumble. Hill's assessment is not hyperbole. The Burghal Hidage is a list of thirty-three places and their hidage assessments, with a coda that provides a formula for calculating hidage assessment based on normative manpower requirements for defending and maintaining lengths of wall. Since 1897 when Frederic Maitland gave the document its popular name, the importance of the Burghal Hidage and its significance for understanding the development of royal government in Anglo-Saxon England has become increasingly clear (though, surprisingly, Dorothy Whitelock chose not to include it in vol. 1 of *English Historical Documents*). The origin of this book is in a conference on the Burghal Hidage sponsored by the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies in May 1989. The inclusion of much needed definitive editions of recension C of the Tribal Hidage and of the A and B versions of the Burghal Hidage (18–31), a translation of a

conflation of A and B "restoring the list of fortifications to its most complete form, while indicating the factual variants" (32–5), facsimiles of the manuscripts (41–43, 48, 50, 52, 54–55), David Hill's alphabetically arranged comprehensive gazetteer of sites with line drawings of the layouts of the towns and forts (189–231), and an annotated bibliography (in chronological order) of scholarship on the Tribal Hidage makes this far more than a long delayed conference proceedings. Despite some reservations I have about the narrowness of its focus and its failure to resolve satisfactorily some basic problems, notably the dating of the document, this is a very important reference book, a "must" purchase for universities and research scholars alike.

The editors' scholarship is well represented in this volume. Alexander Rumble's contributions consist of the editions and translations of the Tribal Hidage and the Burghal Hidage and a full, annotated bibliography for the Tribal Hidage. David Hill is responsible for the gazetteer and three articles. "The development of Burghal Hidage studies: a bibliographical review" (5–13) is a long title for a very brief overview. Hill emphasizes the importance of Nicholas Brooks' 1964 article, "The unidentified forts of the Burghal Hidage," for changing the direction of study by bringing the document "into the ken of archaeologists" and restating the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to the field of early medieval studies (9), and criticizes those (i.e. R.H.C. Davis) who, in Hill's opinion, mis-assign the text to a date in order to bolster a thesis. In "The nature of the figures" Hill attempts to explain and justify his reconstruction of an original text from the various recensions of the Burghal Hidage with their differing figures. Hill warns against "massaging" the figures in order to use them to bolster an interpretation. In devising his list of "certain," "preferred," and "possible" hidages for the sites, Hill begins by establishing that the family of manuscripts designated as 'A' is the superior version, though it is not to be preferred in every instance of difference. He gives preference to figures expressed in words over those expressed by numbers as less likely to have been corrupted by copyist's error, and to longer Roman numerals for the same reason. Despite the omission of Kentish sites and of London, Hill contends that "it is a unitary list marshalled into a sequence by someone who knew where the sites were" (80). As he points out, the sites are listed in a geographical order that, much like the boundary clauses of an Anglo-Saxon charter, proceeds clockwise and return to the starting point. On the question of the relationship between the table of calculations at the end of version A, the given hidage assessment for the sites, and actual lengths of wall or dry ditch, Hill reiterates his warning against "meretricious metrology" that massages figures in order to arrive at a preconceived result. Historians would like to find a close correlation, because it would validate the document as a practical, working tool of tenth-century administration. Hill's examination is inconclusive and ends with an admonition to caution. While there are a number of strikingly close correlations (at Winchester in particular), in at least three sites the

length of the actual defences diverge greatly from the predicted hidage. Hill is less cautious in his third and final contribution, "The calculation and the purpose of the Burghal Hidage" (92-7). Speculating about the possible purposes of the document, Hill suggests that "it was drawn up in Wessex from assessments and measurements made in the shires, checked to see if it would have worked, roughly, for the hidages of the Wessex shires, . . . and was then applied to Mercia as a basis for its shiring in the period when Wessex took over the control of that country in 919" (96). "This workmanlike, sensible and accurate" document, he concludes, ought to be understood as the sole surviving representative of a lost class of working, administrative tools. This is consistent with the conclusions drawn by Mark Blackburn about West Saxon royal administration of mints ("Mints, burhs, and the Grately code, ca. 14.2" (160-75)). Blackburn finds that all ten of the identified mints in Edward's reign within the area covered by the Burghal Hidage were located in towns named in that document, "confirming that the principal commercial centres in that region were incorporated into the network of defensive burhs" (165). Perhaps even more important is his suggestion that behind the Grately code (II Æthelstan, cap. 14), the earliest legislation to refer to the administration of coinage, may lie an earlier administrative directive or memorandum, a sort of "Burghal Hidage" for mints.

David Hinton's "The fortifications and their shires" (151-9), and Nicholas Brooks' "The Administrative Background to the Burghal Hidage" (128-50), cover much of the same ground but with different conclusions. Once again we find comparisons between actual and predicted wall lengths, though Hinton and, to a lesser extent, Brooks, are more willing to "play" with the figures, even to the point of positing different sized "rods" at various sites. (Indeed, one might almost think that Hill had Hinton in mind when he warned against massaging the figures.) Following the leads of Maitland and Sawyer, both examine the relationship between the hidage assessments in the Burghal Hidage and shire totals in the County Hidage and Domesday Book, and find that sometimes the figures correlate well and sometimes they don't. To explain these "quirks of linearity and assessment" (155), Hinton proposes his own model for the origin of the Burghal Hidage. Winchester plays a crucial role in his hypothesis, for it was there that the formula relating hides and wall length in the Burghal Hidage was first worked out. (This explains why the predicted and actual wall lengths at Winchester correlate almost exactly.) Royal agents, Hinton proposes, began with the preexisting combined hidage assessment for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight (hence the round figure of 2400 hides), and used it as the rating for Winchester's defenses. "The existing Roman wall was then measured, and the clever equation set out in Version A was devised" (156). When fortifications were needed elsewhere, this equation was used to establish what the rating should be for their land defenses. (Hinton, again, is playing with the figures, since in a number of the sites the correlation is closest if riverbanks are ex-

cluded.) "All this makes the Burghal Hidage look systematic in some places, piecemeal in others," Hinton concludes (156). Brooks' reconstruction differs in some respects, but is also based upon the conclusion that organization of the Burghal Hidage took into account the pre-existing system of shires and their assessments. The implication seems to be that Alfred inherited a fairly sophisticated West Saxon royal administration. The main evidence for this conclusion is the close correlation he finds between Domesday shire hidage and the sums of the Domesday assessments for those boroughs recorded in the survey. "A pattern that recurs so often is unlikely to be coincidental," he observes (136). Agreed, but why conclude from this that the Burghal Hidage was based on pre-existing shire hidages? It is equally, if not more, plausible to think that the allocation of hidage assessments as recorded in the Burghal Hidage helped stabilize and fix shire assessments. To explain the variations in correlation that Hill, Hinton, and he noted, and to explain why the hidages for temporary forts were not included in the Domesday totals, Brooks offers a tantalizing possibility: the Burghal Hidage perhaps was not a single administrative plan devised at one time to meet a particular crisis. Rather, it may have been "updated in piecemeal fashion over the years or generations in partial response to changing needs" (137). Finally, Brooks considers the difference between those boroughs that were true urban foundations, such as Worcester, and the small forts that had disappeared by the eleventh century. With his characteristic insight, Brooks notes that Alfred would have faced greater resistance in getting these emergency forts built. Without the prospect of gainful employment, service in these boroughs would have entailed economic hardship for both the garrisons and the lords who supplied them. "Indeed," Brooks observes paradoxically, "one measure of the achievement of Alfred and his son is the quantity of places listed in the Burghal Hidage which did *not* become towns" (145).

The tight focus of *The Defence of Wessex* upon the text of the Burghal Hidage and the obsession of its contributors with correlating measurements of wall lengths to hidage assessments makes the book feel a bit claustrophobic. What is missing from it is the historical perspective that makes the Burghal Hidage so important for understanding the history of Anglo-Saxon England. Most scholars, including all the contributors to this volume, acknowledge that whether the document is seen to be a tenth-century compilation (the majority view), or an earlier Alfredian text, its content represents the burghal defenses that Alfred ordered built to defend his kingdom from viking attacks. Only Brooks attempts to discuss, albeit too briefly, the historical context for this building program and its possible antecedents and continental analogues. Edward J. Schoenfeld, "Anglo-Saxon *Burhs* and Continental *Burgen*: Early Medieval Fortifications in Constitutional Perspective," *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 6 (1994), 49-66, complements nicely the articles in Hill's and Rumble's volume. The question that he takes up is whether Alfred's *burhs* provided the inspiration and example for Henry I of Germany's early

tenth-century *Burgen*. Schoenfeld's answer is a definite no. For Schoenfeld the differences between the fortification policies of Alfred and Edward the Elder and Henry I reflect "precisely those differences we should expect to see between insular Saxon and continental German social and political organization in the tenth century" (66). After a critical review of the historiography, Schoenfeld concludes that similarities between the two programs of fortification building were not the result of conscious borrowing, but merely indicative of "a shared environment." *Burhs* and *Burgen*, thus, were similar in size and shape because both were used as refuges for local populations and moveable goods against invader intent on plundering. Both shared the same construction methods because the societies were at the same level of material development. Schoenfeld's review of the historiography is, by far, the most interesting part of the article. His understanding of Anglo-Saxon politics and society seems superficial. Nothing he writes demonstrates that Henry I did not derive his idea for a system of fortifications from the English. Of course, the burden of proof needs to be on those who would demonstrate a connection, but given the well attested cultural and diplomatic contact between England and Germany in early tenth-century, is it so unlikely that Henry I would have brought to Germany not only Edward the Elder's daughter as a wife for his son Otto but also the successful military building program that made Athelstan a suitable father-in-law for the future emperor of Germany? Nonetheless, this is an interesting and provocative essay well worth reading.

The year saw the publication of two important studies of Alfredian historical writing and culture, and the first volleys exchanged in an increasingly virulent debate over Alfred Smyth's 1995 *King Alfred the Great*. Sarah Foot's "The Making of *Anglecynn*: English Identity before the Norman Conquest," *Trans. of the R. Hist. Soc* 6th ser., 6 (1966), 25–49, credits King Alfred and his court circle for the promotion what she sees as "a self-conscious perception of 'English' cultural uniqueness and individuality" (25) which became the basis for a national consciousness. Alfred's great achievement, she argues, was to create a cultural, linguistic, legal, and national identity for "the English" through a program of educational revival and translation. His aim was to invent a common memory of the unity of the English people through historical writings like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Old English Bede. Foot follows Patrick Wormald in seeing Alfred's choice of the term *Anglecynn* rather than "Saxonkind" as owing to the influence of Bede. Alfred, according to Foot, was truly innovative in his attempt to make the West Saxon and Mercian peoples into a single *gens* by appealing to their memory of shared experience and common law, a "memory" that his court invented through its writings. His educational program was a self-conscious way of promoting it.

This is a fine and provocative essay. Its originality lies in its adaption of Patrick Wormald's work on Bede and the emergence of English identity to Alfred and his program for educational and spiritual revival. Overall, I found article

persuasive, though perhaps a bit heavier on rhetoric than analysis of texts. Foot tends to present assumptions as givens. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle *may* have been a product of Alfred's court—and I think it was—but Foot owes it to the reader to explain why she thinks it is. The same can be said with even more force about the *Old English Bede* and *Orosius*. What is also lacking is consideration of the evidence of the charters and Asser's *Life*. Simon Keynes' analysis of these and of the royal styles that Alfred and his son Edward adopted ("king of the Anglo-Saxons") has led him to a quite different conclusion about Alfred's sense of nationhood. ("King Alfred and the Mercians," in M.A.S. Blackburn and D.N. Dumville, eds., *Kings, Currency, and Alliances: The History and Coinage of Southern England, AD 840–900* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998.)

Anton Scharer, "The Writing of History at King Alfred's Court," *Early Med. Europe* 5 (1996), 177–206, is a brilliant study of the purposes and sources of the major historical writings produced by Alfred's court. Like Foot, Scharer sees the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as having courtly origins, noting that it shares themes, especially a preoccupation with legitimacy, with the Chronicle, Alfred's Law code and translations. Scharer attributes this, not completely persuasively, to Ecgberht's anxiety due to Kentish origins (carefully covered up in the Chronicle). While Scharer is provocative in his discussion of the Chronicle, he is nothing short of brilliant in his analysis of Asser's *De rebus gestis Aelfredi*. Asser, according to Scharer, shaped the *Life* to present Alfred as the chosen and elect. The story of his illness, which so disturbed Galbraith and Smyth, here is understood as a representation of *humiliatio-exaltatio*, signifying Alfred's divine election. The models for this come from Carolingian mirrors for princes and, perhaps even more importantly, from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*. Scharer emphasizes the Solomon motif that runs through the work. The inspiration for this was Carolingian, in particular Sedulius Scottus' *Liber de rectoribus Christianis*. By the end of this piece one cannot help but conclude along with Scharer that "the Carolingian element in the political ideologies and historical writing of Anglo-Saxon England is clearly much stronger than is usually acknowledged" (206).

Joaquin Martinez Pizarro, "Kings in Adversity: a Note on Alfred and the Cakes," *Neophilologus* 80 (1996), 319–26, is of interest mainly for a Byzantine analogue that the author found for the tale of Alfred's burnt cakes. The story from Procopius, however, is not really all that similar. Its point about the quirks of fortune is quite different from that of the king who learned patience and humility. Nor does Martinez Pizarro present any possible mechanism of transmission. Harald Kleinschmidt, "The Old English Annal for 757 and West Saxon Dynastic Strife," *Jnl of Med. Hist.* 22 (1996), 209–24, is a far weightier piece. In it the author reconsiders the purposes of the Chronicler in recounting the well known story of King Cynewulf's death at the hands of his kinsman, Cyneheard. This annal has usually been interpreted as a moral tale praising the loyalty of retainers to their lords. Kleinschmidt sees a

different purpose. Noting that all the West Saxon kings and aethelings in the annal are presented in a negative fashion, Kleinschmidt finds that a negative tone pervades the Chronicle's treatment of all West Saxon kings between Ine and his Ecgbert. The annal, it seems, is propaganda for the dynasty derived from Ine's father Coenred. (Alfred descended from Ine's brother Ingeld.) Its purpose was to shed doubt upon the legitimacy of all other branches of the house of Cerdic. Kleinschmidt traces this, less convincingly, to a constitutional crisis in late seventh-century Wessex. Seeing significance in Coenred's choice of names for his sons—Ine represents a break with the previous C- names—the author speculates that Coenred wished to emphasize the special dignity of his sons from their mother's Northumbrian royal blood. He did this because he intended to overturn the rules of succession, which made any male descendant of Cerdic eligible for rule, in favor of one that limited rule to his own bloodline. Where he failed, Alfred succeeded.

I am sure that the readers of the Old English Newsletter are more than familiar with the controversy that has raged over Alfred Smyth's biography of King Alfred, in particular his dismissal of the *Life of King Alfred* as a crude forgery. This year's list includes Smyth's own brief foreshadowing of his argument, "Unmasking Alfred's False Biography," *Brit. Archaeol.* 7 (1995), 8–9 (though, oddly, not David Hill's critique in the same publication, 9, also 1995), a breezy article by Simon Targett on Smyth and the controversy in *The Times Higher Education Suppl* 8 Dec. 1995, 17 (with paragraph-length statements by Smyth and Simon Keynes), and a massive review article by Simon Keynes in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996), 529–51. I must admit that I have definite opinions on the question of Asser's authenticity (I believe firmly that it is genuine) and on Smyth's book, so my appreciation of Keynes' masterly dissection of Smyth's historical errors and sloppy handling of charters may not be completely unbiased. In my judgment, Keynes has Smyth dead to rights on a number of key issues, ranging from Alfred's royal style to Smyth's failed attempt to make the *Life* into propaganda for the tenth-century Benedictine monastic reform. I also share Keynes' dismay over Smyth's charges of academic conspiracy and chicanery. "Scholars of the calibre of W.H. Stevenson, Sir Frank Stenton and Dorothy Whitelock adopted their position," Keynes declares with some heat, "because they believed it to be true; to suggest otherwise is to impugn their integrity, and to insult the reader's intelligence" (550–1). While there is much that is good in Smyth's book—I especially like his sensitive reading of Alfred's translations and his appreciation of the king as intellectual—his 'Pseudo-Asser' hobby horse is not one of those things.

J.M. Wallace-Hadrill in 1971 (*Early Germanic Kingship*) recognized that King Alfred's political ideas and educational program must be understood within a wider perspective that embraces Carolingian ecclesiastical writings and the similar and early program of Charlemagne. It is thus appropriate that Mayr-Harting, one of the doyennes of Anglo-Saxon histori-

cal studies, is represented in the 1996 Year's Work by "Charlemagne, the Saxons, and the Imperial Coronation of 800," *EHR* 111 (1996), 1113–33. Although this article does not touch directly upon Anglo-Saxon England, the connections between England and Francia in the eighth and ninth centuries makes it relevant to our survey. Mayr-Harting has chosen to reconsider perhaps the most widely discussed and studied event in Charlemagne's career, his imperial coronation in Rome on Christmas Day, 800. He sets out his argument clearly and concisely at the start: "Charlemagne needed the imperial coronation of 800 because emperorship was the only conceptual framework within which he could validate and make acceptable his rule of the Saxon aristocracy after he had defeated them" (1113). This is an ingenious argument that moves the question away from its traditional moorings in the relationship between Charlemagne and the papacy. For Mayr-Harting there is no question that Charlemagne wanted to be emperor. The reason was politics, not Italian papal politics, but the Saxon problem. The Saxons prided themselves on having no king, as kingship represented to them tyranny. The lack of kingship was part of their ethnic identity. Though defeated militarily, they could not submit to Charlemagne's kingship without seriously losing face. Charlemagne's problem in the late 790s, then, was to find a way to get the Saxons to accept his rule. This could not be solved either by his becoming their king or by their being joined through a process of ethnogenesis into the Frankish *gens*. The solution was to become an emperor. "An ethnically self-aware *gens*, they would not have to bear the unheard-of yoke of kingly rule, but could submit to the supra-gentilic emperor" (1126). Mayr-Harting further speculates that the coronation may have validated Charlemagne's rule over the Saxons *in his own mind*. This is certainly an ingenious argument and has a certain elegant logic to it, but I would be happier if the author could have adduced any positive documentary evidence for it.

d. The Church, Saints, and Religion

KAREN LOUISE JOLLY's *Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press) is a major contribution to our understanding of religious beliefs and practices in late Anglo-Saxon England. Jolly focuses upon the cultural and religious meaning of the charms (*galdra*), in particular elf charms, that figure so prominently in the two surviving Old English practical medical handbooks, *Leechbook* (ca. 950) and the *Lacnunga* (ca. 1050). Rather than viewing them as signs "of the retention of paganism in the practice of magic and as a failure of the Christianizing effort in the late Saxon church," Jolly contends that they in fact "constitute evidence of the religion's success in conversion by accommodating Anglo-Saxon culture" (9). "The aim of the book," the author writes, "is to use the Christianized charms against elves to show one aspect of how, in this critical cultural transition between 900 and 1050, Christianity and Anglo-Saxon culture intermingled" (2). Her

thesis, baldly stated, is that popular religion in late Saxon England as exemplified by elf charms was a creative amalgamation and mediating force between "formal" Christianity and folklore, which Jolly defines as "the pre-Christian Germanic heritage" (33). The real success of Christianity was precisely in its ability to accommodate older cultural practices, resulting in what Jolly terms "middle practices," the shared product of this interaction. Such middle practices, moreover, were at the very center of Late Saxon religion. In other words, Jolly consciously rejects "the tendency in western thought to propound mutually exclusive opposites" (3), to discuss the process of religious conversion in terms of dualities or binary oppositions, and opts instead for the more flexible idea of a two-way transmission process that Christianized the Anglo-Saxon landscape, evidenced by the cult of the saints, and at the same time "Germanized" Christianity. While there were significant underlying tensions between the "formal" Christianity (the "Augustinian worldview") of literate reformers like Ælfric of Eynsham and Archbishop Wulfstan II of York and pagan Germanic folklore, there was enough common ground between the two, in particular the acceptance of the power of ritual, to allow for synthesis. The "middle practices" that recast folkloric rituals for healing within a Germanic-Christian cosmology are prime examples of this process. The local churches that proliferated in large numbers throughout England in the tenth and eleventh centuries after the initial disasters of the Viking invasions created the perfect environment for this process. Unlike the minsters destroyed by the Vikings, these decentralized, local, proprietary churches placed priests in intimate contact with the laity, as exemplified in the very physical layout of these churches (67–9), so that the parish church became the spiritual locus of communities. Popular religion "was a product of this local environment, in the meeting between everyday domestic and agricultural concerns reflecting Germanic folk customs and the rudimentary Christian expertise of a local priest. Conversion by acculturation was the logical outcome" (70).

Jolly makes a persuasive and compelling argument. She is surely right in seeing Christianity as practiced in late Saxon England as a synthesis and amalgamation of cultures made possible by overlapping world views (nicely represented by a chart on p. 33). But the "straw man" that she has erected might be weaker than she allows. Historians of late medieval and early modern religion have long challenged the old dichotomy between "elite" and "popular" religion which seems to be Jolly's main target. That she has broken down so convincingly the walls between "elite" and "popular" religion in late Saxon England is, nonetheless, a real contribution to the scholarly discourse.

The book is more compelling in its general argumentation than in its specific presentation of evidence and historical analysis. The elf charms that we are initially told are the focus of this study are only introduced in the final chapter, and one might question how much historical weight should be placed on a handful of charms in two surviving manuscript texts.

Given Jolly's focus upon contextualizing these charms, it is disappointing that she did not place her study in a wider chronological and spatial perspective. Chapter two, on the late Saxon religious environment and growth of local churches, is thus undermined by Jolly's cursory treatment of pre-Viking ecclesiastical organization and practice. *Pastoral Care before the Parish*, ed. J. Blair and R. Sharpe (1992), is among the more surprising omissions from Jolly's bibliography. The reader is left with the impression that the process of "Christianizing" the folklore and the development of "middle practices" was peculiar to the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, and this is surely incorrect. A comparison of popular religion and medical charms as practiced in the seventh and eighth centuries would have been helpful and enlightening. Bede's description (and denunciation) of the "incantations, amulets, other mysteries of the devilish arts" that Christianized Northumbrians used in an attempt to ward off plague in the mid seventh century (*Prose Life of St. Cuthbert*, ch. 9) is clearly relevant here. Similarly, Jolly needed to consider more fully the nature and quality of pastoral care in the pre-Viking period. Jolly's discussion of the Augustinian world view as conceived by Wulfstan and Ælfric is also sketchy at best (why it is "Augustinian" is not explained), as is her treatment of "the pre-Christian Germanic heritage." The very characterization of the latter as "Germanic" echoes an outmoded Romanist and Germanist duality. The book cries out for consideration of related Scandinavian and Old High German evidence of "middle practices," precisely the material that one finds in Thomas DuBois's *Nordic Religions in the Viking Age* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), ch. 5 ("Concepts of Health and Healing"). Of course, one cannot fault Jolly for failing to use a book that came out several years after hers, but one would have expected her to have contextualized the English experience by relating it to the Continental sources that DuBois analyzes. Her handling of non-textual sources, particularly of art historical evidence, is, as Lynda Coon noted in her positive review of this book in *Speculum* 73 (197–8), is inexpert. Despite these limitations, this is a book that is well worth reading for its strong theoretical framework and insights.

Jolly assumes that Scandinavian invasion and settlement completely disrupted local ecclesiastical organization in the Danelaw. D.M. Palliser, "The 'Minster Hypothesis': a Case Study," *Early Med. Europe* 5 (1996), 207–14, suggests otherwise. Palliser's review article is a response to Eric Cambridge's and David Rollason's challenge in the same journal in the previous to the "Minster Hypothesis," the view that "most pre-Viking English churches were staffed by communities of clergy with pastoral responsibilities for large areas, areas which became fragmented as the parochial system developed" (207). Palliser acknowledges the lack of early documentation for pastoral functions and the dangers of reading back pastoral care in pre-Viking England from later sources, but asserts nonetheless that in some cases "late-recorded instances have so many archaic features that the onus of proof should be on

those who would deny the possibility of early origins" (207). Palliser's "case study" is of the Yorkshire minster of Beverley. Though historians and archaeologists are divided on what happened to this church during the Viking period, Palliser thinks that what happened at Beverley conforms "to what has been found at several other ecclesiastical sites—reduction of the extent and intensity of occupation after c. 850, but not total abandonment" (209). Despite the lack of documentary evidence for Beverley before the eleventh century, a number of archaic features set it apart from most collegiate churches of the later middle ages. The most relevant to the Minster Hypothesis was "the curious evidence for Beverley's pastoral role" (211). Beverley's constitution in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries dictated that the prime duty of at least seven of its vicars was to exercise cure of souls on behalf of the canons. There were seven parochial units in the pre-Reformation church. Palliser explains Beverley's peculiar parochial arrangement, which echoes that of Ripon, as the "survival of early provisions for pastoral care based on head minsters before the full development of a parochial system" (214). Historians will recognize this as the same reasoning that underlies R.H.C. Davis's attempt to reconstruct pre-Viking social structures in the Danelaw on the basis of a twelfth-century Bury St. Edmunds' register. But critics of Palliser are sure to share David Rollason's and Eric Cambridge's skepticism for an argument for continuity that cannot be confirmed by any documentary evidence. Indeed, Palliser's rejoinder that this is an unreasonable expectation since "there is virtually no surviving pre-Viking documentation" for Yorkshire can in itself be construed by those unsympathetic to Palliser's views as evidence for Viking destruction of religious houses and their muniments.

Even more than Palliser, Dawn Hadley has gone far to overturn old assumptions about the extent to which Viking conquest and settlement disrupted ecclesiastical organization in the Danelaw. Her "Conquest, Colonization and the Church: The Ecclesiastical Organization in the Danelaw," *Hist. Research* 69 (1996), 109–28, critically reconsiders F.M. Stenton's treatment of the impact of Scandinavian settlement on the ecclesiastical organization of the Danelaw. Where Stenton emphasized the disastrous impact of Viking conquest upon the ancient diocese and churches of what became the Danelaw, Hadley detects resilience, creative synthesis, and continuity. Based on a study of charters, sculptures, and material remains, Hadley argues for the survival of Christianity within a society marked by accommodation and the mingling of two cultures. Hadley's analysis complements and supports Jolly's more general discussion of ecclesiastical developments in the tenth century. She too contends that the period saw the proliferation of local churches in the Danelaw which, deprived of the supervision of bishops by the initial disruption and the political machinations of the West Saxon monarchy, came to be under the control of lay lords to a degree unusual elsewhere in England. The precise ecclesiastical organization that emerged varied from region to region. In some areas we see elements of

the "minster model," though Hadley is overall suspicious of it; in others, pastoral duties attached to local churches. Although Hadley does not discuss "middle practices," their shadow can be seen in the Scandinavian Christian hybrid sculptures that she adduces as evidence for the early Christianization of the Scandinavian settlers. Though she admits that it would be foolish to dismiss the disruption and destruction that attended the Scandinavian invasions, Hadley nonetheless believes that the major impact was not the collapse of the Church in the Danelaw but its reshaping through a fusion of cultures. What emerged was an ecclesiastical organization whose contours were determined by facts of conquest, regional estate and social structures, West Saxon influence, and, not least, by continuity with the past.

Two different Saints Oswald received extended scholarly attention in 1996. The Parochial Church Council of St. Oswalds, Durham, commemorated the 1350th anniversary of the death of the seventh-century royal Saint Oswald in 1992 not only in religious observance but by sponsoring a conference, "entitled 'Oswald: Northumbrian King to European Saint,' held on 25 April 1992. The Council also supported publication of the conference papers under the same title (Stamford 1996). The resulting compilation, which was edited and introduced by parishioner and early medieval historian Clare Stancliffe and archaeologist Eric Cambridge, is by no means a hagiography, but a sound synthesis and clear explanation of recent scholarship. Its contributions will interest and inform the educated general audience and historians alike.

The compilation begins with a brief introductory essay by Rosemary Cramp on "The Making of Oswald's Northumbria" (17–32). Modestly described as an "interim account of some aspects of the Northumbrian cultural environment which had developed by the beginning of the seventh century" (17), it provides a clear chronological framework and briefly introduces the reader to the material, religious, and political cultures of the age. The references guide the interested general reader to the essential primary sources and to sound secondary scholarship.

The general editors, Clare Stancliffe and Eric Cambridge, contributed ambitious and analytical, yet clear, overviews, respectively treating the life and accomplishments of the royal saint and the archaeology of his Northumbria. Dr. Stancliffe (33–83) provides a nuanced and detailed comparison of Oswald's actual political achievements and religiosity with his posthumous reputation as the "Most Holy and Victorious King" portrayed in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, Adomnan's *Life of St. Columba*, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The contributions of Drs. Cramp and Stancliffe combine clarity and accessibility of style with reliable scholarship and can be confidently recommended to undergraduate and graduate alike.

The collection builds upon this foundation to analyze the development of the cult of St. Oswald, with special attention given to its growth and persistence in his native Northumbria,

as well as its successful transplantation to the Welf lands of Bavaria and assimilation into Germanic hagiography. Having discharged her duty by providing the historical survey, Clare Stancliffe (84–96) also contributed a shorter technical piece, “Where was Oswald Killed,” in which she thoroughly reviews the evidence supporting the various candidates and, while recognizing the limitations of the evidence, ultimately plumps for what she describes as the “Oswestry hypothesis.”

Alan Thacker’s “Membra Disiecta: the Division of the Body and the Diffusion of the Cult” (97–127), provides a detailed reconstruction of the remarkable dissemination and translations of Oswald’s remains, and relates these actions to contemporary dynastic and political controversies and religious rivalries. These, he argues, motivated Oswald’s royal descendents and then St. Wilfrid and his partisans to promote the cult. Thacker’s conclusion that the persistence and growth of the cult was not inevitable, but the result, first of secular and dynastic interests, and then of the cult’s being taken up by a great episcopal centre and endorsed by Bede and by Hexham, is well argued and convincing. Thacker also describes the further development and dissemination of the cult, both in England and on the Continent, through the eleventh century.

Dagmar O’ Riain-Raedel’s “Edith, Judith, Matilda: The Role of Royal Ladies in the Propagation of the Continental Cult” (210–29), complements Thacker’s paper, emphasizing the efforts of royal ladies and their spouses who, for their own purposes, promoted and reinvigorated the cult. Particularly noteworthy is Riain-Raedel’s treatment of the importance of the role of Judith, widow of Tostig, late ruler of Northumbria, in bringing the cult of St. Oswald to the lands of her second husband, Welf IV of Bavaria. Welf IV and other spouses of Anglo-Saxon royal women sought and publicized the prestige associated with marriage into the house of the warrior saint and martyr, leading to what Thacker describes as “the even more extravagant developments of the later medieval cult” in such Welf cities as Regensburg.

A second St. Oswald, the bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, was also honored by a conference in 1992, in this case on the occasion of the millenium of his death, and by the subsequent publication of a noteworthy collection of papers, *St. Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence* (London and New York: Leicester University Press). Edited by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt, this is a worthy addition both to scholarship and to the *Studies in the Early History of Britain* series. The collection is marked by a unity of subject and felicity of style unusual in such collections, and for which the editors are to be commended.

It begins with Donald Bullough’s *St. Oswald: monk, bishop and archbishop* (1–22), an interesting analysis of Byrthferth’s *Vita s. Oswaldi*, the extant charters, and other sources and insightful discussion of what is known (and recognition of what remains unknowable) of Oswald’s life, complemented by detailed footnotes. Bullough’s conclusion that “Oswald, the man . . . simply evades us” (22) is vividly explained by Michael Lapidge’s devastating critique of Byrthferth’s working methods

and treatment of sources (64–83). After reviewing this catalogue of Byrthferth’s plagiarisms, sloppiness, and outright fabrications, one is likely to agree, as Lapidge urges, “that extreme caution be applied by anyone wishing to use the *Vita s. Oswaldi* as a record of tenth-century history” (79). Lapidge then asks: if Byrthferth barely knew Oswald and cobbled the *Vita* together from existing sources, why did he venerate Oswald so highly? He answers: to Byrthferth, Oswald was an exemplar of Benedictine monasticism. Whatever its limitations as an historical source, the *Vita* remains for Lapidge “one of the most impassioned apologies for the spirituality of Benedictine monasticism which has survived from the English middle ages” (83).

John Nightingale follows Bullough’s summary with “*Oswald, Fleury, and Continental Reform*” (23–45), in which he argues that Fleury’s appeal and authority to Oswald and his contemporaries stemmed from its possession of the relics of Saint Benedict, not from the influence of Odo of Cluny. Anglo-Saxon religious such as Oswald, Nightingale argues, sought the aura and protection of St. Benedict at pre-reform Fleury and the presumed authoritativeness of its version of the *Rule*. Fleury, in its turn, he concludes, benefitted from those who flocked to it “through their learning, through the books, treasures and relics which they gave to the abbey, and, not least, through their very presence” (23–24). Indeed, Nightingale argues, Odo’s attempted reform of Fleury was both later in time and more fiercely resisted than some have previously assumed. The Fleury community’s hostility to Odo’s reforms is shown by its omission of Odo from its liturgy, despite its inclusion of its late student, St. Oswald himself.

The skepticism about the extent and depth of commitment to monastic reform in Oswald’s world which is so prominent a recurring theme in this collection is echoed again by Julia Barrow in “The Community of Worcester, 961–c. 1100” (84–99). Barrow argues, against what she describes as the “Big Bang” theory, that Oswald did not expel clerks from Worcester Cathedral in favor of monks and that the change was not made in a sudden expulsion, but occurred gradually, perhaps as late as Wulfstan’s time, as a monastic community grew at St. Mary’s alongside the clerks of St. Peter’s. [Barrow’s analysis here of the initial conspicuously limited appeal to the Worcester community of Cluniac reform builds upon her important essay, “English Cathedral Communities and Reform in the Late Tenth and the Eleventh Centuries,” which appeared in *Anglo-Norman Durham: 1093–1193* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell 1994), pp. 25–39, another collection of papers from a conference, this held to mark the nine hundredth anniversary of the cathedral. Barrow makes it clear that the Worcester community’s resistance to reforming trends was far from unique and that Benedictine reform movements had little effect in most English cathedral communities until the twelfth century.]

Nightingale’s epigrammatical remark that the “laity did not necessarily prefer the reformed” (26) would serve as an excellent introduction to Andrew Wareham’s equally skepti-

cal paper, "Saint Oswald's Family and Kin" (46–63). Just as Nightingale minimizes the effect of Odo of Cluny's reform efforts at Fleury, Wareham argues that Oswald's foundation of Ramsey and career at Worcester, far from following the Cluniac ideal of freedom from aristocratic influence, were made possible by, and strongly influenced by, Oswald's family ties. Wareham places Oswald firmly in a prominent recently Christian Danish family in East Anglia. Oswald used his personal wealth to found Ramsey. Wareham identifies its principal original benefactors, based on analysis of wills, charters, and chronicle evidence, as Oswald's relatives. He argues that, by doing so, they enhanced their own status and ensured substantial financial benefits, notably in the strikingly generous terms of the well-known Worcester leases. Rather than dismissing these arrangements as simple nepotism or corruption, however, Wareham finds a mutually beneficial survival strategy. Having secured the support (and future) of his extended kin, Oswald did not have to rely upon the support of aeldermen to protect the bishopric and monasteries during the anti-monastic reaction. Wareham concludes: "His shrewd leasehold policy achieved two objectives: it protected the see and it provided for his extended family while keeping privilege within prudent bounds" (61).

Nigel Baker and Richard Holt (129–46) add that St. Oswald leased to his clerical and lay household, not only the rural estates upon which most scholarly attention has focused, but also house-plots within Worcester itself. These frequently subdivided *haga*, moreover, were linked to specific rural estates, giving Oswald's household both a rural source of income and a town house in which to serve the bishop. Baker and Holt emphasize that St. Oswald's and his successors' use of city land to house and reward retainers contributed very significantly to the population growth and geographic expansion of the city. Indeed, they conclude, "the subsequent shape of the city was in large part the legacy of Oswald and the other bishops of the tenth century" (146).

Wareham's view that the apparent nepotism of such leases to kin and retainers actually benefitted religious foundations is shared by Vanessa King in her essay, "St. Oswald's Tenants" (100–16). She notes: "No doubt bishops realized that the crucial time for the recovery of land was at the end of the third life, and this was anticipated to a great extent by limiting their leases to family and close retainers" (115). This, she suggests, might explain the imprecision of the Worcester leases, which, as Stenton noted and King's detailed analysis demonstrates, implied the render of services not explicitly stated. In fact, King argues, this lack of detail about services in the text of the Worcester leases prompted the need for St. Oswald's *Indiculum*, which, she tentatively suggests, may have been prepared before Hemming's *Cartulary* to memorialize the implied terms during the Danish settlement period, when Worcester suffered the loss of so many estates (115).

King's tentative and parenthetical suggestion is, however, disputed by Patrick Wormald, whose informal lecture at the conference, reconstructed here as "Oswaldslow: An Immu-

nity?" (117–28), is described as sketching out an equally tentative argument, indeed, a "dark suspicion" (117), which he has since developed more fully in his chapter "Lordship and justice in the early English kingdom: Oswaldslow revisited," in W. Davies and P. Fouracre, ed., *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1996). Wormald suggests that the *Domesday* rendition of the liberty of Oswaldslow, with its emphasis upon freedom from the authority of the sheriff, is a pious forgery, devised by the sainted Wulfstan on a Continental model, to forestall the predations of the Conqueror's sheriffs. He also contends, *pace* King, that the *Indiculum*, with its notable absence of judicial immunity, was not only pre-Conquest, but dates from St. Oswald himself (119 ff.). The wider implication of all this is that there were no judicial immunities or "private hundreds" in pre-Conquest England. The bishop of Worcester, no matter what he claimed in *Domesday Book*, could not exclude sheriffs from his territories. This does not mean that bishops, abbots, and other great lords were helpless before royal justice, but rather that they exercised clout in local government "as a matter not of institutions but of politics" (128). Before the Conquest, one might add, men like the bishop of Worcester had little need of a judicial immunity to control the local hundred courts, because, more often than not, the sheriff was in the their pocket. One awaits with interest the promised book-length development of these tantalizing suggestions.

While Wormald suggests fraud in the terms of privilege recorded for Oswaldslow in *Domesday Book*, Steven Bassett has discerned a substratum of fact in the "infamous *Altritonant* charter" (169). While conceding that the immunities described in this charter are a twelfth-century invention, Bassett argues in "The Administrative Landscape of the Diocese of Worcester in the Tenth Century" (147–73) that the pious forgers of late eleventh- and twelfth-century Worcester would have had no reason to invent the account of the formation of Oswaldslow through the amalgamation of two existing hundreds with a third, new one (169). He also argues that the development of shires and hundreds coterminous with diocesan geography throughout the West Midland shires was older and longer-established than is sometimes thought.

Even if, as Wareham and King argue, bishops such as St. Oswald leased church lands to family and close retainers in the hope of getting them back at the end of the lease, those hopes were not always realized. Christopher Dyer, in his provocatively titled "St. Oswald and 10,000 West Midland Peasants" (174–93), notes that many of the leased lands ultimately fell into private hands (177). He emphasizes, however, that the relatively small leaseholds granted by Worcester facilitated more efficient exploitation and, in an age of developing markets, contributed to greater economic growth and increased profits, both for the church and for the leaseholders. Dyer, however, retains a healthy skepticism about the effects of this increased administrative attention and efficiency of exploitation upon the lives of the thousands of slaves and peasants upon whose forced labor the entire system depended.

Arguing, following P.D.A. Harvey, that the well-known *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum (RSP)* originated in Worcester and may have been based on a lost tenth-century original, Dyer effectively uses the *RSP* to discuss continuity and change in the world of the laborers of Worcester. Dyer concludes that, while slavery remained an important element of Worcester labor force, and while the growth of a trade economy may have forced peasants to work and pay more to their lay and ecclesiastical lords, peasants may have benefitted somewhat, both from the availability of a market in which sell their produce or labor, and from having some say in the organization of their farms and the layout of their settlements. Given the limitations of the sorts of evidence at his disposal, Dyer is hard pressed to apply the *Annales*-school approach of P. Goubert, whose *Louis XIV and Twenty Million Frenchmen* is commemorated in Dyer's choice of a title, to the peasant tenants of Bishop Oswald, but his focus on the "lives of the uncelebrated" provides a different dimension to this collection of essays.

While many of the charters upon which Emma Mason's fine study of *Westminster Abbey and Its People, c. 1050–c. 1216* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell) is based post-date our period, there is still much here to interest the Anglo-Saxonist. Despite its title, the work actually begins with a summary of the history of the church of Westminster from its legendary Romano-British origins to the reign of Edward the Confessor. The first chapter provides a narrative summary of the church's history from its foundation and growth under Mercian patronage, through its ravaging during the Danish invasions, to its refoundation as a monastic church by St. Dunstan and its rebuilding on a lavish scale and endowment by Edward the Confessor. The second chapter describes the careers of the early abbots from Westminster's refoundation c. 970 through 1136 summarizing what little is known of its Anglo-Saxon abbots in a handful of pages. It is a pity for Anglo-Saxonists that Mason's remarkable ability to clearly and insightfully draw out the political and social implications of the extant charters is necessarily devoted largely to the post-Conquest evidence.

The essays discussed above which analyze the development of Winchester, Worcester, and Durham cathedrals owe much to the influence of Barbara Harvey, whose own works have done so much to illuminate late medieval English monastic life in general and the history of Winchester in particular. It is therefore fitting that the *Festschrift* published in her honor in 1996, *The Cloister and the World: Essays in Medieval History in Honour of Barbara Harvey* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) begins with a brief but insightful essay on "The Minsters of the Thames" (5–28) by John Blair, who also edited the *Festschrift* with Brian Golding. Blair catalogues thirty-three important Anglo-Saxon churches on the Thames, describes the geographical and logistical considerations underlying their initial siting and the development of towns around them in later centuries.

Like Worcester and Winchester, Canterbury also re-

ceived scholarly attention in our year. The ambitious new *History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univer. 1995), edited by Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks, focuses not upon its lands, political influence, or architecture, but upon the Cathedral community itself. Nicholas Brooks' contribution, "The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral Community, 597–1070" (1–37) provides a clear and succinct, yet insightful, narrative of the Cathedral's early history, placing the actions of the successive leaders of its community firmly in the context of contemporary political and intellectual trends.

The 1994 meeting of the American Charles Homer Haskins Society for the study of Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Angevin history was noteworthy for several papers, subsequently published in volume six of the *Haskins Society Journal* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell 1995). Susan J. Ridyard's "Monk-Kings and the Anglo-Saxon Hagiographic Tradition" (13–27) fully develops and substantiates a suggestion first offered in her important book *The Royal Saints of Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge 1988). In that work, Ridyard had noted the contrast between male Anglo-Saxon royal saints, who are consistently portrayed as martyrs in war against pagan foes, and female Anglo-Saxon royal saints, who are venerated for their monastic vocations and foundations. Reviewing the evidence for the active and religious careers of six Anglo-Saxon kings who abdicated their thrones in favor of a religious life, Ridyard concludes that none were posthumously venerated as saints. After insightfully identifying a number of practical and local factors which may have played a part in determining the posthumous reputation of monk-kings, such as the inconvenient lack of relics or subsequent breaks in continuity in the history of the monastic communities with which some had been associated, Ridyard convincingly demonstrates that such abdications were incompatible with a developing ecclesiastical conception of active Christian kingship which looked to kings to protect, reform, and enrich the Church. Ridyard also demonstrates that such abdications were not always voluntary and were potentially destabilizing, both to the kingdoms and the monastic communities involved, thus explaining why the church promoted the cults of warrior kings who died fighting the heathen, but had no desire to encourage monastic vocations among kings.

Patricia Halpin's contribution to the Haskins conference, "Women Religious in Late Anglo-Saxon England" (97–110), offers a useful corrective to the well-worn cliché which compares the 'Golden Age' of pre-Viking double monasteries ruled by abbesses unfavorably with a post-invasion waning of female religious life. While the age of new foundations had admittedly passed and the tenth and eleventh centuries offered fewer opportunities for female leadership in the church than past age, Halpin argues that female religiosity flourished in the aftermath of the Viking invasions and the growth of the monastic reform movement (97). Mining the evidence of wills and charters, Halpin demonstrates that lay patronage, male and female alike, increasingly shifted to male monastic foun-

dations and private churches in which masses could be offered for donors' souls, and that enclosed communal life in an established female foundation became less available and less appealing. Halpin shows that women, however, were still powerfully drawn to a religious life, and given the decline in communal outlets, practiced "alternative religious life styles" (107). She succeeds in teasing from the limited sources insights into the increasingly informal living arrangements which found a number of women "living in some fashion on the edge of both thoroughly reformed male communities and male canonries," and which, she suggests, represent a continuation of the tradition of "vowesses, hermitesses, and anchoresses" (107).

The Haskins Conference was also noteworthy for an important paper by Robin Fleming on the "History and Liturgy at Pre-Conquest Christ Church" (67–83). The leadership, lands, and history of the Christ Church community have often been the subject of historical attention, most notably and recently by Nicholas Brooks. Despite this wealth of existing scholarship, Fleming has found something new and important to say. She did so by fully developing and critically analyzing the implications of the four surviving obituary lists of the community (which she has since edited). Although these lists were compiled well after 1066, they span over seven hundred years; Fleming finds in them a "wealth of information on the friends and benefactors of Christ Church just before the Norman Conquest," which not only identifies these individuals but provides valuable information about their donations of land and other gifts, not all of which survived in charter form. Fleming's original contribution is her critical analysis of the texts, which, she convincingly demonstrates, cannot be taken at face value: "A careful study of the obit-lists reveals that the pre-Conquest information contained in them was collected, compiled, and periodically reworked again and again both before and after the Conquest" (68). Fleming argues that Christ Church deliberately expunged the names of its Kentish benefactors and patrons in the early tenth century, not out of indifference or ignorance, but as part of its efforts to accommodate to the West Saxon hegemony, much as the community again purged its necrology after the Norman Conquest to expunge the names of the Godwinesons and their displaced supporters. Indeed, she suggests, the purged Kentish names may themselves have displaced the names of earlier benefactors (77). Fleming argues, moreover, that the community not only erased the names of politically incorrect former patrons, but replaced them with pious forgeries in which Christ Church attempted to support a claim to the property in question by retroactively attributing the gifts to other kings and archbishops who enjoyed better posthumous repute (76–77). Fleming also notes, following Brooks, that these periodic revisions were not confined to lay donors, but included the community's own members. Like its charters, the community's obituaries were rewritten to give the community a long monastic past which it had not in fact possessed. "The removal of the names of

clerks from the Christ Church obituaries, and their banishing from the community's commemorative liturgy," she notes, "exhibits a mean-spirited and thorough rewriting of the past, as well as a canny recognition of the power of history" (80). Indeed, she concludes, "the more I study this material, the more I am convinced that the cultivators of such obituaries were driven as much by the desire to commemorate their property as their patrons" (81). One ought to stress how innovative Fleming's approach to sources is in this piece. If she is right, monastic *liber vitae* must be considered as a form of historical memory and writing. It will be interesting to see whether her findings for Christ Church hold up for other religious houses.

Significant publications concerning the history of the Church of Canterbury in 1995–1996 include not only the *History of Canterbury Cathedral* referenced above but an interesting collection of essays on *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints, and Scholars 1066–1109* (London: Hambledon Press), edited by Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe. Despite its title, the contributors offer interesting insights and comparisons of pre- and post-Conquest Canterbury which warrant greater recognition than is feasible here. The one article that I would single out for special attention is Richard Emms, "The Historical Traditions of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury" (159–68), which ought to be read in conjunction with Fleming's article on the other Canterbury religious house, Christ Church. Neither community is known for its historical traditions. Indeed, St. Augustine's press has been uniformly bad among modern historians, who have found little to praise in its medieval historians. Emms may not rennovate monastic writers like Goscelin and Thomas of Elmham completely, but, in contrast to Fleming, he does find in their confused memories of the past an honest if inaccurate record of the monks' traditions and beliefs. The works that Emms studies here are all post-Conquest. The preoccupations of the monks in the late eleventh and the early twelfth century are displayed in both a series of forged charters and the historical writings of the monk Goscelin. Interestingly, the earliest extant copies of these forgeries appear in an early twelfth-century manuscript that is otherwise entirely devoted to Goscelin's "History of St. Augustine and the saints who rest with him." The context for these works, according to Emms, was a time of crisis for the monks, not only in terms of the preservation of the house's endowment but in the maintenance of its historical traditions. The forged charters, according to Emms, "illustrate a period when oral traditions were breaking down in the face of new challenges and yet the written word was still not regarded as more binding than the spoken; indeed documents were adapted to what the community believed to be true" (161–2). Goscelin's historical writings complemented these forged charters: the picture that emerged from both emphasized the great antiquity of the abbey, founded in the earliest days of English Christianity by the very man who brought the faith to England. Goscelin is not now held in high regard as a historian, but for Emms he

was crucial in preserving and reshaping St. Augustine's historical memories, rescuing from the Anglo-Saxon past important material that he then rewrote in a way that was acceptable and meaningful in Anglo-Norman times.

Among the early Kentish saints venerated by the monks of St Augustine's and commemorated by Goscelin was St. Mildred. What is often lacking in the analytical scholarship presently devoted to the study of saints and medieval religious houses is an appreciation of Christian spirituality. This criticism cannot be levied against Beda Brooks' *The World of St. Mildred, c. 660–730: A Study of an Anglo-Saxon Nun in the Golden Age of the English Church* (Bath: Downside Abbey), deeply religious appreciation of an Anglo-Saxon royal saint. Beda Brooks, O.S.B., has conscientiously mined a wide range of primary sources, including Goscelin of Canterbury's *Vita Mildrethae*, the writings of Bede, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, charters, Anglo-Saxon and Continental saints' lives, letters, and homilies, in an effort to "reconstruct the main landmarks in her life and to build up a picture of and a feeling for the reality of the 'World of Saint Mildred.'" (vi.) Sister Beda demonstrates familiarity with the works of Stenton, Wormald, and Nicholas Brooks, and her use of the primary sources is not uncritical (she notes, for example, that "the hagiographical literature must always be used with care" (147). Her narrative is basically factually accurate. This is nevertheless a very old-fashioned history, both in tone and in content. It is utterly innocent of the skeptical analyses of dynastic and political motivations which form a *leitmotiv* in the two collections of essays on St. Oswald of Northumbria and St. Oswald of Worcester, reviewed here. Instead, Sister Beda unquestioningly describes the royal house of the Magonsæte, from which St. Mildred sprang, as "distinguished by the genuine strength of its commitment to the cause of Christ" (ix) and consistently ascribes her subjects' actions to religious motivations. For example, she assures the reader: "The point which cannot be overemphasized is that Mildred's parents chose to separate not from any lack of natural affection, but simply for the love of Christ" (25). The style, moreover, is reminiscent of the late Eleanor Shipley Duckett's penchant for "As Charlemagne looked over the battlements, he must have thought . . ." Sister Beda echoes this approach with such phrases as: "It must have been a joy for Merewalh to talk of the new churches and show them to his children" (5). However, despite its occasional naivete and sentimentality, *The World of St. Mildred* does provide a vivid and accessible introductory account which will not factually mislead the unwary reader (the Acknowledgments indicate that Nicholas Brooks read an early draft) and which does succeed in conveying something of the flavor of Saint Mildred's world.

c. Norman Conquest and Settlement

BOYDELL AND BREWER has won a place in the hearts of English medieval historians because of its willingness to reissue useful books that the original publishers have allowed to go out of print. R. Allen Brown, ed., *The Norman Conquest of Eng-*

land: Sources and Documents (Woodbridge and Rochester, N.Y., 1995), first published in 1984, is a case in point; it remains a first-rate compilation of narrative and documentary sources not only for the Conquest itself but for Norman and English law, custom, society, and the Church in the late tenth and the first half of the eleventh century. Eschewing "a piecemeal collection" of short narrative extracts recording the political and military facts of 1066 and its results, Brown undertook the more ambitious task of compiling materials for a study "in as much depth as possible of two societies, their preceding histories, the causes both long-term of their confrontation in 1066, and its results" (xvii). Along with long selections from the expected major Anglo-Saxon, Norman and Anglo-Norman literary and narrative sources (William of Jumièges, William of Poitiers, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'Florence' of Worcester, *The Life of King Edward*, *De Obitu Willelmi*, William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis), the reader will find relevant extracts from monastic chronicles (e.g. from Abingdon, Battle, and Ely) and saints' lives (Gilbert Crispin's *Life of Herluin*). The only major narrative source omitted is the *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, which Brown, following R.H.C. Davis, dismissed as a literary exercise of much later date without historical value. This is an unfortunate omission, since the jury is still out on the authorship and value of the *Carmen*, which may well be a contemporary account written soon after the battle of Hastings by Guy, bishop of Amiens. The narrative sources are rounded out by a selection of charters, writs, customs, letters, and surveys. On the whole, Brown has chosen well, but some of his choices may strike the specialist as odd: why include the Burghal Hidage, the relevance of which to the English military organization in 1066 is suspect, to the say the least, and why so little from the *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* and Domesday Book in a work that purports to place the Conquest in its societal context? Brown includes no wills, an important source of information for pre-Conquest English society and land tenure, and only five poorly reproduced, black and white scenes from the Bayeux Tapestry, presumably for reasons of cost. The translations, however, are uniformly good. Brown himself translated many of the selections, including the large extract from William of Poitiers. The introductions to the selections merely lay out the manuscript history and provide some information about authorship. Brown consciously decided to provide as little interpretive commentary as possible so "that the reader or student should study the subject through the original sources, and to that end the sources should be left so far as possible to speak for themselves" (xviii). For a historian with as pronounced views as Brown, this reticence is nothing short of extraordinary. Brown's pronounced beliefs, in particular his view that the Normans were an advanced feudal society and the English had not achieved this level of development, does, however, color his selection of sources. Thus we find a single lease from Bishop Oswald, but not the famous memorandum (BCS 1136), which both Frederic Maitland and Eric John used so tellingly to establish

the existence of dependent military tenures in pre-Conquest England. On the other hand, one of the writs that Brown includes to illustrate the Norman feudal system, the Conqueror's well known military summons to Æthelwig, abbot of Evesham (no. 178) may, in fact, be spurious. (See David Bates, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acts of William I, 1066-1087*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, no. 131.)

Whereas R. Allen Brown placed the Norman Conquest in its wider social and political context, Stephen Morillo, ed., *The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1996), focuses squarely on the battle of Hastings. Morillo has assembled a collection of translated contemporary accounts and previously published scholarly interpretations of the campaign and battle intended for classroom instruction. Part one, the primary sources, overlaps Brown's collection, but restricts itself to contemporary narrative accounts of the battle. Both thus include excerpts from William of Jumièges, William of Poitiers, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'Florence' of Worcester, and the Bayeux Tapestry (though Morillo presents twenty-two black and white plates covering the entire battle, from the scouts of the two armies sighting one another to the final rout of the English). Morillo also includes an excerpt from the controversial *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, with a judicious introduction to the text laying out the opposing views concerning its provenance and value. Morillo's translation of William of Poitiers is readable and accurate, and it is therefore even more the pity that he chose to use Joseph Stevenson's archaic 1853 rendering of 'Florence' rather than translate the selection anew. Part two, "Interpretations," is divided into three sections. The first, consisting of articles by Marjorie Chibnall and myself, deals with the military organization of England and Normandy in 1066; the second, with the campaign (articles by John Gillingham, Carroll Gillmor, and Christine and Gerald Grainge); and the third, with the battle itself (David Hume, E.A. Freeman, J.F.C. Fuller, Richard Glover, Bernard Bachrach, R. Allen Brown, and Morillo himself). The snippets from Hume and Freeman lend a nice historiographical touch, and all the selections are well thought out, though one regrets that Bachrach is represented by a short piece on the feigned retreat rather than his major article in *Anglo-Norman Studies* 8 (1985) on Duke William's military administration of the Hastings campaign. The articles are also edited down, which, in some cases, lessens their value to the serious scholar, who will still have consult the original publications to obtain the full force of the arguments. The only new interpretation written specifically for this volume is Morillo's introduction, which does far more than highlight the arguments in the selected texts. Morillo has, in fact, written a highly original, critical, and provocative analysis of traditional approaches to the writing of military history. His suggestion that the best intellectual tool for conceptualizing warfare is chaos theory is one that historians ought to consider very seriously. One might have wished, however, that Morillo had pushed this line of argument

further: it remains a suggestion in the introduction rather than a true tool of analysis. One hopes that he will further develop this approach to battle in future publications.

The maps that he prepared to represent the different phases of the battle are themselves unusual; they take into account not only topography but the uncertainties of positions. Morillo's brief introductions to the sources are clearly aimed at teachers and students. In short, this is a useful compendium of sources for undergraduate teaching on what the publisher trumpets as "one of the most significant battles in European history." One might, however, question whether the battle of Hastings as a battle really does merit such in depth treatment. Morillo's own offering, "Hastings: An Unusual Battle," emphasizes that "Hastings was an atypical battle from which it is dangerous to draw too many inferences without reference to a broad range of comparative materials. This emphasis . . . is a reminder that the closest study of Hastings should not stand in isolation from the larger history of which it is a part" (218). In terms of medieval military history, battle history itself is suspect, as John Gillingham reminds us in the article that represents him in this book, "William the Bastard at War" (1989). Here Gillingham advances a persuasive argument that battles such as Hastings were rare in eleventh-century warfare because medieval commanders avoided such engagements and the risk that attended them. William the Conqueror's customary mode of warfare, as Gillingham shows, was to pillage the enemy's countryside and to lay siege to his castles and towns. With all of its many merits as a teaching text, Morillo's *Battle of Hastings* is a book that needs to be used in conjunction with other works that place Hastings in wider context, militarily and politically. On a practical note, the usefulness of both Brown's and Morillo's collections of documents for classroom instruction is seriously undermined by the costliness of the books, both of which now sell for about \$30 in paperback.

Among the articles that Morillo includes is Christine Grainge and Gerald Grainge's "The Pevensey Expedition: Brilliantly Executed Plan or Near Disaster?" *Mariner's Mirror* 79 (1993), 261-73. The Grainges ask whether Duke William's passage from Dives Estuary and neighboring parts to St. Valéry sur Somme before crossing to Pevensey was a carefully thought out plan to take advantage of Harold's dismissal of his *scyp fyrd*, as Carroll Gillmor argued (in another article in Morillo's collection), or simply a circumstance "dictated by nautical and navigational constraints and modified in execution by stress of the weather." The authors come down solidly in the latter camp, declaring that St. Valéry represented a near disaster for the Duke. The article closely examines navigational and weather conditions along the coast of Normandy in the eleventh century. The coast around St. Valéry, they conclude, presented dangers as a lee shore. With a westerly wind blowing, as it was when William left Dives on 12 Sept. 1066, the passage was exceedingly hazardous. Relying heavily upon the *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, which they regard as a genuine and particularly valuable contemporary

source, Christine and Gerald Grainge argue that William did not intend to relocate to St. Valéry but was blown there "willy-nilly," suffering the loss of men and ships in the process. Fortunately for William, Harold proved to be an incompetent strategist. His positioning of his fleet off the Isle of Wight made little sense in terms of naval strategy. From his base, he could neither intercept William's fleet nor prevent it from landing. Rather, Harold's apparent strategy came down simply to waiting until William had landed and then force marching his troops to wherever he was. As it happened, Harold was forced by the Norse invasion to abandon his position on the Isle of Wight. But it was not Harold's dispersal of his fleet that moved William to sail on 12 September but the realization that, westerly wind or not, the Norman fleet had to try a Channel crossing before weather conditions made one impossible. The Grainges conclude: "In light of the prevailing meteorological conditions and with a proper understanding of nautical and navigational issues, the contemporary record suggests that the invasion fleet sailed from Dives in the middle of September in marginal conditions, with the intention of reaching England, but was forced to run downwind to the Somme estuary" (271). In short, St. Valéry represented for William a near disaster.

C.D. Lee responds in *Mariner's Mirror* 80 (1994), 208–9, and 81 (1995), 347, that Harold did, in fact, have a naval strategy. The choice of the Isle of Wight made perfect sense as an assembly point for a fleet collected from ports as far west as Bristol and as far east as the Cinque Ports. The Solent, moreover, not only was a sheltered body of water but close to victualling points. Harold's strategy was to repeat the naval operations that he had used in his Welsh campaign of 1064 (though precisely what this would have entailed is left unclear). Harold failed largely because of exogenous factors: his brother Tostig's raid on the Isle of Wight, which delayed the muster of his troops, and the difficulties of reversing the policy of naval disarmament imposed a generation before by Edward the Confessor. Lee claims that "the shock of changing from a policy of disarmament to one of rearmament in a matter of a few months" when combined with his brother's "treachery," logistical problems, and a fickle weather system proved too much for Harold to overcome.

N.A.M. Rodger, "The Norman Invasion of 1066," *Mariner's Mirror* 80 (1994), 459–63, is persuaded neither by the Grainges nor Lee. He is especially unimpressed with Lee's analogy with defense cuts, which he finds "wide of the mark," since what Edward the Confessor dismissed was his predecessors' Danish mercenary forces, not the regular *scyp fyrd*s upon which the naval defense of England had traditionally rested. Nor were communications as problematic as the Grainges believed. Rodger has no difficulty believing that both Harold and William were able to keep close tabs on each other's forces. The Isle of Wight made nautical sense as a base in that it placed Harold's fleet windward of any Norman fleet sailing across the Channel. From the Isle of Wight, moreover, Harold could—and did—mount a spoiling attack on the

Norman fleet in port. (Rodger is the only one in this debate to have noticed that a Domesday Book entry for Essex, 14b, mentions a "*navale praelium contra Willelmo*" in 1066.) If William sailed, Harold's plan was not try to intercept his fleet, since naval battles in open sea were a virtual impossibility, but would wait until he landed and was most vulnerable and then fall upon him from the sea. William realized this and played a waiting game with Harold, knowing that a Norwegian invasion was imminent. Rodger suggests that the Norman chroniclers invented the tale of the adverse winds blowing for a month to protect William from the charge that he feared to face Harold in battle. Rodger does agree, however, with the Grainges that William did not intend to be blown into St. Valéry and got out of that dangerous port as soon as he could. It was the "fortunes of a desperate and close-fought battle," he concludes, "not faulty strategy, nor unseasonable weather, nor untimely 'defence cuts' that cost Harold his throne and life (461).

John Marshall Carter, "Une réévaluation des interprétations de la fuit sumulée d'Hastings," *Annales de Normandie* 45 (1995), 27–34, reconsiders the evidence for the Normans' use of the stratagem of feigned flight at Hastings to draw the English from their strong defensive position. Carter's article reviews the evidence for the use of this tactic and how historians from the thirteenth century to the present have interpreted the sources. Modern historians (notably Wilhelm Spatz, Alfred Burne, and Charles Lemmon) have contested whether such a maneuver would even have been possible, on the assumption (derived from Sir Charles Oman) that medieval warfare was chaotic and eleventh-century armies ill-disciplined and unsoldierly. They doubted the capacity of the Normans to communicate with one another in battle or to act with the coordination necessary to pull off such a tactic. The absence of evidence that Normans used such a tactic on other occasions clinches the matter for them. Burne and Lemmon explained William of Poitiers' description of the feigned flight as an attempt to cover up a supposed panic of the Norman knights. More recently, R. Allen Brown, Bernard Bachrach, and Stephen Morillo (whom Carter does not mention) have argued that William did order a feigned flight and that it was executed just as William of Poitiers and the *Carmen* depict. For these historians, eleventh-century armies were not amateurish rabble of noble warriors on horseback, but trained, organized forces divided into units known as *conrois*, capable of sophisticated maneuvers. Based on an examination of the terrain of the battlefield, Carter, however, doubts whether the tactic was actually employed. The slope leading up to the English position and the marshy land at the foot of the hill would have made any such maneuver extremely risky. Even if the Normans were capable of executing a feigned retreat (about which Carter remains skeptical), the conditions of the battlefield were such that a good general—and Carter agrees that William was such—would not have ordered one. Carter concludes that William won this hard fought battle not because of his use of this stratagem because he was able to rally

his panicked troops and maintain order in his ranks.

Turning from the Norman Conquest to the Norman settlement, H. Tsurushima, "Domesday Interpreters," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 18 (1996), 201–22, explores the "evidence for those interpreters between English and French or occasionally Latin, who played an essential part" in the Domesday Book inquest and in bridging the divide between the new Norman lords and their English neighbors and peasant tenants. As Tsurushima observes, the Norman Conquest produced a society that was "not merely linguistically mixed but also linguistically ranked." The Norman settlement required interpreters to act as "hinge-men," connecting the French newcomers and the native population, a problem which became particularly acute, according to Tsurushima, during the Domesday Book inquest. Tsurushima's investigation of Domesday Book and early twelfth-century cartularies uncovers eighteen individuals who were either designated as *interpretes* or who bore the byname "latimer," a corrupted form of Latiner, one who can speak Latin. With one exception, these were all minor, local landholders. Tsurushima identifies at least eight as Englishmen. These interpreters fell into three categories: royal agents, baronial tenants, and household retainers. He sees all three as playing important roles in translating between their Norman masters and the native English, and speculates that the Domesday commissioners brought with them their household interpreters, whereas in the county courts themselves there would have also been local interpreters who either acted as royal agents, holding land in chief, or as baronial tenants and domestic servants. A peculiarity of the Domesday interpreters is that they are regionally concentrated in the south. Tsurushima suggests that this reflects early and intensive Norman settlement, which led to Norman lords becoming members of their local communities, and routine attendees at the shire courts, by 1086. This meant that, in the south, "the interpreter's profession was indispensable for the social unification of the two *nationes*" (222). Though Tsurushima's conclusions about the role and importance of interpreters in both the Domesday inquest and the Norman settlement itself are logical, the evidence that he can adduce for them is disappointingly thin. Neither Domesday Book nor any of its satellites, as he admits, shows interpreters in action; as a result, he can do little more than identify the *interpretes* or "latimers" and detail where and from whom they held land.

David Roffe, "The Making of Domesday Book Reconsidered," *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 6 (1994), 153–66, is a summary of an enormous amount of research in and thinking about the making of the Domesday Book survey. In this enormously rich short piece, Roffe makes a persuasive argument for a five stage process for the inquest. The first entailed a survey of royal lands, including towns, and an *inquisitio geld*. The result was an annotated geld list detailing tenure, geld assessment, and possibly value. A second, or at least independent, phase of the inquiry was the gathering of information about the resources of manors. Some of this came from jurors, but most

was provided by the tenants-in-chief or their agents. Roffe rejects V.H. Galbraith's view that these seigniorial returns were processed by the commissioners in "backroom sessions," seeing instead the negotiations as taking place in the public sessions. The third stage was the compilation of the returns, which involved marrying the seigniorial returns with the geographically ordered geld list produced in the first stage. How this was done differed according to circuit. In the southwestern circuit the commissioners proceeded directly to a seigniorially arranged account, as exemplified by the satellite survey known as Exon Domesday Book. This was the procedure probably also followed in the Midland circuit and in East Anglia, where Little Domesday Book seems to have been analogous to Exon. In the East Midland and, probably, in the North and the West, a radically different procedure was followed, in which the form of the geld list was retained and details of the estates inserted into it. This resulted in intermediate surveys, e.g. *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*, which were then rearranged by lordship. The fourth stage involved editing down the circuit returns into the form that they appear in Domesday Book. The fifth, and final, stage was the resolution of disputes, which took place at the same time as, but independent of, the compilation of the text. Roffe's main conclusion is that the Domesday inquest was not the seigniorial process, as thought by the current orthodoxy, but was driven by William the Conqueror's desire to have a record of his royal rights and dues. Despite V.H. Galbraith's assertion to the contrary, the Domesday inquest was intimately connected with the geld survey that was undertaken in 1086. The two surveys were complementary. "Domesday Book proper relates to lordship, both royal and seigniorial. But this was not the only social organization in which the king had an interest. He also had jurisdiction and rights over all free men, and it was through the shire he exercised it" (166). Roffe also challenges received opinion in emphasizing the role played by the jurors, though, in keeping with his central thesis, he sees the audit of geld payment as their main business. This is a nuanced and persuasive sketch of how the inquest occurred. It might, however, underplay too much the interest of the lords in seeking security of title and the juridical aspect of the inquest. Nor does it give much flavor of what really took place in the public sessions. For that one must turn to Robin Fleming's and C.S. Lewis' work on the Domesday jurors, which complements Roffe's piece much as he saw the geld survey complementing Domesday Book.

Roffe rejects the argument advanced by Sally Harvey that much of the information in Domesday Book came from documents compiled before 1066. The surveys that she believed to be pre-Conquest administrative records, he argues, were in fact products of the Conqueror's administration. If Roffe is right, then one of the key pieces of evidence cited for institutional continuity between the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman polities vanishes. Bruce R. O'Brien, on the other hand, finds continuity where one might least expect it, in the famous *murdrum* fine. In "From *Morðor* to *Murdrum*:"

The Preconquest Origin and Norman Revival of the Murder Fine," *Speculum* 71 (1996), 321–57, O'Brien argues that the murder fine, "accepted by most Anglo-Norman historians as proving that the introduction of Norman lordship was commonly resisted with violent, even 'terrorist,' force and that the Normans responded with harsh and equally violent measures to stifle rebellion" (322), in fact well predated the Conquest. It was imposed by a conqueror, to be sure, but that conqueror was Cnut, not William, just as it states in the *Leges Edwardi Confessoris*, an early twelfth-century treatise on breach of peace. On this view, O'Brien answers the obvious objection that the murder fine does not occur in any of Cnut's law codes by suggesting that as a novel imposition from the beginning of his reign we should not expect that it would be included in a law code composed by an Englishman, Bishop Wulfstan, archbishop of York, in the early 1020s. Indeed, O'Brien suggests that the archbishop may have used the unusual term *murð* in Cnut's code, which he makes a *botleas* crime, in order to signal his opposition to the new murder fine, which was atonable. Wulfstan's disapproval reflected the seriousness with which the English regarded *morðor*. By the early eleventh century, the growth of royal lordship had placed all kinless men and strangers under the protection (*borh*) of the king. To kill one, then, became an act of treason "to be punished at the hands of the avenging warriors of the king" (348). Cnut protected his Danish followers by establishing an unusually high fine for any who were slain, and imposing the obligation for payment on those most likely to have been responsible, the English lords. What was new about this, O'Brien contends, was not its apparent harshness, but its mercy: Cnut allowed what had been a *botleas* crime to be emended through the payment of wergild. O'Brien answers

the second obvious objection, that the administration of such a murder fine would require established institutions of communal accusation and local surety (what was to be later known as frankpledge), by showing that just such a system was in place when Cnut came to the throne. Cnut simply tied his new murder fine to the existing system of *borh* and *teodung*.

O'Brien further asserts that Cnut's murder fine continued to be levied under Edward the Confessor, though he is forced to concede that it is not mentioned in any source from the period. William I, with a need similar to Cnut's, "resurrected or maintained Cnut's murder fine," perhaps even with English help (349–50). If O'Brien's argument is accepted, "the reimposition of the murder fine after 1066 can no longer be taken as proof of hostility between the 'races'" (354). On the contrary, it can be seen as one more sign of William's "respect for his inherited Anglo-Saxon royal rights and his conservative goal to rule through traditional powers" (354).

This is a stimulating and learned article. There is much of interest in it, not the least being a short excursus on the semantic confusion between the Old English word *morðor* and the French word *mordre*, that led even early commentators like Richard Fitz Nigel to mistranslate *morðor* as a secret killing, a meaning that it never had. O'Brien's command of languages and sources is impressive. He also establishes to my satisfaction that institutions for communal accusation and surety were already in existence in the early eleventh century. But, all that said, one is still struck by the lack of positive documentary evidence in any contemporary source for the existence of *murdrum* before the Conquest. It is possible that O'Brien and the twelfth-century author of the *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* got it right, but the jury is still out.

R.A.

7. Names

THREE EPNS volumes and a revision of a major book are probably the most significant works in this year's bibliography. In *The Place-Names of Shropshire, II: The Hundreds of Ford and Condover*, Nottingham, 1995, M. Gelling and H.D.G. Foxall provide the usual thorough discussion of the regional place-names of recent EPNS volumes with their focus on regional place-names and field-names since the major names such as township names were discussed in Volume I. This volume as well as Part III (forthcoming) will run parallel to the geographic areas discussed in the corresponding volumes of the *Victoria History of Shropshire*; in the case of this volume, Volume VII is the corresponding *Victoria History* volume. Gelling and Foxall note that the place-names in *l'ab* suggest that much of the area was woodland when the English naming occurred. The main habitative names end in the elements *tūn* or *cot*. In *The Place-Names of Norfolk, Part Two: The Hundreds of East and West Flegg, Happening and Tunstead*, Nottingham, 1996, K.I. Sandred et al. survey the onomastic

evidence of the contact between the English and the Scandinavians in the countryside in this part of the Danelaw, with the greatest emphasis on minor names and field-names. The first volume dealing with the place-names of the City of Norwich provided the evidence for such contact in the urban areas. K. Cameron, with J. Field and J. Insley, has continued his own work on Lincolnshire place-names with *The Place-Names of Lincolnshire, IV: The Wapentakes of Ludborough and Haverstoe*, Nottingham, 1996. This volume follows the pattern established by Cameron of listing the parishes in each wapentake in alphabetical order and of giving the major names, minor names, and field-names for each parish with as much historical data as possible and probable etymologies for many of the names. Cameron's *English Place-Names*, revised ed, London, 1996 is a revision of the third edition of the same book which adds addenda to twelve of the twenty chapters at the end of the book to account for new scholarship on the topics of those chapters since the last edition, particularly

recent studies by Gelling such as *Place-Names in the Landscape*.

A large number of articles this year deal with individual place-names. In "Clovelly, Devon" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 36–44), R. Coates rejects various proposed etymologies of the name *Clovelly* to end up arguing that it is a Cornish name meaning "earthworks associated with Fele(c)," a personal name that was also the source for the place-names in *Velley* and the place-name *Trellick*. In Willibrord und Echternach/Epternacum" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 493–500), F. van der Rhee suggests that the <pt> in *Epternacum* which changed to *Efternach*, and later, to *Echternach* can be traced to the Old Irish and Old English influence of the orthography of Willibrord and his companions in the scriptorium established at the monastery at *Echternach* on the Continent. In "Egglissham—a Lost Dorchester Place Name" (*Proc. of the Dorset Nat. Hist. and Archaeol. Soc.* 116, 139–40), J. Draper identifies the field name discussed by A.D. Mills in *The Place-Names of Dorset Part 1* as *Egglissham* as *Northernhay*, a drained meadow bounded by the Frome to the north and east, the north wall of Dorchester to the south, and the road to Charminster to the west. In "An Old Domesday Crux: Hanechedene, Radnage, & Bradenham" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 36, 161–64), A.H.J. Baines confirms earlier suggestions that *Hanechedene* mentioned in a Domesday Book entry for Buckinghamshire is *Radnage* and argues that *Radnage* and *Bradenham* formed a five-hide fiscal unit named *Eaningadene* which is the valley on whose sides *Radnage* and *Bradenham* sit. In "Bredingcote: a 'Missing' Lost Village" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 36, 173–74), K. Bailey adds Bredingcote occupying marginal land in the northeast corner of Cubbington parish to the list of Buckinghamshire names of the Deserted Medieval Village Research Group. In "The Place-Name Thursley" *N&Q* 43, 387–89), C. Hough supports the derivation of *Thursley* from **Thunres lēah*, thus making it a *Thunor*-name despite the loss of medial -n-. The lost *Thures lege* in Rutland shows the same loss, and both may have been modified by the influence of ON *Thórr* on place-names originally from OE *Thunor*. In "Moonhill" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 32–35, C. Hough and B. Cox suggest that the meaning of the first element of the compound place-name in the title is indeed "moon" but that its use derives from the curving ridge lying across the hill's slope which looks like a shape reminiscent of a crescent moon. That meaning may have been reinforced by its early scrub cover to the northeast which reminded people of the burden of brushwood or thorns which the peasant in the folk-tale of the Man in the Moon was said to carry. In "The Identification of Alentone/Allentone in Wiltshire Domesday" *Wiltshire Archaeol. and Nat. Hist. Mag.* 89, 132–34), J. St. John Nicolle shows conclusively that the place-name *Allentone* held by the nuns of Amesbury Abbey and the royal estate *Alentone* in Domesday which is usually identified as *Allington* about four miles east of Amesbury really is *Alton* about four miles north of Amesbury on the basis of philological, geographical, and

subsequent historical arguments. In "The Place-Name Annesley" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 45–49), C. Hough questions the certainty of attributing the first element in *Annesley* in Nottinghamshire to an unattested personal-name, either OE or ON **An*. She suggests a possible source might be OE *ān* "one," giving the meaning of the place-name as something like "lonely clearing," but she prefers an OE **ānsetles leah* "glade with a hermitage" as a possible etymology.

Other articles deal with clusters of individual place-names. C. Hough observes, in "Three Place-Name Compounds: OE *swinland*, OE *wīperstede*, and OE *cēapland*" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 71–76, that it is hard to differentiate between an *ad hoc* combination of elements and compounds whose meanings may differ from the sum of their parts in place-name studies. However, she suggests that *Swilland* in Suffolk does not just mean "swine-land" as a compound but specifically "swine-pasture," that *Worsted's Farm* in Sussex may derive from OE *wīper* and OE *stede* but that *wīper* should not be interpreted as just "opposite" but *wīperstede* should be interpreted as "substitution" meaning "exchange of the property for something else," and that the Berkshire field-name recorded as *Chapland* from OE *cēap* "trade" and OE *land* does not just mean "land obtained by bargaining" but may be a legal term for "purchased land" as opposed to OE *bōccland* "land granted by charter" and OE *folcland* "land held according to folk-right." In "Four English Place-Name Etymologies" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 431–37), G. Kristenssen argues that *Flitten* in Bedfordshire derives its name from a collective noun OE **flīete* "rivers" plus OE *tūn* so that it comes from OE **Flīettūn* "town by the **flīete* or rivers", that *Kelmarsh* in Northamptonshire derives from an OE **cæg-hyll* and OE *merse* "marsh," but the *cæg* posited is not OE *cæg* "a key or peg" but an OE **cæg* "stone," thus the name meaning "marsh by the stone hill," that *Kirmington* in Lincolnshire derives from an OE *Cirningtūn* whose first element is OE **cirning* or **cyrning*, so the name originally meant "farmstead where butter was churned" and the original /ɛ/ was changed to /k/ because of the Scandinavianization of the area, and that *Sheinton* in Shropshire comes from an OE *Scenctum* "town on the Scenc" because the tributary of the Severn where Sheinton is located "was apparently referred to as OE *Scenc* "draught, cup." B. Cox suggests, in "Yarboroughs in Lindsey" (*Jnl. of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 50–60), that four fortified sites in the Lindsey area of Lincolnshire, including *Yarborough Camp* and *Yarburgh*, both from *eorð-burh* "fortification built of earth," were the remains of late Roman-British fortifications for the region for defence against Germanic invasions from the sea which were themselves incorporated into the *burh* defence system of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey. M. Gelling, in "The Frogmere Sites in Hertfordshire" (*Jnl. of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 28, 61–70, observes that the use of the compound name occurs only in southern counties of England and that *frog* is the most used qualifier of a *mere* in Hertfordshire. She notes that these *Frogmere* sites occur by river confluences, would likely have flooded in late winter and

then dried out in May or June and coincided with frogs' breeding cycle, appear to be natural sumps at the wetter ends of *mōr* sites, and are close to sites that were economically valuable to both Romans and Anglo-Saxons.

Several articles by C. Hough in the bibliography deal with the meanings of individual place-name elements. In "An Old English Etymon for Modern English *drake* 'male duck'" (*Neophilologus* 80, 613–615), she posits the existence of an OE **draca* "drake" as the etymon for the first element of the Gloucestershire field-name *Drakewell* which she interprets as "duckstream" rather than "dragon well" as suggested by A.H. Smith since OE *draca* "dragon" is usually combined with words for hills, valleys, or mounds rather than words for springs, streams, or wells. In "English Place-Names in *Lap-*" (*Nomina* 19, 43–50), she suggests that a derivation of the first elements in *Lapscombe* and *Lapley* from OE *læppe* "lap" referring to land at the edge of a parish may still be preferable but that the first elements in place-names like *Lapford* in Devonshire and *Lapworth* in Warwickshire as well as other place-names should be derived from either OE **(h)læpe* or **(h)læpe* "lapwing" or a personal name based on the bird name. In "Old English *rōt* in Place-Names" (*N&Q* 43, 128–29), she suggests a more plausible source for the first element in *Ratley* in Warwickshire and *Roothill* in Surrey is the OE *rōt* "a root" meaning "the root and stump of a tree" rather than Smith's earlier suggestion of the OE *rōt* "cheerful." In "Place-Name Evidence Relating to the Interpretation of Old English Legal Terminology" (*Leeds Studies in Eng.* 27, 19–48), she shows that OE *morgengifu* in place-names indicates that the practice of giving land to a bride as part of the marriage settlement was widespread and not limited to just the wealthy, that OE *mægden* and *mægdenman* in both place-names and early Old English laws are problematic, but both words may have had connotations of servitude not now associated with the words, and that *gift* in Old English place-names should frequently be considered as having the specialized meaning of "a marriage portion, a dowry." She provides a short appendix of minor names and field-names reflecting *morgengifu* and a fifteen-page appendix presenting place-name evidence reflecting OE *mægden*.

In "*Cillica, Cella, Cellomeris und Chillardus*" (*BN* 31, 164–170), N. Wagner rejects earlier proposed etymologies for these personal names and derives them from a Germanic adjective form **kills* **killja* meaning "soft" or "gentle." In "*Gotish ansis und urgermanisch *ans(u)-*" (*BN* 31, 231–40), A. Bammesberger argues that the name referred to in a Latin passage by a Roman general describing battles with the Goths derives from a Proto-Germanic **ansiz*, the nominative-accusative plural of a consonant-stem noun **ans*.

There are four articles relating to Old English dialects and place-names. A. Breeze argues convincingly, in "The Provenance of the Rushworth Mercian Gloss" (*N&Q* 43, 394–95), that the *Harewood* alluded to by Farmon's *æt harawudu* is indeed the *Harewood* in Yorkshire rather than the one in Herefordshire since the one in Herefordshire was heavily

Welsh during the tenth century when the Rushworth glosses were made by Owun and Farmon and for centuries after that. Therefore, Farmon's glosses must be regarded as East Mercian, not West Mercian. H. Kleinschmidt, in "Nomen und gens: zur gentilen Deutung von Personen- und Ortsnamen in vornormannischen Sussex" (*BN* 31, 123–60), argues that one cannot accept the existence of an independent South Saxon naming tradition in pre-Norman Sussex without considering the influence of and the similarity to West Saxon personal names and place-names in Sussex names. In "An Early Middle English Dialect Feature" (*Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Language*, Tokyo, 1994), J. Fisiak cites onomastic evidence of the spread of the voiced /v/ as a separate phoneme from /f/ in the eleventh century. He suggests that the occurrences as far north as Herefordshire, Worcestershire, northern Northamptonshire, and northern Essex should change the standard view of the spread of southern voicing in late Old English. In "Names will never hurt me" (*Studies in English Language and Literature*, London and New York, 1996), F. Colman raises doubts about dialect boundaries, particularly Kentish, on the basis of the development of Proto-Germanic /a/ before /l/ in personal names on Anglo-Saxon coins.

In "British and European River-Names" (*Trans. of the Philol. Soc.* 94, 73–118), P.R. Kitson presents strong evidence that many of the supposedly Celtic names in Ekwall's *English River-Names* are really "Old European" river-names with roots which frequently refer to water or flowing but which were reshaped by Celts. The river-names in western Indo-European countries may be formed on words not preserved as lexical items in the recorded languages of those countries, so looking at Celtic roots for river names in England may not be going deep-structure enough. The so-called alteuropäisch hydronymists' evidence also suggests that the Indo-European *urheimat* must be "in Europe south of the Baltic and north of the Alps and Carpathians, between roughly the Rhine to the west and perhaps the Don to the East."

Several articles deal with onomastic analyses of the names in specific medieval documents. K. Bailey, in "Early Anglo-Saxon Territorial Organisation in Buckinghamshire and Its Neighbors" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 36, 129–43), attempts to identify the areas allotted to the different tribal grouping in the *Tribal Hidage* compiled under Mercian direction in the seventh century and suggests a possible hierarchical organization of administrative units in the London Region beginning with the kingdoms and major *Tribal Hidage* groups, followed by "primary units" including minor *Tribal Hidage* groups which were generally 600–1200 hide units, secondary units which were generally 50–150 hide units. In "A Linguistic Analysis of the Place-Names of the Burghal Hidage" (*The Defence of Wessex*, Manchester and New York, 1996, 92–122), J.M. Dogson analyzes the thirty-three place-names in their various forms in the several manuscripts of the *Burghal Hidage* in terms of their etymological and grammatical features. He also discusses the sites and possible sites named by the place-names. In "Gazeteer of Burghal Hidage Sites" (*The Defence of*

Wessex, Manchester and New York, 1996, 189–231), D. Hill presents an excellent alphabetized list of *Burghal Hidage* sites along with a physical description of each site, its history and archeology, the *Burghal Hidage* entry and Domesday references, whether it was a “main borough” (defined as being identified as a borough in Domesday, being a town before 930 AD, and having a mint, a wall, and a market), and a plan to scale of the defense of the town. In “A Collation of the Burghal Hidage Place-Names Forms” (*The Defence of Wessex*, Manchester and New York, 1996, 122–27), A.R. Rumble collates the various spellings for the names of fortifications in the *Burghal Hidage* List and Appendix in each of the surviving manuscripts and in Gale, *Scriptores* and in Wanley, *Catalogus*.

Several entries in this year's bibliography focus on Scandinavian influence on Old English names. G. Fellows-Jensen, in *The Vikings and Their Victims: The Verdict of the Names*, London, 1995, uses both place-names and personal name evidence to show that the Vikings who settled in the British Isles intermarried with both the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic inhabitants sometimes named their children non-Scandinavian names or coined new ones from Scandinavian elements which were later carried back to Scandinavia. Fellows-Jensen also shows that Scandinavian personal names were also adopted in the Danelaw by the Anglo-Saxon population in the areas with large Scandinavian settlements in the ninth century. However, Norman personal names drove out most of the Scandinavian personal names after the Conquest, so place-names are the best evidence of the degree of Danish influence on the population of the British Isles. In “The Scandinavian Element in Minor Names and Field-Names in the North-East Lincolnshire” (*Nomina* 19, 5–27), K. Cameron examines the minor names and field-names in his *The Place Names of Lincolnshire, II*, which covers the wapentake of Yarborough, in his *The Place-Names of Lincolnshire, III*, which covers the wapentake of Walshcroft, and his *The Place Names of Lincolnshire, IV*, which (as mentioned above) covers the wapentakes of Ludborough and Haverstoe, although in this article he examines only the data from Haverstoe wapentake and not the Ludborough wapentake. Cameron shows how the Danish place-name elements, Scandinavian compound names, and Scandinavian personal names in the minor names and field-names in these three north-east Lindsey wapentakes strengthen the evidence of the major names in suggesting that the Danish settlement in the area was a large-scale colonization. In “Anglo-Scandinavian Problems in Cumbria, with Particular Reference to the Derwentwater Area” (*Nomina* 19, 91–113), D. Whaley discusses the sparseness of documentation, the problem of OE and ON cognates, and problems with the chronology of place-names in Cumberland. She concludes that there is little Celtic influence on names beyond the river-name *Derwent*, that the names are predominantly Scandinavian such as the *thwaite*-names, that there is significant Anglo-Scandinavian influence in names such as *Causey* in *Causey Pike*, and that later Middle English names in the area are from a highly Scandinavianized dialect of Middle English.

In “Aspects of Norse Place Names in the Western Isles” (*Northern Stud.* 31, 7–24), H. Pálsson calls for a six-sided analysis of Old Norse place-names in the Hebrides: formal, phonological, semantic, topological, contextual, and historical. He also cautions that the Hebridean names in the Icelandic sagas are of two types: names coined by native ON speakers and using native elements and, more commonly, adaptations of earlier Celtic names.

In *Kultura v zerkale iazyka: drevnegermanskie dvuchlennye imena sobstvennye*, Moscow, 1996, T.V. Toporova presents an exhaustive study of Old Germanic compound proper names in terms of their dialect differences, their Indo-European correlations, their morphology and compounding combinations, their semantics, and, most importantly, of their reflection of Old Germanic cultural values, beliefs, and expectations.

An encyclopedic work and three essays in it are also included in this year's bibliography. *Namenforschung/Name Studies/Les noms propres: ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*, Berlin and New York, 1995–96, edited by E. Eichler et al. is, as implied by the title, written in German (60%), English (30%), and French (10%). It is encyclopedic in nature with rather broadly focused essays rather than specifically focused essays which might add to the body of knowledge surrounding name studies. In “Place-Names in England” (I, 786–92), M. Gelling presents a very concise survey of place-name evidence for Celtic and Roman influence on the Anglo-Saxons, a short history of place-name study conclusions in England, and the regional surveys produced by the English Place-Name Society as well as place-name dictionaries. In “Personal Names in England” (I, 782–86), V. Smart provides a short summary of the personal names of Old English and Old Norse origin during the Old English period, but much of the essay deals with Middle English through Modern-Day personal naming practices. In “Name Studies in the United Kingdom” (I, 23–27), I.A. Fraser identifies the major figures, both past and present, and the various national or regional societies or surveys involved in place-name studies in the British Isles as well as recent advances in such studies.

Several other articles are also summaries of recent name studies. In “Recent Onomastic Work in Great Britain” (*Onoma* 32, 19–22), M. Gelling summarizes the work and highlights the most recent work on place-name studies in England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland centered in the various universities. She laments the fact that there is no such system of organized research on personal names in Great Britain but cites R. McKinley's *A History of British Surnames* and T.J. and P. Morgan's *Welsh Surnames* as particularly useful works. S. Denison interviews M. Gelling in “Place-Names at the Barricades” (*British Archaeol.* 3, 14) just prior to her receiving her OBE from the Queen. He, besides the interesting personal data, identifies her major influences on place-name studies to be the shifting of the focus to the influence of ordinary people (reflecting her own “left-wing instincts”) on place-names from F. Stenton's focus on “official” names and establishing the connection between Anglo-Saxon names and

topography by actually going out and looking at the sites carefully. In "Doddington Revisited" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 28–29, 361–76), G. Fellows-Jensen reviews the research on the *x-ingtūn* since her own first paper on the topic in 1974. While she grants that no single interpretation will account for all of the *x-ing* names in the *x-ingtūns*, she still feels that some of these names such as *Doddington* were based on a topographical appellative rather than a personal name but that the majority of *x-ingtūns* are the result of the addition of the generic *tūn* to earlier place-names in singular *-ing*. She feels that the 29 names in *-incthūn* in the Pas de Calais area of northern France settled by Anglo-Saxon settlers support her analysis. In "Hastings, Nottingham, Mucking, Donnington: a Survey of Research into *ing*-Formations in England" (*Namn och Bygd* 84, 43–60), G. Fellows-Jensen summarizes the literature dealing with *ing*-formations in England and focuses on problems such as the significance of the singular and plural forms and the stems to which they were added; the date, status, and nature of the places they represent; and attempts to find parallel or similar *ing*-formations in England and other Germanic countries. The article is indeed a survey, and nearly three pages of the article are a bibliography of references for the article. In "Bibliography for 1995" (*Nomina* 19, 131–48), C. Hough seems comprehensive as usual since, while most of the items in the bibliography deal with scholarly name-studies, she also lists works of more general interests such as a book entitled *Babies Names*.

Three articles in the bibliography describe on-going place-name studies. J. Kemble's "Essex Placenames Project" (*Essex Archaeol. and History News* 124, 3–4) explains how the Essex

Placenames Survey will record field and minor place-names in the country and calls for "Individuals, groups and Local History Societies" to collect place-name data using a common format using record sheets provided by and sent back to the central coordinating body. In "Birds in Amber: the Nature of English Place Name Elements" (*Jnl of the Eng Place-Name Soc.* 28, 5–31), D. Parsons and T. Styles discuss the thoroughness with which the Centre for English Name Studies' *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names* will revise A.H. Smith's *English Place-Name Elements* by discussing the inaccuracies and inadequacies in Smith's entry for *amore*, *omere* which Smith identifies as "a bird, possibly 'the bunting.'" In "The Survey of the Language of English Place-Names" (*Computers and Texts* 6, 15–16), C. Hough summarizes the intended purpose and the scope of the five-year research project funded by the Leverhulme Foundation at the Centre for English Name Studies, University of Nottingham.

J.D.C.

Works Not Seen:

Hodgson, Geoffrey Martin. *The Hodgson Surname: Its Norse Origins and Cumbrian Location*. Standon, Herts: Martlet Books, 1993.

Hough, Carole. *The English Place-Name Survey: a Finding List to Addenda and Corrigenda*. Nottingham: Centre for English Name Studies, University of Nottingham, 1995.

Mills, A.D. *The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight: Their Origins and Meanings*. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996.

Preston, Cyril, "The Norsemen." *Yorkshire Hist. Quarterly* 2.1 (1996), 14.

8. Archaeology and Numismatics

a. Excavations

VERA EVISON published in 1994 an important site, *An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Great Chesterford, Essex*, not previously reviewed here (CBA Research Report 91. York: Council for British Archaeology). Along with the next item reviewed, on Beckford, this helps to disseminate information on excavations done in the 1950s under difficult rescue conditions, and often on the spur of the moment as clearance was approved or new finds located. Anything opened for excavation on site had to be completed within the day, making recording and collecting the material a challenge. Clearly, work in these conditions was done between other, more planned projects, and often the subsequent disposition of material, conservation and recording was also a surplus for the institutions which acquired them. (Great Chesterford material is now mainly with the BM.) Not surprisingly, the delay in publication had consequences; with Great Chesterford, for example, the bones had been grouped anatomically, not as complete skeletons, and were not all labeled, or had labels incorrectly identifying too many bones for one body, allowing only partial analysis. The

form of the publication is an older one, organized by artifact type, with discussion sublimated to that organization. Yet the publication is welcome, even so late. Its significance rests in the extraordinary number of non-adult (15 or younger) burials, including 65 infant and foetus inhumations.

Located in fields NW of the Roman town, the graves were near one of the Roman cemeteries. No AS settlement has yet been detected. 161 inhumations, 33 cremations and burials of two horses and two dogs were found; due to gravel digging, and construction of the M11 motorway in 1977, well over a hundred additional graves were estimated lost. In general, the finds were typical for the Cambridge area, dating between AD 450 and 600. Continuity from the Roman occupation seems indicated, as no distinctively early fifth-century Germanic material was found, though walls, the town and tumuli would have been impressive Roman survivals. Bronze-bound buckets, glass vessels, bronze bowls, a turned wood vessel with surviving metal decoration, girdlehangars and the usual range of beads and brooches were found, while buckles were not—only 20 graves had them, indicating that this was not a

common aspect of dress for either sex. Also unusual was a bird brooch which appears to be of the duck family, rather than the more typical Germanic eagle. Evidence suggested the use of hide as a groundsheet or stretcher in some cases, and nails in the fill of some 40 graves might indicate coffins or biers, though they might also be Roman debris. A high incidence of dental disease was found, as was tooth loss, probably from gum disease. There were two instances of well-healed head wounds, one from a sword, one from a blunt instrument. Little or no evidence for nutritional disease was found, with only 4 possible examples (one neonate, 2 juvenile, and one woman 25–35 with possible iron deficiency), while a possible case of tuberculosis probably came from contaminated milk. Textile evidence had often been lost or greatly reduced in conservation of metal finds, but nothing unusual was found except in the case of bead threads, which survived surprisingly well. The weaving of four-thread cords was thus quite clear.

As for unusual burials, several were grouped in what Evison considered a half circle that respected a Roman quincunx of cremations, something which suggested to her a tumulus with AS graves on the perimeter. Elsewhere, a boy was buried with his dog at his feet, a man's skull and long bones (the rest presumably ploughed out) were found with a horse burial, and a woman and child (4–6) were buried side by side with nearly identical pots in each grave. Another horse burial may stand alone, or be associated with an unusual cremation with one pot inside another vessel.

Also unusual, especially for the fifth and sixth centuries, were as many as 21 male, weaponless graves. Two well furnished sword graves were found at the site, so it was not a ritual unknown to this group; nor was the lack of weapons an indication of lack of status. Rare items, such as a glass vessel, the duck brooch (worn by a man), a razor, and a coin placed on the skull were found in this group. Evison suggests these items make the graves comparable in prestige to weaponed graves, and that "these people were strangers, some perhaps merchants, and some connected with the Romano-British element in the population" (49). She also notes a group of graves featuring 5 inlaid spears, and 3 weaponless graves with enough in common to be distinct, with Roman and Frankish connections. Evison considered the common factor to be religion more than ethnicity, and suggests a Christian influence for W-E orientations with such finds, though she concedes that "the possibility of a Christian motive for general W-E orientation must remain an open question" (50). Findless graves she considers possibly those of slaves and/or Romano-British people: "Some of these graves present the best evidence for the coexistence of a Romano-British population. Otherwise, in view of the proximity of the Roman town and cemeteries with consequent material remains, it is surprising that the Anglo-Saxon graves contain so few acquisitions from the previous inhabitants" (50).

Several graves had multiple infant and foetus burials, seemingly grouped by age: "grave 83 consisted of at least 6 foetuses, all 36–40 weeks. . . . It is possible that graves 95 and

150 might represent burials of twins [0–2 months] or even triplets [2–4 months], but it is difficult to imagine how six or more foetuses of the same age can be buried in the same spot, unless the grave was marked and reopened each time for the burial of a full-term stillborn" (31). Two foetuses were found still in the pelvises of females, who presumably died from complications with their pregnancies. The number of non-adults is comparable to adults, "a remarkable diversion from normal custom" (50), as we rarely find children and have assumed a different method of disposal of the bodies. Perhaps we should be looking for all such burials to be concentrated, even when not buried near adults as they are here. In any case, Great Chesterford provides us with unmatched evidence for children and how their deaths were observed, in their high mortality at this site.

Vera Evison and Prue Hill publish the excavations of the late 50s at *Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Beckford, Hereford and Worcester* (CBA Research Report 103. York: Council for British Archaeology 1996). The nature of hurried rescue excavations in advance of gravel quarrying combines again with an unfortunate delay in publication; field notes and index card sketches are sometimes all we now have here for items subsequently lost during long post-excavation work, and Valerie Cooper's "assiduous detective work" was needed to reunite objects disassociated from their numbers and information collected at the time of excavation. The form of the report itself again seems an older one, focused on finds as the main organizational item, despite the manuscript's having been finished in 1990. The two cemeteries themselves are quite early, as all finds fall between 475 and 550, with perhaps a few graves on either side of those dates. Cemetery A, found first, had 24 graves; a possible founder's grave of a woman with early goods lay near two postholes which may have served as a marker for her or for the cemetery itself. Graves were slightly richer here than in Cemetery B, found a few years later. In B, the preservation of bone was extremely poor, and four cremations in shallow positions indicate the possibility of more extensive cremations lost to later ploughing. The site overall had no finds or features besides those of the burials, despite nearby evidence in this area for prehistoric and Roman occupation. Beckford had no clearly elite goods such as swords, gold or silver; instead, its features mainly conform to expected norms. Female mortality exceeded male, children's graves were mainly absent, and men were buried with spears (sometimes two) and shields while women were buried with brooches that indicate this was a Saxon settlement with virtually no Anglian contacts. Indeed, the notable aspect of Beckford remains its inbreeding and insularity. Physically, the evidence gleaned from bones in A indicate a higher than normal incidence of spina bifida (5 out of 24 graves), and a male instance of leprosy, one of the earliest known. A nearby female grave also had indications of leprosy (made more of by the authors than the medical report seems willing to support), and may have been a sister. Given the poor preservation in B, it is possible that others suffered the same disease. All

skeletons indicated heavy work was the norm in the community, as did the higher incidence than average of young people's graves. The late Calvin Wells, in his report, noted that the men seemed more robust than the women and their bones survive better, and speculated that while higher death rates for women might be due to childbirth, the bones suggest a "rather sharp differentiation in the robustness of the sexes. . . . It seems perhaps probable that in a society dedicated to male dominance the girls may have been somewhat undernourished in their childhood, at least during periods of relative scarcity or famine. . . . If so, the better survival of the male bones may be the result of the boys and young men commanding a better and more abundant diet than the girls" (47). The authors argue that the presence of now-lost tumuli must have drawn AS to the site, suggesting that the patterns of burial and of tumuli in the district point to what was. The grouping of graves for B seems rather strained, and a circular distribution is less clear from the plans than the authors can prove; other instances of such associations, however, would not make an attraction to tumuli sites unlikely.

Philip Abramson *et al.*, "Excavations along the Caythorpe Gas Pipeline, North Humberside," *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 68 (1996), 1–88. The sites covered in this article are largely prehistoric through Romano-British, and later medieval, but one Anglian settlement was recorded and excavated. The excavations took place between April and June 1992. The report includes a plan of the corridor, multi-period strip plans showing the distribution of features, and detailed plans of the principle features. Two Anglian structures were located, a *grubenhaus* (only partially recorded) located on the site of an earlier Romano-British settlement to the north of the Gypsey Race, and a rectangular posthole building in Field 3600. Plans and discussion of the two structures can be found on pages 26–9. In the area near the *grubenhaus* fragments of human remains, a girdle hanger, and three sherds of Anglian pottery were recovered. The posthole building is on the southern edge of what appears to be a larger settlement (based on geophysical survey). The structure measures 7.5m x 4m. All finds recovered from this site were from the fill of the postholes. They include: an iron knife-blade dated 450–700, four sherds of pottery (Iron Age–Anglian), and a fragment of animal bone dated 690–980. The paper includes specialist reports by T.G. Manley (Prehistoric Pottery and Worked Stone), J.N. Dore (Roman Pottery), Christine Haughton (Anglian Pottery—eighty-two sherds representing a maximum of fifty-eight vessels [pp. 52–4]), Peter Makey (Flint), Anthea E. Boylston and Charlotte A. Roberts (Human Skeletal Remains), Sue Stallibrass (Animal Bones), Jacqueline P. Huntley (Plant Remains), and A. Milles (Molluscan Analysis).

Jonathan Parkhouse and Nicola Smith report on "An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Bottledump Corner, Tattenhoe, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 36 [1996 for 1994], 103–19). The article includes contributions by M. Farley, F. Pritchard and A. Waldron. The

cemetery contained five inhumations accompanied by artifacts and was discovered during realignment of the A421 Buckingham-Bletchley road in March 1992. The remains indicate a small seventh-century cemetery. If there were additional burials all evidence for them has been destroyed by plowing, and there are no known contemporary Saxon settlements within the immediate vicinity. The burials are all of adults, aligned north-south, with both skeletal and artifactual evidence indicating three males and two females. (The report includes a detailed analysis of the skeletal remains by Tony Waldron.) The finds, all consistent with a seventh-century date, include: Burial 105: copper-alloy buckle, iron knife, leaf-shaped iron spearhead; Burial 108: glass and amethyst beads, silver pin, fragments of silver chain links and pendant from a necklace; Burial 112: iron knife, spearhead and socket fragments; Burial 125: iron spearhead and stud. Traces of textile are preserved on the iron spearheads, and silver pin and necklace. Several unstratified small finds were also recovered from the surrounding area. A "Corrigenda" to this article appears in *Records of Buckinghamshire* 37 (1997 for 1995), 1–2, and contains a corrected version of figures 1 and 2 and their captions.

Three Excavations Along the Thames and its Tributaries, 1994: Neolithic to Saxon Settlement and Burial in the Thames, Colne, and Kennet Valleys publishes Phil Andrews' and Andrew Crockett's important if limited early AS evidence (Wessex Archaeology Report No. 10. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology, 1996). The Prospect Park site, Harmondsworth, London Borough of Hillingdon, turned up 4 SFB's (sunken featured buildings, formerly termed *Grubenhäuser*) and two possible post-built halls, all with generally EW orientation. All SFB's yielded AS sherds, with one producing 145; the dates seem to range from fifth to mid sixth century. Evidence for such early ceramics is still very new in the region, with Prospect Park at the western limit of the known distribution. Despite the provisional status of any report, then, the assemblage gives important evidence:

A reasonable supposition to explain the presence of such a high proportion of non-local fabric types amongst early Saxon assemblages within the London area could be that the earliest Saxon settlers in the area would have brought with them pottery from their native country, later to be replaced. . . . This supposition, however, is not entirely supported by the results of the petrological analysis carried out for Prospect Park; the evidence is as yet ambiguous. (37)

The Continental sources for form and decoration range across northern Germany, the Low Countries and Denmark. The two post-built halls were approximately 10m x 5m, of post-hole construction. Hall 749 is certainly Saxon and possibly associated with one of the SFBs; Hall 721 has less evidence, but is assigned to Saxon date given its form and nearness to a Saxon pit and SFB, with the three possibly forming a group. It does have a slot across one end which is of late prehistoric date, and 3 sherds of prehistoric date were found; because they were in postholes, they could have been residual. It has a "semicircular arrangement of post-holes at the west end . . . [which] remains somewhat puzzling, but their size and layout

suggest that they may have held angled posts forming a semi-circular arrangement that formed an integral part of the original structure, rather than some form of lean-to or later addition" (49). In fact both "halls" have notable oddities to their layouts, and both seem to be missing one wall, or at least, postholes to mark such a wall, unless the slot and hall 721 are both prehistoric. Also, though hall 749 is drawn with right angled walls, it could just as easily be drawn with a more circular reconstruction to link the postholes (fig. 19). No metalwork and very few finds that would identify the SFBs as workshops were found; only 3 beads were found, in a single SFB.

The second excavation published in the volume took place in Hurst Park, East Molesey, Surrey, producing 6 or 7 SFBs, and several associated features such as pits. Pottery was estimated to date within the fifth to seventh century range. SFB 16 produced the most finds, including 195 sherds, iron finds including a girdle hanger or key, and a quern fragment. Its plan was somewhat unusual in having sides that sloped down to a rounded base, with a ramp at the east end about 1 m wide. A total of 16 metal objects came from the site, all but one of iron. They included heckle teeth and a chisel, giving "some evidence that woodworking and textile preparation took place on the site" (78) though no loomweights were found. They point to domestic occupation, with some pieces possibly recycled Romano-British objects. (Ceramic building material was found which may indicate major buildings nearby in the Romano-British period [92].) The excavators believe the entire AS site was excavated, which makes it a small settlement, possibly of one occupation phase. The SFBs gave no evidence for floors or hearths, which may argue for raised floors. SFB 205 may have served as a "drier" for crops (104), and fields nearby are suggested by related, undated shallow ditches to the south. Andrews provides a comparison of Hurst Park with Prospect Park, seeing significant differences and dating the latter earlier (fifth–sixth), with the former dated to the sixth or seventh century. The sites are markedly different in size, and Prospect Park is the only site in the area with post-built timber halls, associated with SFBs. Hurst Park's SFBs were apparently occupied, not just workshops or storage. Also, the possible field system at this site marks its difference from Prospect Park. The many non-local sherds at Prospect Park "might suggest an involvement in early trade for some settlements in the lower Thames Valley . . . [or] early migration" and these sherds plus the halls may indicate "a higher status settlement, although there is nothing else which would support this suggestion" (111). Both settlements testify to the appeal of river valleys.

The third site, Wickhams Field near Reading, Berks., produced a group of 3 pits on the sides of an Early Iron Age trackway, and 2 timber-lined wells well to the NE. While finds in the wells included sherds of Romano-British and Saxon pottery, a radiocarbon date of the timber of well 332 has a calibrated date of AD 650–870. The second well is similar and so similarly dated. The oak timber linings, all heartwood,

survived because of anaerobic conditions in the waterlogged lower levels. In well 301, 9 upright planks and posts formed the wall, with a slight offset or platform on the east. Well 332 was more steep, with 2 wide planks set on edge to form long walls, as if of a rectangular box. The planks may originally have been held in place by horizontal pieces, and end pieces removed when the well was abandoned. Only half the well was excavated due to unstable soil. As for finds recovered, 9 pieces of slag came from well 322, too little to suggest Saxon ironworking on site, while the pottery sherds found in the pits were undiagnostic and generally date to the early/middle Saxon period. (The excavators note, however, the difficulty here of distinguishing the Saxon pottery found from Early Iron Age wares.) Bulk samples were processed for organic materials, with pit 542 yielding carbonized barley, spelt wheat, hexaploid bread wheat and rye; the lack of accompanying waste chaff suggested a possible use of the pit for grain storage. Waterlogged plant remains yielded samples of weeds "typical of dry, waste ground . . . These may also be indicative of nitrogen enriched soils from animal/stock rearing. . . . Evidence for woodland, scrub, or even hedgerows is minimal" (163). Crockett suggests that a mix of farming, especially of barley, with cattle and sheep raising is likely. Bones of both animals (perhaps also goat) were found, with one cattle radius suggesting large stock. The wells may have served both animals and people. Wickhams Field settlement evidence is the first found as contemporary to the major local inhumation cemetery at Field Farm, and the two may well be connected.

b. Regional Studies

SEVERAL publications during 1996 re-examine the vexed period covering the end of Roman Britain and what followed. K.R. and S.P. Dark argue for a revision of understanding based on "New Archaeological and Palynological Evidence for a Sub-Roman Reoccupation of Hadrian's Wall" (*Arch. Aeliana* 5th ser. 24 [1996], 57–72). The accepted view sees a continuity in occupation of the forts on the Wall in the fifth and sixth centuries, with "residual" populations, possibly ex-military, which settle into an agricultural existence, each site developing independently. The Darks refute both continuity and independence with a new focus on these sites as a "unique regional group" (57) and by incorporating recent work in archaeological findings and in studies of pollen sequences. K.R. Dark develops what he calls the "Redefence Hypothesis," first published in 1992, looking at long-cist burials, inscriptions, signal stations and work done after 1992. He can be counted on for close reasoning, an open-mindedness which allows him to re-evaluate "givens," and a willingness to propose new models; this article is no exception. For example, he discusses stones from NW England at Brougham, Old Carlisle and Maryport, usually described as Late Roman, showing that they can plausibly be more closely related to Class I inscriptions of the fifth or sixth century. Their distribution then "conveniently 'fills in' the otherwise puzzling geographical gap between the 'Whithorn group' of such

inscriptions in the west and Vindolanda in the east" (62) and makes it "possible to observe a northwest British regional group analogous to those regional groups found in Wales and the southwest" (63). Similarly, new finds emphasize the similarity of evidence from different sites in providing both British and AS artefacts. As Dark puts it, "archaeology seems able to tell us that the forts on Hadrian's Wall were used in the fifth and sixth centuries for a string of high-status secular sites, some (perhaps all) of which were defended in a way reminiscent of western British hill-forts of the same date. . . . This coincides with the general interpretation placed on such sites elsewhere in Britain: that of Anglo-Saxon mercenaries attached to British centres in the fifth century" (64). There need be no landscape evidence for continuity since these bands could be quite small, needing less food, and able to use what was available rather than having to farm.

This latter point leads to S.P. Dark's key contribution on the environmental record, which shows that previous interpretations of the pollen record need revision as well. The radiocarbon dates for pollen provide a range, not the highly specific dates which Roman scholars have used in their arguments, and new palynological evidence suggests that woodland regeneration (from Roman period clearing and farming) began much earlier than thought, seeming to indicate "woodland regeneration directly connected with Roman military withdrawal from the north" (67). By examining the full set of dated pollen sequences, S.P. Dark argues for accepting the pattern of clusters of sites as more reliable than the imprecise dating of the sequences themselves. All eleven sites showed evidence of reduced land use. "That this pattern is not reflected at the majority of contemporary sites in Britain indicates that it specifically reflects events associated with the Wall area. . . . the end of Roman Britain was marked by massive ecological transformation resulting from a reduction in agricultural land-use throughout the region, and consequent widespread reversion to woodland" (68). The results strengthen K.R. Dark's suggestion for a sub-Roman reconstruction of the Command of the *Dux Britanniarum* and as the Darks write, help solve a number of other difficulties: "why this area saw so little Anglo-Saxon settlement (outside these British contexts), why hill-forts analogous to those of western Britain and southern Scotland have not been found in the north-west of what is now England, why the British North fell so rapidly to the Northumbrians in the later sixth and seventh century, and why later British poetry recalled the 'men of the North' as offering such fierce resistance to their barbarian foes to the north and the east" (69). A rather impressive list of thorny questions to reconcile, and a measure of how important the theory put forward here is to our grappling with the transition that occurred.

Taking AS reactions to Romans a few centuries later, Peter Carrington explains briefly how ninth-century events made the re-use of Roman walls an option, in "Among the crumbling Roman ruins" (*British Arch.* 7 [1995], 6). While much of the space inside Roman walled settlements was

occupied by debris and fallen walls, the site of Chester has allowed a study of the process of decay and reoccupation over time. Æthelflæd refortified the city in 907 when Viking raids from Ireland and the Danelaw began. The re-use of both major and minor Roman streets within the enclosure "suggests that Roman buildings were still standing to some height" and so defined the streets. Where flimsier barracks of timber on dwarf walls had fallen apart, re-occupation was more intensive, whereas only a SFB was sited near the substantial store compound, and the courtyard building must have survived, as it "remains an open space to this day, serving as the Market Square." Carrington ends by encouraging archaeologists to think less of conventional period markers and to focus more on what survives, rather than what changes. Though this sounds a bit like a plea for the "continuity" so much work of the 70s and 80s argued for, the desire to question artificial labels and barriers to understanding is worthwhile and necessary.

Christopher K. Currie considers "Saxon Charters and Landscape Evolution in the South-Central Hampshire Basin," *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 50 (1995), 103–25. Currie employs a combination of topographic, cartographic, and charter evidence to demonstrate a highly organized system of land use in the area north of Southampton. In the late Saxon period a reorganization of the landscape takes place that is clearly linked to the rising power of Winchester as an ecclesiastical center. Currie provides a critical assessment of earlier studies of the area, particularly that of G.B. Grundy. He also provides a systematic analysis of the bounds and topographical descriptions in, and scholarship on, six charters: the Durley Charter of 900 (Edward to New Minster—probably an eleventh century forgery), the North Stoneham Charter of 932 (Athelstan to thegn Alfred), the Bishopstoke Charter of 960 (Edgar to Bishop Brihtelm), the Horton Charter of 963 and 975 (Edgar to the church at Winchester), the Charter for South Stoneham of 990 and 992 (Æthelred to a landowner at Weston), and the South Stoneham Charter of 1045 (Edward to Winchester Old Minster). In each case Currie's fieldwork is used to refine and elaborate the documentary material. Some of his suggestions for the identification of landscape features with boundary markers mentioned in the texts are conjectural, though certainly possible. For example, his identification of the post-medieval Whitestone Farm with the "white leaved tree" near Knowle mentioned in the Dunley Charter makes sense, but remains hypothetical (p. 107). From the charter evidence Currie identifies a number of settlements associated with common pasture areas accessed by a series of trackways and gates, as well as several cases of significant river engineering. This is a fascinating and highly detailed survey that adds significantly to the study of landscape archaeology in Anglo-Saxon England.

Della Hooke considers the administrative organization, settlement, land use, and charter evidence for Anglo-Saxon Warwickshire in "Reconstructing Anglo-Saxon Landscapes

in Warwickshire," *Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society Transactions* 100 (1996), 99–116. Hooke provides a particularly thorough examination of the place-name evidence and the way in which it can help to reveal the nature and extent of development within the region. What archaeological evidence survives supports the picture provided by place-names, though with the coming of Christianity the topographical evidence declines sharply. Known sites indicate a generally dispersed pattern of settlement, with some high-status sites, well into the ninth century. The picture can be filled out with the charter evidence. Here a broader consideration of the methodology of charter analysis, and the relationship between textual description and landscape is exemplified by consideration of specific Warwickshire sites. This is an interesting, though somewhat dense study that those not as intimately connected with this particular landscape as Hooke may find difficult to follow. Nevertheless, it is well worth reading for its thoughtful consideration of methodology, as well as for its implications for the study of the Anglo-Saxon landscape in general.

The 150th anniversary of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society finds them publishing a volume entitled *A Festival of Norfolk Archaeology*, edited by Sue Margeson, Brian Ayers and Stephen Heywood (1996). The organization is chronological and most articles are rather brief, though five have some interest for AS specialists. David Gurney discusses "The 'Saxon Shore' in Norfolk" (30–39) outlining briefly the three known forts of Brancaster, Caister-on-Sea, and Burgh Castle. These date from the late second, early third and late third/early fourth respectively, and so might interest those looking for evidence of trade on the "Saxon Shore," or for what Roman remains were available to later AS settlers. Gurney suggests that "fort" may be a misleading term here. Caister-on-Sea "may not be a fort in the conventional sense, but a base for military units involved more in the control and safe-guarding of trade, trade routes and merchant shipping" (31). The site evidence also suggests the presence of women and children, and no clear evidence of military buildings exists, with military finds also scarce. Burgh Castle yielded a complicated sequence of fields or enclosures to the NNE of the fort, with extensive Roman settlement around the fort. Confusingly, Brancaster is described as "unlocated," and is not listed on Gurney's map; nevertheless, details of buildings, size and cropmarks are discussed, and reference to "further west, beyond the known extent of the *vicus*, a mosaic . . . said to have been found" does not help clarify the proposed site.

Kenneth Penn writes on "The Early Church in Norfolk: Some Aspects" in the same volume (40–46). His very general survey should be expected, for our information remains limited: "Bede can be supplemented by a few Lives and some later tradition, but by no surviving ecclesiastical fabric of the early period in East Anglia" (40). Penn himself has excavated several of the area's inhumation cemeteries. Here, he gives a broad survey of context, discussing the interrelationship of an estate and a minster's *parochia*, with later parish developments, and

the difficulty of linking literary evidence with a site until physical evidence, archaeological or topographical, is examined. The most useful aspect of this short piece is the survey of possible sites and chance finds in an attempt to flesh out the meager information.

Sue Margeson, in "Viking Settlement in Norfolk: A Study of New Evidence" (47–57), aims to revise the traditional picture of East Anglia in general, and Norwich in particular, as an area of relatively few archaeological traces of Viking settlement. Recent finds in the region consist largely of metalwork discovered in excavations, and by field walkers and metal detectorists. None of the sites are particularly rich, and the finds are mostly of a utilitarian rather than a high status nature—many dress fasteners and items of jewelry imported from the Scandinavian homelands—leading Margeson to suggest a relatively dense population of Viking peasant farmers. Place name evidence lends support to her theory, and is of three major types: 1) names incorporating a Scandinavian personal name, 2) names ending in -by or -thorp, 3) names based on field names or Scandinavian words for identifying features such as *bryggja* (jetty, quay), or *kirkja* (church). The basic pattern of settlement is one that follows that of the Scandinavian countries, and the finds indicate contact with Hedeby in particular. Margeson does not discuss new finds which she believes show the development of Scandinavian styles within Norfolk during the eleventh century, saying only that these will be the basis for another article.

Andrew Rogerson discusses Norfolk's "Rural Settlement c. 400–1200" (58–64) in the best of the articles reviewed here. Beginning with the controversy over the impact of Germanic invasions on natives, Rogerson states that a decline in population must be responsible for decline in settlement and cemetery evidence early on, but rejects the idea of "total disruption or displacement" (58). He notes a "consistently dramatic" decline in the NE and SE settlements of Norfolk, yet goes on to say, "despite the post-Roman decline, almost every parish in Norfolk apart from the western Fens will produce some evidence of activity in the sixth century if subjected to field survey, in the forms of both conventional fieldwalking and metal-detecting [these produce surface evidence]. This is true even in areas of less attractive soils . . ." (59). He goes on to discuss how place-name evidence now indicates hierarchies of settlements, and notes that while study of the Early AS period dates to the nineteenth century, study of the Middle Saxon period (c.650–850) has made great advances more recently, though much of the evidence is based on surface evidence as none of the few sites excavated was excavated in its entirety. Because of Christian conversion, the main source of evidence switches from cemetery to settlement (only two cemeteries with furnished burials date after 650 in Norfolk, Thornham and Harford Farm, Caistor St Edmund), with Ipswich ware as the diagnostic evidence. Interestingly, he notes that currently "there is no evidence for the continuity of site use between the Early and Middle Saxon periods," even where evidence for both periods has turned up on the same

site in excavation (60). Additionally, the first real town appears in the late ninth century, and in general, Late Saxon sites (c. 850–1100) produce more easily recognizable surface evidence, such as Thetford ware. Because of metal detection, finds distribution has “mushroomed”:

Through the evidence of Scandinavian objects we are now, for the first time, in a position to see just how much more widespread later 9th-century Viking settlement was than the distribution of major place-names of Viking origin had previously indicated . . . , although some might doubt the validity of plotting ethnicity by the occurrence of metal artefacts. (61)

Unlike early sites, Middle Saxon sites continued to be occupied in the Late period, though Marshland in particular showed *de novo* foundations. Rogerson sees Scandinavian settlement of the late ninth and early eleventh centuries as having “boosted and encouraged the exploitation of the county within frameworks established in the Middle Saxon period,” noting that the survival of land units even up to modern times testifies to the absence of dislocation (62).

Brian Ayers surveys the wider context of interest in urban archaeology in “The Archaeology of Towns in Norfolk” (65–71), with only some of his comments relevant to AS studies. Noting an upsurge in resources after WWII, Ayers surveys general trends in evidence. Urban life collapsed in Norfolk before the end of the Roman period; calling revival “fitful,” he briefly mentions Middle Saxon Thetford and Norwich, and “nascent urban activity” in the NW around the River Burn. As did Rogerson, Ayers notes the “formative” influence of the Danes. Norwich, for example, has ninth-century activity, “elusive” evidence for the tenth, and “supremacy” by the middle of the eleventh century, when a fortified nucleus on the north bank was superseded by south bank settlement.

The Anglo-Scandinavian boroughs of Norwich and Thetford were both exceptionally large urban settlements relative to towns elsewhere in lowland England of the period. They seem to have operated within a socio-economic framework wherein the urban-rural relationship was markedly different from that experienced in the country as a whole. This has been but little explored and remains an area where archaeological endeavour could make a significant contribution. (67)

Ayers also suggests that work is especially needed on the origins of Great Yarmouth and the decline of Thetford, and applauds the profound effect of interdisciplinary studies in advancing the study of urbanism as a process.

Michal Lutovsky of the Institute of Archaeological Heritage in Prague comments on the “information barrier” in “Between Sutton Hoo and Chernaya Mogila: barrows in eastern and western early medieval Europe” (*Antiquity* 70 [1996], 671–6). He supplements an article by Van de Noort (1993) by considering more extensive finds east of the Elbe, and raising the issue of differences in meaning and ritual, that is, contextual archaeological concerns. Van de Noort’s map, according to Lutovsky, becomes “fuzzy” east of the Elbe: “even the river-courses are wrong—‘hic sunt leones,’” he notes wryly (673). The Slavonic area has over 70 barrow cemeteries of certain date, for example, most between 750 and 1000 AD. He notes that eastern and western barrows all serve as visual indications of burial, but that the characters of each differ.

Stone rings at the bases of eastern barrows are one example of what he terms two distinct worlds: “At the one end are the mound burials of the German nobility, at the other the barrow cemeteries in the Slavic countryside where pottery fragments often represent the only ascertainable ‘grave goods’—that is, probable traces of ritual acts. This difference can be related to the difference in purpose—the one a clearly visible barrow as a monument to an important person, the other a generally accepted custom as an expression of ritual” (675). Noting the difficulty of identifying graves of nobility in Slav regions when the principal burial rite was cremation (e.g. Bohemia up to the mid eighth century), he adds that the limited finds make social analysis impossible: “the rural character of most Slavonic burial grounds is determined by their location outside the then-existing power centres” (675). But in looking at the barrows of the whole Slav territory, he notes that “dozens” of barrow cemeteries exist for the nobility of Kiev, similar to barrows of the west. Chernaya Mogila (Black Barrow) at Chernigov, while not as rich as Sutton Hoo’s Mound 1, is similar in “social purpose and importance for the surrounding milieu” (675). He adds the interesting direction that Scandinavian influence may be part of what affects the eastern barrow rite in its larger context, as occurs with “the barrow burial rite along the southern coast of the Baltic Sea” (676), and that differences in origins mark other points worth taking into account.

c. Urban Studies

STEVE ROSKAMS, “Urban Transition in Early Medieval Britain: the Case of York,” in *Towns in Transition*, ed. N. Christie and S.T. Loseby (Aldershot, Hants. & Brookfield, VT, 1996), 262–88. The period of transition for the essays contained in this volume is 300–800, the period that saw the end of the Roman Empire and a radical transformation of urban forms and functions across Europe. In this paper Roskams (1) assesses the models of transition currently popular in British archaeology, (2) examines the archaeological sequence at York, and (3) suggests his own theoretical model which he hopes will contribute to the agenda of urban archaeology in general. He sees the most popular current model as one in which continuity reigns, at least in part because of the modern need to “look for stability in an unstable world” (p. 263). He also expresses concern about the recent separation of archaeological units from universities and what he sees as the resulting gap between archaeological practice and theory. Roskams believes that notions of “the town” operating according to an “urban motor” and separated from the idiosyncratic development of specific sites are fundamentally flawed. The solution as he sees it is to “stop seeing the town as a thing-in-itself, a generic social reality, and to recognize that such settlements do not indicate the arrival of urbanism with a simple, single relationship with general social development” (p. 264). In other words, we should expect diversity rather than continuity, though the idea of continuity might well apply in some cases, and should not be abandoned altogether. What have

been identified as specific "site types" such as the *"villa regalis,"* *"wic"* and *"burh,"* and their relationships to each other are also in need of closer examination. Within York, Roskams focuses on the development of the fortress, the fortress defenses, and the extramural areas, the colonia and adjacent areas. He sees the following patterns emerging: (1) from the second century A.D. on York was a "boom town," (2) there are, however, contradictory signals indicating that this is an age of transition, particularly in the third and fourth centuries, (3) there is a burst of centralized activity within the fortress in the fifth century, followed by a period of "urban rejection," (4) York was "readopted" as a focus of settlement in the seventh and eighth centuries. Roskams concludes that the "case of York shows that the only urban continuity is continuous transition" (p. 285). His new agenda for understanding urban development stresses that models based on single explanations, individuals, or social phenomenon will always fail because they can never take account of the diversity of human responses, and also because they fail to cover the periods of transition between institutions, policies and ideologies. He recommends "a Marxist outlook on change" (p. 279) with agency "always seen as rooted in specific material reality rather than ideas. With such a view towns become symptoms of variations in social and economic power, a field of action where class conflicts are played out" (p. 279).

Richard Hall has put out two new books on York in the English Heritage series. *English Heritage Book of Viking Age York* (London, Batsford & English Heritage, 1994) begins with two chapters on the history and evolution of the city that provide an admirable balance of historical, archeological and documentary evidence. The remaining five chapters focus on people, buildings, trade and industry, arts and crafts, and everyday life. There are some obvious areas of overlap between these divisions, but Hall manages to avoid unnecessary repetition. The book is plentifully illustrated with a range of maps, drawings, diagrams and photos, and provides an excellent introduction to the city in the Viking age. One caution: my copy fell apart in my hands.

Hall's *English Heritage Book of York* (London, Batsford & English Heritage, 1996) is, like his *Book of Viking Age York*, designed for the general public, and includes chapters on "Discovering York" and "Supernatural York"—the latter actually about death and burial. And, again, the book is illustrated a large number of informative plates and diagrams. The period covered ranges from the prehistoric to the twentieth century. The opening chapter outlines the history, study, and excavation of the city, and is followed by chapters covering the topography, geography and development of the city, the growth of the urban environment, and trade and economy. Chapter three is devoted exclusively to Anglo-Saxon and Viking York. The book is quite general, but does provide an excellent overview of the evolution of the city and its environs.

James Graham-Campbell's "Review Article: The Archaeology of Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian York: Progress to Publication," *Early Medieval Europe* 5 (1996), 71–82, is a

review of several recent publications: Derek Phillips and Brenda Heywood, *Excavations Under York Minster*, vol. 1, *From Roman Fortress to Norman Cathedral*; vols. 8, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the publications of the York Archaeological Trust; and Richard Hall's *English Heritage Book of Viking Age York*.

Derek Keene analyzes the ways in which archaeological excavations, and new approaches to, and interpretations of, the documentary record have revolutionized our understanding of early medieval London over the past twenty years in his "London in the Early Middle Ages 600–1300," *The London Journal* 20.2 (1995), 9–21. Keene believes, quite rightly, that an understanding of the evolution of the city in relationship to the political and geographic history of both the nation and the European mainland is crucial to an understanding of London. For example, in the early seventh–eighth centuries an international trading network focused on the Low Countries was crucial to the economic life of the city. On a domestic scale, the various relationships that existed between London and a number of distant courts and centers of exchange, has formed the basis for much recent and exciting scholarship. Sadly for Anglo-Saxonists, most of the discussion focuses on the post-Conquest period. This is basically a review article that surveys publications on different aspects of the city's history that have appeared in the past twenty years. The publications are divided into eight categories: general works; church and religious history; London and the monarchy; social, economic and political history; sources and editions; art, architecture and culture; archaeology, building and topography, artifacts and manufacturers.

Graham Scobie, "The Topography and Development of Winchester: Part 3—Middle to Late Saxon," *Winchester Museum Service Newsletter* 23 (1995), 2–5, covers the topography and development of the city in the fifth–tenth centuries. (Parts one and two dealt with topography and prehistoric occupation and the development of the Roman city, respectively.) The length of the paper alone should indicate that the report is very superficial and aimed at a general readership. Scobie's information is based largely on the work of Martin Biddle. For those completely unfamiliar with the subject, Scobie provides a good but basic overview and bibliography, but the curious Anglo-Saxonist would do better to go directly to the works listed in his references.

See also Ayers under Regional Studies.

d. Architecture

In "Palaces or minsters? Northampton and Cheddar reconsidered" (*ASE* 25 [1996], 97–121), John Blair writes, "it is arguable that they have been misread: Northampton because the buildings need not be a palace at all, and Cheddar because the palace was a secondary and peripheral element within an initially monastic complex" (97). This is an important article, clearly written and articulate; it questions the standard interpretations of two fundamental sites and proposes a model of "central places" which takes into account the topography and larger contexts of these sites. Blair considers Northampton

first, arguing for a reassessment of its pre-Viking, pre-urban phase as explained by its excavator, John Williams. After pointing out the site as the highest significant point at the convergence of local waterways, he notes that the location of the halls found is between the churches of St. Peter and St. Gregory, and that it parallels not a secular pattern but one found on monastic sites such as Canterbury and Jarrow. He adds that two notable small finds argue further for an ecclesiastical presence, namely an eighth-century Irish house-shaped shrine piece, and a writing stylus of the same date, found E and SE of the halls. (Two other styli were found in other parts of the site.) He argues from these that styli are especially connected to religious sites, then asks, "should we expect the hall of a major royal minster . . . to be significantly different from the hall of a royal palace? I suggest that we should not, once we discard anachronistic expectations of something overly 'monastic'" (104). His point is surely valid, though he assumes that the same masons would build both (could we say such a thing of Jarrow, for example?). More problematic is that the buildings he chooses as analogous at Jarrow seem to be *domestic* buildings (perhaps dormitories or a refectory, perhaps though also a place for chapter), and are not in line with the churches there, but parallel and lower down on the slopes leading to the river. At Canterbury, the buildings sharing an axis are all churches.

Next Blair considers Cheddar and the palace site excavated by Philip Rahtz. Unlike Northampton, which has no documentation for a royal site, Cheddar is known as a royal residence between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. Here, Blair again focuses on the earlier phases of the site, noting "severe" problems with their dating. While internal dating for key features is available, the linking of that dating across features such as the hall site and nearby ditches to make them contemporary remains problematic. Blair proposes a tenth-rather than ninth-century date for the earliest phases, based on his sense that residual deposits are present in the ditch fill; for example, Rahtz accepted coins as deposited close to their minting dates, yet a worn tenth-century strap end found with them argues for a later context. He also re-examines the written evidence, and concludes that an earlier religious site is, in the tenth century, converted to a more secular use as a royal hunting-lodge, probably relocated from Wedmore. Alfred's will, for example, often cited to reinforce the royal connection, writes instead of accommodating "to þam hiwum æt Ceodre," a phrase which Blair compares to one in a forged charter of '978' (for 968) where the Latin for the same phrase is rendered "famulis famulabuse Domini on Ceodre degentibus" and thus cites as evidence for a community on the site. He notes a change in the next 40 years, with mentions of assemblies "in villam que caelebri aet Ceodre" and "in palatio regis in Ceodre" (interestingly, a double-minster), finishing, "the buildings excavated at Cheddar are best seen as the physical signs of royal life encroaching in upon the fringes of monastic life, and eventually swallowing it up" (119). His analysis is convincing and difficult to refute.

Blair's last section deals briefly with the implications of his reassessment. He argues for seeing royal sites as no different from other secular sites of the AS period in that they are increasingly being shown as movable and impermanent. Thus, minsters are topographically different, "the real fixtures in a shifting world, until secular institutions crystallized around them during the ninth to eleventh centuries" (121). He refutes the frequently invoked analogies with continental sites of palace and associated church unless they are the suburban or rural monastery-palace model, where a ruler stays outside the walls of a town in a monastery provided with his own *domus*. Clearly, he sees the monastic or ecclesiastical shapes as formative for these important sites, and admits that not all will see the evidence as he does—but one may turn his earlier point on the resemblance of secular and ecclesiastical halls to good use here as a counterpoint. The first page of his article states that his aim is to show how closely these two sites conform to the normal topography and planning conventions of minsters. Yet surely there were architectural forms and topographical expectations for the halls of rulers early on (indeed, for their burial mounds even), whatever we conceive those rulers to have been (chiefs, kings, local nobles). Why indeed should the topographical expectations for these sites be any different from those established by admittedly elite churchmen? The point seems a "chicken and egg" dilemma which will evoke a different answer for each site considered. Nevertheless, Blair's ideas make this an article with which future considerations of these sites and their problems must contend, and so indispensable. His efforts to destabilize our complacency over what we think we have makes this worthwhile; his care and careful, close reasoning make them crucial to subsequent discussions.

In "The Tower of All Saints' Church, Earls Barton, Northamptonshire: its construction and context" (*Arch. J.* 152 [1995], 73–94), Michel Audouy, Brian Dix and David Parsons write of the chance to examine large and intact areas of fabric on a highly embellished tower, and to ascertain something of the socio-historical context for its construction. During structural repairs in 1991–2, the top two stages were entirely stripped of rough-cast, exposing the fabric between the elaborate pilaster work and arcades, and all accessible areas were examined, measured and photographed. No scale drawings nor stone by stone recordings were done, however, and no reason given for their omission. 127 mortar samples showed that the original mortar was lime-based, and the depth of the plaster or rough-cast would have been at least 20 mm thick. The main interest of the article rests in Parsons' account of the setting which might have occasioned the tower, describing the earthwork to its north as implying "some sort of defensive or status-according feature," where the "building of the tower in close proximity cannot have been accidental" (87). The relationship of the two has been much discussed, as has the relationship of the unusual form of the tower to its function(s). Parsons suggests that in accordance with the late AS Promotion Law, this may have been a multipurpose building designed to enable a change in status to a thegn; the law requires

a landholding of five hides and a *burhgeat* (a debated term, possibly a tower guarding a gate to an enclosed site), a chapel and a bell-tower. The lower stage of the tower at least had an ecclesiastical function, given such details as the windows carved with crosses on the lintels. Doors to the upper level imply a separate function with separate access. Though the tower here seems not to have served as a gate tower, Parsons sees its form as compatible with such a use and possible derived from that structural type. Yet the details of construction and elaboration argue for more than a thegn's residence, and given the importance of the site by Domesday's reckoning, he suggests that the tower's status changed from a *burhgeat* and chapel, dating perhaps no later than the mid-tenth century, to a minster with the older tower incorporated. For comparison, he cites King's Sutton, Northants., positively identified as an AS minster, and its arcading as similar to that found in the chancel of the Earls Barton church. The arcading with chevron decoration is to him reminiscent of canons' stalls in medieval chancels or chapter houses, and at Earls Barton, three were later converted to *sedilia*, enhancing the connection. Parsons notes, "The occurrence of this unusual architectural feature . . . suggests that the chancel here may also represent the post-Conquest successor of an otherwise unknown Anglo-Saxon minster" (90), and he invites "specialists in estate boundaries and early land tenure" to consider "both the topographical and institutional position" (89) of Earls Barton and the eleven other turriform naves and AS towers he lists in an appendix. His challenge seems an important one to accept so that his suggestive reconstruction of context can be expanded or revised. The relationship of secular and religious architecture, and the mutual incentives political and religious concerns could provide for architectural development, are areas well worth exploring, and Parsons has given us a concrete direction in which to begin.

David Stocker, David Went and Mike Farley discuss "The Evidence for a Pre-Viking Church adjacent to the Anglo-Saxon Barrow at Taplow, Buckinghamshire" (*Arch. J.* 152 [1995], 441–50). The site is famous for its mound, "providing the single richest assemblage of Anglo-Saxon artefacts in the country prior to the discovery of the Sutton Hoo treasure in 1939" (442) upon its excavation, poorly done, in 1883. (The British Museum has a publication of the site in progress.) As at Earls Barton, the closeness of the church of St. Nicholas to the mound has been noted, often as an indication of AS date, though without evidence, as the earliest documents discuss changes occurring in 1197. Since the church was demolished, however, sometime after 1852 when Taplow Court's house was refurbished, only an anomaly in the NE corner of the churchyard, found by a Sutton Hoo Research Project team during geophysical survey, indicated where it might be located. An exceptionally dry summer and recent rain provided a very clear parchmark, almost an x-ray of the building, which forms the basis for this article. The writers then proceed to compare known illustrations of the church with the plans deduced from the parchmark, arguing

for a pre-Viking church as the first building. While they rightly acknowledge that all such analysis is speculative in the absence of excavation, and they do posit some very reasonable general suggestions for the date of additions and alterations, the authors by the end clearly let their hopes get in the way of the limitations of their sources. Given that even the basic plan of the section they consider original is unusual, it is simply impossible to date such a form so provocatively, based on that oddness. The thick-walled, continuous nave has a square end to its east, with an apsidal shape within, which the authors suggest may have been a Norman alteration, thus showing the square-ended form to be Saxon. This is dangerous, as is the posited northern "porticus" to solve a problematic, isolated wall and to match a similar form on the south. It may well have been there, but symmetry is not a requirement in Saxon building. Crop marks, while useful "dig here" signs, have been repeatedly shown to mislead in the details of a site; to date and phase a building over ten centuries based only on the marks is something best done only in broad outlines. To be fair, the authors do stick to reasonable and broad suggestions for much of the article. At the end, however, their enthusiasm to suggest what we'd all like to see at such a famous pre-Christian site overcomes them. They argue that an eighth- or ninth-century date "is an important conclusion because known examples of such buildings are so rare," then push on to say "it is surely significant that, on this site dominated by a burial monument of the immediate pagan past, the Christian church . . . has prominent burial annexes in the form of porticus. The discovery of these porticus, then, would seem to provide the evidence for the link which scholars have often hoped to see between pagan burial and Christian burial at the site. . . . In few other places in England can the juxtaposition between paganism and its Christian successor be so clearly visualized" (449–50). Since porticus need not be for burial, and that link is not proven here, these claims are overenthusiastic, as is a comment that here we have proof that Gregory's advice to convert pagan temples has been adopted. A mound is not a temple, a porticus can be an entrance, a vestry, a side chapel, or a baptistry, and an odd plan demands excavation so that any stratigraphy and periodization of wall joints and fabrics can aid in interpretation. With luck, the authors can channel their enthusiasm into venues which provide funding for the excavation so clearly needed at this important site.

Despite the title, Richard Gem and Malcolm Thurlby write of the Late AS architecture of "The Early Monastic Church of Lastingham" (*Yorkshire Monasticism: Archaeology, Art and Architecture, from the 7th to 16th centuries*, ed. Lawrence R. Hoey. Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1995, 31–9). The buildings at Lastingham date, from historical evidence, to 1078 × 86, though Bede of course mentions Cedd and Ceadda in the mid-seventh century. Early forms may have followed the customs of Lindisfarne, and so been of wood, though Gem briefly asks whether Cedd's monastery at Bradwell, Essex, dates to his lifetime and provides clues to Lastingham. Sculpture indicates that despite silence in surviving texts, the

monastery continued through the ninth century, and Scandinavian period sculpture "indicates a Christian continuity on the site into the 10th and 11th centuries, but by this date the monastic community must have lapsed" (31). The late monastic refoundation is "intimately bound up" with the later histories of Whitby and St Mary's Abbey, York. A monk named Stephen was given Lastingham after a dispute with William de Percy, patron of Whitby, but by 1086, Earl Alan Rufus persuaded the monks to move to York. Thus, Lastingham's importance stems from its being the second major Romanesque building in the post-Conquest North (after York), and a rare survival of a monastic church from this period. Abandoned unfinished, it provides the stages of such a construction, one seemingly under important patronage, which Gem suggests may have been that of Berenger de Tosny. The main elements of crypt, apse and forebay of the main sanctuary, square presbytery bay to its west, and four piers of the crossing survive, despite a restoration in 1879. The foundations for a nave and perhaps aisles and transepts were probably laid; some reports exist of such finds in the churchyard. The crypt was least altered, consisting of a "square central chamber with groin vaults carried on four central columns, and to the east of this a narrow barrel-vaulted forebay leading to an apse with a half-dome" (34). The groins show evidence of having been redesigned while building, and Gem notes "considerable fragments of the centring planks of the vault" which should be examined scientifically. The apse has three bays, each with a window, and the east arm overall is compared to Clapham's plan for Whitby Abbey. Gem several times corrects the VCH plan or its interpretations, and finally argues for "a high groin vault in the presbytery and a barrel vault in the forebay" (36) as original, and not from Pearson's 1879 restoration. He also argues for four low arches in the crossing, matching the present east arch, and from this, suggests the monks planned for two storeys in the arms of the church. Finally, Gem places the building in its larger context, linking it to the Anglo-Norman Romanesque tradition while noting aspects that are clearly regional. No evidence exists for Lastingham's influence on subsequent foundations except in one major area: "The probable existence of high vaults in the sanctuary and presbytery at Lastingham is relevant to the development of high vaults in Anglo-Norman architecture in general, and to the rib vaults at Durham Cathedral . . . in particular" (37). Gem suggests that it is possible that the master mason of Durham worked in the North, perhaps even at Lastingham, a point which invites reevaluation by architectural historians.

John Schofield publishes "Saxon and Medieval Parish Churches in the City of London: A Review," in *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society (LAMAS)* 45 (1994): 23-145. A survey of identifiable and dated parish sites, the paper covers "the structural and decorative development of the London parish church from Saxon times to about 1550" (24), and documents 108 churches of which 27 were "at least probably, and in some cases certainly, established by

1100" (41). A brief discussion of general points notes that London has produced more church plans of pre-twelfth-century date than any other English town, and lays out facts such as that all known (stone) Saxon churches in London seem to have been built almost *exclusively* from reused Roman stone, a surprise to this reviewer. The rare evidence for timber churches is reviewed, as is the small but striking body of AS sculpture found, most notably at All Hallows Barking, where four fragments (c. 3 ft.) of an eleventh-century cross shaft with figures and animals was found after bombing in 1940; in addition, two other cross fragments were found, one with Ringerike elements and a lion, the other a cross head, c. 1000. A gazeteer contains details of documentation and evolution, and the article is fully illustrated with photographs and line drawings which excerpt individual churches from Early Modern maps of London. In addition, Schofield covers important "themes for church studies in London," outlining promising and necessary areas of research while sketching a methodology by which to proceed. Given the destruction of buildings that goes on in a large city, in addition to the devastation which the Great Fire and bombings of WWII caused, his concerns and his work here are crucial to documenting what it is still possible to gather. Having all the material for both Saxon and later churches together makes this article an indispensable starting point, as well as a pleasant browse in which the author's devotion to his subject shows.

Philip Rahtz's "Anglo-Saxon and Later Whitby," in L. Hoey, ed., *Yorkshire Monasticism: Archaeology, Art and Architecture from the 7th to the 16th Centuries* (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 1995, 1-11) reviews the archaeological and historical evidence relating to the site. Rahtz feels that the plaque inscribed to Ælfæd is the only concrete proof that Whitby is Bede's *Streoneshalh*, but, as Higgitt has shown (in *From the Isles of the North: Early Medieval Art in Britain and Ireland*, 229-36) it is far from certain that the plaque even refers to Ælfæd. This is primarily a review of previously published evidence that adds little to our understanding of the site itself. Rahtz does, however, rightly take Rosemary Cramp to task for dismissing the possibility of female metalsmiths in her 1976 report on the Whitby finds register (in D. Wilson, *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*). He also believes, *pace* Cramp, that none of the graves so far excavated on the site are of pre-Conquest date. In spite of the difficulties, Rahtz feels that much more can be learned from Whitby. "A great opportunity," he says, "was lost in the 1920s. In no other early monastery has such a dense agglomeration of structures, with such an important array of finds, been located or excavated. Even without further excavation, more could be done on the data available" (p. 9). Most urgently the site is in need of conservation. A new multi-disciplinary approach, as many already know, has been undertaken by English Heritage and Scarborough Borough Council, with assistance from the universities of Durham, York, and Lampeter, and the York Archaeological Trust. The current plan includes study of the site itself, and also a thorough review of the finds, particularly

the impressive corpus of sculpture from the abbey.

In "Pershore Abbey," *Current Archaeology* 150 (1996), 216–21, Kevin Blockley gives a brief report on the Anglo-Saxon church recently uncovered beneath the abbey during excavations in advance of a major program of repair to the existing structure. Much of the evidence for the Anglo-Saxon church was destroyed during Gilbert Scott's 1862 restoration; however, fragments of the rammed gravel Anglo-Saxon foundations did survive in places. "The fragments located presumably represent the choir of the church, perhaps with the nave extending to the west below the crossing of the Romanesque abbey, and porticus (or perhaps aisles) to north and south" (p. 218). It is possible that the church had a polygonal apse. Future work will hopefully uncover the rest of the plan of the Anglo-Saxon abbey.

Current Archaeology 149 (1995) contains Kenneth MacGowan's "Barking Abbey" (pp. 172–8). MacGowan provides a thumbnail sketch of the history of Barking, and a discussion of the site, the major sources relating to it, and the history of excavation at the abbey. The most recent excavations were undertaken between 1985 and 1990 by the author and Michael Stone for the Pasmore Edwards Museum/Newham Museum Service. Extensive evidence of Saxon occupation was revealed: traces of wooden structures, sceattas dated 710–30, evidence of spinning and weaving (spindle whorls, loom weights, pin beaters), styli, gold thread, and items of personal use. Many of the finds are illustrated in *The Making of England* exhibition catalogue. Also discovered were an early mill with a dendrochronological date of 705, and a later Anglo-Saxon glass furnace, tentatively dated 875–975, that included remains of very high quality glass. The latter suggests either activity at the abbey after the Viking invasion, or post-Viking refoundation of the abbey. MacGowan stresses that the mill and furnace may not have been associated directly with the nunnery, but perhaps with workshops connected to the site.

c. Death and Burial

"The Roman Emperor in the Sutton Hoo Ship Burial," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 149 (1996), 1–9, by William Filmer-Sankey, is a reexamination of the Byzantine bowls and other Byzantine inspired objects in the burial. Filmer-Sankey's conclusion should be obvious from his title: the purpose of the burial rite was to portray the dead man as a "Roman Emperor." The author is wrong to claim that the Byzantine objects from Sutton Hoo have been neglected by scholars, as David Whitehouse focused on just these objects in his 1992 "The Mediterranean Perspective" (in R. Farrell and C. Neuman de Vegvar, eds. *Sutton Hoo: Fifty Years After*, 117–23), concluding that they were likely to have entered England via Gaul as a part of imperial gift-exchange. But Filmer-Sankey does muster new evidence—for example, the fragmentary cameo found beneath Sutton Hoo Mound 3, and the strong influence of consular diptychs on Anglo-Saxon art. Whether we can really interpret the whetstone-scepter as

being copied from imperial scepters portrayed in these diptychs is, however, debatable. Given the variety of influences on the burial and its grave goods it is somewhat difficult to accept the author's conclusion that portraying the dead man as a Roman ruler "dressed up" like a Roman emperor was the burial's only purpose.

Oswald: Northumbrian King to European Saint, ed. C. Stancliffe and E. Cambridge (Stamford, Paul Watkins, 1995) is an exemplary anthology. Each essay makes a significant contribution to our knowledge of the saint and his cult, but the authors also address each other's work, and essays refer back and forth to each other throughout the volume. Papers by Eric Cambridge and Richard N. Bailey are of particular archaeological interest. In "Archaeology and the Cult of St. Oswald in Pre-Conquest Northumbria," 128–63, Eric Cambridge's purpose is to try and determine exactly how many Oswald dedications are demonstrably pre-Conquest. Cambridge considers a wide range of documentary, archaeological and place-name evidence in his attempt to answer this question. While fully aware of the potential problems of late dedications on early sites, relocated churches, and rededications, he asks whether there are any "distinctive archaeological characteristics associated with the sites of Oswald dedications and their immediate environs which might point to a possible period of origin for the dedication, and whether such characteristics might change over time" (p. 130). Four criteria emerge: (1) presence or absence of Anglian sculpture, (2) presence or absence of Viking sculpture, (3) degree of proximity to sites that have produced Anglian sculpture, (4) degree of proximity to roads of Roman origin. Cambridge does a good job of explaining why these criteria are important and relatively reliable, as well as indicating the limits of his data and its interpretation. The comparative evidence from five different types of site is considered: (1) cult centers (e.g. Bamburgh), (2) monastic sites, (3) episcopal residences, (4) "other" early ecclesiastical centers, (5) royal centers. The results are conveniently summarized by county in an appendix. Cambridge is careful to balance the textual evidence against the archaeological record, and his points are well argued, and well illustrated by the accompanying maps. He admits that his suggestions can only be tentative, but he has clearly established the groundwork for much future research. His conclusion is that there is enough *prima facie* evidence to suggest a number of pre-Viking Oswald dedications, with most seemingly dependent to some degree on nearby high-status sites. In ecclesiastical centers this "may in part reflect a preference for dedicating the principal church to a universal saint, restricting indigenous dedicatees to subsidiary contexts. More fundamentally, however, it presumably reflects one of the basic characteristics of the structure of early medieval settlement, in which the principal focus is surrounded by a series of dependent settlements, one of which happens to have become fossilized as a result of its ecclesiastical associations" (p. 156). There seem to have been political overtones to the promotion of the cult within Northumbria.

While Cambridge notes the association of Oswald and Cuthbert dedications at some Northumbrian sites, Richard Bailey ("St. Oswald's Heads," 195–209) notes that by the later medieval period the two saints "had been yoked together in order to justify the spiritual authority of the priory church at Durham which sheltered their mortal remains" (p. 195). Bailey's specific interest is in the tradition that Cuthbert's shrine at Durham also contains the head of St. Oswald. The problem is that a number of other sites also claim to have the head, or pieces of the head, of Oswald (with claims by churches in Switzerland, Germany, Luxembourg, and Holland, seemingly reliable). Bailey surveys both the documentary and the archaeological evidence for the head relic, in an attempt to "test the authenticity of the Durham fragments which have . . . the longest recorded history of all the claimants" (p. 203). His conclusions rest on three assumptions: (1) that Oswald's remains were correctly identified (he finds no reason to doubt this), (2) that the head did come to Lindisfarne (again, he sees no reason to doubt this), (3) that Oswald's head remained distinct from the relics of Aidan and Ceolwulf that are also recorded as having traveled with the Lindisfarne community. Specifically, he asks whether or not Reginald can be trusted when he describes the wound to Oswald's skull, which would have distinguished it from those of the saints, who presumably died less violent deaths. Bailey believes so. While modern descriptions of the contents of Cuthbert's shrine are, on the whole, less reliable, the 1899 excavation report does describe fragments of a skull with a weapon inflicted wound. Medical evidence shows that the blow was inflicted at the time of death and not later (so it is not a forged relic). Bailey's answer to the question "Is the Durham skull Oswald's?" is a "guarded yes" (p. 208).

Helen Geake, "The Use of Grave-Goods in Conversion Period England c.600–c.850 A.D.," Dissertation, University of York. *DAI* 57A (1996), and *Index to Theses* 45 (1996), 1311. Geake's purpose is to describe and explain grave-good usage during the period in question. Over 7000 graves from 351 sites are discussed and the details of each grave are listed in an appended gazetteer. A number of graves are chosen as working samples, with the rationale behind the choices carefully established. The study is set in the larger context of state formation, with, not surprisingly, much influence in evidence from the Roman and Byzantine worlds. Grave-goods, like so many other aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture are ultimately a way of establishing the Anglo-Saxons as the heirs to the Roman Empire. This is an important thesis that has already had an impact on the interpretation of important early cemeteries such as Sutton Hoo.

f. Artifacts and Iconography

LLOYD and Jennifer Laing, *Early English Art and Architecture: Archaeology and Society*. Stroud: Sutton, 1996. In their introduction to this volume the Laings state: "This book has been written in order to tie together the now huge amount of constantly changing material that has been accumulated on

the Anglo-Saxons, and to help demonstrate how an understanding of Anglo-Saxon art is firmly dependent on an appreciation of the social, religious and economic milieu in which it was produced" (p. 4). This is an admirable attempt to unite "archaeological" and "art historical" material, but many of the illustrations are small, or out of focus, and many of the color plates are over-exposed and/or with serious distortions of color. More problematically, the division of the material by century, rather than by some sort of political, historical, or art historical marker, may be easy for a student to follow, but is little help in setting the material within its larger historical or cultural context. It also makes the authors' discussion of stylistic development within object types difficult to follow. In chapter three, for example, the text jumps confusingly from sculpture to metalworking to architectural sculpture, and there are problems with the neat divisions between secular and ecclesiastical art throughout. The treatment of Anglo-Saxon sculpture is particularly simplistic, and gives no hint of the controversy over date, meaning, and function that surrounds monuments such as the Ruthwell cross. The Laing's statement that "Strict iconographic conventions were adhered to, so that from the arrangement of figures the devout would immediately recognize the reference" (p. 99), is simply not true, and ignores the ongoing debate over the meaning of Ruthwell, Hovingham, Rothbury, and other monuments, as well as issues of class, gender and education. The iconography of this and other monuments is multivalent, requiring a learned, not just a devout, audience to unlock its full meaning. Moreover, Anglo-Saxon sculpture is characterized as much by its iconographic inventiveness as by its conventions. (And as we all know by now, the Ruthwell cross is not inscribed with the text of *The Dream of the Rood* [p. 116].) Similarly, it is highly unlikely that the figure at the base of the west face of the Bewcastle cross is, as the Laing's believe, John the Evangelist rather than an aristocratic layman. In spite of their efforts to include a greater variety of material than previous surveys of Anglo-Saxon art, their treatment of manuscripts, like their treatment of sculpture, focuses on the better-known works. For example, the dismissal of the Book of Cerne as a manuscript in which little decoration survives is valid only if the manuscript is seen exclusively in comparison to something like the Lindisfarne Gospels. Similar problems and errors characterize the whole of the book. A good up-to-date survey of Anglo-Saxon art remains to be written.

The title of Stephen O. Glosecki's "Movable Beasts: the Manifold Implications of Early Germanic Animal Imagery," *Animals in the Middle Ages*, ed. Nona C. Flores. Garland Medieval Casebooks, 13 (New York & London, 1996), pp. 3–23, refers to the portable and sometimes removable nature of some of this imagery. His thesis is that while beasts may originally have carried meaning they may also eventually have become nothing more than motifs copied from generation to generation. He believes, however, that it is more likely that they retained a mystic and socio-religious content and an apotropaic function. Glosecki's theory that animal imagery

may have multiple meanings but a basically apotropaic function is nothing new. Why he classes interlace from Sutton Hoo amongst Viking art styles (p. 4), or translates the Wanderer line 98b (*wyrmlicum fah*) as "writhing with snake shapes" remains a mystery.

Elizabeth Okasha's "The Lead Cross of Bishop Godfrey of Chichester," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 134 (1996), 63–9, examines an inscribed lead cross found in 1830 in the medieval burial ground within the cloister of Chichester Cathedral. The inscription records a papal absolution for Bishop Godfrey and gives the date of his death as September 25th, 1088. Okasha's study provides a complete description of the cross, transcription and translation of the text of the inscription, and commentary on its content, as well as on what is known about Godfrey. She concludes with a list of eight other lead crosses known from England in this period.

Elizabeth Okasha and Susan Youngs, "The Limpsfield Grange Disc," *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996), 63–8. Discovered in 1992 and acquired by the British Museum in July of 1993 (reg. No. MLA 1993, 10–1,1), the disc is made of gold of a very high purity and decorated on one face with a bird, and rectangular row of dots, and the inscription A – Q (on either side of the bird's head). The authors logically conclude that the inscribed letters represent the abbreviated Latin *aquila*. Both the style and composition of the disc, as well as the comparative evidence (which is thoroughly reviewed), suggest a ninth-century date. The eagle is likely to represent the symbol of John the Evangelist. Okasha and Youngs conclude that the disc could originally have been part of an item of jewelry or church furniture (e.g. a bookcover, reliquary, or piece of altar plate), and was likely to have been one of a set of four evangelist symbols. The best parallel for the Limpsfield Grange eagle is the symbol of John in the ninth-century Book of Cerne. This is an excellent study of both the disc and its contemporary context.

John Hines discusses an example of the simplest and most common (B7) type of wrist-clasp in his "An Early Anglo-Saxon Wrist-Clasp from the Parish of Baydon," *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 89 (1996), 130–32. The clasp is of copper alloy with simple surface decoration, and Hines feels it is most likely of early sixth-century date. While quite common overall, the wrist-clasp is important as the only example of a class B clasp found outside of the Anglian area of England. Its mundane character suggests that it is not likely to have been a gift, or medium of exchange. It most probably represents the presence and death of an Anglian woman in the Baydon area.

D.A.A. Brooks, "The Theory and Methodology of Classifications of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries A.D. in Anglo-Saxon England with reference to Great Square-Headed Brooches," *Index to Theses* 45 (1996), 1800. Brooks' dissertation was completed in 1995 at University College, London. Square-headed brooches are here used as a test case in an attempt to establish a reliable chronology and classification of fifth- and sixth-century metalwork. Brooks notes that none

of the standard dating tools (e.g. documents or coins) has yet supplied a rigorous and objective classification of metalwork, and that establishing such a classification is crucial. While Brooks' sentiments are admirable, one can of course question whether objectivity is ever possible. The thesis highlights the problems with current classifications and chronologies and calls for a new system of classification to be constructed from the ground up.

"Anglian Cross Fragments found in East Lothian" form the subject of Rennie Weatherhead's paper in *Trans. of the East Lothian Antiq. And Field Naturalists' Soc.* 22 (1993), 53–61. The fragments in question are from Aberlady (now in the Royal Scottish Museum Edinburgh) and Tynninghame (now in the possession of the Earl of Haddington). All are dated to the Anglian period on stylistic grounds. The Aberlady fragment is decorated with vinescroll, animal ornament, geometric designs and a figural panel, while the Moreham fragment is decorated only with vinescroll and geometric patterns. Tynninghame displays a panel of figural ornament, as well as geometric and animal patterns. The author's apparent desire to date the stones to the ninth and tenth century is hardly in accord with an "Anglian" provenance. His claim that "appreciation of carved stone" was introduced to Northumbria by Bishop Acca (p. 53) is certainly questionable, as is his assertion that the "knotwork" patterns of Northumbrian manuscripts show a strong Scottish Gaelic influence introduced by Oswald on his return from exile (p. 54).

Richard Sermon attempts to decipher the "cryptic" (ogham-like and runic) inscriptions on the Hackness cross in his "The Hackness Cross Cryptic Inscription," *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 68 (1996), 101–11. With the aid of a computer program written in Microsoft Q-Basic, Sermon generated all possible permutations of letters for the runic and "ogham" alphabets of the inscriptions, discarding readings that obviously made no sense. He concludes that the ogham inscription is in Old Irish and reads "Cross to King Jesus rock of help from Angus," and that the runic inscription, while largely indecipherable, reads in part "Aethelberg knew me." Unfortunately both readings require quite a bit of reconstruction, and the method used to come up with these readings is hardly objective. Finally, the inscriptions make no sense in the context of either this cross or other known monuments of Anglo-Saxon sculpture.

Richard Bailey has written two extremely important studies of Anglo-Saxon sculpture. *England's Earliest Sculptors* (Toronto, PIMS, 1996) is entertaining, informative and clearly written. Bailey has ordered his material so that it moves from issues of methodology and general principles to an analysis of the monuments themselves, an order that students will find particularly easy to follow. For the specialist, the book can be frustrating as, while a complete bibliography is provided, there are annoyingly few notes or references within the text to direct readers to further information on specific questions or monuments.

The individual chapters focus on different themes and are

arranged in roughly chronological order. Chapter one does a good job of contextualizing the material, highlighting the differences between the way in which we perceive Anglo-Saxon sculpture and the way in which the Anglo-Saxons would have seen and understood it. Chapter two surveys monument types and the disparate influences evident in the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon sculpture. Bailey notes that while full publication and analysis of the Winchester material might eventually change the picture, "at the present time it appears that no surviving sculpture need be dated before the Council of Whitby (664) and the subsequent reorganization of the English church under the remarkable leadership of Archbishop Theodore (669–90)" (p. 25). Chapters three and four are devoted to a survey of some of the characteristic forms and iconographic programs of the monuments. Chapters five and six focus on Viking-age sculpture, one of Bailey's particular interests. The final chapter deals with the sculptors and their techniques, as well as the relationship between sculpture and works in other media, providing an excellent conclusion to the survey of forms, meanings and interpretations presented in the earlier chapters. Speaking of the grid that underlies the composition of works in a variety of media, Bailey points out that, "all insular art is . . . subject to identical compositional constraints. Some of the supposed similarities between the various media may therefore be attributable to a common control and not to direct interaction between different kinds of artists" (p. 113).

Bailey's "What Mean These Stones? Some Aspects of Pre-Norman Sculpture in Cheshire and Lancashire," Toller Memorial Lecture, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78.1 (1996), 21–46, is written with an equal combination of wit and insightful scholarship. The paper opens with a brief survey of the unfortunate removal and fragmentation of many of the monuments, and a few anecdotal accounts of their ability to baffle even the most determined scholars. Bailey provides an interesting summary of the distribution and chronology of sculpture in his area of study, as well as a consideration of the stylistic, iconographic and formal links between the different sites. The monuments under consideration are mostly slabs and crosses, with a few fragmentary examples of church furnishings. Bailey's analysis of the sophisticated iconography of monuments such as the ninth-century Hornby cross-shaft, and the tenth-century Winwick cross-head, provides a timely reminder that the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses are not the only examples of Anglo-Saxon sculpture that demand a close reading, or approach via "informed ruminatio" (pp. 26–28). (See also the work of Jane Hawkes reviewed below.) The main focus of this article is on the physical appearance of the original sculptures. Such things as the addition of gesso, paint, metalwork, glass and jewels, would have made for works that looked dramatically different from the objects that survive today. Bailey also provides an excellent consideration of the ways in which sculptors made parts of the monuments look like textiles or metalwork, and the reasons for their doing so (almost always

linked to the function of the monument). The paper contains a surprising number of typos, but this should not detract from the overall value of the material presented.

Jane Hawkes, "The Non-Crucifixion Iconography of the pre-Viking Sculpture in the North of England: Carvings at Hovingham, Masham, Rothbury, Sandbach and Wirksworth," Thesis. University of Newcastle upon Tyne. *Index to Theses* 45 (1996), 1311–12. Hawkes' thesis, completed in 1990 under the supervision of Richard Bailey, promises to change dramatically our interpretation of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in the North of England. Her various conference papers and publications (see below) have already provided new and convincing reinterpretations of the iconography of individual monuments.

Also by Jane Hawkes is: "The Rothbury Cross: An Iconographic Bricolage," *Gesta* 35.1 (1996), 77–94. This paper examines both the meaning of the scenes carved on the cross and the models on which they appear to be based. The Rothbury cross survives in three fragments: two fragments of the shaft (one now serving as the pedestal of the font in the church at Rothbury), and one fragment of the cross head. Hawkes argues against the identification of strong ninth-century Carolingian influence on the figural iconography of the fragments, especially with regard to the Crucifixion depicted on one side of the cross head. She provides convincing visual evidence to back up her suggestion that elements of so-called "Carolingian influence" can in reality be traced back to earlier Anglo-Saxon sources and traditions. In light of this evidence we need no longer date the cross to the ninth century (i.e. later than its supposed sources), and Hawkes suggests a more likely date shortly after the mid eighth century. This article also provides a detailed analysis of the iconographic innovations that characterize several of the Rothbury scenes (the Ascension of Christ on the shaft, for example), indicating the use of many different sources, but reliance on none. The hell scene at Rothbury, for example, is without any obvious precedent. This is a well-researched, well-written, and convincing article.

Hawkes' paper on the Rothbury cross includes a discussion of her previously published reinterpretation of "Christ healing the blind man" as the Raising of Lazarus. Brendan Cassidy rejects both interpretations in his "The Dream of Joseph on the Anglo-Saxon Cross from Rothbury" (*Gesta* 35.2 [1996], 149–55). As the title suggests, Cassidy wishes to interpret the panel in question as the Dream of Joseph, identifying the three figures contained in the panel as Joseph, Mary and an angel, rather than Lazarus, Martha and Christ. His argument depends on moving the cross back into the ninth century in order for it to be later than the models on which he believes it is based. The Dream of Joseph arguably occurs on only one other object produced in Anglo-Saxon England: the Hovingham slab—and even here its identification is extremely controversial. Moreover, however one wishes to interpret Hovingham, the figures bear little resemblance to those at Rothbury. Curiously, Cassidy declines to illustrate

this example which he claims shares with Rothbury the "distinctive detail" of the hand of one figure touching the head of the other. In short, Cassidy provides no convincing visual parallels for the image, nor any explanation of how the scene would fit into the larger iconographic program at Rothbury.

g. Production and Craft

EXCAVATION of the late Saxon clay, rubble and timber embankments at the Thames Exchange waterfront site in 1988–9 revealed 235 lava quernstone fragments, the largest group of such items yet found in Britain. They are the focus of study for Tom Freshwater's "A Lava Quern Workshop in Late Saxon London," *The London Archaeologist* 8 (1996), 39–45. The article is a summary of the author's unpublished dissertation in which he identified the fragments as the remains of a lava quern finishing workshop. Only eighty-nine fragments survive, most suggesting quernstones of standard seventh-ninth century type. All the surviving fragments lack evidence of final seatings and holes, indicating that they are from broken and unfinished quernstones. The fact that this group contains only unfinished stones is unusual in a European context. Whether they were deposited over time or in a single deposition is uncertain. Freshwater emphasizes that the importing of such querns is one aspect of the developing trade that London saw in this period, when beach markets were gradually giving way to a more formalized system of quayside warehouses and market places (p. 45).

Robert Drinkall and Judith Stevenson's "Weighing it all up" (*The London Archaeologist* 8 [1996], 3–9) is a summary report of a study of 115 weights, dating from the Roman to the late medieval period, found on off-site tips from the Vintry (modern day Vintner's Place) excavations in London. The study was part of Drinkall's 1994 BA in Archaeology at University College, London. The present report was compiled by Judith Stevenson of the Museum of London. Drinkall's dissertation provided an illustrated catalogue, surveyed the comparative evidence, and queried whether documented weight standards could be identified in the Vintry material. The weights were divided into eight categories according to shape, material, and surface decoration, in order to see if particular forms could be related to specific weights or sets of weights. For the Anglo-Saxon period Drinkall's findings accorded with those of Susan Kruse ("Late Saxon Balances and Weights from England," *Medieval Archaeology* 36 [1992]), both authors finding that Saxon and Viking weights were usually iron with a copper-alloy coating. The best parallels for the Anglo-Saxon and Viking material, not surprisingly, come from Dublin and other Viking sites. Metrological analysis revealed that no single value for an ounce could be determined within any one type or date range represented at the site, and that no clear system of weight values was in use in London between the late tenth and late fourteenth centuries.

h. Numismatics

TATJANA BERGA has edited volume 45 in the *Sylloge of Coins in the British Isles*, *Latvian Collections Anglo-Saxon and Later*

British Coins (Oxford University Press and Spink and Sons for the British Academy, Oxford, 1996). This is a relatively small collection with only 272 coins, the majority of them late Anglo-Saxon. Most were found in hoards or on archaeological sites in Latvian territory. Anglo-Saxon coins did not start entering Latvia until the first quarter of the eleventh century, largely via the Daugava River. The bulk of coins catalogued, therefore, date from the eleventh century, with the latest Anglo-Saxon coin being a penny of Harold Godwinson. Many of the Anglo-Saxon coins had been turned into pendants as Latvia was not a coin using economy. Written sources indicate that a large number of coins found in the nineteenth and early twentieth century was melted down—other coins have simply been lost. The catalogue is comprised of coins from three major collections: 1) the Museum of History of Riga and Navigation, 2) the Museum of Latvian History, 3) the Institute of Latvian History.

Mark Blackburn has authored and co-authored a host of articles this year. His "Mint Burhs and the Grately Code cap. 14.2," *The Defence of Wessex*, ed. David Hill and Alexander R. Rumble (Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press, 1996), 160–75, focuses on the development of the mint network in Wessex and Mercia in the period 875–925. The study excludes the reconquered Danelaw as it presents a very different scenario. Due to the limited number of coin hoards from the Wessex/Mercia area in the late ninth and early tenth century the study relies largely on stylistic comparisons and evidence provided by the names and numbers of moneyers. Different patterns within the two areas emerge. There is a general pattern of reduction in coin output, followed by an expansion between the 870s and 920s, but in southern England there is a low point around the year 900, followed by a revival under Edward the Elder in 915–24. During these same years Mercia sees intermittent growth with a large increase in the middle years of Edward's reign. In both Wessex and Mercia the majority of mints are located in major trading centers that would later develop into towns.

The Grately Code (ca. 926–39) is the earliest Anglo-Saxon legislative document to refer to administration of coinage, though the chapter on coinage appears to have been inserted from an earlier source, dated, on numismatic grounds, to between the middle of Edward the Elder's reign and the reign of Edgar. While the Code reveals much about mints and moneyers, it remains unclear why the list of mints mentioned is incomplete, covering only a part of Wessex.

"Two Normandy Deniers from the Stornoway Hoard 1988–90," also by Blackburn, appears in *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 334–6. The Stornoway (Isle of Lewis) hoard, a Viking-age silver hoard, was deposited ca. 990–1040. It consists of forty-two pieces of hack silver and two coin fragments that were wrapped in linen and placed in a cattle horn. The hoard is now in the National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh. The coin fragments are apparently parts of two Norman deniers minted in Rouen.

Blackburn reports on two parcels of Edmund pennies that were so similar it seemed likely that they were originally from

the same hoard in "A Hoard of Late St. Edmund Coins from Near Colchester," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 156 (1996), 289–91. Parcel A was made up of ten fragments and two whole coins. Parcel B, said to have been found at Colchester, Essex, contained two whole pennies and a number of fragments. The suggested deposition date is ca. 915. Although problems remain with the interpretation of the hoard, it represents a significant addition to our understanding of the origin and chronology of the St. Edmund coins.

Mark Blackburn and Kevin Leahy's "A Lincoln Mint-Signed Coin from the Reign of Edgar," appears in *The Numismatic Chronicle* 156 (1996), 239–41. The subject of this article is a Circumscription Cross type penny found in September 1995 in the parish of Caistor, Lincs. It is important because of its highly unusual legends. It appears to bear a Lincoln mint signature, though the Lincoln mint issued chiefly Horizontal type coins during Edgar's reign. Moreover, the dies for the coin are likely to have been made in Winchester (based on the form and size of the lettering). The name of the moneyer, is known from coins struck at both Lincoln and London. The coin "raises the interesting question of whether, several years before his celebrated monetary reform, Edgar had tried to impose a uniform mint-signed Circumscription Cross issue on English mints generally" (p. 241).

With Michael Bonser Mark Blackburn has published "Coin Hoards 1995: 12. Bury St. Edmunds," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 333. Blackburn and Bonser provide simple descriptive entries of the finds. The Bury St. Edmunds hoard consists of at least eight silver Anglo-Saxon pennies fused into a single lump. The five coins visible are Æthelred II, Crux type, and it seems likely that all were of this type.

Blackburn's "Coin Hoards 1995: 13. Near Thetford," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 333, is part of the same article. The Thetford hoard is a fused lump of seven Anglo-Saxon silver pennies. Only one, again a Crux type of Æthelred II, can be identified with certainty. Two other coins appear to be of the same variety, and again it is most likely that all seven were Crux type.

Mark Blackburn and Jenny Mann, "A Late Anglo-Saxon Coin Die from Flaxengate London," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 201–8. Blackburn and Mann report on a reverse die of Æthelred II's Crux type discovered during excavations in the center of Lincoln in 1975. Due to heavy corrosion the die went unrecognized until it was cleaned in 1990. The article includes drawings, photos, and a complete description of the die. The authors suggest that the Flaxengate site could have been the location of a moneyer's tenement or die-making workshop. Alternatively, the die could simply have been scrap-iron for recycling, though Blackburn and Mann feel that the archaeological context favors the former interpretation.

James Graham-Campbell and Mark Blackburn, "An Unprovenanced Viking-Age Silver Hoard of Tenth Century Date," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 279–82, covers a hoard sold at Christies on 6 July, 1994 from the collection of

the late Sir Sidney Nolan. The hoard consisted of two complete ingots, two ingot terminal fragments, one twisted-rod arm-ring, one twisted-rod neck-ring, a fragment of a plain arm-ring, and a fragment of an Edgar cut-halfpenny of Horizontal type (struck 959–73). The authors identify this as a classic example of a mixed hack-silver hoard. Because of its content, they speculate that it may originally have been part of a Chester or Ballaquale hoard, though they admit that the evidence is ultimately inconclusive.

In "Mints and Moneyers in the West Midlands and Derby in the Reign of Edmund (939–96)," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155 (1995), 135–61, Hugh Pagan suggests mint attributions for as many coins as the evidence allows, based largely on details of the moneyers signatures. He supplies a useful list of the output for each of the known moneyers working in the mints at Chester, Derby, Shrewsbury, Hereford, Stafford, and Tamworth. In essence, the article is a very detailed refining of the relevant sections of Blunt, Stewart and Lyon, *Coinage in Tenth Century England*. This brief review cannot really do Pagan's paper justice. The nature of the evidence, based as it is on the names of the moneyers and the locations at which they are known to have worked, demands a very close reading (with Blunt, Stewart and Lyon in hand) to be appreciated.

Lord Stewartby has edited three short articles left unfinished by C.E. Blunt at the time of his death in his "Four Tenth-Century Notes: Unfinished Work of C.E. Blunt," *The British Numismatic Journal* 64 (1994), 33–40. Three of the texts included needed only slight revision, and one was reconstructed from Blunt's notes. The first report is on six finds "said to have been found together in the Thames mud," a provenance which Blunt accepted. The finds consist of two St. Edmund memorial coins, three irregular coins of Edward the Elder, and an early St. Peter coin. The mixed nature of the coins suggests that they came from the purse of someone on a ship, and were lost in going ashore. They are not typical of finds from London. Blunt estimates their loss at ca. 910. The second report is on a set of three St. Edmund memorial coins from Suffolk, one coin of a previously unknown type. The third note covers three stray finds (coins of Athelstan, Eadred and Edgar) from the Smarmore hoard (Co. Louth, Ireland). The final note is a brief history of pellet-marked and deliberately flawed obverse dies of Eadred.

i. Miscellaneous

ELIZABETH COATSWORTH, Maria Fitzgerald, Kevin Leahy and Gale Owen-Crocker publish a sample of what the Manchester Medieval Textiles Project will provide in "Anglo-Saxon Textiles from Cleatham, Humberside" (*Textile History* 27.1 (1996), 5–41). The article provides a nice, basic introduction to the study of textiles in AS contexts and the need for the Project itself, using the inhumations at Cleatham as a sample group to show how the database will be catalogued. Cleatham has a major cremation cemetery site, but just over a third of the inhumations, 22, produced textile evidence, usually of skeuomorphs where the fibres were mineralized, or of impres-

sions left on metalwork corrosion products. The textiles themselves provide evidence for clothing, of course, but also for cloths used to wrap weapons, tools and utensils. Here, most of the cloths were tabby weaves and 2/2 twills, though some chevron and broken diamond patterned twills were also found, as were tablet weaves and three shed twills. As the authors note, this last is considered rare in pre-Roman western Europe, until the Scandinavian examples from the Viking period, but "it has been consistently found in a significant proportion of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, where it is considered to reflect Roman influence, on the assumption that the Roman two-beam loom had continued in use and been adopted by the Saxon settlers" (14–15). The Cleatham examples allow for a brief discussion of Bender Jørgensen's work on regional evidence for weaving, here reversing the twill over tabby bias she had identified, but acknowledging that a difference in methodology may be the source of such a reversal. The cataloguing and standardization of terms and approaches which the MMTP offers will go a long way to resolving such differences, as well as offering extensive search possibilities and eventually, statistical studies based on all known sites in the database. The last sections of the article detail the little found for costume evidence in the 22 graves studied; women's costumes are better documented because of the metal jewelry and its placement (to hold clothing together, for example), but some evidence for male costume is recorded as well. The catalogue of fragments finishes out the article, listing single finds and groups according to the grave producing the evidence. The co-directors of the Project, Coatsworth and Owen-Crocker, have long been associated with textile studies, and the project promises to bring new insights on textile development and distribution.

T. Anderson reports on two examples of "Cranial Weapon Injuries from Anglo-Saxon Dover" (*International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 6 [1996], 10–14). Only 14 examples of cranial injuries, including these two wounds, are known from AS contexts. The first (SK 348), a male 30–35 years old, has a gash consistent with a sword blow from above swung by a right-hander; the force was such that it broke off the skull bone when the blade was stopped and twisted out of the wound. Anderson suggests that it was inflicted in battle, since the rarity of swords makes it "not likely to be used in a street brawl," and considers that it may have been delivered from horseback, an interesting aspect to add to the debate over AS battle practice. The other male, of the same age, had some evidence of healing to his wound, probably caused by a small axe, again in battle. Neither man was buried with weapons, though as Anderson notes they might have been taken by the victors (another caveat to add when considering Härke's theories on weapon burial); in addition, SK 303 had a small child, c. 3 years old, placed over his left lower leg, another interesting variable. Bone preservation was generally poor, or the work of Jackson (see below) could have been usefully

applied here. Also noteworthy here is how little evidence we have from bones for deaths in battle; without textual evidence, would we think of the AS as a warrior culture? As Anderson notes, battle victims are few in the archaeological record (or at least the numbers we expect are), probably because injuries to tissue rather than bone leave no traces (14).

Phyllis Jackson brings 50 years of experience as a chiropract to her examination of foot shapes in "Footloose in Archaeology" (*Current Archaeology* 144 [1995], 466–70, and also available online at <http://www.archaeology.co.uk/hilites/feet.htm>). Having divided those 50 years between Herefordshire and the Cotswolds, she observed that slight deformities were turned into typical and hereditary shapes due to intermarriage in these isolated areas. She decided to test whether the isolation of prehistoric peoples produced similar genetic and "tribal" shapes, and even more, she noted a fundamental difference in foot structure between "the traditional English foot," used by shoe manufacturers there, and a distinctly different shape which seems isolated to Celtic areas (Scotland, Ireland, Wales and Cornwall). This is an uncommonly productive and useful new avenue that requires no expensive scientific equipment or destructive means of measurement. The shape of the cuboid bone is particularly diagnostic, as is the overall foot shape. Jackson's breakthrough at Cirencester/Corinium gives an indication of how specific information can inform larger questions. She traced a connection between the inhabitants of Corinium and the "native" feet in an AS cemetery at Lechlade, showing that natives and AS were buried together in that later cemetery, all without recourse to the much-debated relevance of burial goods and ritual as marks of ethnicity. Even more striking, in the early material of Corinium, she was able to identify two odd foot forms as from Wiltshire; these two people were beheaded and buried in a common grave, perhaps because of the very fact that they were strangers to the area. Working with bones from specific areas, she found that earlier remains made it possible "to differentiate between the ethnic origin of people buried within a later cemetery" (467). She was even able to link evidence from a long barrow at Hazleton, Cirencester and the natives at Lechlade, a span of 5,000 years. Of course, foot bones are often lost or damaged over centuries, but luckily, the most diagnostic bones seem to survive the best; when full evidence survives, the results so far seem remarkably consistent. It seems impossible to be overenthusiastic about such a promising avenue.

**Gifford, Edwin, and Joyce Gifford, "The Sailing Performance of Anglo-Saxon Ships as Derived from the Building and Trials of Half-Scale Models of the Sutton Hoo and Graveney Ship Finds" (*Mariner's Mirror* 82 [1996], 131–53), was reviewed in last year's issue.

[Due to lost mail, lost files and deadlines, many items for 1996 could not be included this year, and will appear next year.]

C.K. and K.M.W.-C.

Appendix: History and Culture, 1995

a. Reference and General Works and Collected Papers

1995 saw the publication of the *New Cambridge Medieval History, II: c. 700–c. 900* (Cambridge), edited by Rosamond McKitterick. Six items in this major book provide sound introductions to topics of interest to Anglo-Saxonists.

In “England, 700–900” (18–42), Simon Keynes sketches relationships among the early southern kingdoms. Keynes uses the Tribal Hidage to show the number and diversity of tribes in early England, tribes which as yet had no collective political identity. He argues that the document is Mercian and probably dates to Mercia’s peak in the eighth century, when the Hidage might have been a practical administrative document used to collect dues or a scholarly production meant to celebrate the extent of Mercian rule. (N.J. Higham disagrees: see section b below.) Keynes views overlordship in these centuries as a flexible construct rather than a specific office. The “Mercian supremacy” was not rule over all of southern England but a set of strategies to preserve Mercian territory and influence: Æthelbald and Offa built power from conquest or suppression of local rulers and tried unsuccessfully to subdue Kent, but they also made alliances with independent kings and took tribute from rulers whom they allowed to maintain some status. These Mercian kings sought to maintain or increase their borders and their power but displayed no desire to unite England nor any sense of a unified, “English” identity. The kings’ power emanated from and remained centered in Mercia. Among the West Saxons, Egbert sought regional security, not dominance, through a slightly different set of strategies: instead of attempting to rule Kent he established good relations with it and, after conquering and ruling Mercia for a year, returned it to Mercian governance. Even Alfred allowed the Mercians their own ruler, Æthelred, and put London under Æthelred’s rule. Yet by calling Æthelred not king but ealdorman, and by taking control of London, Alfred did extend his authority to a broader area than the traditional West Saxon lands and set the stage for his heirs to unite England in the tenth century.

Rosamond McKitterick’s principal purpose, in “England and the Continent” (64–84), is to re-examine the achievement of the late seventh- and early eighth-century Anglo-Saxon missionaries to the Continent in the light of research carried out since Wilhelm Levison’s classic study was published in 1946. It has too readily been concluded that the missionaries’ activities bespeak a strong, highly organized English church intervening in a major way in a decadent Frankish church. It should not be forgotten that when Wilfrid preached to the Frisians ca. 679, the South Saxons back in England had yet to be converted, and the organization and institutions of the Anglo-Saxon church were still in the process of being elaborated. Rarely, moreover, were the regions in which the missionaries worked wholly pagan: often there had been preceding Frankish attempts at evangelization,

although Christianity had subsequently weakened or lapsed. McKitterick notes, indeed, how the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons helped the Franks to further their plans. Carolingian mayors supported Willibrord’s work among the Frisians in part because they hoped that evangelization would pave the way for Frankish political aggrandizement: “Christianity and political conquest went hand in hand” (68). McKitterick’s analysis of Boniface’s work is dispassionate and in some respects critical. Boniface, she observes, “told us in his letters what he wanted us to believe” (78). In particular, his account of his success in Bavaria seems exaggerated: from the standpoint of Virgil of Salzburg Boniface’s contribution appeared to be interference rather than worthwhile reorganization. While the succession of Carloman as mayor of Austrasia in 741 was beneficial for Boniface, to whom Carloman turned for help in reforming the church, Boniface seems never to have established a close relationship with Carloman’s brother Pippin, and McKitterick suggests that Boniface’s lack of access to the Frankish ruler after 750 may have contributed to his decision to return to the mission field, a decision which, of course, was to lead to his martyrdom. While the primary focus of this chapter is on the work of the missionaries, McKitterick also briefly describes Anglo-Continental commercial relations and coinage reforms (64–5), the composition of the Echternach scriptorium (70), Anglo-Saxon pilgrimage to the Continent (78), the possible influence of Frankish ecclesiastical reforms on the Anglo-Saxon church (79–82), and the question of which Continental texts may have circulated in England in the ninth century (82–3).

In “The Vikings in Francia and Anglo-Saxon England to 911” (190–201), Simon Coupland divides the Scandinavian raids into three phases. In the first, 790s–841, the raiders made hit-and-run attacks on the coasts against which Franks and Anglo-Saxons had little defense. In the second, 841–75, the size and intensity of raids increased greatly. The raiders continued surprise attacks, began wintering abroad, and formed more and larger war bands; they also started to venture further, striking inland in northern Europe and raiding the Mediterranean. Frankish and Anglo-Saxon resistance in this period met limited success, and paying tribute appeared to be the best strategy: kings could afford it, and it did stop raids. In the third phase, 876–911, some Vikings continued to raid while others colonized areas of England and Francia. Coupland argues that the Vikings’ goal was always booty, never political power or a “pagan crusade.” The period ended when first Alfred and then Charles the Simple developed effective military strategies and ultimately Christianized—civilized—the Danes.

Intellectual centers in England and Francia established “Eighth-Century Foundations” for later learning, according to Rosamond McKitterick (681–94). Although this period is not always viewed as a productive one, monasteries and

cathedral schools were engaged in the crucial work of transmitting texts and establishing modes of thought influential in the coming centuries. English book-production focused on gospel texts; Francia apparently produced a greater range and number of manuscripts, especially liturgical and legal ones. McKitterick emphasizes the creativity of eighth-century compilations, which included new prayers and laws and reorganized the old; and contemporary hagiography, which gave rise to new cults in England and Francia. At the same time, legal tracts and codes demonstrate continued legal training and interest in questions of power and status, especially in Francia, Spain, and Italy. Moreover, English and sometimes Frankish missionaries established houses in German territories which would become important centers of learning. McKitterick concludes that eighth-century intellectual activity, with its focus on Christian learning, authority, and correctness, provided the basis for the Carolingian Renaissance.

Janet Nelson's "Kingship and Royal Government" (383–430) surveys a broad topic while nuancing the work of Henri Pirenne. She agrees with Pirenne that the economy shifted northward but argues that he exaggerated Islam's impact, ignoring internal European dynamics. Land, appointments, and treasure gave power to both kings and aristocrats, while kings alone controlled coinage. Another force, kinship, paradoxically both encouraged aristocratic loyalty to kings and facilitated alliances against kings. Kings and nobles also needed support from subordinates and so had an interest in protecting them. The royal household was the basis of governmental organization, and it extended its power by using nobles and churchmen as local agents even while those men pursued their own interests. Local and central interests, however, merged in royal assemblies responsible for legislation and justice. Nelson concludes that Pirenne was right to identify a new conception of kingship tied to increased church authority and sacral kingship. Yet Pirenne overlooked the length of time the process took and the range of influences, which Nelson identifies as biblical, Roman, and "barbarian" or native strands. Eighth- and ninth-century kings were supposed to govern for the common good, as a shared identity based on an honor ethic, public ritual, and history bound ruler and subjects together.

Niels Lund's "Scandinavia, c. 700–1066" (202–27) includes material of Anglo-Saxon relevance. Lund briefly covers St. Willibrord's fruitless attempt to evangelize Denmark (209–10) and the visit to King Alfred's court by the Norwegian chieftain Ohthere/Ottar (212–13), while pp. 219–23 discuss the escalation of Viking attacks on England in the 990s and the Danish conquest of England. Lund offers the suggestion that King Svein's decision to undertake the conquest in 1013—he had previously been content with mere raids—may well have been influenced by the achievements in England of Thorkell the Tall, who, having accumulated much wealth there and having in 1012 taken service with King Æthelred, had emerged as a significant rival and possible threat to Svein.

Patrick Sims-Williams' book *Britain and Early Christian*

Europe: Studies in Early Medieval History and Culture (Aldershot) is a selection of fourteen of his articles published between 1975 and 1994. The articles group around four themes: historiographical reaction by British and Anglo-Saxon Christian writers to the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in England; early Anglo-Saxon charters and continental influence upon their formulae; the literary links detectable in certain poems and prayers of Insular provenance; and aspects of early medieval private devotion. The first two papers in the collection, "Gildas and the Anglo-Saxons" and "The Settlement of England in Bede and the *Chronicle*," stress the extreme difficulty of establishing a chronology for events in fifth- and sixth-century Britain: Gildas gives no specific dates; Bede was reduced to trying to assign dates from his interpretation of Gildas, his sole available Insular Latin source for those centuries; and the annalistic framework of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is, for the early period, "a snare and delusion which has misled generations of readers into regarding it as a coherent work of history rather than as an artificial amalgam of heterogeneous traditions and inventions of varying and unverifiable veracity" (II-39). The core of the collection consists of a group of six penetrating articles illuminating religious and literary life in the west of England in the seventh and eighth centuries. In "Continental Influence at Bath Monastery in the Seventh Century" (IV) and "St Wilfrid and Two Charters Dated AD 676 and 680" (V), Sims-Williams suggests that the first abbess of Bath, Berta, came from France, perhaps from Chelles or Jouarre which both had links with England; that the Bath foundation charter was largely drafted by Leuthere, bishop of the West Saxons, a Frank whose uncle Agilbert had ordained St Wilfrid as priest; and that the *Anno Domini* dating in that charter and a group of others from the late seventh century (now known only from later copies) reflects Wilfrid's involvement in the drafting of the charters and his promotion of the Dionysian computation. Continental presence at Bath is also an integral theme of "An Unpublished Seventh- or Eighth-Century Anglo-Latin Letter in Boulogne-sur-Mer MS 74 (82)" (VIII), where Sims-Williams suggests that the quasi-poetic epilogue of an Aponius manuscript, in which one Burginda exhorts her addressee to pursue the spiritual life, may be the work of a Frankish nun brought to Bath; the article is also notable for the suggestion that Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 48, the oldest surviving complete copy of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, was written at Bath. Worcester is the focus of three articles. In "Cuthswith, Seventh-Century Abbess of Inkberrow, Near Worcester, and the Würzburg Manuscript of St Jerome" (VII), he identifies the Cuthswith named as owner in an inscription entered at the front of Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. M. p. th. q. 2, as the Cuthswith who occurs in two charters of ca. 700 as abbess of *Penintanham*, i.e. Inkberrow. The Würzburg manuscript, a product of fifth-century Italy, may perhaps have reached Cuthswith through the agency of Offfor, the Northumbrian monk who traveled to Rome and later became bishop of the Hwicce. It may have

been through Bishop Milred of Worcester (d. 774/5) that the book reached Würzburg, for Milred visited St. Boniface in Germany in 753 and corresponded with his successor Lull. Milred's collection of epigrams, seen by William of Malmesbury in the twelfth century and by John Leland in the sixteenth, is the subject of two papers, "Milred of Worcester's Collection of Latin Epigrams and Its Continental Counterparts" (IX) and "William of Malmesbury and *La Silloge Epigrafica di Cambridge*" (X). A fragment of the collection, with annotations by Leland, survives in the library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Sims-Williams reconstructs the content of the collection from this fragment, from Leland's transcriptions in his *Collectanea*, from William of Malmesbury's use of the collection in his edition of the *Liber pontificalis*, and from the content of the Continental collections of epigrams to which Milred's can be shown to be most closely related. Two further articles in the book will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. "Byrhtferth's Ogam Signature" (XI) offers an interpretation of the ogam inscription at the center of the diagram illustrating relationships between the microcosm and the macrocosm on fol. 7v of Byrhtferth's *Manual* (Oxford, St. John's College, MS 17). In "Thoughts on Ephrem the Syrian in Anglo-Saxon England" (XIV), after acknowledging the success of Thomas H. Bestul's rebuttal of the belief that there are reflexes of the work of Ephrem in Old English poetry, Sims-Williams demonstrates that Anglo-Latin offers a more fruitful field of research, for, besides the survival of a fragment of the Latin version of one of Ephrem's works, the *Sermo asceticus*, in the eleventh-century London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 204, there occur Latin prayers extracted from translations of Ephrem's works in Anglo-Saxon prayer-books of the eighth and ninth centuries. This gathering of Sims-Williams' articles is most welcome. Demonstrating an impressive familiarity with English and Continental texts, the papers are distinguished by their author's masterly skill in constructing a persuasive case by drawing evidence from disparate sources.

England in Europe 1066-1453, ed. Nigel Saul (London and New York), seeks to provide a medieval context for issues concerning England's relations with Europe that grew into prominence in the early 1990s, with moves toward greater European political and economic integration. The book is intended for the general reader; there are no footnotes, and each chapter has only a short list of items suggested for further reading. Two chapters are relevant to Anglo-Saxonists. Janet L. Nelson's "England and the Continent in the Anglo-Saxon Period" (21-35) provides a broad overview of the changing nature of England's contacts with the Continent from the fifth century to the eleventh: the Anglo-Saxon settlers' initial maintenance of contacts with their homelands, and their establishment of new contacts with Scandinavia and with the Frankish kingdom; the development of a special relationship with Rome following the conversion, a relationship symbolized by the creation in Rome of an English quarter right next to St. Peter's; the period of Anglo-Saxon missionary activity

on the Continent; the development of dynastic ties in the ninth and tenth centuries, when several Continental rulers married Anglo-Saxon, in particular West Saxon, brides; the Scandinavian rulership of England from 1016 until 1042; the intensification of Continental contacts, and the notable growth of Norman influence, during the reign of Edward the Confessor. In outlining these broad issues she touches on, for example, Anglo-Saxon diplomatic missions to the Continent, one of the side-effects of which may have been the spread to the Continent of Anglo-Saxon coronation rites, disseminated by pontificals left as gifts. She highlights the resumption of the use of coin in England by the eighth century and the development of an enviable currency that promoted commodity exchange, increased England's wealth, and helped to make England appear in Continental eyes as a valuable, and attainable, prize. It was the Normans who claimed the prize, and the background to and effects of their victory at Hastings are the subject of R. Allen Brown's chapter, "The Norman Conquest" (36-47). Unlike several recent historians who have stressed continuities between Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England, Brown argues that the Conquest brought fundamental changes, that "in 1066 at Hastings the Old World went down before the New," with England being "wrested from the barren Scandinavian world" (44) and emerging into an arena of more dynamic contacts. Valuable is his insistence that the origins of the Conquest must be dated back to 1002, when England first became linked with Normandy through Æthelred's marriage to Emma, daughter of Duke Richard I of Normandy; he provides a clear analysis of developing relations between England and Normandy during the following sixty years, and is for the most part prepared to credit the Norman account of the events that led to Hastings: "the Norman version of events cannot be disproved by the normal methods of historical scholarship and tends to be confirmed by independent evidence" (40). While acknowledging the strength of Anglo-Saxon institutions and vernacular writing, he laments the tendency of Anglo-Saxonists to denigrate the Normans and to characterize them as philistine. He sets the physical expansion of the "Norman empire" in the context of "a total Norman achievement which extended from spirituality, monasticism and statecraft to warfare, via learning and the arts" (38). He agrees that the Normans took over existing structures of government, but argues that they used those structures in different ways, running them more efficiently and turning them to new purposes—it was, after all, the Normans and not the Anglo-Saxons who produced that model of bureaucratic efficiency, Domesday Book.

Susan Reynolds' *Ideas and Solidarities of the Medieval Laity: England and Western Europe* (Aldershot) presents a collection of fourteen of her articles published between 1969 and 1995, supplemented by two previously unpublished papers: item VI, "The History of Incorporation or Legal Personality: A Case of Fallacious Teleology," and item XVI, "Space and Time in Medieval English Towns." The overall theme is "the collective activities of medieval lay people and

the solidarities that underlay them" (p. vii), with the principal focus being on English urban history. A handful of the articles touch on Anglo-Saxon subject-matter. In "Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm" (II), her examination of accounts of the mythical origins of peoples leads Reynolds to conclude that such accounts mostly arose in the sixth and seventh centuries, not in popular traditions, but in the desire of learned clerics both to find honorable origins for their own peoples and to make sense of the contemporary world in the light of classical and Christian learning; at least up until the fourteenth century, origin stories served to express or increase a people's sense of solidarity. She detects evidence for Anglo-Saxon solidarity in certain modes of expression adopted in *The Battle of Maldon*, and in the determination to avoid civil war in the political crisis of 1051 (II-384). In "What Do We Mean by 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'Anglo-Saxons'?" (III), she examines the modern use of the term "Anglo-Saxon" and investigates what the Anglo-Saxons called themselves. Criticizing those modern interpretations that rest on inappropriate views of ethnicity, she contends that the creation of a sense of English unity following the Anglo-Saxon invasions was not a matter of physical descent—within a few generations, she observes, many people would not have been of pure native or invading descent—but was a result of changes in political and social solidarity: Anglo-Saxons were "definable primarily by their military allegiance" (III-403). She agrees with Patrick Wormald's view that, from the conversion period, the church played a strong role in fostering the sense of national unity. The unification of the kingdom that occurred in the tenth century was eased by the pre-existing sense of solidarity, although it was the creation of new political circumstances rather than the culmination of a steady trend toward political unity. In a brief consideration of the Danelaw, Reynolds doubts that it was as distinct from the rest of England as some have thought, and she notes that Danes who settled in England soon came to be thought of as English: what made one English was living in the same kingdom, rather than supposed ethnic descent. The brief article "Eadric Silvaticus and the English Resistance" (IV) suggests that the cognomen "silvaticus" applied to the Eadric who resisted the Conqueror in the Hereford and Shropshire area, was not a nickname describing his personal characteristics, but rather a term applied to those native English who opposed the Conquest and who were obliged to take refuge in the woodlands and marshes. "That they should have made their bases in wild country and, like the twentieth-century *maquis*, have been named for it, is perfectly credible" (IV-104). In the two papers "English Towns of the Eleventh Century in a European Context" (VII) and "Towns in Domesday Book" (VIII), Reynolds shows, on coinage evidence, that by 1000 there were some fifty or sixty towns in England, differing only in minor respects from Continental towns, and notes from an analysis of the relevant Domesday book entries that the immediate impact of the Norman Conquest on English towns seems to have been negative, with buildings being destroyed

and divisions arising between the different elements of the populace; by the end of the century, however, towns were on the upswing again, and "[i]t was probably in the towns that the difference between French and English descent first became obliterated" (VII-9). "Space and Time in English Medieval Towns" (XVI) opens with a brief consideration of the *burh*-building activities of the kings of Wessex ca. 900, and of the regularity of the street plans within at least some of these fortified towns.

Henrietta Leyser's *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England 450–1500* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995) explores women's lives from marriage to work to the grave. The book aims at non-specialists and primarily summarizes others' findings, as the author notes in the Introduction. The first quarter treats the Anglo-Saxon period with chapters on "Archaeology," "History and Hagiography," "Law Codes," and "Vernacular Literature"; the second part, "1066 for Women," brings the reader smoothly to the later Middle Ages, the subject of parts three and four. A substantial appendix provides a document in translation to illustrate each chapter. Leyser concentrates more on positive aspects and powerful women than some recent writers, rejecting the idea of medieval misogyny as a pervasive, unified discourse to argue that both before and after 1066 women faced a range of opportunities as well as limitations, and that to evaluate medieval practices for "women's rights" imposes an inappropriate category on the period. One disadvantage of the book is that though it separates the early and late Middle Ages, it makes no distinctions within eras. The brevity of the bibliography is also unfortunate, for Leyser cites both significant older works and recent research, and a more inclusive bibliography of this kind could be valuable. Still, the range of evidence and disciplinary approaches which the book presents should be welcome to an interested general reader.

b. Editions and Textual Studies

Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints' Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, ed. Thomas F.X. Noble and Thomas Head (University Park), comprises a re-issue of translations of the *Vitae* of eleven saints who lived between the fourth and tenth centuries. The volume includes the lives of five Anglo-Saxon saints who worked on the Continent from the late seventh to the late eighth century. Four of these lives—those of Willibrord, Boniface, Leoba, and Willibald—first appeared in C.H. Talbot's *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany*. Some adjustments have been made to Talbot's translations, the prefaces to the lives of Boniface and Willibald have been wholly re-translated, and the preface to the life of Willibrord, which Talbot omitted, is now included. The fifth life of an Anglo-Saxon is that of Willehad (d. 789), a contemporary of Alcuin at York who became a missionary in Saxony and first bishop of Bremen. The translation of Willehad's anonymous *Vita* is the work of Peter J. Potter and Thomas F.X. Noble, and is here published for the first time. The eleven lives appear in the order in which they were

written rather than in that in which their subjects lived, so that the reader can more readily appreciate developments in hagiography as a literary genre. Each life is preceded by a page or two of prefatory comment by the editors, in which they briefly note the salient details of each saint's career and the important or distinctive features of his or her *Vita*, and provide references to the best available critical edition of the Latin text and to one or two essential secondary works. The elegantly written Introduction to the volume offers a survey of the origin and development of the cult of saints and is of especial value for its comments on diachronic changes in the nature of sainthood, that is, in the nature of the characteristics that Christian communities of different periods expected in their saints. Anglo-Saxon hagiography is described as "a novel and surprisingly independent tradition. Its heroes are just that, men and women who share much in common with the aristocratic protagonists of such Old English epic poems as *Beowulf* and the *Battle of Maldon*" (xxxiii–xxxiv).

N.J. Higham considers certain political implications of Bede's account of early Anglo-Saxon history in *An English Empire: Bede and the Early Anglo-Saxon Kings* (Manchester). The second book in Higham's trilogy on the birth of England, this is the sequel to the previous year's *The English Conquest: Gildas and Britain in the Fifth Century*. Here Higham argues that Bede wrote the *Historia ecclesiastica* to justify the Anglo-Saxon conquest against now-lost British polemics. Bede's historical dialectic consistently but often subtly favors Anglo-Saxons over Britons, Northumbria over Mercia, and Bernicia over Deira: in each pair, he emphasizes the first's accomplishments while passing over the second's in silence, and he reserves the word *imperium* for the kingdom he favors. In Bede's view, God has chosen the Anglo-Saxons to succeed the Romans as rulers of England and to chasten the Britons. Higham gives detailed readings of parts of *HE* I–II to show how Bede's selection of events and even specific words makes his account persuasive. He then explores what the Tribal Hidage tells about the fortunes of Edwin (one of Bede's favorites) and his contemporaries, arguing that Bishop Paulinus wrote the document to record tributes due Edwin from his conquests, contrary to Keynes's view (see above, section a) that the document is Mercian. Higham next turns to the broader political and social situation of England: several regional *imperia* existed in late sixth-century England, with overkings ruling local subordinate kings—enough of a factual basis to make Bede's rhetoric of *imperium* persuasive, although no single or inherited office of *bretwalda* ever existed. Four main regions were dominated by different Anglo-Saxon overkings, with British rulers as buffers between them. The power to enforce or reject conversion to Christianity demonstrated the strength of kings, as Higham illustrates with Rædwald, who converted under a Christian overking but apostasized when he grew strong enough. Higham concludes that Bede and his audience saw the *gens Anglorum* as an elite governing an underclass of poor and often unfree Britons because God had disinherited the Britons for their heresy of

Pelagianism and their pride in refusing to convert the Germanic settlers.

In "Bede—the Miraculous and Episcopal Authority in Early Anglo-Saxon England" (*Downside Review* 113, 219–32), Simon Coates investigates bishops' miracles in the *Historia ecclesiastica* and *Vita sancti Cuthberti*. Coates uses J.-L. Derouet's distinction between vertical miracles (involving the saint's relationship with God) and horizontal ("practical") miracles (relationship with others) to detail how Bede used miracle stories to define episcopal authority. Vertical miracles usually occurred in ascetic contexts and might precede episcopal office, while the horizontal related more to episcopal duties; several involved bishops healing supplicants. Miracles, particularly horizontal ones, demonstrated the bishop's orthodoxy and the dependence of the community—including kings and clergy—upon him. Yet miracles were not needed to establish authority or holiness, and some of Bede's bishops performed none. Coates also finds little distinction between "popular" and elite religion: bishops' power, and their cults, extended across social divisions.

Bill Griffiths' *An Introduction to Early English Law* (Hockwold cum Wilton, Norfolk) provides a translation of the law codes of Æthelberht of Kent, Alfred, 3 Edmund, and 10 Æthelred, supplemented by an Introduction, an annotated list of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon laws, a list of Roman, Gothic, Germanic, and Anglo-Saxon law codes, and an annotated bibliography. The Introduction offers a brief overview of Anglo-Saxon law, analyzing it in terms of four contributory strands: tribal custom; the Romano-Christian tradition of codifying information; the growth of centralized kingship; and abstract or moral ideals. Griffiths does not, however, make clear his grounds for selecting the four codes that he translates. While the codes of Æthelberht and Alfred are of the first importance, the brief 3 Edmund and 10 Æthelred are hardly representative of the late Anglo-Saxon period. The flow of his translation is somewhat marred by the frequent insertion within parentheses of the Old English terms translated, and it is notable that the translation of the code of Æthelberht takes no account of recent reinterpretations of individual clauses of the code by Christine Fell and Carole Hough, for example Fell's analysis of the meaning of the term *friwif locbore* in Æthelberht 73 (see *Anglo-Saxon England* 13 [1984], 157–65), and Hough's discussion of the code's coverage of divorce and other issues in clauses 79–80 and 84 (see *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 37 [1993], 1–8, and *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 [1994], 19–34). While it is convenient to have translations of Æthelberht and Alfred in a slim, easily portable form, Griffiths' book will not replace the much more extensive translations of Anglo-Saxon laws by F.L. Attenborough in *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* and by Dorothy Whitelock in the first volume of *English Historical Documents*.

Alan Kennedy, in "Law and Litigation in the *Libellus Æthelwoldi Episcopi*" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 24, 131–83), presents a detailed study of the accounts of litigation involving

the abbey of Ely that are contained in the text whose full title is *Libellus quorundam insignium operum beati Æthelwoldi episcopi*. Written at the request of Bishop Hervey of Ely (1108–31) probably by the monk Gregory, the *Libellus* describes how the endowment of Ely Abbey was accumulated in the years following Æthelwold's refoundation of the abbey in 970, and how the endowment was defended in the unsettled period following the death of King Edgar in 975. The *Libellus* appears to be based upon an Old English source or sources probably composed ca. 990, perhaps in response to concerns about the security of the Ely endowment in the disturbances which followed the death of Æthelwold in 984. The *Libellus* itself survives in two manuscripts and has been printed only once, by Thomas Gale in 1691. It has primarily been known to scholars in the form in which it was incorporated in Book II of the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*, Blake's 1926 edition of which argued that the compiler of the *Liber Eliensis* had access to an earlier text of the *Libellus* than that represented by the two surviving manuscripts. However, Kennedy argues that greater scholarly attention should be directed to the manuscripts of the *Libellus*, as in his view they are independent copies of the work and may both derive immediately from the original; he also announces a forthcoming edition of the work by himself and Simon Keynes, to be accompanied by a translation and commentary. Some twenty-five chapters of the *Libellus* deal with land whose ownership at one time or another became the subject of legal process. It thereby provides the legal historian with an unusual wealth of detailed evidence about how legal business was actually conducted in the later tenth century, evidence that can be set alongside the royal legal codes with their statements of how the law ought to be exercised. Kennedy's survey of the cases in the *Libellus* reveals that in practice the legal structures of late tenth-century England were much more fluid and intermeshed than is suggested by the law codes, which indicate a clear subordination of hundred court (meeting every four weeks) to shire court (meeting twice a year). For example, the *Libellus* attests to quite frequent meetings of several hundreds together, a possibility not mentioned in the codes. It also furnishes evidence for *ad hoc* gatherings organized at a convenient location and at the will of local powers to resolve a single dispute. Again, concerning the conveyance of *bocland*, it reveals that such land was by no means exclusively transferred by charter; rather, the grant of a document was one among a series of public acts that could confirm the conveyance: "it does not appear even in late Anglo-Saxon England that documents in themselves could alone be probative in the ordinary course" (173). As for judgements, like other examples in the corpus of Anglo-Saxon lawsuits, the *Libellus* demonstrates that judgements were almost always collective decisions of the meeting which heard the suit, rather than the pronouncement of the president of the court. Kennedy underlines the striking fact that nowhere in the *Libellus* is there a reference to the royal legal codes. This is the more surprising given that the documents on which it was based were pro-

duced amid the most fertile period of Anglo-Saxon written legislation. The *Libellus* tends to confirm the view that the actual conduct of the law depended less on the written codes and more on the give-and-take of court practice.

Pauline Stafford's "The Portrayal of Royal Women in England, Mid-Tenth to Mid-Twelfth Centuries" (in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parsons [New York, 1993], 143–67 and 217–20) considers texts of three different periods: the late tenth/early eleventh century, the late eleventh century, and the early/mid-twelfth century. Her principal subjects are Eadgifu, mother of King Eadred and grandmother of Kings Eadwig and Edgar; Eadwig's queen Aelfgifu; Ælfthryth, implicated in the murder of her stepson Edward the Martyr; King Edgar's daughter Edith, nun of Wilton; Edward the Confessor's mother Emma and his wife Edith; Margaret of Scotland; and the Empress Matilda. Her sources include the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Ælfric's life of Æthelwold, the early lives of Dunstan, the *Encomium Emmae reginae*, the *Vita Edwardi regis qui nunc apud Westmonasterium requiescit*, Goscelin's lives of female saints, and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum*, which was dedicated to Edith-Matilda, Henry I's queen. Stafford stresses the importance of succession politics in bringing royal woman to prominence in the sources. She notes how stereotypes, including those based on biblical characters, tend to dominate in the first of her three periods: Eadgifu, for example, is cast in the clearly defined role of benefactress of churches and pious influence on her children, with no real consideration of the role she undoubtedly played at court. Goscelin she regards as the most "feminist" of the authors she considers, who in his treatment of Edith justifies the possibility of female rule. Stafford detects growing misogynistic trends in twelfth-century writing, or at least a greater attention to the construction of gender: the role of the public, military man was stressed in ways that appeared to preclude female activity. She concludes by focussing on the *Encomium Emmae* and the *Vita Edwardi*, which stand out from other sources by their direct engagement with contemporary politics and their efforts to describe and discuss those politics. Is it accidental, she asks, that such new ground is broken by two works produced for royal women faced with the peculiar insecurity of being female political actors?

Antonia Gransden continues her longterm study of the abbey of Bury St. Edmunds and its historical sources with an analysis of "The Composition and Authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi* Attributed to 'Hermann the Archdeacon'" (*Journal of Medieval Latin* 5, 1–52). Gransden starts by exploring the relationship between the long and short versions of the *De miraculis* and what sources its author used. She argues that "Hermann" himself, the author of the long version, removed the long version's historical material and "pious exclamations" to make the short version—an abstract suitable for inclusion in collections which could help propagate the young cult of St. Edmund. To research the *De miraculis*, the author consulted witnesses as well as writs and charters. He also found sources in the new church of Bury St.

Edmunds itself, which had a *tabula* sketching its patron saint's life and probably maintained records of miracles. "Hermann" drew on literary precedents as well, including Abbo of Fleury's *Passio sancti Eadmundi*; a lost work on Edmund which "Hermann" describes as "of adamantine difficulty" probably composed late in the reign of Æthelred II (978–1016); and a number of other saints' lives which he mined for *topoi*. Gransden concludes that "Hermann" was not only a skilled Latinist but a careful historical researcher and, while his chronology is not wholly reliable, much of his other information is valuable. He provides unique evidence for the pre-Benedictine community at *Beadericesworth*, the early years of Edmund's cult, and the foundation of the new church, and his work also corroborates and fleshes out other local and national histories. Gransden concludes by asking the identity of "Hermann." The author of *De miraculis* was a learned foreigner and a skilled writer. Other details about the author which emerge in his text rule out identification with any monk known as Hermann at Bury St. Edmunds. Gransden suggests that Henry of Kirkstead later named "Hermannus" as the author of the text on the basis of a damaged manuscript which he had seen: Henry supplied the start of a name for which he had only the last five letters and the title archdeacon. Her alternative identification: Bertrannus, a foreign archdeacon with a strong reputation as a hagiographer whom, she suggests, Abbot Baldwin brought to Bury St. Edmunds in time to record the translation of St. Edmund's body to the new abbey church in 1095.

David Townsend presents a new edition of Henry of Avranches' thirteenth-century verse reworking of Abbo's *Passio sancti Eadmundi* in "The *Vita Sancti Edmundi* of Henry of Avranches" (*Journal of Medieval Latin* 5, 95–118). The *Vita* had previously been edited by Francis Hervey in his *Corolla Sancti Edmundi: The Garland of S. Edmund, King and Martyr* (London, 1907). Townsend's welcome new edition forms part of his ongoing project to provide reliable texts of Henry's saints' lives: his editions of the lives of Oswald, Birinus, and Fremund have already appeared. His source manuscript for all these lives is Cambridge University Library MS Dd.11.78, a compilation of Henry's works put together by Matthew Paris. In his useful introductory comments on the *Vita* of Edmund, Townsend sketches Henry's career as a writer and situates the *Vita* in the early to mid-1220s, stylistically later than his life of Thomas Becket of ca. 1222, but earlier than the lives of Guthlac, Birinus, and Oswald. In essence, Henry transforms the material of Abbo's prose life into elegiac couplets, but he abridges freely and introduces changes of emphasis, as in his expansion of Abbo's comparison of Edmund to the biblical Job; he also introduces matter drawn from later sources, the mid-twelfth-century *De infantia sancti Edmundi* of Gaufridus de Fontibus and the account of the miracles of Edmund compiled by Osbert of Clare and reworked in the late twelfth century by Abbot Samson of Bury St. Edmunds. Townsend's edition includes at the end both a brief textual apparatus, and a set of notes on the text.

His formatting of the *Vita* makes clear that it is structured in alternating hexameters and pentameters. Perhaps questionable is his decision to mark by a mere indentation those lines that in the manuscript begin with an enlarged initial or are preceded by a paraph mark. The indentations are difficult to pick out at a glance, and it might have been clearer to mark these new sections within the text by introducing a space between the lines at these points. One line has inadvertently been omitted between the lines numbered 9 and 10: "Vt totum posset perdere multa dedit." In his note on line 254, "Funiculus triplex uix rumpitur," Townsend has failed to observe that the words are a quotation from Ecclesiastes (4:12). These minor blemishes do not detract from the generally high quality of Townsend's work; his textual notes are trenchant and sensitive to the qualities of Henry's style.

Michael Winterbottom's "The *Gesta Regum* of William of Malmesbury" (*Journal of Medieval Latin* 5, 158–73) presents the text of his J.R. O'Donnell Memorial Lecture delivered in Toronto in September 1994, and looks ahead to his forthcoming Oxford Medieval Texts edition (undertaken in collaboration with Rodney Thomson) of the *Gesta regum*. The article is largely devoted to a consideration of William's motive for writing the work, and to a penetrating discussion of his method and style. William laments, in his *Historia novella* and in the preface to the *Gesta regum*, that there was no significant Anglo-Saxon historian after Bede; he acknowledges the importance of the work of his near contemporary Eadmer, but notes that Eadmer's *Historia novorum* begins only in the late tenth century. William seeks to plug the gap. His method in doing so is scrupulously to compare the available sources and to build on their foundation. Where the sources are rich (as for the period covered by Bede), he abridges. However, where they are scant, he will fill them out, as Winterbottom demonstrates by a study of William's account of King Swein's arrival in England in 1013 and his subjection of the country, ending with his attack on London. William's only source for these events seems to have been the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, whose narrative is bald and unemotional. William expands it, alters the emphasis to make the English seem more successful and more praiseworthy, and ends his chapter by putting into the mouth of King Æthelred a speech that appears to be William's own free composition. Throughout William's historiography there runs the self-professed moral purpose of spurring the reader to emulate good examples and to shun bad. On Winterbottom's assessment, William's method is most comparable to that of Livy, although he had no direct knowledge of Livy, copies of whose work were unknown in England at the time. William was, however, explicit about his wish to season his account with "Roman salt," and Winterbottom's careful analysis of elements of his style confirms the depth of William's reading and highlights his debts to Sallust, Lucan, Statius, and Virgil.

At his death in 1977, R.R. Darlington left in draft state an edition of the annals for 450–1066 of the chronicle of John of Worcester (attributed by previous editors to Florence of

Worcester). Patrick McGurk has since then worked to bring the edition to completion, and to extend it to incorporate the annals for 1067–1140. The full publication, in the Oxford Medieval Texts series, will encompass three volumes: a general introduction together with an edition of the episcopal lists and other tables that preface the chronicle; the annals for 450–1066; and the annals for 1067–1140. 1995 saw the welcome publication of the second volume: *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, II: The Annals from 450 to 1066*, ed. R.R. Darlington and P. McGurk, with translation by Jennifer Bray and P. McGurk (Oxford). Importantly, and unlike the nineteenth-century editions of Petrie and Thorpe, this new edition gives priority to the manuscript that is now known to be that on which all others are directly or indirectly based, and that includes revisions in the hand of John of Worcester himself: Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 157. As McGurk points out in the Introduction to this volume, the impulse for the compilation of the Worcester chronicle very likely came from Wulfstan, the last Anglo-Saxon bishop of Worcester (1062–95). The substratum for the chronicle was the universal chronicle compiled by Marianus Scotus, Irish monk of Mainz, in the 1070s; to Marianus's text the Worcester chronicle added information specifically relating to English history. The edition helpfully separates off the English material by placing it in its own paragraph within each annal. McGurk's Introduction provides judicious descriptions of the five surviving manuscripts of the text, and of the single leaf of a sixth manuscript that may well have been the exemplar for two of the others; also of Trinity College Dublin MS 503, which contains John of Worcester's own abbreviated version of the chronicle, and British Library MS Cotton Nero C. v, a copy of Marianus's chronicle known to have been present at Worcester around the time the Worcester chronicle was compiled. In his analysis of the text, McGurk agrees with Martin Brett who in 1981 postulated that there were at least three different stages in the compilation; and he enumerates the sources of the portion relating to Anglo-Saxon history as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, *Vita sancti Cuthberti*, and *Historia abbatum*, the anonymous *Historia abbatum*, Felix's *Vita sancti Guthlaci*, Asser's *Vita Ælfredi* (for the modern reconstruction of which the Worcester chronicle is a vital witness), the lives of Dunstan by B., Adelard, and Osbern, Byrhtferth's *Vita sancti Oswaldi*, and Osbern's *Vita sancti Alphegi*, as well as a scattering of other sources. The general introduction of the forthcoming vol. I will discuss the question of which versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* were used, and whether a specifically confected version was John's source. McGurk skilfully handles the complex issue of the relationship John of Worcester's work has with Eadmer's *Historia novorum* and the *Historia regum* attributed to Symeon of Durham. Two Appendices to the volume provide the Abingdon and Bury St. Edmunds interpolations that are found in three copies of the chronicle, Lambeth Palace Library MS 42 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 92 (both Abingdon), and Bodleian Library MS Bodley 297

(Bury). This volume will be of enormous service to historians, and the appearance of volumes I and III is eagerly awaited.

Geoffrey of Monmouth has generally been considered an unscrupulous fabricator in his account of the early history of Britain. In "Geoffrey of Monmouth's Portrayal of the Arrival of Christianity in Britain. Fact or Fiction?" (*Reading Medieval Studies* 19, 3–13), Alison André argues that at least when dealing with religion, Geoffrey is more reliable, having taken greater pains to draw upon authentic source material. Admittedly he might bend the evidence, as when reporting that the Bishop Eldadus who was murdered by Hengist was bishop of Gloucester: there was in fact no see at Gloucester until some time later, and Geoffrey's assignment of Eldadus to Gloucester was evidently aimed at flattering Geoffrey's patron, Robert of Gloucester. On other details, though, Geoffrey can be shown to be more trustworthy. For example, he writes that the pagan church in Britain had twenty-eight territorial divisions presided over by flamens, who in turn were subject to three arch-flamens at London, York, and Caerleon. His account appears to be in line with the description of the hierarchical organization of the pagan church in the Pseudo-Isidoran *Decretals* and the Anselmian *Collectio canonum*. Geoffrey's description of how in the second century King Lucius wrote to Pope Eleutherius who sent the missionaries Faganus and Duvianus to Britain parallels the account found in both Bede and the *Historia Brittonum*; a reference to the missionary work of Faganus and Duvianus occurs in a letter sent to Pope Honorius II (1124–30) by the chapter of St. David's, a letter that Geoffrey perhaps knew and drew upon as a source. Geoffrey's description of how Germanus of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes restored the true faith in Britain by combatting the twin perils of resurgent paganism and the heresy of Pelagianism is supported by the testimony of Augustine of Hippo and of Bede that Pelagianism gained a hold upon Britain. Geoffrey's account of Dubricius, the archbishop of Caerleon who crowned King Arthur, was drawn from Welsh tradition, for Dubricius appears in the *Vita Samsonis*, the earliest surviving life of a Celtic saint. There is independent corroboration for other individuals mentioned by Geoffrey: for example, the Piramus whom Geoffrey identifies as Arthur's chaplain has some historical authenticity, for the name is probably a misspelling of Piranus, to whom Cornish chapels were dedicated. While Geoffrey must always be read with caution, the examination of his account of early Christianity in Britain demonstrates that he did not merely draw on the resources of his own imagination, but made use of existing source material.

Oxford Medieval Texts has produced a welcome new edition, with accompanying translation, of the chronicle of Waltham Abbey: *The Waltham Chronicle: An Account of the Discovery of Our Holy Cross at Montacute and Its Conveyance to Waltham*, ed. and trans. Leslie Warkiss and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994). This is the text previously edited by Stubbs for the Rolls Series as *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey: The Tract "De Inventione Sanctae Crucis Nostrae"* (1861). The chronicle tells the story

of the miraculous discovery at Montacute, during Cnut's reign, of a life-size statue of the crucified Christ; of how Cnut's thegn Tovi the Proud had the statue transported to his estate at Waltham; of Earl Harold's foundation of a college of canons at Waltham; of the burial of Harold's body there after the Battle of Hastings; and of the way of life of the canons up until 1144. It was written by a former member of the Waltham community shortly after Henry II had in 1177 replaced the secular canons by regular Augustinian canons; while it is in part a lament for the extinction of the community in which the author's life had been spent, it was also written for the benefit of the new Augustinian community, to ensure that the past glories of the house should not be forgotten by the new occupants and that they should appreciate their inheritance. The chronicle survives in two medieval manuscripts, respectively of the early thirteenth and the mid-fourteenth century, and it is the earlier copy, British Library, MS Cotton Julius D. vi, that serves as the basis for the edition. The well constructed Introduction is mostly the work of Marjorie Chibnall, with Leslie Watkiss contributing descriptions of the manuscripts. Chibnall makes the interesting suggestion that the statue discovered at Montacute had perhaps earlier belonged to Waltham (there is evidence for a ninth-century church there) and been removed from there to Montacute and buried at a time of Viking depredations: such a background would help to explain the later "miraculous" discovery of the statue and its transportation to Waltham. Chibnall also provides a valuable analysis of the nature of the community founded by Harold in 1062. It would have followed—although perhaps somewhat loosely—the enlarged version of the Rule for canons by Chrodegang of Metz, observance of which spread in England during the eleventh century, and Harold's admiration for which would have been encouraged by his contacts with Lotharingia; some of the first Waltham canons, indeed, were recruited from Lotharingia. One of the chronicle's most contentious claims is that the abbey possessed the bones of King Harold. According to its account, Harold had expressed the wish to be buried there; after the Battle of Hastings, two canons who had been in Harold's retinue, Osgod Cnoppe and Æthelric Childemaister, tried to identify his body but, being unable to do so, sought the help of his concubine, Edith Swan-neck, who succeeded in recognizing it, after which it was buried honorably at Waltham. This account stands in opposition to the reports of William of Poitiers and Orderic Vitalis, who state that the Conqueror ordered Harold's body to be buried on the sea-shore (and to the account of the thirteenth-century *Vita Haroldi*, according to which Harold survived Hastings). In Chibnall's view, "a good case" can be made for "the substantial truth of the . . . Waltham version" (xlv).

St. Æthelthryth (d. 679) enjoyed singular status among the female saints of Anglo-Saxon England. Having been granted land on the Isle of Ely in dower by her first husband, Tonbert of the South Gyrwe, she founded a religious house there following the dissolution of her second marriage to

Ecgrith, king of Northumbria. Through both her marriages she maintained her virginity. Bede praised her for her virginity and asceticism; Æthelwold, who refounded Ely as a monastery in 970, held her in especial reverence; and she was the only native Englishwoman to whom Ælfric devoted a life in his hagiographical writings. She continued to serve as a role model after the Conquest, although in subtly yet significantly modified ways. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, in "Rerouting the Dower: The Anglo-Norman Life of St. Audrey by Marie (of Chatteris?)," in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Urbana and Chicago), 27–56, offers a critical examination of *La Vie Sainte Audrée*, a version of Æthelthryth's life written in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. The author, who names herself as Marie, may perhaps have belonged to the female community at Chatteris, which is known to have revered Æthelthryth and of which the feudal rights belonged to Ely. The text survives in a single thirteenth-century manuscript (British Library, MS Add. 70813), a large collection of Anglo-Norman verse saint's legends used for reading aloud at mealtimes in the Anglo-Norman nunnery at Campsey Ash, Suffolk. Marie derives her knowledge of Æthelthryth from the Latin account of the saint's life in the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*. However, Wogan-Browne shows that whereas in Bede, Ælfric, and the *Liber Æthelthryth's* life is presented more or less as a series of rhetorical *loci* providing suitable moral instruction for monks and highlighting her as a type or symbol rather than a biographical role model, in Marie's Anglo-Norman version she emerges as a protagonist with a viewpoint, as one who has experienced marriage as tribulation. Whereas for the monks of Ely the dower associated with Æthelthryth's first marriage was important as providing the entitlement to the lands of Ely's first foundress, in Marie's version the saint's dower lands are even more importantly a refuge and the basis for her independent life. In presenting Æthelthryth as twice married, once widowed, and once separated before becoming a monastic foundress, and by stressing her autonomy and underscoring the importance of her dower lands, Marie was able to speak to women of varying experience, but in particular to that class of aristocratic and gentry widows who founded, patronized, and/or populated nunneries in the post-Conquest period. In Wogan-Browne's illuminating interpretation, *La Vie Sainte Audrée* presents a fascinating example of the reworking of the life of an Anglo-Saxon saint for an Anglo-Norman female audience.

c. Sub-Roman Britain, the Anglo-Saxon Settlement, and the Pictish and Celtic Worlds

K.R. DARK, in *Civitas to Kingdom: British Political Continuity 300–800* (Leicester, 1994), offers a reinterpretation of sub-Roman and Dark Age Britain based on a combination of historical and archaeological evidence. The book is a revised, expanded and updated version of the last two chapters of Dark's 1989 Cambridge Ph.D. thesis. His principal theme "is that Roman Britain ended not in the fifth century, but in the

seventh" (xii); that after the withdrawal of Roman troops in the early fifth century, the culture of the British kingdoms was far more romanized than has been realized, and that, except in the east of England, those kingdoms persisted through the fifth and sixth centuries, succumbing to the Anglo-Saxon invaders only in the seventh. According to traditional interpretations, the culture of sub-Roman Britain was "Celtic-heroic," dominated by elites consisting of thoroughly deromanized aristocratic warbands; Christianity aside, the culture of these groups has been reckoned to be as "barbarian" as that of the early Anglo-Saxons themselves. Dark presents archaeological evidence to argue that much of sub-Roman Britain was as culturally romanized in the sixth century as it was in the fourth, characterized by urbanism, coinage-use, Latin literacy, and Roman-style bureaucracy. His evidence merits serious consideration, although less happy is his suggestion of a British origin for the *Vergilius Romanus*, an illustrated copy of works of Virgil (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 3867) that is of disputed date and place of origin; his discussion of the manuscript on pp. 185–91 ignores the 1986 facsimile edition with accompanying commentary, in which the issue of origin is examined in detail. One point of particular interest for Anglo-Saxonists is Dark's demonstration of a geo-political continuity extending from pre-Roman Britain into early Anglo-Saxon times. The *civitates* (i.e. administrative regions) into which Roman Britain was divided were based on pre-Roman tribal territories; the *civitates* in turn were transformed into sub-Roman British kingdoms, and the pattern of conquest by which the Anglo-Saxons first acquired territory in eastern England reflected the same territorial divisions, as areas were taken over separately as distinct polities. There is, as a result, "a close similarity between the territories of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, as attested in the seventh century, and the pattern of Roman *civitates* in the east of Britain" (135).

The warband or *comitatus* is the focus of Stephen S. Evans' 1995 Ph.D. dissertation on "The Lords of Battle: A Study of the Comitatus in Dark-Age Britain" (Temple University). Drawing upon a range of literary and historical sources as well as on archaeological findings, the dissertation examines the formal structure of the warband as it existed among the various Celtic and Germanic tribes inhabiting Britain from the mid-fifth to the mid-eighth century, and the various cultural, social, and economic institutions and practices that supported it. After opening chapters that consider such structural issues as military organization and the framework of duties and obligations, there are individual chapters on court poets and their poetry, the hall (both its physical construction and its concept), the distribution of wealth and the practices of hostage-taking and fosterage, and the economic institutions of food-renders, tribute, and booty. "The study concludes that the comitatus, as an institution, was more complex and formally organized than many historians have realized." Appendix A offers a tentative dating scheme for *Beowulf*. (Abstract only seen.)

The warband also looms large in Michael J. Enright's **Lady with a Mead-Cup: Ritual Prophecy and Lordship in the European Warband from La Tène to the Viking Age* (Blackrock). Enright moves from Wealhtheow's presentation of the cup to *Beowulf* (Buf607–41) to explore the genesis and organization of Celtic and Germanic warbands. He argues that Wealhtheow plays a ritual role familiar to Germanic audiences but not to us: the lady with the mead-cup confirms the authority of the leader of the warband, then the hierarchy of its members, by serving each in turn while dispensing advice and requests. In Enright's reconstruction, Western Celtic and Germanic tribes (whom the Celts heavily influenced) moved from larger tribal organizations to societies based on the smaller warband and war-leader. The new warband drew on both divine and human models: the war-leader Julius Civilis, a Roman citizen leading Celtic troops in a rebellion against Rome 69–70 A.D., and the German prophetess Veleda, who predicted his victory, formed a pair that seems at first to replicate the couple Wodan/Odin and the goddess of fertility and prophecy, Rosmerta. Enright argues, however, that the human pair actually set the pattern for the divine; he finds Odin a development of the early decades A.D. from the Gallo-Roman Mercury, not an ancient god. The female in both couples initially proclaimed the male as leader, then periodically affirmed his status and prophesied. In Celtic and Germanic warbands, where the woman was often the leader's wife, she also bound his followers together in a drinking ritual which simultaneously affirmed the group's hierarchy—for the warband was not egalitarian, as some would have it. Enright notes that links between prophecy, weaving, dispensing drink, and sexuality occur often in literature but have not been fully studied. He views them as elements of one mindset which we have lost and must recover to understand Wealhtheow and others. Enright challenges both feminists who argue for women's independent power and traditional scholars who minimize women's roles with his conclusion that the lady of the warband was subject to her husband and acted in accord with his wishes, but possessed real power to maintain hierarchy and bonds within the warband by dispensing words and drink.

S.R. Garman undertakes a study of Anglo-Saxon foundation myths, seeking parallels and contrasts with those generated by Rome in Antiquity, in his 1994 London School of Economics Ph.D. thesis on "Foundation Myths and Political Identity: Ancient Rome and Anglo-Saxon England Compared." Undertaken from a sociological perspective, the thesis identifies certain central themes within the foundation myths, while also isolating structural differences between them that can be related to socio-political aspects of the politics with which they were associated. The importance of the foundation myth for mobilizing and sustaining political support is emphasized, as are diachronic changes in the function, theme, and form of the myths. (Abstract only seen.)

W.A. Cummins' *The Age of the Picts* (Stroud) pieces together Pictish history from the fifth to the tenth century,

and traces Pictish relations with the Scots of Dalriada and the British and Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, by drawing on the *Pictish Chronicle*, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Irish Annals*, and other sources. He sees the Picts as a confederation of tribes formed in opposition to the Romans in Britain, a confederation that acknowledged the overlordship of a single king. The Picts were notably successful in maintaining their unity through centuries when the British and Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of Britain were divided into several kingdoms. Cummins links that success to the Pictish custom, noted by Bede, of succession through the female royal line: he suggests (35) that husbands were found for the Pictish princesses from among the princes of the various Pictish tribes, so that each tribe had an equal chance of providing a king, a factor that worked for the political stability of the nation. He also believes that matrilinear succession helps to explain the union of the Scots and Picts under Kenneth mac Alpin (d. 860). Kenneth was king of the Scots before he became king of the Picts, and has been thought to have conquered the Picts in battle. Cummins, however, suggests that in Kenneth the Scottish and Pictish royal lines were united, that his maternal grandfather was a Pictish king, perhaps Constantine (d. 820), and that under him Scots and Picts came together, partly in order to oppose the Viking threat. Chapter 12 (89–95) discusses Pictish relations with Northumbria during the seventh century, in particular Bede's statement that, during the reigns of Oswald (634–42) and Oswy (642–70), Picts and Scots were subject to Northumbrian rule. Oswald, Oswy, and their brother Eanfred had spent seventeen years of exile among the Picts and Scots, and would have formed links with them; Eanfrid, indeed, married a Pictish princess, and their son Talorgan was king of the Picts. Cummins suggests that the Scots and Picts may indeed have recognized the overlordship of Oswald and Oswy and have paid tribute to them, but that this was balanced by Oswald's and Oswy's commitment to Ionan Christianity. This balanced relationship between Northumbria and its northern neighbors was unsettled by the Synod of Whitby in 664, and finally undone by the Pictish victory over the Northumbrians at Nechtansmere in 685.

The title of Patrick Sims-Williams' article "Historical Need and Literary Narrative: A Caveat from Ninth-Century Wales" (*Welsh History Review* 17 [1994], 1–40) echoes that of Donnchadh Ó Corráin's 1983 lecture, "Historical Need and Literary Narrative," in which Professor Ó Corráin demonstrated that certain Irish literary works were composed in response to specific political or dynastic interests. Sims-Williams argues that other scholars have on occasion too readily tied Celtic literary composition to particular political circumstances. He considers in detail the case of the poems about Llywarch Hen, which both D.P. Kirby and Patrick K. Ford believe were composed for the benefit of Merfyn Fritch, ruler of Gwynedd ca. 836–44, and his son Rhodri Mawr (d. 878), whom Kirby and Ford believe to be descendants of Llywarch Hen. Sims-Williams' analysis suggests that the claim that Llywarch was an ancestor of Merfyn originated

some centuries after Merfyn's own day, and that Merfyn and Rhodri would therefore have had no vested interest in patronizing poetry about Llywarch and his kindred. He concludes that the attempt to attribute the creation of the Llywarch Hen poetry to identifiable historical needs is mistaken, and that "[t]here may be a warning here for Celtic historians seeking to explain the existence of other literary narratives" (40).

d. Anglo-Saxon Paganism

ANGLO-SAXON PAGANISM in the period before the conversion was the subject of several studies published in 1995. The extent of Bede's reliability as a source of evidence for Anglo-Saxon pre-Christian belief and practice is discussed by R.I. Page in his paper "Anglo-Saxon Paganism: The Evidence of Bede," 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 (Groningen), 99–129. Page compares two passages of Bede with what is known of Germanic and Scandinavian practice, and with Anglo-Saxon archaeological and place-name evidence. His first example is Bede's famous account of the meeting in 626/7 of the council of King Edwin that debated the relative merits of paganism and Christianity (*Historia ecclesiastica* II. 13). Page stresses that this episode must be interpreted in the light of its broader context within the *Historia ecclesiastica*. At this point in his work, Bede is attempting to demonstrate God's grace working through different agents in various ways to bring salvation to Northumbria. This broad general theme may well have shaped the way he presented the council episode, for which his evidence may have been relatively slender—the council had, after all, taken place over a hundred years before Bede completed his history. The well known comparison of human life to the passage of a sparrow through a hall, placed by Bede in the mouth of an unnamed councillor of Edwin, suggests that Anglo-Saxon pagans had no beliefs concerning an after-life. Yet, Page argues, this is unlikely to have been the case: Scandinavian pagan beliefs in an after-life are well attested, and the nature of the grave-goods in Anglo-Saxon pagan cemeteries, and the evidence for ritual sacrifice of the slaves of deceased Anglo-Saxon pagan lords, all combine to indicate that the Anglo-Saxons believed that the dead lived on in a life not very different from the present one. On the issue of pagan practice, Page questions Bede's indication that there was a separate priestly class—represented at the council by Coifi *primus pontifex*—and his statement that priests were forbidden to bear arms. Germanic sources indicate that in northern and western Germania, sacral functions were exercised, not by a separate priestly class, but by leading secular figures who would certainly have borne arms in their daily life. In England, the place-names Peper Harrow (Surrey), Patchway (Sussex), and the untraced *Cusanweoh* (Surrey) may well record a Pipera, Pæccel, and Cusa who were both owners and priests of the shrines that took their names; if so, they were

both religious and secular lords. Page concludes that several of the details in Bede's account of the council should not be taken at face value, but should be seen as rhetorical coloring. He then turns to his second Bedan passage, the account of the Anglo-Saxon names of the months in chapter 15 of *De temporum ratione*. In the context of this scientific treatise, Bede is unlikely to have been influenced by rhetorical, theological, or stylistic conventions. However, several of his etymologies of the names of the months—linking them to pagan goddesses or practices—can be shown by modern scholarship to be false or at least questionable, for example his statement that *solmonath*, the name for February, derived from cakes that the Anglo-Saxons offered to their gods: there is no certain example of OE *sol* with such a meaning. It seems that in this chapter, Bede was not writing from expert knowledge, but rather following the common practice of adducing etymologies for vernacular terms. Bede's evidence for Anglo-Saxon paganism should therefore not be accepted uncritically: the scholar should take into account both the context in which he presents it and the relative weakness and potential ambiguity of some of his material.

Resonances of Germanic pagan practice in Anglo-Saxon Northumbria are the theme of another paper in the same Groningen volume, C. Tolley's "Oswald's Tree" (149–73). King Oswald (634–42), before defeating Cædwalla (who had succeeded in establishing himself as ruler of Northumbria for a year) at *Denisesburn*, performed a ritual in which he set up a cross at a place called *Hefenefeld*, and, with his small band of followers, prayed for victory. The episode is narrated by Bede in chapters 1 and 2 of Book III of the *Historia ecclesiastica*; Bede in turn had heard of it from the monks of Hexham. The story no doubt acquired layers of accretion both from Bede and from his Hexham informants. Tolley attempts to uncover Oswald's original intentions. His thesis is that Oswald was adapting a pagan rite to Christian purposes, and seeking to impress his followers thereby. In his view, the cross or "Tree of Life" that Oswald erected at a place whose name means "Heavenfield" is reminiscent of pagan Germanic legends of the world-tree *Yggdrasill*, which stands in a plain and at which the gods hold council daily; and also of *Irmensul*, the sacred wooden column believed to support the world. From Widukind of Corvey's account of the pagan Saxons of Germany, it would appear that the Saxons would erect a sacred symbol of *Irmensul* following a victory. Oswald, by erecting and praying to the cross *before* battle, was proclaiming his faith in victory, and may deliberately have been instilling his men with confidence by anticipating an act that their pagan understanding would lead them to expect only after victory. Tolley holds that the interweaving of paganism and Christianity in the early days of the conversion would have been more complex than Bede indicates, and that Oswald may have deliberately exploited pagan habits of thought in his moves to bring Christianity into the hearts of his people.

Lutz E. v. Padberg seeks to probe behind the sparse details that Christian authors from different parts of Western Europe

provide on the actual process by which pagans were converted in "Odin oder Christus? Loyalitäts- und Orientierungskonflikte in der frühmittelalterlichen Christianisierungsepoche" (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 77, 249–78). How did individuals and groups resolve the issues of loyalty and orientation with which the Christian missionaries confronted them? What happened to pagan priests at the time of conversion to Christianity? Padberg examines evidence relating to Anglo-Saxon England (largely from Bede, whom he is more prepared to accept at face value than is Page), from eighth-century Frisia (as contained in Altfried's *Vita Liudgeri* and the *Vita Vulftramni*), from ninth-century Denmark (as contained in Rimbert's *Vita Anskari*), and from eleventh-century Sweden (Adam of Bremen on the pagan sanctuary at Uppsala). His comparative approach highlights a series of motifs: the king who marries a Christian wife and in whose realm paganism is practiced alongside Christianity (as happened in the cases of Æthelberht of Kent and Edwin of Northumbria, before their own conversions); the king's son who, unlike his father, refuses to be converted (Æthelberht's son Eadbald, the three sons of Sæberht of Essex), with the consequent possibility of reversion of the kingdom to paganism following the father's death; the recently converted king who becomes an apostate on suffering some disaster that appears to compromise the power of the Christian God (King Sighere of Essex, with whom Padberg compares Horik II of Denmark, sympathetic to Christianity until misfortune befell his kingdom). Padberg probes Bede's account of the conversion of the pagan priest Coifi, and focuses also on Rædwald of East Anglia's attempt to serve both Christ and the pagan gods by maintaining Christian and pagan altars within the same sanctuary. A sifting of the varied evidence, he concludes, shows that the phenomenon of conversion was far from the unilinear process retrospectively pictured by medieval ecclesiastical authors, but rather was filled with nuanced possibilities for conflict.

Prudence Jones and Nigel Pennick's *A History of Pagan Europe* (London) is a broad study of paganism that introduces readers to traditional religions from prehistoric times to modern. Aiming for breadth rather than depth, the book presents an impressive array of gods and goddesses with brief descriptions of the cultures that worshipped them. The authors take particular interest in pagan survivals after Christianization, although they do not distinguish between actual rites and aesthetic appreciation, or indicate whether those who preserved certain dances or symbols were aware of their meanings or origins. They argue that paganism enjoyed long continuity: although ongoing priesthoods were not maintained, many different pagan customs were preserved which are now being revived by modern-day Pagans, Wiccans, and others. Those new adherents may find this book of interest; scholars will find it less useful. There are factual errors and the index lacks many of the proper names cited in the text. Endnotes and bibliography are brief, and a number of the notes lack page references, although in some cases specific information or even direct quotations have been used. The

authors say they have not listed editions (or translations) of primary sources because so many are available, yet this lack of guidance may frustrate a reader eager to pursue a topic but confronted by dozens of versions of each text, some less reliable than others. The material is fascinating but the presentation leaves much to be desired.

c. Slavery in Anglo-Saxon England

DAVID A.E. PELTERET's *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England: From the Reign of Alfred until the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge) offers a detailed and well documented account of slavery in early England. Due to the varied and fragmentary evidence, he first surveys the materials generically, then draws synthetic conclusions. After briefly defining terms (a meticulous study of the Old English vocabulary of slavery and freedom appears as Appendix I), Pelteret reviews literature; laws and penitentials; wills; manumission documents; charters, surveys, and customs; and Domesday Book. He concludes that early England used three systems of law: tribal, ecclesiastical, and manorial; and that each gradually recognized the personhood of a slave. Under Alfred, slaves gained the right to earn and own property; more rights and duties came later. Masters had great power over slaves' labor and movements, although the church mandated some fast days and holidays and laws gave slaves a little time to work for themselves. Owners also held rights of vengeance and compensation for injuries done their slaves. Slaves were usually punished physically, by whipping or death, for they could not normally pay fines. They could, however, marry, and their spouses could be free. Slaves could also become free: many were manumitted, and a few purchased freedom. Wills indicate some personal bonds between owners and slaves, and slaves were not thought morally or intellectually inferior. The church held contradictory positions on slavery. Slaves were not supposed to become priests, even as the church also insisted on the equality of all in regard to sin and redemption, and at least one slave is known to have actually been a priest. To maintain its holdings, the church discouraged freeing ecclesiastical slaves, yet it encouraged manumission as a virtuous act, and required that ecclesiastical penal slaves be freed at the death of a bishop. The church never recognized the split between its administrative and moral principles because the Bible and patristic writings presented slavery as universal and natural. Slavery eventually disappeared in England, Pelteret concludes, more for economic than moral reasons. In the shift to a manorial economy, lords gained more control over freemen's movements and labor, and they increasingly freed slaves on condition that they stay and work land their lords gave them, in return for rent and other duties. These changes were hastened by Normans seeking to exploit their newly won lands more efficiently, and by the early twelfth century, slavery was largely forgotten in England.

Three papers touch on Anglo-Saxon slavery in *The Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery, and Labor in Medieval England*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen and Douglas Moffat (Glasgow, 1994).

Ruth Mazo Karras, in "Desire, Descendants, and Dominance: Slavery, the Exchange of Women, and Masculine Power" (16–29), seeks to demonstrate that slavery in early medieval Europe was a gendered institution: "It was not only the subjective experience of male and female slaves that differed, but also the effect of men's and women's enslavement on the enslaving society" (16). The symbolic power of the enslavement of women, she argues, came from their sexual use rather than from the imposition of forced labor: by exerting his power over his slave women, a master could also express his dominance over the slave men whose women he was appropriating, other free men with whom he might be competing for multiple sexual partners, and the free women whom he could threaten by preferring slave women to them. To support her case, Karras adduces evidence drawn primarily from Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon sources, including Anglo-Saxon penitential literature and the Old English law codes. For example, she notes that in the seventh-century laws of King Æthelberht of Kent, the tariff for having sexual intercourse with another man's slave increased with the status of the owner, "indicating a significant honor or prestige component in the master's maintenance of control over the sexual activity of his slave" (21). She also notes evidence in the codes of Æthelberht, Ine, and Cnut, that brides were purchased by a payment of money to their kinsmen, and she regards this bride-price, like the slave-price, as an exercise of control over a woman's sexual behavior. She concludes by suggesting that one contributing factor to the disappearance of slavery in England may have been that, in a world in which bride-price gave place to dowry (whereby the bride brought property to her husband), purchase of sexual control over women was no longer so important to men.

The same volume includes Elizabeth Stevens Girsch's paper, "Metaphorical Usage, Sexual Exploitation, and Divergence in the Old English Terminology for Male and Female Slaves" (30–54), a masterful and perceptively reasoned study in historical linguistics. Girsch notes that from the early Old English period there existed five terms signifying "slave of unspecified gender" or "male slave": *þeow(a)*, *þræl*, *þegn*, *esne*, and *wealh*. *Þeow(a)* was the primary word for slave throughout the Old English period, although it occurred increasingly in metaphorical expressions like *þeow(a) godes*. By the transitional period between late Old English and early Middle English, however, *þræl* had become the principal slave-word, and, as modern *thrall*, it is the group's only survivor in Present-Day English. Girsch sees the changes that the group of terms underwent as resulting from a combination of external historical circumstances (the disappearance of slavery as a legal entity and social institution in England, the new social structures introduced by the Norman Conquest) and internal linguistic forces. All the terms except *þræl* either could also refer to non-slaves (for example, *þegn* also meant "king's liegeman"), or else developed metaphorical meanings at odds with the connotations of slavery. A somewhat different picture is presented by the terms that referred specifically

to female slaves: *þinen*, *þeowen*, *mennen*, and *wyln*. All four terms disappear virtually without a trace by the end of the Old English period. Girsch links this development in part to the association that existed between the terms for female slaves and the sexual submissiveness imposed upon female slaves by their state. Ælfric, for example, preferred not to use *mennen*, the term most commonly found in specific statutes dealing with sexual abuse of slave-women, and to restrict his use of *þeowen*; instead, he resurrected from obscurity the term *wyln*—which carried little baggage with it—when he wished to refer to a literal female slave. He avoided any female equivalent for the phrase *godes þeow(a)* that he frequently applied to male religious. Wulfstan never used female slave terms. Girsch also highlights social conditions that could have assisted the disappearance of the female terms. While for women the passage from statutory servitude to ostensible freedom nevertheless carried the burden of subservience to a husband or father, freed female slaves were at least no longer so subject to sexual exploitation outside of marriage, a circumstance that could have accelerated the obsolescence of terms with connotations of involuntary sexual availability.

The third relevant paper in the volume is Ross Samson's "The End of Medieval Slavery" (95–124), although in this case there is little specific reference to Anglo-Saxon England. Samson presents a general survey of the causes contributing to the end of slavery in Western Europe in the period 800–1100. He criticizes most traditional explanations, including the economic one that slavery disappeared because lords found it more expedient to have dependent peasants who fed themselves than to rely on slaves who had to be fed at the lord's expense; he draws attention to "the underlying capitalist assumptions concerning incentives and motivations that are to be found in most of the explanations by scholars who have little practical or theoretical knowledge of economic practice in non-industrial, non-capitalist societies" (117). He also does not believe that the church played a significant direct role in ending slavery, although he highlights the indirect effect of two aspects of ecclesiastical policy: by regulating sexual unions through insistence on marriage and its inviolability, the church weakened owners' control over their slaves, whose unions masters had in classical times been free to forbid or to break; and by prohibiting work on Sundays—a prohibition in which slaves were explicitly included as early as the Council of Mâcon of 585—the church weakened masters' control over the labor of their slaves. Samson's study includes passing references to episodes in Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman history: to St. Wilfrid's efforts to wrest the young son from a woman who, against her will, had promised him to the church (108); to the will of Ælfwold, bishop of Crediton (d. 1008), which stipulated that all slaves on his estate were to be freed (109); and to the pronouncements by Bishop Wulfstan II of Worcester against trading in humans (110).

f. The Early Anglo-Saxon Church

THE ORGANIZATION of the early Christian church in England was the focus of two articles. Eric Cambridge and David

Rollason's "Debate: The Pastoral Organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Review of the 'Minster Hypothesis'" (*Early Medieval Europe* 4, 87–104) responds to *Minsters and Parish Churches: the Local Church in Transition 950–1250*, ed. John Blair (Oxford, 1988), and *Pastoral Care before the Parish*, ed. John Blair and Richard Sharpe (Leicester, 1992). The Minster Hypothesis, in Cambridge's and Rollason's summary, considers clerical communities, rather than individual priests or bishops, responsible for pastoral care before the Viking age; afterwards, the minsters' territories fragmented with the rise of private churches, and the parish system emerged, often following the old minster structure. The authors argue instead that while monasteries may have played some missionary role, bishops generally presided over what pastoral care existed in the unsystematized early English church. The post-Viking period thus saw not disintegration but the first establishment of church hierarchy along Carolingian lines. Some mother churches were established on monastic sites, but others created legends of earlier foundations or were simply new. The authors conclude that the hypothesis obscures the diversity of pre-Viking church foundations and masks significant developments in both the pre- and post-Viking English church.

John Blair responds to Cambridge and Rollason (and a forthcoming article by Rollason) in "Debate: Ecclesiastical Organization and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Early Medieval Europe* 4, 193–212). He agrees with their warnings against "the hardening of an orthodoxy" (212) but argues that the two criticize a more simplistic and rigid model than most scholars actually use. Blair's "minster" denotes a wider variety of foundations than Cambridge and Rollason recognize, and he notes that even monasteries strictly defined included priests as well as contemplatives. The various foundations never excluded each other: bishops often carried out their pastoral functions through minsters, although he characterizes minsters less as institutions of pastoral care than as territorial centers for extracting revenues. He also discusses the continuity of specific mother churches, arguing that the minster system did indeed underlie later parish organization. Blair concludes that while the minster model has sometimes been misused, the significance of minsters in the early English church is undeniable.

Another kind of foundation in the early English church provides the focus of an article by Barbara Mitchell. "Anglo-Saxon Double Monasteries" (*History Today* 45:10, 33–39) introduces readers to that "peculiar institution" which thrived for less than two centuries in England. Double monasteries housed both monks and nuns: priests celebrated the sacraments for mixed congregations while abbesses ruled the joint foundations. The practice began in Francia and spread to England in the seventh century when high-born English women took the veil in northern Frankish double monasteries and returned home to found similar institutions. Under both Frankish and Anglo-Saxon law, women could own land, and the communities' isolation required that the priests needed to minister to the nuns live on the premises. Contemporary

violence produced high-ranking widows who had the resources to endow such monasteries and the social position to retain control of them. Bede's accounts of double monasteries show glimpses of active abbesses such as Hild, Ælfflæd, and Æthelthryth, but Bede downplays both the number of double foundations and the intellectual attainments suggested by other writers and by the finding of many writing styli at Whitby. While little evidence exists for English opposition to the system, it ran counter to Roman practice, and Theodore of Tarsus disapproved; Bede's reticence about the women's accomplishments indicates his ambivalence as well. Fears of sexual immorality and pressure from Rome made the decline of the double monastery inevitable, Mitchell writes. Legal innovations by the Carolingians, and later by the Norman conquerors of England, made it much more difficult for women to own land, and those institutions which survived the ninth century could not survive the Conquest. In their time, however, the double monasteries produced learned and powerful women as well as men.

Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis, in "Church Burial in Anglo-Saxon England: The Prerogative of Kings" (*Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29, 96–119), draws on a combination of written and archaeological evidence to discuss distinctive characteristics of Anglo-Saxon royal burials in the period from the conversion up until the early ninth century. References in Bede and in later sources indicate that during this period, it was only kings, saints, and bishops who were buried in Anglo-Saxon churches, and excavations at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and at Ripon, for example, confirm the implication in the written sources that these burials took place, not in the main liturgical space of the church, but in *porticus* or mausolea distinct from the central body of the church: for example, King Æthelberht of Kent (d. 616) was buried in a south *porticus* at St. Augustine's, and at York Minster the head of King Edwin of Northumbria (d. 632) was buried in a *porticus* dedicated to St. Gregory. The Anglo-Saxon practice contrasts with that of Merovingian France, where burials took place in the naves of funerary basilicas and where the tombs of monarchs were surrounded by those of their entourage. Deliyannis suggests several influences that might help account for the particularities of the Anglo-Saxon practice. First, that the Anglo-Saxon Christian population other than royalty and prominent ecclesiastics were not buried in churches she links to canons of several Continental church councils that banned church burials, canons that were evidently observed in England much more rigorously than on the Continent itself. Secondly, she suggests that the special status accorded the Christian Anglo-Saxon king in burial may have been influenced by Anglo-Saxon pagan practices, for excavations at pagan burial sites indicate that from the late sixth century there emerged a new type of pagan cemetery consisting solely of very rich graves, a development that has been linked to the growth of the concept of hereditary kingship. Finally, the habit of burying royalty in structures annexed to the main liturgical space of the church probably reflects

awareness of the tradition at Constantinople and Rome of burying emperors in separate mausolea (although the Anglo-Saxon structures did not imitate the imperial ones in their forms). It could have been the Augustinian mission that first brought knowledge of this tradition to England. Deliyannis concludes the article with a table—based on information in Karl Heinrich Krüger's *Königsgrabkirchen der Franken, Angelsachsen und Langobarden* (1971)—in which she lists the names and the burial sites of all Anglo-Saxon kings up to ca. 800 whose place of burial is known, and notes the source of the information.

Veronica Ortenberg, in "*Angli aut angeli: les Anglo-Saxons ont-ils 'sauvé' la papauté au VII^e siècle?*" (*Revue Mabillon*, n.s. 6, 5–32), considers the role played by the Anglo-Saxon church in the gradual seventh-century reorientation of the focus of papal policy away from the Mediterranean East and on to a north-south axis, a reorientation that meant that in the middle of the eighth century the papacy's principal alliance was with the newly powerful Franks, not with the Byzantine Empire. This outcome, in her view, resulted from seeds sown by Gregory the Great in despatching a mission to a country, England, that became fanatically devoted to Rome, although she stresses that the papal reorientation proceeded not from a grand overall design, but through reactions to a series of fortuitous circumstances. One of the principal Anglo-Saxon contributions to the reshaping of papal attitudes came through Anglo-Saxon devotion to St. Peter, as demonstrated by the pilgrimages to the tomb of Peter made by rulers and leading ecclesiastical figures. The symbolic importance of St. Peter was also demonstrated by Benedict Biscop's decision to invite the precentor John, who was a clerk of St. Peter's, not of the papal court at the Lateran, to introduce Roman liturgy in Northumbria. It was the northern European pilgrims, and principally the Anglo-Saxons, who taught the papacy to make best use of their possession of the tomb of St. Peter. Again, the Anglo-Saxon practice of making appeal to Rome not just on matters of doctrine but also with regard to ecclesiastical organization, increased the self-confidence of the papacy and assisted it to enlarge its field of competence. Principal among the appellants was of course St. Wilfrid, and if, as Ortenberg holds probable, the relics that Wilfrid brought back from Rome in 680 and again in 704 were actual corporeal relics of Roman saints, that would have been the first time that the papacy agreed to the transportation of relics away from Rome. This demonstration of the importance that the papacy attached to the Anglo-Saxon church is supported also by its willingness to despatch to England Theodore, reputed to have a better grasp of eastern theology than any of his contemporaries in Rome, and by the fact that Theodore's short-lived predecessor Wigheard, who died at Rome while collecting the pallium, was accorded the honor of burial at St. Peter's, an honor traditionally accorded only to popes. The respect of the Anglo-Saxon church for the papacy thus produced a reciprocal recognition on the part of Rome, a recognition that contributed to the evolution of papal policy

as it turned its attention increasingly away from the Greek East to focus more singly on the Latin West.

Ian Wood prefaces his article on "Northumbrians and Franks in the Age of Wilfrid" (*Northern History* 31, 10–21) by briefly delineating the Merovingian contribution to the Northumbrian Renaissance: the great Northumbrian monasteries were partly modeled on communities within Francia, Benedict Biscop employed Gallic masons, and manuscripts that Biscop brought back from the Rhone valley contributed substantially to the library upon which Bede drew. Northumbrian evidence, indeed, provides some of the best insights into the Merovingian culture of the time: the churches of Monkwearmouth, Jarrow, and Escomb, and possibly the crypts of Ripon and Hexham, are arguably the most substantial surviving oeuvre of seventh-century Gallic masons, and a number of episodes in Merovingian history are known only from Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* and Stephanus's *Vita sancti Wilfridi*. The main substance of the article is devoted to a study of the accounts of the journeys through Francia of Biscop, Wilfrid, Theodore, Hadrian, and Ceolfrith provided by Bede, Stephanus, and the anonymous author of the *Vita Ceolfridi*. These accounts provide important insights into the mechanics of travel in the early Middle Ages, underlining the necessity for thorough preparation, for guides, for good connections, and for letters of recommendation and formal approval. The Frankish connections of Queen Eanflæd, for example, were vital in smoothing Wilfrid's path through Francia on his first journey to Rome. The travel narratives, notably Stephanus's description of Wilfrid's Italian journey in 679 and his return a year later, provide vital information for the twists and turns of Frankish politics, which are only fragmentarily recorded in continental sources. Friendships established during travel could vitally affect the way Merovingians were depicted in Anglo-Saxon sources: thus Chilperic II, who welcomed Ceolfrith hospitably in 716, received a good press in England, even meriting an entry in the *Liber vitae* of St. Cuthbert's community; in Francia, by contrast, the victory of Chilperic's enemies in 717 led to his being unfavorably represented in the histories. Wood concludes by drawing attention to the final mention of the Frankish kingdom in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. Bede alludes to a Frankish victory over the Muslims which he links to the appearance of two comets in 729. His chronology fits ill with the two known victories, that of Eudo of Aquitaine in 721 and the "Battle of Poitiers" fought some time between 732 and 734. It is impossible to pinpoint the event to which Bede refers. This, Wood observes, is "a hard limitation to recognize, when so much of our evidence for contacts between Northumbria and Francia seems to reflect a world of very precise knowledge, required so that a traveller could traverse kingdoms in safety; knowledge which could then be passed on to the hagiographer or historian to be recorded for posterity" (21).

In "The Genesis of a Cult: Cuthbert of Farne and Ecclesiastical Politics in Northumbria in the Late Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries" (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*

46, 383–97), D.P. Kirby relates the emergence of the cult of St. Cuthbert, and its development of specific characteristics, to issues confronting the Lindisfarne community and affecting the role of the community within the Northumbrian church as a whole. The period was one of striking changes of fortune: Wilfrid's victory at the Synod of Whitby in 664 had been followed by the departure from Lindisfarne of Bishop Colman and his followers and the replacement of the see of Lindisfarne by that of York, but in 678 Wilfrid himself was expelled from his see, a development that opened up the Northumbrian diocese to large-scale reorganization, including the re-establishment of a diocese at Lindisfarne. Wilfrid's return to favor in 686 seems again to have posed a threat to Lindisfarne, while in the period ca. 715–24 Acca, bishop of Hexham, and the surviving Wilfridians may once more have questioned Lindisfarne's status as the seat of a bishopric. The impact upon Lindisfarne of these developments is detectable in different emphases in the presentation of Cuthbert as saint in the anonymous *Life* written between 699 and 704, in Bede's metrical *Life* written a few years later, in his prose *Life* completed before ca. 721, and in the account of Cuthbert in the *Historia ecclesiastica* completed in 731. For example, the claim of the author of the anonymous *Life* that Cuthbert adopted the Petrine tonsure at Ripon in the early 660s is not believable, but was clearly designed to give Cuthbert what Clare Stancliffe has called "an impeccable Roman ancestry." Again, in the account of Cuthbert's dying moments that Bede, in the prose *Life*, places in the mouth of the eye-witness Herefrith, Cuthbert supposedly urges his followers to have no communion with those who do not celebrate Easter at the correct time. In Kirby's opinion this cannot be authentic, for the comment would have applied toward the Picts, who would not at the time have observed the Roman Easter; yet Cuthbert is known to have been well disposed to the Picts. This episode of the *Life* "is a vivid demonstration of the way in which the Cuthbert tradition evolved to bring the image of Cuthbert into conformity with the expectations of relevant contemporary opinion. The Cuthbert whom Bede admired was being made appropriately orthodox" (389). The "literary canonisation of Cuthbert" (390), indeed, established as one of the most celebrated in the Northumbrian kingdom what may have begun as a relatively obscure cult. At Lindisfarne itself, there seems to have been a tension within the community between those who valued communal living and those more committed to the anchoritic experience which Cuthbert himself had cultivated. The anonymous *Life* stresses Cuthbert's spiritual achievement, but Bede is keen to emphasize his role as monastic teacher, preacher, and bishop; he stresses how Cuthbert observed the monastic rules with the other brethren at Melrose and how he instructed the Lindisfarne community in correct monastic observance. The traditions surrounding Cuthbert evidently developed in response to specific pressures, "the whole process culminating in the writing of Bede's [prose] *Life*" (397).

The life, work, and impact of Archbishop Theodore of

Canterbury were the focus of a symposium held in Cambridge in 1990, the 1300th anniversary of his death. The proceedings of that symposium have now appeared as vol. 11 of the series *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England: Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on His Life and Influence*, ed. by Michael Lapidge (Cambridge). Six papers in the volume have historical content.

As Michael Lapidge notes in "The Career of Archbishop Theodore" (1–29), until recently our knowledge of Theodore's life was dependent almost entirely on the information provided by Bede in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. However, the publication by Lapidge and Bernhard Bischoff of the biblical commentaries produced by the school that Theodore established at Canterbury now allows a fuller picture of his career to be reconstructed, for there are illuminating specific allusions in the commentaries, while aspects of the content and presentation also provide clues to Theodore's background (B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge, ed., *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian* [Cambridge, 1994], reviewed in *OEN* 29:2, 73–6). As Bede informs us, Theodore was born at Tarsus in Cilicia in 602. Lapidge suggests that for his schooling, he went to Antioch, the nearest major city; the concern of the Canterbury biblical commentaries with explaining the literal sense of scripture matches the preoccupations of the Antiochene school of exegesis which had chiefly flourished in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, but which appears still to have been active in the early seventh. While Antioch was the focus of Greek Christianity in Syria, Edessa was the center of Syriac Christianity, and one allusion to Edessa in the commentaries, along with several references to Syriac writers, notably Ephrem, raises the possibility that Theodore traveled to Edessa. Later he was at Constantinople, for the commentaries give his eye-witness report of some relics there. Lapidge suggests that he traveled there perhaps in the late 630s as a refugee from the Arab occupation of Syria, and that in Constantinople he would have benefited from the remarkable florescence of learning encouraged and supported by the Emperor Heraclius (610–41) and Patriarch Sergius (610–38). The Canterbury commentaries reveal some acquaintance with jurisprudence, Greek medicine, astronomy, computus, and Greek philosophy. "[T]he familiarity with all these subjects . . . indicates convincingly that the young Theodore took advantage of his stay in Constantinople to pursue his studies in the subjects which were then particularly in vogue" (19). The next phase of Theodore's career of which we have knowledge is his sojourn in Rome, for Bede tells us that at the time of his appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury he was living as a monk in Rome. Lapidge believes it likely that, of the four communities of eastern monks in seventh-century Rome, Theodore would have belonged to the Cilician community in the monastery of St. Anastasius *ad aquas Salvias*, outside the walls on the south side of the city. Theodore may perhaps have been the author of a Latin translation of the *Passio* of St. Anastasius that was transmitted to England by the late seventh century. Lapidge

also suggests that the future archbishop may be identifiable as the *Theodorus monachus* who advised on the drawing up of the *acta* of the Lateran Council of 649, which pronounced against Monotheletism, that is, the doctrine that Christ, while existing in two natures, human and divine, had one energy or will. His role in this would help explain why in 680, when Monotheletism was again the focus of debate, Pope Agatho wrote to the emperor that Theodore, now at Canterbury, was the only churchman with true understanding of the complex issues involved. Theodore's acquaintance with Monotheletism and other eastern doctrines might also explain why when Pope Vitalian despatched Theodore to England in 668, he ordered Hadrian to accompany him to ensure that, in Bede's words, Theodore "did not introduce into the church over which he was to preside anything contrary to the truth of the faith in the manner of the Greeks." The English portion of Theodore's career is, of course, quite well recorded by Bede. Lapidge emphasizes Bede's evidence that Theodore was a highly effective administrator, breaking up the old, large dioceses and increasing the number of bishoprics, summoning a national synod, and promulgating rules intended to secure unanimity of practice throughout England in matters of orthodox belief. Further, in establishing at Canterbury the school that gave rise to the biblical commentaries and other works, Theodore was responsible for "one of the high points, perhaps the acme, of intellectual culture in the early Middle Ages" (29).

Sebastian P. Brock, in "The Syriac Background" (30–53), considers the structure and activity of Syriac Christianity in the time of Theodore, and possible channels through which Syriac influence could have reached England. He notes that at this time there were three Syriac religious groupings: the Syrian Orthodox, who rejected the Council of Chalcedon; the Church of the East, which regarded Theodore of Mopsuestia as its guide; and the Syriac-speaking Chalcedonian communities of Syria and Lebanon. The Latin Church was in closer sympathy with the Church of the East, geographically the more distant, than with the Syrian Orthodox: Theodore of Mopsuestia was acceptable to both the Latin Church and the Church of the East, whereas his writings had been condemned by the Greek Church in 553, and had always been anathema to the Syrian Orthodox. The seventh century was a period of great literary activity in all the Syriac churches, and saw a climax in the gradual process of the hellenization of Syriac literary culture. By this time Syriac scholars had developed sophisticated techniques of mirror translation capable of producing highly literal versions of their originals. Most of the translation activity of the seventh century was the work of scholars of the Syrian Orthodox Church who had been trained in monasteries of which the most important was perhaps Qenneshre on the Euphrates. By contrast, learning in the Church of the East was concentrated in the church schools of which the best known was the School of Nisibis, which fostered the influence of the Antiochene exegetical tradition. Theodore of Tarsus's own ecclesiastical allegiance would have meant that any contact he might have had with

the Syriac world would have been not with the Syrian Orthodox but with the Chalcedonian community, for whose activity at this time there is little surviving evidence. However, while in Rome he could have encountered refugees who belonged to the Church of the East. Theodore himself would have been the principal channel through which Syriac influence could have reached England, but there is also some evidence that hagiographical texts may have reached Western Europe through the agency of Syrian merchant communities (for example, that settled in the Rhone valley); intriguing similarities between Syriac and Hiberno-Latin versions of certain biblical apocrypha suggest yet another route by which texts from the eastern Mediterranean world may have entered the British Isles. (In a second article published in 1995, "St Theodore of Canterbury, the Canterbury School and the Christian East" [*Heythrop Journal* 36 (1995), 431–8], Brock contributes to the study of the Canterbury biblical commentaries by drawing attention to a handful of parallels, not noted by Bischoff and Lapidge, between the commentaries and Greek and Syriac exegesis.)

Guglielmo Cavallo's paper on "Theodore of Tarsus and the Greek Culture of His Time" (54–67) notes how difficult it is, given the lack of available evidence, to ascertain precisely where and when Theodore acquired his Greek learning. Cavallo therefore opts to provide a broad reconstruction of the intellectual climate of the Greek-speaking world of Theodore's time, on the premise that such a reconstruction will at least "help to illuminate the circumstances of his education" (54). Cavallo contrasts the situation in Constantinople, which increasingly fell victim to "rusticity," with that in the outlying provinces—Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor—where there was cultural continuity and where Greek texts were preserved and transmitted even after the provinces had been lost to the Byzantine empire. There was, however, a last florescence of "Hellenic" culture in the capital during the reign of Heraclius (610–41), when Stephen of Alexandria was summoned to Constantinople as teacher, and Cavallo agrees with Lapidge that it is possible that Theodore attended lectures there, perhaps those of Stephen himself, and may even have encountered the learned scholars John Moschus and Sophronius. Yet Theodore's education need not have taken place exclusively in Constantinople. "During the years of his scholarly apprenticeship the Byzantine provinces were enjoying a more lively level of Greek culture than was the capital itself; and Theodore . . . will certainly have had the opportunity of studying in various regions and centres of the Byzantine world" (66–7). Moreover, the *acta* of the Lateran Council of 649 reveal that significant Greek materials were available in Rome at the time, so Theodore could have strengthened and deepened his Greek learning during his years in Rome immediately before his departure to England.

Thomas F.X. Noble, in his contribution on "Rome in the Seventh Century" (68–87), provides a sketch of the major developments in Roman civil, political, and ecclesiastical life in order to consider how Theodore's experience in Rome

could have prepared him for what he was to encounter in England. The seventh century was, Noble observes, "a critical period in the social and political history of Italy" (78). The old civil administration and senatorial aristocracy disappeared, to be replaced by military and clerical elites consisting of "new men" who rose to positions of prominence through merit rather than birth. The Roman clergy expanded its traditional roles in ways that gave it increasing power and influence, with the papacy assuming a significant part in public works such as protecting Rome from the Lombards and maintaining the city's water supply. Increasingly the papacy was taken up in routine administration; papal letters of the period exhibit a trend toward a certain institutional and ideological inflexibility, but in Noble's view they do not reveal theological backwardness, as has sometimes been supposed. Noble draws broad parallels between the Roman and English situations in the seventh century to argue that "every single area of activity that attracted Theodore's attention in England had at least a rough precedent in Rome," and that as a result of what he observed and participated in at Rome, Theodore was, by the time of his despatch to England, "in a sense, a Lateran professional" (87).

In "Theodore, the English Church and the Monothelete Controversy" (88–95), Henry Chadwick seeks to probe behind Bede's account of the council of the English church convened by Theodore at *Hæthfeld*, probably in 679. Bede reports how the assembled English bishops affirmed their faith in the five oecumenical councils and in Pope Martin I's Lateran Council of 649 which had pronounced against Monotheletism. Bede adds that the Council of *Hæthfeld* also backed the view that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son (*filioque*). He goes on to note that Benedict Biscop, returning from pilgrimage to Rome, had brought with him John, the precentor of St. Peter's, commissioned by the pope to examine the orthodoxy of the English church and to report back to Rome. The upholding by the Council of *Hæthfeld* of the decisions of the Lateran Council of 649 was intended to support Pope Agatho, who was to journey to Constantinople in 680 to show that the Western Church presented a united front against Monotheletism. Chadwick finds it remarkable that the Council of *Hæthfeld* placed emphasis on the dual procession of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine was not at issue in the Western Church, although it was scorned in the East; Agatho would not have welcomed attention being drawn to it at a time when he hoped to reach agreement with the East. Chadwick detects here evidence of undercurrents of the tensions between Theodore and Wilfrid. Theodore had ejected Wilfrid from the see of York in 678, and in 679 Wilfrid was in Rome presenting his case to the pope. Chadwick suggests that Wilfrid perhaps insinuated to Agatho that some of the Greek Theodore's views were doctrinally questionable, that the mission of the precentor John to check on the orthodoxy of the English church could have resulted from fears raised by Wilfrid, and that Theodore needed the Council of *Hæthfeld* to affirm the *filioque* in order

to help silence such fears.

Martin Brett's aim, in "Theodore and the Latin Canon Law" (120–40), is to attempt to establish which canon law source(s) Theodore can be shown to have used while in England. Brett considers three types of evidence: the pronouncements of the Councils of Hertford and *Hæthfeld* over which Theodore presided; the canon law glosses in the Leiden and Paris glossaries, two manuscripts which, while dating from the late eighth or ninth century, show clear signs of a connection with Theodore's school at Canterbury; and the so-called Penitential of Theodore, actually compiled by an anonymous *discipulus Umbrensius* in the early eighth century, but based at least in part on Theodore's teaching. The pronouncements of Theodore's two councils, reported by Bede, provide the most authentic testimony for Theodore's canon law, yet their evidence is not straightforward. Bede's account of the Council of Hertford establishes that Theodore had a particular collection of Latin canon law to which he asked his bishops to give their assent, but the pronouncements of the council show considerable verbal variation from any known surviving collection of canon law. There are, however, certain similarities with the second collection compiled by Dionysius Exiguus, which included a Latin translation of the Greek councils from Nicaea to Chalcedon together with a body of material from Africa as well as a collection of papal decretals. The council of *Hæthfeld*, which endorsed the *acta* of the Lateran Council of 649, nonetheless differed from the *acta* in details of its verbal formulations, a fact that suggests that the relationship between Hertford and the Dionysian collection may be closer than is apparently indicated by non-Dionysian turns of phrase. Certainly, the *Dionysiana* would account for the great majority of the canon law words in the two glossary manuscripts, although the exceptions suggest the likelihood that some additional canon law material must also have been in circulation in England. Very little precise information can be derived from the Penitential, for the *discipulus* is free in his treatment of citations; but his two quotations that are definitely identifiable come from the canon law collection known as the *Sanblasiana*. Brett emphasizes that it is highly likely that there was significant further canon law material available in seventh-century England, material that current analysis of the evidence has not yet enabled us to detect.

It was Theodore who, by summoning the council at Hertford in 672, initiated the tradition of regular Anglo-Saxon church councils that continued throughout the eighth century and into the ninth. These Anglo-Saxon councils have tended to be neglected by scholars because the volume of their surviving legislation is slight in comparison with that of Frankish and Visigothic councils: only four sets of Anglo-Saxon canons have come down to us, from the Council of Hertford itself, from *Clofesho* in 747, from the legatine synods of 786, and from Chelsea in 816, while there is also the doctrinal statement issued by the Council of *Hæthfeld* in 679. However, literary evidence, and the evidence of charters

whose witness lists show that they were issued at councils, indicates that councils were a regular feature of the Anglo-Saxon church over a period of a century and a half. Catherine Cubitt seeks to do justice to the available evidence in her *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils c.650–c.850* (London and New York). The book is divided into two principal sections. Part One discusses the fundamentals of Anglo-Saxon conciliar practice. Within this part, Cubitt analyzes the sites where councils were held and notes that they tended to take place by rivers and within a mile or two of Roman roads; she therefore rejects Brixworth as the site for the councils of *Clofesho*, for Brixworth does not meet these criteria (34 and 305–6). She emphasizes the directing role played at councils by archbishops, which contrasts with Frankish and Visigothic practice, whereby the king tended to preside: for example, Charlemagne's major work of conciliar legislation, the *Admonitio generalis* of 789, is written in the first person as a direct statement of his will. The diplomatic and procedural aspects of the Anglo-Saxon councils seem to have been strongly influenced by Roman practice. It was Roman models that provided the pattern for English conciliar *acta*, and Cubitt also suggests (86–7) that Roman influence then rubbed off on aspects of the Anglo-Saxon land charter, for example the popularity of non-autograph subscriptions. Part II presents a close examination of the legislation promulgated by the Council of *Clofesho* of 747, by the legatine councils of 786, and by the Council of Chelsea of 816, as well as analyzing the political situation that lay behind the numerous councils that took place during the Mercian Supremacy. In discussing the 747 council, Cubitt notes its uniquely wide-ranging proposals for reform in every area of church life: pastoral care, liturgy and worship, the monastic life. These reforms anticipated Continental developments by some forty years, for only in Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* is there as thoroughgoing a program for the renewal of Christian society. Cubitt's analysis of similarities between the *Clofesho* reforms and points mentioned by the missionary Boniface in his letter from Germany to Archbishop Cuthberht of Canterbury, in which he reported on the canons of his Frankish councils and urged Cuthberht to focus on reform, confirms the traditional view that Boniface had a significant influence on the *Clofesho* proceedings, against the suggestion of Hannah Vollrath, in her *Die Synoden Englands bis 1066* (1985), that it was the *Clofesho* canons that influenced Boniface in his own work. In discussing the legatine councils of 786, which were presided over by the papal legate George of Ostia, Cubitt emphasizes the role likely to have been played by Alcuin, who, returning to England from Charlemagne's court, joined the legation at York. Numerous parallels between the legatine canons (first promulgated in Northumbria) and various Alcuinian texts (discussed on pp. 164–90) suggest to Cubitt that Alcuin had a significant hand in drafting the canons, although in their final form they would have been the work of the legate. There are some notable parallels with Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis*, and "it is remarkable to realize that the great Carolingian reform had been rehearsed at

least partly in England three years earlier" (190). Cubitt concludes the book by considering the decline in regularity of councils after 825 (only three being recorded during the following twenty years). The vital factor, she believes, was not Viking depredations, which grew serious only after the mid-century, but the transition from Mercian to West Saxon dominance of Southumbria: with this transition, the king no longer attended councils, partly because West Saxon kings had no control over the London region within which many councils had taken place; and councils ceased to adjudicate important property cases, which thenceforward were dealt with in smaller, local assemblies. Archiepiscopal authority in judicial matters seems to have been undermined as the West Saxon kings extended their control over the churches and monasteries of Southumbria, so that, while synods may have continued to meet and discuss church matters, "they no longer played the important political role that they had during the reigns of the Mercian kings" (240). Two Appendices provide an enumeration of the documentary sources for all councils within the period for which we have evidence of any kind, and a list of the sites of the councils, with discussion of the possible location of those sites not yet firmly identified. This is a substantial book with a wealth of information and perceptive discussion sure to prove serviceable to historians of this period.

g. Wessex and King Alfred

BARBARA YORKE develops a detailed account of Wessex from roughly 400 to 1066 in her *Wessex in the Early Middle Ages* (London and New York). The first three chapters reconstruct the political formation of Wessex from archaeological and documentary sources. Early Wessex (ca. 400–600) was split into British and Anglo-Saxon areas, divisions which left traces in later West Saxon governments. Over the next two centuries, conquests and administrative advances by Ine and other kings gave Wessex coherence, but it was still one of four kingdoms and showed little sign of the supremacy it would establish over England. Egbert's line consolidated military and administrative power starting in 802 until, under Alfred and his successors, Wessex became the only kingdom to fend off the Vikings and emerged as the dominant force in England. Yorke concludes that Wessex maintained regional distinctiveness and a key role in English politics until Æthelred II; beginning with his reign, kings spent more time, energy, and money on other parts of England as London became the focus of communication and government. The second half of the book surveys religious and social developments. Yorke argues that Christianity spread rapidly through a minster system to have a profound effect on early West Saxon society. Ninth-century declines in monasticism and learning led Alfred to initiate a revival which his heirs continued, resulting in the tenth-century reform. Chapter 6 explores local social structure from slave to noble, with special attention to rural settlement patterns and social mobility; Chapter 7 examines towns and trading, from small, self-sufficient settlements to

later towns which played important roles in the Wessex economy. The book synthesizes a wide range of materials to provide an excellent introduction to the regional history of Wessex, while its footnotes and bibliography should enable the reader to pursue individual topics in greater depth.

Wessex's most famous king attracted two books in 1995. David Sturdy's *Alfred the Great* (London) presents the king in the context of his times and his court. The translation of the *Chronicle* which Sturdy calls the "backbone" of his study (1) is unfortunately frequently misleading. He rarely acknowledges differences between manuscripts or indicates which manuscript he is following, and his translations appear from comparison with the *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* (Cambridge, 1983–) to be very loose (although he never states which editions he is using, or whether he consulted manuscripts). Sturdy sets Alfred in a European context by reading Continental annals of Viking attacks and comparing the archaeology of Continental fortifications with what is known of Anglo-Saxon ones. Seriology, adapted from Egyptology, helps him put Anglo-Saxon charters into chronological order and extract information about witnesses. He argues that most of the officials in Wessex were from a small number of "dynasties" marked by recurring name roots such as Os- and Wulf-; he then relates some families to Alfred himself. While sketching these contexts, he recounts the lives of Alfred and his dynasty through the *Chronicle*, Asser, and charters. Endnotes are few and limited: editions are not listed for the *Chronicle* texts; references for other primary texts are to translations and not editions; some articles are cited without titles. Sturdy also glosses over numerous ongoing debates, most seriously assuming the full reliability of Asser's *Life*, and makes claims whose support may lie twenty pages before or after his statement, if there is support at all.

Alfred P. Smyth's controversial *King Alfred the Great* (Oxford) seeks to revise significantly our conceptions about Alfred's life and reign. (See also his "Unmasking Alfred's False Biography," *British Archaeology* 7 [Sept.], 8–9, which summarizes his main points.) Smyth argues that Asser's *Life of Alfred* was not written by the Welsh bishop but forged by Byrhtferth or his circle around the turn of the millennium. Part I of the book provides a reconstruction of Alfred's reign without the *Life* for comparison with "the pseudo-Asser's" version. Along the way Smyth rejects a number of documents as forgeries and many *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entries as false or confused. The resulting biography proclaims Alfred's successful negotiations with the Danes his greatest royal accomplishment, and his intellectual achievements real but relevant only to a small elite. Part II, "A Thousand Years of Deceit," directly attacks Asser's text as a forgery. Though rejecting Galbraith's identification of the author as Leofric, Smyth reiterates Galbraith's arguments against Asser and attacks Stenton and Whitelock for using Asser politically during World War II. He castigates scholars who adhere to Stenton and Whitelock's "orthodoxy," while those who disagree show "courage." Smyth then proceeds through the *Life*, showing

where the narrative contradicts itself, disagrees with other sources, or is simply improbable. He finds sources for the *Life* in folktales and Scripture, the *Chronicle*, and, most seriously for its defenders, the *Life* of Gerald of Aurillac, written by Odo of Cluny ca. 930. He argues that the *Life*'s Latin matches that of Byrhtferth's circle, although reviewers have questioned his stylistic analysis and shown errors in his Latin. In the third section Smyth examines Alfredian charters in detail, concluding that many are forged. He reads Æthelwulf's and Alfred's wills and contestation over them as evidence that Alfred enforced weak claims to land through personal influence over the *witan*, and concludes that Alfred cheated his nephews. He argues that the *witan*'s role in these disputes indicates its power; its consent was necessary to the king. Alfred might manipulate the *witan* but could neither force nor ignore it. The final section treats Alfredian literature. Smyth deems the *Chronicle* a product of Alfred's court, though the king exercised little control over it himself, and dates it to 896. Smyth also maintains that many of the Alfredian translations were not part of the king's educational program but meant for an elite: the Psalms and *Dialogues* could be basic readers, but Alfred's *Pastoral Care* was appropriate only for the clergy, and the difficult *Boethius* and *Soliloquies* could reach only a select few. Smyth's Alfred is a lifelong scholar and "frustrated philosopher," not a man miraculously gifted with the ability to read and translate Latin who wants to share that gift with everyone. Smyth concludes that the conventional wisdom about Alfred's life has been accepted for too long and that it is time to re-examine what we know about Alfred. While he raises some valid queries and concerns, particularly about the composition and reliability of the *Life*, the personal invective in the book (and in some of the reviews it has attracted) does little to advance study of Alfred; more could be accomplished with less vitriol.

h. The Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

GUNTHER WOLF, in "Æthelfled von Mercia und ottonische 'dominae': zum Rechtscharakter frühmittelalterlicher Frauenherrschaft" (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, 111 [1994], 523–35), draws parallels between the position of power and influence occupied by Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians, and that of three German "dominae" of the second half of the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries: Otto I's daughter Mathilda (955–99), who in 966 became abbess of Quedlinburg, and two daughters of Otto II and Theophanu, Adelheid (977–1043), who succeeded Mathilda at Quedlinburg, and Sophia (978–1039), who became abbess of Gandersheim in 1002. All three German princesses attained political prominence, attested, for example, by Otto III's delegation of authority in Saxony to Mathilda on the occasion of his departure for Italy in 997. In Wolf's assessment, such power had not been exercised by imperial daughters and sisters in the Carolingian period, and was not to be exercised again afterwards. Wolf argues for the direct influence of Æthelflæd's example on the German situ-

ation. He believes that Æthelflæd's niece Eadgyth, whom her father Edward the Elder married to the future Otto I in 929, would have heard much about her aunt, although she was only about two years old when Æthelflæd died; that, following Æthelflæd's example, Eadgyth herself assumed a position of significant influence at the Ottonian court; and that through Eadgyth that example was transmitted to other female members of the German imperial family. The argument is intriguing, but would require more definitive evidence that Eadgyth was indeed directly influenced by the example of Æthelflæd to make it convincing.

In a lapidary article, Peter Sawyer challenges the accepted chronology for the Scandinavian kingship of York during the reign of Eadred, king of England 946–55 ("The Last Scandinavian Kings of York," *Northern History* 31, 39–44). Eadred was recognized as king in Northumbria only at the beginning and end of his reign. According to the latest (1986) edition of the *Handbook of British Chronology*, the sequence of kings of York during Eadred's reign was as follows: Eadred 946–47; Erik Haraldsson 947–48; Olaf Sihtricsson 950?–52; Erik Haraldsson 952–54; Eadred 954–55. This chronology is based on the D and E manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Historia regum* attributed to Symeon of Durham, and the *Flores historiarum* of Roger of Wendover. However, the exact sequence of the *Handbook* occurs in no single one of these sources, but is a conflation of them all; and, as Sawyer shows, the dates in the D and E manuscripts are unreliable for this period. Sawyer's analysis of the sources and of charter evidence leads him to conclude that the sequence should be: Eadred 946–47; Olaf 947–50; Erik 950–?52; Eadred 952?–55. The relevant charter evidence concerns the occurrence as witness of Wulfstan, archbishop of York, who was imprisoned by Eadred when the king marched north following the acceptance of Erik as king in York. Wulfstan witnesses charters until 950, but does not attest any of Eadred's five charters dated 951; there are no surviving charters for 952, but Wulfstan appears as witness once more in 953, which suggests that he had been at least partly restored to favor by then, and, concomitantly, that Erik had been expelled by that year. Sawyer concludes his article by noting that it could be objected that numismatic evidence confirms the conventional chronology. Two types of coin were struck in the name of Erik, and it has been assumed that these reflect his two periods as king of York, as proposed by the *Handbook*. However, Sawyer points out that there is no decisive numismatic argument for such an interpretation, and that the two types could just as well have been contemporary with one another. He hopes that his suggested revised chronology will prompt numismatists to re-examine their evidence.

Janet M. Pope, in "Monks and Nobles in the Anglo-Saxon Monastic Reform" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 17, 165–80), looks beyond royal patronage of the tenth-century Benedictine reform to examine the role played by aristocratic patrons, and to analyze the reasons that lay behind aristocratic decisions to support particular monasteries. She draws much

of her evidence from the cases of the six monasteries of Abingdon, Burton, Ely, Glastonbury, Ramsey, and Worcester. Her examination of the sources shows that, while aristocrats certainly made donations for religious reasons, they were also strongly influenced by familial, social, and political factors. Her conclusions parallel those reached by Barbara Rosenwein in her study of tenth- and eleventh-century Cluny (*To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* [Ithaca, 1989]). Among Pope's principal examples is the case of the family of Ealdorman Ælfgar. His daughters Æthelflæd and Ælfflæd (the latter the wife of Ealdorman Byrhtnoth, vanquished at Maldon) patronized the same houses as Ælfgar himself: Stoke-by-Nayland, Christ Church (Canterbury), Bury St. Edmunds, Barking, St. Paul's (London), and Mersea. It is notable that these included both unreformed and reformed houses; the donations were guided by considerations of kinship. A similar pattern is revealed by the donations of the family of the Ealdorman Æthelwine who gave the land on which St. Oswald founded Ramsey Abbey. Æthelwine's father, Athelstan "Half-King," was a patron of Glastonbury (and finally became a monk there); Æthelwine and five of his kin all patronized Glastonbury. Monastic patronage was clearly influenced strongly by the dynamics of the kin group. Similarly, social enmity could impact upon the monasteries. Following the death of King Edgar in 975, the two ealdormen Æthelwine and Ælfhere emerged as major political adversaries who patronized or attacked monasteries as an expression of political alliance. Both men patronized some reformed houses and despoiled others: Ælfhere despoiled Æthelwine's Ramsey, and none of Oswald's foundations received anything from any of Ælfhere's kin; rather, they supported Glastonbury and Abingdon, associated with Dunstan and Æthelwold, and Æthelwine on occasion despoiled Æthelwold's foundation of Ely. Pope concludes that "[i]n essence, the aristocratic gifts to monasteries can illuminate not only the religious life of tenth-century England but the social, familial, and political bonds of that world as well" (180).

B.R. Taylor's 1994 University of Manchester Ph.D. thesis, "Tithes in Eleventh-Century England and the Norman Influence," characterizes itself as "the first study to be made of the early developments of tithe-payment in England and to put these developments into their European context." Taylor notes the changes made to tithe-renders during the later tenth century, when King Edgar's law code ruled that tithe was to be rendered from a tenth of the ploughland: this measure was intended to replace existing fixed tithe-payments, although it was never fully effective. A different tithe-tradition developed in Normandy in the pre-Conquest period. There, the Norman rulers' enthusiasm for monasticism as a stabilizing force led the ducal family to found a number of monastic houses and to donate most of their tithes to monks, and to encourage their knights to act similarly. Taylor shows that in post-Conquest England, tithe-payments made to monks by the Conqueror and his knights in the Norman

tradition from their English demesne-lands contrasted with the tithe-renders being made at the same time by Anglo-Saxon villagers. Taylor also considers the introduction into England of the village tithe-keeper, an officer who is recorded in both Domesday Book and contemporary deeds, and who can be shown to have originated in Normandy. (Abstract only seen.)

Patricia Halpin's "Women Religious in Late Anglo-Saxon England" (*Haskins Society Journal* 6 [1994], 97-110) argues that in the tenth and eleventh centuries, female religious life, when compared with the earlier Anglo-Saxon period, experienced not decline but "a golden age of a different sort" (97). Few women's foundations remained and abbesses receded from public life, but women's devotion thrived in unconventional forms. Some widows led religious lives on their own estates while retaining secular roles. Moreover, as both male and female patrons supported men's communities or manorial churches rather than nunneries, individual women or small groups associated themselves with monasteries or canonries and lived as vowesses or hermitesses with support from the male foundations. A number of post-Conquest women's foundations apparently arose from these hermitages on the edge of male communities, marking social acceptance of alternative religious lifestyles chosen by the women themselves.

In "Cnut's Geld and the Size of Danish Ships" (*English Historical Review* 110, 392-403), N.A.M. Rodger, of the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich, London, uses philological and archaeological evidence to reinterpret a much discussed passage in the E-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, concerning King Harthacnut's imposition of a severe geld upon the English in 1040, to pay for his fleet. The Chronicle reports that £21,099 was paid to sixty-two ships, and a further £11,048 to thirty-two ships, at the rate of eight marks "æt ælcere hamulan." The passage has prompted scholars to calculate the size of the Danish ships and the number of men they carried. For example, Simon Keynes, in *The Diplomas of King Æthelred the "Unready"* (1980), valuing the mark at 13s. 4d., calculated the crew of each ship as consisting of sixty-five men, while M.K. Lawson, in an article published in the *English Historical Review* in 1984, reckoning the mark at 10s. 8d., arrived at a figure of eighty men. Rodger draws attention to the fact that these calculations rest on some questionable assumptions about the meaning of the term *hamele*, otherwise unattested in Old English (with one possible but dubious exception), and about the ways in which the ships would have been manned. *hamele* has traditionally been interpreted as meaning "rowlock," but Rodger draws upon parallel evidence from Scandinavian sources to show that the term was used to refer to a unit of naval service, to the man, or men, levied to man each "half-room" in a vessel, the "room" being that section of a hull within which a pair of oars were worked. The half-room need not necessarily have been manned by a single person: Norwegian evidence suggests that it could include two, three, or more men. Further, one should entertain the

possibility that ships' crews may have incorporated a core of more professional sailors who may not have been included in the *hamele*. In the event, Rodger believes that for Harthacnut's fleet, the *hamele* was probably a unit of one man, and that previous calculations of the size of the crews are likely to be approximately correct. However, he concludes with a caution against too readily making the equation that "one man equals one oar": "warships were often manned on twice or thrice this scale" (402).

The extent of Norman influence in England during the reign of Edward the Confessor has for long been a topic of investigation among historians. In an article full of perceptive insights, C.P. Lewis puts a new perspective on this issue ("The French in England before the Norman Conquest", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 17, 123–44). It has too readily been assumed, Lewis shows, that all those with French names in England before 1066 were Normans; many clearly came from other parts of France. Again, too much attention has been focused on the court, and on the rise and fall of the Norman faction in 1051–52. Lewis paints a broader picture. "The contention of this paper . . . is that the Normans at court were unrepresentative of the Frenchmen in England before 1066. The typical Anglo-Frenchman of Edward's reign was not one of his Norman cousins or household priests whose lives revolved around winning favours from the king, but a local landowner of modest wealth and uncertain (to us) origins settled on a manor somewhere in provincial England" (124). The core of his paper comprises an analysis of those with French names who are listed in Domesday Book as having held land in England during the Confessor's reign. An Appendix lists these individuals—seventy-nine in all—and notes the extent, whereabouts, and value of their land-holdings. Lewis shows that the men and women in question spanned quite a wide social range, from those who were no better off than rich peasants to very wealthy thegns. Geographically, few held land in Yorkshire, north-west Mercia, the Danelaw, and the south-east Midlands; the greatest concentration occurred in central Wessex and the south-east. The distribution pattern can be explained in part by the influence of the Frenchmen at Edward's court: for example, the Frenchmen in Herefordshire and the adjoining parts of Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, south Shropshire, and south Staffordshire might all have arrived with Earl Ralph of Hereford. The most obvious characteristic is that the main concentrations of French thegns were in southern English counties like Hampshire, Sussex, Surrey, and Kent, that is, in those districts most easily accessible from France. The French presence in England was an aspect of a broader West European trend, the search of noble migrants for land. "French names and French thegns before the Norman Conquest are . . . a further strand of evidence for the many and varied ways in which England was gradually tightening its many bonds with the nearer parts of the Continent in the earlier eleventh century" (139). It is notable also that these French settlers of the pre-Conquest period were regarded by the Norman con-

querors as having been assimilated into the English population; in the laws of William the Conqueror they have a legal status the same as that of the indigenous English.

Two articles by Patrick Wormald consider the tenth- and eleventh-century origins of the English state, and discuss the factors that made late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England a more stable political entity than contemporary Continental powers: "The Making of England" (*History Today* [February 1995], 26–32) and "Engla Lond: The Making of an Allegiance" (*Journal of Historical Sociology* 7 [1994], 1–24). The two articles cover much the same ground, with that in the *Journal of Historical Sociology* being directed at a more professional audience. The title of the *History Today* article echoes that of the notable exhibition held at the British Museum in 1991. Wormald argues that, strictly speaking, the exhibition was mistitled, for it covered the period from the conversion in 597 to Alfred's death in 899, and even by the end of that period, there was no single kingdom of England that had been "made." It was Alfred's grandson Athelstan who, during the 920s, was the first to call himself "king of the Anglo-Saxons." What distinguishes England from the Continent is that from the tenth century onwards, there was persistent allegiance to the national identity. Regional forces could have split England asunder, but they did not. In part this can be explained by patterns of land-holding. As Domesday Book reveals, during the time of Edward the Confessor the more powerful in the kingdom held land in several different regions. They therefore had a vested interest in preventing the division of the kingdom. However, at a deeper level, Wormald detects "an ideologically engendered allegiance" that is "the key to the antiquity and resilience of the English state" ("Engla Lond," 3). The idea of "England" was current long before a single kingdom emerged. Gregory the Great, when despatching the Augustinian mission, looked upon all the pagans whom Augustine was to convert as "Angli." A single English kingdom was anticipated by a single English church, and the very name "English" was one of its fruits. The sense of national identity was, moreover, fostered and spread by Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, which furnished the Anglo-Saxons with the idea that, like the children of Israel, they were a people in covenant with God—an idea exploited by King Alfred in his laws. "England was *not* made as a fact in the period covered by the British Museum exhibition, but it had been born as an idea. Its ultimate makers would achieve a more permanent creation than any continental counterpart because they did not have to invent their own ideological justification" ("The Making of England," 32).

James Campbell delivered the British Academy's 1994 Raleigh Lecture on History on the theme of "The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximum View" (*Proceedings of the British Academy* 87, 39–65). Campbell investigates the institutions and practices that had made of England, by the eleventh century, what can only be termed a "nation state": that is, "an entity with an effective central authority, uniformly organized institutions, a national language, a national church, defined

frontiers (admittedly with considerable fluidity in the North), and, above all, a strong sense of national identity" (47). He seeks to identify what in the late Anglo-Saxon state was new and what old, what linked it with other Western European countries and what set it apart. Of basic importance for the assertion and implementation of central authority was an overall system of land-assessment. Such a system, seen in greatest detail in Domesday Book, can be traced back through the County Hidage, the Burghal Hidage, and the Tribal Hidage, the latter dating from the seventh or eighth century. The Tribal Hidage is already indicative of complex government organized over wide areas; Campbell makes the arresting suggestion (45) that the assessment systems of Anglo-Saxon England may even "have had an ancestry extending back to the Iron Age kingdoms of the time of Caesar." The hundredal system, on the other hand, he sees as a creation of the late ninth or the tenth century. Another significant development that can be dated to the tenth century was the change in the role of the ealdorman. In the ninth century, Wessex and probably Mercia had an ealdorman for each shire; but by some time before 1000 the ealdorman had responsibility for many shires. This meant that in England there was no longer an equivalent for the Carolingian or post-Carolingian count. One of the features of the break-up of Carolingian power was the development of comital independence, but in England there were no counts to become independent. Campbell also detects a considerable, and distinctive, degree of constitutionalism in late Anglo-Saxon England, with emphasis placed on formal procedures. It is notable, for example, that in the debacle of 1051, Earl Godwin faced charges before a formal assembly, with stress laid on conciliar participation. A remarkable concern to have the goodwill of the political nation is apparent in Cnut's two letters (respectively dating from 1019/20 and 1027) addressed to the English nation at large; these letters from the monarch to the nation cannot be paralleled in any other contemporary Western European power. A further significant contrast with the Continent lay in the system of justice, which in England was notably more public and less seigneurial than elsewhere. Campbell endorses Stenton's view that, in however narrow a form, the late Anglo-Saxon state had the character of a constitutional monarchy. It was, moreover, a state whose institutions were sufficiently strong to survive and to continue to impart their impress to national life after the Norman Conquest.

Two papers by Lesley Abrams cover the Christianization of the Scandinavian countries and the part played therein by the Anglo-Saxon church: "Eleventh-Century Missions and the Early Stages of Ecclesiastical Organisation in Scandinavia" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 17, 21–40) and "The Anglo-Saxons and the Christianization of Scandinavia" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 24, 213–49). The papers complement one another and overlap in their content. Their principal themes are the role of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries in the conversion of Scandinavia in the late tenth and eleventh centuries, the rivalry with the archdiocese of Hamburg–Bremen (which considered that it

had a mandate for the conversion of the North), the nature of ecclesiastical organization in the different Scandinavian countries, and the identity of the English churches with which the missionary effort was most closely linked. Reliable written evidence for the period is scanty: Abrams notes the irony of the fact that documentation is much better for the ultimately unsuccessful ninth-century mission led by the Frank St. Anskar than for the more lastingly fruitful work of the late tenth and eleventh centuries. The principal sources are passages in Adam of Bremen's *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae*—passages from which the scholar must on occasion filter out elements of bias—and later Scandinavian sagas which the historian must treat with caution. Additionally, significant insights can accrue from examination of archaeological, architectural, and liturgical evidence. The written sources provide us with the names of several Anglo-Saxon missionaries, but generally do not note where in England they came from. However, at least one missionary may have been linked with Glastonbury, for the *De antiquitate Glastoniensis ecclesiae* by William of Malmesbury includes a list of bishops among whom is one Sigefridus who was "episcopus Norwegianus," apparently during the time of King Edgar (957–75). Again, the late eleventh-century *Miracula sancti Yvonis* by Goscelin records a monk, Wulfred, and a bishop, Siward, who returned to Ramsey some time between 993 and 1009 after a stint as missionaries "per alta pericula maris et nationum gentilium." Abrams suggests that they could have been among the missionaries whom Adam of Bremen reports to have assisted King Olaf Trygvesson of Norway (995–1000). She also wonders whether a missionary impulse may have been felt in parts of England with major Scandinavian settlement; certainly, the missionary Grimkel, whom Adam of Bremen reports to have been recruited from England by King Olaf Haraldsson (1014–30), has a name suggestive of possible Scandinavian background. The ecclesiastical organization initially established in Scandinavia by the English missionaries differed significantly from that at home in England. Fixed sees were not at first established. In contrasting this with the way rulers had quickly granted territories to the early Anglo-Saxon church, Abrams suggests that the difference resulted from the fact that, unlike Anglo-Saxon rulers of earlier centuries, Viking-Age Scandinavian kings, while personally strong, were weak in institutional terms, and may not have had land to give. The missionaries seem to have served on the one hand as personal chaplains to Scandinavian monarchs, and on the other as workers in the field, preaching to the pagans. Archaeological evidence attesting to the cessation of pagan burial practices in various parts of Scandinavia indicates their success in the latter capacity. When dioceses were established, English ecclesiastical practice had a significant impact on the organization and liturgical practice of the cathedral churches. For example, at Odense ca. 1095, monks from Evesham were recruited to set up a monastic cathedral chapter along English lines; the cathedral was dedicated to King Cnut the Holy (d. 1086), and the liturgy for him composed at Odense—the

earliest known to have been produced in Denmark—was directly related to that in use at St. Albans in England. Abrams ends her *Anglo-Saxon England* article by commenting that, while formal record is for the most part woefully scarce, the English contribution to the Christianization of Scandinavia can be further illuminated by the continuing examination of linguistic, liturgical, architectural, and archaeological evidence.

i. The Conquest and Beyond

C.D. LEE's "England's Naval Trauma: 1066" (*Mariner's Mirror* 80 [1994], 208–9) responds to Christine and Gerald Grainge's article "The Pevensey Expedition: Brilliantly Executed Plan or Near Disaster?" (*Mariner's Mirror* 79 [1993], 261–73) which, in assessing the course adopted by the Norman invasion fleet in September 1066, had criticized the naivety of King Harold's defensive strategy and his decision to dismiss the *scyp fyrð* just a few days before the Conqueror finally set sail. Lee defends Harold's naval strategy and choice of the Isle of Wight as the point of muster, and suggests that he was the victim of circumstances. No order for the assembly of a fleet had been issued for some fifteen years, since Edward the Confessor had disbanded the fleet and canceled the geld for its upkeep. This complicated the muster procedure, as did the treacherous activities of Harold's brother Tostig, who arrived at Wight while the muster was taking place. Harold's choice of the Isle of Wight was sound enough, for had wind conditions been normal, the Conqueror's fleet, assembled at Dives, could have been expected to reach the English coast somewhere near Bosham. It was the long wait resulting from prolonged contrary winds that finally obliged Harold to dismiss the *scyp fyrð* and William to move his fleet eastwards along the Norman coast and change his route to England. In respect of his nautical defense strategy, Harold should be known, Lee suggests, not as "the Incompetent," but as "the Unfortunate" (209).

In *Neglected Heroes: Leadership and War in the Early Medieval Period* (Westport, CT, and London), Terry L. Gore attempts to retell the story of various medieval battles and campaigns. His premise is that military historians have undervalued medieval tactical thinking and the inspirational role of the leader, which he seeks to highlight. One chapter relates to Anglo-Saxon England: "The Campaign for England: Harold II, Hardrada and William the Conqueror, A.D. 1066" (59–86 and 183–7). The chapter retraces the course of the Battles of Fulford Gate, Stamford Bridge, and Hastings by drawing on a wide range of medieval sources. However, there is little that is new in Gore's perceptions, and there is no attempt to assess the accuracy and value of the different sources, so that, for example, the words that Snorri Sturluson puts in the mouths of the protagonists of Stamford Bridge in *King Harald's Saga* are treated as though they were genuine. The chapter holds little to draw the interest of the professional historian, and there is a scattering of infelicities and errors, including repeated references to the "Bayeau Tapestry"

(e.g. pp. 61, 62) and the statement that the Utrecht Psalter is a mid-eleventh-century manuscript "showing mounted Englishmen in fighting poses" (63).

Elizabeth van Houts's article "The Norman Conquest through European Eyes" (*English Historical Review* 110, 832–53) sets out to rectify a surprising omission in modern historiography: that no historian of the Norman Conquest and no biographer of William the Conqueror has ever examined how the events of 1066 are treated in Continental sources. Restricting herself to Western Europe, and setting her chronological limit at 1150, she considers in turn the accounts of William's Conquest in annals and chronicles written in Scandinavia, the Holy Roman Empire, Flanders, France, and Italy. Her footnotes provide full citations from the Latin sources. Her conclusion is that Continental contemporaries "expressed at least as much condemnation of the arguments and violence used by the Normans as they expressed admiration of the military victory and the reform of the English church" (852). In Scandinavia there was regret over the failure of an Anglo-Danish union; German chroniclers bespeak fear of Norman aggression coupled with admiration for William's achievement; Flemish authors, mindful of the longstanding ties between England and Flanders, are unanimous in condemning William's aggression; French sources tend to express admiration for William and to support his claim that he fought a just war; Italian Normans showed themselves to be William's natural partisans. About a generation after the Conquest, the realization that the Normans were going to stay in England resulted in Continental views becoming more positive, with retrospective justification of the Conquest. Occasionally the Continental sources provide information or insights not otherwise available. For example, Adam of Bremen writes that William confiscated 300 ships left in England by Harald Hardrada, together with the gold that Harald had collected while a Varangian guard in Greece; if, as is possible, this story originated with King Svein of Denmark, then it reinforces the hypothesis that Svein's attacks on England in the immediate post-Conquest period were inspired by a quest for booty as well as land. Again, among French chroniclers, Hariulf of Saint-Riquier, whose abbot Gervinus was on good terms with Edward the Confessor and his queen, reports that Harold Godwinson broke an oath sworn to King Edward himself whereby he would have conceded the kingdom to Edward's cousin Ælfgar. Hariulf has almost certainly mistaken the name, for there is no evidence that Ælfgar, son of Leofwine, earl of East Anglia, ever had pretensions to the throne. But if, as seems likely, by Ælfgar Hariulf means Edgar the Atheling, then his story would support the tradition that at some point—perhaps in the early 1060s—King Edward considered that his young nephew might be a suitable successor.

In "William the Conqueror and Ireland" (*Irish Historical Studies* 29 [1994], 145–58), Benjamin Hudson posits that there were two distinct phases in the Conqueror's relations with Ireland, 1072 being the pivotal year that brought a

change in policy. He supports his case with a variety of evidence which perhaps cannot in all cases support the conclusions he reads into it, although his basic case is justifiable. William seems at first to have treated Ireland as a possible threat. Troops from Ireland had participated in attacks on England at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, and at least two sons of Harold fled to Ireland after Hastings, being sheltered there by Diarmait mac Máel na mBó, king of Leinster and claimant to the high-kingship of Ireland. During the early years of his reign, the Conqueror appears to have feared the possibility of an Irish-Anglo-Saxon-Danish alliance, and it was perhaps to counter the possible threat from Ireland that he settled some of his ablest military leaders in the west of England, for example William fitz Osbern, who in 1067 was designated *comes palatii* of a region extending at least from Herefordshire to Bristol. However, following Diarmait's death in 1072, Toirrdelbach ua Briain, king of Munster, emerged as the most powerful man in Ireland, and a new era in Hiberno-English affairs appears to follow, with William cultivating good relations with Toirrdelbach. One sign of this is the interaction between the Irish and English churches, visible in the Irish request to Lanfranc, in 1074, to consecrate Patricius, the newly elected bishop of Dublin. Hudson speculates that friendly relations with Toirrdelbach could perhaps have been a factor that contributed to the failure of the earls' revolt of 1075: it is notable that, while the Danes were invited to participate in the revolt, no Irish took part. By contrast, in 1080 Toirrdelbach's son Diarmait ua Briain led a fleet to Wales and ravaged the countryside. Hudson suggests, again somewhat speculatively, that this action could have been undertaken on William's behalf to bring Welsh princes to heel and to pave the way for William's Welsh expedition of 1081, during which Rhys ap Tewder, prince of Dyfed, offered himself as William's client. Whether or not this was so, Hudson's basic suggestion of two distinct phases in the Conqueror's attitude to and relations with Ireland seems a fair conclusion from the available evidence.

Ann Williams describes her *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY) as a study that "differs from many others in being concerned with the conquered rather than the conquerors" (1). The book is filled with detailed information to illustrate its central theme of the experience of the English under their Norman conquerors up until the mid-twelfth century. Williams describes the early resistance in the years immediately following the Conquest—the stand against the Conqueror at Exeter, the northern rebellion, the Fenland opposition, and the Revolt of the Three Earls—and the Conqueror's strong action against that resistance. These events produced a hardening of attitude that, she feels, prevented any chance of the creation of an Anglo-Norman society comparable to the Anglo-Danish society of Cnut's reign. Paradoxically, it may have been the Conqueror's initial mildness that produced this situation. Cnut's conquest was in the first place far more brutal, but no revolts resulted and those English magnates not killed in the

course of the Danish takeover retained their wealth and power. The Norman Conquest, by contrast, was followed by the imposition of a foreign elite, both lay and ecclesiastical, upon the native inhabitants. The few Englishmen who thereafter held land directly from the king fell into two principal groups: surviving kinsmen of Edward the Confessor, and royal servants and officials of various kinds. The experience of the second group—which included such men as Godric the steward, who had charge of various royal manors, and Bernard, scribe to Henry I and holder of lands in Cornwall—shows how through royal service it was possible, if only on a modest scale, for families to regain something of what they had lost at the Conquest. Williams' survey of mesne-tenants, which she bases on the evidence of the four counties of Dorset, Kent, Cambridgeshire, and Shropshire, shows that at this level also, while very few English survived as major landholders, lesser men managed to salvage something: "They have been reduced in wealth and in social standing, and have survived by commending themselves to the incoming continental magnates, by undertaking ministerial duties, and by taking land at farm, sometimes on onerous terms" (96). There was a notable regional variation in that there was a much higher rate of survival of English mesne-tenants in the Mercian and northern regions than in the south of the country. While Normans replaced English in the upper echelons of society, they were none the less respectful of English institutions and traditions. Williams points out that in the ecclesiastical context, this is to be seen in the Norman enthusiasm for monastic cathedral chapters: these increased in number from the pre-Conquest four to nine by the early twelfth century. The renaissance of monasticism in the north she describes as a genuinely Anglo-Norman venture, looking to the Anglo-Saxon past but building for the future, and marked by community of interest between English and Normans. Respect for the Anglo-Saxon past was notable among those who, in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, revived the art of writing history. In a fine chapter on "Remembering the Past," Williams analyzes the historiography of Eadmer, John of Worcester, Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Geoffrey Gaimar, and Ailred of Rievaulx. These historians all admired Bede, whose *Historia ecclesiastica* has been said to have created the first image of a unified English people. Their own work, "by presenting the pre-Conquest past as part of a 'continuous history of England', helped to weld English and Normans into a new English nation" (186).

As Robin Fleming notes in her article "Oral Testimony and the Domesday Inquest" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 17, 101–22), over the last thirty years much scholarly attention has been applied to the "shadowy written records" that lie behind Domesday Book. Fleming, by contrast, now seeks to draw attention to the nature of the oral testimony voiced at the assemblies that were convened in order for the Domesday inquest to be made. She examines a triad of topics related to Domesday testimony: local assemblies, jurors, and writs. She

notes that from the Domesday text itself, it is evident that the groups of jurors representing different hundreds were assembled and empaneled at the same time and in the same place in each county, and that in addition to the juries of sworn hundredmen, county and borough panels and individuals with their followers were present: this is apparent from the fact that the testimony of different groups and individuals appears side by side in Domesday Book, countering, lending support to, or supplementing the memories of other jurors. Fleming finds the roots of such combined courts in the late Anglo-Saxon legal system: for example, in the late tenth century, eight Northamptonshire and East Anglian hundreds had convened at Wansford to adjudicate a territorial dispute between Bishop Æthelwold and the widow Siflæd. As for the oral testimony that was voiced by the jurors in the Domesday assemblies and recorded in Domesday Book, historians have tended to trust it. However, Fleming emphasizes that the opinions of jurors were likely to have been influenced by the personal relationships upon which they depended. It is also notable that lords who controlled lands in villis where hundred courts traditionally met appear to have had a better chance of placing "their" men on juries than other lords. Evidence here comes from the two Domesday satellites, the *Inquisitio comitatus Cantabrigiensis* and the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, which provide the names of the jurors representing different hundreds. It is reasonable to conclude that the lords of jurors, through their personal influence, had a definite impact upon the verdicts presented by the courts and on the tenor of the descriptions and adjudications that were eventually incorporated into the Domesday survey. Again, Fleming detects Anglo-Saxon precedents for the ability of great men to receive favorable judgments at local courts: for example, in the "anti-monastic reaction" that followed King Edgar's death in 975, both Ely Abbey and Rochester Cathedral were stripped of disputed lands by decisions of local assemblies whose jurors apparently came under pressure from the laymen laying claim to the land. The final portion of Fleming's article considers how the king eventually succeeded in making inroads into local assemblies and increased his ability to direct their actions and suitors in ways that would have been inconceivable in Edward the Confessor's reign. The Conqueror and his sons played a crucial role in this through their increasing use of writs and their diversification of the purposes for which writs were used: whereas in the Anglo-Saxon period the king, through his writ, harnessed local assemblies in order to intervene specifically in fiscal matters relating to his rights and property, following the Conquest the king regularly used writs to mandate assemblies to remedy particular disputes in which royal interests were not directly threatened. The Domesday inquest itself swiftly routinized the employment of the writ as a proof of seisin and as a way of bringing disputes to law. The first generation of Norman rule saw impressive gains in royal power over local interests.

The status and reliability of oral testimony is also a focus for Patrick Wormald in his "Lordship and Justice in the Early

English Kingdom: Oswaldslow Revisited," in *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge), 114–36. The paper is an elaborated version of the one that he gave at the 1992 conference on St. Oswald (published in 1996 as "Oswaldslow: An Immunity?" in *St. Oswald: Life and Influence*, ed. Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt). Oswaldslow was a hundred of 300 hides belonging to Worcester Cathedral. According to Domesday Book, the bishop of Worcester had for long held special rights there: the profits of justice accrued to him, as did all the dues and obligations that might otherwise have been owed to the king; the king's officers were excluded from exercising their normal judicial functions there. Maitland used the example of Oswaldslow to argue that the "seigneurial" or "feudal" justice that existed on the Continent was developing in pre-Conquest England too; Maitland held that the privileges enjoyed by Worcester would by no means have been unique in Anglo-Saxon England, and that the granting of such privileges had potentially grave effects on both royal revenue and enforcement of the royal will. Wormald, however, holds that it is most unlikely that pre-Conquest bishops of Worcester actually held the kinds of privileges in Oswaldslow that Domesday Book outlines. Although Domesday Book states that "the whole shire" testified to these privileges, Wormald shows that those who had the ear of the Domesday commissioners were men favorable to Worcester's claims: the bishop of Worcester had a strong hold over "county opinion." Although judicial revenues from Oswaldslow may indeed have been alienated to the bishop in Anglo-Saxon times, it is most unlikely that royal officials were excluded from the hundred. That Worcester's post-Conquest claims over Oswaldslow were inflated is indicated by the dispute with the abbot of Evesham concerning the matter. There is, indeed, no surviving documentation to support those claims. Further, there is nothing in Anglo-Saxon legislation or litigation to support the idea that immunities were created anywhere in the country, although in the Anglo-Norman period such houses as Glastonbury, Ramsey, Ely, and Bury St. Edmunds fabricated documents to press such claims. Wormald concludes that, "[s]o far from affording evidence that royal justice was passing into private hands, the whole drift of pre-conquest legislation tends to integrate lordship into its administration. The sort of references that Carolingian capitularies make to immunities have absolutely no English counterparts" (132).

Victor Head attempts to reconstruct the career of that leader of resistance to the Conquest, Hereward the Wake, in *Hereward* (Stroud). His principal sources are the twelfth-century *De gestis Herewardi* in Peterborough Cathedral MS 1 (now kept in Cambridge University Library), the accounts of Hereward's activities in John of Worcester's chronicle, in the chronicle attributed to Ingulph of Crowland, and in Geoffrey Gaimar's *L'Estorie des Engles*, and the references to Hereward as a landholder in Domesday Book. The *De gestis Herewardi* presents much the fullest narrative, but, although it claims to be based in part on a poem by Hereward's chaplain Leofric, it

includes much that is of dubious veracity, from which the grains of truth must be carefully sifted. On Head's analysis, Hereward was born ca. 1037 and was exiled for seditious activity by Edward the Confessor, perhaps ca. 1055; he then spent time in Ireland and Cornwall and later in Flanders, perhaps at the court of Count Baldwin V in Bruges. He returned to England only after the Conquest, perhaps in 1069 on hearing reports of Norman devastation of his Lincolnshire homeland, and it was in 1070–71 that he emerged as the leader of Anglo-Saxon resistance on the Isle of Ely. Head inclines to the view that he later became reconciled with William: this would explain his appearance as a landholder in Domesday Book, and the account in some sources of his peaceful end and burial at Crowland Abbey. While Head's book includes some original insights, it is not a work intended for the professional historian. Passages from the sources are quoted in translation only, and without full citations to indicate exactly where they may be found within the source in question. There are also extensive quotations from two nineteenth-century works of questionable historical value, Charles Kingsley's novel *Hereward the Wake: Last of the English* and General Thomas Netherton Howard's *Hereward: The Saxon Patriot*. Head accepts, more or less uncritically, the view that Hereward was the son of Earl Leofric of Mercia (a view dismissed vigorously by Freeman in the last century), and there are occasional ineptitudes, as when on p. 17 a page of the Eadwine Psalter is wrongly identified as being from the Utrecht Psalter. The mysterious tenth-century "Abbé Floriancensis" who appears on p. 141 is presumably Abbo of Fleury ("Floriacensis"). In his preface Head comments that any attempt to tell the story of Hereward is "largely an exercise in deduction, surmise and speculation," and that remains the case: the sources are, ultimately, too shadowy to allow any definitively full picture of Hereward's life to emerge.

The impact of the Conquest on monasteries founded during the Anglo-Saxon period is the principal theme of E.F. Cownie's 1994 University of Wales (Cardiff) Ph.D. thesis, "The Religious Patronage of the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy in England: With Special Reference to the Old English Monasteries." Cownie examines the distribution and timing of gifts granted by the Normans, focussing in particular on the five houses of Abingdon, Gloucester, Bury St. Edmunds, St. Albans, and St. Augustine's (Canterbury); the Fenland monasteries and the other Anglo-Saxon foundations are also covered, but in less detail. Cownie finds that the experiences of these monasteries partly reflected general trends in the religious patronage of the time. He notes, however, that the abilities of particularly outstanding abbots could have a profound impact on the volume of patronage that monasteries received. (Abstract only seen.)

It is, of course, generally accepted that feudalism—defined as the tenure of a fee (*feodum*) in return for knight service—was unknown in England before the Conquest: as J.E.A. Jolliffe put it, "because the English had not the fee, they also had not feudalism." Eleventh-century Normandy, by con-

trast, is perceived as having been a highly feudalized society, and the Conqueror has been credited with the introduction of knight service into England. Hirokazu Tsurushima challenges some traditional assumptions in "Feodum in Kent c. 1066–1215" (*Journal of Medieval History* 21, 97–115). The article presents a semantic study of the term *feodum*, based on its occurrences in Kentish documents over a period of some 150 years following the Conquest. The main point to emerge is that it was only in the course of the twelfth century that the concept of *feodum* became inextricably bound with that of military service. In the Domesday period, Tsurushima writes, "there was no necessary connection between military tenure and the word *feodum*" (106). In most cases where the term occurs in Domesday Book, it means a unit of lordship, or a landholder's total holding or "property"; in some other cases, it means land held at rent (*firma*) for a limited term. The early twelfth-century *Leges Henrici Primi* reveal that by that time, in some cases, a man who held a farm in fee did homage for it to his lord. By the middle of the twelfth century, *feodum* had begun to dissociate itself sharply from *firma*, and a case in the *Curia Regis* roll for 1201 clearly distinguishes between the two. Tsurushima concludes that "[i]n the process of the formation of an idea of *feodum unius militis*, the conception of the standard knight's fee had not been created until the thirteenth century" (114). His hope is that closer attention to the development of the meaning of *feodum* will clarify discussion of the introduction and spread of feudalism in England.

j. Local and Regional Studies

ONE HAS COME TO EXPECT that each year will produce a crop of significant contributions to the study of Anglo-Saxon local history. 1995 proved to be no exception.

St. Wilfrid was the master of very considerable estates in the north of England. Some of these were enumerated by his biographer Stephanus who, in his account of the consecration of the church built by Wilfrid at Ripon in the 670s, notes that by royal grants Wilfrid received lands "iuxta Rippel et Ingaedynne et in regione Dunutinga et Incaetlevum in caeterisque locis." Colgrave, in his 1927 edition of Stephanus's *Vita*, identified the four named places as Ribble, Yeadon, Dent, and Catlow. Some of these identifications have since been challenged; in particular, Ian Wood in 1987 argued against Yeadon (near Otley), which is the only one of Colgrave's identifications outside the western Pennines, and suggested instead that there may have been another place called "steep hill" closer to the Ribble Valley. G.R.J. Jones, in "Some Donations to Bishop Wilfrid in Northern England" (*Northern History* 31, 22–8), persuasively restates the case for Colgrave's identification. Stephanus also observes that the territories owned by Wilfrid included the sites of *loca sancta* from which the British clergy had fled some time previously. From his analysis of Wilfrid's territories, Jones suggests that there may formerly have been such British *loca sancta* on Wilfrid's lands at Dent, Hexham, Ripon, and Tidover, as well as at Yeadon. The evidence from which he justifies his view includes the presence

in these places of wells dedicated to St. Helen (known to have been revered by the British church), and the occurrence nearby of place-names including the element *Eccles*, a derivative of Primitive Welsh *eglēs* (meaning a population center with Christian worship). One conclusion that emerges from Jones's study is that all the named donations made to Wilfrid in northern England were located on or flanked Roman roads. Such lands would have been fitting acquisitions "for an ambitious prelate who was also a *grand seigneur*" (38).

W. Pearson, in "Bramham Moor and the Red, White and Brown Battles" (*Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 67, 23–50), seeks to demonstrate that Bramham Moor (Yorkshire)—the venue for two significant battles in the Wars of the Roses—was probably the site of several battles of the Anglo-Saxon period. Bramham Moor is located north-east of Leeds, at the junction of Yorkshire's main Roman roads. Pearson deploys historical, topographical, and linguistic evidence to make his case. The larger, and most interesting, part of his article is devoted to a discussion of the site of the Battle of "Brunanburh," celebrated in verse in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The issue was of course explored in great detail by Alistair Campbell in his 1938 edition of the poem; Campbell's conclusion was that it is impossible to prove where "Brunanburh" took place. Pearson proposes that the Battle of *Vínheiðr* described in the Icelandic *Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar*—a battle in which Egil Skallagrímsson and his brother Thorolf served King Athelstan as mercenaries—is identical with "Brunanburh." Whereas the "Brunanburh" poem gives lamentably few exact details of the battle—its chief aim being to praise the victorious Athelstan—the Icelandic account includes some precise topographical information about the battle-site. Pearson believes that the account may have been handed down in Iceland by one who took part in the events. He then demonstrates a close correspondence between features in the vicinity of Bramham Moor and features mentioned in the account of *Vínheiðr*. He argues that the name "Brunanburh" may be a corruption of the real place-name by the West Saxon poet, whose choice of the name may have been guided by alliterative considerations. Symeon of Durham refers to the location as "Etbrunnanwerc vel Brunnanbyrig"; elsewhere Symeon gives the battlefield the name "Weondune." Pearson suggests that the place-name Bramham may derive from *Brūnan-bām*, and that if so, Symeon's "Brunnanwerc" could signify an earthwork above *Brūnan-bām*/Bramham. He also notes the presence in the area of Wendel Hill, which could be Symeon's "Weondune." Pearson's arguments for Bramham Moor as the site of "Brunanburh" are worthy of serious pondering. He stretches credulity, however, in seeking to suggest that Bramham Moor and its region could have been the site of several other battles of the Anglo-Saxon period: the battle near the River "Winwæd" at which King Oswy defeated Penda of Mercia (655), the battle of Maserfelth (traditionally associated with Oswestry) at which Penda defeated and slew King Oswald (642), the battle of Gwen Ystrad at which Urien Rheged defeated the men of "Prydein," and no less than eight of the twelve battles

that the *Historia Brittonum* associates with King Arthur.

Della Hooke's *Pre-Conquest Charter-Bounds of Devon and Cornwall* (Woodbridge, 1994) is a follow-up to her *The Anglo-Saxon Charter-Bounds of Worcestershire* (1990). The book undertakes a reconstruction of the landscape of Anglo-Saxon Devon and Cornwall insofar as it can be gleaned from the topographical information contained in charters and manumissions. Within the charters, that information usually occurs in three forms: as a description of the location of a particular estate, as a comment upon the appurtenances of an estate, and, most fully, in the boundary-clauses. Hooke provides transcriptions of those portions of the charters, followed by translations and by her notes discussing and providing identifications of places and landscape features mentioned in the documents. These notes are perhaps the most valuable aspect of the book; she is able to refine many of the identifications proposed by H.P.R. Finberg in his *The Early Charters of Wessex* (1964), and by other local studies. Aspects of the book are, however, unsatisfactory. It is disconcerting to be provided with just the topographical phrases from the documents, disembodied from their context. Nor can one feel fully confident of the transcriptions, judging from the case of King Edgar's grant of Tywarnhayle to Eanulf, where the transcription is accompanied by a plate showing the original charter (4–5): comparison of the two reveals some half-dozen transcription errors. Finally, there are numerous errors in translations from Latin. Among the most notable are the rendition of "et maledictus sit qui fregerit hanc libertatem" as "and he would be evil-speaking who infringes this liberty" (81–2; *recte* "and cursed be he . . ."); and of "Carta Adthelstani Regis concessa Beauto [sic] Petro" as "Charter of King Athelstan, by leave of the blessed Peter" (142; *recte* ". . . granted to blessed Peter," i.e. to St. Peter's, Exeter).

Two papers by Pamela Taylor focus on the history of St. Albans Abbey and of portions of Hertfordshire and Middlesex. In "The Early St. Albans Endowment and Its Chroniclers" (*Historical Research* 68, 119–42), she notes that most of what we know of the early history and endowment of St. Albans Abbey comes to us filtered through the famous later St. Albans chroniclers, in particular Matthew Paris and Thomas Walsingham. Paris's *Liber additamentorum* comprises what was until recently the earliest known St. Albans cartulary, and the only one to contain the bulk of the materials relating to the pre-Conquest period. In 1993, Simon Keynes, in his article "A Lost Cartulary of St Albans Abbey" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 22, 253–79), brought to light a seventeenth-century transcript of the twelfth-century cartulary which must have been Paris's source. Examination of the documents in this cartulary and in the other St. Albans medieval sources shows that St. Albans did not, as has commonly been supposed, indulge in wholesale forgery of documents to establish its claim to own estates, as happened, for example, at Westminster and St. Paul's. Taylor shows that St. Albans did not have to resort to forgery because the reputation of St. Alban himself, "protomartyr Anglorum," powerfully encouraged royal and

other donors to endow the abbey with estates: it had no need to fabricate claims to ownership. There is, in fact, little surviving documentation concerning the pre-Conquest endowment, although there does exist a series of grants made by King Æthelred between 996 and 1007. Analysis of the copies of these grants in the transcript of the twelfth-century cartulary shows that there has been a limited amount of doctoring of the grants, chiefly through the insertion of a few interpolated passages, but no wholesale forgery. Taylor suggests that the interpolation took place as the abbey prepared a portfolio of documents to present to Pope Calixtus in 1122, in its successful attempt to secure papal privileges.

Taylor's second article, "Boundaries and Margins: Barnet, Finchley and Totteridge," in *Medieval Ecclesiastical Studies in Honour of Dorothy M. Owen*, ed. M.J. Franklin and Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY), 259-79, charts the history, up until the twelfth century, of the neighboring manors and parishes of Barnet (which belonged to St. Albans Abbey), Finchley (which belonged to the bishops of London), and Totteridge (which belonged to the bishops of Ely). Little early documentary material is available, but the recently discovered St. Albans cartulary proves, by the boundary clauses attached to King Æthelred's grant to St. Albans in 1005, that already by this time Barnet was an identifiable estate. Finchley and Totteridge, for their part, seem to reflect considerable land transfers that occurred in the tenth and early eleventh centuries and that affected a broader area of north Middlesex and south Hertfordshire. The article includes some consideration of broader general issues such as the nature of pastoral provision on Anglo-Saxon estates, and the degree of control exercised by London over its surrounding territory.

David Sullivan, in *The Westminster Corridor: An Exploration of the Anglo-Saxon History of Westminster Abbey and Its Nearby Lands and Peoples* (London, 1994), traces the early

history of Westminster Abbey and its relationship with the Middlesex estates that it acquired in the pre-Conquest period. Those estates formed a corridor of land stretching from Westminster itself in a north-westerly direction and centered on the line of Watling Street, extending as far as the northern limits of the shire of Middlesex. They played a vital role in the abbey's economy. From his examination of Westminster's charters, Sullivan shows that the estates were acquired in two phases. In the first phase, from the foundation under Dunstan's impetus in the early 970s until 1005, the abbey obtained lands in the area of Paddington, Hampstead, and Hendon; in the second wave, during the Confessor's reign, when it also acquired extensive property in other countries, it consolidated its Middlesex holdings through grants of land at Knightsbridge, Westbourne, and Kingsbury. In evaluating the charter evidence, Sullivan acknowledges the problems presented to the historian as a result of the extensive fabrication of documents at Westminster in the twelfth century, and underlines the need to retain the kernel of truth around which the fabrications were made. Individual chapters consider each of the major estates in turn, assessing how much of them would have been meadowland, how much ploughland, and how much woodland, and evaluating how their produce would have met the abbey's needs and demands. The text is well illustrated with a helpful series of color maps, as well as with reproductions of one or two of the relevant charters.

N.G.D. and T.C.G.

[N.G.D. reviewed books and articles by (in order of mention) Keynes, Coupland, McKitterick ("Eight-Century Foundations"), Nelson ("Kingship and Royal Government"), Leyser, Higham, Coates, Gransden, Enright, Jones & Pennick, Pelteret, Cambridge & Rollason, Blair, Mitchell, Yorke, Sturdy, Smyth, and Halpin; T.C.G. reviewed the remainder and co-ordinated the material.]

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 and 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 to the Spring issue, write:

Robert L. Schichler
Department of English
Arkansas State Univ.
State University, AR 72467-1890
fax: 501-972-2795
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